

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

Response Number	Date Received	Format	Comment
1.	18/10/2021	Website	'Illegally built loads of rules broken don't even look like the original plan the VOG are right needs to be demolished and never rebuilt.'
2.	28/10/2021	Website	'I do not want it in Barry.'
3.	14/11/2021	Email	<p>'To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to raise some issues that I have with your recent EIA statement. Firstly, it is written mostly on past data, with no new/current investigations being done. The reasoning for this, seems to be that it is because there was a delay in doing this EIA statement.</p> <p>The delay in the EIA statement was due to the planners on behalf of the incinerator stating that the incinerator was not an incinerator, but instead a gasification plant. It has since been decided that this mistake by your planners has caused this delay to a very important report, but I don't think it should be any lighter as a result.</p> <p>As we come out of COP26, all nations have come together to promise to reduce coal. The climate change section from the EIA report, can be summarised as the following: "We think we emit less emissions than coal and oil, so give us permission.. and some subsidies". Subsidies which amount to £1 billion a year for incineration across the UK.</p> <p>Whilst fanciful language is used in the EIA report, the scientific studies to back up the figures are limited. There are discrepancies in the report itself, referring to itself in places as having both a 10MWe and a 9Mwe average electrical annual output. This shows lack of care in the calculations. The transport of the wood is only considered in minute detail and this can have a big impact. There is no discussion of water content: measures nor controls to mitigate emissions. There is no mention of carbon capture. It assumes continuous running, which may not be the case. Less running would actually mean higher emissions per unit of energy, due to it needing to be powered up to the correct temperature using diesel.</p> <p>As Richard Taylor, from Natural Resources Wales has shared more accurate figures of emissions with me:</p> <p>"Different reference sources give different statistics for comparing CO2 emissions from wood and coal. This is why the UK uses DUKES to try and standardise this process. Wood and coal are largely comparable. The Standard measure for CO2 from coal is found on page 230 of the link.</p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/736148/DUKES_2018.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/736148/DUKES_2018.pdf</a></p> <p>There is no standard CO2 release for wood. The CO2 released is affected by the moisture content. You remember that the plant is optimally tuned to run on waste wood at 20% moisture content. In the following publication, at tables 2 and 3 – the CO2 from waste wood at 20% moisture content is comparable to anthracite coal at 120kg CO2 per Kg.</p> <p><a href="https://futuremetrics.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/CO2-from-Wood-and-Coal-Combustion.pdf">https://futuremetrics.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/CO2-from-Wood-and-Coal-Combustion.pdf</a>"</p> <p>Whilst you could argue that the wood would disintegrate over the next 100+ years anyway causing a slow release of emissions, this argument also has several flaws, which perhaps why the EIA report doesn't include it. Firstly, taking from 100 years in the future, takes us way past 2050, which is well after when we need to be at 0. It would be hugely detrimental to bring forward these emission. Secondly, we need wood chippings to grow new forests and lots of them. Thirdly, it's becoming more and more accepted that a lot of the wood used could actually be recycled or actually and controversially, has actually been chopped down purely to be incinerated.</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>The scandal of virgin wood being used on mass for incineration is currently being exposed. The documentary that will be out shortly states: "Twice a month a very large bulk carrier sales from Estonia to Rotterdam. On board [is] approximately 30 thousand tons of crushed forest. Differently said 30 thousand mature trees... Biomass consumption has become one of the biggest political abusers internationally, resulting in large scale ecological destruction and violation of human and animal rights on a global level."</p> <p>I understand that a welsh government official has given an unofficial thumbs up for work to continue with an EIA statement being carried out. I disagree with this as a climate emergency has been declared and therefore urgent tasks, such as assessing risks to the climate should be prioritised. Especially as it should have been done years ago. The public have been betrayed by car manufactures on emissions. It is vital that a proper risk assessment is done in advance. It is clear that people's lives are at stake and the last thing we want I negligent loss of life.</p> <p>I also have major objections to the emissions being released by this proposed incinerator. This data given in the report is only historic and does not take seriously the recent request for this report. More and more data on the ill effects of VOCs and PM2.5s are being learnt. Major new developments have been built up around the stack. The contours of the land and sea winds are not taken into proper account by the models used the measure damage. There are hills within 50m of the stack which are higher than the stack itself and in the direction of the prevailing wind. In the trials, the legal limits (which are far too lax already) were exceeded. Since Covid, emissions have been having an even larger impact on life and death.</p> <p>We do not afford to get this decision wrong. Climate change is already happening. We have already had 1 degree of warming and the results have already been devastating: From repeated floods across Wales, to the fires of California and Australia, natural disasters are no longer surprising events. If you turn a blind eye to this wood incinerator, you will be doing the same to all the others across Wales. And that will have an impact.'</p>
4.	17/12/2021	Website	<p>'As someone living very close to the proposed incinerator, I strongly object on the effects it'll have on the health of local people. I also fail to see how this incinerator can go ahead now that the Vale of Glamorgan council has declared a climate emergency. On a wider level, how does this incinerator also benefit any pledges made after COP26?'</p>
5.	05/01/2022	Email	<p>'I feel that sustainable availability of resources, light, the disposal and recovery of waste, the risks to human health, accidents, disasters and the impact the project has on climate change and vulnerability, I feel the Environmental statement does not conform to part 1 schedule 4 of the EIA regulations.</p> <p>With a number of assessments in the 2010/2019 statements, there is potential that not all likely significant adverse effects have been identified and assessed and therefore suitable mitigation measures be proposed.</p> <p>No GHG assessment undertaken. No rationale for its omission, the potential to be significant.</p> <p>The predicted impacts section does not consider the operational waste, that is 3 times the total weight of ash previously estimated.</p> <p>There is very limited drainage strategy information.</p> <p>No acceptable assessment of potential future flood risks.</p> <p>There are significant gaps in relation to ecology, landscape, air quality, ground conditions, noise, water and climate factors.'</p>
6.	07/01/2022	Website	<p>'The Barry incinerator is built in the wrong place. Too close to homes in Barry and the chimney is the same height as the residents of Dock View Road. It is an accident waiting to happen next to the Dow Corning COMAH site.</p> <p>It was only passed through planning permissions as the councillors were worried about costs if they turned it down and then lost on appeal as what happed last time.</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			So with the future generations act, climate change and a pandemic now it the time to stop this in its tracks. They have produced no electricity after all this time. It's a scandal the receive government grant money.'
7.	07/01/2022	Email	'The impact on climate change, the risks to health, accidents and disasters and the disposal and recovery of waste. The ES does not conform to part 1 schedule 4 of the EIA regs. There is a potential not all likely adverse effects have been identified or assessed. No GHG assessment undertaken. The predicted impacts do not consider that operational waste is 3 times more in total than the weight of ash previously estimated. Not adequate drainage information. No acceptable assessment of future flood risk. Gaps in landscape, air quality, ground conditions, noise, waster climate and ecology factors.'
8.	08/01/2022	Website	'We the town of Barry our children, our grandchildren could suffer ill health If the Aviva/Biomass incinerator gets the go ahead from Welsh Government. Action must be taken to avoid this going ahead.'
9.	08/01/2022	Website	'1... Air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels 2... Damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels. Wales has most polluted air in UK 3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year 4... Incinerator built without full planning and not according the plans submitted 5... Incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests 6... Wrong type of permit issued by NRW 7... Incinerator built without the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment 8... Burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down 9... As incinerator have been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an enforcement notice an expectation the Welsh Government should be to uphold the law 10... Expect the Welsh Government stand up for people for speculators'
10.	08/01/2022	Email	'No for future of our kids and grandkids etc.'
11.	08/01/2022	Email	'I think this biomass should not go ahead as a Barry person all my life with kids and a young family I think it's a bad idea if it was put somewhere else without houses a few miles away then it's a maybe BUT NOT around here, so my signature [REDACTED] for it NOT to go ahead. Thank you.'
12.	09/01/2022	Email	'We the town of Barry our children, our grandchildren could suffer ill health if the Aviva/Biomass incinerator gets the go ahead from the Welsh Government. 1... Air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels 2... Damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels. Wales has most polluted air in UK 3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year 4... Incinerator built without full planning and not according the plans submitted 5... Incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests 6... Wrong type of permit issued by NRW

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>7... Incinerator built without the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment</p> <p>8... Burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down</p> <p>9... As incinerator have been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an enforcement notice an expectation the Welsh Government should be to uphold the law</p> <p>10... Expect the Welsh Government stand up for people for speculators.'</p>
13.	09/01/2022	Email	<p>'We the town of Barry, our children, our grandchildren could suffer ill health if the Aviva/Biomass incinerator gets the go ahead from Welsh Government.</p> <p>Please can you address the following points by return email correspondence.</p> <p>1... Air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels. 2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels Wales has most polluted air in uk. 3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year. 4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted. 5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests. 6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW. 7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment. 8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down. 9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law. 10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation of your response and the correct result.'</p>
14.	09/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object for the following reasons</p> <p>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels 2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels Wales has most polluted air in uk 3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year 4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted 5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests 6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW 7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment 8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down 9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law 10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators Regards.'</p>
15.	09/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to the possible operation of the biomass incinerator because over the operational lifetime of 30 Yeats it will emit millions of tonnes of co2 accelerating dangerous climate change.'</p>
16.	10/01/2022	Email	<p>'Dear sir, I understand that you are the person to who we should address our concerns re. the Barry Biomass.</p> <p>My wife and I both believe that the town of Barry, our children and grandchildren will all be subject to ill health, if this project is approved.</p> <p>It will be adding pollutants to levels that are already high locally. I understand that it will produce high levels of CO2, which is of obvious concern, plus high levels of toxins and particulate matter.</p> <p>I know that a high number of local residents also feel this way.'</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

17.	10/01/2022	Website	<p>‘Despite being educated to postgraduate level and being a qualified solicitor, I cannot comment on the documents provided by the representatives for the incinerator as they are not of a length or in a format that can be understood by anyone who is not a speciality in such matters. However I would like to raise the following comments/objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This EIA and process comes too late in the day to be genuine and lawful and nothing can be done now to make operation of the incinerator lawful.</li> <li>• The incinerator is operating unlawfully under an illegal/wrong permit from the NRW.</li> <li>• Given that the incinerator operators have already breached the terms of the permit and have committed other legal breaches eg of planning law, nothing they present in these documents can be trusted or relied upon.</li> <li>• There are no safe levels of air pollution.</li> <li>• Air pollution in this area is already high.</li> <li>• There is evidence that the incinerator is and will be harmful to health and it is situated in a particularly built up residential area with homes and schools close by.</li> <li>• The incinerator will be devastating for climate change with its annual CO2 emissions.</li> <li>• Allowing the incinerator to operate is contrary to the WG policy on climate change and the environment.</li> </ul> <p>Given the many flaws in the unlawful processes for allowing the incinerator to operate to date WG and NRW have acted unlawfully and dishonestly and must remedy this situation by refusing to allow further operation, or be liable in criminal and civil proceedings for the harm that follows. Personal liability will follow for individual officers and representatives of WG and NRW who have been knowingly complicit in these unlawful processes.’</p>
18.	10/01/2022	Website	<p>‘I regard this as a made up process designed as an escape route for the developer and the Welsh Government. European law required an EIA and Welsh Government seem to have finally decided an EIA is necessary: this is not an EIA.’</p>
19.	10/01/2022	Email	<p>‘I am very concerned and do not agree with the use of the Barry Biomass Incinerator. The location of it being in a densely populated area, the detrimental effect on the air quality and health of the residents of Barry, when already have air pollutants from large industry locally.</p> <p>Hundreds of chemical compounds are released from incinerators. They include a host of chemicals produced from the burning of plastic and similar substances and include polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), brominated flame retardants, polychlorinated biphenols (PCBs), dioxins, polychlorinated dibenzofurans (furans). These substances are lipophilic and accumulate in fatty tissue and remain active in the living organisms and the environment for many years. They have been linked with early puberty<sup>112</sup>, endometriosis<sup>113</sup>, breast cancer<sup>114</sup>, <sup>114</sup>, reduced sperm counts<sup>116</sup> and other disorders of male reproductive tissues<sup>117</sup>, testicular cancer<sup>118</sup> and thyroid disruption<sup>11</sup>. It has been claimed that about 10% of man-made chemicals are carcinogenic (see section 5.1), and many are now recognised as endocrine disrupters. Most of these health effects were not anticipated and are only now being recognised. No safety data exists on many of the compounds released by incinerators. PAHs are an example of organic toxicants. Although emission levels are small these substances are toxic at parts per billion or even at parts per trillion<sup>73</sup> as opposed to parts per million for many other pollutants. They can cause cancer, immune changes, lung and liver damage, r*****d cognitive and motor development, lowered birth weight and lowered growth rate<sup>73</sup>.</p> <p>PAH No evidence is given for the ‘urban background’ assumption of 0.33ng/m<sup>3</sup>. Because South Wales is generally high, with industrial and shipping emissions, and because the UK inventory shows increasing emissions over recent years, Barry’s current BaP level may</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>exceed the 1.0ng/m<sup>3</sup> target level. Entran’s claim of ‘headroom’ for PAH emissions from this incineration plant and its fuel is unproven. The NRW should have challenged this claim in the old Air Quality Report v.5. The WHO REVIHAPP review said PAH/BaP “levels in air should be kept as low as possible” as PAH is carcinogenic and causes harm in terms of heart conditions and child-development. Represented by the letter Oak Field Primary and nursery school and Ysgol Gymraeg Gwaun y Nant which are located 1.6km away from the waste incinerator. The danger for these children is their playground sits at the base of three steep 53m hills. The plume would collect in this bowl making these children very vulnerable to prolonged exposure to pollutants. There is an average of 162 pupils who attend Oak Field Primary and nursery school and 237 attend Ysgol Gymraeg Gwaun y Nant. Both schools are mixed gender and have nursery, infants and Junior classes.</p> <p>In terms of the basic, proposed plant operation, shredded mixed waste wood will be delivered directly into the Fuel Reception Building, during daytime hours only, via electrically operated fast roller shutter doors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you consider fast roller shutter doors an adequate means of containment considering their will be 15 lorries in then out over the space of 12 hours Monday to Saturday 8 hours Sundays?</li> <li>• Will the accelerated motion of the roller shutters, stir up the particulate matter (dust) causing further circulation of the Toxins?</li> <li>• How much of an effect will the movement of vehicles in and out of the Fuel Reception Building have on the circulation of toxic particulate material or dust?</li> <li>• Residents would be exposed at least 60 pulses of carcinogenic wood dust in a working day averages every 12 minutes, Sundays every 8 minutes.</li> <li>• On Sundays will there be the same amount of fuel delivered in a shorter space of time?</li> <li>• Does this require more specific assessment for this operational activity?</li> <li>• These key receptors are not affected by the pollution plume but by the threat of the sites operational activities why has this not been taken into account?</li> <li>• Negative-positive pressure displacing and moving dust particles.</li> </ul> <p>Wind data from Rhoose airport is not shown to be applicable in Barry Dock basin where windroses from Dow Corning’s Dock-sited monitor differ strongly from windroses from Rhoose. If, as the NRW say, they will use the Met Office model (NWP-UM) for local winds, those data should supplied to Biomass UK/Entran to sue, as well as to DIAG’s independent modellers.</p> <p>ADMs model used is a demonstration version, not the full scientific one. The results are questionable in showing no effects of downwash or hills to the north (buildings up to 26m high 30m to the N and 50mm to the NNW of the stack). The apparent downwash to the east implies a building from a superseded plan. They appear to use a constant ‘roughness length’ despite the open land/urban area/open water areas around the site.</p> <p>The absence of downwash at housing areas to the north is probably due to lack of assumed winds from SSW to SSE, quite different form in the windrose from the nearby Dow Corning site.</p> <p>The buildings are rearranged in the new modelling. The absolute location of the stack is changed, from (312660,167664) to (312619.3,167637.2). Checking with the previous AERMOD results Is not readily possible, because of this. The AERMOD input files show that they used an old version (v14134).</p>
--	--	---

