

FREETHS

| <u>Response No:</u> | <u>Page:</u> |
|---|---------------------|
| Response 649434312 | 1-3 |
| Response 968986531 Response 160258346 Response 814213965 Response 415411938 Response 215380647 | 5 |
| Response 396478685 | 5-6 |
| Response 48808325 Response 564601046 Response 776795330 Response 167225959 | 6 |
| Response 8139127 Response 79660615 | 7 |
| Response 516069385 | 7-13 |
| Response 885442409 | 13 |
| Response 607639733 | 13-14 |
| Response 502838608 Response 629462726 Response 594392172 Response 520493833 | 14 |
| Response 248159091 Response 632560302 Response 984007576 | 15 |
| Response 775229659 | 15-17 |
| Response 1051319844 Response 1064275959 | 17 |
| Response 156267309 | 17-18 |
| Response 1030321814 Response 1003643907 Response 908985202 Response 871009800 Response 717980253 Response 30550348 | 18 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Response 535622759 Response 514420661 | 19 |
| Response 651665326 | 19-20 |
| Response 971009113 Response 446591765 Response 912793264 | 20 |
| Response 760733266 | 20-21 |
| Response 4057828 | 21-22 |
| Response 165042463 | 23 |
| Response 317397759 | 23-25 |
| Response 174980827 | 25 |
| Response 368472867 | 25-26 |
| Response 248692199 Response 959243179 Response 865871398 | 26 |
| Response 1026726857 | 26-27 |
| Response 924823052 Response 718250874 Response 337171116 | 27 |
| Response 34519676 Response 608376910 Response 127590109 Response 55238767 | 28 |

RESPONSE 649434312

Whilst I am in favour of the land at Daneshill being regenerated and brought back into public use, I am concerned about the proposed methods for sorting asbestos contaminated waste.

I am not opposed to the potential for this work to be carried out at the site in question but do consider that there is a significant risk for asbestos fibres to be released into the environment as a result of the proposals as they stand.

I am one of the UKs leading experts in asbestos management, having acted as an expert witness in well over a thousand cases in the High Court and formerly was employed by the Health & Safety Executive as one of her Majesty's Inspectors of Health & Safety.

The legislative requirements for asbestos dust require that all risks are reduced to the lowest levels that are reasonably practicable (see Sections 2 & 3 of the Health & Safety at Work etc. Act 1974). Similar duties are required under other statutory provisions enforced by HSE.

I have attached a copy of the response to HSE to a Freedom of Information request (no 202010232) which confirms the position of HSE. In particular that the clearance level of 0.01 f/ml does not represent an acceptable or safe level of exposure and dutyholders are required to reduce exposure to all types of asbestos dust to the lowest level that is reasonably practicable.

Unfortunately, whilst I have many other electronic documents which support my views, your system does not allow for more than one document to be uploaded and therefore my ability to evidence my concerns is severely hampered by IT issues.

The applicant in its proposals refers to the EA blue book to justify its proposal of carrying out the sorting of asbestos contaminated soils outside, in the open. This blue book, as far as I understand, was archived in 2018 as the guidance is no longer current.

The guidance upon which the applicant forms its proposal was, as I understand, originally intended to relate to peripatetic or transient work on brownfield sites where limited amounts of contaminated soils were encountered. Such works would take place over a period of a few days or weeks and would not be a semi-permanent operation over a ten year period as is proposed in this case.

There is no doubt that all types of asbestos dust can cause mesothelioma, with crocidolite and amosite being particularly associated with mesothelioma. Epidemiological studies have suggested that these are 500 x and 100 x more dangerous than chrysotile.

The proposal is based on asbestos contaminated soils containing bonded asbestos being sorted on site. Those materials include floor tiles, plastics such as bakelite and asbestos cement. Whilst I would agree that floor tiles and asbestos plastics and resinous containing materials are not friable, asbestos cement can be friable, particularly when weathered. Again I have papers confirming this to be the case.

The applicant suggests that asbestos cement contains chrysotile and not other forms of asbestos. This is not correct and HSE literature and sampling results I have seen (plus evidence from manufacturers) confirm that many asbestos cement materials contained crocidolite and/or amosite as well as chrysotile. Again I have many documents that confirm this.

It is therefore the case that a material which is known to be friable when old and weathered and which contains amphibole is proposed to be sorted outside and in areas near to sensitive receptor sites (including schools and sensitive nature reserves). Additionally, vulnerable groups live in very close proximity to the site and there is a clear need for the proposal and associated risks to be explained to all living in those areas to make sure that their voices are heard and considered.

The applicant carries out this work at a site in Rowley Regis and has decided, on a risk assessed basis, that the work needs to be carried out indoors due. It is therefore unclear why a similar approach cannot be taken here and a temporary building erected for the purpose of storing and sorting waste. That building could be fitted with a high degree of filtration and workers provided with a high level of protective equipment. I believe that this would offer local communities the reassurance needed during the period that the work is proposed.

I have outlined my concerns to the Planning Authority and believe that many of my concerns were outside of its remit but may be within the EA's remit.

In summary, I believe that the following conditions would provide reassurance to local communities:

- 1) The use of a building with filtration and bunding to prevent the escape of hazardous materials;
- 2) The work be limited to a set time period with no prospect of this being extended (i.e. set hours over a period of no more than 10 years;
- 3) No remediated soils be removed from the site for profit and the remediated soils be used below non-contaminated soils;
- 4) A system of environmental monitoring be carried out which is sensitive enough to measure whether background levels of asbestos dust are elevated during this work. This would include sampling before the work starts on the site, site perimeter and at key receptor sites as well as routine sampling during the period of the works at those same sites.
- 5) A system where, if elevated levels are identified, work stops and investigations carried out by the applicant to determine what remedial actions are necessary;
- 6) The applicant carries out a consultation with the local community to identify a proposal which would cause such anxiety and concern;
- 7) A working liaison group is set up between the applicant and local communities to identify and resolve other outstanding concerns - including the transport of soils to site, the transport of asbestos waste from site, working hours and controls at source to minimise the dust.

It may also assist the EA to consider the financial aspects of the proposal to consider what is reasonably practicable. I anticipate that the sorting of contaminated soils is a profitable area of work and as such I would welcome the EA to consider whether the cost of erecting a temporary building and filtration would be reasonably practicable when considering the revenue the applicant is likely to receive from this activity.

I would be more than willing to work with the applicant to see if the genuine and legitimate concerns of the community can be resolved and a satisfactory solution can be identified that suits all parties.

I hope that this is constructive.

RESPONSE 968986531

Too near to a Nature Reserve.
Too near to our Village.
Do not want Potent environment in the air as we live close by.
Do not want Hazardous Waste Transported through our Villages and causing disruption.
Do not want our wildlife harmed by this pollution.
Do not want this hazardous waste in our drinking water.
Take it elsewhere where there are no Villages and Nature Reserves nearby.

RESPONSE 160258346

Too close the Daneshill lakes nature reserve and could pose a threat to wildlife and residents in the area.

RESPONSE 814213965

I am very concerned about how safe the site's processes will be. Asbestos in the soil will be exposed to the air and we know these particles travel far especially on windy days. Why can other processes that remove this risk not be used?

RESPONSE 415411938

To knowingly develop a site for hazardous waste in such close proximity to villages and well established nature reserves is contemptible. Establishing the potential for airborne and soil contamination to infect residents, wildlife and the environment is beyond comprehension. No matter how stringent the monitoring of pollution there will always be a risk, a risk that may cause death or poor health. This site should not under any circumstances be allowed to open at Daneshill.

RESPONSE 215380647

My concern is that the outdoor asbestos treatment plant is on a site which is relatively close to the village of Lound and even closer to the Daneshill residential caravan site. Asbestos is a well known carcinogenic substance and, should particles be released into the air and carried away by the wind, these could be inhaled by local people, including children. The prevailing winds here are from the West which would mean that extremely dangerous particles could be carried into the village. This could have a huge negative effect on residents health, especially those who are vulnerable such as the many elderly people who reside here. I understand that soil containing a large amount of asbestos will be sheeted, but that containing relatively small amounts will not. I am cynical that human error may mean that sheeting is inadequate or not carried out. I also query the impact of high winds on unsheeted material which, nevertheless still contains asbestos. If dust from the site is blown into the village this could create long term health problems for the population.

RESPONSE 396478685

As a resident of the nearby village of Lound, to the east of the Daneshill site, I feel very concerned about the potential hazards to the locality.

One of my concerns is human error. The hand picking facility relies both on human judgement and constant focussing on the task. I have worked on production lines and I know that errors are inevitable and not infrequent.

