

# Appendix 14.2

## Consultation Responses



## **Appendix 14.2 – Consultation Responses**

### **Comments received via the telephone information line**

The telephone information line, 0845 300 4430 was provided to help ensure that Staffordshire County Council was open and honest regarding the proposed EfW. To date (4<sup>th</sup> March 2008), 52 calls have been received, they have broached the following topics:

#### **Air Quality**

One gentleman was particularly concerned about the Four Ashes site due to the fact that there is already a 'chemical burning' facility on the Four Ashes Industrial Estate. He stated that residents were told 29 years ago, that the incineration site had a limited life. The council used to monitor the pollutants in the air but have now stopped. He would like this to resume – he would like monthly estimates of air pollution, with exact levels, and figures.

Other callers wanted information about the waste gases that would be produced, most specifically; what will be done with them, what level of air pollution will there be, and why have Penkridge residents not been informed? One caller stated, Methane will have to be burned (producing CO<sub>2</sub>). They requested information on dioxin emissions.

(3 calls in total on air quality)

#### **Traffic**

In general callers were concerned about the route that traffic would take to and from the site. Some callers were concerned about the capacity of the junction where Station Road meets the A5. Other callers were concerned about the tight bend immediately westbound of the canal bridge. Local residents were also concerned about the surface of Vicarage Road and its junction with the Straight Mile.

One caller, a lorry driver who lives on Vicarage Road, pointed out that it was already the scene of a lot of accidents, some of which had included fatalities. The suggestion was that there needs to be some work done to the junction with the A5 to allow the lorries to turn out of Vicarage Road. Traffic lights would be the best option.

(5 calls in total on traffic)

#### **Positioning of the site**

Callers wanted to know the exact position of the site, with grid references.

(3 calls in total on the site position)

#### **Compensation**

Callers asked if there was compensation available due to the effect the facility will have on house prices.

(2 calls regarding compensation)

### **Requesting briefing packs/further information** (including on surgeries)

(8 calls in total)

#### **The waste**

Callers enquired as to what tonnage of waste will come from outside the county? They asked why Staffordshire proposed to take waste from other counties? If Staffordshire did not then could the county build a smaller plant? Are we charging West Midlands for burning their waste?

(5 calls)

Other calls were primarily regarding the surgeries.

### **Comments received via emails and written correspondence**

A dedicated email address was set up to provide a central point of enquiry for members of public to contact. A number of emails were received, the details of which are summarized below:

#### **Recycling**

One email was received on recycling.

#### **Progress update**

One email was received asking to be updated on progress being made.

#### **Further Information**

Four emails requesting further information were received.

#### **Jobs and employment**

One email asked if their company could tender for the running of the facility.

Two offers of CVs for workers at the facility were received.

#### **Questions from Hatherton Parish Council meetings**

The Parish Council clerk forwarded questions from the meeting, these questions were varied and included references to traffic and access, the rationale for the public communication 4km radius, impact on wildlife habitats and energy generation.

#### **Traffic**

Two emails were specifically regarding traffic problems.

### **Comments received at the surgeries**

During the initial phase of consultation a number of surgeries were convened around Four Ashes. These events gave local residents the opportunity to meet with senior officers responsible for the proposed EfW facility.

The main issues raised at these surgeries involved issues related to the potential impact on traffic flows to and from the Four Ashes site. In particular, residents who live near to the junction of Vicarage Road and Straight Mile were concerned about:

- ◆ the speed of traffic travelling through or past this junction
- ◆ the quality of the road surface in front of their properties
- ◆ the impact heavy good vehicles might have on the structural integrity of their properties.

One resident, who lives closest to the Four Ashes site, also raised particular concerns about the visual impact of the proposed EfW facility.

Stakeholder consultation will continue once the planning application has been submitted to ensure the proposed EfW facility continues to be delivered in an open and transparent manner.