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>POPs the background level given for dioxins/furans is fictitious- 28.8fg/m<sup>3</sup> TEQequiv. In Table 10- Barry is unlike Manchester and London cited in BAQv.5, being more influenced by South Wales industry and shipping, with Port Talbot steelworks being a leading UK dioxing source. Its other power plants are also significant sources. Dioxin emissions are much higher during start-up, as well as during failure of the activated carbon dosing of Table C1. The excuse of “no short-term air quality standard for dioxins and furans, therefore assessment of this pollutant has not been possible” must be rejected. The pathway to humans is via deposition/accumulation in soil and uptake in crops.</p> <p>Nanoparticles. There is no air quality standard covering nanoparticles. As these are though the most health-harmful emissions, the company should supply data on them and the predicted levels at receptors.</p> <p>NRW’s excuse for not asking for calculations of higher stacks (don’t yet know if impacts are significant; costs of higher stacks) is unacceptable. The NRW’s criterion of ‘significant’ is relative to levels of air pollutants known to cause harm to more vulnerable groups; for pollutants that have no ‘safe’ thresholds, it does not meet the ‘no health harm’ criterion. The 43m is identical to that given for Biomass UK No.1 in Hull’s flat terrain. It is much less than the 60m stack for a little smaller Outotec incinerator in Surrey.</p> <p>The BiomassUK choice of the 43-metre stack height took no account of Barry’s hilly topography. Best practice would use plume modelling for a range of heights to determine the optimum height, likely to be higher than 43m compared with 60-70m hillsides. The NRW stated publicly that the 43m choice was at the company’s “own risk”.</p> <p>Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH)-UK AQO state an objective level of 0.25ng/m<sup>3</sup> Due to existing local industry the levels of these hazardous to health pollutants are worryingly high. Combining your air impact modelling 0.12ng/m<sup>3</sup> and the 0.33ng/m<sup>3</sup> will place the annual mean of this pollutant at 80% over recommended levels. Ultrafine particles from high temperature incineration processes are known to pass with exhaust-gases through the bag filters used here. Professor Howard's evidence accepted by the National Assembly's Petitions committee was that ultrafines may be the most hazardous particulates to health, yet the PM10 limit and PM2.5 particulate guidelines don't set limits on ultrafines. NRW refused to take them into account in the licensing, so the planning authority has to take into account their potential impacts on health.</p>
20.	11/01/2022	Email	<p>‘Hello I'm writing to you in objection to the biomass site.  NOTED CONCERNS OVER BASELINE POLLUTION LEVELS PH  Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH)-UK AQO state an objective level of 0.25ng/m<sup>3</sup>  Due to existing local industry the levels of these hazardous to health pollutants are worryingly high. Combining your air impact modelling 0.12ng/m<sup>3</sup> and the 0.33ng/m<sup>3</sup> will place the annual mean of this pollutant at 80% over recommended levels.  BaP measurements were originally to be a surrogate (‘marker’) for PAH, which is calculated as a weighted average over 39 polycyclic aromatics. The PAH limit was set at 1ng/m<sup>3</sup>. BaP was about 0.15-0.30 of the total PAH in a 2003 survey, so they set 0.25ng/m<sup>3</sup> as target (2000 review; AQEG). Port Talbot had BaP alone 0.59 (2001) 0.4 (2002) 0.34 (2003). Govt then changed to 1ng/m<sup>3</sup> BaP in 2007 (for the 2011 strategy) while claiming no weakening of standards.  Thus the citation of 0.25ng/m<sup>3</sup> by the Entran consultant is mistaken. That he did not remark on the exceedance shows lack of quality/expertise  The 1ng/m<sup>3</sup> is not protective of health, it was the target for Dec.2012 only. 0.25 is now a better target for BaP, giving some margin for uncertainty,</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· # Emissions generally are increasing; the relatively high values measured in S Wales show there is a real problem (UK average map in Air Pollution in the UK 2015, Figure 5-43.</li> <li>· # BaP is an uncertain surrogate for PAH; for health purposes we need to know the actual PAH level</li> <li>· # The current values of BaP in Barry should be measured, also the total 39 PAHs</li> <li>· # the addition of this plant to BaP is high; requires close scrutiny.</li> <li>· # the UK AQS** 2011 warning against PAH from biomass power needs to be taken seriously</li> </ul> <p>** <i>The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland 2011</i></p> <p>s. 101. Generating heat and power from biomass combustion is another area that allows carbon savings to be made, although careful analysis of the energy inputs required to produce, process and transport the fuel is needed in order to accurately quantify such savings. There is also a need to balance any carbon savings against air quality effects such as the potentially increased emission of particulates or PAH.</p> <p>PAH No evidence is given for the ‘urban background’ assumption of 0.33ng/m<sup>3</sup>. Because South Wales is generally high, with industrial and shipping emissions, and because the UK inventory shows increasing emissions over recent years, Barry’s current BaP level may exceed the 1.0ng/m<sup>3</sup> target level. Entran’s claim of ‘headroom’ for PAH emissions from this incineration plant and its fuel is unproven. The NRW should have challenged this claim in the old Air Quality Report v.5. The WHO REVIHAPP review said PAH/BaP “levels in air should be kept as low as possible” as PAH is carcinogenic and causes harm in terms of heart conditions and child-development.</p> <p>ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT.</p> <p>UN-RECOGNISED RECEPTORS EFFECTED BY PLUME.</p> <p>A – Incinerator top of stack</p> <p>B - Dock View Road (Bottom of George Street) 111 houses 6 flats</p> <p>C - George Street (Mid-Point) 121 houses and 2 flats</p> <p>D - Holton Road Primary School 414 pupils, mixed gender, nursery, infants and juniors</p> <p>E - St Helens School - Corner of Court Road / Wyndham Street</p> <p>E - St Helens School - Corner of Court Road / Maes-Y-Cwm Street 176 pupils, mixed gender, nursery and infants because the two schools are so close I've used one point.</p> <p>F - Court Road Surgery 6 x doctors, 4 x practice nurses, 1x midwife, 1x health visitor, 1 x counsellor and 9 receptionists</p> <p>G - Flying Start / Family Centre - Gladstone Road 2 x Gil time play groups children age 2-3 years plus staff - H - Allotments - Gladstone Road - I - Police Station</p> <p>J - Jenner Park Stadium (Also used by schools for sports days and Disabled cycling club)</p> <p>K - Gwaen - Y - Nant School Welsh medium, 237 pupils, nursery, infants and primary.</p> <p>Oakfield School - 162 pupils, nursery, infants and primary</p> <p>L - The Four Winds Healing Centre, Alternative medical treatments Merthyr Dyfan Road</p> <p>N - Vale Family Practice 3 x doctors, 2 x Practice nurses, 10 x admin and reception</p> <p>M - Flying Start - Skomer Road Staff consist of midwives, health visitors, play workers and early learning support workers</p> <p>O - Holm View Leisure Centre - Skomer Road</p>
--	--	--



## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>P - Ysgol Gyfun Bro Morgannwg Welsh medium, ages 3-19, 1016 pupils  Q - Barry Community Hospital Offers a secondary care service, 1x day unit, 2 x wards with 60 bed spaces      R - Barry Boys Comprehensive School 953 pupils  S - Highlight Park Medical Centre 4 doctors, 2 practice nurses, 11 admin</p> <p>Most Vulnerable Receptors effected by plume.  Represented by the letter <u>K</u> Oak Field Primary and nursery school and Ysgol Gymraeg Gwaun y Nant which are located 1.6 km away from the waste incinerator. The danger for these children is their playground sits at the base of three steep 53m hills. The plume would collect in this bowl making these children very vulnerable to prolonged exposure to pollutants. There is an average of 162 pupils who attend Oak Field Primary and nursery school and 237 attend Ysgol Gymraeg Gwaun y Nant. Both schools are mixed gender and have nursey, infants and Junior classes.  These images show not only the vulnerability of the schools but the whole of the Gibbons Down area which is a densely populated area with resident's homes, care homes outdoor play areas, parks, schools, shops and scout groups. Due to the topography of this area makes the receptors highly vulnerable to pollutant deposits particularly metals.</p> <p>A. Image 1 – Incinerator top of stack  B. Image 2 - Vale open Learning Centre  C. Image 3 - Gladstone School  D. Image 5 - Ysgol Cymraeg Sant Curig  E. Image 4 - Buttrills Road/ Cherry Orchard  F. Image 8 - Alexander Gardens  G. Image 7 - Barry Boys Comp. School?  H. Image 6 - Highlight Park Medical Centre</p> <p>“3.19 Oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emitted to atmosphere as a result of combustion will consist largely of nitric oxide (NO), a relatively innocuous substance. Once released into the atmosphere, NO is oxidised to NO2. The proportion of NO converted to NO2 depends on a number of factors including wind speed, distance from the source, solar irradiation and the availability of oxidants, such as ozone (O3).</p> <p>3.20 A conversion ratio of 70% NOx: NO2 has been assumed for comparison of predicted concentrations with the long-term objectives for NO2. A conversion ratio of 35% has been utilised for the assessment of short-term impacts, as recommended by Environment Agency guidance10.”</p> <p>3.31 The predicted nitrogen deposition rates assume a 100% NOx: NO2 conversion. This represents a worst-case for the assessment since nitric oxide (NO) has a lower deposition velocity than NO2 and consequently results in lower deposition rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The above graph is a cross section of the topography of Barry, its typical cross section of the town the to of the stack in someplace measures 50m below the surrounding hills.</li> <li>· 3:20 states a conversion ratio of 70% NOx: NO2 has been assumed for comparison of predicted concentrations with the long-term objectives for NO2. The residents and local business will most certainly be effected by the long-term effects of exposure.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· NO2 has a higher deposition velocity in section 1 shows an ordinance graph highlighting key receptors and pollution traps F – M.</li> <li>· With this in mind would you agree an AQIA &amp; HIA would be required due to exposure levels to these receptors? Un-recognised receptors effected by operational activities. DOCUMENT REFERENCE: P1714-REP02-Rev A-SJF Page 4 Environmental Noise Impact Assessment “In terms of the basic, proposed plant operation, shredded mixed waste wood will be delivered directly into the Fuel Reception Building, during daytime hours only, via electrically operated fast roller shutter doors.”</li> <li>· Do you consider fast roller shutter doors an adequate means of containment considering their will be 15 lorries in then out over the space of 12 hours Monday to Saturday 8 hours Sundays?</li> <li>· Will the accelerated motion of the roller shutters, stir up the particulate matter (dust) causing further circulation of the Toxins?</li> <li>· How much of an effect will the movement of vehicles in and out of the Fuel Reception Building have on the circulation of toxic particulate material or dust?</li> <li>· Residents would be exposed at least 60 pulses of carcinogenic wood dust in a working day averaged every 12 minutes, Sundays every 8 minutes.</li> <li>· On Sundays will there be the same amount of fuel delivered in a shorter space of time?</li> <li>· Does this require more specific assessment for this operational activity?</li> <li>· These key receptors are not affected by the pollution plume but by the threat of the sites operational activities why has this not been taken in to account?</li> <li>· Negative – positive pressure displacing and moving dust particles</li> </ul> <p>Schedule 5 response: page 3 section Planning permission granted by Vale of Glamorgan Council (ref. 2015/00031/OUT) “The deliveries to site will be in accordance with the planning permission. Therefore, deliveries will take place Monday to Saturday: 07:00 - 19:00 and Sunday/Bank/Public Holidays: 08:00 - 16:00.”</p> <p>Wind Data The wind data from Rhoose airport is not shown to be applicable in Barry Dock basin, where windroses from Dow Corning’s Dock-sited monitor differ strongly from windroses from Rhoose. If, as the NRW say, they will use the Met Office model (NWP-UM) for local winds, those data should supplied to Biomass UK/Entran to use, as well as to DIAG’s independent modellers. ADMS model used is a demonstration version, not the full scientific one. The results are questionable in showing no effects of downwash or hills to the north (buildings up to 26m high 30m to the N and 50m to the NNW of the stack). The apparent downwash to the east implies a building from a superseded plan. They appear to use a constant ‘roughness length’ despite the open land/urban area/open water areas around the site. The absence of downwash at housing areas to the north is probably due to lack of assumed winds from SSW to SSE, quite different from in the windrose from the nearby Dow Corning site. The buildings are rearranged in the new modelling. The absolute location of the stack is changed, from (312660,167664) to (312619.3,167637.2). Checking with the previous AERMOD results is not readily possible, because of this. The AERMOD input files show that they used an old version (v14134).</p>
--	--	---

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>No health harm To meet the ‘no health harm’ requirement under waste-planning, mapping of the highest modelled NO2 1-hour levels is needed. Mapping the 18<sup>th</sup> highest level in each grid-square as Entran do (ignoring the 17 higher ones), is relevant just for meeting the AQS limits, which are now accepted to encompass health-harm to vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Entran modelling is unacceptable for assessing impacts Their assuming winds that differ strongly from those experienced at Barry, ignoring coastal effects and failing to give worst-case 1-hour NO2 mapping makes their results quite unreliable. The failure to assess uncertainties, even in their own terms, goes to confirm the unprofessionalism. Their results cannot be used with an uncertainty factor even as high as 10. The NRW should not be making ‘proper’ calculations on the applicant’s behalf; instead just reject them on the grounds given re. Cwmfelinfach, that they do not provide confidence that the incinerator’s emissions will cause no harm to health</p> <p>Stack height calculation It is clear to see from the above graphs that the stack height is well undersized. The topography of the land will hold at least all of the heavy metals from the omissions from the stack. The stack height was determined before the appropriate dispersion modelling was completed and the data used was from Cardiff airport which sits, in and is surrounded by flat land. This is not acceptable and needs to be correctly assessed before any other stage of the process. NRW’s excuse for not asking for calculations of higher stacks (don’t yet know if impacts are significant; costs of higher stacks) is unacceptable. The NRW’s criterion of ‘significant’ is relative to levels of air pollutants known to cause harm to more vulnerable groups; for pollutants that have no ‘safe’ thresholds, it does not meet the ‘no harm to health’ criterion. The 43m is identical to that given for Biomass UK No.1 in Hull’s flat terrain. It is much less than the 60m stack for a little smaller Outotec incinerator in Surrey. The BiomassUK choice of the 43-metre stack height took no account of Barry’s hilly topography. Best practice would use plume modelling for a range of heights to determine the optimum height, likely to be higher than 43m compared with 60-70m hillsides. The NRW stated publicly that the 43m choice was at the company’s “own risk”.</p> <p>Dioxins/furans Dioxins/furans have the potential to be transported long distances and deposited far away from their place of release. The NRW needs to ask for sufficient information to fulfil their POPs obligations, which concern not just local limits but require the applicant to show they have</p> <p>Nanoparticles. There is no air quality standard covering nanoparticles. As these are thought the most health-harmful emissions, the company should supply data on them and the predicted levels at receptors.</p> <p>Persistent Organic Pollutants POPs The background level given for dioxins/furans is fictitious – 28.8fg/m3 TEQequiv. In Table 10 – Barry is unlike Manchester and London cited in BAQv.5, being more influenced by South Wales industry and shipping, with Port Talbot steelworks being a leading UK dioxin source. Its other power plants and Aberthaw power station are also significant sources. Dioxin emissions are much higher during start-up, as well as during failure of the activated carbon dosing of Table C1. The excuse of “no short-term air quality</p>
--	--	---

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>standard for dioxins and furans, therefore assessment of this pollutant has not been possible” must be rejected. The pathway to humans is via deposition/accumulation in soil and uptake in crops.</p> <p>To assess this, they need to give data on the worst case scenarios, assuming number of hours operation p.a. without the activated carbon dosing, and twice per day start-ups (for peaking supply). Deposition would be significant when the emissions plume grounds on Barry’s hillsides and in mist that brings down droplets with adhering dioxins.</p> <p>The NRW enforces the restrictions and bans of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Wales, under the POPs Directive and the Stockholm Convention on POPs - chemicals which: # are toxic, # persist in the environment #and can build up in in food and human tissues. Dioxins and furans are the POPs at issue here.’</p>
21.	11/01/2022	Website	<p>‘Myself and my wife oppose this development, as we consider it a threat to the health of Barry residents, we have followed this as best as we can with the information being offered, it has been a very unprofessional development, as a businessman if I acted as this company has I would have been stopped long ago.’</p>
22.	11/01/2022	Website	<p>‘I live quite close to the Biomass Plant, I have objected from the beginning &amp; will continue to do so. There is much research to show such a plant should not be in a residential area &amp; zero thought given to the residents who have to live nearby. To my mind this has been a corrupt process from the beginning, with big business calling the shots. Have a heart &amp; spare our children’s lungs PLEASE!!!’</p>
23.	13/01/2022	Email	<p>‘Barry Town Council met on 10 January 2022 (remotely via Zoom) to consider the consultation being undertaken on the Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement produced by Biomass UK (no. 2) for the biomass fired renewable energy generation facility located at Woodham Road, Barry Docks, Barry, Vale of Glamorgan, South Wales.</p> <p>Members of the public were present and raised concerns regarding the absence of an Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Following a detailed discussion Council on behalf of the people of Barry are urging Welsh Ministers to reject and condemn the commissioning of the Biomass incinerator on Barry Docks without a full EIA process being followed and to explain the logical basis for following a voluntary retrospective EIA process that is outside the EIA legislation, and therefore possibly outside the law.</p> <p>This Council asks Welsh Ministers to make public the full Appendix 4.1 which was removed from the Barry Biomass Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement Documentation and contains the full exchange of correspondence between Welsh Government and the owners of the incinerator. This Council is concerned of a possible perception that decisions regarding this matter are not being dealt with in an open and transparent manner.</p> <p>This Council recommends Welsh Government reject the Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement due to the following major concerns:</p> <p>a) That the document is produced outside of the current legislative framework and has questionable, if any, legitimacy;</p> <p>b) That the possible impact of climate change and tidal surge that might flood the incinerator site has not been considered. The owners agreed in 2018 that flooding and tidal surge pose considerable threat to the plant and the repercussions are considerable in terms of fire risk and industrial spillage;</p> <p>That the stack height calculation is inaccurate as advised by the Welsh Government experts (WSP). The information relating to emissions is therefore inaccurate and cannot be relied on.’</p>
24.	14/01/2022	Website	<p>‘I object to the incinerator being given approval. It needs to be stopped.’</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