The prevailing winds are westerly and travel from the site towards Lound (and other nearby villages) and any airborne particles will inevitably be inhaled by the inhabitants, of whom a higher than average proportion are elderly and therefore more vulnerable.

Sheeting is to be used on soil with upwards of a certain percentage of asbestos and I have concerns with the efficacy of the sheeting (probably soft plastic and therefore easily damaged), and the fact that other soils will not be sheeted, despite containing asbestos which is an extremely dangerous carcinogen and are therefore liable to wind transfer towards residential area.

I am not a subscriber to NIMBYISM - and understand that these substances have to be disposed of somewhere but my concerns are for the fact that it is an open air process, the efficiency and safety of the process and the quality of both the proposed containment materials and the reliance on human judgement.

RESPONSE 48808325

As a nearby local, my opinion on this proposed site is that it will be hugely detrimental not only to our health but the future generations health as well. My other concerns are the negative impact on the environment and the potential harm to wildlife and their habitat.

RESPONSE 564601046

I'm a resident of Lound, a local village, and am extremely concerned about the potential hazards to human health and the health of wildlife in the surrounding areas.

You are proposing an element of hand picking - which means that errors will be inevitable and not infrequent. The sheeting of the soil is not an acceptable barrier to prevent particles escaping, which will then be blown on the prevailing westerly wind into nearby settlements.

I understand that these materials have to be processed and disposed of. However I would suggest that doing this in an open air facility, with low quality/ineffective containment materials, and relying on human judgement is a high risk option.

Asbestos is a highly dangerous carcinogen and the potential risk to human and animal health given the site's proximity to settlements is unacceptable.

RESPONSE 776795330

I object to this facility being in the proposed location because the prevailing wind is from the west/southwest and therefore Lound village, which is less than a mile as the crow flies, will be in line for pollution from any blown particles and therefore a health hazard for residents.

The location should be further from any residential settlement.

RESPONSE 167225959

I, along with my husband and 2 children, reside in Lound. To hear about the proposed asbestos processing plant is a of major concern. As much as all efforts taken to make this open air processing plant safe, I'm not convinced that particles of asbestos will not be carried on winds to Lound, or to the nearby caravan park, where many of my children's friends also live.

Asbestos is a well known as being carcinogenic, and I am not happy that my family, and fellow residents, are being put at risk from this open air processing plant potentially being cited so close to Lound.

RESPONSE 8139127

I am very concerned about the presence of an outdoor asbestos treatment facility located so close to the village and to a much loved nature reserve which is frequented by children and the elderly. Asbestos always runs a high risk as a well known carcinogenic substance, and the proposal to carry out this work in an outdoor facility, where these dangerous particles could be easily transported to nearby sites seems to be an irresponsible and needlessly risky undertaking. I believe that the facility should have to be indoors and temporary, or not be allowed in such close proximity to the neighbouring village and nature reserve. Considering we are currently in the midst of a health pandemic with an ongoing disease which already severely affects respiratory function, and there is a high percentage of elderly and highly vulnerable people in the village, the risk of such a proposed facility does appear extremely misguided and I would therefore hope that before any of this work is permitted that a much more thorough plan is in place to ensure that there is no risk to nearby areas. There appears to be too much room for human error under the current proposal. If it is not possible to amend the plans with far lower risk factors to nearby populations then I do not think it should be going ahead at this location.

RESPONSE 79660615

I am extremely concerned about the possible contamination of asbestos particles and possibly other dangerous substances into the atmosphere. The site is too near the nature reserve and at least 3 local villages which includes local schools.

My other concern is the transportation of dangerous materials through our local villages.

RESPONSE 516069385

I wish to object to FCC's application EPR/NP3538MF/V009 for a permit to import, process and use asbestos residual waste plus various additional types of residual hazardous waste for the end use of a recreational park facility.

Besides the bureaucracy of this matter, wouldn't common sense dictate that importing, processing and then leaving hundreds of thousands of tonnes of hazardous waste immediately next to a site of special scientific interest and a nature reserve, plus above an 'A' aquifer and adjacent to a caravan park and residential property, and then open the area up for recreational public use not be a sensible thing to do? Had a hydrocarbon, hazardous waste spill or asbestos contamination taken place right next to a SSSI or nature reserve and lakes/aquifer, wouldn't such an incident attract press attention and great concern from those seeking to protect these locations - the correct thing to do be to remove such hazards from such a sensitive location as quickly and thoroughly as possible?

There are multiple negative environmental issues related to the site, please take account of the cumulative nature of all these problems rather than isolated issues, plus the length of time the local community has suffered them (over 38 years).

Public amenity has been severely affected for nearly 4 full decades for residents of Torworth Parish due to construction and operation of the landfill site, commencing destructively with significant loss of the built heritage environment on day one through the whole operational site being made viable by a new link road, created through Compulsory Purchase Order of grade 2 listed farm buildings and subsequent demolition (Daneshill Road to A638 junction). The remaining G2 listed buildings from the adjacent farm were also reduced in size and gable ends rebuilt with entirely inappropriate modern bricks and windows which have never been rectified by the authorities. Limestone walls of

this remaining heritage property adjacent to the route are black with exhaust particulate emissions from the large number of HGV's, the limestone walls around the corner are still white and unpolluted, indicating the area in question has suffered heavy air pollution for a long period. This was a significant direct loss of built environmental heritage (including habitat for such protected species as owl and bat) for the parish and county as a whole - the remaining buildings are stated as in the best one or two of their type in Nottinghamshire by the Bassetlaw conservation officer - so the scale of loss of built environmental heritage should be apparent from this (not to mention no bat/protected species survey that we can find from the original CPO).

The quiet enjoyment of Torworth Parish in the vicinity of the landfill site has also been affected heavily by HGV traffic since it opened, the parishioners have been very tolerant to the noise and vibration (for example my parents house shakes and rattles with each HGV - you are welcome to witness this). Public feeling is strong at meetings I have attended, that enough is enough and the site should be reinstated as originally planned with the closure of the final cell, roadway and the 2018 proposals carried through to the 2023 closure or as close to it as possible. The stress to parishioners of millions of tonnes of waste transported past their doors by HGV's and regular spillages (discussed below) from these HGV's have deposited in the parish is a pertinent issue - the landfill has had decades to clean up its act and become a positive part of the local community but has never done so, the same problems still occur. Incidentally, responses to my Freedom of Information request to Nottinghamshire Country Council and the Environment Agency for the tonnage of waste per year received into the site only provided information since 2009 from both parties, there was no weight, volume or material data for the 28 years prior to this which is rather concerning.

For the operational life of the site waste has been ejected from HGV's onto the road, surrounding dykes, hedges, fields and woods due to unsheeted vehicles accessing the site (illegal and a breach of the sites planning regulations). No-one from FCC has ever been or contributed to clear any of this larger mess up despite the ejections regularly seen, photographed and regularly reported. Occasional road-sweeping has taken place during very wet periods when the road has been particularly bad though, but also perhaps indicating that the site wheel-wash is not effective. For example, during the last year the site has accepted batches of aggregate waste on several separate occasions a few weeks apart. Photographic evidence of HGV's accessing the site without sheets has been handed to Notts CC on each occasion, some unsheeted load examples: 24th-28th August 2020 reported to Notts CC with HGV reg numbers, 27th November 2020 unsheeted loads reported to NCC with HGV reg and photographs, 16th December 2020 reported to Notts CC with HGV reg and photographs, Police also informed at this stage - chief inspector of Notts Police responded stating her officers would "familiarise themselves with the relevant legislation and can focus some patrols on that area. The seriousness of the issue cannot be underestimated given the overarching figures you state, but also the fact that there was a tragic fatality on a BNS road last year as a result of exactly what you describe. I will share with our Roads Policing team also.", then reported again 31st March 2021, again on 1st April 2021 reported to Notts CC with photographs, it just goes on and on and has done for years. The CC enforcement department have visited the site multiple times to discuss this with the operator FCC, the issue keeps repeating so it does not seem to be taken seriously by the operators. FCC have proved over many years that they do not or can not control their contractors safely by demonstrating these failings countless times. Even during the period when their initial planning application for hazard waste processing had been submitted and was under consideration - when one may think they would be on best behaviour, they still did not operate with diligence or apparent care for the environment and local community - multiple loads were photographed entering the site unsheeted and I have personally picked up waste ejected from these lorries from the public highway on Daneshill Road more times than I can remember. The council's planning enforcement has been responsive but not effective. This looks to contravene the EA document 'Environmental permitting: core guidance', section; Section 9.19 - 9.27; 'poor record of compliance and behaviour'.

Regarding the original planning application for the landfill site -

There is a disparity in the existing operating hours awarded by Notts CC and those actually applied for by the landfill site operator.

