

[REDACTED]
Abernethy
[REDACTED]

5 May 2009

The Registrar
SEPA
Strathearn House
Broxden Business Park
Perth
PH1 1RX

Dear Sir,

SITA APPLICATION FOR A PPC LICENCE - BINN FARM

As a resident of Abernethy I have reported to you air pollution apparently originating from Binn Farm on many occasions over the last few years. Based on this past history of inadequate controls on air pollution at the Binn Farm site I request that you refuse SITA's application for a PPC licence. If SITA are unable to correctly control emissions from their planned incinerator, not only will SEPA be faced with an increased workload for monitoring SITA's activities, but it is also possible that any accidental emissions will be extremely harmful to people and the environment in general. Indeed, SITA's planning application to Perth and Kinross, volume 2 main report, states that, "Some heavy metals are considered to be definite or possible human carcinogens".

In addition, when SITA applied for permission to build a similar incinerator in Altens, Aberdeen, their application was rejected based on the risk of pollution and consequent risk to health. Aberdeen City Council's independent expert questioned the adequacy of SITA's air quality analysis. Could this also apply to pollution and health analyses in the Binn Farm application? Abernethy is in the wind shadow of the prevailing south-westerly, in direct line for fall-out from most planned or accidental emissions. I attach a copy of that report for your information.

SITA's Altens plan also proposed transporting the toxic bottom ash to landfill at Binn Farm, page 3 paragraph 3 and page 22 paragraph 1, illustrating that SITA plan to "import" landfill waste to Binn Farm from other councils, presumably also waste for incineration, despite landfill resources being scarce in Perth and Kinross and despite the current landfill permission expiring no later than 2014, around the time this proposal is due to start operating. Clearly, SITA plan to extend the landfill beyond the already extended expiry date of 2014. Binn Farm landfill is, effectively, already full, and "landfill waste" is now creating a "waste mountain", which threatens to dominate the landscape in the Abernethy area and far exceeds the pollution control measures of earlier landfill developments. For your ease of reference, I attach a list of planning applications relating to the Binn Farm site.

As a result of the seemingly endless financial and operating problems at the old and new incinerators at the nearby DERL Baldovie, there is considerable local public uncertainty on the reliability of this process and of the filtering of emissions, and on the effect of these emissions on health and the environment.

In the Community Council meeting of 20 July 2006, SITA accepted that there were inaccuracies in the water requirements in the proposal reported in the plan. What will be the impact be on the supply to local farms and residents of drawing from the local water supply for operations and, separately, for transporting the 3,600 (or more) tonnes of hazardous ash? Earlier planning consent protected the burn which runs from the site to Abernethy Glen, but the current application proposes to release surface water and treated effluent into Binn Burn. Will that lead to contamination of the watershed, including, ultimately, the Special Area of Conservation Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary?

Please reject SITA's application for a PPC licence.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

BINN FARM SITE - PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL

90/1498 The Binn Farm waste tip is situated on land that only 16 years ago was farmland, used in part at that time as an unlicensed tip for road materials by Tayside Regional Council, Roads and Transport Department, tenants of John McGregor of Binn Farm. When retrospective permission was granted for the tipping of road construction/maintenance materials, strictly limited to inert road materials, with the stream running from the site into Abernethy Glen being culverted in a sealed construction, the Director of Planning expected the 0.9ha tip to have a life span of 25 years and an average number of lorry loads per day of 10-15. Permission was granted with the condition that on completion of tipping operations, the site was to be left in a manner suitable for agriculture or forestry or other suitable use.

90/0331 In 1990, planning permission was granted to Mr J McGregor for the formation of a waste tip for builders' rubble, limited to inert non-leachate-forming waste with protection, maintenance or diversion of any ditch, stream or watercourse. Again, conditions were stipulated for the reinstatement of land to agricultural or a suitable alternative use on completion of tipping operations. No application to the Tay River Purification Board was required because there would be no discharge of effluent to streams. At that time the the Binn Farm site was considered to be very remote.

91/0650 In 1991, a planning application was submitted by Mr J McGregor and Binn Farm Landfill (Glenfarg) Limited, which subsequently became a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northumbrian Environmental Management, itself a subsidiary of Northumberland Water, for a large, contained landfill waste tip. Permission was granted in 1993 subject to a maximum of 2.25 million tonnes, based on an estimated annual input volume of 150,000 tonnes. After one year of site preparation, the site would be operational for 15 years, ie, to the end of 2009, with one year after cessation for site restoration. The site would not operate on Sundays. It was under this consent that tipping at the site of 90/0331 apparently ceased. The Director of Planning apparently reported to the Development Control Committee of 18 December 1991 that, "The Tayside Structure Plan does not address the problem of waste disposal. In rural areas Policy P44 states that there will be a presumption in favour of small scale non-residential development in the countryside providing it does not:

- a) Unnecessarily involve irreversible development of prime agricultural land
- b) Undermine landscape and wildlife interest, in particular, National Scenic Areas, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, national and local nature reserves
- c) Impair the overall appearance of the countryside
- d) Detrimentially affect any scheduled ancient monument or site of archaeological interest or the setting of a listed building or conservation area
- e) Involve an unjustified need for additional service's expenditure
- f) Result in a dangerous road access.

95/1041 In 1995 an amendment to the landfill was granted, apparently without public opposition.

98/1377 In 2001 this large, contained landfill waste tip was granted an extension of five years, to 30 June 2014, and an increase in capacity replacing the 2.25 million tonne limit by revised final contours. It was apparently reported to the Development Control Committee of 7 April 1999 that there were "181 letters of objection to 91/0650 and no letters of objection to 95/1041. The local community were informed at the time of the original application that tipping would cease by 2009. Other things being equal I would have preferred that this could be the case to allow landscape restoration and a return to the previous upland agricultural use as soon as possible. However, this site has a relatively low impact on the public because of its location ... reflected in the lack of representation from the public ... accordingly ... consider the five year extension acceptable. For the same reasons ... willing to omit the previous tonnage for the site ... the finished profile providing extended capacity in principle irrespective of its actual cubic contents ... the hours of operation permitted ... adequately controlling traffic movements ... The Council as a major user of this landfill site has a financial interest in this application ... the Secretary of State does not require to be notified in this case as the proposed permission ... has not attracted a substantial body of objections"