25.	14/01/2022	Website	'Living just under 500 meters away from this eye sore, I still feel very uneasy that this will not only be unsafe on my health but the health of my 12 year old, I wont list all the health and safety risks it also brings being in close proximity to residential property.'
26.	14/01/2022	Email	'I agree an EIA is vital to preserve the air quality in Barry for the future and wellbeing of our children this EIA should have been done before this was built.'
27.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
28.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the biomass project on basis of widespread representations raised in respect of incorrect procedures followed by company and subsequent breaches.'
29.	14/01/2022	Website	'Object.'
30.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
31.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object. I object. I object.'
32.	14/01/2022	Website	'I wish to raise my objection to the plant and its location to the many houses and schools. The noise and mess caused by the fuel is a blight on the area.'
33.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to this plant being given a licence. It should have never been built as it is endangering the health of local residents.'
34.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
35.	14/01/2022	Website	'As a life long resident of Barry with concerns about pollution as well as health and safety for the local population I strongly OBJECT to the current situation with the incinerator. An Environmental Impact (EIA) Assessment is absolutely ESSENTIAL. Failure to implement this rather late EIA is a grave and serious failure of Council and govt. So worrying and disappointing.'
36.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
37.	14/01/2022	Website	'Object.'
38.	14/01/2022	Website	'We don't want this pumping fumes out all over our town !'
39.	14/01/2022	Email	'As a former member of the Barry Regeneration Board, an a lifelong inhabitant of our town, I absolutely object to this biomass plant operating in such close proximity to homes, to schools, to places where people gather together such as shopping centres, retail areas, to recreational spaces such as the Waterfront, to the sailing centre, to workspaces such as the Dock Office, to the microbusinesses operating very close in units nearby. I object to the whole manner in which this process has not followed due process, to the disregard for environmental, social, governance, for disregard of social responsibility towards the people of Barry, to the young people of Barry, to Future Generations, and to the Barry Regeneration Strategy to which this plant was never part of. In my view, in building the plant without making a full risk assessment of all risks and impacts prior to commencement of a spade in the ground should be fully investigated by an independent body. The ongoing appeals and saga between the company, all the stakeholders, all business and political leadership, needs a full public investigation and full disclosure. People need to be held to account. I object, and the company should withdraw, dismantle the plant, make good the land, create an environmental use and donate it and gift it to community use, and fully apologise to the people of Barry.'
40.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to this monstrosity.'
41.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to this becoming active I have concerns regard rhe effect of health on the whole town as its within a short distance of housing, schools and recreational areas for children.'
42.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object. This incinerator has legally always required a Full EIA not a voluntary one.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

43.	14/01/2022	Website	'This incinerator is built too close to factory workers on the direct are. The noise of the conveyor during the day is loud, when people on dock view road are trying to sleep it will unbearable.'
44.	14/01/2022	Website	'This is our objection to the incinerator built at Barry Waterfront. How a wood fuelled incinerator was built near residential housing is just beyond belief. Shame on NRW, Welsh Government and planning officers.'
45.	14/01/2022	Website	'A ridiculous proposal to burn fuel in a residential area and essentially pump approximately 3000 tonnes of CO2 into the atmosphere further poisoning the environment and the people of Barry. I object most strongly to this application.'
46.	14/01/2022	Website	'The company has acted in an underhand way throughout this and should never have been built in a built up area with new housing and amenities all around it.'
47.	14/01/2022	Website	'The application must require an EIA.'
48.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
49.	14/01/2022	Website	'Big boo to the incinerator.'
50.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator. It is in a very built up residential area. My major concern is the bowl shape of Barry and how emissions become trapped.'
51.	14/01/2022	Website	'I absolutely 100% object to this incinerator/gasification plant and it should never have been built in the middle of a housing estate in the first place. I live over by morrisons and the noise and smell when it was running/tested was unbearable, (it's a dirty smelly incinerator btw and should be ripped down ASAP).'
52.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the statements- a full EIA is required. The wood being burnt will contain hazardous materials, the plume direction has not been correctly calculated and the storage is inadequate.'
53.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
54.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object!'
55.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
56.	14/01/2022	Website	'Stop this diabolical travesty. It's not beneficial to the local people, o'r environment. Health over money!!! If you back this, you are lacking .orsl empathy abd basic understanding of science etc. I can only presume that you have been lied to or brought in some financial way. Please think of us, you children, your grandchildren, the future generations and the environment. This is toxic on every level.'
57.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator.'
58.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
59.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
60.	14/01/2022	Website	'I oppose the Barry biomass development because it will have numerous detrimental effects.'
61.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the building and operation of the Barry Biomass incinerator. I also object to the flawed planning process associated with the incinerator and the many errors that have occurred over the last 7 years, particularly that the Welsh Government and Vale of Glamorgan council have taken 7 years to come to the conclusion that the incinerator is Schedule 1 development and therefore has always required a full EIA, not done retrospectively, prior to any planning permission being granted. The existing planning permission must be withdrawn and the incinerator dismantled with all possible speed. It is an unlawful construction and should be treated as such!'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

62.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object!'
63.	14/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object this project and always have done, it should never have been built where it is.'
64.	14/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object.'
65.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
66.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
67.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to this incinerator.'
68.	14/01/2022	Website	'Objected.'
69.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the Biomass.'
70.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to biomass due to environmental reasons and the impact it will have on local residents health.'
71.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the Barry Biomass, it was constructed without the required environmental impact statement, has not fully complied with planning throughout its construction. The location of the biomass is hugely inappropriate given its proximity to existing housing in addition to the proposed new house builds just across the road. The stack is not of an adequate height to prevent emissions being blown into the homes on dick view road. This project will further impact air quality at a time welsh fovernment have declared an environmental emergency in wales for air quality.'
72.	14/01/2022	Website	'Keep Wales green.'
73.	14/01/2022	Email	'I strongly object to this facility being permitted to operate.'
74.	14/01/2022	Website	'I wish to object & I consider an EIA to be absolutely essential.'
75.	14/01/2022	Website	'I want to object to this.'
76.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object to the Barry Biomass incinerator.'
77.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
78.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
79.	14/01/2022	Email	<p>'I live in Barry and am asthmatic.</p> <p>I am aware that South Wales already has a high level of air pollution. The end of coal fired generation at the Aberthaw site was a small light at the end of a very dark tunnel. We are now being asked to accept an incinerator being built right in the middle of the town. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.</p> <p>I understand that there many issues with planning permission. Common sense must now be applied. This incinerator must not be used to burn wood or any other product. This is not a green energy site.'</p>
80.	14/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
81.	14/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to the Barry Biomass Plant Installation and any form of potential operation of said Plant.</p> <p>Barry Biomass Plant will endanger the lives of every Inhabitant of Barry, Sully, Dinas Powys, Llandough and the Penarth Basin, approximately 330,000 people impacted by the operation of this Plant due to onshore prevailing wind conditions and varying direction.</p> <p>Stoichiometric Combustion is the process of achieving complete combustion of a given combustible fuel. The <a href="#">stoichiometric ratio</a> is the <a href="#">exact</a> ratio between air and <a href="#">flammable</a> gas or vapor at which <a href="#">complete combustion</a> takes place with no remaining combustibles.</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>The Barry Biomass Plant would operate a system of Pyrolytic Degradation, a process of combusting biomass material(wood pellets) by an incineration process at 850 degrees centigrade in a reduced oxygen environment. This process does not respect the principle of stoichiometric combustion. The resulting Syngas fuel given off is burned to produce energy. The violently dangerous waste gases produced from this method of incomplete combustion contain some of the most dangerous chemicals known to science. Dioxins, Particulates of PM2.5 and smaller, oxides and acids of sulphur, hydrogen, nitrogen and Fluorine will be generated amongst other toxic and corrosive elements. The cosmetic protests of the Biomass Company that the process was a renewable energy process and not an incineration were disproved by European Union regulations which expressly defined the Biomass Process as an incineration.</p> <p>The Barry dockside location of the Barry Biomass Plant will release these violently dangerous waste gases into the prevailing, virtually permanent onshore winds at a distance of barely 400 metres from the centre of the densely populated Barry Township. The emissions stack at 43 metres is virtually at street level in Barry Township terms due to the elevated position the township construction in relation to the dockside location of the Barry Biomass Plant. The widely publicised electro static filtration system regularly fails due to filter coking problems caused by the high temperatures of the process.</p> <p>The scale of the toxic, corrosive pollution can be measured from consideration of the following facts. The Barry Biomass annual production capacity is 84000 tonnes of (dry) wood pulp in the form of pellets. This would generate some 134000 tonnes of carbon dioxide/waste chemical pollution plume. This plume would be generated 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It would enter the prevailing winds and spread at low level through the streets of Barry and surrounding communities dependent on wide direction. The known impacts of constant inhalation of such chemicals are Cancers of all types from brain, soft organ, bone and skin through to lung and respiratory channels. There is no doubt of this consequence. Death from these conditions is certain. A further concern is that miscarriage and early infant death rates have been statistically correlated at elevated levels in the vicinity of these plants. Dioxins collate in the umbilical cord of pregnant women and the other pollutant derail the cell dividing process of foetal development 94000 litres per day of toxic, corrosive effluent would stream from this process. The strength of this toxicity and corrosion mixture would rot the concrete pipes in which it would be conveyed. This is a measure to which human beings would be at risk through inhalation of these toxins.</p> <p>The owners of the Barry Biomass Plant have a consistent, appalling record of active non compliance with planning regulations. They have failed to construct a subterranean safety water facility, essential to a process with a known risk of explosion and breakdown. They have further developed and built plant and equipment that were NOT on the approved(now withdrawn) planning submission. They have developed and built on land that was NOT included in the formerly approved(now withdrawn) planning application. They have, I believe, no planning permission nor operating licence for this process at present. They have exhibited a form of delinquent non compliance with repeated demands form the Vale of Glamorgan for immediate resolution of the stated planning violations. The Vale of Glamorgan Council have now issued closure notification to the company for such persistent failures of compliance.</p> <p>The Welsh Government have very recently written to the <a href="#">Vale of Glamorgan Council</a> informing them that the Incinerator does in fact come under Schedule 1 of the planning EIA regulations and does legally require an EIA. I believe the consequences for this “consultation” process are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The higher level EIA is a requirement of the Schedule 1 Planning regulation Process. This EIA is of a more comprehensive and higher level technical content than the “voluntary” version from the company with the delinquency record of non compliance with the lower level planning procedure.</li> </ol>
--	--	---



## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>2. An EIA must be completed before an Environmental Statement can be prepared. The Environmental Statement is a summation that rests on the findings of the EIA. The findings of this higher level EIA <u>MUST</u> be incorporated into the higher level planning application. Since no higher level Planning Application exists, none of the above requirements have been complied with. The Voluntary Submission from the (delinquent) owners of the Biomass is , therefore, obsolete and irrelevant.</p> <p>3. The new planning application, I believe, must now start from scratch and must await the completion of a suitably prepared E.I.A, not a comprised “voluntary” effort based on an incorrect, irrelevant, withdrawn previous planning permission</p> <p>4. In view of the timescale involved in this process, in the interests of Health and Safety and environmental concerns, the existing non compliant, unlicensed Biomass Plant should be demolished.’</p>
82.	14/01/2022	Website	‘I object.’
83.	14/01/2022	Email	<p>‘1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels</p> <p>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels Wales has most polluted air in uk</p> <p>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year</p> <p>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted</p> <p>5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests</p> <p>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW</p> <p>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment</p> <p>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down</p> <p>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law</p> <p>10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.’</p>
84.	14/01/2022	Website	‘I object.’
85.	14/01/2022	Website	‘I object to the Biomass plant.’
86.	14/01/2022	Website	‘I object.’
87.	14/01/2022	Website	‘I absolutely object to the biomass plant going ahead.’
88.	15/01/2022	Website	‘I would like to object the biomass facility in Barry as it is not a true renewable energy.’
89.	15/01/2022	Website	‘I object.’
90.	15/01/2022	Website	‘I object to this development and disagree with the conclusions of the EIA, for reasons I wont spend time detailing here.’
91.	15/01/2022	Website	‘This monstrosity should never ever been built so close to civilisation polluting the air we breathe its bad enough that people use wood burner’s in their home which should also be band.’
92.	15/01/2022	Website	<p>‘I object to the incinerator being allowed to operate where it is, in the heart of the town and so close to schools. As a community we have objected from the start but our comments have been ignored.</p> <p>We have asked over and over for an environmental impact assessment so we know through facts how this will impact our community. The operators of the incinerator have never followed the rules/laws and feel they are above them and can just bulldoze local council,</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			welsh government and do what they want regardless of the environmental impact on our town and the health impact on our children and vulnerable adults! To think they are being allowed a voluntary retrospective EIS is a joke, they will do the bare minimum to ensure that piece of paper is signed and they can operate without a care of their impact on our community. As a community we deserve our voices to be heard! I object to the voluntary environmental statement.'
93.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the Barry biomass incinerator.'
94.	15/01/2022	Website	'1... air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels 2... damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels 3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year 4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted 5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests 6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW 7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment 8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down 9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law 10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.'
95.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object to any licence being granted and this site should be closed down permanently.'
96.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this incinerator.'
97.	15/01/2022	Website	'I don't want the incinerator.'
98.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
99.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object to the incinerator.'
100.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the environmental statement.'
101.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object to having this biomass operating in our town and effecting peoples lives and environment all they have down is lie from day one to get permission to operate.'
102.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
103.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT.'
104.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
105.	15/01/2022	Website	'An environmental disaster waiting to happen, smoke, mirrors and back handers. Shame on VOG Council and Welsh government. Take it down.'
106.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
107.	15/01/2022	Website	'Object! Why build next to a residential area when there are large brown field sites available away from mass population.'
108.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT.'
109.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object.'
110.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT!!'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

111.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
112.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object to the incinerator. It should never be any where near residential areas and believe that this would severely impact the health of the residents of Barry if it is allowed to remain.'
113.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the location of this incinerator, it should be well away from any houses.'
114.	15/01/2022	Email	'I object.'
115.	15/01/2022	Website	'There is no way this incinerator should have been allowed to be built in the place it has been. Thousands of people living and working only yards from it and the prospect of pollution being spread for miles. I object most definitely to this incinerator being given a licence to pollute the air around me and my family and friends and all the people of the area.'
116.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this.'
117.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this.'
118.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
119.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
120.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
121.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
122.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
123.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
124.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this as it is to close to homes and schools should not have been allowed to been built so close to a built up area.'
125.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this incinerator.'
126.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
127.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this incinerator being given a licence.'
128.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this application consultation.'
129.	15/01/2022	Website	'As a resident of Barry Waterfront I object to this.'
130.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the plant being there. It should never have been built without a environmental impact assessment being completed.'
131.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object most strongly to this incinerator being placed in the midst of this heavily populated town of Barry. The people of Barry worry about the future health of the generations to come Destroy this incinerator now.'
132.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
133.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT most strongly to the building and commissioning of the Barry biomass, It should never have been approved and will cause a huge environmental impact on our town should it be given the go ahead. Stop the project and the process.'
134.	15/01/2022	Website	'I feel that the biomass incinerator is potentially a major health risk to residents living close by possibly the rest of the town of Barry. I cannot understand why it was constructed so close to a populated area it should be shut down and move to a safer location.'
135.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object to the incinerator being right in the Valley of Wales largest town polluting the air and reducing air quality. Since the beginning it should have had a proper EIA. TO determine it's impact on the air we breathe.'
136.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
137.	15/01/2022	Website	'I am objecting to the biomass incinerator in Barry as I have read its impact and I live opposite it.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

138.	15/01/2022	Email	<p>'I am writing to object to this illegal Environmental Statement on the grounds that it in no way covers what a Legal Environmental Impact assessment would. There are many things missing such as the health risks to the local population of the incinerator, and of Birth 31 on the docks, which should be included as Birth 31 has always being linked in documentation to the incinerator. There is a huge risk on health of the local population due too the wood dust from processing and risk to the dock water, yet this has not been included.</p> <p>Flooding is not accounted for sufficiently, neither is Best Available Technology in the non legal Environmental statement. The Environmental statement is also not transparent or easy to read. The closest ward to the incinerator, Castleand ward, is an area of deprivation, and as such, the local population is excluded from this consultation for many reasons, as are the future generations. I also object to...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels which have not been accounted for sufficiently.</li> <li>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter. The World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels. Wales has the most polluted air in uk.</li> <li>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change. The incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per yea.</li> <li>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted, in which case the companies documentation does not represent the true health impact, for example, the changes to the emissions plume.</li> <li>5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests.</li> <li>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW.</li> <li>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment.</li> <li>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down.</li> <li>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully, hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice, an expectation that the Welsh Government should uphold the law and a stop notice should be given.</li> <li>10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators who will be earning money whilst the local populations health will decline even further with the rates of asthma being above average already.' </li></ol>
139.	15/01/2022	Website	'I personally think this should have not been built where it is and we definitely should be using it to depose items that are not from the vale of Glamorgan but I do know it is all about money and not about the health and future of our residents please if it is not going to help our planet survive we should not be supporting it or creating things that are destroying our planet.'
140.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
141.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
142.	15/01/2022	Email	'I object to this incinerator plant and it is bad for the environment and harmful to the public. I confirm my objection to this plant and confirm wishes for its closure.'
143.	15/01/2022	Website	'I fundamentally object.'
144.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT.'
145.	15/01/2022	Website	' I object