The application 1/18/00219/CDM FCC requested 7.30am-4.30pm weekdays and 7.30am-11.30am Saturdays, however the council actually awarded 7.30am to 6.00pm on Mondays to Fridays and between 7.30am and 1.00pm on Saturdays. Why was the commercial advantage of extra hours amounting to an extra working day per week - 9 hours, over and above those applied for given to a private company? It shows no consideration for local amenity, in fact it specifically reduces local amenity while increasing periods of dust, noise, traffic, risk of operational pollution by effectively an extra day per week for no apparent reason or justification. The new application seeks to operate at these hours, so the local community are immediately disadvantaged to greater unsociable working hours. On this precedent the CC or other body may award the applicant a wider operational remit and advantage than they ask for, this must surely be completely unacceptable? This must also carry an environmental cost and greater risk which we have seen no justification for.

Relating to 'planning and environmental' applications, the Environmental permitting: Core guidance' section 5.14 states 'it is recommended that the operator should make both applications in parallel wherever possible'. This has clearly not happened with this most recent application, the above example related to the previous application discrepancy on operational hours highlights a previous fairly major consideration which did not receive due scrutiny (given operating hours have an environmental repercussion), there is precedent here, so I believe a dim view should be taken of the refusal not to run parallel applications, as in the above instance it resulted in the applicants favour and the local community's disadvantage.

1.1.13 in the non technical summary (plus repeated elsewhere) give the impression of a satisfactory level of 0.01% of cryolite asbestos and 0.01% of other asbestos fibres as if this is an accepted tolerance, the truth is there is no safe level for asbestos, this is the position of the UK Health and Safety executive and the World Health Organisation, which states 100,000-250,000 people per year die from asbestos related diseases. They have a resolution 58.22 on cancer prevention and illness from non communicable diseases, their direct quote is "bearing in mind there is no evidence for a threshold for the carcinogenic effect of asbestos, including chrysotile, and that increased cancer risks have been observed in populations exposed to very low levels" continues "it is not recommended to carry out work that is likely to disturb asbestos fibres. If necessary, such work should be carried out only under strict control measures to avoid exposure to asbestos, such as encapsulation, wet processes, local exhaust ventilation with filtration, and regular cleaning. It also requires the use of personal protective equipment - special respirators, safety goggles, protective gloves and clothing - and provision of special facilities for their decontamination". - Hardly the best place to carry this out over an area of 11,830 square metres is next to a nature reserve where families regularly visit and immediately adjacent to a site of special scientific interest.

The applicant discusses asbestos sheets as if they are not friable, this is not the case, additionally the heavy mechanical movement and friction from the demolition and loading processes into HGV negates the friability statement as the sheets have been disturbed, snapped, rubbed - all releasing fibres.

There is no safe level of asbestos in the air, however the applicant appears to think there is - a fundamental flaw to their general views and consequent application. 'Environmental permitting: core guidance' states under 'determination', 'assessing environmental risk' section 7.3 that the regulator needs to satisfy itself that assumptions the operator has made about its proposals must be clearly justified - the operator has attempted to do this but has based their assumption that a safe level asbestos exists, this is factually not the correct.

Asbestos should not be disturbed or recycled or disturbed but should be deep buried in a location such as a lined quarry with no nearby sensitive receptors which is being repurposed for accepting waste.

Although mostly concerned with human suffering and fatality from asbestos exposure, The United Nations alongside the EPA since 2006 has outlined the toxicity to wildlife from asbestos, and identified areas of severe contamination in waterways resulting in death of vertebrates, this is an area which requires much more study, but certainly an area of concern which the public will become more aware of and cases and research will become more prevalent over the coming years.

FCC openly advertise the cost benefit to parties wishing to pass on the hazardous waste as a recycled material for a further use versus a hazardous material to be land filled at greater financial cost (also reducing the tax revenue which would otherwise come into the public purse).

FCC answer 'no' to 'have you or any other relevant person been convicted of any relevant offence' within the waste recycling section. In 2015 FCC Waste Services Ltd was fined £200,000 by the health and safety executive (details available on H and S website). The two companies share an identical address, plus share 20 directors. The tragic incident was occupational. There are also two enforcement notices from HSE against FCC in 2016 in the realm of failure to carry out risk assessments. This appears to relate to the EP core guidance section A1.14. Given the extreme danger of working with hazardous substances, this may be worth considering to confirm whether every possible action has been taken (recommendations outlined in the World Health Organisation's stance stated above) or if employees are simply picking asbestos from a load tipped out by a lorry onto the ground in the open air by hand next to a public nature reserve - which is what the application appears to amount to in my interpretation. The EA's comments on filling in these sections are as follows: "Please note that if you knowingly or carelessly make a statement that is false or misleading to help you get an environmental permit (for yourself or anyone else), you may be committing an offence under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016."

We have a copy of details of the lease between FCC and Notts CC, this is obviously a public body ownership to a private company, within it as expected are numerous requirements, I suspect perhaps 5 points are questionable whether they are adhered to entirely, ranging from nuisance waste to neighbours, statutory best practice process - FCC feeling no requirement for an EAI (upheld by SOS) plus not twin-tracking, waste in drainage ditches, full and accurate records - 28 years of data not available from FOI?, unsheeted loads.

3d within the application - FCC have not checked the box stating they 'read the guidance and that your management system will meet our requirements'. They have checked the box for ISO 14001, but they have not referenced the relevant document, and I cannot find a 14001 certificate on their website, the website holds a link for 14001 but it takes you to a list of ISO 9001 certificates. (Relevant to 'Environmental Permitting: Core guidance section 9.7).

The question 5d 'Are you applying for an activity that includes the storage of combustible wastes?' is checked that the waste to be received is not combustible, I would imagine the nature of waste stated including hydrocarbon waste which can be classified as 'HP1 - explosive, HP2 Oxidising and HP3 Flammable', one might think hydrocarbons would be combustible and flammable? The site is also a former ordnance factory where risk of ignition is high (see later*), this lack of consideration is a touch concerning. This answer also affects 5e and 5f.

Environmental permitting: Core guidance states within section 6.4 refers to 'ensuring applications are complete and duly made'. The 'box ticking' portion, predominantly pre-constructed forms provided by the EA permit application process have many sections unchecked or unanswered.

The site setting within the emissions management neglects to mention the site of special scientific interest which shares a boundary with the landfill site. The application also does not specify the thickness of the polythene bags or nature of the tape required to seal for bagged asbestos, there is a specific minimum requirement measured in microns which is well known within the industry (125microns/500guage), one might think this is an important point and tolerance considering asbestos waste transfer stations will not and should not accept waste sealed in sub thickness polythene.

The comments on risk assessment do not appear to include remediation of spillages of hazardous materials on the public highway (perhaps due to road traffic accidents for example) on routes which FCC state are dedicated haul routes or on third party property such as HGV spillage onto farmland, given public highways are less controlled than the confines of the site and hence much greater risk of incident and within the public arena, the fact that this is not covered at all appears to be a major shortcoming to the application.

FCC state the land is not contaminated, but make no mention of the buffer zone discussed by environmental health in application ref WK/000139019 from the same original holding which states: This site is within the buffer zone of the Royal Ordinance site. If, during the development, land contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further works shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Where are details of this buffer zone and associated risks? The application refers to the whole site, but concentrates on the processing area, however the greatest land area is actually the area covered by reinstatement using recovered materials, the Environmental Permitting: core guidance refers to 'the site of the regulated facility, section 7.26 stating in many cases this can be determined by the perimeter fence, however this is less likely to be the case for regulated facilities situated within larger facilities. I hope this consideration is not lost within the application.

I recently walked the perimeter public footpath of the site, the surrounding surface water ditches are clearly visible, they contain a significant tonnage of concrete and brick waste, presumably from the former Fairclough and Duck-Tube works or the ROF. The material had been indifferently and unceremoniously 'shoved' to the extremities of the site, it does not demonstrate pride or diligence in how the site has been treated. These ditches ultimately filter to the adjacent marshland SSSI, to and through the Sherwood A Aquifer, and the site itself is in a zone 3 protection designation for agricultural irrigation and groundwater abstraction for human consumption. Given the wider site has been used for general waste, plus the recent leachate lagoons (please note cumulative development), one would acknowledge pollutant levels must be a significant risk into these dykes. The operations proposal location is on concreted area hence surface water could not penetrate and would drain into existing site perimeter watercourses as shown in the EA report 2019 surface water risk image, this is also reinforced by Natural England's response - "1. Consideration of water quality impacts due to increased sediment in surface water being discharged from site. 2. Consideration of appropriate biocontrols". The flood risk may be low, but the run-off into the waterways network is significant, particularly given the additional forced run off angle of repose of the tip head itself into surrounding dykes. Comments by P.Goldsmith, planning advisor for the EA on a recent nearby application also state: A compliance action plan has recently been submitted to the Environment Agency, for comment, to address a number of permit non-compliances to include elevated; leachate levels, perimeter gas levels and suspended solids in surface water. Showing clearly that FCC breach safety standards.

