

Summary of issues raised in correspondence

Respondent Number	Correspondence Number	Issue	Summarised Comments
			KEY
			Comments made by
CGr			Campaign and Representative Groups
Com			Commercial organisations
DCo			District Council Members
MPM EP			Member Parliament/Member of the European Parliament
PCo			Parish/ Town Councils
Pub			Public

PCo 001	PFI/ 015	01	When will the consultation start?
Pub 001	PFI/ 016	01	If NYCC is going to build a waste incineration plant, please make sure its a Waste to Energy plant and then at least we derive some use out of our waste
Pub 008	PFI/ 017	01	Information request response forwarded after previous dialogue
Pub 002	PFI/ 021	01	Waste Incinerator at Allerton Park makes very little sense - such an incinerator is designed to produce electricity this requires access to a large supply of water and access to the national grid. Allerton has neither of these therefore there will be a Financial cost and Environmental impact- pylons to tie up with the National Grid.
Pub 002	PFI/ 021	02	Local road system will have additional traffic which is already is great use.
Pub 002	PFI/ 021	03	Why, when the existing power stations near Selby possesses access to both water and the National Grid as well as having access to rail network, they are not being considered? The proposal to site the incinerator at Allerton makes no sense whereas locating it next to an existing power station, especially one that it is coal fired does. Please, therefore, let me know exactly why Allerton has been chosen
Pub 003	PFI/ 022	01	This will be deeply unpopular and I am disgusted that you have wasted taxpayers money on what will be at best a very expensive battle and at worst, and I sincerely hope this will be the case, a failed planning Application. You had the chance to go to consultation before deciding on a controversial strategy but have ignored that opportunity You say you will now consult. Will you drop plans for the incineration aspect of the strategy if the public are against it?
PCo 002	PFI/ 028	01	On behalf of Parish Council I would like to register an interest in the details of the long term PFI contract to manage household waste generated by residents of North Yorkshire and City of York at the Allerton site. Please send up to date information.
Com 001	PFI/ 029	01	I would appreciate if you could let me know the total value of the waste PFI contract (including civils value)
Com 001	PFI/ 029	02	and the design company working for the scheme

Pub 004	PFI/030	01	Protest against waste strategy proposal, They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire County. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly
Pub 004	PFI/030	02	Strategy based on old technologies including incineration which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions.
Pub 004	PFI/030	03	Ignores new government commitments to a massive increase in recycling and a review of waste strategies
Pub 004	PFI/030	04	Ignores the public views of today relying on consultation completed several years ago.
Pub 004	PFI/030	05	Urges member to oppose and asks for a review to include increased recycling
Pub 004	PFI/030	06	At time of spending cuts it would be irresponsible to continue with the current strategy without careful review.
Pub 005	PFI/031	01	There is a lot of concern being expressed about NYCC waste treatment intentions and a lot of confusion. Request for information regarding contractors and are we going to build an incinerator at various location(s) My County Councillor can't or won't tell me anything. Your NY times only mention that May Gurney have taken over NY Waste management. Your web tells me that there is an Exhibition at Boroughbridge for local people on July 15 th . What is going on?
Pub 006	PFI/032	01	Incinerator would produce highly toxic nanoparticles. How will you ensure these particles do not damage health of local children as they inhale them in daily?
Pub 007	PFI/033	01	Request for detailed list of recyclable materials and non recyclable materials which you wish to incinerate.
Pub 007	PFI/033	02	Suggests the hire of a 250 ft high crane for a week to give local residents an in sight of what they will be living with.

Pub 007	PFI/033	03	Where will the 6000 tons of toxic fly ash produced every year from the filters will be dumped?
Pub 007	PFI/033	04	Where will the 70 workers come from, I would expect as usual these will be migrant workers there are none locally!!
Pub 007	PFI/033	05	What penalties will NYCC suffer if they fail to come up with enough waste
Pub 007	PFI/033	06	You say 10% of waste will still go to landfill will this be at Allerton park if yes what is the remaining capacity of Allerton park
Pub 007	PFI/033	07	Will there be an operators licence to keep HGVs at Allerton park if so how many
Pub 007	PFI/033	08	Proximity to homes 200 m and 500m away - why weren't these houses taken into consideration when choosing the site
Pub 007	PFI/033	09	why haven't we been consulted (homes within proximity of Allerton Park)
Pub 007	PFI/033	10	With regards your reply to the property price we have already been informed by a NYCC council that property prices will fall by at least 20% in local villages I am 500m or so form the incinerator and my land adjoins the site I am currently having a before and after valuation carried out
Pub 008	PFI/034	01	How does the project save the Council £320 million - hasn't this figure just been estimated against 'do the minimum' option where escalating landfill taxes make 'doing the minimum' (ie continuing to put all rubbish in landfill) a very expensive option, when in fact there are many more cost effective options to consider . Even to the extent that over 25 years, the Council is saddled with paying far more to you than would have been the case if the alternatives had been introduced from the start?
Pub 008	PFI/034	02	What happens after 25 years - do you dismantle the facility?

Pub 008	PFI/034	03	Isn't the benefit of the electricity generation from incinerating the rubbish insignificant when you aim to produce annually 24mw, how can you justify the infrastructure for such a small amount of power.
Pub 008	PFI/034	04	What are your plans if planning permission for Allerton Park is refused?
Pub 008	PFI/034	05	Would you engage with the Council if they had a change of heart and decided to ask you to completely rethink the strategy along the principals of reduce, reuse and recycle - without an incinerator?
Pub 008	PFI/034a	06	Offer to work with the council to explore if there are viable, cleaner, greener and more economical alternatives to dealing with waste.
Pub 008	PFI/034a	07	Request for contact for details for Yorwaste (Scarborough Power project)
Pub 008	PFI/034b	01	Request for links to DEFRA LATS allocations and AmeyCespa Websites and details of the active and inert waste split
PCo 001	PFI/036	01	Could you please explain exactly what 'very extensive consultations' are, and what is their geographical extent? Surely the whole of NY should be involved?
PCo 001	PFI/036	02	Also, can you please explain why Marton cum Grafton is not on the planning consultee list on this NYCC webpage https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/Online%20Register/
Pub 009	PFI/037	01	Your support is needed - VOTE NO TO INCINERATION - I write to urge you to oppose this strategy so that a review can take place which will hopefully lead to a more environmentally friendly way forward.
Pub 009	PFI/037	02	These plans are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire County. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly
Pub 009	PFI/037	03	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions

Pub 009	PFI/037	04	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies
Pub 009	PFI/037	05	It ignores the public's view today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 009	PFI/037	06	I have found it difficult to recycle with very little help from the local council. We have no recycle point that is less than 5 miles away and we have no facilities in the form of bins provided.
Pub 009	PFI/037	07	The colossal cost of this incineration plant could be better placed helping families by providing better facilities and educating the public about the benefits of recycling.
Pub 009	PFI/037	08	There are so many negatives around incineration, environmental, health and cost and is without doubt the wrong way forward
Pub 009	PFI/037	09	Would you please read the attached presentation and consider the points made?
Pub 010	PFI/038	01	If NYCC fall short in the supply of waste will AmeyCespa impose fines on NYCC?
Pub 010	PFI/038	02	Also has European recycling rates and co2 emissions been taken into consideration,
Pub 010	PFI/038	03	What happens if in 10 years time EEC says no incineration you are signed up for 25 years.
Pub 010	PFI/038	04	I live quite near this site I am also concerned about Nanoparticles entering my blood stream
Pub 010	PFI/038	05	You cannot guarantee this is safe they told us asbestos was safe in the 50's. What unbiased report has been carried out to show this is the best way of getting rid of waste you can not rely on AmeyCespa who have a financial interest in this facility

Pub 011	PFI/039	01	We urge you to give careful consideration to what is proposed and to oppose it.
Pub 011	PFI/039	02	Do not commit us to a £900 million spend over 25 years. Given the current financial difficulties can we afford such expense? What about the other services that will suffer because of this commitment? Do you realize that there are significant penalty clauses associated with this proposal? As part of the contract it is understood that a certain level of waste is needed to feed the incinerator. If this level is not reached the contractor is able to recoup costs from North Yorkshire County Council (i.e. ratepayers) and these penalties are believed to be significant. Are you really prepared to expose the council and the ratepayers to this level of financial risk?
Pub 011	PFI/039	03	This proposal is in opposition to the new government's position on waste management in which they call for a "zero waste" strategy. In the coalition agreement it is stated in the Energy and Climate Change section that: "We will introduce measures to promote a huge increase in energy from waste through anaerobic digestion" -there is no mention of incineration.
Pub 011	PFI/039	04	The proposed facility locks us into outdated technology (incineration) for 25 years and creates increased CO2 emissions as outlined above.
Pub 011	PFI/039	05	Virtually all of this waste could be recycled or reused and disposed
Pub 011	PFI/039	06	Incinerators also prevent recycling as they have to be fed once built
Pub 011	PFI/039	07	They cost jobs in recycling/reuse and they prevent the take up of new and better emerging technologies due to their capital investment and 25 year lifespan
Pub 011	PFI/039	08	The deal centralises waste disposal when we should be de-centralising and dealing with the waste in smaller facilities, run by local companies that can react quickly to changing waste management technologies.
Pub 011	PFI/039	09	There is a huge amount of evidence worldwide that shows just how damaging waste disposal incinerators are to human health via air pollution.
Pub 011	PFI/039	10	Waste will be transported from across the entire county of North Yorkshire to this facility and possibly even from outside to feed this incinerator. Further HGV traffic will only further exacerbate the current problems, not to mention lead to even poorer air quality, which was recently highlighted as slipping below acceptable standards already in towns such as Knaresborough, which is very close by.
Pub 011	PFI/039	11	We urge you to and NYCC to take a lead in the country by exploring methods and technologies other than incineration and setting and achieving much more aggressive recycling targets

Pub 012	PFI/040	01	I strongly oppose the proposed incinerator at Allerton Quarry and to ask you to vote against it when the time comes.
Pub 012	PFI/040	02	I don't believe that there is no health risk.
Pub 012	PFI/040	03	The cost will be enormous and there are alternatives to incineration
Pub 012	PFI/040	04	Investment should alternatively be made in recycling companies.
Pub 012	PFI/040	05	If built the incinerator will have more capacity than there is waste, which means waste will be brought to it from outside the county
Pub 013	PFI/041	01	I am extremely concerned about the increase in our rates bills that would result from the building of a very expensive incinerator at Allerton. This would affect the North Yorkshire County Council residents for many years to come.
Pub 013	PFI/041	02	In the current economic climate this cost seems unnecessary and should not be rushed into before we have worked to increase our recycling rates and can see if there actually is a need.
Pub 013	PFI/041	03	I do not object to Allerton as a waste disposal site but urge you to take care as to the scale of the operation. We do not want to be saddled with processes that cost us huge amounts of money to set up and only seem to benefit AmeyCespa and other regions wishing to dispose of their waste!
Pub 014	PFI/042	01	I write to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals they are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire County. They are misleading because recycling rates could be much higher, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly
Pub 014	PFI/042	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions
Pub 014	PFI/042	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies

Pub 014	PFI/042	04	It ignores the public's view today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 014	PFI/042	05	North Yorkshire has a recycling rate of 44%. The current plan is to only increase recycling by 0.5% between 2013 and 2020 (this just half of one percent in 7 years). This is totally unacceptable when other areas of the country are already achieving over 70% (South Oxfordshire). Other councils across the country have voted against incineration in favour of 100% Anaerobic Digestion, a clean and safe waste disposal method
Pub 014	PFI/042	06	I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture. We should not be tied to a single contractor and a single method of waste disposal for the next 25 years. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review
Pub 015	PFI/043	01	I am writing to you to urge you to oppose these plans as they are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire County. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly
Pub 015	PFI/043	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions
Pub 015	PFI/043	03	It ignores the new Government's recent recommendations for a moratorium on incineration projects and its commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies
Pub 015	PFI/043	04	It ignores the public's view today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 015	PFI/043	05	I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review
Pub 006	PFI/044	01	The so called independent expert present (Harrogate Roadshow 17/07/10) is in fact paid by Cespa - so not really independent at all 'he who pays the piper etc'.
Pub 006	PFI/044	02	None of the presentation material mentioned the dangerous nanoparticles it will emit. When I spoke to the 'independent expert' on the subject of nanoparticles - the first three things she said to me were - yes it will emit nanoparticles - yes they are dangerous- yes they spread widely and cannot really be measured accurately QED After that she tried to reassure me that there was nothing to worry about!!

Pub 006	PFI/ 044	03	This roadshow is strong on the so called pros and very weak on the cons - no surprise there. When are you and the Council going to put on a truly independent and balanced roadshow, giving the public both the pros and cons for their consideration?
Pub 006	PFI/ 045	01	The Scottish Protection Agency's (SEPA) comprehensive health effects research concluded "inconclusively" on health effects in Oct. 2009. The authors stress, that even though no conclusive evidence of non-occupational health effects from incinerators were found in the existing literature, "small but important effects might be virtually impossible to detect". The report highlights epidemiological deficiencies in previous UK health studies and suggests areas for future studies. Scotland is taking a much more cautious 'we do not know all the facts' stance. So why is England being so sanguine?
Pub 006	PFI/ 045	02	You quote the Health Protection Agency report - they say "any potential risk of cancer due to residency near to municipal waste incinerators is exceedingly low and probably not measurable by the most modern techniques" Just because something is not measurable it does not mean that it does not exist or that the risk is small. Any decent scientist would confirm this point. How can the HPA be sure that the cancer risk is low if it's not measurable? Please send me the 'proof' of how they reach this conclusion. Not the evidence (which is always partial) - I'm looking for their PROOF.
Pub 006	PFI/ 045	03	Bonfires and fireworks do emit higher percentages of nanoparticles but of course this argument is fallacious. These bonfires are dispersed across the British Isles and nanoparticles emitted are percentages of a relatively small plume of smoke in each case for a short period. What we are talking about at Allerton is 1% of an enormous amount of smoke concentrated in one location and generated day after day 24/7 for years, much of it likely to be being dumped on small children one mile away. And again because as you say there are no known proven links between ultra fine particles emitted from incinerators and measurable health impacts- does not mean there aren't any. What we do know is that these nanoparticle air emissions are NOT regulated or measured and are certainly not removed by the incineration plant's filters. They travel long distances penetrate deep into the lungs, cross into the bloodstream and then the blood/brain barrier. So - I ask again, how will you ensure these particles do not damage the health of these growing children as they inhale them in daily?
Pub 006	PFI/ 045a		America-like the UK is only just waking up to the potential dangers of nanoparticles Here are some findings from across there....(several non referenced points in support of above).
PCo 003	PFI/ 048	01	This parish has had no information or consultation regarding the above proposal. The subject of waste disposal (household and commercial) is continually discussed at every level, it affects us all and to assume that there is no need to explain not only the amount of money involved in setting up this scheme, but also the processes of incineration and what is involved, is both high handed and inexcusable of the County

PCo 003	PFI/ 048	01	Our coalition government is advising that local communities be involved in how councils are spending their monies and this is a very good example of tax payers being side-lined by their County Council. We ask that you arrange a public meeting to clarify your proposals.
Pub 016	PFI/ 049	01	LIKE many York residents, I am worried the council is preparing to sign a contract for a new incinerator to be built at Allerton quarry.
Pub 016	PFI/ 049	02	Although the incinerator contains some positive design elements, most of its waste will be burnt - thus adding to York's CO2 emissions
Pub 016	PFI/ 049	03	The biggest problem with this incinerator is the fact that it ties the council into a contract for 25 years. This contract stipulates that York must supply the private operator with at least 80 per cent of a pre-arranged level of waste - if the city fails to do this, then the council must compensate the company.
Pub 016	PFI/ 049	04	York residents will surely be concerned about any contract which offers an incentive to the council to keep producing high levels of waste. If York is to play its part in combating climate change, then the council should be looking at long-term strategies to reduce the amount of waste produced in the city - not signing 25 year contracts that trap us into a cycle of consumption that the planet simply cannot afford
Pub 017	PFI/ 050	01	Can you confirm that all domestic waste and some commercial waste from every part of North Yorkshire is to be brought to Allerton? Is NYCC to be responsible for collection and delivery to Allerton? In view of escalating fuel costs and possible shortages in the foreseeable future, never mind congestion and wear and tear on the highways, this seems a ludicrous and very short sighted proposal. Not at all in keeping with a 'green image'. Do you have a transport scheme in mind which does not involve bin lorries travelling from every location in North Yorkshire to Allerton
Pub 006	PFI/ 051	01	Were Drax, Ferrybridge or other power station sites considered for this proposed incinerator? They have the space, the technology, the road network and one more chimney would not make any difference.
Pub 008	PFI/ 052	01	Request for information and links to the Defra website for the LATS Allocations per Council

Pub 008	PFI/ 052	02	What the Council will be paying per tonne of waste processed at Allerton once it is up and running?
PCo 004	PFI/ 053	01	Against the NYCC Waste strategy proposals as they are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire county and because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly
PCo 004	PFI/ 053	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions
PCo 004	PFI/ 053	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies
PCo 004	PFI/ 053	04	It ignores the public's view today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
PCo 004	PFI/ 053	05	The Council urges the County Council to reconsider this plan and seek a thorough review of the way forward In particular it asks that the County council pushes for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such an expensive and risky venture. At a time of Government spending cuts, it would be inappropriate to continue the current strategy without careful review
DCo 001	PFI/ 054	01	Cllr has been given a gate fee for the proposed plant by the above but wants to check if it is correct at between £80-85 per tonne as he was surprised it was as much as this especially compared to the Ferrybridge gate fee at £35/tonne. When I was on the group the latter did have the pre-treatment by an MBT prior to incineration which would be an additional cost presumably. Also he would like to know what the current gate fee is at Scorton?
Pub 018	PFI/ 055	01	I wish to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals. They are based on unrealistically low targets for recycling that exaggerate the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire County. The proposals are misleading because the amount of waste produced is already dropping due to less packaging, and recycling rates could rise much higher and more quickly than assumed in the current waste strategy, with the result that landfill costs would drop significantly. Such a large incinerator and waste management plant is simply not needed in North Yorkshire
Pub 018	PFI/ 055	02	NYCC's current proposals are based on North Yorkshire achieving a recycling rate of 50% only by 2020. We're not far from that figure today. If we recycle more, the need for a huge facility like this will go. Recycling reduces the need for landfill and what is left can be processed more efficiently using newer technologies.
Pub 018	PFI/ 055	03	NYCC's waste strategy proposals claim that incineration is the best way forward. Has NYCC calculated how much an alternative strategy based on increased recycling and waste reduction would cost? There appears to be no "Plan B" - only the one developed by a private contractor that has a vested interest in maximising the amount of waste it can incinerate. Where are the costs for an alternative, green solution based on higher levels of recycling?

Pub 018	PFI/055	04	Surely North Yorkshire can recycle more. Within the county, some districts are already recycling over 50% and 60-70% could be achieved relatively easily and quickly. For example, this year Craven District Council announced that the amount of household waste going to landfill has plummeted since the introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC) Elsewhere, South Oxfordshire has just rolled out its new recycling scheme and in the first period of its operation has achieved rates of 71%.
Pub 018	PFI/055	05	Other counties are also reducing the amount of waste directed to landfill without resorting to incineration. Lancashire dropped its plans for incineration in favour of Anaerobic Digestion and Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT). This process, common in Europe and the USA, Lancashire's target for recycling by 2020 is now 61%, compared to North Yorkshire's target of 50%. West Sussex County Council signed a £1 billion deal with Biffa to process 327,000 tonnes of waste per year, using similar technology to that used by Lancashire. Has NYCC been in contact with any of these councils to research an alternative strategy?
Pub 018	PFI/055	06	There will be no incentive to recycle more or to produce less waste. In fact, if waste levels fell and the district councils sent less waste to be incinerated, there would be financial penalties. Would waste then have to be brought in from outside North Yorkshire to fuel the incinerator?
Pub 018	PFI/055	07	Every person in North Yorkshire will end up paying for this, directly in unnecessary increases in Council Tax or indirectly in reduced investment in other public services.
Pub 018	PFI/055	08	North Yorkshire will be locked into a 25-year deal, unable to respond to new technical innovations in waste management, or to changes in national and EU regulations on waste management. What happens if the costs of incineration go up, or if waste levels fall dramatically as they are expected to do as we move towards a "Zero Waste" economy?
Pub 018	PFI/055	09	The current strategy is based on incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions of any method of waste disposal.
Pub 018	PFI/055	10	NYCC's current proposals fly in the face of the new coalition Government's commitment to reduce CO2 emissions, increase recycling and reduce waste, and comes at a time when a major review of all existing waste strategies is about to start. The new coalition is committed to massively increasing recycling - why is North Yorkshire not following this lead?
Pub 018	PFI/055	11	NYCC's current waste strategy proposals also completely ignore current public opinion, which is strongly in favour of large increases in recycling, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 018	PFI/055	12	I urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward. In particular I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review.

Pub 018	PFI/055	13	Why build such a huge facility?
Pub 018	PFI/055	14	Where would the large amount of waste needed to continue to fuel the incinerator come from? Would it be brought in from outside North Yorkshire? If so, why should we pay for this?
Pub 014	PFI/056	01	I would be grateful if you could provide me with a list of venues in the whole of the North Yorkshire region, with the dates, where AmeyCespa will be hosting public exhibitions about the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Park.
Pub 014	PFI/056	02	I would also be grateful if you could provide the names of the Country Councillors who will be present at each of the exhibitions to answer questions from the public relating to the scheme
Pub 014	PFI/056a	01	<p>On 15 June 2010, the Secretary of State for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs the Rt Hon Caroline Spelman MP announced that the Government would undertake a full review of waste policy in England. http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/waste-review/index.htm The Review of Waste Policy will look at all aspects of waste policy and delivery in England. Its main aim will be to ensure that we are taking the right steps towards creating a 'zero waste' economy, where resources are fully valued, and nothing of value gets thrown away.</p> <p>All comments and suggestions received in the discussion or to the survey before 9 September 2010 will be considered and fed into the Review. The Call for Evidence will close on 7 October 2010. The early results of the Review will be made available in Spring 2011. I would like to enquire if North Yorkshire County Council and City of York Council have any intention to participate in this national Review of Waste Policy and if not, the reason for that decision. As the date of the final vote about the proposed waste facility at Allerton Park in October 2010 is clearly out of sync with the above dates, I request that NYCC postpone the vote at least until the FINAL results of the national review are made public.</p>
Pub 019	PFI/058	01	What are you predicting to be the tonnage of municipal waste for each year between now and 2040 generated by NYCC?
Pub 019	PFI/058	02	How much do you think recycling efforts will reduce that amount by?
Pub 019	PFI/058	03	What assumptions do you make regarding population growth and how that may influence municipal waste levels?

