

From: [REDACTED]
To: Appeals_NPS@environment-agency.gov.uk; [Bunten, James](mailto:Bunten_James@defra.gov.uk); Secretary.State@defra.gov.uk
Subject: FCC application to process contaminated soil at Daneshill, Nottinghamshire
Date: 24 April 2024 22:08:53

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sirs

I am writing to you as a concerned resident of a nearby village to where this applicant has been issued with a permit.

Firstly I do not believe asbestos contaminated soil should be processed in the vicinity of any dwelling, let alone village, as the risk of windblown aerial contamination is likely to be hazardous to anyone living in the surrounding area.

Furthermore I raise concerns about the way the application and permitting process was undertaken. Specially these concerns are:

- FCC's *own solicitors* say that the issue of the permit variation allowing the processing of asbestos was unlawful because it was outside of the permit procedure.
- -No members of the public (e.g. Parish Council, respondents to the consultation etc.) were informed of the variation to the permit allowing the processing of asbestos.
- -The appeal (1/6/2023) was **outside of the agreed timescales** as the EA had rejected the importing of soils containing asbestos on 22/10/2022. The appeal window is 6 months.
- -The lack of responses by the public to the appeal (July 2023) was because no new information was given about the variation to allow asbestos processing.
- -The decision by the EA to allow asbestos to be processed (1/8/2023) was issued before the end of the consultation period.
- -Fundamentally, the EA have already outlined in the document on 9/12/2022 that there are serious risks associated with processing asbestos. No matter what controls are put in place the transport and processing of asbestos in any way will put local residents at unreasonable risk.

I urge that this decision to grant a permit be retracted.

Yours faithfully,
Tom Biddulph