The permitting considerations in the EP core strategy reference conservation within A1.28 relating to SSSI's and A1.29 relative to general biodiversity, it comes under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

The public footpath leading into the site is littered with pollution and waste materials. FCC, even though they have waste facilities just metres away never keep this public route clean or free from hazards and pollutants, despite the issue being formally raised with photographs with Notts CC. Along this footpath one can see sofas, canisters, commercial materials all sat on the immediate verge plus dumped in the water of the dyke immediately next to it, this waste has been in place and accumulated for years, it's disgraceful and shows no responsibility for public or wildlife safety.

The last major development application on Daneshill Road was the Coal Bed Methane extraction site, you may recall that a last minute investigation into the Royal Ordnance Factory site - which is actually the same holding as the landfill site, was instigated after local people pointed out the presence of cordite and RDX, both highly explosive, plus other hazardous materials including acids within the ground. Record keeping was not perfect during the war and post war years, and ordnance is regularly unearthed in surrounding areas of former sites, so this lack of investigation immediately adjacent to the site does not inspire confidence in the scrutiny the application received, it was featured in numerous press articles, the Bassetlaw MP at the time summarised: "It is beyond comprehension that you would choose a former ordnance site for your first drilling site,". "There needs to be a proper investigation of the risks of drilling on the munitions site and that has not been done. All the authorities are passing the buck on this." - We have a similar feeling on this hazardous waste proposal, concerns of local people were dismissed until a legal challenge by friends of the earth on the matter was taken and upheld by the secretary of state.

We actually used to rent this same large grass area holding of land east of Daneshill Lakes for agricultural purposes for many years from Notts CC so know the entire old ROF site very well, we were restricted to mowing the grass or grazing with animals, we were not permitted to even plough the soil due to the risk of ignition(*) and release of hazardous chemicals into the atmosphere. We were most surprised when a substantial hydrocarbon drilling site operation was mounted in the immediate locality, and now hydrocarbon processing and storage is proposed - one rule for one, one rule for another. The lack of due diligence from the exploration company and asset managers and other regulatory bodies over something relatively well known and basic does not inspire confidence in the scrutiny and processes for safety of the latest waste site proposal. The Daneshill application must be scrutinised more than ever before, and we believe giving permission would be an environmentally and health damaging mistake.

The nature of the risk of asbestos pollution alongside the hydrocarbon and similar hazardous wastes outlined in the application is significant and persistent, asbestos is a Carc 1A class carcinogen, the results of the fibres kills people in an incredibly unpleasant manner. There is a prevailing wind map within the application, however we regularly have northerly winds too, plus there is a large area of turbulence as wind currents pass over the abrupt hill and down into the proposed hazardous waste area, affecting air currents creating rotors and wake, further increasing airborne pollutants concentration risk of transfer around the locality and traffic routes as a colourless, odourless fibre for inhalation and ocular contamination which affect humans and wildlife. As suggested above, disposal of asbestos really requires a site less elevated and further away from residential, business property SSSI's and nature reserves. The nearby cottages, businesses, caravan park, rural homesteads and the villages of Torworth, Lound, Ranskill and others are all sensitive receptors at significant risk, my experiences with the operation of Daneshill waste site have not given me confidence that a more hazardous activity than previous operation would be treated with the professionalism, competence, respect and safety it deserves despite the reams of paperwork FCC have submitted - I have lived in the parish since prior to the construction of the landfill site and have seen what happens first hand over a very long period.

I do not believe that siting an asbestos and hazardous waste treatment facility adjacent to a SSSI (Mattersey Hill Marsh) and Daneshill Lakes - the well loved nature reserve where families visit to feel safe, connect with the outdoors, enjoy themselves and appreciate the peace and wildlife is

appropriate, it defeats the whole premise of this type of reserve - to protect life, wild or otherwise from risk of external harm.

The Daneshill site has had a solid working life and served its purpose, the cumulative effects of its operation alongside other local heavy industry such as what is mentioned above, plus concrete products and aggregate production must be taken into consideration. I have no confidence in the safe transport to and operation of the facility for the reasons outlined. Many people have been adversely affected by the landfill site, we have taken a significant brunt of the impact and believe it is now time for the site to close and be restored with inert material by the originally agreed date of 2023 in the interim plan or as soon after as possible.

We have a great deal of local experience of the wildlife, communities, land and ecosystems, not all of this is easy to quantify empirically, but believe as a family who have lived on Daneshill road for 100 years we understand the locality, including public feeling, as well as anyone. We have dedicated our lives to being custodians of the land and all it supports around Daneshill for future generations, and the constant industrial bombardment and introduction of waste and hazardous materials is not welcome. Please add weight to our concerns as consultation with the public under the EP core guidance section 10.4 includes consultation with anyone who is or is likely to be affected by an application (given we farm very close to the site, lost our farm buildings to facilitate construction of the original site - without which none of this would be happening) plus other factors outlined throughout this response). Due to the development we have already lost the heritage of farm buildings, experienced drilling for coal bed methane, exploratory fracking sites, undermined for coal, extraction of millions of tonnes of aggregate and accrued millions of tonnes of waste all on adjacent boundaries of land we have farmed. We have done all we can to protect the property we own and have control over and the wildlife it supports despite these surrounding incursions. We believe the cumulative effect of these developments has reached a threshold and that no more industrial type development should take place, particularly involving asbestos and hazardous waste, please endorse our legitimate concerns and find a more suitable location and end use for these practices. Who would want to spend leisure time with families and pets on ground contaminated with residual hazardous waste?- The location when opened as a recreational facility will forever have a stigma of contamination.

As happened with the original planning application, which was reviewed by the secretary of state and subsequently local concerns supported by Friends of the Earth were upheld so the original application has fallen away, all of these discrepancies and more - bureaucratically and practically on the ground are well documented by local residents and ourselves, we have 100 years of paperwork covering the history of the site and locality, and are quite happy to delve deeper into all of this, in order to do everything we can to protect the local community and environment from harm.

RESPONSE 885442409

I live in Sutton and do not support these proposals. The damage to the environment and to wildlife would be unacceptable. There are many animal and plant species of special scientific interest in the locality that would suffer. Also airborne particles, pollution and unpleasant smells will pose a significant risk to residents health and wellbeing. Increased heavy traffic would magnify the noise and air pollution. This project is not in keeping with the local conservation ethos and practice.

RESPONSE 607639733

We are extremely concerned that the proposed process will be conducted in an open air environment, which would be exposed to the elements. Although there is to be some sort of sheeting, it is unlikely that production would be halted due to weather conditions so the

contaminants would have a very high probability of escaping into the atmosphere. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty with nature and wildlife reserves, fishing lakes, local walks, schools, residential care homes, and residents / families. There are also a lot of farms and people that grow their own produce. We're worried that there is the possibility that these dangerous particles could enter the food chain by being ingested from crops grown in the area or meat/milk from animals grazing in the fields. There would also be an influx of lorries, in addition to the ones already operating in the locality, that could create more noise and pollution, particularly when queuing at the railway level crossing.

RESPONSE 502838608

Being a local resident and using the facilities at Danehills lake daily. I love the nature reserve and all the hard work that goes into the provision of this nature reserve. Any slight possibility of contamination into the lakes and surrounding countryside and woods would be catastrophic to the wildlife and nature in my view. No guarantees can be given that this would not be a possibility so the best policy would be a no go for this application.

RESPONSE 629462726

It's been a land fill site for years. We don't mind that but do not want but think it full enough. This area relies on ground water sources and any leakage would catastrophic. And the narrow roads leading to the ground fill are blocked enough.

RESPONSE 594392172

I'm sure we'll all hear cries of Nimby, however, this proposal is just shocking. There's no detail of what "other hazardous material" will be processed here, as if the already extensive lost of dangerously hazardous materials isn't scary enough.

This site is directly adjoining a SSSI, there's a serious risk to our aquifer, the airborne risks of Asbestos and other hazardous materials is real and given this is a former FOF site, with the potential of munitions and reactions with existing chemicals, its ridiculous to even consider this application.

I will oppose this application at every turn.

RESPONSE 520493833

The site borders an important Nature Reserve and Site of Special Scientific Interest which will be diminished as a result of the new infrastructure and increase in heavy goods vehicles.

The location is directly above the local water aquifer and the risk of pollution from the site is a danger to this valuable resource.

