



I am against the incinerator! Use modern technology that will not further pollute HK! Make HK a world class city instead of a garbage dump!

HomeSolutions Real Estate to: yspang

21/03/2014 16:19

Dear LEGCO,

I am against the incinerator! Use modern technology that will not further pollute HK! Make HK a world class city instead of a garbage dump!

There are Two key issues:

- 1) The exhausting of landfill sites in Hong Kong and the need for extension.
- 2) The need to reduce waste sent to landfill.

The IWMF Plan proposed does not in entirety solve any of the above key issues and would necessitate the need for Extension of Landfill. The use of a Mass Burn Incinerator (MBI) would only encourage an apathy for the need to reduce waste. The MBI will also send 1/3rd of what is burnt to landfill, It will also be costly to run due to the treatment and need to dispose of the fly ash. This MBI will be a financial burden on Hong Kong not only in initial costs but also running costs because no product is produced apart from small amounts of electricity.

All the data provided by the EPD has recently been proven to be false. The Recycling rates are false! Even the proclaimed prevailing wind direction is false (meaning there will be an impact on Hong Kong's air quality)! The statistics about the Incinerator are produced by engineers and sponsored by questionable links with a bank that supports the building of incinerators (I refer to the letter by Dr Martin Williams on the 27th February 2014 published in the SCMP). I therefore believe on closer inspection, what's claimed will also be false. Any Hong Kong Citizen can see through the data and therefore any Hong Kong Citizen can see this IWMF will be a mistake and I could argue a fatal one at that!

What do I propose:

I believe like everyone else, that a multi pronged attack on waste needs to be implemented. The biggest issue is organic (food) waste, some 50% of the daily waste Hong Kong generates. This waste is the first of a series of Reduce Reuse and Recycle initiatives that have been proposed by various parties. This would reduce Hong Kong's waste and would extend the life of the landfill sites. If this initiative alone was instigated in 2011, the council would not be voting on the need to extend landfill sites.

Recycling needs to be effectively implemented and increased. This would be done by bringing in a waste charging initiative already supported by the EPD. However it has only been a trial. The effect of the charging scheme would be similar to the levy on plastic bags. It would immediately gain support and the change in the output of waste and the amount of recycling would be significant. Also further negating the need for a vote on extension of landfill.

Finally "Gasification" needs to be considered as a way to reduce waste and tackle the landfill issue. The problem is the EPD's plan chooses

an incinerator (the wrong incinerator). It also chooses the wrong location. The EPD has tried to show that their proposed incinerator is the best choice with proven results. But too much research and submissions from other parties proves that it is not the best. The other better alternative has been proven in multiple countries all over the world. The alternative is Plasma arc or Gasification. These are not incinerators as the process is different. Please refer to the attached submission from The New Territories Concern Group (NTCG). This is far superior and will tackle the two key issues I raised above. It will reduce and even reclaim existing landfill sites with the ability to back mine MSW. It will provide no residue that needs to go to Landfill instead it will provide a harmless construction aggregate that currently Hong Kong imports. The benefits of Plasma arc and the proposal I suggest is included. Additionally there will be a benefit of no emissions compared with the (MBI) proposed by the EPD.

Thank you for leading and being able to see that there is a better way to handle HK's waste issues. Just because there is a plan, does not mean you have to implement it if it is a bad plan. Sometimes, you need to make a new plan. This is one of those times!

Kindest regards,

Kelly Merrick

--

HomeSolutions Real Estate Limited
Licence C-044849
Office +852 - 3483 5003
Fax +852 - 3483 7009
www.homesolutions.hk
property@homesolutions.hk

This email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete this email and all copies in your possession. The sender does not accept liability for any errors or omissions as a result of electronic transmission.



Re: I am against the incinerator! Use modern technology that will not further pollute HK! Make HK a world class city instead of a garbage dump!