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>We the town of Barry our children, our grandchildren could suffer ill health if the Aviva/Biomass incinerator gets the go ahead from Welsh Government.</p> <p>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels which have not been accounted for sufficiently.</p> <p>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter. The World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels. Wales has the most polluted air in uk.</p> <p>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change. The incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per yea.</p> <p>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted, in which case the companies documentation does not represent the true health impact, for example, the changes to the emissions plume.</p> <p>5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests.</p> <p>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW.</p> <p>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down.</p> <p>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully, hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice, an expectation that the Welsh Government should uphold the law and a stop notice should be given.</p> <p>10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators who will be earning money whilst the local populations health will decline even further with the rates of asthma being above average already.'</p>
146.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object.'
147.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
148.	15/01/2022	Website	'Please note this as my objection to the retrospective permission sought. My objection is based on the severe environmental and health impacts of this operation.'
149.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
150.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
151.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
152.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
153.	15/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to the opening and use of the incinerator in Barry, I believe it will be detrimental to the health of the people of Barry and to our planet because we are in a climate emergency.</p> <p>We the town of Barry our children, our grandchildren could suffer ill health if the Aviva/Biomass incinerator gets the go ahead from Welsh Government</p> <p>Incinerator air pollution will be added to already acknowledged high local levels</p> <p>This will cause damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels</p> <p>Wales has most polluted air in uk</p> <p>CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year</p> <p>Incinerator was built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted</p> <p>The incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>The wrong type of permit issued by NRW          Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment          Burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down          As incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law          We expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.'</p>
154.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this monstrosity, the stack is level with our bedroom windows, it should never have been built so near to housing, what have the next generation got to look forward too, so close to schools.'
155.	15/01/2022	Website	'I am a resident in Barry and I completely object to the Biomass plant. It is not required and I have serious concerns regarding not only its effect on the environment, but also the process of how it came to be in existences in the first place.'
156.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this project.'
157.	15/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object to this plant.          I also object to this retrospective consultation on something that should have been done before planning.          This plant would never have been built if that had happened, because they would have had no chance to get the subsidy. That's why all this was rushed- and within 250m of a densely populated area. Its shameful.          To the Welsh government and council- please stand up for proper process, and not allowing companies with expensive lawyers run rings around/legally threaten public organisations.'</p>
158.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this biomass plant. It is far too close to residents and schools.'
159.	15/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object to the incinerator, it should never have been built and this just highlights how this has been covered over for SEVEN years with a complete lack of legally required paperwork as shown.          Take it down.'</p>
160.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
161.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
162.	15/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to the biomass incinerator. I have a daughter and two grandchildren living extremely close to the plant on Coronation Street. All suffer with asthma. I live on Harbour Road and can see the chimney from my window. I have COPD. I am sure there are many other families in Barry and the VOG who have similar respiratory conditions.          Anything that has the potential to emit harmful emissions or further pollute the environment in a densely populated area should not be permitted to proceed.'</p>
163.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this going ahead, and It is a blot on the landscape.'
164.	15/01/2022	Website	'Strongly object to this plant was built to close to the town.'
165.	15/01/2022	Website	'I wish to object against this incinerator. Objection based on lies told by council leader and by the way the development have been allowed to not adhere to planning regulations. Lastly, the underhand and corrupt way in which the council and its employees have conducted themselves.'
166.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
167.	15/01/2022	Website	'Terrible that this was even built without an EIA. We need to be protecting our Environment for our future generations.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

168.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
169.	15/01/2022	Website	'Strongly object to this development. Direct conflict with climate change strategies including WG Beyond Recycling. Consultation process has been flawed throughout. The environmental impact of this proposal cannot be justifiably mitigated. Environmental permits should not be granted. Should this proposal go ahead it will be a huge step backwards for Wales.'
170.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this so close to residential houses and schools the burning of biomass is now a key indicator for lung disease on the all wales prescribing document it is dangerous and ridiculous to allow this going forward.'
171.	15/01/2022	Website	'We're told from the beginning by DIA that this is not the thing to do having this biomass but ignored to put the people of the vale under pressing times which may result to future ill health or more severe issues from this biomass burners, its to to put on hold as from NOW!!!'
172.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this plant being commissioned.'
173.	15/01/2022	Website	'I wish to object to the Barry biomass project on the grounds that it has never had an EIA.'
174.	15/01/2022	Website	'We object.'
175.	15/01/2022	Website	'The position of this installation is ill conceived to say the least, no consideration seems to have been given to elevated position of homes in the area, with the prevailing wind direction in this region it should be southwest of an open area.'
176.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object against incinerator in Barry.'
177.	15/01/2022	Website	'Objection.'
178.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator being here in Barry! Get it gone.'
179.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
180.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this.'
181.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator in Barry. I live local and not only is it an eyesore it's extremely bad for the health of us living here.'
182.	15/01/2022	Website	'I think this incinerator should have an EIA and this should have been required before construction not 7 yrs later. This incinerator will cause long term health problems to the local community and is not built in a suitable location.'
183.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
184.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
185.	15/01/2022	Email	<p>'Reasons for why I object to the Barry mass incinerator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels which have not been accounted for sufficiently.</li> <li>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter. The World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels. Wales has the most polluted air in uk.</li> <li>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change. The incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per yea.</li> <li>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted, in which case the companies documentation does not represent the true health impact, for example, the changes to the emissions plume.</li> <li>5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests.</li> <li>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW.</li> <li>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment.</li> <li>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down.</li> </ol>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully, hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice, an expectation that the Welsh Government should uphold the law and a stop notice should be given.</p> <p>10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators who will be earning money whilst the local populations health will decline even further with the rates of asthma being above average already.</p> <p>Barry is my home, my childrens home, and I do not wish for this to be on our doorstep pollution the air we breathe.'</p>
186.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT.'
187.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
188.	15/01/2022	Email	<p>'I as a resident of Barry wish to voice my objections to the monstrosity known as the Barry biomass, not only is it an eye saw to the town, but they have been sold on the pretence of being "CLEAN" and " GREEN" energy which we now know is untrue, the original spec of wooden pellets being brought by road by "diesel" trucks alone destroys this myth. we have the potential on the Welsh coast to build and maintain completely green power by building a tidal barrage but of course its the Welsh coast so this will not happen. The Law demands that a structure of this size an E.I.A. be carried out "BEFORE" a shovel is laid in the ground, seven years on we are still waiting ( the Welsh government have this week just admitted that yes this project should have had an E.I.A.) The planning permission granted for Barry and the structure built are not the same, if i was to build a dwelling like this i would be made to pull it down.</p> <p>I believe that the Welsh Government and National Resources Wales have a "DUTY OF CARE" to the people of Barry and should never have allowed the biomass to be built in a residential area surrounded by schools and affordable housing, children look to their parents and piers for their safety and guidance and trust them to look after their health, they need fresh air and exercise to assist in their growth, not toxins and pollution.'</p>
189.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this being given approval as it will have a detrimental impact on the health of the people living in the area.'
190.	15/01/2022	Website	'I have tried to read the information provided but even with a degree in engineering it is unintelligible. I object to this incinerator in public health grounds. Biomass emissions are recognised as a cause of COPD and other breathing and chest illnesses.'
191.	15/01/2022	Email	'We do not want this in our town.'
192.	15/01/2022	Website	'I am strongly against the incinerator going ahead/working in any way. Do NOT allow this to go ahead... for the health and well-being of our future generations please STOP the BARRY INCINERATOR!!!!'
193.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the building and running of this gasification plant.'
194.	15/01/2022	Website	'As a lay person I find the reports on the Barry biomass very complex. I do however object to it on health grounds.'
195.	15/01/2022	Website	'A good decision made by the Welsh Government for once.'
196.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object strongly to the operation of the biomass plant.'
197.	15/01/2022	Website	'Attempting to operate without an Environmental Impact Assessment only proves how underhand the company is. They must have something to hide or else they would be happy to undertake any assessment! This development is not to be trusted, they are trying to sneak in through the back door. Wales has been ravaged in so many ways in the past. Let's not stand for this practice anymore.'
198.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
199.	15/01/2022	Website	'I oppose the biomass ever operating as it is not safe for the health of residents in Barry. The site should never have been chosen as houses are nearby.'



## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

200.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object!'
201.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to everything that would allow this monstrosity to become operational.'
202.	15/01/2022	Website	'150,000 tons of CO2 is enough. What happens on Barry affects the whole of Wales.'
203.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator at Barry Docks. It is too near residential dwellings and schools and should never have been built.'
204.	15/01/2022	Website	'I OBJECT!! The incinerator should never have been built without this EIA being carried out!'
205.	15/01/2022	Website	'I would like to object to the incinerator continuing to operate as I feel it is causing people and the environment damage.'
206.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
207.	15/01/2022	Website	'This needs to be stopped, polluting the environment and endangering lives.'
208.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
209.	15/01/2022	Website	<p>I live on Barry Island we have noticed Ash on our cars in the mornings already, I hate to think what we are breathing in. It feels like Barry has been the chosen to house the incinerator because the Vale council did not put up much of a fight. It is not hard to find online the issues these incinerators are causing not only to health but the environment. I cannot believe that it was built without objection! Why was it allowed to be built? It almost seems if someone has been given a golden handshake to waver planning. Friends of the earth have great research about these I quote</p> <p>"Burning materials at incinerator plants produces toxic pollutants that can harm our health: Dioxin impacts your immune system and, in some cases, can cause cancer. Hazardous ash can cause both short-term effects (such as nausea and vomiting) to long-term effects (like kidney damage and cancer). 30 Mar 2021".</p> <p>It's so hypocritical of not only the Vale Council but the Welsh assembly to tell the people of our community to think of our environment then this monstrosity is burning and spewing out Ash over our heads. I wonder what someone was promised for us to house this in Incinerator here in Barry!</p>
210.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object!!'
211.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object due unable to understand non technical information provided.'
212.	15/01/2022	Website	'Makes me feel threatened by its proximity.'
213.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object!!!'
214.	15/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object.'
215.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object 100% to this monstrosity.'
216.	15/01/2022	Website	'I am opposed to the proposition of having an incinerator installed in Barry.'
217.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
218.	15/01/2022	Website	'This atrocity is a poisonous legacy for our children and Grandchildren. It may well contribute to sever illness or even death of unborn residents of Barry. One is too many for the sake of the mighty dollar. Do the right thing and demolish this poisonous plant... we don't want it.. you would not want it in your backyard either!'
219.	15/01/2022	Email	'I object to the biomass plant.'
220.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the biomass plant on an environmental, public health and moral level.'
221.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this.'
222.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

223.	15/01/2022	Email	'I strongly object to the Barry bio-mass incinerator.'
224.	15/01/2022	Website	'Why are the carrying on when they know what they are doing is wrong? Shut the damn thing down.'
225.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
226.	15/01/2022	Website	'I am against the Biomass incinerator polluting the air of Barry.'
227.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this and insist that an Environmental Impact Assessment is carried out.'
228.	15/01/2022	Email	'I object.'
229.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object strongly to the biomass incinerator being operated in the town of Barry. I have read the information which indicates that the plant would be spewing out toxic fumes throughout the Vale of Glamorgan. The health and welfare of my children, grandchildren and residents of the Vale should be paramount.'
230.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator.'
231.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
232.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this dirty pollutant plant operating in Barry.'
233.	15/01/2022	Website	'Object.'
234.	15/01/2022	Website	'I would like to see the world stop being destroyed by greedy human,s.'
235.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object fully !'
236.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
237.	15/01/2022	Email	'I strongly object to the biomass plant being in Barry. I also object to It operating in Barry, because of the known health risk.'
238.	15/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object.</p> <p>I object on so many issues connected with the BiomassUK2 incinerator which has already been built in Barry, close to residential areas, schools, public buildings and the town centre. I object because the plant was built without public consultation at the planning stage and no EIA was carried out before the build although it is now clear from the PEDW letter of 13.01.2022 to Planning Enforcement Vale of Glamorgan that BiomassUK2 is development as described in Para 10 of Schedule 1 to the EIA Regulations. This has been clear to the residents of Barry for years as it takes very little research to establish that, being an incinerator that burns more that 100 tonnes per day, it cannot be classed under Schedule 2.</p> <p>I further object to the fact that without an initial EIA, there should be no possibility of an Environmental Statement. Referring to it as 'voluntary' and 'retrospective' makes a mockery of the law that exists to protect people and environments; this VRES is neither right nor ethical. An Environmental Impact Statement is a public document, intended to inform the public of the nature and likely consequences of a development <u>in time</u> to comment and/or participate in the <u>final project design</u>. None of this is now possible, that ship has sailed.</p> <p>Further, the Non-Technical Summary intended to inform the general, non-expert public is in part too complicated, lacks a glossary of terms and is reliant on background information not present in the booklet/online. It is also lacking in important information only to be found in the larger files which had to be individually requested. I received my hard copies free of charge, but many were put off by the cost then said to be levied.</p> <p>At every stage up till now, there has been obfuscation and delay in responding to the concerns of the public. Heavily redacted material gained through FOI Act requests has served only to confirm the public's suspicions that WG, NRW and the Vale of Glamorgan Council leaned towards support of the developers rather than protection of the public and the environment. The WG stance on which aspects</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>of scoping are no longer relevant (flood risk etc.) is a case in point. The developers do not want to include flood risk, although it remains a major risk, and the WG has agreed and relieved them of this accountability.</p> <p>NRW: ‘We will only issue a permit if we believe that significant pollution will not be caused and the operator has the ability to meet the conditions of the permit. Any permit we may issue will include appropriate conditions to protect human health and the environment.’ (NRW Information Sheet ‘How To Have Your Say’ pertaining to BiomassUK2 environmental permit application.)</p> <p>There is ample evidence from WHO and longitudinal research from a variety of universities to show that there are no safe limits of certain emissions. In fact, even when ‘safe’ levels have been established and accepted by some agencies, they are deemed safe for healthy adults, with no mention of other populations: children, the elderly, those with chronic or acute medical conditions. Recent (2018) research from Queen Mary University of London has provided direct evidence that PM2.5 from polluted air/incinerator emissions, is capable of reaching the placenta and potentially affecting foetal development. Further, 2017 research by the Stockholm Environment Institute, York, found that exposure to PM2.5 and finer could be associated with 2.7 – 3.4 million pre-term births in 2010. WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines (Sept. 2021) describe PM10 and PM2.5 and finer, as penetrating deep into the lungs, with PM2.5 capable of entering the blood stream, resulting in cardiovascular and respiratory impacts, and affecting other organs (WHO International Agency for Research in Cancer classified all particulate matter as carcinogenic in 2013).</p> <p>All this evidence is in the public sphere and accessible to incinerator developers and government agencies who have the power to grant, or not grant, permits and approvals.</p> <p>The BiomassUK2 stack is 43m from ground level. Rising from the maritime plain on which the incinerator is situated, by means of a steep cliff face, is the town of Barry, with Dock View Road overlooking the dock area. Dock View Road is between 13 and 36.6 metres above sea level. The houses built on the road are old Victorian stock, many of them 3 storeys high, with windows 10m above road level. In many cases there are windows higher than the incinerator stack. The assessment of local air quality, wind dispersal etc was largely carried out at Cardiff Airport, which is situated on a wide, flat plateau 67metres above sea level. Barry is a mass of hills and valleys with a variety of tall Victorian buildings. I cannot think of two sites more unlike.’</p>
239.	15/01/2022	Website	‘I object to the Aviva incinerator.’
240.	15/01/2022	Website	‘I object.’
241.	15/01/2022	Website	‘As a ratepayer and resident of Barry I object strongly to this biomass plant being given permission to continue in Barry. It’s application should be refused by the Vale of Glamorgan Council.’
242.	15/01/2022	Website	‘I object to the biomass in Barry.’
243.	15/01/2022	Website	<p>‘Our air and our lives are at stake- please put a stop to Biomass 2. I HAVE A BABY AND CHILD UNDER 5. Im begging you to stop this. This project is unlicensed, non-compliant and dangerous. Incineration of biomass pellets is proven to release highly hazardous nano-particulates.</p> <p>This would be taking place 24/7, half a kilometer from my house! Biomass is not the sustainable, renewable, efficient energy source it’s conveniently labelled as,- it’s still just burning stuff through a filthy chimney which cokes up. Also transporting the woods pellets is all done by diesel lorries.. It’s disgusting that this could still happen in the midst of a growing town in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (not 19<sup>th</sup>!!!). This is NOT a green technology.. I’m begging you to stop this.’</p>
244.	15/01/2022	Email	‘I object to this without and Environmental Impact Assessment.’