PCo 005	PFI/ 059	01	Very unhappy about NYCC's waste management plan and recent commitment to a 25yr deal to divert waste to a centralised facility
PCo 005	PFI/ 059	02	There was no consultation with our communities on this specific plan
PCo 005	PFI/ 059	03	We call on NYCC to implement a moratorium on the current plan and look at waste management requirements again in the light of recent technological developments and best practice
PCo 005	PFI/ 059	04	We call on NYCC to take a lead in the country setting and achieving much more aggressive recycling targets
Pub 020	PFI/ 060	01	I am writing to object to the proposal that there will be an incinerator at Allerton Park. I will do all in my power to oppose the incinerator.
Pub 020	PFI/ 060	02	According to reports I have read on incinerators, Health effects of Waste incinerators –British Society for Ecological Medicine (2008), there will be various pollutants emitted particularly dioxins. I do not want this land , my grazing animals and ourselves to be eating these pollutants
Pub 020	PFI/ 060	03	I don't believe incineration is the answer. Less rubbish will be recycled
Pub 020	PFI/ 060	04	It has been stated that this is the first incinerator of this type in the country, therefore untried and untested.
Pub 021	PFI/ 062	01	I would like to formally lodge my concerns with you, I can see no benefits to having the biggest waste facility in the UK on my doorstep, regardless of any future environment implications that we are unable to predict at this point.
Pub 021	PFI/ 062	02	I am sure that the incinerators that were banned in the nineties were regarded as 'safe' initially.
Pub 021	PFI/ 062	03	I would like to see alternative solutions pursued, for example, improve domestic recycling. Encourage supermarkets to retrieve the packaging from goods purchased from them - most of which is unnecessary advertising material.

Pub 021	PFI/062	04	I was extremely disappointed that there was no representation from NYCC at the meeting last night, other than John Savage (presentation by AmeyCespa at Great Ouseburn village hall, 20 July)
Pub 021	PFI/062	05	I just don't want it on my doorstep without proper consultation and other avenues explored. This is a very serious matter that requires respectful consideration and dialogue between the local Community and the local Authority that serves us
Pub 022	PFI/063	01	First, let me make plain my position concerning the proposals for Allerton Park. Whilst in a perfect world I would much prefer not to have this facility anywhere near my home, I also recognise that there is a responsibility to take a wider view which appreciates the doomsday scenario of not radically re-organising our methods of waste generation and disposal. Thus my immediate concerns are about the safeguards which need implementation concerning health, transport implications, and the need to minimise the impact on the environment at and around Allerton Park
Pub 022	PFI/063	02	Second, I think it is a mistake for AmeyCespa to be fronting up the consultation process alone. There are fundamental national, regional and local political perspectives which should be, and are, the responsibility of politicians and their advisers to present, promote, and, if necessary, defend. At Great Ouseburn AmeyCespa were trying to do all these things - some effectively, some less so. Where was the politician who could describe the imperatives for change - and justify why so little is being done to reduce packaging and waste generation? Where is the client who prepared the brief? Where is the environment agency which dictates the construction of the so controversial chimney stack? Where are the local public health doctors who could refute some of the more grotesque statements made last night? I was particularly disappointed by the absence of any authoritative NYCC voice - I discount the contribution made by the sole NYCC councillor who attended. I thought it disgraceful that he should seek to distance himself from the Council's brief and in doing so has ensured that a difficult process will be more difficult
Pub 022	PFI/063	03	Third, there are some presentation details which I think need attention. You already intend to produce "what will it look like" pictures of the recovery park. I think it will also be useful to have cross sections to the 4 compass points showing contours and lines of sight from local communities - to indicate exactly who may or may not see some or all of the infamous chimney.
Pub 022	PFI/063	04	I also think there needs to be some indication of existing air quality in local communities, alongside the projected impact of the incinerator, to tackle the recurring theme of incipient health risk. Personally I am more worried about the exhaust fumes of the local buses in Little Ouseburn than of the combustion products at Allerton Park
Pub 023	PFI/064	01	Someone writing in the Knaresborough Post said that the Allerton Waste project would cost the taxpayer £1.4 billion over 25 years. Is this true? Please give me the estimated cost. I am very much for the project in principle.

Pub 024	PFI/ 065	01	A number of things concern me over the plans to build an incinerator at Allerton but my question today is - can you tell me how advanced these plans are ahead of public consultation? I am presuming that before consultation takes place that there is no commitment to go ahead with the contract with AmeyCespa if the public decide that is not the way they wish to go?
Pub 024	PFI/ 065	02	I would not like to think that we were committed to such vast expenditure or that there would be any financial commitment in this direction ahead of the consultation process. Can you confirm to me that if your tax payers do not want this that you can pull out without financial penalties?
Pub 024	PFI/ 065	03	Also the Conservative Government made a pre-election speech (by Nick Herbert, Shadow Environment) to the effect that incineration would only take place with community consent, and I would like you assurance that NYCC and City of York Council will respect this?
Pub 024	PFI/ 065	04	One more question. Why is NYCC's target for recycling by 2020 only 50% when South Oxfordshire met 73% this year?
PCo 006	PFI/ 066	01	My Council has asked me to write to you about its concerns about the proposed option to commit to a long term expensive contract to divert all non-recycled waste to a large centralised facility managed by an outside contractor
PCo 006	PFI/ 066	02	My Council strongly urges you to investigate all the alternative options thoroughly on both an economic and environmental basis before asking about committing every local resident to this contract
Pub 007	PFI/ 067	01	Please could you advise how you are going to compensate me as my house price been devalued by 40%? This is backed up by two reports from local estate agents and also from Councillor John Watson at a meeting in Marton Cum Grafton school on the 25th June 2010. He explained house prices would fall by at least 20%. My house will over look the chimney about 400 metres away and will be Devalued more than most.
Pub 007	PFI/ 067	02	I would expect recycling to be a priority along with schools and old persons welfare not a Tory council hell bent on building a £900 million incinerator they cant afford
Pub 007	PFI/ 067	03	It does not comply with energy from waste strategy issued by the government on two accounts firstly it does not use the heat which will go into the atmosphere this should be used to heat a commercial swimming pool or green houses etc secondly the government say the local community should back the scheme clearly with the recent demonstrations you have no local community support.

Pub 007	PFI/067	04	The co2 levels you talk about are flawed as Allerton park land fill collects all the methane gas and produces electricity from gas generators it is set up for 3mw and produces just under this amount, further more there is 2 million tons of land fill space available at Allerton park which by the way will be mothballed if you build an incinerator as it wont be worth while to keep it open if landfill levels fall.
Pub 007	PFI/067	05	Finally your business plan was formed when the economy was at a high there are now empty industrial units on every estate and there is very little if any house building taking place I think if you look at your business model you will find it is out of date just like incineration its self.
Pub 025	PFI/069	01	Incineration is a quick fix solution and comes as a result of the councils appalling ability to develop any degree of recycling process. It does nothing to encourage, better packaging design, reduced consumption, reuse of materials, recycling of products and rethinking of the waste process.
Pub 025	PFI/069	02	Incineration is also highly capital intensive and creates few jobs and binds ratepayers to a single course of action over the next 25 years. It also destroys jobs (in recycling) and creativity which we as a modern nation need
Pub 025	PFI/069	03	I have investigated the proposals for this site and in addition to above I also feel that the following should be considered: - The contamination equivalent to hundreds of tonnes of toxic ash every year - Contamination of thousands of acres of farm land contamination
Pub 025	PFI/069	04	- A doubling of our local traffic pollution
Pub 025	PFI/070	01	Unfortunately I find the engagement process which you refer to and which has historically operated around this matter somewhat lacking and rather frustrating. I have only recently been made aware of this proposed solution and as a resident in the local area I feel that significantly more could have been done to engage. Given that this process started in 2006 and my consequent recent awareness, I think this demonstrates the lack of initial engagement from the local council. I recently tried to attend a local council meeting which was held last week in Northallerton. To my disbelief I was turned away from this meeting along with numerous other people (over 100) with the message that there simply wasn't enough room. I also understand that this meeting voted against holding a public enquiry which again demonstrates the lack of desire to engage with the public in the process and conflicts against all government engagement policies.
Pub 025	PFI/070	02	I am sure that there is a better long term solution to our waste disposal which doesn't include burning and generating 180,000 tons of unnecessary pollution (regardless of its safety issues where evidence is undetermined as the effects are difficult to measure)

Pub 025	PFI/070	03	North Yorkshires current recycling rate is only reaching 45% and this is dreadful when compared to the UK normal distribution. The introduction of a waste disposal site will only increase recycling levels by a further 5 % which is surely not the way forward and still falls short of all UK averages. In the Harrogate district, we have been given no opportunity or leadership from our council to demonstrate that recycling is the way forward and the construction of an incinerator is therefore in my view an easy option.
Pub 025	PFI/070	04	I would also add that the incinerator plan predetermines the upcoming Waste Core Strategy based on flawed evidence that was rejected in a Public Examination by Joanthan King in December 2008.
Pub 025	PFI/070	05	I have significant knowledge of PFI builds and Signing up to an incineration plant for a period of 25 years is also bad business. This will preclude using the general market trends, technological developments, and waste reduction techniques and advancements in reuse and recycling that will, over that prolonged period of time become available. Indeed many of which are already in development and will also be encouraged by increased Landfill Taxation and legislation. Significant new trends have emerged as the cost profile for waste disposal to landfill has exploded and leading regions move towards 'Zero Waste.'
Pub 026	PFI/071	01	Worried about exactly what will come out of the stack – emissions.
Pub 027	PFI/072	01	What are the present recycling figures for each district council? What will the figures be in five and ten years time if the incinerator goes ahead and what will they be if it doesn't?
Pub 028	PFI/073	01	I am most keen to see this sort of project become a reality in North Yorkshire. It is well overdue and has the potential to be of great benefit to the community and is just plain common sense.
Pub 028	PFI/073	02	I would like to know the selection criteria and ranking for the preferred bidder and whether the selected contractor was the cheapest?
Pub 028	PFI/073	03	I would like to know is the County going to buy part of the electricity generated by the project to supply energy to schools and other similar facilities as well as selling to the Districts for their use in local authority buildings. If no, how exactly is the generated electricity to be credited in the contract?
Pub 028	PFI/073	04	I would like to know how long is the contract for the management of the site.

Pub 028	PFI/073	05	I would like to know what financial benefits will accrue to the residents of North Yorkshire as a result of this facility.
Pub 029	PFI/074	01	Please find attached a true artists impression of what the so called recovery park will be. (sourced from Calendar news) I am quite saddened to see that you do not report the truth when you write your articles. You should be ashamed of yourself for printing such a one side article are you not supposed to report a balanced view.
Pub 029	PFI/074	02	This so called recovery park will incinerate 80% why have you actually neglected to report that fact?
Pub 029	PFI/074	03	North York CC refused a motion to have a public debate on this, on the 21st July at Northallerton if it is so good for us why did they do this?
Pub 029	PFI/074	04	This will cost NY £900m the biggest investment ever - how does this save us £320m and why is NY not allowed to know the real facts on this.
Pub 029	PFI/074	05	MP's in this area do not support the incinerator - and the NYCC don't understand or care it is a short term fix for them.
Pub 029	PFI/074	06	How is burning 80% of NY rubbish a form of recycling how does it encourage people to change behaviour & reduce their consumption & how does it protect the health of our young children. On pg3 you report about the 19 household waste recycling centres - what will happen to these.
Pub 029	PFI/074	07	I try to recycle as much as I can, HBC do not provide much help, we can't recycle plastic or cardboard but small villages in the Yorkshire Dales can. HBC recycling rate is 30% as a wealthy, intelligent town they should be ashamed of themselves
Pub 029	PFI/074	08	My children have a right to breath healthy air & the knowledge that they have a healthy future - wind travels this will affect everyone. If this is all so safe why do we need a 250ft chimney or is this required because is it truly about commercial waste rather than household waste
Pub 030	PFI/075	01	What is the total capital cost of the Allerton Park scheme and does it include the cost of the site

Pub 008	PFI/076	01	Last week I visited a private waste disposal contractor which operates 4 MT (Mechanical Treatment) plants, the largest of which is handling 250,000 tonnes per annum of mostly black bag waste and was achieving an 82% recycling rate. The plant was not perfect and could have been improved with a Biological element. However it was successfully sorting waste from all over the country at a cost of under £70 / tonne treated I don't know what NY is proposing to pay to the 'preferred contractor' but deduced from the figures I read in the press and in other publications I estimate it to be in the region of £130 - £140 /tonne.
Pub 008	PFI/076	02	The figure of £320 million which the 'preferred contractors' claim they are saving is, with all due respect, a nonsense as it is only being measured against escalating, both, tonnages of waste and landfill charges over the 25 year contract. If it was measured against the private contractor mentioned above, I calculate the saving to the Council would be in the order of £600 million over the life time of the contract or round about £25 million per year. This is also without increasing source separation of waste which is where the future is. To quote Yorwaste, 'Don't waste waste'. I would like to verify my figures with you.
Pub 031	PFI/077	01	This type of facility is long overdue. Scandinavian countries have had such facilities for decades. I fully support this proposal
Pub 031	PFI/077	02	However, there is still a role to allow for better sorting of plastic containers by the consumer at amenity sites. In my view there should be separate bins for each plastic type - 1 = polyester, 2 = polyolefin etc and all plastic should be recycled
Pub 032	PFI/078	01	I have read the NY Times dated Aug 2010 and am concerned on two points: 1.no where does it mention that an incinerator is proposed fro the site with the environmental implications attached thereto. The whole story if one of spin and gloss-not at all factual and no doubt designed to soften local people's attitude to the proposed development. 2/the County council has used the NY Times as a propaganda tool for the above purposes and surely as this is a newspaper paid for by local people thorough their community charge it is wholly unacceptable to use it for propaganda? The article should have been factual and given the reader a balanced report. Even in these days of cynical spin I was taken aback by its blatant bias.
Pub 033	PFI/079	01	I formally object to your plans to build a giant incinerator in North Yorkshire. Please save us tall the inconvenience and expense by ditching this highly controversial proposal and exploring the alternatives thoroughly.
Pub 033	PFI/079	02	My arguments have bee forcefully expressed by DISC NYWAG and Marton Cum Grafton PC
Pub 033	PFI/079	03	Relationship of Cllr Wood to Lord Mowbray?

Pub 034	PFI/080	01	If the proposal goes ahead his property will be seriously devalued. Would we reduce his council tax? (Resident lives 400-500yds away from the proposed plant).
Pub 035	PFI/081	01	It seems there are 2 different targets being quoted, 0.5% increase over 7 years in the PFI contract, and 5% increase over 7 years in the AmeyCespa proposals. Are you please able to clarify which of these widely differing targets is the correct one
Pub 036	PFI/082	01	Further to my email below on the 15th July, I have received not ONE reply from anyone of the 73 NYCC Councillors. I would also like to know from the conservative councillors, why they either abstained or voted against a full public debate on this matter, when there is clearly so much public concern? I would appreciate a response.
Pub 036	PFI/083	01	I would appreciate a response to my letter please. Also I would like to know the details of the public meetings planned for September and how they are being publicised to the public.
Pub 008	PFI/093	01	Arrangements for a meeting with Assistant Director Waste Management
Pub 037	PFI/095	01	Read the article in the NY Times how big is the chimney and what is its circumference? Is it a pipe or a wide chimney?
Pub 037	PFI/095	02	In the NYCC press Release dated 29.06.10 it refers to a Mechanical Sorting and Reclamation facility dealing with 20,000tpa but at the public exhibition it said household waste produced was 470,000tpa. Is the 20,000tpa being burnt and will this figure gradually increase?
Pub 037	PFI/095	03	Would like traffic movement information, what roads will be used as the A59 is very congested already
PCo 008	PFI/096	01	Unanimously agreed to oppose the Allerton Waste Recovery Park proposal based on the alternative requirement for further recycling facilities
PCo 008	PFI/096	02	Opposed to incineration processes – which is felt is an outdated process for waste disposal

PCo 008	PFI/ 096	03	May cause harm to the environment and will cause CF emissions.
PCo 008	PFI/ 096	04	May cause harm to landscape – particularly with a 250ft incinerator, which will be seen from many local parishes in the surrounding area
PCo 008	PFI/ 096	05	The parish council wishes other forms of recycling waste disposal treatments such as Anaerobic Digestion to be considered.
PCo 008	PFI/ 096	06	In addition, the plan proposed doesn't meet the new coalition governments' commitment to increasing recycling.
PCo 008	PFI/ 096	07	It is felt the financial penalties that could be applied, in the event of not enough waste being processed, will be coming direct out of North Yorkshire County Council taxpayers, but the waste will be coming from areas outside of North Yorkshire. This means North Yorkshire taxpayers may be paying for waste disposal facilities for other non paying tax
Pub 038	PFI/ 097	01	I have just received NY TIMES with its article on the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Site. Nowhere is the cost of the site mentioned, only a PFI input, which amounts to a very expensive credit card, making us vulnerable to future interest charges. What is the total cost, and where is it coming from? Why was the total cost not mentioned?
Pub 038	PFI/ 097	02	In the light of the annual tonnage figures proposed: 20,000 for recycling, 40,000 for anaerobic digestion and 320,000 for incineration (this figure was somehow omitted from the article), why was the word 'incineration' not mentioned in the article? You could say that it was dressed up as 'thermal energy from waste treatment', but this sounds like deliberate misleading of the public to me
Pub 038	PFI/ 097	03	In view of the fact that many communities are now actively working to reduce waste, as we must because of the global waste crisis, will the site still be viable if in, say, five years' time we've managed to halve our waste production? Much waste comes from oil-based materials, which will become more scarce as oil prices rise and that in itself will reduce our extravagant waste production. What is the minimum tonnage at which it can operate? Will AmeyCespa like that, or are you putting us into some sort of strait-jacket of deliberate waste production? I understand that some similar European sites are already having to import waste from other countries to keep their incinerators running.
Pub 038	PFI/ 097	04	Have you looked into any emissions-free closed loop incineration? www.eclipsuk.co.uk < http://www.eclipsuk.co.uk > for example?
Pub 038	PFI/ 097	05	Request for further information on Waste PFI and Waste Strategy

Pub 006	PFI/098	01	I would like to know what pollutants - and at what fractions - will be produced by this incinerator?
Pub 006	PFI/098	02	How they will be continuously monitored, since this represents a considerable challenge, particularly in the case of nanoparticles?
Pub 006	PFI/098	03	What assumptions have been made in modelling the pollutant outputs and their geographic spread, particularly in the light of these statements from the report above? http://www.airquality.co.uk/reports/cat05/1006241607_100608_MIP_Final_Version.pdf
Pub 006	PFI/098	04	Research indicates that incineration creates many more PM2.5 and smaller particles than PM10 particles. This is true for both primary and secondary particulates (secondary particulates are formed beyond pollution controls in the incinerator stack and are "emitted unabated") and the WHO state that there is no safe level of PM2.5 and health effects have been observed at surprisingly low concentrations with no threshold. Are the Council members aware of the WHO statement and if so what is their view on it?
Pub 039	PFI/100	01	Various objections to the waste site at Allerton he said the Council has never until now consulted the public &
Pub 039	PFI/100	02	The council appears to be using public funds that will benefit the waste contractor & that is contrary to the PFI Regs
Pub 039	PFI/100	03	If the council advertised kerbside recycling more that would solve a lot of the waste problem
Pub 039	PFI/100	04	NYCC have not quoted the facts & figures correctly regarding the hazards of this site.
Pub 040	PFI/101	01	Suggested that the old Corus Steel Works site in the North East should be used as it will benefit employment in the north east, utilise an already industrial area and leave North Yorkshire in its present beautiful state.
PCo 009	PFI/102	01	What is the annual loan repayment including a breakdown on the interest charges on the PFI credits?

PCo 010	PFI/ 103	01	We are writing to ask you to vote to reject the proposed waste facility at Allerton when the matter comes before you in October
PCo 010	PFI/ 103	02	The facility will become unnecessary as recycling rates improve, as they must under EU and UK targets, therefore household and industrial waste will have to be sourced from outside the county to fulfil the contract
PCo 010	PFI/ 103	03	New waste management strategies are changing so quickly now that to commit our Council Tax to a contract for the next 25 years would be foolhardy to say the least. Many UK counties have already rejected incineration in favour of cheaper, greener alternatives and remain in control, so they can adapt to change as it happens.
PCo 010	PFI/ 103	04	The 70 jobs created at Allerton would be at the expense of existing jobs at other sites, whereas investing in waste recovery sites and promoting a zero waste policy culture would create much more employment and would be self-financing.
PCo 010	PFI/ 103	05	Furthermore, our Parish Council would like to know why NYCC has not examined alternative strategies for waste management. Ferrybridge and Drax are already operational, with good road and rail links and have spare capacity for burning our non-recyclable waste, without need for further development.
PCo 010	PFI/ 103	06	It simply does not make sense to pay in excess of £200 per tonne when we could pay a fraction of that on the open market.
Pub 041	PFI/ 104	01	I write to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals. They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'superfacility' for the entire county. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly.
Pub 041	PFI/ 104	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of C02 emissions
Pub 041	PFI/ 104	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies.
Pub 041	PFI/ 104	04	It ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.

