

URBASER BALFOUR BEATTY ADVOCATE MBT

MBT the better solution

What better advocate can there be for MBT than the applicant themselves? UBB, in their recent Planning Application to Essex County Council to build an MBT plant made the following statements[1]:

8.2 Part 2 Page 73	<p><i>“The mechanical processing facility will directly contribute towards materials recycling by removing those products from the waste stream that would otherwise be managed lower down the waste hierarchy;</i></p> <p><i>The biostabilisation process will facilitate mass loss through the aerobic treatment of the residual waste resulting in a Stabilised Output Material (SOM) or Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF). This process will significantly reduce the amount of waste material that will be managed further down the waste hierarchy through either recovery treatment or landfill. ”</i></p>
8.2 Part 2 p 74	<p><i>“The proposed solution diverts significant volumes of waste from landfill while maximising the amount of waste that can be recycled, and providing the opportunity for energy to be recovered from residual waste by generating a product which could be sent for energy recovery. As such the proposed solution is considered to be the most appropriate residual waste treatment option.”</i></p>
8.6 Part 2 p 78	<p><i>“The proposed development offers an integrated facility which will maximise the quantity of waste that can be reasonably recycled and minimise the quantity of waste sent to landfill. The output product will comprise either a Stabilised Output Material (SOM) that will minimise the quantity of</i></p>

	<i>material disposed of to landfill, or a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) that can be processed off site at a thermal treatment facility. The creation of SRF can provide clear benefits in providing a 'renewable' fuel supply that can assist in reducing carbon emissions and minimise the effects of climate change."</i>
--	--

These statements show that in UBB's opinion, MBT better meets the waste hierarchy because it recycles some of the waste and biostabilises the remainder, significantly reducing the amount of waste dealt with lower down the waste hierarchy in 'recovery'. UBB states that MBT is therefore *"the most appropriate residual waste treatment option"*, and we agree. Why is Gloucestershire proposing a less appropriate option?

The GCC commissioned report from Resource Futures "Composition analysis of kerbside residual waste, food waste, garden waste and dry recycling" shows that "there are significant amounts of paper and card and potentially recyclable plastics remaining in the residual waste stream". It states that up to two-thirds of Gloucestershire's residual waste could be recycled or composted. However, the incinerator would burn this waste as 'recovery' rather than sorting it for 'recycling', higher up the waste hierarchy.

This Javelin Park proposal should be refused on the grounds that it manages waste lower down the waste hierarchy than other alternatives, thus not meeting the Waste Framework Directive 2008, or the Vision in Gloucestershire's Waste Core Strategy in 3.34 that *"Opportunities for re-using, recycling and composting waste are maximised across all waste streams"*.

[1] <http://www.ubbessex.co.uk/planning-application>