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

245.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to the incinerator being in Barry.'
246.	15/01/2022	Website	'The incinerator owners have sought to circumnavigate laws at every step, I object to this proceeding. We cannot reward duplicity.'
247.	15/01/2022	Website	'Object on the grounds of the amount of CO2 that will be pumped out. I have a respiratory condition what will be made worse with poor air quality.'
248.	15/01/2022	Website	'I object to this incinerator being built.'
249.	15/01/2022	Website	'Object on the basis of being so close to residential area. A park which is not being promoted for family. The biomass will spread pollution over these areas. Not good for Barry.'
250.	15/01/2022	Website	'Object.'
251.	16/01/2022	Website	'I disagree with the building and use of the biomass facility as it does not comply with the relevant legislation.'
252.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
253.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to the planning for this incinerator.'
254.	16/01/2022	Website	'I want my children to grow up in a town that is not exposed to these constant toxins.'
255.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this, it should never have been built so close to the town or new housing developments.'
256.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to the building of this incinerator on environmental, scientific, financial and sustainability grounds.'
257.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this development.'
258.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
259.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to the biomass incinerator, it should never have been built.'
260.	16/01/2022	Website	'Strongly object.'
261.	16/01/2022	Website	<p>'I have serious concerns in respect of the kids that impact the biomass incinerator will have on our environment. In addition to polluting the environment with harmful gases that contribute to climate change, the incinerator will deposit harmful pollutants into the air in an already attributed as being highly polluted.</p> <p>The cost to our community in terms of the health of future generations could be significant and its impact will mostly be felt locally within the pockets of deprivation by many who are currently economically inactive.'</p>
262.	16/01/2022	Website	'OBJECT.'
263.	16/01/2022	Website	'I'm against the incinerator.'
264.	16/01/2022	Email	<p>'Dear Sir</p> <p>Consultation on Barry Biomass Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to be able to comment on the Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement for the Biomass facility in Barry. I have noted that this consultation relates only to the Environmental Statement and not the wider application.</p> <p>Over recent years I have spoken to many residents regarding their concerns with the biomass facility. I therefore make the following observations after reading the Environmental Statement.</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>According to the Environmental Statement, the Barry Biomass Facility will accept and process up to 72,000 dry tonnes of mixed waste wood per annum. The delivery of such an amount of waste wood annually is expected to involve around 10 vehicle deliveries per day</p> <p>While it is noted that Transportation and Highways Impacts are outside the scope of the Environmental Statement, the potential impact on air quality caused by heavy goods vehicles delivering waste wood to the site would appear to be relevant.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement considers the potential impact on areas such as air quality and climate change due to the actual facility, but it is less clear whether the impact on air quality and climate change from vehicles bringing the waste to the site have also been considered.</p> <p>I strongly believe that an increase in heavy good vehicle movements caused by the delivery of waste wood to the facility will adversely impact the air quality to those in the surrounding area.</p> <p>I would further add that the operation of the biomass incinerator will cause air quality problems to nearby elevated properties such as Dock View Road and across the wider area in general. The height of the chimney stack corresponds to the height of the residential areas. This was an issue of concern in planning terms but the air quality and environmental issues were not properly addressed. The incinerator is in effect constructed in a basin.</p> <p>Finally, there are a number of schools within a short distance and the impact on children will be exaggerated.</p> <p>I hope you take into consideration the above points.</p> <p>Kind regards Alun Rt Hon Alun Cairns MP Vale of Glamorgan Constituency'</p>
265.	16/01/2022	Email	<p>'I would like to offer my objection to the Biomass Plant at Barry</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels</li> <li>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels</li> </ol> <p>Wales has most polluted air in uk. There are countless peer reviewed studies that prove that this incinerator will have a depremental effect on residents health.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year. Considering a climate crisis has been declared this can not be ignored.</li> <li>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted. The company is still in dispute with the building contactors as the plans changed monthly.</li> </ol>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests. They did not have the decency to even read the report made the residents of Barry through Diag.</p> <p>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW. It has now been verified that it was always a schedual 1 project.</p> <p>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment. This was and still is a, legal requirement. What has been asked of Biomass is not an EIA</p> <p>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down. Calculations using waste figures on the gov website South Wales does not need anymore incinerator for the amount of wood waste produced commercially or publicly. There is enough capacity within Wales to dispose of all waste created.</p> <p>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law.</p> <p>10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.'</p>
266.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
267.	16/01/2022	Website	<p>'I strongly object to this application, it is a complete fallacy that the development is a renewable source of energy and could only make a negative impact to all that the Clean Air (Wales) Bill proposes to achieve.</p> <p>Also the proposal does not heed the advice from DEFRA in their "Waste Wood As A Biomass Fuel" publication, particularly section 6.3.2 being so close to an urban population.'</p>
268.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
269.	16/01/2022	Website	'There's enough c**p floating around the area without this monstrosity being allowed to operate.'
270.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this incinerator. It is on my doorstep and would not want myself or my community breathing in polluted air.'
271.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
272.	16/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object on the grounds that 1) The incinerator was built without an EIA at the start contrary to EU and UK Regulations so was therefore illegal.</p> <p>2) The incinerator has been built without full planning permission and not in accordance with the plans submitted.</p> <p>3) The incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes of CO2 per annum contributing to the climate crisis.</p> <p>4) Air pollution both locally and Wales wide is already very high the Incinerator will contribute to more Air Pollution in highly populated areas.</p> <p>5) The Welsh Government have declared a Climate Emergency. The Welsh Government have placed a Moratorium on new Incinerators, there is no justification for allowing any further Incinerators to begin operating in Wales.</p> <p>I expect both Authorities to take meaningful action to halt and reverse CO2 pollution and Air Pollution in general in Wales.'</p>
273.	16/01/2022	Website	'Please accept my objection to this incinerator operating in Barry.'
274.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
275.	16/01/2022	Website	<p>'Do not want this.</p> <p>Put it in cowbridge or llantwit Major and see how many people object !!'</p>
276.	16/01/2022	Website	'How many times does the Vale of Glamorgan have to get it so damn wrong? Why aren't head of planning dismissed from their positions? The utter waste of rate money on these flawed planning application which the council seem to inherently gloss over at their leisure is an utter disgrace. Being a predominantly southerly or south westerly wind doesn't take rocket science to work out this

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			premises will pump fumes over a huge swath of eastern Barry and Dinas Powis. This plant should never have been positioned at its current location. Should have gone through the CORRECT planning process and the people of the Vale of Glamorgan (i.e. those that pay your wages don't forget), should be listened to and not overlooked with the sheer arrogance you seem to have in your council. Between this and Model farm, you are considered corrupt by the very residents you serve.'
277.	16/01/2022	Email	'I object to the incinerator. In Barry it is too near homes and schools. It will give off too many toxic emissions which is illegal and this incinerator has no EIA which should have been done before it was even built. There has been no constant interaction with the residents of Barry they have built without permission for certain items that was not on the original plans which shows that this company will ride roughshod to get what they want without concern for anyone's future.'
278.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
279.	16/01/2022	Website	'This development should never have gone forward without an EIA. It was pushed forward by the Vale Planning Department who failed to understand the impact on the local community a development of this nature would have. The Vale Council and their planning department have failed their community and need to put this right by not allowing this unit to be used.'
280.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
281.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
282.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object in the strongest possible terms.'
283.	16/01/2022	Website	'I totally object to this incinerator (that's what it is) being placed in my hometown of Barry. Air pollution kills and that's a recognised fact! This incinerator is sited ridiculously close to residential properties and, when operating, will produce extremely harmful airborne pollutants. The owners of the incinerator are in breach of planning and environmental regulations too! The thing needs to be dismantled ASAP !!'
284.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object. One specific point I would like to highlight is the misconceptions that a gasification incinerator placed in the middle of a busy town is part of net-zero Carbon strategy. Neither will incinerators provide a lot of skilled jobs for future generations.'
285.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this development due to its location close to major housing estates.'
286.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
287.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
288.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
289.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
290.	16/01/2022	Email	'I object.'
291.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to the biomass for environmental and health reasons. It is placed in the bottom of a basin in a very large town, any gases cannot escape safely from the area. Also the extra large traffic vehicles going to that area will cause environmental issues.'
292.	16/01/2022	Website	'Please there is enough pollution in Barry without this carbuncle on the skyline. Enough is enough it should not have been allowed to be built in the first place.'
293.	16/01/2022	Website	'N/A'
294.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object. I don't believe this is in the best interest of the people of Barry.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

295.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object. They have broken planning law and should be treated the same as anyone else. It should removed. It's a health risk to its residents and does not help with climate control.'
296.	16/01/2022	Website	'I wish to object to the biomass plant not just because of the way it has been pushed through simply because it is too close to residential housing. It should be away from the population.'
297.	16/01/2022	Email	'We wish to object to this, and assert that an EIA was necessary all along. No progress should be made and the plant should not operate until the EIA has been approved/agreed. We have small grand-daughters growing up in Barry, and hope that you will consider the lungs of all the Barry children, and others in The Vale, when making a decision. The plant should never have been built so close to such a large centre of population. Please log our objections. Thank you.'
298.	16/01/2022	Website	'I don't believe that a Voluntary Environmental Assessment is sufficient to allay the fears that the population of Barry have for the Biomass plant that has been built, The environmental impact on the town and surrounding areas, could be severe if this plant is allowed to operate being situated in the middle of a densely populated area, any escape of noxious gasses will be effect the residents both in the Barry Dock area and beyond. There needs to be a full Environmental Impact Assessment carried out independently. The best result would be if this plant ( which should never have been built in such a densly populated area) be removed as soon as possible, to safeguard the health and wellbeing of the residents of Barry and the rest of the Vale of Glamorgan.'
299.	16/01/2022	Website	'It should never have been built in the first place! And to have taken all these years to sort out is ridiculous shame on everyone involved in giving It the go ahead!'
300.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to the Barry Biomass incinerator on the grounds of the environmental impact it will have on the local community and the wider area within the Vale of Glamorgan and Cardiff.'
301.	16/01/2022	Website	'W are suppose to be cleaning up the Environment not polluting it. The smoke coming from this is affecting people breathing.'
302.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
303.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this on the grounds that there has been no EIA, the stack heights are too low and it has breached planning regulations.'
304.	16/01/2022	Website	'I am strongly opposed to the incinerator. It would produce more carbon in the atmosphere at a time when councils up and own the country have declared climate emergencies. It is near homes and schools and the additional pollution will impact on the people in this area. It was wrong in 2008, its even more wrong now.'
305.	16/01/2022	Website	'This has been allowed through back door, it should not be allowed to continue. It's a disgrace that something like this has been allowed to continue. It's a disgrace that something like this has been allowed without proper public consultation and independent inspection for pollution risks. I think the police called in to investigate how the process was dealt with in the first place.'
306.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object as a full EIA assessment was not carried out. Therefore how on earth could planning permission be granted without this being in place.'
307.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
308.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to the barry biomass.'
309.	16/01/2022	Website	'From the time of if inception I always believed this plant needed an Environmental Impact Assessment although the Vale of Glamorgan Planning Committee were advised that one was not necessary in 2015 at which the application was passed by the committee of which I was a member, but as in the previous application I voted against this application as I have always been concerned



## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			about this plant vicinity to the residential properties and businesses and the Voluntary Environmental Statement both technical and non-technical does not answer all the concerns that have been raised and does nothing to convince myself of the safety element of this plant.'
310.	16/01/2022	Website	'This should never have been allowed. So near housing & so unhealthy. Something went seriously wrong but hopefully now can be corrected.'
311.	16/01/2022	Website	'Object.'
312.	16/01/2022	Website	'To whom it may concern As a resident of Barry I wish to object to the Biomass incinerator in Barry. It is completely the wrong place to put a plant which will be incinerating wood chips. I think this should never be allowed to operate so close to an area of high population density creating concerning pollution in the atmosphere.'
313.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
314.	16/01/2022	Website	'Please do not allow the Barry Biomass Incinerator to be commissioned. Our health and our children's and grandchildren's health is more important than Aviva shareholder's financial profit. Planet Earth Is sick. Allowing this and similar projects to proceed would be to ignore all the evidence and hasten Planet Earth's demise. Please do the right thing.'
315.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
316.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this business.'
317.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object to this being built due to the close proximity of peoples houses, and the increased risk of fire, pollution and sound especially at night.'
318.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object most strongly to this abomination.'
319.	16/01/2022	Website	'I was told about the consultation and wanted to ask that the incinerator is fully reviewed, including all its paperwork due to the concerns around whether permits were issued appropriately and the correct planning processes were applied. Also, the location is next to so much housing, and Barry is an extremely busy and growing town, full of young families, and they deserve to be assured that their health is priority above profit. So I also ask that pollution levels are reviewed, including longer term environmental impacts as we gear up to a decarbonised future in all areas of industry.'
320.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
321.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
322.	16/01/2022	Email	'I wholeheartedly object to there being a biomass plant in Barry. For health reasons, I worry about its impact. Please add my name to the list of objectors.'
323.	16/01/2022	Website	'This 'development' is a white elephant and must be removed. It is a danger to our citizens health and the health of our environment.'
324.	16/01/2022	Website	'I wish to object as my daughter and granddaughter live close to this proposal.'
325.	16/01/2022	Website	'We the town of Barry, our children, our grandchildren could suffer ill health if the Aviva/Biomass incinerator gets the go ahead from Welsh Government. I demand a proper EIA as is our legal right, instead of the cobbled together fictional farce that has been named an 'Environmental Impact Statement'.  I object to the plant for the following reasons;

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels</p> <p>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels Wales has most polluted air in uk. There are countless peer reviewed studies that prove that this incinerator will have a depremental effect on residents health.</p> <p>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year. Considering a climate crisis has been declared this can not be ignored.</p> <p>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted. The company is still in dispute with the building contactors as the plans changed monthly.</p> <p>5...incinerator given permit by Natural Resources Wales before completion and before safety tests. They did not have the decency to even read the report made the residents of Barry through Diag.</p> <p>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW. It has now been verified that it was always a schedual 1 project.</p> <p>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment. This was and still is a, legal requitement. What has been asked of Biomass is not an EIA</p> <p>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down. Calculations using waste figures on the gov website South Wales does not need anymore incinerator for the amount of wood waste produced commercially or publicly. There is enough capacity within Wales to dispose of all waste created.</p> <p>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law.</p> <p>10...expect the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.'</p>
326.	16/01/2022	Email	'I wish to lodge my objection to the Barry Incinerator, especially after hearing that it should have had an EIA all along.'
327.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
328.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
329.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object and think that it does impact on the environment.'
330.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
331.	16/01/2022	Website	'Your documents are unintelligible. However, what is clear is that any information that you put into the public domain should be tested and evaluated by third party experts as part of a true Environmental Impact Assessment. This has not happened. I object to the plant and the process. Neither are lawful.'
332.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
333.	16/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
334.	16/01/2022	Website	'I strongly object to this process as a concerned resident. Please do not grant permission to the biomass plant. Keep our air and environment clean. There have been a number of times on the way home to Barry we have seen a pollution blume hanging over the docks and Barry Island but it will surely get worse if permission is granted and we have further pollution pumped into the air. We have enough already from Dow Corning! How do you think this will not have a negative impact on Barry's growth, if I was looking to move into the area now, we moved here in the 80s, and I knew about this I would have definitely have reconsidered as I'm sure people especially with young children will be doing now if it gets the go ahead.'
335.	17/01/2022	Website	'This is totally unacceptable in a highly populated area and an eyesore for the new waterside development.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