Pub 041	PFI/ 104	05	I urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward.
Pub 041	PFI/ 104	06	In particular I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review.
PCo 011	PFI/ 105	01	We hear that NYCC have stated that they will not be calling any Public Meetings to discuss waste. However I believe you propose to invite Local Parish Councils to discuss the plans. Unfortunately we are not one of the 11 you have earmarked so we'd like to ask for Parish Council to be added to the list of PC attendees.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	01	We write to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals. They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'superfacility' for the entire county. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of C02 emissions
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	04	It ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	05	We would suggest household recycling provision for cardboard and plastic bottles rather than having to produce more C02 emissions taking carloads to Ripon every week.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	06	We moved to the Village of Arkendale, an area of outstanding natural beauty and a protected area, for a quiet and peaceful existence and not to be surrounded by horrendous movement of waste with all the noise and disruption that this entails. In addition the attraction and value of our property would undoubtedly decrease due to this proposal.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	07	We urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward.
Pub 042	PFI/ 106	08	In particular we ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review

Com 003	PFI/ 107	01	Can you please therefore explain to me why at the NYCC meeting last week a vote to have a public consultation was refused by 41 councillors present?
Com 003	PFI/ 107	02	Please can you list all the seminars, public libraries, venues etc where the councillors of North Yorkshire are present to discuss and explain to all residents throughout York and North York's the nature of the above project?
Com 003	PFI/ 107	03	I would also be pleased to receive a detailed breakdown of the costs associated with the above proposal over the next 25 years against a breakdown of costs for the recycling of waste over the same period, as I assume a comparison was made prior to North York's County Council choosing incineration as the way forward.
Com 003	PFI/ 107	04	Can you confirm why one large plant is being proposed when several smaller plants 'pepper potted ' throughout the region and I or existing facilities upgraded could be an alternative?
Com 003	PFI/ 107	05	I am a sure as we recycle more the need for a plant of the size in question will become redundant
PCo 12	PFI/ 108	01	After carefully considering all the information the Parish Council are very much against this incinerator being built unless the correct technology is used as contained in the Ferrybridge report compiled by Dr Dick Van Steenis.
PCo 023	PFI/ 110	01	Please will you let me know when NYCC wants responses from Parish Councils about Waste Management policy (your letter RF/CJB of 27th July refers)?
Pub 044	PFI/ 086	01	Support for project. Need to improve recycling of plastics and milk cartons
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	01	I am taking the unusual step of writing to each of the county councillors for North Yorkshire and the City of York because of the deep concerns I have about the outcome of the controversial North Yorkshire Waste Strategy Plan.
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	02	Not only will it be the biggest contract that NYCC has ever awarded, eventually costing taxpayers a total of £1.4b, it will also, in my opinion, turn out to be NYCC's biggest mistake. A mistake which will dog the taxpayers of North Yorkshire for 25 years or more. How can any NYCC or City of York councillor justify supporting this kind of risky venture when there are going to be such drastic cuts to other services in the region under the current austerity drive?
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	03	This plan was first mooted in 2006 in line with the objectives of the former government which, given the current state of knowledge and financial climate at the time, favoured incineration; a vastly more expensive solution than other options. We are now in 2010 and the economic climate, waste technology and local aspirations have all moved on into a very different era.

Pub 045	PFI/ 111	04	A number of more forward-thinking councils have rejected incineration as part of the solution to their waste problem and opted for less expensive, more efficient, environmentally-friendly and healthier alternatives such as MBT (Mechanical Biological Treatment) and AD (Anaerobic Digestion) combined with more recycling and re-use.
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	05	If there does prove to be a problem with residual waste then why are existing alternatives not being examined, such as the spare capacity at Drax, Ferrybridge and Hartlepool all of which would welcome extra waste from North Yorkshire
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	06	Coalition government ministers (PM David Cameron and Secretary of State for the Environment, Caroline Spelman) have made announcements advocating these methods and indeed stating that they have a policy objective of zero waste.
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	07	So why does NYCC -and indeed as a conservative-dominated council -still seem determined to continue with this obviously outmoded, expensive form of waste management with such a long-term financial burden and risks?
Pub 045	PFI/ 111	08	I would urge you all to think very carefully about the present situation and the future and demand a re-examination of this waste strategy to take into account the developments in both technology and society.
Pub 046	PFI/ 112	01	I am writing to voice my opposition to the planned incinerator at Allerton in North Yorkshire.
Pub 046	PFI/ 112	02	Firstly it is planned to be built in a rural area, which to my mind cannot be right for a distinctly industrial unit, plus the area is very beautiful and will be marred terribly by the 76 metre high chimney required for the incinerator. This chimney will be visible for miles across the rural landscape it will clash very badly with the local scenery! Yorkshire is renowned for its beautiful countryside and an eyesore such as this will not help tourism.
Pub 046	PFI/ 112	03	Secondly incineration is very unpopular and is being phased out in many countries and areas. They produce vast quantities of greenhouse gasses which are not collected. Waste gasses will be produced 24 hours a day, 365 days a year and though we are assured these are within government limits and will be constantly monitored there will be faults which will cause it to exceed these limits. We are assured by AmeyCespa the exhaust gasses from the chimney will be no different than those of your car or central heating system exhaust, this is not true, cars and heating systems don't burn rubbish! Added to which I have yet to see a car or central heating exhaust 76 metres high and a several metres in diameter. It might be worth noting here that asbestos was once considered to be a safe and inert substance. Whoever is living down wind of this chimney will be constantly poisoned

Pub 046	PFI/ 112	04	Thirdly the literature and promotion of this planned project makes it appear to be a recycling centre, this is not really true as only a small percentage will go to recycling and anaerobic digestion the largest amount by far will be burned! This will not encourage the local councils of North Yorkshire to improve their currently woeful kerbside recycling record. It will just be seen as the answer to the problem when in truth it will barely improve the overall recycling percentages of the county at all. There are counties within England who recycle far, far more than we do and if it can be done by them then why not by us, it is just excuses.
Pub 046	PFI/ 112	05	At a time of belt tightening is it really a good idea to tie our selves into an uncertain product with a 25 years lifespan. Improving recycling will be far easier to build up and without such high costs
Pub 046	PFI/ 112	06	Consultation with residents of North Yorkshire has been poor. Many people I have spoken to who will be affected by this proposal are entirely unaware of its existence.
Pub 046	PFI/ 112	07	I urge you to oppose this plan and instead, encourage you to work towards the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling.
PCo 007	PFI/ 113	01	I have had many also from the villages around the site asking for backing to prevent the site ever happening. I have consulted with my Parish, and the majority view is against.
PCo 007	PFI/ 113	02	Why do we need it?
PCo 007	PFI/ 113	03	Can the costs and penalties ever achieve the IRR (not published as far as I know) to justify it
PCo 007	PFI/ 113	04	Why on this site, at the entrance to the Dales, and in the middle of farms and villages, opposite a high investment leisure facility and Hotel, a Stately home, and with a blot on the landscape emissions chimney over 200feet high.
PCo 007	PFI/ 113	05	Why do not investigate the already established sites of the power stations a few miles away where major road and canal systems would serve to ship the waste. These sites are already linked into the grid, and so would be much less intrusive and probably a cheaper option.

PCo 007	PFI/ 113	06	Lastly but more importantly why are York and North Yorkshire not re-cycling more. I was recently in Spain, where in the area I was in Javia, Incineration had ceased, and there were numerous clean and discreet local sites to take rubbish for recycling 24 hours a day 365 days a year. The culture of bury or burn will not change if more facilities for the public are not provided in a sensible and convenient way.
PCo 007	PFI/ 114	01	I was not suggesting that the waste was disposed of through the current / biomass facilities at Ferry bridge but that the new proposed plant and its facilities be built and based there alongside the current power station, on the extensive grounds of that site with its road and canal and grid links.
PCo 007	PFI/ 114	02	I think the costs and benefits of such a project should be investigated before the move to accept Allerton as the preferred site. Further the actual figures that justify, or not, each site should be published. It would also be in the public interest to know the numbers of new houses estimated for the area that have been built into the calculation. This way a totally transparent presentation will allow a totally open opinion to be made by those from whom you are seeking input.
Pub 036	PFI/ 115	01	Unfortunately I haven't heard from you and given that the public meetings on this matter are scheduled for September, I would like to know when they are happening and where. I would appreciate a response in full ASAP. I live in and I would like to know when the area committee will take place regarding the Allerton Park Incinerator Proposal. I would also like to know what efforts have/will be made to make these meetings publicly known.
Pub 008	PFI/ 116	01	If the cost of continuing to bury the combined Councils' rubbish would be £1.8 billion over 25 years , as you reported in the NY Times this month, and AmeyCespa are saving us £320 million, then the cost will be(£1,800,000,000 - 320,000,000) £1,480,000,000 If the total tonnage of waste treated is 350,000 tonnes/annum. Over 25 years that is a total of 8,750,000 tonnes. Therefore the cost of treating 1 tonne is; £169.14. Could you kindly let me know if this is correct or at least in the ' ball park'.
Pub 047	PFI/ 117	01	I have received, with my morning paper, today a leaflet from North Yorkshire waste Action Group that is against the incinerator being built. They say that it will cost me money and could impact on my health. Can you tell me what the impact on my health could be?
Pub 047	PFI/ 117	02	How much money per year it is going to cost me?
Pub 047	PFI/ 117	03	Could you also tell me how any heat energy will be used from the burning of the waste?

PCo 013	PFI/ 118	01	First let me say that although the Parish Meeting has not met formally, on the evidence available it will certainly support the NYCC proposal, which it will wish to see implemented with all speed and no unnecessary cost
PCo 013	PFI/ 118	02	As someone whose professional expertise included locational analysis, I would expect one large plant in Allerton quarry to be selected.
PCo 013	PFI/ 118	03	A criticism of NYCC is that it was slow to distribute information, thereby giving nimbyist objectors the opportunity to circulate misinformation. Thus people who should know better, if the full facts had been available, gave their support to the objectors. Hence NYCC should ignore comments expressed prior to its sending information to parish councils/meetings.
PCo 013	PFI/ 118	04	One objection was that apparently similar plants in Germany are white elephants and are having to import waste. Presumably NYCC tested its proposal for different waste recycling rates and this should be stated explicitly.
PCo 013	PFI/ 118	05	The coalition government is apparently examining a return to weekly waste collection. Although not NYCC's responsibility, it seems likely to increase the cost unless DCs can mix waste. Thus I am interested to know whether the combination of technologies at Allerton will enable householders to put all their waste in one bin.[Presently I have three bins and plastic bags for paper.] If that is the case, NYCC should say so, as the profusion of bins in National Park villages and older urban developments is an eyesore.
Pub 048	PFI/ 119	01	Why has the Allerton site been chosen?
Pub 048	PFI/ 119	02	What job opportunities will there be?
Pub 049	PFI/ 120	01	Want to know about opportunities to object to the proposals. Would like to know more about the expected process of Council approval to award the contract, and opportunities to make representations then. How many letter have we had?
PCo 014	PFI/ 121	01	Members were in general opposed to the use of incinerators and felt that alternative technology should be seriously investigated before going down the incinerator path.
PCo 014	PFI/ 121	02	More importantly, strong view were expressed about the poor performance of both North Yorkshire and Harrogate Borough in terms of recycling, both authorities being well down the league tables for this service. Because the proposals will have little impact on the village this has not been a major issue for the Council, but the view of members was that recycling must be improved if the alternative is an incinerator.

PCo 015	PFI/ 122	01Council would wish to support the request to pause and consider alternative options.
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	01	I trust you will register my strong opposition to this scheme.
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	02	I read the August NY Times Article which did not mention some important facts, the articles enthusiasm for the scheme implied that it was sound both environmentally and financially I beg to differ.
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	03	There are well documented and justifiable arguments against such facilities
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	04	Why was the word incinerator not used in the article?
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	05	The contract ties the Councils for 25 years, given the speed of technological advance both the need for waste processing and the method will change long before 25 years have elapsed, making the incinerator either redundant or too big.
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	06	The Councils efforts should be directed towards the reduction of waste, Ryedale has excellent recycling targets why not use this area as a standard. Why not have North Yorkshire take a national lead in encouraging all packaging to be reduced or to be entirely recyclable
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	07	I am deeply suspicious of PFI schemes a view endorsed by a senior economist. I believe they only benefit financiers and mortgage organisations.
Pub 050	PFI/ 123	08	This scheme proposes a central processing plant which would mean a massive increase in transportation of waste, more traffic and huge fuel costs. Is this wise at a time when we will see a continual rise in fuel charges? It is also a negative step with regards to pollution and the increase in greenhouse gases.
PCo 016	PFI/ 124	01	We urge you to reject this proposal for several reasons.
PCo 016	PFI/ 124	02	Any incinerator of domestic waste will create Toxins, the fall out from this site will cover a wide area North East of it - ten to 30 miles away, consequently we in our parish will be in the area affected.

PCo 016	PFI/ 124	03	It will require a large amount of waste which will entail a lot of transport by road, if an incinerator must be used it should be near a railway so that waste transport can be moved away from the already congested roads.
PCo 016	PFI/ 124	04	A successful reduction in waste packaging will be discouraged, the incinerator will encourage the councils to divert more waste for burning instead of recycling
PCo 016	PFI/ 124	05	Any material which is burned is a loss of future resources.
PCo 016	PFI/ 124	06	I am aware that this contract is expected to involve the recovery of recyclable materials but past attempts to involve commercial organisations with incinerators resulted in very little recovery.
PCo 016	PFI/ 124	07	Appears to be another case of deliberately wasting tax payer's money by building a copy of something which is already there at DRAX which is on a railway. Why should we be employing overseas companies when we have such as Drax which with very little capital cost can do the job?
PCo 017	PFI/ 125	01	Parish Council met on 10/8 and discussed your paper/letter dated 27/7: York and North Yorks PFI, and at the same time the paper/letter from Parish Council opposing the development of 'an industrial sized incinerator' as proposed by you. Parish Council is concerned at the cost and would prefer to see resources/finance put into recycling. At the moment Parish Council feels unable to support the incinerator proposal along with its repercussions
Pub 006	PFI/ 126	01	If in say 5 years time incineration of waste is outlawed or stopped in the UK for whatever reason, will the council tax payers of North Yorks still have to go on paying Amey Cespa under the terms of the PFI agreement for the following 25 years?
Pub 051	PFI/ 127	01	The council seem intent on signing us local tax payers up to a 25 year deal with a Spanish company to burn a large proportion of the county's waste as a way to avoid paying landfill tax. We feel this plan is a disaster in both environmental terms and as value for money for the tax payer.
Pub 051	PFI/ 127	02	North Yorkshire recycles a pretty poor amount (16s than 50%) of its waste and the cost effectiveness of this plan is based on the alternative being to do nothing, whereas simply recycling more - as other counties are doing (Oxfordshire for example recycles more than 70% of its waste) would also save a great deal of money and would not tie us into any long term deal
Pub 051	PFI/ 127	03	We would further point out that this plan does not fit with governments 'zero waste' strategy which is much more sensibly focused on reducing waste at source and improving re-use and recycling.
Pub 051	PFI/ 127	04	Burning waste as proposed here does nothing to reduce the amount of waste, will emit tonnes of CO2 and also some very nasty chemicals (burning plastic bin bags for example emits PCB's, some of the worst carcinogens known to man) which would blight the area for years to come and threaten our health and the safety of the farms that grow food here..

Pub 051	PFI/ 127	05	This is to say nothing of the impact transporting all of North Yorkshire's waste here will have on local roads and infrastructure
Pub 051	PFI/ 127	06	We feel very strongly that the Allerton incinerator is a bad idea and the council must be made to stop and reconsider. We believe that the decision makers have not been given the full facts of the plan and have been given a false picture of the cost / benefit to bias them in favour of this plan. Please let us know that as our local representative we have your support in this matter and that you will do all in your power to make the council abandon this plan and seek a truly sustainable and cost effective alternative.
Pub 025	PFI/ 128	01	I am writing in response to the recent NY Times article which shows a lovely picture and tells us how the Allerton park waste disposal site is an "energy from waste plant". However there seems to be no mention of an incinerator or cost of £1.4bn over 25 years (source: NYCC)
Pub 025	PFI/ 128	02	I do feel that the REAL proposals do little to increase recycling and certainly offer no real solution for our waste.
Pub 025	PFI/ 128	03	This has not been effectively discussed in the article and to that end I would be grateful if you could let me now if you are to/ are willing to publish an opposing view?
Pub 053	PFI/ 129	01	I have received a copy of the NY Times and would like to comment on the above article. Why was there not a realistic artists impression of the incinerator which will, after all, be the dominant feature? I had to use a magnifying glass to see the chimney, although it will in actual fact be higher than York Minster! I feel this is a totally misrepresentative impression of the actual site and therefore a misleading view to have published. I am well aware that NYCC are fully behind this plant at Allerton Park, but to print such a untrue picture of the proposal is outrageous! Are you prepared to print an article about opposing views as well, I wonder? I have to say that I will now view everything I read in the NY Times as potentially suspect.
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	01	The Chimney Stack would be a prominent stand alone feature in an area of open quarried farmland with no other industrial development close by. Its presence would have a harmful visual impact on Allerton Castle a Listed Building and its Historic Parkland Setting; the chimney would be an alien feature which would be widely viewed from the surrounding Countryside. In our opinion the application would not meet with the requirements of PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment which sets out planning policies on the conservation of the Historic environment.
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	02	Quarries allowed on High Grade Agricultural Land should be restored back to agricultural use as a priority to feed the rising population.

CGr 002	PFI/ 129	03	The local residents who will be the most adversely affected are strongly opposed to the scheme; all the meetings which we have been invited to have been well attended. There was not one person who offered support to the scheme in any of the meetings to our knowledge. Planning is about what the people want according to Government Guidance so the people's views must be taken into account as it is they who have to live with developments.
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	04	The height of the chimney is designed to disperse the remaining pollutants this will be effective to some extent, but on a damp foggy or wet day the pollutants we presume will come down around the plant area? On a normal day the prevailing wind will take them towards York? The pollution levels locally will be increased due to the proposed plant being large scale as it has to serve the entire area of North Yorkshire. Should other plants be made available this would lessen the pollution?
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	05	This site does not currently generate high levels of pollution, local people who have chosen to live away from built up areas are understandably angry by this proposal. Will Ameycespa be offering any compensation to the owners of the properties which have suffered devaluation?
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	06	The impact on Human Health with a development of this scale is largely unknown; the impact on Agriculture and the Food Chain is again unknown? There is serious concern that this plant will be harmful to the Human Health and the Food Chain
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	07	We question the 25 year Contract using technology which is being updated all the time; this leads us to doubt whether now is, the right time to enter into such a massive investment? The plant at Sema Carr has failed we are informed this was due to the costs associated to burning the waste and the waste plant being unable to produce salable energy. We do not know exactly what happened but it has lead us to be cautious with this costly proposal
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	08	The scheme presented by Amey Cespa will not produce any heat for local dwellings; we are told the incinerator could produce heat for 40.000 homes or more had it been located closer to dwellings. Surely this is a waste of energy and it is unsustainable
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	09	The site chosen is not served by a Rail Link which would lead to HGV's and bin wagons bringing waste from all over NY. NY being the largest County in the UK this concerns us. It is the Governments policy to get more vehicles off the road's with the use of the existing rail network. The planning of new developments needs to take into account additional travel needs it is also a Government target to reduce emissions. The proposal will increase emissions and lead to more vehicles on the roads. The cost of fuel for the HGV's will be enormous which again questions the sustainability of the proposed plant.
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	10	The area of NY would be better served by at least 3-4 waste treatment plants if they are needed at all.
CGr 002	PFI/ 129	11	Recycling targets and investments are low by comparison to other areas of the UK and other Countries; Harrogate being one of the worst in the UK. More money and efforts should be made available to reach better recycling targets before incineration is considered

Com 02	PFI/ 131	01	We are opening an anaerobic digestion biogas plant on Teesside. The plant is due to start operating in June 2011. We are currently sourcing the feedstocks required to operate the plant. The plant requires 1420MT energy crops, 800MT organic/animal/food spoil, 750MT slurry per month. The energy crop can consist of almost anything from wheat chaff to grass cuttings. Are you able to provide any of these waste streams to us? I see that you plan to have your own AD facility operating by 2014 but hope that you may still be able to help us.
Pub 006	PFI/ 132	01	Would you please send me a list of the councillors who at the last meeting in Northallerton in July - when it was suggested there should be a public meeting on the Allerton Park Incinerator, voted AGAINST a public meeting.
PCo 18	PFI/ 133	01	I have been asked by the Parish Council to enquire if there is another plan other than the incinerator that is being considered by North Yorkshire County Council or is this the only proposal?
Pub 054	PFI/ 134	01	We are totally opposed to the siting of an Incinerator at Allerton Park. This is not the place for an incinerator. Please VOTE NO TO THE INCINERATOR AT ALLERTON PARK
Pub 054	PFI/ 134	02	There has not been enough public information
Pub 054	PFI/ 134	03	It is questionable whether or not incineration is the best process for waste.
Pub 054	PFI/ 134	04	Council must encourage more recycling and provide more drop off points for waste etc. surely then the need for incineration in the future would be less.
Pub 055	PFI/ 135	01	I am writing to ask you to reject the proposal that has been made to the planning authority to build a waste plant at Allerton.
Pub 055	PFI/ 135	02	Whilst superficially attractive with some token recycling activities at the planned site, the reality is that this facility would be a hugely profitable venture for its developers and a huge expense for the people of North Yorkshire for whom there is a much cheaper and much simpler alternative.
Pub 055	PFI/ 135	03	We simply need to increase the amount of recycling that is achieved in the sub-region; our performance is pathetic by comparison with other parts of Yorkshire, let alone other parts of the UK and other parts of the world.
Pub 055	PFI/ 135	04	After we have minimised the waste that isn't recycled why can't we dispose of it to the area's power stations that are already incinerating material?

