

# **Your Voice In Europe: ROADMAP feedback for Waste to Energy Communication**

## **User's data:**

- Domain: Citizen
- Name: Jon Taylor
- Email: [jontaylor34@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:jontaylor34@hotmail.co.uk)
- Country: United Kingdom
- Headquarter: select
- Size: select
- Publication: can be published with your personal information

## **Related document: Waste to Energy Communication**

## **Feedback:**

*We are supposed to be working towards a circular economy; to put forward the burning of waste as the core of a proposal seems is a failure. This is not renewable energy. Both scientific research and the evidence of our senses tell us that burning waste is amongst the most inefficient form of energy we know; we should in no circumstances be burning waste unless there is absolutely no alternative. And there are alternatives.*

*But worse than that, building incineration plants only encourages the creation of waste to feed them as well as being a hugely expensive investment. What we should be doing is seeking ways to reduce waste and not rely on it to produce energy. You will I am sure be aware (and if you are not, you should be) that burning waste produces more carbon dioxide per megawatt of energy than any fossil fuel.*

*Products and materials contain vast quantities of energy which, if extracted and used through waste avoidance and re-cycling, can save more energy than burning waste can produce. The further advantage to this is that no extra greenhouse gases are emitted.*

*It is at the design stage that materials and non-recyclable waste should be eliminated. The Commission should be encouraging designers everywhere in the EU to consider how their work can be turned to eliminating waste by their products. Indeed, such thinking should be embedded in courses for designers in universities and colleges throughout the EU.*

*There is a curious paradox in the circular. By 2030 only about 30% of our waste should be incinerated; have you tested whether this level of incineration would produce a good return for investors ? I suspect not because it would not. In fact, the Commission should be discouraging members from giving permission for more incinerators to be constructed. Is it the case that there is more waste being produced than there are incinerators available to take it ?*

*But what would happen if member states burned all the non-recyclable waste ? They would produce 2% of our energy demand by 2020. Hardly an effective and efficient use of resources.*

*So how should we move forward ? First, the Commission should carry out an analysis – or even better should have such an analysis carried out by an independent body – on the current capacity of incineration plants. Until that analysis is available to the Commission, there should be a moratorium on the construction of all new waste-to-energy plants. Using that analysis as a base, the next step should be to produce plans to reduce the existing over-capacity of our current stock of incinerators.*

*Finally – and despite the considerable health and environmental concerns of local citizens, the roadmap nowhere mentions the role of civil society and local government in the list of stakeholders. We need badly more bottom-up work by the Commission. This certainly is not “Better Regulation”.*