

# **Summary of Responses to Potential Waste Management Sites**

**Leicestershire and Leicester  
Waste Development  
Framework  
(LLWDF)**

## Summary of Responses to Potential Waste Management Sites

Ref. No.	Individual or Organisation	Summary of Comments	Response
<b>Soars Lodge Farm, Foston (Extension of composting facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	An 'issue' located approximately 160 m to the south of the site is likely to be a spring and will need to be safeguarded. Although underlain by a non aquifer some protection measures should be incorporated into the design of the site to ensure that the spring is not contaminated. Composting of green wastes / plant matter on site is authorised and currently exempt from a waste management licence.	The proposed extension of the site is not a preferred allocation.
2.	Blaby District Council	In principle supports this proposal for inclusion in the Waste Development Framework as a site for composting.	The proposed extension of the site has not been selected as a preferred allocation on the grounds of highway safety.
3.	Highways	Visibility splay requirements would mean the removal of a significant length of roadside hedge. Additional signing may be necessary. (VAS {Vehicle Actuated Sign} if appropriate). As there could be (pro rata) a 260% increase in traffic and access is off a fast section of road a full transportation assessment would needed before the site is put forward formally.	As a result of these concerns the site has not been selected as a preferred allocation.
<b>Enderby Hill Quarry (Construction &amp; Demolition waste recycling facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site is underlain by a non aquifer and is a closed landfill site with no current live waste management licence. The site is a designated contaminated land site. It is known to have accepted domestic and industrial wastes, and since completion action has been taken to monitor and control landfill gas and leachate.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
2.	Blaby District Council	Strongly objects to the proposed inclusion of this site in the Waste Development Framework because of: a) The likely impact on the amenities of local residents; and b) The loss of employment land.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation, on the grounds of the likely significant adverse effect on the amenity of local residents from operations, which would take place in the open air.

4.	Enderby Parish Council	The site was subject to a recent planning application that was vigorously opposed by the Council and many local residents. The Council remains of the opinion that the site should not be used for the recycling of construction waste because of the problems of noise, pollution and dust in such close proximity to residential properties. There would also be a problem of traffic in the vicinity of the site and additional heavy vehicles using Mill Hill, presenting a local traffic hazard.	See above.
3.	Highways	Acceptable in principle in view of Local Plan allocation.	Noted.
<b>Sapcote/Granitethorpe Quarries (Landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	Both are disused quarries with no current waste management licences authorising waste disposal/recovery activities. Sapcote Quarry is underlain by a non aquifer. Granitethorpe Quarry is indicated on the OS maps as being a water body, which requires further clarification before it can be considered as a waste site. There is also a water body situated approximately 175 m to the north and as a result appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination.	The sites are not a preferred allocation.
2.	Blaby District Council	Strongly objects to the inclusion of these sites in the Waste Development Framework as both quarries are currently safeguarded for recreation and leisure use in the Blaby District Local Plan (1999). Both quarries are also designated as Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS), Policy CE19 in the Blaby District Local Plan (1999) protects all RIGS from development which would adversely effect them. Furthermore it is not known if the quarries are hydrogeologically linked to Stoney Cove, a water-filled quarry and diving centre located directly to north of Granitethorpe Quarry. Stoney Cove is of significant economic importance to the surrounding locality and any development which may pose a risk of contamination to the water in Stoney Cove will not be acceptable.	The sites have not been selected as a preferred allocation on the grounds of highway safety, and because they propose landfill only, which runs counter to the Preferred Options Strategy.
5	Sapcote Parish Council	These old quarries are pre Cambrian Syenite, which is an impervious rock but is massively fissured and jointed and therefore has a free flowing aquifer and drainage regime. A survey carried out a number of years ago identified that the aquifer affecting the quarries, the now infilled Calver	See above.

		Hey and Carey Hill Quarries and the Cove (formerly Lane's Hill Quarry) were all interconnected and levels in these quarries interacted. One of the means of level control of these sites was drainage into the brook at Fields Farm/Boundary Farm which flows into the Soar. When Carey Hill was being infilled the level of this stream rose frequently causing local flooding. The quarries were officially infilled with hardcore etc, but some pollution did occur and methane venting has been necessary. Any pollution of this aquifer from the use of any of these sites for landfill would automatically pollute not only the Stoney Cove Diving Centre, but the stream controlling the water table. The quarries have for many years been the site of Badger setts. It is surprising that there is any contemplation of using these quarries for landfill.	
6.	Stoney Stanton Parish Council	The quarries are connected by aquifer to Carey Hill and Clint Hill Quarries in Stoney Stanton as well as Stoney Cove, and any development to one quarry affects the rest. The access to the sites is very restricted and would cause highway problems.	See above.
3.	Highways	From a desktop study it would appear that a new access in the vicinity of that shown on the proposal plan would not comply with the minimum required standard for safe operation. In view of the horizontal alignment of the road there is no identifiable location that would be to the appropriate standard. Therefore the site is unlikely to be acceptable.	This highway safety objection is one of the reasons that these sites have not been selected as a preferred allocation.
<b>Thurlaston Sawmills (Wood and concrete recycling facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	A spring located approximately 70 m from the site appears to feed into the Feeding Brook and as a result appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
2.	Blaby District Council	Has concerns about the potential impact of any proposed recycling facility on the amenities of residents of Thurlaston. In the absence of a full appraisal of the potential impacts demonstrating that appropriate mitigation could be achieved, inclusion of this site in the Waste Development Framework is not supported.	As the site has already accommodated a use with similar effects to that of the proposed use, it has been selected as a preferred allocation. Routeing of vehicles to avoid villages is a site planning requirement.
7.	Thurlaston Parish	Thurlaston is a small village, which can only be accessed by small country	See above.