Pub 055	PFI/ 135	05	I fear that a huge incinerator chimney towering above everything else in the subregion would rapidly become an expensive white elephant and a dreadful eyesore that would conflict with the truthful and wonderful images portrayed so eloquently by Gary Verity and his colleagues at 'Welcome to Yorkshire'.
Pub 055	PFI/ 135	06	The pace of change is far to fast to be committing £900m to such a controversial project
Pub 006	PFI/ 136	01	Thank you for your response, but you have not answered my first question which was: if the Allerton Park Incinerator is closed- for whatever reason- will the council tax payers of North Yorkshire still have to go on paying Amey Cespa for the full term of the PFI contract ie 25 years (if this is the term).Non of us can see into the future, but we should know as council tax payers what our financial commitment is, should circumstances change.
Pub 006	PFI/ 136	02	I note your response on recording councillors votes, which appears to be a wildly undemocratic principle.
Pub 056	PFI/ 138	01	Will the proceedings, process and details of the due diligence check be made available to the public before the meeting in October?
Pub 056	PFI/ 138	02	In particular will the due diligence check publish their views and findings about the assumptions and calculations that give the reported savings of £320m over 25 years, given the current reductions in packaging and expected increases in recycling?
Pub 008	PFI/ 139	01	How much per tonne "gate fee" is the Council going to pay their contractor to dispose of the waste?
Pub 008	PFI/ 139	02	Is there any "rebate" to the Council for electricity or recyclables sold by the contractor
Pub 036	PFI/ 140	01	I have just read the September edition of the NY Times and finally found a tiny mention of the area committees on pg 6. This, in my opinion, is completely unsatisfactory in informing the public of this meeting, particularly as it does not reference the incinerator at all. Please advise on what publicity the NYCC intend to do on this matter. Please forward me a list of venues/dates and times in the whole of NY by reply

Pub 036	PFI/ 140	02	<p>I recently read in an article in the Yorkshire Post that you are adamant "that the public was being fully briefed about the plans" and that David Bowe thinks it "very important to us that everyone has the opportunity to learn about the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Park".</p> <p>If that was the case, then surely you would have mentioned the meetings in the main article on the incinerator in the NY Times and not tucked away on page 6 as a date for an area committee, with no reference to the incinerator as a discussion point of the meeting? I have seen no mention of the proposals in the Knaresborough library, nothing on my Parish notice board and I only know about this because I have made it my business to know.</p> <p>I find this approach very disappointing given that this is the largest contract ever issued by the NYCC and will effect everyone in our county for the next 25 years. There is no wonder that there is a view this is being rail roaded through.</p>
Pub 036	PFI/ 140	03	<p>May I point out that there was no article publicising the meeting in the NY Times, there is no poster in a prominent place in my local community and the meeting in my local area is on a working day in working hours and therefore I cannot attend. This is not a proper public consultation and therefore you cannot possibly take account of what people are telling to include in your report as a result. How can I include my comments if I cannot attend the meetings? The way that this is being conducted says to me that you can state that you followed a process of consultation, but in reality it's a farce.</p>
Pub 057	PFI/ 142	01	<p>The North Yorkshire and York Councils must be congratulated for their forward thinking in the fight against the use of landfill as a solution to manage waste. Their 25 Year Plan will use technologies to divert a targeted 75 percent of waste away from landfill.</p>
Pub 057	PFI/ 142	02	<p>Whichever technologies they ultimately utilise there seems to be a major oversight in the battle to achieve the best green solution. The Allerton Quarry location, at the bottom left hand comer of the Councils region, does not provide the greatest environmental benefit. Therefore, any transportation has to be kept to the lowest level possible. If you do a simple geographical population analysis of the councils zones you will find the centre of minimal travel is in fact York. There would be a 20% saving on road usage transporting waste if the facility was sited at York. Secondly, with York being the hub of the rail network, any use of rail to bulk transport waste from some of the conurbations (Northallerton, Thirsk and even the east coast) would significantly reduce the use of road transport and thus achieve an even greater reduction to the desired minimum emission of green house gases It is with this above logic in mind that I would welcome your input in requesting North Yorkshire Council's justification of Allerton Quarry as its potential waste facility, if green house gases are, as they say, a very important issue of concern.</p>

Pub 058	PFI/ 143	01	In reference to the article in your house newsletter of August 2010; may I make the following observations; The characterisation of a Private finance initiative as a form of grant Funding is inaccurate and ingenuous. Surely a grant is a sum of money that by definition does not have to be repaid, whereas a PFI is an arrangement almost exactly the same as a mortgage or bank loan, repayable with interest over an agreed term. I use the word almost in the above sentence advisedly, since the problem with PFI schemes is that the term is fixed at the outset, as are the minimum interest and capital repayments. I wish I had been able to buy my house with a grant then I wouldn't have to repay it!
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	02	What would the cost of the scheme be if the local authorities concerned had raised the money themselves, and commissioned the building and running of the facility directly?
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	03	What is the duration of the PFI contract, and what will happen to the site and buildings on it at the end of it?
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	04	Technology and waste disposal regulations change constantly, and what Would the legal position be if burning or digesting waste on this site were to be made illegal; or the incinerator were to need uprating to meet a change in the law?
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	05	PFI contracts are in themselves a tradeable commodity, and will there be provision for clawback of profits made on the resale of the proposed contract to a third party?
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	06	Will the contract contain covenants restricting the operation of it to UK based onshore taxpaying companies? This is not an idle or theoretical question for example, all of the offices of HM Revenue and Customs are currently owned by and leased back through a company registered in one of the Caribbean tax havens, so that all of the payments of rent and service charges represent a loss to the UK taxpayer.
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	07	What provision is there for the termination of the PFI contract in the event of non-performance by AmeyCespa, or insolvency by any successor company?
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	08	My own interest in asking these questions is both as a local council tax payer , and also as a resident within range of the plume of flue gases from the proposed plant, which will almost inevitably contain toxic products, such as dioxins, for which I am sure you are aware there is no safe level of exposure.
Pub 058	PFI/ 143	09	I am convinced that this proposal is a lazy way of disposing of waste, most of which could be dealt with by raising the level of recycling to the percentage achieved in Northern European EU countries I find it appalling for example, that many plastic items bearing recycling category logos have to go into landfill.

Pub 058	PFI/ 143	10	All organic waste should be collected and processed in digestors, which could be sited and operated locally not needing large centralised facilities, such as the present proposal. Every settlement sends its domestic effluent to a local processing plant, and this could be combined with other organic waste (farm slurry, garden and food waste) to generate methane which can be used to generate process heat and electricity; and provide saleable by products such as compost and liquid fertiliser. Methane from landfill is a much more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, after all.
Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	01	Strategy - Why is this proposed waste facility, which is very long term, being considered at this stage when the Waste Core Strategy has not even been adopted? What is the fallback position of the Council if the Strategy, of which clearly this must constitute an integral part, is not adopted?
Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	02	<p>Financial Viability - As you are, no doubt aware, Amey UK plc and Cespa S.A. that make up the joint venture that is proposing to create the Allerton Park facility are both subsidiaries of Ferrovial S.A. which is currently in considerable financial difficulties – it made substantial losses in 2008 and 2009 which have been added to in the first quarter results of 2010 and quarter 2 is not expected to reflect any improvement. Its debt-to-equity ratio is exceedingly unattractive standing at almost 500% in March of this year. The Allerton Park proposal is for a contract between AmeyCespa and NYCC that has a 25 year term. The concern here is two-fold:</p> <p>a. Are the safeguards that are being put in place to protect the North Yorkshire residents and tax-payers in the event that AmeyCespa is unable to fulfil its contract adequate?</p> <p>b. In the event that AmeyCespa is unable to fulfil its contract what is the fall-back position NYCC?</p>
Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	03	Dioxins and Toxins - The PR department of AmeyCespa has attempted to reassure the public that 95% of the harmful toxins/dioxins will be removed from the exhaust released into the air (Public Meeting at Great Ouseburn on July 20th.). Recently a newly reconstituted incinerator on the Isle of Wight was closed down because the level of toxins/dioxins exceeded the legal limits by in excess of 800%. What are the safeguards in place for NYCC and its residents/taxpayers in the event that this occurs at Allerton Park?
Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	04	Location - Other than the comment that Allerton Park is central within the NYCC area, I have seen no justification for putting a very large tract of agricultural land at risk by locating the site there. It would have been far more sensible to locate it next to the Eggborough or Drax Power stations since they would not provide any greater risk that already exists at these sites. What are the safeguards that are being taken by NYCC to protect itself and the residents/taxpayers from litigation in the event that real damage is done to the agricultural land?

Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	05	Quantity - At present NYCC has a very poor record in the level of recycling that it achieves, I understand that it is in the low twenties in percentage terms. This, I understand, has necessitated planning for the size of incinerator and the guarantees of levels of waste to be delivered to the facility. Why has more effort not been considered/made to increase this level? I understand that the city of Carlisle achieves up to 72%! If the level of recycling is increased, the taxpayers will, I understand, still be left with a large bill and the reported "savings" of £ 300m will be purely illusory. What safeguards and being put in place to protect the residents and tax-payers from this?
Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	06	In light of the entry into administration of BCB Environmental Management, the operator of the Tockwith waste facility, I would also be grateful if would let me know the following: 1. Was this eventuality covered by the risk assessment prepared at the time of the award of the contract to BCB? 2. Will the residents and tax-payers have to bear any additional cost or is the performance bond adequate to take care of all costs involved? 3. Will this event have any impact on the level of the performance bond requested from AmeyCespa?
Pub 002	PFI/ 144a	07	I would like to know the financial penalties on the Council in the event that the contract is awarded but the planning permission is denied.
Pub 002	PFI/ 144b	01	Unfortunately you do not really appear to have not answered the questions that I raised. Strategy You are currently working on the Core Waste Strategy and, from your public pronouncements. you are clearly fully in favour of the proposed incinerator. The issue with which I am most concerned is what is the fallback position, in the event that NYCC reject your proposal in relation to the proposed incinerator? Since doing nothing is not a strategy, what are the alternatives that are being considered what are their anticipated costs? This issue was also raised under Financial Viability
Pub 002	PFI/ 144b	02	Financial Viability I sincerely hope that NYCC is doing its own due diligence since it would be a total abdication of their responsibilities effectively to delegate the due diligence process to the funding syndicate which will have substantially different objectives to NYCC. Part of the reason for raising this issue is that if AmeyCespa is the only "horse" left in the "race", I suspect that it would be very difficult to find a replacement in the event that Ferrovial SA fails thereby bringing down Amey plc, Cespa SA and their JV AmeyCespa, the proposed operator.
Pub 002	PFI/ 144b	03	Financial Penalties I was glad to learn that you have managed to mitigate the potential cost to NYCC in the event that the planning permission is refused. I hope, therefore, that, as prudence would dictate, this potential cost is covered by contingencies within the council budget

Pub 002	PFI/ 144b	04	<p>Health</p> <p>Unfortunately this is an issue on which the experts themselves disagree! My concern is to ensure that NYCC and the taxpayers are adequately protected in the event of a failure such as at in the Isle of Wight and at Biker in Newcastle. Please confirm that NYCC has taken adequate and competent legal advice to back up your that no cause of action would lie against NYCC since it would provide a field day Tort practitioners with NYCC involved.</p>
Pub 002	PFI/ 144b	05	<p>Site Location</p> <p>Of course AmeyCespa would prefer to have the site at Allerton. They stand to make more money that way. Why was the alternative of using the rail network not put in as a condition since it would have utilised the resource and removed a number of other problems as well?</p>
Pub 008	PFI/ 145	01	<p>Costs per tonne- Out of interest I did the arithmetic on compound interest at 2% per year on a base cost of £69 over a 25 year period which indicated the equivalent cost after 25 years would be £112 - then to average this over the period for comparative purposes would be at around £91. But in order for this to be meaningful we, I assume, need to apply the same RPI to your preferred contractors costs - or another way would be to identify your contractors first year cost and then we could assume that they would escalate by the same percentage depending on RPI, to give us accurate comparisons.</p> <p>Thank you for giving us the time yesterday afternoon. I think we left it that a) you would be given authority to assist us (by the provision of information) to correct any figures on my spread sheet which Ian and yourself felt needed adjustment in order for it to be a document which we could jointly recognise as accurate and consequently be suitable, for us, to present to members as an accurate reflection of the cost of the alternative strategies.</p>
Pub 008	PFI/ 145	02	<p>b) you could confirm, as mentioned at the meeting, that the previous request for tenders was aimed more or less exclusively at 'multi national' companies and did not encourage smaller local individual companies or consortiums of smaller local companies to bid. and</p>
Pub 008	PFI/ 145	03	<p>c) you could also kindly confirm that the prospect of having a large 'waste to energy' plant at Ferrybridge 20 miles from Allerton (and looking for 'Waste Derived Fuel' suppliers) was not a consideration at the time the tenders where being evaluated.</p>
Pub 008	PFI/ 145	04	<p>I've had a look at the website which is very interesting and, it seems to me and I hope you agree, with the substitution of some basic alternative numbers we should be able to produce a relatively accurate comparative. Would you kindly let me know when you will be able to get back to me with the information?</p>
Pub 008	PFI/ 145	05	<p>Not very satisfied with response.</p>

DCo 002	PFI/ 146	01	In relation to the proposed 25 year contract to incinerate North Yorkshire's non-recyclable waste, could you therefore please tell me:1. If there are any minimum stipulated amounts of waste which the County will be obliged to supply to the incinerator over the course of the contract.
DCo 002	PFI/ 146	02	2. If there are such minimum commitments, what percentage of North Yorkshire's current non-recyclable waste do those levels represent?
DCo 002	PFI/ 146	03	3.Are there any financial penalties payable by the Council if it doesn't supply the stated amount?
DCo 002	PFI/ 146	04	4. If so, what would be the annual financial implication of a reduction of, say, 30% of the level of non-recyclable waste produced accross the County?
DCo 002	PFI/ 146a	01	Thanks for sending this. However, I don't think you've really explicitly answered any of my questions, which were..... I understand that NYCC are asking for comments on these proposals up until the middle of september. In order to be able to do so in an informed manner then I, for one, would need to know the answers to the above questions so that I can know exactly what it is that we're signing up to, whether or not it impacts any other long-term aspirations that we may have as a Council or a society, and whether or not presents a financial risk in the long-term.
DCo 002	PFI/ 146a	02	You've implied that the answer to question 1 is yes, although I'm not clear whether or not the GMT commitment is for the full 25 year term of the contract, or whether or not the GMT increases or decreases over time. You state that you anticipate that we should be able to reach our 2020recycling targets early with the assistance of this facility. That sounds good, but this is a 25 year contract - what are our recycling targets for 2025, 2030 and 2035, and how does the facility and the GMT fit in with those?
DCo 002	PFI/ 146b	01	Given that the plant includes a MRF and an anaerobic digestion facility, could you please confirm whether or not the GMT includes amounts to go to the facility as a whole or just to the incineration part. And if the GMT relates to the amount of waste to be treated by all methods at the plant: 1. How much is expected to be recovered by the MRF for recycling or treated by anaerobic digestion? 2. Does the Council have any say as to how much is treated by each method, or is this a matter purely for the operator? In other words, would the operator still have fulfilled their contract obligations if all the waste they received was incinerated and none treated by any of the other methods?
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	01	We have Ferrybridge which is already able to receive municipal waste to burn and could be used in the short term whilst we put into effect the reduce and reuse parts of the waste hierarchy. Why are there plans to build new facilities, and what proportion of the costs and profits are taken by the incinerator part of this project?

Pub 059	PFI/ 147	02	What are the targets of the current reduction campaigns? are they successful? how is this measured and can they be expanded and enlarged upon? If they haven't been successful what will be done to make sure that reduce and reuse remain at the top of the waste hierarchy?
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	03	We have been given figures of reduced waste disposal costs of £260million by Councillor Clare Woods, but in the 'Lets talk less rubbish', they say that this figure will be £320 million, How can the public know what to believe? There is a lot of difference here.
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	04	We have also been told that the criteria for judging the tenders was based on a balance of 60% environmental, technical and quality as against 40% financial. How can we know how the first three were balanced, or are they considered to be the same thing? Why is the environment given only twenty % weighting against 40% for financial considerations?
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	05	Whilst we can all agree that current methods of waste disposal are not sustainable why are we only being asked to compare figures with that situation rather than best practice elsewhere?
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	06	How will this facility reduce waste production and promote re-use at local levels?
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	07	This facility seems to be based around road transport. Has any consideration been given to rail transport from the proposed waste transfer sites, and whether there might be environmental and cost benefits?
Pub 059	PFI/ 147	08	Finally, How can we know that the proposed public consultation will not just be window dressing after the decision has been decided? Where we be able to see whether or how they have been allowed to influence the final decision making?
Pub 060	PFI/ 148	01	<p>First of all the volume of waste that is produced needs to be cut drastically. The secondary problem is what to do with the rest, and for that there will need be a number of different solutions.</p> <p>Most domestic waste is produced and delivered to the public from food suppliers via the supermarkets. It should not be the duty of the public to pay for its disposal. The return of this waste to the suppliers, via the supermarkets in the lorries that go back empty at present, would be more just. If this were implemented then the food suppliers would be very quick to develop packaging that could either be recycled, or that they wanted back to re-use. Another possible idea: Disposable nappies account for an unpleasant and large amount of domestic waste. If reusable nappies were subsidised, and provided free of charge together with biodegradable nappy liners, that could be flushed away, that's half the problem solved. Then if local laundries could arrange doorstep collection and delivery services (also subsidised and therefore free) that could be another nasty mess removed at a modest cost.</p>

Pub 060	PFI/ 148	02	If the waste crisis is dealt with imaginatively then the amount of incinerator waste will rapidly reduce below that which is needed to keep a large incinerator going. Locking North Yorkshire into a contract commits us to produce un-recyclable waste in large quantities for the next 25 or 30 years. The consequences for the environment are appalling. My question is: Is this really what you want us to do?
Pub 060	PFI/ 148a	01	Request for a copy of the York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership waste management strategy.
Pub 060	PFI/ 148a	02	York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership waste management strategy- when do you anticipate something more up to date will be available and request for information on the PFI.
Pub 060	PFI/ 148b	01	I have just received NY TIMES with its article on the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Site. 1. Nowhere is the cost of the site mentioned, only a PFI input, which amounts to a very expensive credit card, making us vulnerable to future interest charges. What is the total cost, and where is it coming from? Why was the total cost not mentioned? 2. In the light of the annual tonnage figures proposed: 20,000 for recycling, 40,000 for anaerobic digestion and 320,000 for incineration (this figure was somehow omitted from the article), why was the word 'incineration' not mentioned in the article? You could say that it was dressed up as 'thermal energy from waste treatment', but this sounds like deliberate misleading of the public to me.
Pub 060	PFI/ 148b	02	In view of the fact that many communities are now actively working to reduce waste, as we must because of the global waste crisis, will the site still be viable if in, say, five years' time we've managed to halve our waste production? Much waste comes from oil-based materials, which will become more scarce as oil prices rise and that in itself will reduce our extravagant waste production (much as our carbon production is at present being reduced by people driving less). What is the minimum tonnage at which it can operate? Will AmeyCespa like that, or are you putting us into some sort of strait-jacket of deliberate waste production? I understand that some similar European sites are already having to import waste from other countries to keep their incinerators running.
Pub 060	PFI/ 148b	03	Have you looked into any emissions-free closed loop incineration? www.eclipsuk.co.uk < http://www.eclipsuk.co.uk > for example?
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	01	We write to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals. They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire county. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly.

Pub 061	PFI/ 151	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions.
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies.
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	04	And it ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	05	The prospect of emissions being pumped out 24/7 frightens us, other parents and pregnant ladies in the area. Toxins building up in the atmosphere over a 10 to 20 year period during their developmental lifetime, to an amount that will eventually be present forever and will greatly reduce the already heavily polluted air in addition to local motorway and busy York and Harrogate feeder roads (M1, A59 and old A1). The mechanical sorting and anaerobic digester planned for the site will only deal with a small portion of the waste going there so the majority will be burnt in the incinerator, so there will be more greenhouse gas emissions. Will we and our children be exposed to cancerous toxins which will reduce our life expectancies? Will my children's reproductive health be affected? Why are out-dated toxic incineration plans being proposed and supported? We live in a fertile agricultural area with many small holdings, not to mention home grown produce in allotments and gardens. Not only will the pollution affect the air quality but the produce and water we put into our mouths and which will enter into the food chain generally.
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	06	As well as the busy road networks already affecting the areas in terms of pollution (see above), an incinerator would increase traffic and further pollution (air and noise) as a consequence. Commuter times to work and leisure locations for residents and visitors will be affected
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	07	The Vale of York is a flat expanse of land which is probably the worst location for such an ugly building and huge tower. It will spoil an area of outstanding beauty with such a monstrosity of a building.
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	08	This will also have a significant knock on effect of reducing house prices
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	09	North Yorkshire's rate payers will be tied into a 25 year, £900 million investment of outdated technology
Pub 061	PFI/ 151	10	The councils have not properly considered the alternatives such as: Rapidly ramping up the recycling rate; Reducing waste; More composting or Multi-site facilities .North Yorkshire is slowly ramping up to 50% recycling

Pub 061	PFI/ 151	11	Large scale incineration is not needed, it's out of date and; it's a waste of our money. We understand that you will be asked to vote in favour of the council's plans later this summer. We urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward. In particular we ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossal expensive and risky venture. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review.
Pub 062	PFI/ 152	01	Request for information
Pub 063	PFI/ 153	01	Is it true that the land is only going to be leased to Amey-Cespa and that they are not buying it? If so how long is the lease for?
Pub 063	PFI/ 153	02	I am very concerned about the finances involved in this project. From a layman's point of view it seems as though NYCC are spending massive sums of money for a landowner and private company to make all the profit. How does the council tax payer benefit from all this
Pub 063	PFI/ 153	03	Is there a viable alternative which involves more recycling or is it really too expensive for the NYCC to run? I don't understand why so many councillors seem to be ignoring the green footprint when councils elsewhere are going wholeheartedly down the road of recycling.
Pub 063	PFI/ 153	04	A rather cynical question but has anyone in NYCC got a vested interest in all this – any connections with the directors of Amey-Cespa?
Pub 064	PFI/ 154	01	Is this affordable? And how has this been assessed
Pub 064	PFI/ 154	02	Waste is reducing will there be waste for the facility
Pub 064	PFI/ 154	03	What are the current recycling rates and how will this increase our recycling?
Pub 064	PFI/ 154	04	What is the audit trail for the site selection?
Pub 065	PFI/ 156	01	Why are you pursuing the PFI route? Is there not enough evidence now available to suggest that this form of contract has been well and truly discredited. there is no shortage of examples... where the long term costs are far greater than was contracted for

Pub 065	PFI/ 156	02	I dont believe that local authorities have the legal or finance expertise to prevent such a contract from allowing Amey Cespa from 'stitching up ' North Yorkshire County Council in the long term.
Pub 065	PFI/ 156	03	What are the full life costs of this plant?
Pub 065	PFI/ 156	04	There is no mention of the income that will be generated from the production of electricity. Is this going to be fed in the 'Grid'?
Pub 065	PFI/ 156	05	The article mentions that savings of £320m on waste management bills will be made. During what period will these saving be made?
Pub 065	PFI/ 156	06	What is this plant going to cost bearing in mind that £65m is coming from Central Govt, however it would be niaive to rely on this as we dont know what cuts are going to be made in the near future.
Pub 050	PFI/ 157	01	I can only repeat my first letter ... the proposed scheme has too long a contract for such an antiquated systemwhich may be obsolete in 10 years, not to mention the crippling finanacila burdens.
Pub 050	PFI/ 157	02	There was a Radio 4 Today programme in which health authorities were raising that PFI schemes were costing them far more than had originally been thought.
Pub 050	PFI/ 157	03	FOE have a detailed document on Waste disposal I urge you to read it and take up its proposals instead of the incinerator scheme
PCo 019	PFI/ 158	01	What is advocated we support in achieving these long term objectives (reducing waste disposal and cost of disposal)
PCo 019	PFI/ 158	02	What commitment is there by the company for the operation and maintenance of this plant?
PCo 019	PFI/ 158	03	Will this plant be manned by UK residents and if so how many compared with the full compliment require on site
PCo 019	PFI/ 158	04	We recognise that there will be communities who are not happy about the outcome but as ever it is a balancing act.
Pub 066	PFI/ 159	01	Called to log an objection to and comments on the Allerton Park proposals.