The proposed site also borders Daneshill Traveller's Site. The risk posed by the increased traffic, size of the vehicles and general pollution are huge considering the proximity of this community to the site.

The overall risk to the residents, local farmland and wildlife is too great and the proposal should be rejected. It is simply ludicrous to position such a facility in that location.

RESPONSE 248159091

Having read all the 12 responses, I am extremely concerned about the impact this site will have on the nearby village of Lound from the airborne asbestos particles from the site. Not only the village itself but the neighbouring traveller site, bungalows nearby and nature reserve. Anyone disposing of asbestos has to pay thousands to have it safely removed for it then to be treated so close to a populated area and in the open air is unthinkable.

If nothing else, the comments from the first response should be taken into account and the offer of help in the disposal accepted as this person appears to have a great deal of knowledge in this field.

On a personal level and for that of my neighbours in this area, I certainly do not want any more heavy vehicles passing through our village of Barnby Moor and I'm sure the residents of Torworth, Ranskill and Blyth feel the same.

The site should be further away from civilisation.

RESPONSE 632560302

I wish to object the application based on its potential to leak dangerous chemicals in to household water not to mention the dangers it poses to the wildlife of which is in abundance in our rural village.

RESPONSE 984007576

I live in the cottage a few hundred metres away from Daneshill Land Fill Site. I and my husband oppose the use of the site for asbestos sorting and have no confidence in the safe operation of the proposed facility. It is proposed that waste will be sorted outside which will mean that there is a significant risk of asbestos fibres being released into the environment. Sheeting would be used on some but not all of the materials and even where sheeting is used, the process would be subject to human error. There would be a clear risk of dangerous carcinogens becoming airborne. This would create a health hazard to residents in our cottages, the nearby farm, the caravan site and the villages of Lound, Torworth and Ranskill. Daneshill Nature Reserve shares a boundary with the site and the proposed activities would put wildlife in danger. There is also the risk of soil and water contamination. Many people's lives have been blighted by the land fill site since it opened but as the closest residents we have borne the brunt of this. We have suffered from the very heavy traffic on Daneshill Road and this proposal would exacerbate this. We believe that the site should close and be restored by the originally agreed date of 2023.

RESPONSE 775229659

I am in full agreement with response 649434312 and I have read the HSE attachment. I have read the 13 documents related to the FCC application and the Environmental Permitting Core Guidance. I have the following doubts and observations about the Company and the site at Daneshill but have no doubts about the potential dangers to the environment and the health of local residents should this permit be approved.

FCC states "This permit relates to varying an existing permit dated 2017 and therefore the principle is already established." This is incorrect as this must be considered as a completely new activity added within the existing permit boundary on the same site. There was another application for a variation of the permit on 18th September 2018 Bassetlaw ref 1/18/00217/CDM, (a 25 page document involving comments from CC, Nature Conservation Officer, Anglian Water, Highways etc) and agreed between the Waste Planning Authority and the Applicant to close the plant on 31st

December 2023; this linked in with the remaining restoration obligations indicated in the 2018 Aftercare Report as stated in Condition 21 of planning permission 1/29/11/00010. FCC reneged on this agreement as FCC had already instructed Caulmert Ltd Environmental Consultants and a draft report had already proposed the STF at Daneshill.

Regulator and Operator: "This permit application could be refused if the Applicant will NOT be the Operator of the regulated facility. "FCC has "a strategic agreement" with Provectus which will manage the site. Provectus Remediation will provide technical assistance for the operation of the STF as required " Does this mean a different Company is involved as this is against EA rules? Who is responsible for checking the documentation and formally accepting soils after initial reception analysis in accordance with STF PRO 2 ? Will it be an employee of FCC or Provectus ?

"This application could be refused if the EA considers the Operator to be NOT competent to run the regulated facility in accordance with the Permit" The past record of FCC on this site, with continued problems with unsheeted lorries, suggest it is unlikely to comply with the proposed Permit conditions as the submissions by their Environmental Consultants have shown a relaxed attitude to the dangers of asbestos fibre release even challenging HSE recommendations.

There have been convictions by HSE ,one a fatality at another FCC site dealing with non-hazardous waste, the fine was £200,000 (prosecution notices 4366535 and 307616653, 307616665)an indication of lack of compliance with HSE regulations. If this Permit is to be granted the potential Operator must show competence and abide by "The Control of Asbestos Regulations" and code of practice and the minimum standards for protection from risks associated with exposure to asbestos must be complied with. There are legal duties to meet the requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (SI 2016 No 1154). (Torworth still has unsheeted lorries and lost loads)

The environmental risks to the surroundings and health risks to local residents have not been sufficiently noted(see Activities and Operating Techniques, Caulmert) The statement suggesting that " the results of asbestos fibre monitoring will be similar to the Operator's other site "at Rowley Regis is misleading and untrue , there can be no comparison as ERQ is in a building. " The Amenity and Risk assessment " by Caulmert states "Fugitive emissions risk assessment...Dust emissions are transient and likely to dissipate before settling" . The other firm of Environmental Consultants advising FCC is Barton Willmore which suggests " the open air operation would be screened by the large belt of trees to the south of the proposed development site which creates a buffer between the Traveller Community located 500m to the south of the site and the STF."

The possibility of escape of asbestos fibres from the point of delivery of contaminated soils to the end of the removal process is thought by these 2 Consultants to be " so low almost insignificant and of little consequence "

"Emissions Management Plan" This mentions Volatile Organic Compounds VOCs xylene, toluene, benzene and ethyl benzene, all carcinogenic -will these be added to the permit? There is a suggestion that the "monitoring data for the biofilter at Daneshill will have similar results as Rowley Regis " This monitoring is carried out weekly (or when dust is suspected) Is this biofilter inside at RR? (NB for VOCs not asbestos.)

What is the " FCC safeguard online incident recording system ?"Should this be part of "Facilities Management System"?

I am alarmed that supposed experts can even consider such a facility involving asbestos contaminated soils in the open-air. There may be a suggestion that a building on site could be the answer to all our fears. Unfortunately , Daneshill was the site of one of the few Munitions Factory during the war and the ground is seriously contaminated with chemicals from RDX, cordite, nitric acid production and chemicals sensitive to percussion are widespread . I have attached a R&D Technical report P5-042/TR/03 "LAND CONTAMINATION: TECHNICAL GUIDANCE ON SPECIAL SITES: EXPLOSIVES MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING SITES" by Dr Bullock et al .

BULLOCK 4.2.1 states "Free from Explosive Certificates should be treated with care as often inspections only involved visual checks for surface contamination." It will not be possible to build on this site an appropriately secure building.

This site was declared "open countryside" under criteria in WPS Policy WCS7.

These are my reasons why this site is totally unsuitable for the proposed STF.

RESPONSE 1051319844

As a resident of Lound near the proposed site I am concerned that it is now expected that soils known to be contaminated with asbestos will be imported to cover the former landfill site.

From reading the original applications regarding the site I understood that clean cover fill would be imported and that the manual checking for asbestos was precautionary only. Later amendments to the application seem to suggest a different approach.

I am concerned that sifting for asbestos in the open air is a highly risky proposition. It offers potential for highly dangerous asbestos fibres to be carried on the prevailing Westerly winds directly into the village of Lound.

From my experience of working in the construction industry all buildings require an asbestos survey before any alterations, demolition or refurbishment are undertaken. Should asbestos be found this is removed by expert operatives in a controlled environment contained by tenting. Why then is it proposed that soil is brought to the site which still contains asbestos for sorting on site in the open air?

RESPONSE 1065275959

As a resident of Torworth Retford Notts, I am very concerned about the proposal to transport and process hazardous waste ie asbestos at the Daneshill Soils Treatment Facility near the village of Torworth. The existing treatment facility which is situated on a WW2 ordnance factory where traces of cordite and RDX have been found is to my mind foolish enough without introducing yet another highly toxic substance namely asbestos . Many years ago, asbestos was considered a suitable material in the building of steam locomotives as insulation or for simple oven gloves in the kitchen! Since then the drastic danger to health has been revealed to the sorrow of many people who were exposed to it.

Despite this we now have a proposal to treat this toxic substance in a highly unsuitable location next to a site of SSSI nature reserve and water containing area that supports wild life. It would seem that the past record of transporting waste material to the existing site which is proposed for the asbestos , is hardly an unblemished record of care and attention , with lorries entering the site without cover sheets and waste deposited on local roads and left there. Am I to believe that suddenly all will be perfect with the transport of asbestos? Who will supervise the operation from site to site? There is always a danger that things can slip once people become complacent about such things. Will penalties be enforced if instructions are not carried out?