336.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
337.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
338.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to the Aviva/Biomass incinerator in Barry for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The incinerator poses a threat to the health of the people of Barry and the surrounding areas. It will pose a threat to the health of future generations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The incinerator will emit poisons, such as Dioxins, Chromium VI and particulate matter. I do not accept that these will be monitored and kept 'within safe levels'. The World Health Organisation states there are NO safe levels.</li> <li>- The All Wales COPD Management and Prescribing Guidelines provides a checklist for clinicians to consider when assessing the likelihood of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in patients. Second on the COPD likelihood checklist is exposure to biomass fuel burning, other noxious fume exposure and pollution.</li> </ul> <p>Given these facts, there is no doubt that the incinerator is a threat to the health of the people of Barry and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>2) The incinerator is a threat to the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon dioxide emissions are the primary driver of global climate change. It is widely recognized that, to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, the world needs to urgently reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year. This is not compatible with the need to reduce CO2 emissions.</li> <li>- Wales has the most polluted air in the UK. There are already high local levels of pollution. It is known there will be increased traffic from lorries delivering waste wood to the incinerator. This additional traffic will also increase air (and noise) pollution.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above, the incinerator is a threat to the environment.</p> <p>3) The incinerator was built unlawfully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The incinerator was built without full planning permission. The finished structure is not in accordance with the plans submitted.</li> <li>- The incinerator was given a permit by Natural Resources Wales before construction was completed and before safety tests were carried out. NRW also issued the wrong permit.</li> <li>- The Welsh Government has confirmed to the Vale of Glamorgan Council that the incinerator does come under Schedule 1 of the planning EIA regulations so legally requires an Environmental Impact Assessment. The incinerator was built without the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment and is currently subject to an Enforcement Notice issued by the Vale of Glamorgan Council.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above, the incinerator was built unlawfully.</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>It is the first responsibility of government in a democratic society to protect and safeguard the lives of its citizens. I expect the Welsh Government to meet this first responsibility and protect us from the harm the incinerator will cause by upholding the law. Their responsibility is to the people of Barry not to Aviva investors.</p> <p>On October 8th, 2021, The United Nations Human Rights Council adopted a resolution recognising that the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment is a human right. I expect the Welsh Government to stand up for and defend the human right of the people of Barry to live in a safe, clean and healthy environment.</p> <p>To conclude: I object to the Aviva/Biomass incinerator in Barry.'</p>
339.	17/01/2022	Website	'I do not agree with the biomass development in Barry.'
340.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
341.	17/01/2022	Email	'Please register my objection to the Environmental Assessment report submitted in support of the Barry biomass plant.'
342.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
343.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'I wish to make representations on the Barry Biomass Plant and the environmental effects the activities of the plant will cause:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1...air pollution added to already acknowledged high local levels</li> <li>2...damage to health caused by poisons dioxins and particulate matter World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels</li> <li>Wales has most polluted air in uk</li> <li>3... CO2 emissions proven to cause climate change the incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year</li> <li>4...incinerator built with out full planning and not according the plans submitted</li> <li>5...incinerator given permit by the then Natural Resources Wales (NRW) before completion and before safety tests</li> <li>6...wrong type of permit issued by NRW</li> <li>7... Incinerator built with out the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment</li> <li>8...burning waste wood means less available chip board and more trees chopped down</li> <li>9...as incinerator has been built unlawfully hence vale issuing an Enforcement notice an expectation of the Welsh Government should uphold the law</li> <li>10...expectation that the Welsh Government stand up for people not speculators.'</li> </ol>
344.	17/01/2022	Website	'I would like to register my objection to the biomass furnace being used in Barry.'
345.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
346.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
347.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
348.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
349.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I want to submit a strong objection to the EIA statement - the public of Barry have asked and demanded that this was carried out as part of the original planning application, which was ignored time and time again by the owner of the Biomass incinerator. Since this time the company has misled the residents by flouting planning consent (illegal water tanks) and worked against our concerns. There is an irrefutable breakdown of trust and I cannot see anything in the EIA statement to make me change my mind. The operators have no regard of the impact of the incinerator on the residents of Barry and I firmly believe flouts the intent of the Future Generations (Wales) Act upon our children, who will have to live with the long term effects of this incinerator.'</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

350.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object to the continuing of any further development at Biomass 2, and I support VOG in its legal enforcement notice requiring that "the plant and all buildings are removed from the land".</p> <p>The ES document</p> <p>The summary was not understandable, with no glossary, not concise, too technical with no explanations. This document is not informative if it's not easily understood by a person with no background to this.</p> <p>Where's their rationale for using the term 'As Built'?</p> <p>No definitions have been given in its use throughout the document.</p> <p>'As Built', if you research it yourself, asserts that the end build differs from the original blueprint, but that at every stage planning consent has been gained. This is not the case.</p> <p>I don't accept that it is 'As Built' and I find the use of this term loaded, to lend this failed plant credibility.</p> <p>The EIA</p> <p>I object to this unlawful attempt to write a preemptive assessment after the event.</p> <p>There is nothing in law that makes a late EIA legitimate. This is unprecedented and paradoxical. One cannot risk assess pre-build, something which already stands and is already unsanctioned. It has no validity.</p> <p>An EIA has a PURPOSE.</p> <p>Either write a proper lawful EIA or don't.</p> <p>And in this case; they haven't. Historical doesn't count. You don't check a patient's fitness for surgery just before you put the knife to skin (certainly not after dodging safety checks and consent forms all the way).</p> <p>It's understandable that it's no longer possible not to be historical but why should it then be legitimate?</p> <p>An environmental statement cannot be made if informed by a document that isn't legitimately written and didn't exist until a moment ago.</p> <p>And it states it will only use data relating to 2014 and earlier. Why assert it's okay to write one now without then using data and safety levels of now? I don't accept that we must purposely use 8+ year out-of-date data if we are in any way assessing today's risks with any seriousness.</p> <p>The EIA should unquestionably have been carried out before build, and the people of Barry have repeatedly stated this for years. You'll observe who have been up to code and up-to-date this whole time, and it's the community of Barry.</p> <p>Biomass assert that this is a 'voluntary' EIA and statement now. They are not the good guys for having built this without due process..!</p> <p>Furthermore, it has been cherry picked; where the developers choose certain risks are now irrelevant to consideration because the thing's built now. If they're writing in the here-and-now and not retrospectively, then they can go ahead and let all aspects be assessed fully, and to current standards.</p> <p>Who are they to choose what we should have been allowed to object to, in an original consultation?</p> <p>This just justifies the fact that this EIA is not fit for purpose, no EIA can be written now which would be fit for purpose, and this whole sad exercise is a mockery.</p>
------	------------	---------	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>If an original EIA had brought up issues that stopped development, due to flood risk or suitability of the area, they can't be trivialised just because the building's already erected. In fact there are risks with flooding in that area and with the layout of their development which I would also have wanted to comment on.</p> <p>Same for emissions.</p> <p>Emissions</p> <p>No developers get to decide what is 'insignificant' or 'negligible' without explaining how in the statement.</p> <p>Many emissions still don't have 'safe levels' and it's unlawful to assert that they are safe (then to go and disperse them over Barry), on the basis that nobody has established any.</p> <p>Carcinogens for example don't have any safe levels at all. Cobalt and furans for example.</p> <p>It's false to assert something, that forms a public's viewpoint, on data that doesn't exist.</p> <p>Nowhere has there been any transparency over the emissions, what they contain and that they do, of course, have ill health effects. I can barely count the incidence of "we don't know so let's go ahead" that this EIA throws up.</p> <p>And for some pollutants, the levels are dismissed as irrelevant.</p> <p>They say 'not relevant', the WHO's AQG safe levels would say 'not met'.</p> <p>Carbon matters. Our commitment to cutting CO2 matters. How long does it take to burn a tree and slowly grow a tree? Then burn a tree and slowly grow another tree? This cycle is stupid and unsustainable. Sustainable means we can keep it coming. It shouldn't mean that we can keep it coming at the detriment of the whole planet, the life upon it and everything that we love.</p> <p>We're heading into a crippling CO2 debt and the 'neutral' scam is a stalling device. We have 28 years to even meet our COP26 promise in Wales. We have less as a planet.</p> <p>Meanwhile we know this is a dead industry. Nobody wants incineration. People were sold a dream of clean steam with happy electricity, they even manually handled the pellets, but thankfully in other areas they realised they'd walked into a marketing scam that was after snaffling the subsidies for actual green energy futures.</p> <p>Harmful chemicals matter. We don't want them in the lungs of Barry.</p> <p>Ultrafine particles and humans don't mix.</p> <p>The development</p> <p>So did the company itself request to be categorised as a Schedule 2?</p> <p>And for there to be no EIA.</p> <p>The Schedule 2 category was given - wrongly. Simply because they suggested it? Were planners too negligent to do anything other than what the developers had suggested?</p> <p>It was always clearly a Schedule 1 development. But they banked on no one checking. And for everyone to be starry eyed from the marketing day.</p> <p>Given all the vague unknowns that made their basis for 'safety', we cannot take Biomass's own assessment of their predicted impact as in any way trustworthy.</p> <p>'You can't just leave those who created the problem in charge of the solution'.</p> <p>'Green energy'</p>
--	--	---

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>So originally, they introduce themselves with this delightful 'plan' for cute pellets of nice tidy little wood, good enough to invite the media to come and play with and marvel at, then suddenly... laminated, plastic coated, metal, paint soiled, chipped waste from the construction industry and from recycling centres.</p> <p>How is this not closed down already?!</p> <p>The moment they went off the original plan, upon which all their shiny claims were made?</p> <p>When it first emerged that the showroom marketing device of a 'clean energy' miracle suddenly had excuses drawn, and the project wanted it's fuel downgrading - two full places - to incorporate junk, scrap and polluted wood, why did alarm bells not ring about the integrity of this development?</p> <p>Biomass is NOT green. I resent this misrepresentation and the subsidies being swallowed by unethical developments that would harm us and impede our urgent move to clean fuel.</p> <p>Biomass incineration releases 50% more carbon dioxide (per unit of energy produced) than coal burning. Partnership for Policy Integrity reported this back in 2011 as well as many others since, so this isn't new information. This is widely available public knowledge that has been discussed in mainstream media and reported in official policy for a long time.  <a href="https://www.pfpi.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/PFPI-biomass-carbon-accounting-overview_April.pdf">https://www.pfpi.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/PFPI-biomass-carbon-accounting-overview_April.pdf</a></p> <p>Even if using fresh wood source, this cycle digs us deeper and deeper every moment into the CO2 crisis.</p> <p>Proponents of biomass claim that it is "carbon neutral" because trees will suck up the extra CO2. But this is not true within any meaningful time frame to address climate change, by which time we've cut down an extra twenty years' worth of trees.</p> <p>Some studies also show a permanent increase in atmospheric carbon.</p> <p>But every year's fuel supply for biomass requires creating a new "carbon debt".</p> <p>If this goes ahead we will soon wish we could travel back in time and cut up the credit card before we've spent even a single unit worth of carbon. And yet we are at that moment right now, and we absolutely can.</p> <p>Biomass incineration also releases the same types of pollutants as coal burning, including carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO2), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur dioxide (SO2), dioxins/furans, acid gases, radioactive pollutants and toxic metals like arsenic, chromium and mercury.</p> <p>Biomass is dirtier than most fossil fuels, but is considered 'renewable' (which sounds green but is misleading), competing for subsidies with true, environmentally progressive renewables like wind and solar.</p> <p>Incinerators. Firstly, you don't call them 'gasification' plants unless you know incineration is as filthy as it sounds. And using terms like 'black steam' when the stack is belching filthy fumes from cleaning dirt, is purposeful sleight of hand. So is claiming that 'small particles don't do harm because they're small', with regards PM2.5 substances.</p> <p>They don't fit, they are debunked, they aren't fit for purpose. If any developer wanted to embrace true progression they would change plans to wind or solar farm, they'd be worthy of their subsidy. It would not poison folk and we can have a hope of meeting our national COP26 aims.</p> <p>We must rectify at the last minute what a mistake this incinerator would have been. And that it was misleading from the start.</p> <p>We have a moment in time to get this right.</p>
--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>Sustainable is not synonymous with environmental. You might discover any disgusting and infinitely suppliable substance that converts to energy under the right unhealthy conditions, but that doesn't make it climate friendly. This really must be our foremost target now.</p> <p>When officials repeat numbers and catchphrases without scrutiny, straight from the company brochure, sounding like a person who just got themselves into a timeshare scam, it is frustrating and time consuming and dangerous. It stops them getting this right first time:</p> <p>It IS an incinerator, it IS infinitely harmful and it IS consistently unlawful in it's construction.</p> <p>The not checking, not attending when it's billowing smoke for days, the not researching to check it needs an EIA or should be Schedule 1, the corporate enabling: Instead of allying themselves with the town. It's an own goal and it's a huge bias against your own town!</p> <p>It's time to listen to the team of committed Barrians who definitely have done more work on keeping this accountable than most anyone involved. The people who never would have guessed ten years ago how much they would know about incineration, energy, pollutants, public health, flood risk, geography, fire and more.</p> <p>We should have more love and ambition and more exciting aims for Barry. We can do better than this nonsense. This development. The skewing and misrepresenting, the cycle of non-compliance, and dodging accountability. Enough already.</p> <p>We don't want this outfit and their ~14 jobs and decades of filth. Barry has higher aspirations and better things to be doing. Our future does not include this thing.</p> <p>Future</p> <p>It will be after some of you (officials) leave office that this will be decommissioned and you may read about the many 'avoidable lessons' learned. I imagine future officers who are part of the decommissioning process will reflect back on this moment as perhaps a time 'before people really understood'. But actually all our understanding is fully there. Now. It's just courage in the face of a large decision, a counting down clock, and facing big and impatient players who make it feel like we can't do the right thing, and stop this now.</p> <p>In fact we only need to add the full stop, and this is history.</p> <p>I would look to the skilled individuals who have campaigned, informed themselves and the community, every step of this process, from planning, the science, the law, all from the perspective of best interests, and looking for evidence without prejudice. No motives but that of what's right, what's ethical, legal and benefits the community, Wales and further. To know that there is only one answer to this and that's uncategorically to cease this fossil of a botched plan.</p> <p>It's two whole generations ago, so echoes of Aberfan won't play on some people's minds, but it staggers to consider that in a generation's time, we could be wringing our hands regretfully at growing numbers of children with neuropathic disorders, developmental delays and suffering the effects of disruptions in fetal development. And having to sit down and 'learn from it'.</p> <p>Wherever there are moments where we are tasked with learning from disasters, one always discovers the people who were there, warning directly of the risks, at the time. The 'learned from' is already previously known and there are individuals desperately trying to alert.</p>
--	--	---



## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>And we have the opportunity to pause these mistakes with immediate effect and avoid being in a terrible situation in a few years time desperately trying to end a contract and decommission it and counting down the days until we can end this environmental elephant and start claiming back our health and climate promises.</p> <p>And to only just begin the journey to come into line with the UK and COP26 goals in twenty five years, from a bigger deficit. It'll be awful.</p> <p>Or, we can be many years into our commitment to CO2 neutral, certainly aim sooner than 2050 as is Wales' ambition, and have avoided a generation worth of pollution failures and pulmonary, cardiac, brain and neurocognitive problems, and other diseases in nearby Castleland, Cadoxton and across our whole town of Barry.</p> <p>Which brings me to the sites of the meteorological modelling.</p> <p>Modelling</p> <p>What is the rationale for not taking wind dispersal and topological information from Dock View Road, Millennium Way, Holton Road..? Anywhere actually close by, relevant, at risk, and of the right topography?</p> <p>Absurd laziness and skewing, to take it at a high plateau, 7 miles west, sticking out to sea.</p> <p>We should have been modelling, years ago, in the area this plant was submitting to operate. It would have been apparent, immediately, this project doesn't fit.</p> <p>This should have been carried out, and no further polluting developments should ever be considered again for this area without it being carried out, due to important geographical factors and current air quality already relating to the Docks and to Barry itself.</p> <p>The Vale of Glamorgan monitors currently already show PM2.5 levels exceeding safety guidelines.</p> <p>But there are already chemical plants (Dow, etc) emitting PM2.5, ships burning sulphurous fuel, traffic emissions (including diesel buses and lorries) in Barry. There is absolutely no spare capacity for Biomass to add to PM2.5 emissions.</p> <p>The long-term health consequences are dire, and adding to the town's PM2.5 load over the 25 years of an incinerator would entirely undo the work of the Welsh Government Future Generation pledges.</p> <p>Barry is also well above NO2 guidelines. WHO's new AQG have been slashed from 40 to 10mg/m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>We're simply maxed out with emissions. This was just a terrible idea.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I reject that you can write your own statement on a retro-fitted EIA that leaves half of the issues out and still expect it to be legitimate.</p> <p>The deadlines missed should exclude this development from any further steps. Enough.</p> <p>The repeated missed deadlines support that we need to show no more patience and favours for this failed project. It needs no further consideration.</p> <p>Biomass excluded themselves already. This would not stand for any other planning applicant. Any domestic applicant would be expected to start applications over and any lawless structure they might have built would require to be disassembled .</p> <p>This is really rather simple.</p> <p>This project doesn't adhere to regulations... It's been unlawfully built and unlawfully permitted.</p> <p>I don't trust this developer with the interests and welfare of Barry.</p>
--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>The developer cannot be trusted to do any further work properly after all evidence of their fudging and evading. I don't trust them with our health. Repeatedly building things unlawfully and removing them when found out, then shirking the final planning requirements and dodging requests altogether until their actual timer ran out. By now this should be in the ground. These are not the people to assess or consult on matters pertaining to the wellbeing of the town. They have hidden everything they can from public scrutiny until forced, every time. How many times must they prove that they repeatedly can't be trusted, fail to comply and want special dispensations when they are unlawful or seven years late? This project should not be seen to go another day. What is legal is the Vale of Glamorgan Council ruling the plant should be torn down because of consistent recurrent planning irregularities. Unanimously. It's about the first true, decent and honest action to have arisen up until now, and it is welcomed. The developers didn't comply, and gave up submitting evidence to the contrary, even when reminded. It ended. End date was missed. This should be acted upon. Planners were utterly right to issue this order and, from here on in, we must stick wholeheartedly with the right thing. This plant is not the right thing. Not for this part of the country and no longer in the UK future. And they have helped prove this themselves with their constant flouting and clear disassociation from decency and integrity.'</p>
351.	17/01/2022	Website	'I totally object to this going ahead.'
352.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
353.	17/01/2022	Email	'I object.'
354.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to the Aviva/Biomass incinerator in Barry for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The incinerator poses a threat to the health of the people of Barry and the surrounding areas. It will pose a threat to the health of future generations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The incinerator will emit poisons, such as Dioxins, Chromium VI and particulate matter. I do not accept that these will be monitored and kept 'within safe levels'. The World Health Organisation states there are NO safe levels.</li> <li>• The All Wales COPD Management and Prescribing Guidelines provides a checklist for clinicians to consider when assessing the likelihood of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in patients. Second on the COPD likelihood checklist is exposure to biomass fuel burning, other noxious fume exposure and pollution. Given these facts, there is no doubt that the incinerator is a threat to the health of the people of Barry and the surrounding areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) The incinerator is a threat to the environment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon dioxide emissions are the primary driver of global climate change. It is widely recognized that, to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, the world needs to urgently reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The incinerator will emit 150,000 tonnes per year. This is not compatible with the need to reduce CO2 emissions.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wales has the most polluted air in the UK. There are already high local levels of pollution. It is know there will be increased traffic from lorries delivering waste wood to the incinerator. This additional traffic will also increase air (and noise) pollution. Given the above, the incinerator is a threat to the environment.</li> </ul> <p>3) The incinerator was built unlawfully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The incinerator was built without full planning permission, The finished structure is not in accordance with the plans submitted.</li> <li>The incinerator was given a permit by Natural Resources Wales before construction was completed and before safety tests were carried out. NRW also issued the wrong permit.</li> <li>The Welsh Government has confirmed to the Vale of Glamorgan Council that the incinerator does come under Schedule 1 of the planning EIA regulations so legally requires an Environmental Impact Assessment. The incinerator was built without the legally required Environmental Impact Assessment and is currently subject to an Enforcement Notice issued by the Vale of Glamorgan Council. Given the above, the incinerator was built unlawfully.</li> </ul> <p>It is the first responsibility of government in a democratic society to protect and safeguard the lives of its citizens. I expect the Welsh Government to meet this first responsibility and protect us from the harm the incinerator will cause by upholding the law. Their responsibility is to the people of Barry not to Aviva investors.</p> <p>On October 8<sup>th</sup> 2021, The United Nations Human Rights Council adopted a resolution recognising that the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment is a human right. I expect the Welsh Government to stand up for and defend the human right of the people of Barry to live in a safe, clean and healthy environment.</p> <p>To conclude: I object to the Aviva/Biomass incinerator in Barry.</p>
355.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'Barry Athletic Football Club object to this facility. We provide football for over 200 local children less than a mile from the plant and do not want to be inhaling waste that is pumped into the air.'</p>
356.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I am objecting to the information contained in this voluntary Environmental impact assessment. But firstly I would like to stress the point that even the 'non scientific' information is not easy to understand for members of the public trying to object to this proposal. The information must be clear for all people to understand, we need to be clear on what threat there is to our existence and the air we breathe, we can only do this if the information is written in a way that a lay person can understand, otherwise there is no point to this consultation?</p> <p>The data relates to historic weather information that does not relate to the site of the incinerator or the climate in Barry and particularly the low lying docklands area.</p> <p>The EIA states that the incinerator fits in with its current surroundings. It plainly doesn't! it's an unsightly giant grey box and is no way aesthetically pleasing even in what was an industrial landscape, it does not fit in with the now 2,000 new homes or the previous industrial buildings.</p> <p>The data does not give a true picture of the damage the emissions give to humans and animals or flora and fauna. Dioxins/furans have the potential to be transported long distances and deposited far away from their place of release. The NRW needs to ask for sufficient information to fulfil their POPs obligations, which concern not just local limits but require the applicant to show they have Due to the</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>poor air quality and health in this area It would be reasonable to say that for the most highly polluted place in wales the monitoring is insufficient. The EIA does not meet the ‘no health harm’ requirement under waste-planning, mapping of the highest modelled NO2 1-hour levels is needed. Mapping the 18th highest level in each grid-square as Entran do (ignoring the 17 higher ones), is relevant just for meeting the AQS limits, which are now accepted to encompass health-harm to vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Entran modelling is unacceptable for assessing impacts</p> <p>This assumes winds that differ strongly from those experienced at Barry, ignoring coastal effects and failing to give worst-case 1-hour NO2 mapping makes their results quite unreliable. The failure to assess uncertainties, even in their own terms, goes to confirm the unprofessionalism. The results cannot be used with an uncertainty factor even as high as 10.</p> <p>With the rising rate of asthma and deaths linked to air pollution and since finding out that there are other external air pollution factors such as the dust from the wood store. Do you consider fast roller shutter doors an adequate means of containment considering their will be 15 lorries in then out over the space of 12 hours Monday to Saturday 8 hours Sundays?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Will the accelerated motion of the roller shutters, stir up the particulate matter (dust) causing further circulation of the Toxins?</li> <li>· How much of an effect will the movement of vehicles in and out of the Fuel Reception Building have on the circulation of toxic particulate material or dust?</li> <li>· Residents would be exposed at least 60 pulses of carcinogenic wood dust in a working day averaged every 12 minutes, Sundays every 8 minutes.</li> <li>· On Sundays will there be the same amount of fuel delivered in a shorter space of time?</li> <li>· Does this require more specific assessment for this operational activity?</li> <li>· These key receptors are not affected by the pollution plume but by the threat of the sites operational activities why has this not been taken in to account?</li> <li>· Could you say without reasonable doubt that there will not be significant harm to health form the operation of the Barry Biomass Incinerator?'</li> </ul>
357.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
358.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object to this, it's ridiculous.'
359.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
360.	17/01/2022	Email	'As residents of Barry Island with 2 young children we object to the incinerator and any suggestion that it should not have an EIA.'
361.	17/01/2022	Website	'As a Barry resident, I wish to express my consternation at the conduct of the biomass company who have not followed rules and the environmental impact of industrialisation in what is primarily a residential area.'
362.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object to this pollution being imposed on our town and on future generations of children.'
363.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object on the grounds that it will cause untold harm to the health of the residents of this town. Children in particular, are affected by pollution and it is our duty to look out for the health of our children. This incinerator is inappropriate and NOT a green source of energy.'
364.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
365.	17/01/2022	Email	'The development is an EIA Development within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Wales) Regulations 2017 as confirmed by Planning and Environment Decisions Wales in their letter to the company of the 13th January 2022. I understand that as such a mandatory Environmental Statement is required.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>In my submission on the Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement I would like to start by restating my ongoing objection to the siting of the Biomass Incinerator at every stage of the planning process and consultation. I have been contacted by local residents who have listed health and safety as well as environmental and practical concerns throughout the application process for planning and licencing permission for Barry Biomass, particularly since construction began in 2016. I have outlined concerns below in response to the consultation regarding the environmental statement for the Barry Biomass plant.</p> <p>Health and safety concerns</p> <p>Concerns have been continuously raised regarding local residents being at risk from releases of particulate matter and micro-organisms.</p> <p>The site is very close to a residential area and a busy train station which is a cause for great concern given that the pathway for bioaerosols is air transport leading to inhalation.</p> <p>From the outset there have been failures to meet environmental and health and safety requirements. Concerns have been raised that a fire tank and other safety measures have been built after testing began and it became clear that they were required despite local people being informed all requirements had been satisfied before testing.</p> <p>There have been incidences of black smoke being reported by local people since construction began and testing commenced which I have also witnessed.</p> <p>I continue to question how the risk can be mitigated by a dust management plan with the proximity of the site to a populous residential area. In addition to the release of polluting materials to the air (smoke or fumes, dust and bioaerosols), there is potential for release of pollutants via water or land.</p> <p>There is a clear risk of dust nuisance as dust could be deposited on cars and clothes in the local area. The application notes a risk of noise nuisance. The local population has been subject to disturbances from the adjacent site in the form of ongoing light pollution, dust, noise, smoke and increase in traffic. Strong wind and dry weather will increase the likelihood of dust from the site causing a disturbance.</p> <p>Traffic pollution concerns</p> <p>Alongside local residents I am concerned about the potential increase in traffic in the area. This will lead to increased levels of pollution and noise in the area and could cause disturbance to the local residents. There are also concerns that increased volumes of traffic could impact on commuters from HGVs in particular.</p>
--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>Noise and light pollution</p> <p>There are concerns regarding disturbance to the local population with regarding to noise and bright lights. I understand that noise from onsite vehicles will be 24/7 which presumably means floodlights will also be operational 24/7. I have received complaints from local residents about the light and noise pollution since construction began.</p> <p>The documents note:</p> <p>The operational Biomass site has approximately 17 - 20 staff. The site is operational on a continuous 24/7 basis with deliveries, loading and unloading activities generally carried out between 07:00 – 19:00 Monday to Friday, and in accordance with the stipulations of Condition 24 of the 2015 Planning Permission<sup>10</sup></p> <p>Concerns regarding the consultation</p> <p>There is wide public concern regarding the Biomass Plant. Local people have lost trust in the company.</p> <p>The documents note:</p> <p>Since the commencement of the construction of the site in 2016, a number of environmental concerns have been raised by the public concerning the environmental and health impacts of the development. 1.6 As such, the Owner has agreed with a request from the Welsh Government to prepare this statement with a view providing an objective account of the likely significant environmental effects of the Biomass Facility by setting out the results of the EIA which has been undertaken of the 'As-Built' development. It is intended to provide the Welsh Government with sufficient information to evaluate the likely significant environmental effects of the Biomass Facility having due regard to the protection of the local amenity and the environment as a whole.</p> <p>Local people have not been reassured that the significant environmental impact in such close proximity to a residential area has been mitigated and concerns remain that a site so near a residential area is inappropriate for such a development.</p> <p>The documents notes:</p> <p>The effects of the Biomass Facility have been assessed throughout the ES based upon what has been constructed and is currently existing. For example, pre-construction information and the associated impacts have been specifically excluded at the request of the Welsh Government on the basis that they have already occurred and there is no longer any potential to change, modify or make adjustments as a result of this assessment.</p>
--	--	--	---

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>Given the long term and ongoing concerns of local residents and representatives I am concerned that the statement suggests that there is no scope for change if concerns have not been addressed.</p> <p>It also notes that:</p> <p>The measures that have been incorporated into the design which either reduce or avoid adverse environmental effects arising from the consented scheme and 'As-Built' development have been included as part of the project design.</p> <p>Further confirmation is needed that no expansion will be permitted and that previous safety and environmental concerns have all been addressed.</p> <p>I am concerned that the documentation provided by the company and published on the consultation website is incredibly lengthy and technical. Not all interested members of the public will have access to digital platforms to access this information and it is inaccessible due to the language and subject matter. This is an obstacle to meaningful consultation. I understand that there is a cost for accessing the documents in a different format.</p> <p>Ongoing concerns presented in 2017/18 which have not been resolved by the statement:</p> <p>1.1.1. AIR QUALITY</p> <p>(i) The Biomass Stack may discharge pollutants within the legal limit but I am concerned that these discharges will create a cumulative effect with existing industrial activity on the Docks Estate and along the A4055.</p> <p>(ii) The Welsh Government clearly states in its most recent guidance that there is no "safe" level of air particles.</p> <p>(iii) Barry residents remain sceptical of the readings and data offered by Biomass.</p> <p>(iv) I must emphasise that in the immediate vicinity of the Biomass Plant are the socially deprived wards of Castleland and Cadoc where health, education and employment levels are already low. Additional particles in the air will be damaging to the health of Castleland and Cadoc residents, their older people and children.</p> <p>(v) The Report by the Shared Regulatory Service (Cardiff, Bridgend and Vale Councils) expresses concern over air quality. Note that this Report is written by professional officers and can be accessed here.</p> <p>1.1.2. NOISE</p> <p>(i) Noise has been a feature of the construction of the Plant, which the Vale of Glamorgan Council has made efforts to curtail.</p> <p>(ii) I am not convinced that noise will not continue should the Plant become operational.</p>
--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>(iii) The Plant is likely to operate 24 hours per day with noise pollution caused by the arrival of HGVs and the opening and closing of the roller doors into the reception hall.</p> <p>(iv) During daylight hours, there will be 30 HGV deliveries of woodchip per day, making for (with return journeys) 60 HGV journeys along the A4055 and the A4231 daily.</p> <p>1.1.3. LIGHT POLLUTION</p> <p>(i) Light pollution is a constant source of annoyance to the residents of Dock View Road (and the terraced housing in and around the immediate hinterland of the Docks Estate). This can be attributed to construction; however, there are no guarantees that light pollution will not continue once the Plant is operational.</p> <p>1.1.4. TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND TRAFFIC EMISSIONS ALONG THE A4055</p> <p>(i) I remain extremely concerned that traffic congestion will emerge as a serious issue along the A4231, the A4055, Ffordd Y Mileniwm, Cory Way and David Davies Road. At a minimum, we can expect 60 HGV round-trip journeys along these routes.</p> <p>(ii) The Castleland and Cadoc Wards are among the most socially and economically deprived wards in Wales. As a result, educational achievement, health and employment levels are among the lowest in Wales. There is evidence also of high levels of respiratory problems in Castleland and Cadoc, and the addition of HGV emissions on a serious and sustained high level is of great concern.</p> <p>1.1.5. CHILDREN’S COMMISSIONER FOR WALES / OLDER PEOPLE’S COMMISSIONER FOR WALES</p> <p>(i) Both Professor Sally Holland (Children’s Commissioner) and Sarah Rochira (the former Older People’s Commissioner) share my concerns about the health and well-being of children and older people living in the Castleland and Cadoc Wards, and across Barry and the Vale of Glamorgan. These concerns have also been raised with the Future Generations Advisory Panel.</p> <p>1.1.6. CLIMATE CHANGE, FLOODING AND TIDAL SURGE</p> <p>(i) These are real concerns which Biomass UK No 2 does not appear to have written into its construction plans.</p> <p>(ii) Flooding and tidal surge pose considerable threat to the Plant and the repercussions are considerable in terms of fire risk and industrial spillage.</p> <p>1.1.7. PROXIMITY TO DWELLINGS</p> <p>(i) The Biomass UK No 2 Plant is being constructed in the heart of “Victorian” Barry.</p> <p>(ii) The Town of Barry was built in the 19th century to house the influx of workers who came to work on the Docks. The Barry Dock area of the town joined up the rural, medieval villages and hamlets of Barry, Merthyr Dyfan and Cadoxton. The</p>
--	--	--	--



## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

		<p>construction of Barry Docks created a thriving industrial landscape which ended the isolation of Barry Island and brought it within the urban development. At the end of the 19th Century and the early part of the 20th Century, Barry was one of the largest coal-exporting towns in the world, rivalling Cardiff for size and status. Trains bringing coal from the South Wales Valleys operated 24/7 and Barry Docks was a thriving centre of activity and industrial magnificence. The Town’s heritage and culture survive to this day, not least in the densely populated area of terraced housing in Barry Dock and Cadoxton. These are close-knit communities.</p> <p>(iii) Similarly, the brownfield site (“The Quays”) across redundant areas of the Docks Estate, has been developed by Taylor Wimpey, Persimmon and Barratt Homes and provides accommodation for 5000 new residents of Barry. At the same time, this development includes social housing of a high standard and in line with the Welsh Government Housing Quality Standard.</p> <p>(iv) The new estate is close to the Biomass UK No 2 Plant and will be affected by the noise, traffic, emissions and other inconveniences which will emanate from the Plant.</p> <p>(v) The Social Housing development, as the final stage of the Quays redevelopment of the Barry Docks brownfield site, will be erected a mere 200 metres from the Plant.</p> <p>(vi) Should there be an incident at the Plant (fire, spillage) the effect on the immediate hinterland will be serious. I have written to the Vale of Glamorgan Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Transport and Civil Protection asking for reassurances around the civil protection of the populace should an incident occur. However, it would appear that Civil Protection Plans will not be drawn up by the Shared Regulatory Service (SRS) (Cardiff, Vale of Glamorgan, Bridgend Councils) until the plant is fully operational.</p> <p>(vii) I will refer in more detail to the SRS Report later in this submission.</p> <p>1.1.8. BEST AVAILABLE TECHNIQUES (“BAT”)</p> <p>(i) This terminology has been a regular feature of the debate since it began.</p> <p>(ii) The concern is that we are entering a world of new, untested technology and Barry residents are (apparently) to be the experiment.</p> <p>(iii) In my meeting with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), held on 10th November 2017 at the Government Buildings in Llanishen (Cardiff), HSE admitted that the Department had set up a new policy function to examine the new technology which is emerging in Barry Docks and across the UK.</p> <p>1.1.9. DOMINO EFFECT</p> <p>(i) The Barry Docks Estate is home to the Chemical Industry; viz.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dow Silicones (formerly Dow Corning)</li> <li>• Hexion UK Ltd</li> <li>• The Bomar Quest is a chemical tanker which docks every 2 weeks; its cargo is unloaded onto trains which cross the docks estate en-route to Dow Silicones.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S and K Haulage; a haulage company immediately adjacent to the Biomass Plant whose cargoes often include dangerous substances and are parked up routinely next to the Biomass Plant, often (apparently) with load residue still present in the vehicles overnight.</li> </ul> <p>(ii) An incident at the Biomass UK No 2 Plant would create a “domino effect” across the docks estate with repercussions for the Quays Housing development and the terraced housing in and around the docks immediate hinterland.</p> <p>1.1.10. DISCHARGE OF INDUSTRIAL AND BIOLOGICAL EFFLUENT INTO THE DOCKS</p> <p>(i) This concern has been the subject of two papers written by the Docks Incinerator Action Group. These papers are entitled: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Release of Effluent from Biomass No2 in to CSOs</li> <li>• Release of Effluent and Surface Water from Biomass No2</li> </ul> <p>(ii) Both papers are articulate and well-researched and I am enclosing copies with this submission by way of evidence.</p> <p>(iii) I am concerned about the proximity to the Ocean Watersports Trust at The Mole (immediately adjacent to Asda), of which I am a Trustee.</p> <p>1.1.11. ADDITIONAL PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>(i) I was dismayed to discover that a second Planning Application had been submitted requesting an extension of the Plant’s curtilage to accommodate a car-park and also the construction of a water tower.</p> <p>(ii) The original drawings for the Plant indicated the presence of attenuation tanks to capture toxic fire-water in the event of a fire at the plant which would create run-off from hoses used by the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service. My understanding was that this toxic waste water would be tankered off the site for secure disposal. However, as a result of enquiries by Vale Councillors, it would appear that these attenuation tanks have not been constructed; hence the need to erect a water tower almost as an afterthought. The car-park is an obvious feature of a development such as this and it does not inspire confidence that the original design had not considered this.</p> <p>(iii) The water tower, if constructed, will create downwash, further affecting air quality.</p> <p>1.1.12. FIRE PREVENTION PLAN</p> <p>(i) There is continuing concern that the Biomass Fire Prevention Plan is not robust enough to cope with a serious incident.</p> <p>(ii) Woodchip fires deep in the centre of stored feed (at both sites) are difficult to detect.</p> <p>(iii) Access by South Wales Fire and Rescue continues to worry residents</p>
--	--	--	--