Pub 066	PFI/ 159	02	She read the article in NY Times and nowhere in the article does it use the words 'incinerate' or 'burn'. Neither is it clear from the photos or article that there will be a 76m (250ft) chimney. The article is very misleading and had she not been to one of the Amey Cespa meetings she would not be aware of this and would perhaps think that the overall idea was not that bad. Call was angry at article in particular as it was so misleading, 'almost like propaganda' which is going to be seen by 100s of thousands of people.
Pub 066	PFI/ 159	03	The article mentions the aim to reach 50% recycling but this does not compare to other counties, some of whom reach up to 70% recycling without building installations like this
Pub 066	PFI/ 159	04	The chimney will be higher than York Minster and visible for miles around. Locals are already referring to this as 'The Chimney of the North'
Pub 066	PFI/ 159	05	At the Great Ouseburn meeting someone asked why this could not have been built at Drax and one of the Amey Cespa staff replied that Drax was not in North Yorkshire. This did not inspire confidence
Pub 066	PFI/ 159	06	Someone else at a meeting complained that house prices would be affected by this. The Amey Cespa representative said 'it doesn't matter because I can't afford to live here anyway.' The caller's brother's house sale has fallen through due to this
Pub 066	PFI/ 159	07	Why commit to 25 years worth of spending when the council is struggling to save money?
Pub 067	PFI/ 160	01	Whilst agrees that Allerton Park is a better site than most if the facility has to be built, does it really have to be built at all.
Pub 067	PFI/ 160	02	Surely the money would be better spent elsewhere, not least in increasing kerbside recycling
Pub 067	PFI/ 160	03	There will be the huge cost of building it probably followed by more cost when the county still does not reach quotas, and so the taxpayer will doubly suffer.
Pub 067	PFI/ 160	04	Concerned about the increased traffic as lorries visit the facility from all over the county. The A1 and A168 will suffer but specifically the A59, already a very busy road, will be hit the hardest. Has this been addressed?
Pub 068	PFI/ 161	01	I write to ask you to reject the proposal that has been made to the planning authority to build a waste plant at Allerton

Pub 068	PFI/ 161	02	I understand that it involves incineration thus creating energy and that it would be a PFI project. If my understanding is correct, the cost of disposing of household waste would be mitigated by charging commercial organisations to incinerate their waste and by the production and sale of electricity. While superficially attractive with some token recycling activities at the planned site, the reality is that this facility would be a hugely profitable venture for its developers and a massive expense for the people of North Yorkshire for whom there is a much cheaper and simpler alternative
Pub 068	PFI/ 161	03	We simply need to increase the amount of recycling that is achieved in the sub-region. Our performance is pathetic by comparison with other parts of Yorkshire, let alone other parts of the UK and indeed other parts of the world
Pub 068	PFI/ 161	04	After we have minimised the waste that isn't recycled why can't we dispose of it to the areas power stations that are already incinerating material
Pub 068	PFI/ 161	05	I believe that the huge incinerator chimney towering above everything else in the subregion would rapidly become an expensive white elephant and a dreadful eyesore that would conflict totally with the truthful and wonderful images portrayed so eloquently by Gary Verity and his colleagues at 'Welcome to Yorkshire'.
Pub 068	PFI/ 161	06	The pace of change is far to fast to be committing £900m to such a controversial project
Pub 069	PFI/ 162	01	I am writing to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire County.
Pub 069	PFI/ 162	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of C02 emissions.
Pub 069	PFI/ 162	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies.
Pub 069	PFI/ 162	04	It ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 069	PFI/ 162	05	I urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward.
Pub 069	PFI/ 162	06	In particular I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a hugely expensive and risky venture. At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review.

Pub 070	PFI/ 163	01	I am emailing to express my dismay and disappointment at the article concerning the Allerton Park proposals in the NY Times for September 2010. The very least you could have done is given people the full information on which to make an informed decision. The information you choose to avoid printing renders you guilty. As for Amey Cespa I really think you need to look at the home page of your web site as the misinformation continues.
Pub 070	PFI/ 163	02	You know that this is NOT only not the best solution that there are much better solutions out there or perhaps you are not that up to date! You are not looking to put in state of the art technology but out dated and ill thought out technology. It may have been good in its day but its day has gone.
Pub 070	PFI/ 163	03	Think about the future for our children not only in deserving clean air, soil and food
Pub 070	PFI/ 163	04	The financial chains you wish to put around their necks because you did not look at all this earlier!
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	01	Why is it in that in all of the publicity for this plan you continue to avoid the word incinerator? It has been describe as a waste recycling plant, a waste handing facility, a waste recovery park and considering that 85% of the waste will be burn in a giant incinerator with a 200 ft chimney?
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	02	Why do you not recite that this solution is not green, because what comes out the chimney with be carbon mixed with a number of nano particles such as furans and dioxin which are amongst the most deadly
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	03	Why did the council not allow for a public debate? Why the public was not consulted properly?
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	04	Why do we need this monstrosity when recycling waste is actually reducing on an annual basis and with a little help from the district councils will hit 50% recycling in the next 2 years anyway?
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	05	Why are the council gagging to spend money which we do not have when it could be spent in many other areas that are being cut? Why are the council opting for an expensive solution when there are better and cheaper solution available to them?
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	06	Why are the council continuing to ignore - reason and logic on this subject? Why does the council try to mislead the public and treat them as stupid?
Pub 071	PFI/ 164	07	the only beneficiially to this plan will be the Spanish contactor and Lord Mowbray who already has millions

Pub 072	PFI/ 165	01	Called to object to the proposed facility,
Pub 072	PFI/ 165	02	Specifically to the emissions which the chimney will be putting out: Will this not increase carbon emissions in a time when everyone is trying to reduce them.
Pub 072	PFI/ 165	03	How will this affect the health of nearby residents (the whole of Harrogate is nearby)? The smell from the chimney could be appalling.
Pub 073	PFI/ 166	01	I am writing to ask for your support in opposing the Allerton Park Incinerator
Pub 073	PFI/ 166	02	POLLUTION –Wide spread toxic emissions-24/7-putting local children, babies, unborn babies and the general public's health at risk. There are conflicting opinions about the level of long-term toxic emissions from the chimney, plus the dangers associated with toxic debris resulting from incineration. This subject needs careful debate. This project will result in a vast increase in exhaust emissions incurred by the extended mileage of waste refuse vehicles
Pub 073	PFI/ 166	03	LOGISTICS -It is inconceivable that all North Yorkshire's refuse vehicles (120 vehicles, I am led to believe) will descend on Allerton Park. Vehicles from Scarborough or Whitby will incur a 4-5 hour return journey in addition to their daily collection duties. Not to mention the route they will take -A64, York ring road, with many congested roundabouts and the A59 all extremely busy roads, or would it be the A170, negotiating Helmsley and Sutton Bank?
Pub 073	PFI/ 166	04	VISUAL IMPACT -A 250 foot chimney! This can't be a fitting introduction to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a disaster for tourist towns like Knaresborough, Ripon and Thirsk.
Pub 073	PFI/ 166	05	COST -The cost to ratepayers is £900 million to dispose of household waste. With better Council Management of kerb-side re-cycling, would there be a need for this high capacity incinerator? There would be a great increase in the cost of extra fuel, maintenance and man hours incurred in transportation.
Pub 073	PFI/ 166	06	ALTERNATIVES -Educate the general public to re-cycle. The Council should improve the kerb-side re-cycling service to bring us in line with other areas. There should be regional waste screening plants in BROWNFIELD sites to handle local domestic waste. This would dramatically reduce the amount going to landfill.
Pub 074	PFI/ 167	01	Called to log objections to the scheme.

Pub 074	PFI/ 167	02	As a rate payer he is already angry that he is not provided with kerbside recycling and has to do it all of his own back.
Pub 074	PFI/ 167	03	He is amazed the NYCC is choosing to invest a massive sum of money in 'old fashioned' technology (incinerator) when it would be so much more well spent encouraging people to personally recycle.
Pub 075	PFI/ 168	01	Has called not to complain, however would like to make a comment about the location of the plant. Worried about the major environmental effect this location will have on the atmosphere due to the increased amount of lorries going to be used to transport goods. The current location is in the most south west corner of North Yorkshire Area. Have you not thought about using the central geographically area of North Yorkshire. The most scientific area is York even though this location is densely populated location it is however in the hub or the railways which could be used to transport the goods better
Pub 076	PFI/ 169	01	Would like to log opposition entirely to the site and strongly objects to facility on all grounds
Pub 076	PFI/ 169	02	Misleading and unfounded and in no article does it refer to this as a incinerator,
Pub 076	PFI/ 169	03	Objects to the chimney being in an area close to residential areas.
Pub 076	PFI/ 169	04	Does not believe that the pollution is going to be less that that from a car exhaust
PCo 020	PFI/ 170	01	Although the Councillors were concerned about the plan, they felt that they didn't have enough information to make a decision. They have therefore asked me to invite an officer from NYCC to their next meeting to explain the facility and answer questions.
PCo 021	PFI/ 171	01	Could you please let me know what the present situation is about the proposals for the new waste disposal plant at Allerton near Harrogate? I have heard there was a fire there and that plans have been put on hold, would you let me know
Pub 077	PFI/ 172	01	Support for Allerton Waste Recovery Park and the need to move away from the unsustainable practice of landfill.

Pub 078	PFI/ 173	01	Would like a list of who attended the recent meeting about the proposed Waste Treatment Facility. Particularly interested in the names of the Councillors who attended. (Alverton Castle Hotel "Waste disposal the Burning Issue")
Pub 078	PFI/ 173	02	Details of proposal requested by phone.
Pub 079	PFI/ 174	01	Worried about the proximity of the Allerton Waste Recovery site to Boroughbridge, especially the height of the proposed chimney stack. Bearing in mind that Boroughbridge is due east of Allerton we will be subject to the wind which regularly blows from the west and we feel much rubbish and unpleasant smells will be dumped on Boroughbridge changing it from the very pleasant town it now is to an absolute hell hole.
PCo 022	PFI/ 175	01	I am instructed to reiterate our request, made by letter addressed to our County Councillor, Andrew Lee, on the 2 August 2010, that a Public Inquiry be called to decide upon this matter. I am writing to you to add the concerns of this Parish Council to those already widely expressed by others, and to request that the final decision over the construction of an industrial sized waste facility be taken not at County level. The subject is of such magnitude, that we feel that it should be more widely discussed, and would therefore ask that a Public Inquiry be called.
Pub 080	PFI/ 176	01	More information to be published on NYCC's website of the proposed incinerator at Allerton Park. and also the dates and venues of the forthcoming presentation meetings proposed for September.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	01	I am writing on behalf of theto object to the plans to build an 'Energy from Waste 'incinerator.... we ask you to reject this plan.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	02	pollution including emissions of greenhouse gases, Incinerators are an archaic tool of waste disposal, shown to produce dangerous levels of dioxins, which has been linked to cancer, IQ deficits, disrupted sexual development, birth defects, immune system damage, behavioural disorders and diabetes, causing rising dissatisfaction and health problems. Despite the claims made by enthusiasts this is still the case. We also note the emerging research suggesting that extremely fine particles ("nanoparticles" of the order of 1-100nm), which cannot be successfully cleaned from exhaust, can pose a danger to health disproportionate to their mass. Such effects are not correctly assessed under the existing emissions regime'. Nor is the existing regime a guarantee of safety: Dundee's PFI "waste-to-energy" incinerator at one point breached its emission limits 19 times in three months. Dundee's scheme has not proved cost effective either-since it opened in 2000 the Dundee incinerator has run up losses of £26 million".

CGr 003	PFI/ 177	03	We believe that such a plan would neither be cost effective Frequently such losses are picked up by the public sector after guarantees in the contract. We would like an assurance that York and North Yorkshire councils will not be liable for penalties in the event of supply shortfalls in waste volume or financial losses incurred by the operator. (In Nottingham the Council was paying £100,000 per month in 2007 as a result of reduction of demand for heating'), The cost is already unacceptable. £900 million over the next 25years is difficult to defend amid diminished budgets in sectors that the public may feel are more important.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	04	A would have a detrimental effect on recycling rates, An incinerator would send out the wrong message to the Yorkshire community. In 2002, after getting locked into an energy-From-waste contract, Nottingham Council gained the lowest rate of recycling in the UK. In York we are only 2% away from our recycling 2013 target already. Over its six-year history, the JMWP has consistently been proven wrong in its projections predicting an increase in waste arisings when there was a decline, and failing to predict the dramatic increase in recycling rates
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	05	The landscape of the Vale of York. We also consider the siting of the incinerator to be inappropriate. The proposed site is adjacent to a Grade 1 listed castle, a newly build golf course and a planned five star hotel. This is an inconsiderate and inappropriate location that will cost many jobs and livelihoods. It is also a highly visible location from all around the Vale of York.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	06	However, with over 45 recycling points and successful schemes such as the 'York Rotters' with 6000 members there is heavy evidence to suggest that York wants to recycle more. Compare this to the statement from the Associate Director of Environmental Services at Stockton Borough Council (in Cleveland) that now, "essentially we are into waste maximisation", constrained by contract from doing even a modest amount of recycling.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	07	York recently applied to the Zero Waste Places Standard, aimed at progressively reducing residual waste; this 25-year contract renders those aspirations meaningless. Recycling waste saves three to six times as much energy as incinerating waste and many successful profit making companies use recycled goods. Anaerobic digesters are operating in various places in the UK as profit-making enterprises. Centralising our waste disposal and committing it to incineration will result in a significant increase in vehicle miles and greenhouse gases emitted.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177	08	The proposed incinerator does not accord with policies promoting reuse and recycling.
CGr 003	PFI/ 177a	01	We had exaggerated the cost of landfill and that we'd underestimated recycling. His theory was if landfill tax didn't rise exponentially, and if recycling did, the economic case for the incinerator would disappear. He recommended a plan B be drawn up.
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	01	Enter the EEC and central government, fines, landfill taxes and year on year increases, so getting rid of waste inevitably becomes more and more expensive.

Pub 010	PFI/ 178	02	Enter recycling which isn't cheap but must be cheaper than this new alternative, but lets increase the EEC penalties that should swing the exercise.
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	03	The NYCC recycling system works well for me if plastic and cardboard could be recycled there would be little residue I could manage with a monthly collection. I don't understand why North Yorkshire is stuck at 31% recycling others at 50-70%, is it a management problem?
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	04	NYCC are pushing for an incineration solution which leaves 20-30% ashes to be landfilled
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	05	There is also the pollution effect
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	06	I note that Holland and Germany are successful at recycling so this system might have possibilities
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	07	PFI has cost the UK taxpayers billions in various areas
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	08	What is the total estimate building cost, how are NYCC going to be charged and over how many years and what costs will be passed to the council tax payer
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	09	What recycling rates is the cost based upon
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	10	What if NYCC can beat these rates
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	11	Is the £320 m saving returned to the council tax payer
Pub 010	PFI/ 178	12	What would happen to property prices in the vicinity of the incinerator?

Pub 010	PFI/ 178a	01	Is the £675.8 million adjusted for inflation?
Pub 010	PFI/ 178a	02	What is the recycling rate for North Yorkshire?
Pub 010	PFI/ 178a	03	Please can you provide clarification on the figure for Total cost of PFI (includes non PFI e.g. HWRC)
Pub 010	PFI/ 178a	04	Dates/times for Harrogate Area Committee and the AmeyCespa exhibitions at Marton Moor and Arkendale
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	01	Is there a conflict of interest between Members of Council voting on the project and those who also sit on the planning committee?
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	02	If planning is passed, can there be a Public Inquiry?
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	03	Is NYCC breaching European Human Rights Laws by not giving thorough consultation and closing consultation on the 12th November?
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	04	Has Richard Flinton had experience of working outside of the public sector? Why was he not at the Hambleton Area Committee at Helperby?
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	05	What are the recycling rates across North Yorkshire and York
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	06	Asked whether individuals have been invited to speak to the Council or individual members of the project team
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	07	Felt that the presentation did not have enough information on finance, there was no compelling evidence put forward for the project and little information about environmental impacts (traffic etc)

Pub 081	PFI/ 180	08	North Yorks does not have adequate infrastructure or road network and we should look at waste management on a local scale.
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	09	Asked whether we would be importing waste to the facility in the future as waste is reducing. EU laws are about stopping waste at the source
Pub 081	PFI/ 180	10	What is the Partnership with AmeyCespa?
Pub 082	PFI/ 181	01	I have now read the technical details of the document. I admit I was misled by what was a NIMBY approach and save for doubts about the length of the contract I am sure this should be supported.
Pub 082	PFI/ 181	02	Even in these days of zero risk taking it should be accepted that proper incineration destroys all toxic organic chemicals
Pub 083	PFI/ 182	01	I am asking for a copy of your "separate and more detailed briefing note" to your fellow-councillors about the proposed Allerton incinerator, to which you refer in your statement of 21 July. There is so much mis-information flying around, and I am sure this will help me to understand what is proposed, and why.
Pub 084	PFI/ 183	01	NYCC should be investing in re-cycling and NOT in toxic incineration.
Pub 084	PFI/ 183	02	NYCC are lagging way behind the rest of the country in recycling and this money could and should be spent on improving recycling facilities throughout the county.
Pub 084	PFI/ 183	03	Incineration would actually be a disincentive to recycling.
Pub 084	PFI/ 183	04	It is outdated technology,
Pub 084	PFI/ 183	05	Would distribute toxic particles all over North Yorkshire - a hell of a legacy for future generations. Furthermore it would be a massive addition to the county's carbon footprint,

Pub 084	PFI/ 183	06	The 240 foot high chimney would be an eyesore for miles around.
Pub 052	PFI/ 184	01	Log his opposition for the waste incinerator
Pub 052	PFI/ 184	02	It is near to a grade 1 listed castle -It will change the character of the area
Pub 052	PFI/ 184	03	Feels the tax payers money should not be used to fund it
Pub 052	PFI/ 184	04	Perhaps as a Council we could do more to recycle
Pub 085	PFI/ 185	01	Protest strongly at the proposed folly of building an industrial incineration plant in the heart of North Yorkshire
Pub 086	PFI/ 186	01	<p>I understand that the public meetings have been arranged to discuss the proposed Waste Recovery Park to be built in Allerton Park, Knaresborough. I am extremely disappointed that only one of them is arranged outside of normal working hours. How can these be called public meetings if a huge majority of people affected by the proposals cannot attend due to work commitments?</p> <p>I am also frankly amazed that only one of the meetings is in any vicinity of the proposed site and those people affected by the proposals. Why has nothing been arranged in Knaresborough or Boroughbridge?</p> <p>Many voters in the community feel extremely alienated by the way these meetings and the consultation process are being managed.</p>
PCo 023	PFI/ 187	01	At its meeting last nightParish Council accepted the present plans for waste disposal outlined by NYCC.
PCo 023	PFI/ 187	02	but expressed concern about traffic levels and the environmental impact of distances travelled to the proposed facility
Pub 087	PFI/ 188	01	Concerns about the cost of the project and the length of time the project will take. Lots of PFI contracts are expensive for the Tax payers at a time when we are going to be under some financial pressure. It seems that it is not a commitment we should be entering into.

Pub 087	PFI/ 188	02	Technology in processing waste of different kinds is improving and developing all the time. It is wrong to enter into a long term contract with ONE type of processor.
PCo 024	PFI/ 190	01	My council discussed the generality of this and resolved to say that they were reluctant to agree to the incineration of potentially dangerous waste.
PCo 034	PFI/ 191	01	We are advised that officers from your Waste Management Services Department have recently authorised the removal of roadside signs put out by local groups and Parish Councils to raise public awareness of the proposals for a large waste processing site at Allerton Quarry. The above actions make it clear to us that certain officers employed by North Yorkshire Council are trying to stifle opposition to the Allerton Waste Site proposals and by doing so are attempting to suppress the democratic process of free expression.
Pub 078	PFI/ 192	01	What is the present situation with any contracts signed - the reason being one of the City of York Council at the seminar held last night raised the question that if the project does not go a head then what would be the cost to NYCC?
Pub 078	PFI/ 192	02	Planning -how is transport going to be assessed?
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	01	A major problem is that we have not been given a meaningful flow sheet of the treatment that is proposed at Allerton Waste Plant
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	02	Airborne pollution will strike susceptible lungs over a wide area, before settling on the soil
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	03	Nor is it clear what research you have carried out into alternative environmentally-sound. non thermal/non hazardous mechanical biological treatments.
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	04	I believe that all residents would enthusiastically support an early Implementation of enhanced programs of source recycling that would make way for a large reduction in tonnage of residual waste to be treated.
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	05	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times gives no information about its reduction recycling and reuse activities nor the extent AD will play
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	06	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times is a selective in its presentation of facts
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	07	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times.... Artist's impression lacks explanation.

Pub 089	PFI/ 194	08	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times.... there is no mention of the proposed monstrous incinerator with its 260 ft high chimney, no effluent greenhouse gas and dust cloud /toxic chemicals harmful to our health
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	09	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times.....no mention that York City Council has banned incinerators
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	10	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times....no mention of the transportation and associated pollution of 400,000 tons of household waste to the incinerator
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	11	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times.....no mention of our poor rate of recycling. If we recycled 100% there would be no residual waste to incinerate
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	12	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times....there is no mention of this inevitable shortfall of waste
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	13	The NYCC (August) article in NY Times..... no mention of justification for nominating AmeyCespa
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	14	Alternative way forward, recycle waste that is currently disposed of
Pub 089	PFI/ 194	15	Alternative way forward, treatment of organics MBT and use of AD
Pub 090	PFI/ 196	01	Are there any other facilities like AmeyCespa are proposing in the area and are any other facilities producing electricity?
Pub 090	PFI/ 196	02	Are we are meeting our recycling targets?
Pub 091	PFI/ 199	01	Please press on with all possible speed with the incinerator
Pub 091	PFI/ 199	02	Too much time is given to objections from people whose objections are rooted in ignorance.
Pub 091	PFI/ 199	03	Present positive outcomes from incinerators already in use elsewhere.

