

Sarah Jane Smith
The Editor
Shropshire Star
Ketley,
Telford,
TF1 5HU

25 August 2010

Recorded delivery package number AG 6614 0619 5GB

Dear Ms Smith,

Harlescott incinerator irregularities which should be reported:
❖ **IPPC permit illegally issued by Environment Agency**
❖ **Shropshire County Primary Care Trust and Shropshire Council both fully aware that Professor Rod Thomson has been misled by the Health Protection Agency on the health impact of the Harlescott incinerator**

Clause 2 of the NUJ Code of Conduct includes this sentence, which is applicable to the Harlescott incinerator issue:

“He/she shall strive to eliminate extortion, news suppression and censorship.”

The wrongful banning of my “letters to the editor” by your deputy editor, Jon Simcock, has prevented me from alerting both Councillors and your very wide readership from being made aware of the full facts relating to Harlescott incinerator. The censorship exercised by that ban has undermined the integrity of Local Government by preventing Councillors and their electors from being made aware of the health effects of the Harlescott incinerator.

“Your Officers and Councillors cannot be expected to make a correct decision on the Harlescott incinerator unless relevant health and mortality data is carefully examined and understood. The Council has opted for an unsafe and expensive method of waste disposal when they knew about the safer alternative of plasma gasification over five years ago in January 2004.” (last paragraph of my letter of objection to Shropshire Council , 27 April 2009)

Liane Auliffe, from the Environment Agency, has admitted that they have received no letter from either the Shropshire County PCT, or the Health Protection Agency regarding the health effects of the Harlescott incinerator. This means that the IPPC permit has been improperly issued to Veolia. The Environment Agency do have a copy of Dr Rob Carr’s letter to Shropshire County PCT (21 April 2009), but that’s the Health Protection Agency’s advice to the PCT, which appears not to have been adopted or endorsed in any letter to the Environment Agency according to the FoI documents I’ve received from both the Environment Agency and the Shropshire County PCT.

The enclosed documents show that the Environment Agency, Shropshire Council and also Shropshire County PCT are all fully aware that the Health Protection Agency has given false advice to Shropshire County PCT on the health effects of incineration.

If you've not got a copy of the ten-page letter of 21 April 2010 from Dr Rob Carr (Health Protection Agency), to Dr L MacHardie, who was Director of Public Health at Shropshire County PCT, I'll be willing to supply the remaining 8 pages, but the enclosed pages 1 and 10 are sufficient to show that the Primary Care Trust was expected to monitor health effects and, if so, then similar advice would have been given to other PCTs around the country which **should** have enabled them to see for themselves the adverse health effects of incinerators in their areas and also to check data around other incinerators – just as the Health Protection Agency had promised to do in August 2003. (see “Chemical danger testing”, Western Daily Press, 6 August 2003)

I've no recollection of whether or not the Shropshire Star reporting the written reply to the Parliamentary Questions by Paul Holmes MP regarding the written reply to the Parliamentary Questions by Paul Holmes MP (Hansard, 30 November 2009, Column 539W), but it's extremely important for the Harlescott incinerator issue on which Councillors are due to vote on 1 September 2010.

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmhansrd/cm091130/text/91130w0038.htm>

Incinerators: Health Hazards

Paul Holmes: To ask the Secretary of State for Health (1) what recent assessment his Department has made of the effect on public health of emissions from a functioning incinerator; [302956]

(2) with reference to the answer to the hon. Member for Lewes of 17 September 2007, *Official Report*, column 2209W, on infant mortality: incineration, what recent assessment his Department has made of the correlation between the presence of a functioning incinerator and the incidence of infant mortality in that area. [302957]

Ann Keen: The Department has made no recent assessments of the effect on public health of emissions from incinerators, or the effects on infant mortality.

The health protection agency (HPA) recently reviewed the latest research on the impact on health of emissions to air from modern municipal waste incinerators and published a statement in September 2009. It concluded that, while it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects completely, any potential damage from modern, well-run and regulated incinerators is likely to be so small that it would be

undetectable. The advice is available on the agency's website at:

www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1251473372175

The HPA also advised that studies of public health around modern, well managed municipal waste incinerators are not recommended, since any possible health effects are likely to be small.

