**PLANNING APPLICATION NO: LCC/2022/003**

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND ERECTION OF PURPOSE-BUILT BUILDING (AND ANCILLARY STRUCTURES) TO HOUSE HIGH TREATMENT FACILITY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF MEDICAL WASTE.**

**FROM SIMONSWOOD PARISH COUCIL**

**RE: ATKINS report dated 28 September 2022**

Firstly we would like to make it known that SPC consider that this report should have been made available to the Planning Committee for their information and consideration prior to the ORIGINAL Planning Meeting. Although we are not technically trained in the aspects of this report we find it very disturbing that there are so many negative comments in the conclusion of this report. We are dealing with the health of residents here and surely answers should be in black or white??

We note in the column indicating ‘Actions proposed by Atkins’ , items 6 , 28, 29, 33 , 35 ,37 ,41 ,43 ,44 ,45, 48, 52, 57, 62, 70, 74, 78, 84 - That some of these actions have **not been carried out by Culzean** or they are highlighted as **‘refer to permitting’**. Do Atkins simply accept these answers?

On the conclusion page Atkins use this negative terminology: -

PARAGRPH 1 ‘**generally’** found’

PARAGRAPH 2 ‘**Most areas** that were identified for clarification’

PARAGRAPH 3 ‘**the Applicant states’**

PARAGRAPH 4 ‘**’effects are not significant’**

PARAGRAPH 5 ‘There are a few points which ‘**we suggest’** can be

 addressed at permitting stage …

PARAGRAPH 6 ‘**There is a question’** still over the suitability of data from

 older municipal waste/waste wood

 incinerators……….’**commonly accepted’** by the regulator

 in the absence of other data.

 ‘**the assumption’** can be supported with emissions

 monitoring data **, ‘once available’**

PARAGRAPH 7 ‘**This appears to be’** a common approach taken by some

 applicants and has been accepted by the regulator but

 means that the maximum concentrations in the local

 area have not been evaluated.’

PARAGRAPH 8 **‘This further check may be requested’** at the permitting

 stage by the regulator and LCC can comment further at

 that time’

PARAGRAPH 9 ‘The permit application should also describe other

 pragmatic measures such as how to ensure odours and

 dust are kept under control and how abatement

 equipment such as filters and scrubbers would be

 maintained ‘**so as to avoid cases of malfunctioning’**

PARAGRAPH 10 ‘**would be unlikely’** to make a material difference’

Whilst we appreciate that this report was commissioned and paid for with LCC ratepayers money we feel that it does not instil enough confidence to assure all the surrounding residents of this application that this will be a completely safe operation. There should be no doubt at all when considering the health and welfare of local residents.