Com 004	PFI/ 200	01	Currently, I am working on a profile for the above project and had heard that the bank mandate had been won. I was wondering if you would be able to confirm that this information is correct and if possible, name who the banks are.
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	01	I am confused with all the figures which are published with no facts to back-up the figures.
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	02	What is the estimated cost of the facility installation?
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	03	What is the estimated cost of NY landfill over the 25 year period without the waste management facility?
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	04	Does the £320m saving include the cost of the waste management installation?
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	05	What are the potential financial liabilities to NY ratepayers for any breach of Contract?
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	06	Does the estimated £320m saving take account of any potential contractual penalties?
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	07	Are the contractual penalties covered by insurance within the forecast savings?
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	08	Having read your e-mail, I now wonder who will actually own the waste management plant and who will pay to
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	09	I would like to close by expressing my concern at being involved in a very long term contract which provides no improved waste management policy capability.
Pub 092	PFI/ 201	10	I understand that a number of waste transfer stations are being installed throughout the County. Waste screening at these Plants, in my opinion, would provide a good alternative project which could handle waste locally.
Pub 078	PFI/ 202	01	Questions about the process at AWRP

Pub 078	PFI/ 202	02	Concern was about the metal extraction and that he had recently been to see Dr Paul Connett and that he felt we should be doing more to recycle.
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	01	In the newsletter there is no information provided as to what percentage of the waste taken to the site will be incinerated. Can you deny that it will be 80% with only 5% recycled? If the claim is that the plant will help us recycle more then why do we need such a large incinerator/chimney? You are in effect, refuting your own argument
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	02	Why do you have to pursue the incinerator option at all?
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	03	Is it not possible to take account of the experience of other councils and to re-consider your decision to build a plant of this size and type, which after all was made a number of years ago and must therefore be possible to improve upon?
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	04	Why do you have to build one large plant which immediately causes issues around traffic movements, visual impact and location?
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	05	Building a number of smaller sites would be more appropriate and would allow you to benefit from the by-products of the incineration process if that had to be included. Hot water for example could be used by local industries if you were to locate individual plants in urban industrial areas.
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	06	Why are you proposing to make use of the bottom ash in aggregates to such a high degree? Recent experience (i.e. in Newcastle) has demonstrated the high toxicity and dangerous nature of bottom ash when mis-used. How will it be handled?
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	07	This is not the reasoned debate that we would expect from a mature, intelligent and responsible county council. Hand in hand goes the woeful attitude to public consultation which has been demonstrated to date.
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	08	The distortion of facts is best seen in the pictorial images of the plant in both NY Times and the latest newsletter. In the former the chimney has actually been "cut off so that it's full height cannot be seen. The scale "drawings" in the newsletter suggest that the chimney is going to be approx 100 metres which is actually higher than the 260 feet (c. 80 metres) we were originally advised. The image in NY Times shows the plant standing proud not sunk down into the quarry in contrast to the impression given by the text of the newsletter. Just exactly how high is it going to be? It is ludicrous to say that the site is already well screened -yes, because the operations are below ground level and the proposed plant is not - I would like to see you try to screen a 100m chimney!
Pub 011	PFI/ 203	09	In regards to traffic movements we are extremely concerned about the increased movements surely to be expected particularly along the A59 which is already congested in the peak hours and only in recent days there has been serious congestion following accidents on the A1 between Allerton and Boroughbridge junctions. It is disingenuous to say as you have, that you have been consulting on traffic movements when none have been forthcoming. In the newsletter it says "we expect traffic levels to be similar" -this is ridiculously vague. When will the transport assessment be released for public scrutiny?
Pub 011	PFI/ 203a	01	At recent public meetings reference was made to the need for waste transfer sites at various locations across North Yorkshire to support your proposals. Please can you let us know the proposed sites?

Pub 011	PFI/ 203b	01	Please can you confirm the locations of the current waste transfer stations (Hambleton, Richmondshire and Scarborough) - i.e. which towns/villages are they near? Please can you explain what change there will be in the amount of waste these stations handle between the present and proposed future situations Please can you give some indication of the size of the new waste transfer stations? What will be their capacity? How much waste (tonnage) will be handled by each of them? How much land will they take up? Please can you supply any further information about potential locations? I assume below "Land at Burn Airfield in Selby District" refers to the proposed new Selby site.
Pub 011	PFI/ 203c	01	Repeat request for above information
Pub 011	PFI/ 203d	01	Many thanks for this information. Please can you tell me what tonnages Thirsk, Whitby and Scorton handle now?
Pub 093	PFI/ 204	01	I cannot express strongly enough my opposition to the plan to inflict such a project on North Yorkshire.
Pub 093	PFI/ 204	02	<p>As someone living near the Allerton site who plans to start a family shortly and has read many alarming reports of increased birth defects and adult cancers near incinerator.</p> <p>I am particularly interested, alarmed but somehow not surprised to read that you wrote 'Independently reviewed evidence shows no adverse health effects to people from living near incinerators (source DEFRA Waste Strategy for England 2007) and in its most recent report, The Health Protection Agency said that it did not recommend doing any more studies of public health around modern, well managed municipal waste incinerators as the effects are probably not measurable.' I presume you have not read any of the numerous reports concerning the very real and imminent threat from waste incinerators, particularly concerning adult cancers and birth defects? I suggest you start here http://www.ecomed.org.uk/publications/reports/the-health-effects-of-waste-incinerators. No surprise the ironically named Health Protection Agency don't recommend any more studies, is it?</p>
Pub 093	PFI/ 204	03	Putting it out to market will always bring the most profitable tenders for waste companies, not the projects that most benefit the environment or the citizens and voters of York and North Yorkshire.
Pub 093	PFI/ 204	04	North Yorks has a poor record on recycling. In 2010 we should be looking to cities like San Francisco and Oxford in developing a zero waste policy, and following the lead of councils like Lancashire in declaring a "no incinerator" policy on their lands. I have read extensively on this issue and fail to see why Yorkshire cannot follow Lancashire's lead in adopting a greener waste policy that concentrates on recycling and refuses to go down the incinerator route full stop.

Pub 093	PFI/ 204	05	I am also highly unconvinced by the economic arguments and suggest NYCC are heading blindly into a £900 white elephant
CGr 004	PFI/ 206	01	<p>Re: Article in NY Times September 2010 edition "Have Your Say on Waste Plans" We wish to complain about the above article. Nowhere in the article is the word incineration mentioned, despite this being the main activity at the site It mentions reclamation of 20,000 tonnes a year at the site, but does not put this into context of 320,000 tonnes going through the site each year. The photograph showing the proposed site does not clearly show the chimney and one might not even realise that there is a chimney at the site and certainly would not realise it was 260ft high. Nor is the chimney mentioned in the text.</p> <p>The photograph of the existing site gives a misleading impression It ie, an aerial view and looks very industrial However, because the site is a quarry surrounded by woodland it is not highly visible, in reality you can drive by it without knowing it is there. This is not the impression given by the photograph. Ground elevation views of the current site and the proposed site would give a very different impression</p> <p>The article gives an indication of alleged savings to the tax payer, but no indication of costs-which are colossal.</p> <p>It talks about recycling targets of 50%, but gives no comparison with rates achieved elsewhere</p> <p>The article asks for comments on North Yorkshire County Council's waste plans, however, we believe the way the information has been presented in this article is misleading and therefore does not allow the reader to make an informed judgement about the subject We would like to hear your views before referring this to the Press Complaints Commission.</p>
PCo 025	PFI/ 207	01	On the current proposals the Parish Council could not support NYCC
PCo 025	PFI/ 207	02	The cost of transporting waste form Skipton to the site will be enormous -? cost effective
PCo 025	PFI/ 207	03	25 years is far too long to tie anyone into a scheme for
PCo 025	PFI/ 207	04	By the time the centre is built and in operation the equipment and processors will be out of date
PCo 025	PFI/ 207	05	In a world of fast changing technology , in 25 years time things will have changed dramatically
PCo 025	PFI/ 207	06	The PFI will not benefit the community.

PCo 025	PFI/ 207	07	The targets that are aimed at, are quite low
Pub 094	PFI/ 208	01	I am a resident in Allerton Park, in close proximity (400yds) to the proposed new incineration plant and current landfill site. I find it extremely surprising that we have never had any support from the council to help us segregate our waste. Instead we are supplied black bags. This is especially ironic because of our geography. Please can you address this and inform me of your plans to deal with this. NYCC needs to increase recycling rates but to achieve this it must support residents who wish to participate and provide us the tools to support.
Pub 095	PFI/ 209	01	The information in the NYCC August Times was incorrect the site will only generate enough Electricity for 16,000 homes ie 24 MW at after diversity max demand of 1.5 KW. I have checked this with my ex Company NEDL and they agree with my calculations. Could you please arrange for the correct information to be in the October NYCC Times
Com 005	PFI/ 210	01	We are a local business situated close to the proposed site of Allerton Waste Recovery Park, and would like some more information about the facility
Pub 006	PFI/ 211	01	Do you know whether the Allerton Park Incinerator proposal is energy neutral ie it will produce more energy in total than it requires to run the whole plant
Pub 006	PFI/ 211	02	what will happen to the CO2 the plant will emit (since I thought the coalition were against increasing CO2 levels)
Pub 006	PFI/ 211	03	- have you, the other councillors and Ian looked at the Dunarbon solution?
Pub 006	PFI/ 211	04	Will the council tax payers in North Yorks benefit financially from the revenue Amey Cespa will earn by selling 23.5Mwh of power to the grid ie is there a clause in the PFI contract to ensure this?
Pub 006	PFI/ 211	05	Is there any solution to the waste issue that would produce less CO2 than the proposed Amey EfW solution?
DCo 003	PFI/ 212	01	I was told NYCC were looking for a site in the skipton area for this purpose, did they find one?? Who is the contact atDistrict Council is that you've been liaising with.

Pub 096	PFI/ 216	01	Not for or against it but would like some more information.
PCo 026	PFI/ 218	01	The view ofParish Council is that it generally supports the initiative, providing that recycling rates already being achieved by Ryedale District Council, are improved rather than diminished
PCo 027	PFI/ 218	01	Potential affect/impact of the inversion area that exists in the Vale of York,
PCo 027	PFI/ 219	02	The potential long-term financial impact of the PFI to the County Council and its tax payers if the heads of agreement are not carefully vetted and understood
Pub 097	PFI/ 220	01	I find the proposed decision for an incinerator at the December council meeting is quite outrageous bearing in mind that the national government will be presenting new recycling plans early in the new year. It would appear to be more sensible to wait until this information is to hand.
Pub 098	PFI/ 223	01	I wish to object to the Waste Recovery Plant at Allerton Park Quarry I formally request that these comments are circulated to all councillors on the planning committee including the Chairman himself.
Pub 098	PFI/ 223	02	Firstly the visual impact is disgraceful! The whole main building and large tower are visible from the Eastern views from Arkendale and this is a blight on the landscape. If the Waste Recovery Plant goes ahead I, along with many others, may consider moving and will be suing the council for the loss of value to my property. I will gain a Surveyors valuation pre Waste Plant and a valuation post Waste plant and I expect the council to make up the difference.
Pub 098	PFI/ 223	03	I wish to object and raise concerns on the health implications that are associated with the Waste Plant. I can imagine that AmeyCespa have given us strong guarantees that the Waste Plant will cause minimal harm to the environment and does not pose a threat to humans and wildlife. However they can not be 100% certain! No one can. The local villages are home to many families with babies and small children, such as my own. If the new plant goes ahead then many of these will consider moving away (refer to point one re loss of house value) and in any event this is going to discourage new families moving to the area. Let's just hope that there will indeed be no harm posed by any unknown toxics and, if there is, the councillors that make this decision will have it on their consciences for life and will be held accountable.
PCo 028	PFI/ 224	01	Clearly, this is a highly technical matter with other options available but the Parish Council supports the scheme in the hope that the County Council's research conclusions and financial projections prove to be well founded.

PCo 029	PFI/ 226	01	Is this needed knowing the Government's commitment to recycling and waste reduction?
PCo 029	PFI/ 226	02	Could not the money be invested in aiming to recycle more?
PCo 029	PFI/ 226	03	What incentives will residents have to carry on recycling if the plant is built
PCo 029	PFI/ 226	04	What are the financial penalties if recycling goes up leading to a decline in waste for incineration?
PCo 029	PFI/ 226	05	Is it not risky to be locked into a 25 year deal?
PCo 029	PFI/ 226	06	Is money being diverted from other essential services to pay for this project?
Pub 099	PFI/ 227	01	In the NY times edition in August there was an article about the Allerton waste recovery park proposal. The image produced of the incinerator, should I understand not have been published due to the inaccurate representation of the of the chimney height. The project manager of the Allerton park waste site told me at a public information event that this was just a draft picture and couldn't be published due to the fact it wasn't quite correct. Yet this same picture appears in the newspaper when it is very misleading to the public. I also felt the article was clearly biased in favour of AmeyCespa the preferred waste contractor and that the article didn't present another point of view or a even a balanced arguments regarding the project.
PCo 030	PFI/ 229	01	Whilst we appreciate that there is a need for efficient waste disposal and are of the opinion that the root cause of excess waste lies in the hands of the manufacturers and the supermarkets, concerns were expressed about the proposed 'tie In' to the contract for 25 years.

CGr 005	PFI/ 230	01	<p>My question is I will discuss the financial aspects of the proposed Allerton incinerator, demonstrating the tenuous economic assumptions which underpin the plan. The main argument in favour of moving to incinerating waste has been financial. We are told that doing nothing will cost far more in terms of landfill than signing up to an 'Energy From Waste' plant. The figure we are repeatedly told is a saving of £320 million, yet this number is based upon predictions which are highly speculative and likely to be wrong. The public and the Council have been misled by a failure to properly explain these risks.</p> <p>North Yorkshire County Council predicts that landfill taxes are going to be £175 per ton by 2040, when the contract ends. Currently, landfill taxes are less than £40 per ton. No-one knows what these costs will be after 2020 because they are yet to be decided. The UK government has said that the tax will increase annually by £8 per ton until April 2014, and that future landfill costs will not be below £80 per ton. After that it is pure guesswork. Yet these guesses have huge significance for the proposed financial justification of the project.</p> <p>The rises in landfill costs are driven by EU measures designed to encourage sustainability and recycling. However, if Councils respond to the higher landfill costs by building incinerators then it is entirely possible that those costs will change, given that the policy would be producing exactly the opposite effect to that which was intended. /If/ this happens, then the apparent savings of incineration will be significantly reduced. And, I repeat, NO-ONE knows what the rates will be after 2014, let alone the 20 years between 2020 and 2040.</p> <p>Furthermore, if we assume that recycling rates will increase to at least 60% during this period, in-line with targets in Scotland and Wales, then the claimed £320 m savings will be wiped out entirely. It will be cheaper to "do nothing" than to pursue the PFI!</p> <p>Even accounting for population increases, it is likely that the amount of future household waste which is not recycled or re-used locally will be significantly lower than the total capacity of the Allerton incinerator. We could be left with the most expensive option, under a financial imperative to keep feeding the incinerator, and be unable to change course. A waste contract lasting a quarter of century is, therefore, an enormously risky undertaking.</p>
CGr 005	PFI/ 230	02	<p>We are told that the shortfall in capacity will be made up with Commercial waste. But this is a municipal waste strategy and NYCC cannot, by EU law, now sign a contract that requires a significant element of commercial waste. This was not what was originally advertised and the public have been grossly misled.</p>
CGr 005	PFI/ 230	03	<p>There is an urgent need to cost a 'Plan B' based around resource recovery and waste reduction, recycling, re-use, repair and composting, so that councillors can take a decision on the incinerator knowing that they have considered all of the possibilities. This doesn't mean households have to sort all their waste, or even collect food waste separately. The technology now exists for smart machinery to do much of this sorting at a waste recovery facility. This waste is a RESOURCE -- it should not be burnt</p>

CGr 005	PFI/ 230	04	I'm also aware that another option has been put to officers by a waste group. This would have provided massive savings without incineration. They were told that they were told they were too late. As the public were not made aware of the proposal until June 29th, how can this be too late?
CGr 005	PFI/ 230	05	I urge councillors to at least delay any decision until the Government announce their policy on the matter in the new year
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	01	We write to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals.
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	02	They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire county. They are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly.
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	03	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO ₂ emissions
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	04	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies.
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	05	it ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	06	We understand that you will be asked to vote in favour of the Council's plans later this summer and we urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward.
PCo 031	PFI/ 231	07	At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review
PCo 032	PFI/ 233	01	The Council is very concerned at the length of the contract, 25 years, and the amount of money involved, £900m, which the NYCC is proposing to buy into. There is every possibility that new developments will be made during this long time period in the area of waste disposal which could prove more environmentally friendly and cost less to the tax payers. However, with this contract in place it will be impossible for any other development to be considered as such a huge amount of money has been tied up in the one project.

PCo 032	PFI/ 233	02	<p>However, what is of greater concern to the Council, is the fact that no information has been forthcoming as to how the decision to recommend this particular contract was arrived at. It has been presented as a "fait a comply" with the decision for the county councillors only being to accept this contract or reject it, with no other options being put forward for a comparative decision to be made. The Parish Council is aware that 17 other possible avenues were considered but no information has been forthcoming on any of these as to why they were considered not to be suitable for the council's waste project. The Council would like to know who considered these other options and on what criteria were they rejected. It would appear that none of this has been open and above board as no information has been circulated.</p> <p>The NYCC needs to assure itself and those it represents that the preferred solution put before them is the correct one. The degree of opposition and disquiet about the way the whole affair has been conducted should be enough to persuade them that the contract should not be awarded to AmeyCespa until some independent "due diligence" has been completed, even if this means there is a delay.</p>
PCo 032	PFI/ 233	03	<p>The Council has been made aware that there are many existing waste disposal plants in neighbouring counties, either in operation or at the building or planning stages. Has anyone even looked into the possibility of sending NY waste to these facilities? It is unlikely that all are full to capacity and sending NY waste out of county would have the result that large lorries are not travelling across miles of open countryside to congregate on one site when shorter more direct journeys could be made to neighbouring counties. The Parish Council wishes to know what steps have been taken to explore the possibility of out of county multiple site use and the relevant costings.</p>
Pub 093	PFI/ 234	01	<p>Lancashire has vowed no incinerations on its green and pleasant land? Why not Yorkshire with its already appalling air quality in the Vale of York.. Think back to 1985 and how far we have come on waste in the 25 years since - is it really wise to commit to old technology for 25 years???</p> <p>As a resident of Tockwith near Allerton I am most concerned at the plans to build a huge incinerator in the area. I am also concerned about the economic ramifications of you committing NYCC taxpayers to such a project over 25 years at a cost in the billion.</p> <p>As it is, North Yorkshire's recycling rates could be massively improved (at 45%, we are some 25% behind Oxford) and I am baffled why you are pressing ahead with technology which may be the most profitable for the companies concerned but which is not the best for the area or the taxpayer. Lancashire has vowed no incinerations on its green and pleasant land?</p> <p>At the moment NYCC seem to be being led by the companies, not the other way round, as a result of putting the decision out to market in the first place.</p>

Pub 093	PFI/ 234	02	There has been almost zero consultation on this matter and the project has been presented as a fait accompli, despite world-renowned experts in the field calling it a "mad" decision and suggesting greener and indeed much cheaper alternatives
Pub 093	PFI/ 234	03	I suggest that a project of this nature and a decision of this importance cannot be rushed through in the way it has, and with opposition to the plans mounting amongst Yorkshire residents call on you to announce a moratorium for another six months, allowing NYCC to consider all possible alternatives and consult much wider (with public and experts) before going ahead
MPM EP 001	PFI/ 235	01	I write to object to the proposal to build a 'Waste Recover Park' at Allerton Park Quarry, Knaresborough (that will include an 'energy from waste' incinerator).
MPM EP 001	PFI/ 235	02	Such incinerators provide a disincentive to recycle
MPM EP 001	PFI/ 235	03	Once built it will require large volumes of waste in order to be kept in operation.
MPM EP 001	PFI/ 235	04	I also feel that the proposals are not sympathetic to the local environment and the building of this facility would have a negative impact upon the local environment and population.
Pub 100	PFI/ 238	01	Upper Dales constituent has sent me details of a waste processing scheme Please could you advise me: If NYCC has previously examined the proposals (or similar proposals) as put forward, and if so what were the conclusions?? If not, are you prepared to examine the proposals as set out in the attached, and give your opinion of whether they have any relevance to future waste processing requirements in the County ?? Are the proposals in any way an alternative to the Waste PFI scheme at Allerton Park, and especially the incinerator element of the scheme which is causing so much community concern??
PCo 007	PFI/ 239	01	Concern on the Industrial and Commercial waste to be used to fill the headroom built into the Incinerator which is way beyond the apparent needs of domestic projections.
PCo 007	PFI/ 239	02	Not enough information on the carbon miles created by the lorries bringing the waste to the site from across the County.

PCo 007	PFI/ 239	03	No information, or apparent preparation and costings presented on the interim waste stations to be placed across the County.
PCo 007	PFI/ 239	04	Reasons for not considering the current power station site on the A1 with its links to the grid, road/rail/canal network in place seem flimsy at best.
PCo 007	PFI/ 239	05	It now seems that whilst the chimney will remain the same height, the base will be below ground, at quarry bottom level thus having a lower above ground projection. This must be a concern as to the calculations on emissions, and the area of spread.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	01	The residents of North Yorkshire did not vote for this nor do they deserve to have this imposed on them. On this basis we write to formally protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	02	The proposed facility is based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overplay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire county. The figures supplied by NYCC and Amey Cespa are misleading because recycling rates will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	03	From what we have learnt of the proposed facility at Allerton Park its capacity is far in excess of what can be reasonably be supplied from the local area meaning that the plant will be forced to take waste material from a far greater range of sources - possibly even abroad. Reference to the experience of Sheffield and the incineration plant there clearly points to inadequate local supply of material for incineration and the consequent need to extend the 'catchment area' - possibly to include sourcing of industrial waste from much further a field,.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	04	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	05	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	06	Indeed, the facilities for curbside re-cycling in the Harrogate area are woeful (at the time of writing, just glass and newspapers are collected) and much more could be done to improve recycling rates rather than resorting to a facility such as the one proposed
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	07	NYCC's proposal also ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.
Pub 101	PFI/ 240	08	I urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward. In particular I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture.