I've enclosed a copy of my 3-page letter of 20 August 2010 to Professor Rod Thomson, Director of Public Health, Shropshire County PCT and also the letter from Professor Rod Thomson to Malcolm Bell at Shropshire Council, in which Professor Bell effectively tells the Council that there's be no adverse health effects.

Also enclosed are my 4-page letter of objection to Shropshire Council dated 27 April 2009 and my 3-page letter of objection to the Environment Agency dated 18 March 2009 – both letters relating to Harlescott incinerator.

Unless your London correspondent was outside the House of Commons on 7 November 2001, you'd be unlikely to have a photograph of me holding a placard saying "HAPPY TO HARM YOU" – as part of an anti-incinerator lobby.

I've enclosed a copy here, together with the press release that Alan Dalton (an Environment Agency Board Member until December 2001) wrote for the launch of his tabloid magazine "DIRT" in 2002. Note the message on the rubber stamp in the cartoon. No changes there!

He was appalled at the way the Environment Agency brushed aside health concerns of those living near landfill sites and incinerators as seen from his report ("Just who do the Environment Agency protect?". August 2001) to Michael Meacher, and which also names me in the "stress" case study.

If Alan Dalton had lived (he died December 2003), he'd have made sure that the £500,000 or so spent by the Environment Agency on the "Steve Evans" stress case (started 13 Feb 2001, ended at Employment Tribunal remedy hearing 24 November 2004, reported by Dan Slee, who was in court with Steve Evans & myself that day) would have led to criminal proceedings as SABC's Andy Goldsmith failed to follow-up his "smacked wrist" sentence on the failure of the EA to comply with health & safety legislation:

<http://www.no-incinerator.org.uk/Environment%20Agency%20report.htm>

Just Who Does the Environment Agency

Protect?

A Report of Environment Agency Board Member Alan Dalton
to
The Minister for the Environment - Michael Meacher MP

August 2001.

"As the Environment Agency becomes, as we hope it will, a more effective and confident organisation, we fully expect that it will start to say things which the government may not want to hear.".....continues

Your newspaper can report that I've written to Professor Rod Thomson to let him know that he's been misinformed by the Health Protection Agency and that I've asked him to withdraw his letter of 8 April 2010 to Malcolm Bell at Shropshire Council.

You can also report that both the Environment Agency and Shropshire Council have both been made aware, via my letters of 18 March 2009 and 27 April 2009 respectively, that the Health Protection Agency were wrong to claim that incinerators **'do not pose a significant threat to public health'** (Daily Mail, 5 September 2009) The HPA were wrong because they've not examined any relevant data in electoral wards around any incinerator.

Daily Mail: Incinerators cleared of cancer link

Daily Mail, The (London, England) - Saturday, September 5, 2009

Readability: 11-12 grade level (Lexile: 1270L)

Author: Sean Poulter

INCINERATORS for household rubbish are likely to be built on sites across the country after health watchdogs rejected claims that they are 'cancer factories'.

The Health Protection Agency has concluded that the plants, where waste is burned to create energy, 'do not pose a significant threat to public health'.

The news will wreck efforts by residents' groups, MPs and health campaigners, who have been fighting plans to build **incinerators** on sites around Britain.

....continues

I've also enclosed copies of:

1. Big Issue in the North article "Incinerator health risks denied", 26 April-2 May 2010

2. Carlisle Gazette article “Healthy concern”, 29 July 2010
3. Runcorn Weekly News “Incinerator health fears: Researcher claims emissions from burning waste can cause increase in child deaths”, 8 April 2010.

You can see the above three articles, plus other relevant material in the window of Wild Thyme Wholefood shop, Castle Gates, Shrewsbury.

I e-mailed Daniel Kawczynski a copy of my letter to Professor Rod Thompson, plus some back-up information to confirm what I’d written. I’ve not yet had any reply from him, or from Professor Thomson.

I’m sure that you’ll agree that it’s in the public interest that readers of your newspaper are aware that Councillors have been wrongly advised on the health effects of the proposed Harlescote incinerator – and that they are made aware of this fact prior to the planning meeting on 1 September 2010. If you think I’ve been a bit harsh on your paper at the end of my letter to Professor Rod Thomson, take a look at some of the score or so newspapers that have reported my research – while yours has chosen to stay silent. It’s unlikely that the Press Complaints Commission will decide that the others were all wrong and that the Shropshire Star “got it right”.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Ryan