Joe Reilly

From: John Outram <theresa.outram@gmail.com>
Sent: 28 November 2011 14:43
To: Licensing Staff
Subject: New submission entered for Reg no: W0140-04. (Reference Number: W0140-04-111128024252)
Attachments: John Outram.pdf

Importance: High

Title: Mr
First Name: John
SurName: Outram
Organisation Name:
Address Line 1: Greenfield Rathdrinagh
Address Line 2: Beauparc
Address Line 3: Navan
County: Meath
Post Code:
Phone Number: 0879746779
Email: theresa.outram@gmail.com

19

Brian Meaney EPA Inspector
Environmental Protection Agency Headquarters
Po. Box 3000
Johnstown Castle Estate
Co. Wexford

27 Nov 2011

Subject Panda Waste Service Ltd Licence Application ref no. W0140-04 (Application Review)

Dear Mr. Meaney,

We are extremely concerned about Panda Waste Services Ltd (Panda) proposals as detailed in application W0140-04. Panda regularly breach the terms of their existing licence W0140-03 and frequently cause serious disturbance including pollution which potentially has health impacts for my family and I.

For example, since the current licence was issued in March 2009, we have suffered sickening odours, noise and other environmental nuisances from the facility on a regular basis. In the period 2006 - 2010, Panda even sprayed large quantities of a chemical into the air to try hide the smell, this was actually worse than the smell of household waste coming from the facility. We don't know why Panda stopped spraying the chemical but thankfully they finally did in mid 2010 after many years of contaminating the air. Nobody knows the long term health effects of Panda actions, but only time will tell. However, the sickening odour pollution is still frequently emitted from the facility and is a constant torment on our lives.

Many of the children and some adults who live close to the facility suffer from respiratory problems such as asthma, which is linked to poor air quality. We do know the smell of rubbish contains many harmful chemicals but again we are helpless to do anything about it and have had to endure it for long periods and are at the mercy of the breeze which brings the odorous pollution into our home.

Panda regularly start operating at 5:00am (outside licensed hours) and continue working late into the night. Heavy machinery and other equipment can be heard making loud noises, revving engines and sharp banging noises. The heavy lorries entering and existing Panda's facility frequently wake up my family in the early hours. Panda do not stop working at the time specified on the current licence but continue working late into the night. The noise comes from operations at the licensed facility and not only the activates involving the garage as mentioned in the last licence review. Panda uses the side entrance to continue allowing waste handling lorries access to the licensed facility at various times after hours once the front entrance is closed.

The noise frequently wakens my family which results in children being exhausted, irritable and run down going to school. This has gone on for many years, the constant exposure impacts negatively on our health and wellbeing. This noise and after hours working problem was highlighted by a number of residents during the licence review of W0140-02 in 2007 and before, and again during many individual complaints, yet the situation has not improved.

Panda continue to ignore the Agencies licence requirements because they know the EPA will not be around to check compliance outside normal working hours and blatantly abuse the conditions of the licence.

During day time hours the situation is unfortunately no better, the noise coming from the facility is actually even worse. During the last licence review, incidents such as noise was blamed on background noise from the N2 which does emit noise but not at the constant high levels as those emitted from Panda's operations. Local residents have actually measured the noise from Panda's facility and found Panda's operations to be well over the licence limits, the information was submitted to the Environmental Enforcement Forcer. The background noise from the N2 was found to be well under the daytime licence noise limits.

Over the last few months the noise intensity and traffic from Panda site has dramatically increased to unbearable levels. It is extremely disturbing and we feel helpless to do anything about it, the same can be said about the sickening odours we also have to endure.

It's now over 2.5 years since Panda were issued the current licence, in that time, Panda have failed to install many of the critical pollution emission control systems specified within the current licence. For example, Panda have failed to install the critical negative air systems (condition 3.11.3) and Wetlands (Reed beds) for treatment of water runoff into the adjacent river, despite continuing to process odour generating domestic waste. Panda should not be granted permission to expand their already large operation because they have continuously failed

to honour the terms and conditions of the existing licence. They have demonstrated they not capable of safely containing the environmental nuisance and pollution from existing relatively simple waste handling processes compared with the considerable risks associated with the proposed new unproven technologies for which Panda have no previous experience

If Panda are granted a licence W0140-04, the following will result:

- Increased odour pollution from foul odorous operations involving Anaerobic Digestion of biodegradable MSW and other pre-processes from Shed 3 and Shed 1
- Increased noise pollution with no rest bit for local residents due to 24/7 operations
- Increased litter and vermin activity
- Increased traffic leaving and entering the facility at all hours with associated nuisance and safety risks.
- Increased toxic air pollution emissions from the Bio-mass furnace, CHP, RDF dryer, Shed 4, Shed 3 and other proposed processes
- Impacts to food safety, particularly local vegetable and diary food production in farm lands adjacent to the facility due the release of toxic substances and infectious disease emissions/releases, resulting from the incubation of pathogen contaminated municipal waste organic fraction within the 14 Dry Fermentation Anaerobic Digesters
- Risks to farm incomes and Irish food exports due to an infectious disease outbreak as a result of using high risk MSW feedstock for the Bio-gas facility (Shed 4) in an unsuitable rural agricultural area
- Impact health and safety of my family, neighbours, friends and the many families who live around the facility
- Potentially damage to the river Lougher beside shed 4, the Boyne River downstream and the fish that live within and other wildlife which depends on these rivers for contaminated waste water and chemical emissions
- Increase fire and explosion risks associated with Bio-gas production, Combined Heat & Power(CHP) and Bio-mass Furnace
- Impacts to tourism in the sensitive Boyne valley/Newgrange interpretive centre

We the local residents understand all too well, what will result from granting the licence because we have suffered regularly and are all too aware of Panda's poor track record at complying with their current licence. We who live close to the facility will be subjected to unfair disturbance and health risks if the licence W0140-04 is granted

We are also extremely disappointed that no environmental impact statement was sought or provided for an development of the scale proposed, in this high risk locate particularly involving new unproven technology. Panda proposals will emit several new pollution substances and potential infectious disease which pose grave health risk to my family and the local community

During the previous licence review W0140-03, Panda claimed in submissions to the EPA that there would be no significant environmental nuisance or pollution if granted licence W0140-03 in 2009. (See Application Documents for licence 140-03, letter stamped 18 Dec 2008 from Mr. Naughton on behalf of Panda)
Those claims made by Panda proved over the past few years to be entirely false and misguided. Panda are again wrong about their claims made regarding this licence current application (W0140-04) but unlike previously, the proposed developments involve far greater impacts/risks than associated with the existing licence, which involved only relatively simple waste handling operations.

We beseech the EPA to consider the new unproven technologies requested, the poor track record, the impacts to this rural agricultural food producing environment and the families who live close to the facility and refuse to grant the application 140-04, for above all, the seeks of our children

Yours Faithfully,