Pub 101	PFI/ 240	09	At a time of deep Government spending cuts, it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review
Pub 102	PFI/ 241	01	I see no reason why this facility has so many objections. We need to cut down on landfill sites and this is a greener alternative. How will it interfere with the local community, no residential homes will be affected. It is the same old story, people talk how green they want to be, but object when it is in their back yard.
PCo 013	PFI/ 242	01	At its meeting the Parish Meeting received an update on the Allerton Waste Recovery Park and expressed its support for the plans. The Parish Meeting wishes to see the plans implemented as quickly as possible at the minimum cost. It hopes that each and every Councillor will recognise a moral duty to represent the supportive views of the overwhelming, silent majority of North Yorkshire electors and not be influenced by the strident calls of a tiny minority.
PCo 033	PFI/ 243	01	This Council is concerned at the apparent waste management strategy
PCo 033	PFI/ 243	02	At a time when the Government is proposing changes and DEFRA is undertaking a country wide consultation it seem strange pushing forward with an outdated strategy. Why rush without waiting for Defra report to be published?
PCo 033	PFI/ 243	03	The technology being proposed is questionable
PCo 033	PFI/ 243	04	The Council is greatly concerned that the PFI contract represents a disproportionate risk to tax payers now and in the future.
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	01	Strong opinions are being expressed as to the wisdom of entering into PFI contract reportedly with a 25 year term but with no break clause in the event that as recycling increases waste quantities will decrease..
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	02	In the summer of 2009 UK Coal plc held a meeting with Parish Councillors of Escrick at which they outlined their intention to seek planning permission to develop the former North Selby Mine site for waste disposal by incineration. Aware that this proposal has no connection?
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	03	Why are we being led into the most expensive option for dealing with waste , one which is thought to offer the most pollution
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	04	How will a PFI contract fare when others are planning to offer an alternative

CGr 006	PFI/ 244	05	The proposal to locate North Yorkshire and the City of York's waste disposal facility in the Allerton Quarry has much to commend it. A large limestone quarry close to being worked out and in part currently in use for waste collection and disposal.
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	06	The location is close to the edge of the very area it is to serve, conflicts with the Proximity Principle and consequently will generate significant traffic movements.
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	07	It is understood that as planned the facility will have a shortfall of some 40% and hence will only use two thirds of its design capacity. This suggests a strong possibility that as recycling increases and waste quantities for collection decrease there will be pressures to take industrial waste or / and waste from the nearby Leeds conurbation
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	08	There are few grounds for challenging the mix of recyclable and composting proposals. However, there are very strong objections to the Incinerator proposal. By location there is little chance of energy recovery or combined heat and power, albeit use of methane to generate power for transmission to the National Grid is welcomed
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	09	Incineration is considered to be the most expensive options of waste disposal and fears have been expressed that North Yorkshire will become a net importer of waste through incineration. North Yorkshire has a poor air quality but given that the quarry lies below surrounding ground there will always be the possibility of inversion of the exhaust plume.
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	10	A far better proposition and less expensive would be conversion of waste to Mechanical Biological Treatment, namely conversion to pelletised fuel which, subject to satisfactory calorific value could be injected with the fuel mix into any of the three major coal fired power stations in the region. Can you confirm that Mechanical Biological Treatment was considered
CGr 006	PFI/ 244	11	The public have not been told what other processes were examined in the highly secretive negotiations but, given the very nature of the contract, Private Financial Initiative (PFI), it is crucial that as recycling increases and waste quantities reduce a satisfactory 'break' clause. The planning and subsequent negotiations have been so secretive that Executive and Councillors of the City of York appear to be almost completely in the dark. The public has no chance yet it appears that they will be required to foot the bill.
Pub 008	PFI/ 245	01	I would like to explore with you if the consortia I have in mind could buy Yorwaste and absorb it into the group and if the current referred waste contract could be abandoned and a re-tender instigated.
Pub 008	PFI/ 245	02	Could you kindly run through, with me, the scenario ie what would happen next if the Members did vote no in December?
Pub 103	PFI/ 246	01	I am writing to express our shock at the proposal to site a new waste incinerator in Yorkshire. While I understand the desire to reduce the risk of a penalty tax for waste going to land-fill, we are alarmed that you think an incinerator is the answer. We implore you to stand against the planning application for this project for the reasons given.

Pub 103	PFI/ 246	02	Many areas, including Bentham, are doing all they can to reduce the amount of waste produced. If this goes ahead there will be little or no incentive to continue with this work. As we understand it, the volume of waste going to land-fill has reduced in the recent past (up to 70% reduction in some areas) and is continuing to do so. Wouldn't it be better to invest in schemes that result in less waste created?
Pub 103	PFI/ 246	03	Our waste will be transported across Yorkshire, increasing its carbon footprint beyond that caused by the incineration and adding to traffic congestion
Pub 103	PFI/ 246	04	An incinerator has the potential to release large volumes of toxic waste into the atmosphere i.e. heavy metals, CO ₂ , CO, sulphur dioxide
Pub 103	PFI/ 246	05	As this is to be a private venture, profits will need to be maintained. If those of us with a conscience continue to reduce the waste we create, will the contractor be allowed to bring waste into this facility for incineration? That will surely increase pollution again from the incinerator and transportation
Pub 103	PFI/ 246	06	This strategy appears to ignore the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies. Does the county not support this?
Pub 103	PFI/ 246	07	This appears to be the public being led into paying for facilities for a private enterprise to make a profit!
DCo 004	PFI/ 247	01	Thank you for providing the information requested. It appears to me that Members here haven't taken on board the fact that there's more to the project than incineration! It would be helpful if you could confirm the percentages of the GMT which is expected to be recycled/recovered or treated through the AD plant. I think this should be in the order of 10% in terms of recyclates and 20% in relation to the AD plant (based on a GMT of 200,000 tonnes which seems to be a rough average based on your figures) - is this about right?
Pub 104	PFI/ 248	01	I have read the report on page 5 of the latest NY Times about the Allerton waste plant proposal. I suggest that on such a controversial and major issue the NY Times should present both sides of the argument, allowing space for critics to have their say. Could this opportunity be given in the next issue?
Pub 105	PFI/ 249	01	November's ny times requests comments on the above. I am strongly in favour of this development. As far as I can see it is well planned, and it is a facility NY needs. It is not possible to keep chucking rubbish in holes and forgetting about it. Yes, recycling needs to improve still more, but there will remain non-recyclable waste which needs to be dealt with. Careful incineration is at least as safe as other options...and if the heat by-product can be used, so much the better.

Pub 106	PFI/ 250	01	Whilst I have no objection to a waste disposal site continuing at Allerton Park, I do have serious misgivings about the scale of the operation proposed. My main objections are:1 the cost of a large incinerator, as I am not convinced that once we have better recycling we will still have enough N Yorks waste to burn. I have just learned that the City of Antwerp in Belgium actually dismantled an incinerator because they no longer had enough waste to feed it and the fumes were proving to be more of a problem than they had anticipated
Pub 106	PFI/ 250	02	2: increased traffic movements. I have heard quoted that the increases will be minimal but I do not see how. Currently no waste comes to the site from York or Scarborough so there will definitely be a lot more movements along the A59 and this road is already working over capacity. Even with more local collection sites we will have increased movement and probably much heavier vehicles. I do not think the current infrastructure could take it without very considerable improvements. These have not been costed in to the equation I am sure. Overall I feel a better way to meet EU and Government targets is to recycle more and to have more smaller waste management sites. I appreciate that there are targets to be met but I urge you not to saddle us with something that is unpopular and difficult to get out of if it proves to be unpractical.
Pub 107	PFI/ 251	01	I understand from the ny times that the consultation on long term waste strategy ends on Nov 12th. Can you please confirm if this is so as NYCC & CYC do not make their respective decisions on this until mid-Dec. We have a project here with young people around climate change & would like them to be able to express their views. Nov 12th does not leave long for this so will any later views be considered please? Looking at the NYCC website under consultations does not list this consultation! Do we simply e-mail views of the young people's group to you?
Pub 045	PFI/ 252	01	You may not be surprised by the fact that the alternatives are cheaper but I think you will be astonished by just how much can be saved by using existing local companies, whilst at the same time, removing all risks from the taxpayers and achieving the added prizes of sustainability and flexibility by not building the contentious incinerator
Pub 045	PFI/ 252	02	OPTION 1 This is the 'Do the minimum' (ie continue to landfill) which the council estimates will cost us £1.8bn and which is obviously not acceptable
Pub 045	PFI/ 252	03	OPTION 2 – AmeyCespa This is the only proposal of which you will be asked to approve by the officers and your Executive. It includes a PFI funded incinerator and you should be aware that it is based on extremely risky and poorly supported assumptions, which in reality will not deliver the savings promised. Promised SAVING £320m

Pub 045	PFI/ 252	04	OPTION 3 - Alternative Contractors without incinerator This is based on a scenario (and price structure)using small to medium local companies with their own facilities and using their own capital to build further new plant as required , capable of digesting and mechanically sorting black bag waste, all without the need to build an incinerator. Shorter contracts will give greater flexibility and act as a stepping stone to option 4 and beyond. This is not an untried or untested approach. Councils across the UK are already using this type of operation to dispose of their waste. It includes a permitted level of landfill (within EU guidelines) and involves no risk for taxpayers. It also creates local jobs, not foreign profits. This has already been discussed with NYCC senior officers and the price per tonne of this option verified by established Waste contractors. Any queries or clarification should be addressed to Ian Fielding. SAVING £958m. This option, which is immediately available, gives an improved saving of £638m over Option 2, which equates to £25.5m saving per annum . Against the current cutbacks now facing us how on earth can this extra saving be ignored?
Pub 045	PFI/ 252	05	OPTION 4 Working towards Zero Waste by Reduce Reuse Recycle This is a realistic estimate, achievable in 5-10 years with reduced tonnages and as recycled resources become more valuable, reduced collection charges. This is in line with Rt. Hon Caroline Spelman's vision of working towards 'Zero Waste' and implementing a waste hierarchy where Reduce, Re-use and Recycle are rated above incineration for energy. Many regions and cities across the world have exceeded the 60% recycled rate suggested and used in this option. SAVING £1.2bn
Pub 045	PFI/ 252	06	I recognize that Councillors and Officers have a very difficult job, serving the community, while complying with Government legislation and following due process as well as balancing the all important budget. I am also aware that the proposed waste contract is a culmination of a process which started 5 years ago and which has incurred £2m-£3m of fees. However, if ultimately these costs have to be written off they should be taken in the context of saving over £1 BILLION during the lifetime of the contract. You will be aware that your fiduciary duty is to review all the facts and examine the alternatives, before exercising your judgment and making a decision. Much has changed in the last 5 years and I rely upon you to acknowledge this by insisting on a deferment with a full, transparent and independent review of all options. Such a review should examine the possibility of even further economies of scale by working with adjacent authorities as is now being undertaken in the London Councils to drive costs down. This will be the biggest decision that you will be called upon to make as a Councillor. I trust that you will make it wisely.
PCo 035	PFI/ 253	01	A couple of concerns 1. The letter only had the NYCC main website address and he found it difficult to find the FAQs about the PFI 2. The letter mentioned that there was a meeting with Marton cum Grafton and he would like more details about what was discussed and what the key issues raised were. He felt as though the letter glossed over the meeting and he would like some more information if possible.
PCo 036	PFI/ 254	01	We wish to register our objection and request the Authority to consider (whilst the opportunity exists) alternative plans and methodologies to deal with waste disposal in the area, taking on board new opportunities for waste recovery and working practices that have evolved and are being promoted since initial decisions were taken.

Pub 108	PFI/ 255	01	I have been contacted by a constituent who has asked me to find out the answers to the following questions regarding the County Council's Waste Strategy (specifically the incinerator proposal): How many waste transfer stations will be required throughout NY and at what extra cost above thef 900m over 25 years? Where will the waste transfer stations be situated, Knaresborough? What are the anticipated costs of transporting this waste to Allerton Park in both carbon emissions and pounds sterling? Why have these proposals not being made public? What are the costs of similar waste transfer stations in other parts of the country? Have these costings been budgeted for and can NY afford them under the new financial constraints?
Pub 109	PFI/ 256	01	I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding the proposed incinerator at Allerton Park. The Government is producing a White Paper in February to cover the waste disposal strategy and it seems an unnecessary commitment to a massive financial undertaking to give the go ahead prior to that document. In addition the financial argument fails to take into the account the EU Emissions Trading Scheme which will tax the Carbon produced by the incinerator. Finally - the contract commits North Yorksire to send specific tonnages of waste to the site, ignoring the anticipated waste volume reductions required by the Government's strategy of reducing waste at source e.g. by packaging reduction. I would be grateful if you would re-think this proposal before we are bound by a £1Bn millstone.
PCo 037	PFI/ 256	01	<p>None of the Parish Councillors feels that they have enough technical knowledge to come up with a definitive view on this matter so feel that they have to hope and trust that when the Members of North Yorkshire County Council do finally reach their decision that they take full account of the potential impact on recycling rates and that they also look very carefully at the contract being awarded so that no perverse outcomes result from it. Our Parish Council would like to see North Yorkshire County Council continue to put pressure on manufactures to keep reducing the amounts of packaging being used on products and to maintain if not increase the current rates of household recycling being achieved.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like to see a cap put on the increase in Council Tax that can be raised to help to pay for this contract if it goes ahead.</p>
Pub 110	PFI/ 258	01	He wanted to register that he approves of the proposed incinerator at Allerton Park
MPM EP 002	PFI/ 259	01	Thank you very much indeed for sending me a detailed brief regarding the energy from waste product you are proposing. When I was in the European Parliament I was involved in the formulation of the large combustion plants directive and therefore understand that if a plant of this type is operated within the tough conditions set within that directive there is no risk whatsoever to people living nearby. In fact there is more risk from a next door neighbour, for example, having a garden bonfire. That said I know that in areas where planning applications have been made there has been a lot of local opposition, not least in connection with the increased lorry traffic. I hope that your project is successful and certainly hope you will use a mature technology rather than the Scarborough power plant which still is standing inactive despite 6 million pounds of Government money being poured into this new experimental technology of pylorysis.

Pub 111	PFI/ 260	01	Having seen your website on the proposed waste park and would like to say I am very strongly in favour of the plans!
PCo 038	PFI/ 261	01	The Parish Council has asked me to write to you to express its opposition to the proposed waste incinerator plant at Allerton Park.
PCo 038	PFI/ 261	02	Members have expressed a number of grounds for taking this position -among them are the visual effect on the neighbourhood, the size, cost and length of the contract, and public health concerns. Members also have serious concerns about the viability of this contract in the light of current thinking on future recycling levels across the county.
Pub 112	PFI/ 262	01	I personally think the proposal meets the needs of the requirement to handle waste in this area. This opinion was echoed by the members of the above council but we were not quorate and thus I cannot speak for the council as a whole.
PCo 039	PFI/ 263	01	The Parish Meeting met on Monday 11 October and were fully in support of the Allerton Waste Recovery Park Proposal. They were in support of the proposal because they consider that there needs to be a coordinated and integrated strategy to deal with the waste produced. Continually resorting to landfill is not a sustainable option and it is better to try to make some use of the waste than simply to bury it.They were also in support of the general area chosen for the Waste Recovery Park. North Yorkshire is a large county, but many areas are totally unsuitable for this sort of activity; for example, the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty rule themselves out straight away. Allerton is ideally placed, close to the A1 and within easy transport reach of York and Harrogate, the major centres of population
PCo 002	PFI/ 264	01	The Parish Council invited ArneyCespa to make a presentation at an open meeting in the village in order that local residents could make an informed judgement about the proposed Allerton Waste Recovery Park. To balance that, the parish councillors also met with the Chairman of Parish Council, who kindly shared with us their Due Diligence Reports of August and October 2010. These documents seriously call to question the strategy for waste management being adopted by NYCC that will commit the county's taxpayers to the funding of the AWRP scheme for its 25 year duration. In your letter, you make reference to your own meeting with representatives from Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council but, whilst you list the issues discussed, you fail to mention NYCC's response to each of the points they raised or what action you intend to take. Therefore, rather than brush over them, as your letter appears to do, please advise:1 :the actions you have taken to investigate the issues raised in their reports; 2:your answer to each of the issues raised ; 3:your actions to have those issues debated by the Members; 4:your action to make those issues public, together with your responses Until you have satisfactorily addressed these outstanding points, we do not believe that NYCC can claim that due diligence has been fulfilled, that the waste strategy is demonstrably best value for money, or that you can legitimately proceed with the AWRP contract

CGr 007	PFI/ 265	01	We feel that the proposed incinerator plant at Allerton Park will cause enormous damage to significant built assets and landscape both locally and throughout North Yorkshire. This plant will include a 38 metre tall incinerator with a 76 metre tall chimney disgorging fumes above the surrounding fields and villages and as far afield as the City of York. Not only will this chimney be seen from several miles away but it will be located right next to the A1 on the gateway to some of the regions tourists gems, including Knaresborough and Harrogate
CGr 007	PFI/ 265	02	There are many financial and health arguments for improving recycling rates rather than burning nearly a billion pounds of tax payers money with this scheme. We support and agree with these and hope that the County Councillors are fully informed before coming to any decision. However, the Society's responsibility is to ensure the health and safety of our town.
CGr 007	PFI/ 265	03	The proposed complex of buildings, including the incinerator, will be located right next to the historic, Grade 1 listed Allerton Castle. Grade 11 listed parks and gardens and other Grade 1, 11 and 11* buildings.
CGr 007	PFI/ 265	04	The value and identity of all these is now under threat from the eyesore of an industrial chimney billowing smoke across the landscape and from increased HGV traffic required to maintain the 24 hour operation of the incinerator.
CGr 007	PFI/ 265	05	As DEFRA is due to issue a new waste management report next year which may invalidate all the justifications put forward for this scheme, we ask that Councillors at least delay their decision until then. We also urge that they re-examine the waste volume predictions for the county and reconsider the current management strategy that ignores the resource value of waste and negates any opportunity to develop a sustainable recycling industry, The Society recognises that waste disposal is a huge challenge for the county but this over-priced, short term solution will cause long-term damage to the fabric of our culture
PCo 016	PFI/ 266	01	Members are prepared to support the project in principal
PCo 016	PFI/ 266	02	However there are still concerns regarding projected volumes of waste timescales and cost. It is to be hoped that packaging and food waste is drastically reduced in the next few years
PCo 016	PFI/ 266	03	The project life of 25 years is a long time, foresight on such a scale is high risk when involving public funds and private enterprise in partnership
PCo 016	PFI/ 266	04	The costs of many of these projects in the public sector have the habit of going over budget
PCo 040	PFI/ 267	01	It is obvious that a solution other than landfill must be found for our waste. However, to contract to spend £2 billion over 25 years would seem not only to be committing a great deal of money but also putting the county into a metaphorical straight jacket – where it will be unable to respond to newer technologies and better methods of waste disposal for a quarter of a century.

PCo 040	PFI/ 267	02	It does seem nonsensical for the County to make a decision that will tie it into a process until well beyond 2030 without knowing the outcome of the Government's report on its review of future waste policy, which is published in the New Year. Surely it would make sense to delay any decision until these results are known?
PCo 040	PFI/ 267	03	Even if the current proposal is, at the present time, the best solution available, with all the research being conducted on recycling and waste disposal, looking for better methods and greater recovery rates, wouldn't it make more sense to commit the county to a more medium term project of perhaps 15 years instead. After all, incineration is not exactly a green process and it is likely that other more acceptable solutions will become more readily available in the future. Indeed it may be that incineration becomes even less acceptable in the future, leaving the county with an expensive white elephant
PCo 040	PFI/ 267	04	On a slightly different note, North Yorkshire is a huge area in geographical terms, which means that waste will have to be moved some extremely significant distances – particularly from North Craven. Is the county sure that a single site for the treatment of all waste is the best solution? Certainly from a recycling standpoint, the movement of waste more than approximately 10 miles negates the benefits accrued by recycling. With fuel prices continuing to rise, it seems a very expensive solution to transport all our waste more than half way across the county for disposal. Can the county show that this is the most cost effective solution, and that two or more smaller facilities across North Yorkshire would not be better?
PCo 040	PFI/ 267	05	In conclusion then,Town Council would ask NYCC to delay making its decision on the Waste PFI contract until after the Government report on future waste policy becomes available. It would also ask the county to seriously consider a more medium term contract to the one currently on offer, and to prove that a single site for waste disposal is the most cost effective option in the future as fuel prices continue to increase.
CGr 008	PFI/ 268	01	Please find below the concerns and objections of regarding the proposed waste management facility at Allerton. These concerns and objections were agreed at a meeting of the party on 28th October 2010.
CGr 008	PFI/ 268	02	The proposed contract includes a requirement to make a guaranteed minimum payment to the contractor (AmeyCespa the preferred bidder) as if North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) had delivered approximately 80% of waste projected at the time of final tenders. Although there are no proposed penalties for failure to deliver this amount of waste, North Yorkshire County Council may have to compensate AmeyCespa for loss of electricity revenues associated with any shortfall if the contractor is unable to secure alternative commercial or industrial waste to replace the Council's waste. ? Commercial/industrial waste is the next big target for recycling efforts as much of it can easily be separated into different waste streams at source (e.g. paper, glass, food waste etc.). So there is no certainty that over 25 years enough commercial/industrial waste will be available to make up any shortfall in household waste. ?

CGr 008	PFI/ 268	03	The proposed waste management facility is unnecessary as a substantial increase in re-use, recycling including composting (an overall recycling rate of only 44% at present) and campaign aimed at reducing overall consumption of goods, materials and resources could deal with the waste and save the county council expenditure on landfill taxes. Between 2009-10 South Oxfordshire District Council achieved a recycling rate of 70% , the same effort is required in North Yorkshire. NYCC could achieve its 2020 50% recycling target by following the example of other local authorities like South Oxfordshire District Council. ? Both locally and nationally there are waste minimisation policies which should substantially reduce waste over the next 25 years. Additionally, the rising cost of oil and other raw materials will drive businesses to reduce waste and consumers to consume less.
CGr 008	PFI/ 268	04	The proposed waste management facility will discourage recycling amongst residents as they will feel that it is unnecessary to recycle when all their waste is being diverted from landfill to the facility. ?
CGr 008	PFI/ 268	05	The establishment of a centralised waste management facility will lead to an increase in greenhouse and pollutant emissions from lorries transporting waste from all over the county to the facility. It is much better to treat waste locally where possible. This is particularly the case with food waste, which can be done effectively at District level and almost certainly will be within the next 5 years or so. Collecting and treating food waste locally is more sustainable in terms of transport, and also because the residue can be spread on the land, which is not the case when it is recovered from mixed waste and will have chemical pollutants with it.
CGr 009	PFI/ 269	01	We understand that you have a huge problem, literally huge, in disposing of the waste we generate but believe that the contract with AmeyCespa would be a mistake
CGr 009	PFI/ 269	02	The sums: For promised savings of only £320 million - that is less than one sixth of outlay and a rather small percent considering how much may change in 25 years (like the introduction of taxes on CO2 emissions taxes) and the assumptions made about costs of transport of waste (underestimates given the likely future of oil prices).
CGr 009	PFI/ 269	03	The technology: we would be tied in for 25 years to a system which will be out of date by the time it is commissioned. There is such innovation afoot: we are in contact with a locally based environmental engineer who has pioneered small self contained units where he achieves 75% recycling, inert waste only to landfill, with packaging and building products for sale. These would be decentralised with the added advantage that communities would have a sense of responsibility for their own waste generation - rather than one community being lumbered for all of us.
CGr 009	PFI/ 269	04	The longer term: this is a 'fix' as the answer to a pressing problem. The sums only show savings by comparing with existing habits, in fact assuming that we will be throwing away more and more. It ignores all the work that you and we have been doing changing attitudes and reducing quantities for landfill. Unless we learn to use less and throw away less, to reuse and repair more, the problem will escalate and we will be scrabbling around for more and more expensive and desperate solutions.