Sharon HomeSolutions

to:

yspang

21/03/2014 16:52

Cc:

Sharon HomeSolutions

Hide Details

From: Sharon HomeSolutions

To: yspang@legco.gov.hk

Cc: Sharon HomeSolutions

Security:

To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

Dear LEGCO,

I have lived on South Lantau for over 15 years. It is an amazing place for my children but

I'm now concerned that this lovely area will be polluted and ruined for all the families who live here.

There are other ways! Let's not ruin such a beautiful place enjoyed by everyone in Hong Kong.

I am against the incinerator! Use modern technology that will not further pollute HK! Make HK a world class city instead of a garbage dump!

There are Two key issues:

- 1) The exhausting of landfill sites in Hong Kong and the need for extension.
- 2) The need to reduce waste sent to landfill.

The IWWMF Plan proposed does not in entirety solve any of the above key issues and would necessitate the need for Extension of Landfill. The use of a Mass Burn Incinerator (MBI) would only encourage an apathy for the need to reduce waste. The MBI will also send 1/3rd of what is burnt to landfill, It will also be costly to run due to the treatment and need to dispose of the fly ash. This MBI will be a financial burden on Hong Kong not only in initial costs but also running costs because no product is produced apart from small amounts of electricity.

All the data provided by the EPD has recently been proven to be false. The Recycling rates are false! Even the proclaimed prevailing wind direction is false (meaning there will be an impact on Hong Kong's air quality)! The statistics about the Incinerator are produced by engineers and sponsored by questionable links with a bank that supports the building of incinerators (I refer to the letter by Dr Martin Williams on the 27th February 2014 published in the SCMP). I therefore believe on closer inspection, what's claimed will also be false. Any Hong Kong Citizen can see through the data and therefore any Hong Kong Citizen can see this IWWMF will be a mistake and I could argue a fatal one at that!

What do I propose:

I believe like everyone else, that a multi pronged attack on waste needs to be implemented. The biggest issue is organic (food) waste, some 50% of the daily waste Hong Kong generates. This waste is the

first of a series of Reduce Reuse and Recycle initiatives that have been proposed by various parties. This would reduce Hong Kong's waste and would extend the life of the landfill sites. If this initiative alone was instigated in 2011, the council would not be voting on the need to extend landfill sites.

Recycling needs to be effectively implemented and increased. This would be done by bringing in a waste charging initiative already supported by the EPD. However it has only been a trial. The effect of the charging scheme would be similar to the levy on plastic bags. It would immediately gain support and the change in the output of waste and the amount of recycling would be significant. Also further negating the need for a vote on extension of landfill.

Finally "Gasification" needs to be considered as a way to reduce waste and tackle the landfill issue. The problem is the EPD's plan chooses an incinerator (the wrong incinerator). It also chooses the wrong location. The EPD has tried to show that their proposed incinerator is the best choice with proven results. But too much research and submissions from other parties proves that it is not the best. The other better alternative has been proven in multiple countries all over the world. The alternative is Plasma arc or Gasification. These are not incinerators as the process is different. Please refer to the attached submission from The New Territories Concern Group (NTCG). This

is far superior and will tackle the two key issues I raised above. It will reduce and even reclaim existing landfill sites with the ability to back mine MSW. It will provide no residue that needs to go to Landfill instead it will provide a harmless construction aggregate that currently Hong Kong imports. The benefits of Plasma arc and the proposal I suggest is included. Additionally there will be a benefit of no emissions compared with the (MBI) proposed by the EPD.

Thank you for leading and being able to see that there is a better way to handle HK's waste issues. Just because there is a plan, does not meet you have to implement it if it is a bad plan. Sometimes, you need to make a new plan. This is one of those times! Please think of our children and their future!

Warm Regards,

Sharon Christine Riley

HomeSolutions Real Estate Limited
Licence C-044849
Office +852 - 3483 5003
Fax +852 - 3483 7009
www.homesolutions.hk
property@homesolutions.hk



This email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete this email and all copies in your possession.
The sender does not accept liability for any errors or omissions as a result of electronic transmission.