Much of the old site is on hard concrete where surface runoff can percolate into surrounding drains and water courses .With the threat of global warming and possible increased rainfall this could become a real hazard.

It has been disappointing in the way that the existing site has been operated and so I can have no confidence in the safe handling of asbestos there. A more safer location is urgently needed before it is too late.

RESPONSE 156267309

Looking at the research having hazardous waste in such close proximity to villages and nature reserves is dangerous as there could be airborne and soil contamination that could infect residents, wildlife and the environment.

No matter the monitoring of pollution there will always be a risk, and how will the maintenance be handled if the company were to close?

This site should not under any circumstances be allowed to open at Daneshill.

RESPONSE 1030321814

As Member of Parliament for Bassetlaw I have consulted widely with constituents and parish councils from the community. It is quite apparent that granting a permit would be unsuitable in this instance. The proposal would be detrimental to the local population and the sensitivity of the site. If granted, the proposal would present a persistent and clear danger to local people and the wider environment. I would therefore urge a refusal on this occasion.

RESPONSE 1003643907

Further to the comprehensive response from 516069385 I would make comment on the risk burden of lorries loaded with asbestos waste using a minor road where numerous lorries have gone into dykes and shed their loads, plus the added danger to individuals and families walking on this road to access Daneshill Lakes with no available footpath making this road totally unsuitable for the proposed use.

RESPONSE 908985202

I am extremely concerned about this proposed project due to the proximity to a nature reserve, river and local villages. The airborne nature of asbestos dust suggests there is a risk to the immediate local community and its surroundings, as well as the environment and wildlife which thrive nearby.

RESPONSE 871009800

I am a resident of Lound and I feel that the asbestos recycling would be very detrimental to the area. We have other villages in the areas and important nature reserves, and schools which could all be affected it could discourage people coming to the area to enjoy the area and relocate.

Surely there are other places this plant could be located I strongly object to the plan.

RESPONSE 717980253

I think this will be dangerous and detrimental to the residents and wild life of the area.

RESPONSE 30550348

As a Lound resident and therefore much of the time downwind of this site, I am very concerned by the possible airborne contamination of the air I breathe. Lound has had much to contend with regarding waste (the landfill site) and this seems like a further worry. If this proposal were to be approved, I just hope that stringent conditions would be imposed to ensure that the safety of all local residents is assured. The process must surely operate in a fully enclosed facility with tight monitoring of escaping particulates and safe handling and transport of the sorted asbestos.

Having said this, I really do feel that for Lound enough is enough and a more suitable location should be identified.

RESPONSE 535622759

I live in Lound and am very worried about the impact on the health of people in Lound, the Daneshill caravan and camp site and surrounding villages. As we all know Asbestos is a carcinogenic substance and, if particles are released into the air and carried away by the wind, these could be inhaled by local people. The prevailing westerly wind makes this a serious possibility. I have read that soil with large amounts of asbestos will be sheeted, and smaller amounts will not. I do not have confidence that the sheeting will be adequate, and am worried about people making mistakes. High winds could bring dust into Lound and seriously affect people, even small amounts from the unsheeted soil could be detrimental to people's health. We know that asbestos can cause serious harm to elderly and vulnerable people, of which there are many in Lound, as well as the young.

I do understand that asbestos needs to be disposed of somewhere but I do not understand and I seriously question why this has to be so close to a village, and why it is an open air process. I question the quality and effectiveness of the proposed containment materials, the opportunity for human error, and the efficiency and safety of the proposed process. I question whether enough notice has been taken of scientific evidence and advice and beg decision makers to thoroughly review all of the evidence relating to the safety of the proposal and the potential effect on the health of local people.

RESPONSE 514420661

I am very concerned and unhappy about the application for the disposal of asbestos from contaminated soil. The sheer volume of contaminated soil that would be treated on a daily basis is terrifying and I feel that the impact of this will slowly but surely be felt by the neighbouring villages.

The proposed site is very near a travellers site, which has young children and families, who will surely be impacted by the toxic environment that you will enforce on them.

The close proximity to Danehill nature reserve is also a cause for concern; asbestos is carcinogenic and even with the measures of sheeting (what is the sheeting made of?), can you guarantee 100 % that there will not be any escaping particles of asbestos, carried off into the environment? I believe the answer to that question is a resounding 'no'.

The neighbouring of Sutton-cum-Lound, Ranskill, Mattersey all have primary schools, with young, vulnerable children and there is a large proportion of retired residents, living in these communities. You are endangering the health of the young children and the elderly residents and potentially subjecting people to a lifetime of respiratory complaints and far worse.

Furthermore the influx of large vehicles transporting the contaminated soil to and from the area will have a huge impact on the community. The road to the site is small and winding with a dangerous crossroads, that has had a history of accidents. I feel this has not been considered at all and if it has, then has been disregarded.

To build a toxic site so close to all the neighbouring villages is not only immoral, it is exploiting the location, in the corner of the county.

RESPONSE 651665326

It is not something we need- a contaminant on our doorsteps for hundreds of years. Dispose of it somewhere underground- Harworth Pit springs to mind. Then seal it off. The vehicles transporting it will pass through our villages and are endangering our environment.

RESPONSE 971009113

As the Sutton Ward District Councillor I write on behalf of the residents that I represent. It should be noted that as their advocate I confirm that the majority of persons within the ward object most strongly to the nature and location of this proposed waste recycling development for its suggested purposes. This are a number of reasons including the ramifications of the traffic and noise disruption upon an area that is rural and indeed part of an intrinsic area for nature reserves.

It is also held that we agree with all objections but in particular, with the findings as alluded to in representation number 649434312. Where one of the key concerns is the asbestos fibers that will, without doubt emanate from the site causing eminent danger to the local population and surrounding areas. This also extends to the points of objection further raised in representation number 775229659 which we further concur in addition to our Member of Parliaments representations; number 103321814.

The dangers and strength of feeling therefore exceed all reasonable doubt as to any suitability or indeed merit of this permit application and thus we request the denial of this application upon that basis.

RESPONSE 446591765

All the technical jargon that has been provided is way above the heads of normal people but what we do know is that the disposal of this exceptionally hazardous waste is undesirable in the extreme on the proposed site.

If there is any chance of the waste entering the water supply then this cannot be acceptable.

The possibility of asbestos contamination is equally worrying especially since a local resident has recently died due to contamination with asbestos when working with it over 50 years ago. Therefore this is not just a short term problem.

Lound, where I live, is on the leeward side of the site and therefore on the front line for contamination by any airborne particles.

I firmly oppose the permit application on these grounds particularly.

RESPONSE 912793264

In my opinion, the proposed sight is too close to neighbouring villages and especially close to the popular beauty spot of Daneshill

I have no confidence in any claims that the environment and local population will not be adversely affected as these claims are all too often coloured by business and financial concerns

RESPONSE 760733266

I think this is too hazardous an activity to be taken on this proposed site. The close proximity to the natural water table is a major concern due to the risk of contamination of said water which supplies an enormous area with drinking water.

Also as we don't really know what contamination is being brought in which could be airborne either as particles or fumes to the local in detriment to plant ,animal as well as human wellbeing.

I strongly object to having this type of waste being transported from many miles away to the local area to be 'cleaned' . HGV traffic is bound to increase and the local roads are not designed for large traffic and us busy enough with local businesses and agriculture.
I say a definite NO to this application.

RESPONSE 4057828

Wastes to be Treated

Bulk solid wastes are difficult to sample. The value of any analysis is nullified if the sampling is not representative of the bulk. I note the close relationship between Provectus and FCC, the former offering the FCC facility at Rowley Regis to its customer base. In the Waste Acceptance Procedure offered by FCC for Daneshill it is the Customer Waste Description that is accepted initially which is then subject to FCC and Provectus Review. The Sampling and analysis of the waste to any STF at Daneshill should be undertaken by an accredited body, demonstrably independent of the processor (FCC) and Provectus, such as the agency referenced in the application documentation SOCOTEC. SOCOTEC have a background in the sampling and analysis of bulk solids. The accredited laboratory should be employed at the customers expense (provider of the waste) to provide an independent analysis of the waste that is truly representative.

It is important that any contamination including certain asbestos fibres are identified in the waste before transport to the STF (as above). Movement of such materials will increase the risk of contaminants entering the environment. It is not appropriate to routinely identify out of specification waste contaminants on delivery and tipping on site. Important also that incoming wastes are carried in sheeted vehicles and that the waste is properly conditioned prior to lifting and transport to the STF.

Waste Streams

Oil containing drilling muds and wastes. Which are in liquid form (normally), how will this be treated?