CGr 009	PFI/ 269	05	<p>Attitudes and waste management practices are changing fast. In such confusing times the key is flexibility. Instead of tying up enormous resources in one basket, NYCC could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · supporting the development of solutions that can be more responsive to changes in technology · promoting drastic changes in our waste producing habits so that this ceases to be such a major consumer of resources. <p>We urge you to look at how you can harness the passion there is in North Yorkshire for finding real, long term solutions which will safeguard the future</p>
Pub 113	PFI/ 270	01	<p>I have serious concerns about this project going ahead for the following reasons. 1 There is a 'conflict of interest' as NYCC are using their own planning department. I know it is allowed in the rules however to be seen as being unbiased it should be put through the local Planning Department not NYCC.</p>
Pub 113	PFI/ 270	02	<p>2 All PFI's are very risky. AmeyCespa (or any other bidder) are in business to make a profit...to make money, not to break even or a loss for their share holders, so once any contract is signed any changes in specification from day one of the build will start inflating the prices, and I defy any one to show me where no changes are made in any construction sites. Every building site there is and has been has needed changes to be made.</p>
Pub 113	PFI/ 270	03	<p>3 So changes that are made will incur additional costs to the rate payers but it wont be at normal prices...it will be at highly inflated prices 'to cover for all the extra maintenance for the remaining contract period'. So anything that was not in the original specification as agreed, whether a 3 pin plug or for example a filtration system that is in adequate or does not work, we will have to pay. You might say that they would be responsible if something did not work, but this is not true as the specification agreed, good bad or indifferent, is all part of the agreement. Take them to court you might say but them even more costs again....which could mean delayswhich means more costs....an so it spirals out of control.</p>
Pub 113	PFI/ 270	04	<p>4 AmeyCespa (or any other contractor for that matter) will I am sure build a complex that will be fit for purpose *_on the day it is built*_...as per contract of course and will be maintained for the 25 years as per the contract. But this means you are closing the door on technological advances for 25 years and then any request upgrades to encompass more environmentally proven advances takes me back to point 3 above. Can NYCC guarantee that they or future employees will not make such requests in the future? I think not. So despite the promises of saving money...this is still not guaranteed!</p>
Pub 113	PFI/ 270	05	<p>5 After 25 years, what do we have left? A site, with an obsolete complex that, even if it still works will be well past its sell by date and in the need of a total refurbishment or rebuild if we haven't already paid out for more. How do I know this? Because the contract will be for 25 years so the plant will be built with an life expectancy of 25 years, not 26 years or 30 years. For the sake of repeating myself, 'there will be "BOGOF" deals from AmeyCespa because they shareholders to satisfy so they will not do anyone any favours, least of all to NYCC</p>

Pub 113	PFI/ 270	06	6 Waste Management must be handled with a flexible approach and kept within our own NYCC total control. Technology is changing daily, science is improving and recycling methods are getting better so the lack of flexibility is what we will pay for...either financially or environmetaly. We cannot afford either.
Pub 113	PFI/ 270	07	7 Your cross section drawing used as part of the consultation process is distorted and misleading. The Wind Farm was imposed by HM Planning Inspectors on a community that did not want it. We will not see the chimney to any great extent as Allerton Park residents may see 'our' wind farm in any great scale. If we sign up to the PFI we be locking us out of improving our targets beyond those already committed to and if not you will be condeming us to sudden and unexpected increases in cost that are, in fact hidden in the 'fog', 'small print' or technical mathematics of the PFI contracts.
Pub 114	PFI/ 271	01	No to alletron park ...recycle more in villages. There shoud be more recycling plants in North Yorkshire. Harrogate do not collect anything.
CGr 010	PFI/ 272	01	We would like to register our objections to the Waste Strategy PFI in its current form, We believe that the proposal to enter into a 25-year contract to incinerate waste is in conflict with Council policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase recycling. The economic case is flawed and outdated, and insufficient consultation was carried out on the plan before going to tender, We also are not convinced that there will be no health impacts due to emissions.

CGr 010	PFI/ 272	02	<p>Residents of York and North Yorkshire have never been consulted on different waste disposal technologies. The consultation produced in November 2005 offered two choices, both of which involved building a mass-burn Energy from Waste (EfW) incinerator. This, despite the fact that the Best Practicable Environmental Option report showed that alternatives involving higher levels of recycling was both cheaper and less damaging to health and the environment'. Such an option was not put forward for consultation because officers did not believe that a 60% recycling target was feasible by 2020 –a position which now appears hard to justify given that municipalities in the UK are already achieving recycling rates between 60%-70%,</p> <p>The consultation was carried out in December 2005, over the Christmas period. There were widespread reports of the consultation not being received -which is not uncommon with any mass mailing. However, this consultation was particularly badly affected. Council officers acknowledged at the time that there was a problem with leaflet distribution (and arrangements would be changed in 2006), and we were told that there would be another consultation later in the year which would include disposal technologies'. This did not take place.</p> <p>The response rate in the City of York area was 0.7% and unsurprisingly, given the lack of any real choice, “the results of the public consultation on this Strategy did not show a strong preference overall for either option”</p> <p>Instead, the strategy went to tender on a supposedly 'technology neutral' basis, but with economics skewed towards incineration (see below). We regard this as a failure of political leadership,</p> <p>The options for waste disposal were solely dictated by the private sector, and there was no proper consultation. Neither politicians nor citizens have been presented with any meaningful choice.</p>
------------	-------------	----	--

CGr 010	PFI/ 272	03	<p>AmeyCespa claims that there will be no impact on recycling, composting and reuse rates . For inst ance :</p> <p>"We expect the Allerton Waste Recovery Park to help us achieve and exceed our 2020 50% recycling target early. We could further increase our recycling figure if we could include the recycled incinerator bottom ash (IBA) in our figures.... If we achieved 55% recycling and could then add in IBA it would take our recycling performance up to 65% ."</p> <p>However, as mentioned, municipalities in the UK are already achieving recycling rates between 60%-70% -and this without the need to include IBA. AmeyCespa's recycling aspirations are not ambitious. The Waste Strategy has set the target of 50% for 2020, and no further targets beyond this date, despite this contract lasting until 2040.</p> <p>There have been many claims and counter claims about what impacts the need to fuel a 270,000 tonne-a-year incinerator will have on the Council's recycling efforts. However the following are certain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The incinerator will require a constant stream of waste to be viable • AmeyCespa's bid included a set of Guaranteed Minimum Tonnes (GMT) to be supplied by the Councils over the contract period. The amounts increase steadily year-on-year over the period. • The Councils may be liable to pay compensation if GMTs are not met • Elsewhere in the world, local authorities have struggled to increase recycling whilst tied into such a contract: ". Cleveland County Council's Associate Director of Environmental Services said of their waste disposal contract ""essentially we are into waste maximization" <p>Hampshire and Sheffield have both had to vary the planning conditions to allow municipal waste incinerators to get sufficient waste - which has not gone well. Other authorities who have commissioned incinerators and then developed a poor recycling record include Nottingham and Newcastle -the latter managing to turn around their record once they began to work seriously with community groups toward a 'zero waste' policy. We can be reasonably sure that these authorities did not intend to limit themselves in the ways that they did, We have no reason to assume that our situation will succeed where so many have failed.</p> <p>York joined the "Zero Waste Places" initiative this year. We cannot become a 'zero waste place' whilst supplying a guaranteed minimum tonnage to an incinerator. The plans are in conflict with many Council strategies, including our efforts to reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>In the absence of clear and ambitious targets set for recycling and composting, this contract will represent a disincentive to increase recycling levels.</p>
------------	-------------	----	---

CGr 010	PFI/ 272	04	<p>The Waste Strategy has, from the beginning, been built on speculation. The Best Practical Environmental Option (BPEO) report assumed an increase in waste volumes from 2004 to 2010, when volumes would level off and remain static for the next 15 years", When figures were published for 2004-5, waste volumes had fallen. The BPEO had been proved wrong even as the consultation finished. Yet at no point was there any re-examination of the outcomes.</p> <p>Waste volumes in York are still below 2004 levels. EU legislation on packaging and waste is still being brought into force, and we are witnessing a massive expansion in home composting and biodegradable packaging. The waste strategy did not foresee these effects, and has not learnt from them. It still assumes a growth in waste volumes over the 25 -year period of the strategy. If waste continues to fall -as indeed it should, with the encouragement of the Councils -then the economic case begins to deteriorate. The saving of £320 million that is often quoted by the Waste Partnership and AmeyCespa (against an entirely 'straw man' do-nothing option) looks even more spurious.</p> <p>Technology has moved on also. Anaerobic Digestion (AD) has become established as a proven and profitable technology. This has been recognised by AmeyCespa, who will use it to deal with 12.5% of the waste. It could be used to a far greater extent, had the BPEO not been so outdated at the time the strategy finally went out to tender.</p> <p>And policy has moved on -the coalition government recently began a new round of consultation on waste strategy. This is in line with the pledge in the Government's Coalition Agreement committing the UK to " work towards a zero waste economy", and "measures to promote a huge increase in energy from waste through anaerobic digestion."</p> <p>A further assumption on which the Strategy rests is that of landfill tax. The Partnership has built its.business case on these taxes reaching £175 by the end of the contract p rioid. Yet rates have not been set beyond 2014, except that they will not fall below £80 per tonne before 2020.</p> <p>A further assumption on which the Strategy rests is that of landfill tax. The Partnership has built its.business case on these taxes reaching £175 by the end of the contract p rioid. Yet rates have not been set beyond 2014, except that they will not fall below £80 per tonne before 2020.</p> <p>The new government has a clear zero-waste agenda, which will not support incineration, We may well see a different approach, and a completely different landfill tax regime. In this situation, the projected savings as against doing nothing become completely intended.</p> <p>The new government has a clear zero-waste agenda, which will not support incineration, We may well see a different approach, and a completely different landfill tax regime. In this situation, the projected savings as against doing nothing become completely illusory.</p> <p>As usual with PFI schemes, the Councils will bear all the risk, should the venture not prove profitable.</p> <p>It is further worth pointing out that employment, and therefore the local economy of York, would benefit greater from a high recycling strategy than one based on massburn. As well as generating more than twice as much revenue, recycling provides around ten times the number of jobs per tonne of waste as compared to Inctneration".</p> <p>The flawed assumptions and outdated information on which the PFI case is based mean we will be overpaying for an oversized incinerator, when alternative options may be cheaper for the taxpayer and better for the local economy.</p>
------------	-------------	----	---

CGr 010	PFI/ 272	05	<p>As already mentioned, alternatives to EfW were found to be better for the environment, but have not been costed, or included in consultation or options presented to Councillors. The carbon-efficiency of EfW -the amount of carbon generated per unit of electrical energy -is complex. EfW is given an artificial boost in the BPEO assessment by making the unjustified assumption that any energy generated by a waste facility will offset emissions exclusively from coal fired power stations, rather than a grid average, It receives another one from the exclusion of CO2 generated by burning "renewable " waste (paper, cardboard etc.), with no consideration given to CO2 emissions saved by recycling said waste.</p> <p>If we exclude this biogenic waste, EfW performs better than coal but worse than natural gas", If, however, we assume recycling levels will increase, in line with Council policy, then this biogenic fraction becomes less significant, and EfW becomes one of the worst technologies available in terms of its climate change impact.</p> <p>Many full -lifecycle studies have shown that generally, it costs less energy (and therefore less carbon) to recycle most materials than it does to burn them, generate electricity from that, and make a new one from a virgin natural resource".</p> <p>EfW is not a sustainable technology.</p>
CGr 010	PFI/ 272	06	<p>Much has been made about the improvement in emissions standards of incinerators required by the EU. The Health Protection Agency has attempted to close the ongoing debate on the subject -"the HPA said that it did not recommend doing any more studies of public health around modern,well managed municipal waste incinerators as the effects are probably not measurable"</p> <p>Unfortunately the recent history of incinerators in Britain demonstrates that all too often, they are not very well managed at all. You can see our website for a rich history of mismanagement and explosions at waste incinerator sites -including but not limited to Crymlyn Burrows, Teeside, Edmonton, Kirklees, Dundee, Newcastle, Nottingham and Sheffield, The EU has regulated very effectively the emissions known to be injurious to health. The open question is still around those emissions not currently understood. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that nanoparticles emitted by incineration may pose a health risk. These are very fine particles whose size is of the order of 1 nm (nanometre -a millionth of a millimetre). Science is only just beginning to understand and investigate the unexpected properties of such small packets of matter, and we are some way off being able to quantify and regulate such emissions.</p> <p>The safety of incinerators is not proven, and the record of the technology is undeniably poor.</p>
CGr 010	PFI/ 272	07	<p>For all these reasons, we urge you to reject the current Waste Strategy bid and develop an alternative based on up-to-date information and technology. The strategy must include ambitious targets for waste reuse, recycling and composting for its full duration and these must have primacy over landfill diversion. It should also embrace the concept of 'zero waste',</p>
Pub 115	PFI/ 273	01	<p>Asked for further information to be sent.</p>

Pub 116	PFI/ 274	01	Further details of the Waste PFI contract
Com 006	PFI/ 275	01	Has concerns over affect on property sale in Arkendale
Pub 118	PFI/ 276	01	More information requested
Pub 119	PFI/ 277	01	Technical issues - condensers and co-firing.
Pub 120	PFI/ 278	01	Traffic volumes through Boroughbridge.
Pub 121	PFI/ 279	01	Asked for confirmation of the closing date for comments by individuals and organisations. NYWAG had submitted a document Waste: A Green Strategy last month and had been told (via an e-mail from NYWAG) that it was too late, would not be considered or even mentioned. Confused that it wouldn't be considered even though sent in before 12.11.10. The document was based on a report sent to Defra about alternatives to NYCC/CYC proposal. NYWAG felt that the Council thought this document was being submitted as a tender.
PCo 034	PFI/ 280	01	The Parish believe that NorthYorkshire have chosen the wrong optionfor dealing with their waste. The proposed solution is very expensive and does not meet the needs of the residents of the County. If the residnts were asked to re cycle more the amount of residual waste will be much less than envisaged and the need for such a large Incinerator would be unnecessary.Other counties such as Hampshire are now having to import waste from other counties in order to feed their incineration plants, despite the fact that this was not part of their agreed plan. Such a scenario is highly likely to occur in North Yorkshir as Waste Volumes nationally are acknowledged to be declining
PCo 034	PFI/ 280	02	For the Council to enter into a 25 year inflexible contract with Arney Cespa is a very high risk strategy, as waste technology is currently developing rapidly and the costs of incineration could well rise in future thereby putting an extra burden on the Council Taxpayers. In a climate of Budget cuts to many other Council services such as schools, rural bus services and care for the elderly \We consider it seems like folly for The Council to be entering into such an expensive and inflexible long term contract.
PCo 034	PFI/ 280	03	The County's proposal to Incinerate over 80% of the waste delivered to the site will be a disincentive for residents to recycle and will ofcourse destroy valuable resources which could be reused or recycled. Evidence of this can be seen in Denmark where districts with Incineration are recycling a lot less than those without Incineration. Our view is that North Yorkshire could easily recycle more waste and the target to achieve 50% by 2020 appears to be an admission of the failure of its current policies.

PCo 034	PFI/ 280	04	We are very concerned that The Council have not properly evaluated cheaper and more environmentally friendly solutions for dealing with their waste, such as MBT and AD. These alternatives would be far less costly and would be more adaptable to changing trends in the make up of future waste. The technology also now exists to convert all plastics back to biofuels, so this will inevitably change the way such waste is managed in the near future.
PCo 034	PFI/ 280	05	The County' s proposals fly in the face of the new coalition Government's commitment to increased recycling and reducing waste. North Yorkshire should be taking the lead in adopting new technologies to support the Governments strategies. There are many expert opinions suggesting that Incineration is now an outdated technology which should be consigned to history. This is probably already evidenced in the USA where there have been no new Incinerators built since 1995
PCo 034	PFI/ 280	06	There has to be cheaper way to deal with North Yorkshire' s waste and we urge The Council to think again and change their plans before it is too late. To make such an important decision on December 15 th , which will tie in the Council Taxpayers to a heavy financial burden for 25 years without fully evaluating alternative technologies and without conducting adequate public consultation appears to be undemocratic. The Council should at the very least defer such an important decision until after the DEFRA review is completed in the spring of 2011.
CGr 009	PFI/ 281	01	I'm disappointed that you have replied to our letter with what must be a formula letter since you don't seem to address any of the points we made. We had already read the publicity which you appear to paraphrase, leaving us with our concerns and opposition to the proposal as put intact.
CGr 011	PFI/ 282	01	We have a number of serious reservations about this proposal which concern the decision process, the technical advantages and disadvantages of the scheme as proposed, the location of the scheme and its transport implications, and the inflexibility of the contract. Each of these reservations is expanded below.
CGr 011	PFI/ 282	02	The decision process The emphasis during the consultation was on the provision of a large centralised project with incineration as its principle element. Whether this is the Best Practicable Environmental Option has not been demonstrated. The planning and tendering process has followed that course too narrowly, and its non.-transparent nature has left a damaging sense of exclusion. Whether the PFI system with its inbuilt protection of the interests of the private-sector partners and its long-term burden on the public purse is the most cost effective financing mechanism is open to question, particularly in the current economic climate.

CGr 011	PFI/ 282	03	<p>Technical advantages and disadvantages of the scheme as proposed We are satisfied that the initial stages of the treatment process at Allerton Park will represent state-of-the-art technology in the separation of waste into different streams. This will enable recovery of metals and the feeding of organic matter to the anaerobic digester for the production of gas. We note too that the incineration process will generate substantial quantities of electricity. However, locating this plant midway between Harrogate and York means that it is not near to a settlement or industry that could use the waste heat. The concept of building smaller, more flexible plants, one of which could have been located on the former British Sugar site so that the adjacent housing could have been supplied with the waste heat should have merited further consideration. We do not know whether the alternative of several smaller plants has been examined, but we note that Combined Heat and Power plants fed with waste are to be found within cities in mainland Europe. Anaerobic digestion produces a residual solid digestate, a compost-like material. Because of the mixed input this digestate would only be suitable for landfill cover and land reclamation. There appears to be no provision for the necessary high-temperature treatment of food waste, which could provide a valuable agricultural resource.</p> <p>An option not apparently considered would be the manufacture of NBT pelletised fuel from the residual waste which could be fed into the furnaces of the Aire Valley power stations in partial substitution of fossil coal. We understand that this technology is proven.</p>
CGr 011	PFI/ 282	04	<p>Location and transport Smaller local plants would also reduce the lorry traffic, but, as a single plant seems to be the preferred solution, given the case for a single plant, its location between York and Harrogate does make geographic sense because it is their populations that generate the majority of the waste. Nevertheless some material will have to be hauled considerable distances. It would be more sensible to transport waste generated in the north of the territory across the regional boundary to Teesside. Conversely, Wetherby is close to Allerton Park, but as it is not within North Yorkshire its waste cannot at present be handled there. It is unacceptable that the legislation imposes these arbitrary boundaries with damaging environmental consequences, and we expect the Councils to campaign to have them removed. We also express concern that the transfer stations which will receive the refuse-collection vehicles and compact their contents for haulage to Allerton Park in large lorries appear to be unfunded and are not an integral part of the scheme. This means that, once the main project is approved, approval of the stations will become urgent and inevitable, whatever local opposition there might be.</p> <p>We have questions about the best use of the gas produced by the anaerobic digester. This is destined to be burnt to produce electricity. Instead the gas (which is mostly methane) could be cleaned and liquefied for use as a clean fuel for the lorry fleet. This technology would have to be agreed by the organisations responsible for the vehicles, but replacing dirty fossil diesel with renewable and particulate-free methane would be more efficient and cleaner</p>

CGr 011	PFI/ 282	05	<p>The contract We are acutely anxious about the inflexibility of the contract. While the proposal is based on a recycling rate of 50% by 2020, we believe that this is not sufficiently ambitious -other authorities are aiming for rates up to 70%. If York and North Yorkshire succeed in increasing true recycling rates and thereby reduce the quantity of waste suitable for the Allerton Park plant it appears that there could be penalties related to the quantities agreed in the contract. The fact that landfilling would have been avoided is not the point: any disincentive to the imperative of at-source-waste-reduction/reuse /recycling is. This problem could be alleviated by taking waste from further afield (at some environmental cost from the lorry-miles), but we suspect that the same situation affects other plans for large processing plants and that there is a risk of excess regional capacity that could undermine the national waste strategy. It is not clear to us how taking commercial waste could make up any shortfall.</p> <p>Unfortunately legislation appears to impose another arbitrary boundary, namely between 'municipal' waste collected by Councils from homes and some businesses and waste collected from organisations by private-sector companies. We ask the Councils to work to have this distinction removed and all waste diverted from landfill and other outdated treatments. If that were to happen we would like to see Allerton Park take such commercial waste that is unable to be handled by other more sustainable methods. That should of course be at the expense of the businesses generating it, and residents should share any profit.</p>
CGr 011	PFI/ 282	06	<p>Conclusion Our reservations to this proposal are substantial. We hope that the Councillors charged with the decision will pause and reflect before making the enormous commitment of resources for a 25 year period to Allerton Waste Recovery Park. Even if it is decided to proceed we implore the Councils not to abandon our preferred longer term goal of a zero waste society.</p>