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>(iv) The August 2017 Capita Reports express these concerns and are cited as evidence in this submission.</p> <p>1.1.13. CIVIL PROTECTION PLAN</p> <p>(i) The Vale of Glamorgan Civil Protection Team says that it cannot produce an accurate Civil Protection Plan until the Biomass Plant is fully operational.</p> <p>2. THE WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS (WALES) ACT 2015</p> <p>2.1. I call for Public Services Boards created under the Act and the Public Bodies involved (e.g. NRW; Vale of Glamorgan; South Wales Fire and Rescue Service; Public Health Wales; Cardiff and Vale University Health Board) to examine the commitments in the form of Well-being Objectives that each PSB and Public Body has made to the 7 Well-Being Goals and the 5 ways of working.</p> <p>2.2. This approach could help to influence decisions by public bodies associated with the Biomass Plant on Barry Docks.</p> <p>I am copying this submission to the Minister for Climate Change, Julie James MS, the Cabinet Member for the Vale of Glamorgan Council and Barry Town Council.'</p>
366.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object to this EI statement and the whole eia process here as diag have been correct for 7 years about the eia requirement. The vale and Welsh govt have declared a climate emergency and co2 emissions are at the heart of this so 150,000 tons of co2 emissions is an insult to the public. I'm also not sure how this eia includes the east quay development which will now mean "receptors" are less than 80m to the stack rather than the 300m of dock view road.'</p>
367.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'In relation to the current consultation re the above, it is a matter of concern that the period of time allowed for responses is so short-particularly given the length of the technical documents which residents are being asked to consider. I am also very concerned that Welsh Government has not commissioned an independent Environmental Impact Assessment- something residents have been requesting for years.</p> <p>It is not clear what status the Enviromental Statement has in law and on that basis I have no confidence that its findings can be relied on.</p> <p>Wales experiences significant levels of air pollution and the area in which I live in Barry already has very poor air quality which is likley to get worse if the biomass plant is given permission to operate. This creates a potential risk for local children and those with underlying health risks, which the findings of the Environmental Statement do nothing to alleviate. The history of the construction and the subsequent behaviour of the company is such that it is hard to imagine anything can now be done to reassure residents that the facility does not pose a significant threat to health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The specific concerns I wish to raise are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The potential damage to health caused by emitted dioxins and particulate matter for which the World Health Organisation says there are no safe levels</li> </ul>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>- If the incinerator emits 150,000 tonnes of CO2 per year, how will this enable Welsh Government to meet its zero carbon commitments</p> <p>- Elements of the incinerator have not been built according to the plans submitted: this shows a complete lack of care for residents and has eroded any trust local people may once have had in the integrity of the company or their commitment to working within the required statutory framework.</p> <p>As a matter of urgency, I would ask Welsh Government to meet with local councillors and residents to hear their concerns and to commission an Environmental Impact Assessment.'</p>
368.	17/01/2022	Website	'The Biomass was built in completely the wrong place. There are other areas more industrial in nature that could have been used. How anyone thought that building this monstrosity in the middle of a residential area was a good idea, is beyond belief.'
369.	17/01/2022	Website	'The Appeal should be dismissed since there is no current EIA and it was not undertaken at the time of pre-construction. The enforcement notice should be upheld. A retrospective EIA is not democratic and cannot correct the wrong or erecting and running a plant outside the law.'
370.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'As a Barry resident, I feel that not enough consultation in relation to environmental impact has been carried out on this project - prior to its construction. Surely this should have been a planning restraint to be satisfied prior to commencement on site - rather than prior to occupation?</p> <p>Impact of the wind direction blowing the residual smoke on to the properties at Dock View Road should be made a priority as this is clearly a trajectory of impact.</p> <p>I vehemently object to the use of this building as a biomass waste site, and the environmental impact of constructing this to be unfit for purpose should be investigated.'</p>
371.	17/01/2022	Website	'Every step has been Let's see if we can get what we want by ignoring the rules everyone else has to abide by. Not a thought for the people who live in Barry. They didn't get the right planning they have tried to build without the water tanks and tried sneaking them in. No environmental report. Who is looking after our environment? The Welsh government should be but No one is standing up and saying This is not acceptable?'
372.	17/01/2022	Website	'Please register my objection to this plant on the basis of noise and air pollution. The is a large residential area in the near vicinity and several schools nearby.'
373.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We write this formal response to the Consultation on behalf of the named Councillors from the Conservative Group on the Vale of Glamorgan Council.</p> <p>Firstly, we note that this Statement is long overdue, having demanded a proper Environmental Impact Assessment for a number of years. Sadly, what the Developers have brought forward falls far short of the proper EIA that an application of this scale and significance demands. What worries us most is not that we have been forced to campaign for this for so long, but that it effectively represents the Developers attempting to mark their own homework. This Statement is not open and transparent and with public interest in the application so high, this is an issue of trust – a commodity in short supply after years of obfuscation and delay. From our point of view there are many different reasons to oppose the development, both objective and subjective, and we have always worried about the Applicants' claim that the Biomass Plant would be zero emission. This is simply not credible. You only have to look at the cost of wood versus the value of the energy that the plant will develop. It all implies that the quality of the wood will be of a</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>lower standard. Wood with paint, oil varnish, nails - and other issues. This is not going to be clean wood, and the impact on the health of Barry residents will be felt for all unfortunate enough to live beside it should it go ahead.</p> <p>From a subjective point of view as well, the fact that we still have this application hanging over us highlights the weakness of the Welsh Government's Future Generations &amp; Wellbeing Act. You only have to consider the location of the proposed incinerator; in the middle of a densely populated town with lots of young people, elderly people and people with respiratory conditions. And all the while it's in an area that the Vale council is seeking to make a focal point for investment &amp; regeneration. However, this is not the forum for a reiteration of our extreme concerns about the damage that the incinerator could cause if it is to go ahead. Instead, let us be clear that as a Group, we question the validity and legality of allowing the developers to undertake a voluntary retrospective Environmental Statement. This is a process that falls outside of the Welsh Government's EIA legislation, and is quite likely therefore to fall outside the scope of the law. We simply cannot endorse it.</p> <p>We also ask the Developers to make public the full Appendix 4.1, which has been removed from the documents which have been made public for our consideration – and which contains the full correspondence between the Developers and Welsh Government Ministers. We also share the Docks Incinerator Action Group's concerns that the possible impact of climate change and tidal surge that might flood the incinerator site has not been considered in this document. The owners themselves agreed in 2018 that flooding and tidal surge pose a plausible and significant threat to the plant, and the repercussions are considerable in terms of fire risk and industrial spillage. Furthermore, it is a known fact that the stack height calculation is inaccurate, as advised by Welsh Government experts.</p> <p>Above all, we have been asked to consider this statement in all of its 1000 and more pages, within a short space of time, which feels cynical in itself. We hope that the comments contained in this response will provide the developers – and indeed the Welsh Government - with food for thought. We believe that there is a broad public consensus of opinion on the proposed incinerator and we will be sharing this response with the Welsh Government, who we will be urging to reject the commissioning of this plant without a full EIA process having been undertaken. The developers cannot be allowed to creep this plant into full production without proper planning consent, and without ever having satisfied public concerns over the damage it could do to public health.</p> <p>Yours,  Cllr Vincent Bailey  Conservative Councillor for Dyfan Ward  Spokesperson on the Barry Biomass  Cllr George Carroll. Cllr Leighton Rowlands Cllr Vince Driscoll Cllr Steve Giffiths  Cllr Andy Robertson Cllr Rob Crowley Cllr Rachel Nugent-Fin Cllr Janice Charles Cllr Margurita Wright Cllr Stewart Edwards Cllr Gordon Kemp Cllr Andrew RT Davies MS Cllr Christine Cave'</p>
374.	17/01/2022	Website	'I object.'
375.	17/01/2022	Website	'Not only do incinerators emit substances known to be toxic, harmful and carcinogenic, they also release compounds which may affect people in ways we do not yet know or understand. I am a resident of Barry and very strongly oppose this proposal.'

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

376.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I'd like to formally document my disdain for the proposed attack on local human, environmental and economic health, that is the Biomass incinerator on Barry Dock.</p> <p>Beyond being a tremendous eye sore, this atrociously-placed-cancer inducer, will persistently spew toxic waste into our air once operational. As I'm sure you're aware, biomass combustion emits not only copious amounts of greenhouse gases - namely CO2 - but also umpteen deadly toxins into the atmosphere (pfpi.net; enegyjustice.net), several of which have the very real potential to cause cancer, and virtually all of said toxins may result in the development of other deadly illnesses in humans and animals alike. Since the intended use of this incinerator is biomass combustion, the people of Barry - and surrounding - will suffer continuous inhalation of the associated carcinogenic toxins and I fail to see how any governing body feels this is acceptable.</p> <p>Well documented scientific research highlights the adverse effects that fine particulate matter (PM10&gt;) has on the health of humans and animals. It is diabolical that it has been permitted for a biomass incinerator, that will release particulate matter lower than PM10 and PM2.5, to be situated in a densely populated town! The rate and magnitude of poisonous inhalation significantly increases with each incremental decrease of particulate matter below PM10 (arb.ca.gov). Ultimately meaning that PM2.5, and below, will undoubtedly decimate the health of our community. Further research has found that PM2.5 may alter the size and development of children's brains (USC.edu). As a young parent, I'm outraged that this mockery has been allowed to develop into a reality and I demand that action be taken to rectify the Welsh government's mistake.</p> <p>I refuse to sit idly by whilst this atrocity kills my community and I do not stand alone. The backhanded and outright illegal actions taken to erect this monstrosity, in our town, sickens every morally driven human when they're presented with the facts.</p> <p>I was under the impression that the word's governments had an obligation to protect the Earth, as well as the people that inhabit it? Do not add to the suffering of our town and our planet. The only justifiable recourse now, is to tear it down before it's too late.'</p>
377.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I most certainly object. It is an unwanted environmental hazard.'</p>
378.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'I have only just heard about this process - so I guess not adequately advertised. Anyway, as a lay person I will make some comments because I am totally against the incinerator for multiple reasons. I spent many weeks writing my concerns to Natural Rescources Wales. There was a lot not right about that whole process and I did not even have an email to say my submission had been received. I do not have many weeks to write this. But I am sure you will have had responses that outline the very real and significant worries about pollution, health, environmental risks, where this amount of wood will actually come from etc. I will have to let these submissions talk for me. As my children and grandchildren live and go to scool in Barry my Heart is in my objections to this incinerator.</p> <p>It is strange that this is called a voluntary environmental report. Everything I have researched suggests it was a legal requirement. It is also strange how the submission slips into "as built " as if this is entirely natural and acceptable. Surely these 10 deviations from planning make the planning permission nul and void.</p> <p>The submission states that The Nearest Residential Development is on Dock View Road and has several sections describing the various businesses around . It does also mention that there is a Waterfront development 200 metres to the West. This is not expanded. The photographs are ones that preceed this development. Dock View Road is much too close and will be exposed to the fumes etc. and there are houses being constructed right now that are much closer than that. PLease see above photo. Barry's New Waterside Adventure with the massive Incinerator right behind it. ( Why wasn't this made clearer in the report.) Most of these houses will be</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			<p>homes for families and children. They should not be exposed to the pollution of the incinerator - and such a monstrosity of a building as their view. This is madness. Our MP, Welsh Assembly Member and Council are all against this. The people of Barry have marched, petitioned, filled the Memo, written to everyone involved etc. Is Barry for its inhabitants and elected leaders? Or is it for a company who cant even stick to the planning permission it did receive.</p> <p>I wish I had more time to make a more detailed response. This development is negative for Barry in every way.'</p>
379.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I very very strongly object to this incinerator. It's Beggars belief that it was built in the first place in a highly populated area to begin with. Without planning permission I would add and without consultation with the people of Barry. It is an absolute Eyesore and it's spews out clouds of God knows what. It is going to fill the lungs of our children with filth. It was built far too close to housing and it should have been pulled down immediately. I cannot believe that the monstrosity is still there and I question how many palms were greased at the Vale of GlaMorgan council. It is completely toxic and must be destroyed immediately.'</p>
380.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object.'</p>
381.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'The Barry incinerator is a health hazard and an eye sore. The stack is the same hight as my house and garden. It's totally inappropriate for the site both because of the particulate matter and the fire risk. Please ensure the health of Barry residents by refusing any licenses for this incinerator. Thank you.'</p>
382.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'Don't agree shuldnever have been built.'</p>
383.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'This is a public consultation with a massive document full of technical details which nobody in their right mind can understand, even the non technical summary is deliberately written in the most confusing way. I can't comment on this so I object to it entirely until you can produce something the public can understand.'</p>
384.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'I object.'</p>
385.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'I would like to submit my comments towards the consultation on the Barry Biomass Voluntary Retrospective Environmental Statement.</p> <p>I understand that under Welsh Government legislation, the applicant is able to carry out a voluntary retrospective environment impact assessment. This may possibly be a satisfactory avenue to take on other large scale works, however in regards to the Barry Biomass Incinerator I believe this is no-where satisfactory.</p> <p>There have been numerous concerns raised regarding the incinerator for multiple years; campaigners have called out for a proper, independently led environment impact assessment. It would be in the applicant's interest to commission an independent assessment, as one that would address the public concerns and ensure transparency and impartiality. Since the applicant has not gone down the route of an independent assessment, it does not give myself the level of confidence that the incinerator will not do any harm to Dinas Powys, Barry and the wider Vale of Glamorgan.</p> <p>Therefore I must respectfully reject the commissioning of this plant without a full environmental impact assessment that is independently led.'</p>
386.	17/01/2022	Website	<p>'Two wrongs don't make a right.'</p>

## ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses

			The incinerator is like putting a car on the road with no MOT and driving it without a licence.'
387.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>'I object to this incinerator and consultation. I have been actively involved in fighting this incinerator since 2017 and even I had difficulty understanding the majority of the information in the non-technical summary. For residents and interested parties this is impossible to understand.</p> <p>I have doubts that the incinerator has the 3 attenuation tanks it needs, as every photo examined only shows 3 tanks instead of the 4 required on planning. This I believe, is because there was insufficient room to put 4 tanks in. This is an essential part of the site and operations, as they are needed for water run off if there is a fire, and calculations would have been done to show that 4 tanks were needed.</p> <p>The site is too small for operation, as has been seen by residents who have seen the fire water tank taken down and then put back up again, and the lorries delivering wood having to use ground to turn round on, which is not part of the incinerator site according to the planning permission in place.</p> <p>The site has also been built as a mirror image of the plans, there are various add ons and buildings in place that aren't on the plans, and the extra land being used as part of operations, doubles the size of the site, again without planning permission.</p> <p>Residents close to the site have suffered from light pollution from the numerous spotlights on site. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>The dimensions for the stack are numerous and vary greatly over different documents. This makes it impossible to calculate the level of emissions from the stack accurately. With residents due to live within 100 metres of the incinerator, it is vital that pollution levels are kept to a minimum, but no-one knows what they'll be.</p> <p>We have already been told by a member of staff at the site that there was 5 minutes of black smoke when the incinerator started up when in fact it was closer to a month, so it doesn't give residents much hope that our children and loved ones are going to be protected from PM1.5, PM10 and NO2 by the operators.</p> <p>With COP26 and Climate change being at the forefront of global and WG conversations, it is time that someone in WG stood up and said that this incinerator is in the wrong place and needs to be taken down, to protect our future generations.'</p>
388.	17/01/2022	Email	<p>I wish to object to the findings of the EIA as published.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that the Biomass plant is in the wrong location as it is too close to residential properties and is remote from the source of fuel.</p> <p>To say that this development will reduce vehicle movements may be correct in the big scheme of things but in the area in which it is situated this is just not true, the same lorry movements will be created as if the waste was going to landfill. If the plant was not there, there would be far less vehicle movements in the Barry area.</p>



**ATISN 15969 – Barry Biomass Consultation Responses**

			Councillor John Thomas, Vale of Glamorgan Council.
--	--	--	--