Drilling muds containing other drilling wastes and hazardous substances. Can contain NORM, BTEX, H₂S amongst some other non hydrocarbon contaminants, how will these be identified. Presumably for example the presence of NORM at some level (not mentioned or quantified in the documentation) which is higher than the tolerance value for such oilfield wastes/residues will result in the rejection of that consignment of waste?

Oil spills may also contain a host of harmful analytes present in the oil and produced water (apart from BTEX). How will these be identified and treated?

Waste may, we are told, contain creosote, phenols chlorinated solvents etc. but presumably not contaminated with asbestos in the same batch. Otherwise the hand pickers in particular will be subjected to some rather nasty carcinogens. Important again that sampling and analysis are representative of the whole batch allowing (perhaps) for rejection of the batch at source.

Air Quality Impact Assessment

Is based on the premise that the contaminants in the waste stream are similar to those presented in the streams to the Edwin Richards Quarry. How valid is this assumption? Far more appropriate to undertake some analysis of likely waste streams from sites presumably already identified by FCC as potential customers in their own business case. A number of would be waste streams should be sampled/analysed and a more relevant assessment undertaken.

Visual Comparison of Edwin Richards facility & Daneshill Proposal

The picking belt and associated activity at Edwin Richards is seemingly undertaken in an enclosed building. The proposed activity at Daneshill, outside, under a canvas slung over the picking belt. Hardly an impressive set up and not at all pleasant for FCC personnel working there. Possible that when windy there will be fugitive dust emissions from the belt. The EA should insist upon an enclosed building operating with adequate filtration under a slight negative pressure, as containment.

Chemical Analysis Waste Input.

Based on visual examination sampling frequency will be considered, this in relation to the volume from each hazardous waste site. Sampling will be undertaken on soils using composite sampling methods as described in BS812.

As we are considering the chemical analysis a visual examination will prove nothing. Sampling should have already identified any out of specification contaminants at source and caused rejection of same. The idea that someone on site will sample to BS812 is fanciful. Any likely out of spec material should be sampled/analysed by independent experts as previously described.

Remedial Action Plan

Following a receipt of a complaint or identification of visual emissions at the STF which may give rise to an offsite impact the following action plan will be undertaken, including:

“Halting of those operations on site likely to have caused the emissions until properly investigated”
An addition that I believe the EA should ask for.

Complaints Procedure & Communications Forum

A liaison group (Community Liaison Group) should be established to allow a structured engagement between local residents and FCC. Formed of residents, Parish Councils, District and County Councillors. Much as was successfully implemented to provide local representation during the work to establish Exploratory Boreholes into the Bowland Shale at Tinker Lane/Misson.

RESPONSE 165042463

The news that the Environment Agency are requesting a permit to remove asbestos on a open air facility near our village is HORRIFYING. As a mother of two young children, I am shocked to learn that this could be happening so close to where we live. The potential risks to our family's health are very worrying, considering the risk that the asbestos fibres could be released into the air and could very easily be blown towards Lound, I am extremely concerned that this action would mean that Lound is no longer a safe place to live for our family. It would be great to see the land regenerated but not if it poses such health risks.

RESPONSE 317397759

I have lived in Lound since 1977. I am a Chemical Engineer by profession and for over 40 years I have been responsible for the design, construction, commissioning, operation, maintenance, decommissioning and demolition of a wide range of industrial installations. These include chemical plants handling substances which fall into the top-tier category of the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations.

Asbestos was employed for many years as a very useful material in a wide variety of applications in the home and at work, but today it is known to be a terrifyingly dangerous substance and an insidious killer. Humans exposed to fine asbestos particles, which have been allowed to escape through inadequate containment and control, are at serious risk of mesothelioma and death.

This proposal from FCC Recycling (UK) Limited (FCC) to handle the most dangerous types of asbestos in the open air at the Daneshill Landfill Site is of great concern to the people who live and work nearby and those who use the adjacent Daneshill Lakes for recreation. Given my experience, the main focus of my present comments is "Whether the right process is being used for the activity, for example whether the technology is the right one" and "The shape and use of the land around the site in terms of its potential impact, whether that impact is acceptable and what pollution control or abatement may be required" in relation to FCC's proposal to remove asbestos from hazardous waste in order to produce clean soil which is safe to be used for land restoration at Daneshill.

At Rowley Regis, FCC operates a similar facility where asbestos is handled inside a sealed building, which, in FCC's words, "provides regulators with some degree of comfort that emissions can be controlled more easily". In contrast, at Daneshill, FCC plans to handle this more hazardous material totally in the open air. As per Caulmert's Amenity and Accident Risk Assessment document at page 4, on arrival by lorry at site the waste is unloaded onto an open-air concrete pad for assessment. Testing, which takes 5 to 7 days, is carried out (to standards that are not currently valid, as explained in Response 649434312 of this consultation and its attached letter from the Health & Safety Executive, dated 9 November 2020). If the results are high the load will be rejected and the material will have to be re-loaded for dispatch. All these steps may be prolonged overnight or during a weekend or holiday period and contaminated waste will inevitably at times be exposed to the elements, especially during unloading and re-loading. Sheeting over lorries and storage pads is intended to minimise this, but at best sheeting can never provide 100% containment of fine particles.

For the asbestos picking operation itself FCC are proposing a mobile conveyor belt. This piece of equipment is shown in the Caulmert Emissions Management Plan at Appendix 1. The manufacturers, CRS NI Ltd, describe the equipment in their brochure as "Designed for Building & Construction Sites to retrieve valuable products from waste reducing what goes in to your skip". The brochure shows a small tented area, which is described there as a "canopy for weather protection". This could give minimal shelter from rain, but would in no way contribute towards the containment of fine asbestos particles. Caulmert say in their Amenity and Accident Risk

Assessment document in Table 4 “Fugitive Emissions Risk Assessment” on page 13 “Preventative measures include: hand-picking operations are carried out in a fully enclosed picking station” and this is completely inaccurate. The words from the manufacturer clearly describe the type of work that this unit would be suitable for, namely very temporary arrangements. These might be put in place to deal with asbestos on a building site, rather than for an operation which is going to be in constant use for ten years, handling large tonnages of material. Even the removal of small quantities of asbestos by specialist companies, such as I witnessed recently from a boiler house at a school, involves temporary total containment techniques and certainly their work is not carried out in the open air.

The necessary written procedures and safety signage will no doubt be put in place, but the operation remains a repetitive and entirely manual one, relying on the conscientious attention to detail of the operatives at all times. In reality, it will be almost impossible for FCC to consistently exercise proper control over these operations, outside in all weathers with varying lighting conditions, for 58 hours a week, 52 weeks a year for the next 10 years, in such a remote location, without incidents occurring which will release asbestos particles into the environment. How will the senior Site Manager, who will be needed to lead these operations, ensure that they are carried out correctly at all times?

The proposed operating procedures were summed up by Via (Reclamation) in Nottinghamshire County Council’s planning report: “These processes and procedures are heavily dependent on the competence and integrity of the operatives undertaking the work and therefore risk cannot completely be eliminated”. Again Response 396478685 of this consultation expresses a similar view: “One of my concerns is human error. The hand picking facility relies both on human judgement and constant focussing on the task. I have worked on production lines and I know that errors are inevitable and not infrequent.”

In the Caulmert Amenity and Accident Risk Assessment document in Table 5 “Accidents Risk Assessment” the loss of containment of fine asbestos particles is not even mentioned. I would suggest this is because, once asbestos has been released, there is nothing that can be done to recover the situation. Sadly, the readiness of water bowsers and water sprays would be too late to render any effective assistance under such circumstances.

The Caulmert Emissions Management Plan says for Potential Airborne Pathways on page 9 at paragraph 5.1.2 “Meteorological data from Doncaster/Sheffield airport weather station (winderfinder.com) indicates that the prevailing wind is from the south-west, west-south-west and west towards the north-east, east, and east-north-east. These wind conditions are reflective of those likely to be experienced at Daneshill Soil Treatment Facility. A review of the sensitive receptors in Table 1 shows that the receptor likely to be impacted by emissions within 500m of the site boundary, is Loundfield farm which is located 495m east from the site boundary. However, given the transient nature of airborne emissions and the distance of this receptor from site, it is unlikely to be significantly impacted by emissions from site.”

The unavoidable conclusion from these words is that the dangers to people from asbestos as a result of these proposed operations are not being taken sufficiently seriously by FCC and its consultants. Apart from Loundfield Farm there are other dwellings and places of work, which are closer than 500 m and at times the wind will blow in other directions. This material does not become harmless beyond an arbitrary 500 m line and, as asbestos is neither water-soluble nor biodegradable, it will lie dormant until it is picked up again on the next dry windy day and fine asbestos particles will be taken further afield to endanger more people. Such material must simply not be allowed to escape in the first place. The arrangements currently proposed clearly do not meet the standards required to ensure a safe and successful operation.

