

Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy Results from Preliminary Consultation

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The preliminary consultation on the Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy was carried out between 11th July and 22nd August 2005.
- 1.2 The leaflet was sent out to around 1,500 contacts held on our mailing list of which 60 submitted a response to the questionnaire attached to the leaflet. Fifty-four representations were received before the deadline and 6 after the deadline.

2. Relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes

2.1 The following documents were referred to as useful for inclusion in preparation:

- Children's Play Areas
- Barford Parish Plans
- Various Draft Parish Plans in Stratford District (Andy Ford)
- Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2001
- Warwickshire Police – Estates Strategy
- RSS (RPG11)
- PPS 10
- ABPR 2003
- Landfill Directive
- Development of a Dynamic Housed Windrow system, Organic Resource Agency, May 05
- Target Recycling Paper – FOE
(www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/target_recycling.pdf)
- www.foe.co.uk/resource/briefing_notes/way_forward_on_biowaste.pdf
- www.foe.co.uk/resource/briefings/way_forward_waste.pdf
- www.foe.co.uk/resource/briefings/up_in_smoke.pdf

3. Site Information

- 3.1 A number of sites were submitted as part of the consultation. Some operators submitted details of their aspirations for their sites, but most were simply logged for information with the intention of discussing their aspirations at a more appropriate stage in the plan-making process. Details of 19 existing sites were supplied:
 - Marsh Lane, Water Orton
 - Brandon Quarry, Rugby
 - Ufton Hill Landfill, Nr Southam
 - Land at EMR Ltd (Scrap Yard), Kingsbury Siding
 - Marston Fields Farm, Nr Lea Marston
 - ABS Skip Hire
 - Avon Autospares
 - B Reilly & Son

- Brinklow Quarry
 - Hammonds Recycling
 - J Gill
 - J Roberts
 - Kingsbury Transport
 - KSD Haulage
 - L & B Smith
 - Mil-Ver Metals
 - Tipping Resources
 - Tom White Waste
 - Truckbusters
- 3.2 No details were received from Waste operators outside of the county who wish to locate new facilities in Warwickshire.

4. Feedback on Policies

- 4.1 One respondent felt that all existing policies in the Waste Local Plan ought to be carried forward, whereas another simply stated that the plan was outdated.
- 4.2 It was indicated which policies should be carried forward as listed in **Table 1:**

Table 1: Policies to be included in the revised Waste Development Framework

Policy /Para.No.	Policy Name	To be carried forward	NOT to be carried forward
1	General Land Use	✓ (6)	
2	Conditions and Agreements	✓ (4)	
3	Landfilling	✓ (4)	✓ (1)
4	Land-raising	✓ (3)	✓ (3)
5	Incinerators	✓ (6)	✓ (2)
6	Material Recycling Facilities	✓ (7)	
7	Scrap Yards	✓ (5)	
8	Transfer Stations	✓ (4)	
9	Large Scale Composting	✓ (6)	✓ (1)
10	Household Waste Facilities	✓ (5)	✓ (1)
11	Other Development	✓ (4)	
12	Segregation of Waste Streams	✓ (4)	
13	Proposed Facilities	✓ (5)	
14	Jeens & Boons Quarry and Midland Quarry	✓ (4)	
2.3.2	Waste Imports	✓ (1)	
4.3	Planning Conditions and Agreements	✓ (1)	

5. Waste Issues

- 5.1 Waste Issues was the most widely completed part of the questionnaire with 268 issues raised. However, many of these issues are more relevant to the Waste Management Strategy (which only deals with municipal waste) than to the Waste

Development Framework (which deals with all types of waste). We have therefore summarized the waste issues under these two categories: Waste Management Strategy and Waste Development Framework.

Waste Development Framework

- 5.2 It was felt that householders/recycling facilities were too far away. It was suggested that we should ensure each town/village is within a 10-mile radius of facilities.
- 5.3 Issues regarding the new regulations for agricultural waste were raised.
- 5.4 Concern about increased toxicity and complexity of waste streams and other health and safety/environmental impacts of development, including pollution in watercourse from waste and agricultural land.
- 5.5 There is concern about the high level of imports of waste from outside the county.
- 5.6 The issue of heat treatment was raised – the respondent felt that it should be well tested and have no negative impacts. Also needed to look at suitable sites, impact on local roads and the community, pollution and cost.
- 5.7 Sites and their surroundings should be protected from encroachment by competing development.
- 5.8 Other issues raised included quarry restoration; future shortage of waste disposal facilities; the increasing contribution that waste movements make to road traffic congestion.

Waste Management Strategy

- 5.9 The main focus of many of the responses in this section was increasing the frequency range of recycling collection. There was a specific focus on plastics. Educating the community and fining those who do not recycle were also popular topic choices.
- 5.10 Limiting the amount of rubbish per household, discouraging waste production at source and reducing/placing a tax on packaging were also raised as issues.
- 5.11 There are differing opinions about incineration with some supporting it and some not. Incineration with minimal emissions, increased incineration of non-combustibles were all ideas suggested.
- 5.12 Composting facilities should be broader than just open-windrow of green waste.
- 5.13 Local residents felt that Grendon site should be moved.