

Tuesday 28th November, 2006

Trip consisted of District Councilors, various Parish Councilors and N.S.D.C. Officers. (List available for Legal and Research and Publicity).

Information was distributed by N.S.D.C but later on Allen and I distributed packs containing 'Health Effects of Waste Incinerators', maps and a leaflet 'To Burn or not to Burn? That is the Burning Question.

Marchwood Incinerator, Hampshire.

Built next to the site of an old incinerator that has been decommissioned.

However, there are plans to build another incinerator on the previous site as well.

On an industrial estate next to Southampton Water.

Serves Southampton and surrounding areas.

Very slick, professional and a great sales promotion by John Collis.

Only going to burn whatever cannot be recycled.

Answers about ash not really believable.

Bottom ash used in road building after the removal of any large pieces.

Fly-ash - goes through lime slurry to neutralize.

Somewhere in the midlands there is a processing plant that ends up with acid.

Add acid to fly-ash and it renders it inert? Then goes to landfill.

Questions not answered. Why isn't lime slurry sufficient?

Is the ash transported to the acid or the acid to the ash? Think it is the first but not really clarified. If the ash is then inert why not use in road building?

Dioxins.

As quoted: Modern technology incinerators have excellent filtering systems meaning very few emissions into the atmosphere. The system eats dioxins, I assume like a smoke eater boiler. We asked many questions but lacked the technical knowledge to challenge a lot of the answers. However, if these things work so efficiently and pose no problems, is the information in the 4th. Report of the British Society for Ecological Medicine, out of date and irrelevant?

Marchwood Parish Council had been very against the incinerator and we met Parish Councilors who still felt the same way. However, once they knew it was going to happen anyway, they worked with Veolia, making all sorts of conditions and insisting on architectural enhancements. Marchwood looks like a big silver doughnut with a chimney and this big dome completely covers all the working bits.

In the evening we met officers and Councilors from the local district council and the Parish of

Marchwood.

Again, very slick but Allen, Andy, Paul and I felt a bit uneasy about this road show. Unfortunately, by this time a number of N.S.D.C. councilors were pretty much convinced what a great idea it was. Well it would be if it is not on their doorstep.

Wednesday, 29th November 2006

Chineham Incinerator

This incinerator is in the countryside, next to a sewage farm so a very similar position to the Rufford Colliery site.

No architectural enhancements so basically a box with a chimney.

Same process.

Heavy guns from Veolia trying to win us over. Very good at answering all the questions but they need to be when these huge amounts of money are involved.

Some councilors will do anything to ensure they are on the winning side and we need to understand this in our fight. They are also likely to support this project as long as it is not in their backyard.

After a number of probing questions, it would seem that architectural enhancements are paid for by Veolia and the County Council. Marchwood must have been very, very expensive. But it is a thought we need to keep in mind linking into the Sherwood Forest Living Legend Landmark loftery bid for £50.million

Also, the hot water that is produced could be used in many ways i.e to heat a swimming pool, or a mini Eden project.

Veolia are hoping for more industry on the site so they could sell this resource to them.

Rufford Colliery site had, apparently, been identified as the preferred site in 2005. Think that Veolia had definitely been misleading communities.

‘Veolia did not know what the MAIN campaign was all about and we have to ask them’

Proposed composting site A614 near the limes cafe. Open windrow system.