I believe these problems constitute an unacceptably dangerous situation and that they must be eliminated; they should be designed out by the provision of Total Containment for all asbestos related operations. I am in agreement with the view expressed in Response 649434312 of this consultation that the only acceptable solution would be to carry out all such work within a purpose-designed building to ensure that they are safe. This would be a completely sealed unit with double air lock doors for both vehicles and people. The building would be fitted with a ventilation unit so that all air leaving would be handled through a filtration system. Vehicle movements inside this building would include arrival, unloading, loading, cleaning and departure.

FCC has obviously put a great deal of effort into this application and this leads one to believe that the company has a strong business case for carrying out this operation at Daneshill. Accordingly, given the real problems with open-air operation, I believe that, if these operations are to be allowed to go ahead, there is an overwhelming case to require FCC to invest in a sealed building as part of the project scope.

RESPONSE 174980827

The area chosen is rural and next to a wildlife area as well as private housing. There seems no logic to such a choice, given the dangers surrounding the treatment and substance. Even the smallest partial escaping can cause damage to health not just in the immediate area but on route to the site.

RESPONSE 368472867

Daneshill Lakes
A Nature Reserve

The Daneshill Local Nature Reserve Lakes have been designed to accommodate a variety of different uses. The lake is leased by an angling club and a sailing club and has a long established perimeter footway. In addition to wildfowl, the site also supports a great variety of butterflies, including the Common Blue, Meadow Brown and Gatekeeper together with damselflies and dragonflies.

It is a quiet nature reserve specifically for wildlife conservation. Nottinghamshire County Council and the local Parish Councils have worked together to protect this natural environment.

Habitats

This site is particularly valuable for wildlife due to the wide range of habitats, including open water, wet grassland, and drier areas of gorse and willow/birch scrub. Many flowering plants grow here including Common Spotted and Southern Marsh Orchids, Celery Leafed Buttercup, Weld and Goat's Rue. Brambles and gorse attract many types of butterfly such as Brimstone, Common Blue and Meadow Brown.

There is a good chance of seeing any one of our three native woodpeckers and kingfishers, which frequent the reserve, as do a number of Waders like Redshank, Greenshank, Ringed Plover and Little Ringed Plover. This is also a good site for damselflies and dragonflies, and both adder and grass snakes are present but are rarely seen.

The local parish councils have been working in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council's Wayfinder Project to open up and establish the paths and bridges on the North Lake and adjacent woodland, with funding gained from Nottinghamshire County Council, Heritage lottery fund and Waste Recycling Environment Ltd (WREN).

WHY anyone would support this application to start using the area for recycling toxic and contaminated waste materials and other substances is beyond my comprehension.

[Redacted text]

RESPONSE 248692199

I am complaining in the strongest terms possible regarding this application for an asbestos processing operation at Daneshill tip.

Asbestos is so toxic it remains the worlds biggest single cause of industrial related deaths with approximately 90,000 people each year dying of diseases caused by exposure to asbestos.

Asbestos was banned in Britain in 1999 but its danger was recorded as early as 1898 and its effects can occur up to 50 years after exposure.

Aware of these facts the NCC appear to be taking the view of Sir Ralph Bateman former president of the CBI and chairman of Turner & Newhall the worlds largest asbestos factory (now gone) that asbestos could be safe. How wrong.

The proposed plan is to introduce this plant onto what was once a tip which had very little control on its contents placed there from as early as the second world war onwards including munitions chemicals and other toxic waste. As a cosequence existing dangerous waste materials could be disturbed.

Due to the location of the asbestos plant and its proximity to villagers and local residents including in some cases people living and working within yards of the process and its incoming road transported waste is a major concern. Additionally within again only yards there is a popular and well frequented nature reserve.

If this process needs to be carried out it needs to be done in a safe indoor controlled and well planned environment at a more suitable site and not in close proximity to residential areas.

RESPONSE 959243179

The impact on the roads through our villages will be a massive increase in vehicles, noise, road damage.

Pollution will impact on the health of the village residents particularly the young and those with health issues

RESPONSE 865871398

Refused. A landfill so close to a nature reserve is not viable. We do not want the traffic, smell or an un-environmentally friendly site here. Having learnt all we have in the last decade about landfills I cannot believe that this proposal is being sort. Only applications for recycling plants or green sites should be considered and I am disappointed that the council have even allowed it this far.

RESPONSE 1026726857

As a chartered building engineer and chartered building surveyor, I understand more than most over the risks associated with asbestos containing materials and their potentially carcinogenic outcomes..

It is incredulous that such open air proposals are even being considered. Clearly the company concerned and even the County Council have poor knowledge or choose to ignore the significant health issues associated with asbestos fibres which are microscopic and cannot be seen necessarily with the human eye but yet there is no known medical minimum exposure to such fibres which can result in tumours developing in the body of those unfortunate to be exposed to such fibres. It is a long term issue as the result of such tumours developing can be many years later and medical evidence is resolute that there is no safe minimum exposure level. Yet this industrial process that is being dumped in the open air in rural countryside is only financially beneficial to the company transporting and dumping the waste and ultimately to the County Council

who stand to benefit from land that has had the contaminated soils dumped upon. Such soils will never be safe and cannot be made so without effective encapsulation but that still leaves a risk for future generations.

The company proposing this commercial activity stands to profit but put the lives of employees and contractors at significant risk in addition to the local populace who will unfortunately suffer the ill effects of wind blown fibres from the site that being microscopic cannot be effectively contained when dumped in the open air or indeed with difficulty when inside a building as vehicles will still need to access such buildings although no such building has been suggested for this site.

The whole proposal is an appalling and damning slight on those concerned as well as everybody likely to suffer the health consequences of such appalling and abysmal actions made only for profit.

The proposal must be halted and rejected forthwith.

RESPONSE 924823052

I am involved in construction myself and I understand more than most over the risks associated with asbestos containing materials and their potentially carcinogenic outcomes.

It is incredulous that such open air proposals are even being considered. Clearly the company concerned and even the County Council have poor knowledge or choose to ignore the significant health issues associated with asbestos fibres which are microscopic and cannot be seen necessarily with the human eye but yet there is no known medical minimum exposure to such fibres which can result in tumours developing in the body of those unfortunate to be exposed to such fibres. It is a long term issue as the result of such tumours developing can be many years later and medical evidence is resolute that there is no safe minimum exposure level. Yet this industrial process that is being dumped in the open air in rural countryside is only financially beneficial to the company transporting and dumping the waste and ultimately to the County Council who stand to benefit from land that has had the contaminated soils dumped upon. Such soils will never be safe and cannot be made so without effective encapsulation but that still leaves a risk for future generations.

The company proposing this commercial activity stands to profit but put the lives of employees and contractors at significant risk in addition to the local populace who will unfortunately suffer the ill effects of wind blown fibres from the site that being microscopic cannot be effectively contained when dumped in the open air or indeed with difficulty when inside a building as vehicles will still need to access such buildings although no such building has been suggested for this site.

The whole proposal is an appalling and damning slight on those concerned as well as everybody likely to suffer the health consequences of such appalling and abysmal actions made only for profit.

The proposal must be halted and rejected forthwith.

RESPONSE 718250874

Would not be happy at this proposal in our area due to extra traffic & smell.

RESPONSE 337171116

Totally wrong for the area and would have unwanted noise and traffic for the area .

RESPONSE 34519676

This is near residential areas and also an area with extensive wildlife, where we often walk as a family. The impact of more traffic, smells from the site and pollution would have a detrimental impact on the area and health. I completely disagree with the application. I'm happy to discuss this further.

RESPONSE 608376910

I do not feel that enough attention has been given to the risk to the health of people in Lound and surrounding villages from particles of asbestos that could easily be carried to the villages by the wind. I do not have confidence that the suggested methods are sufficient to ensure no risk of air contamination. I strongly feel the permit should not be granted.

RESPONSE 127590109

My family live in Lound.

I have read the objection number 649434312

This person is obviously an expert. Please please please take his/her advice and if you are to permit regeneration of the land, ensure that the asbestos is removed safely, without risking damaging the health of my family and other in and around Lound. The methods suggested in the FCC application do not appear safe, so I request that you do not grant permission as it stands
Thank you

RESPONSE 55238767

I have read the objection number 649434312

This person is obviously an expert. Please please please take his/her advice and if you are to permit regeneration of the land, ensure that the asbestos is removed safely, without risking damaging the health of my family and other in and around Lound. The methods suggested in the FCC application do not appear safe, so I request that you do not grant permission as it stands
Thank you