	Council	lanes, and the concern is that a site of this nature would alter the approach to and potentially the character of the village. Concerned about possible noise and smell pollution that would be inevitable with this type of development. The pollution impact on Thurlaston from the M69 is already considerable. It would be unreasonable to site another pollution source at the opposite end of the village. Thurlaston is currently being considered for a sand and gravel quarry extension. If these developments were to go ahead, it would create misery for the Parishioners and have a negative impact upon housing prices, making it difficult for homeowners to relocate. Fears have been raised over the impact a recycling/reuse site would have upon the environment and visual aspect of the local area. The development would result in a considerable increase in volume of traffic, both in terms of heavy lorries and workers commuting to the site. The roads entering the village would be unsuitable in their present form. The Parish Council are aware that this site has been used for industrial work for a number of years and as such has provided employment for the village. The Parish Council would be pleased to see this site developed into small business/office units.	
3.	Highways	Acceptable in principle for small-scale development in view of previous uses, but no traffic through Thurlaston village (or Huncote via the north). Additional signing may be required.	As a preferred allocation routeing of vehicles to avoid villages is a site planning requirement.
<b>Coventry Rd, Narborough (Commercial &amp; Industrial waste recycling facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site is proposed to be a licensed waste transfer and recovery station, for which an application is currently with the planning authority. The River Soar lies immediately next to the site boundary and the site is underlain by a minor aquifer. Drainage from the site needs to be directed to a sealed system to ensure that surface and groundwater are not at risk from contamination.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
2.	Blaby District Council	Has concerns about the potential impact of any proposed recycling facility on the amenities of residents of Narborough. In the absence of a full appraisal of the potential impacts demonstrating that appropriate mitigation could be achieved, inclusion of this site in the Waste Development Framework is not supported.	Given that the proposed use would need to take place in a building it is considered that local amenity could be adequately protected and the site has been selected as a preferred allocation.

8.	Narborough Parish Council	Raises major and grave concerns about the proposed site in close proximity to residential areas. There has been a significant volume of objection to the recent planning application for this site. Concerned about pollution by noise, and emissions of dust and odours, unacceptable traffic increase, and potential pollution of nearby River Soar.	See above.
	Highways	Acceptable in principle in view of previous permissions. Additional signing may be required.	Noted.
<b>Manor Farm, Aston Flamville (Extension of composting facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	Composting of green wastes/plant matter on site is authorised and currently exempt from a waste management licence. Soar Brook lies approximately 100 m to the east. Appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
2.	Blaby District Council	Supports in principle this proposal for inclusion in the Waste Development Framework as a site for composting	The proposed extension of the site is a preferred allocation
3.	Highways	Likely to be acceptable provided the extension leads to non-material increase in traffic. A transportation assessment would be required. Vehicle routing would be necessary to prevent heavy traffic passing through Aston Flamville. Additional signing may be required.	As a preferred allocation a transportation assessment and routing of vehicles to avoid Aston Flamville are site planning requirements.
<b>Whetstone RHWS (Extension of facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site is underlain by a minor aquifer and is situated 60 m from the River Sence. Appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination, including drainage into a sealed system.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
2.	Blaby District Council	Whetstone RHWS is a long established waste facility and, in principle, an extension to an existing site is a more favourable option than the establishment of a new waste facility. Inclusion of this site in the Waste Development Framework therefore in principle supported, provided the amenities of nearby residents are safeguarded.	The site is a preferred allocation.
9.	Whetstone Parish Council	Concerned about road structure surrounding the site. Consideration should be given to major improvements to the entrance and egress from and onto	As a preferred allocation highway improvements are a site planning

		the very busy B582, Enderby Road.	requirement.
<b>Anstey Lane, Thurcaston (Waste recycling and transfer facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	Works with 8 metres of the Rothley Brook will require Agency consent as the watercourse is Main River. A Flood Risk Assessment of surface water management to show provision of an acceptable floodplain compensation scheme would be required. The site is underlain by a minor aquifer. Drainage from the site should be to a sealed system to ensure that surface and groundwater are not at risk from contamination from the site. The site is a disused sewage treatment works, with no currently licensed waste management activities.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
10.	Anstey Parish Council	Strongly objects to the inclusion of this site, which has been the subject of two previous planning inquiries. In each case the Inspector has insisted that the development is restricted to the actual buildings on site, with no additional building. All activities have to be carried on inside with no permission for outside storage.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation on the grounds of highway safety, and because of its Green Wedge location.
11.	Thurcaston & Cropston Parish Council	Extremely concerned about the proposed inclusion of this site. A previous planning application for waste processing was refused. There was huge opposition to this proposal. The reasons for rejecting this proposal are unchanged and there would be no more acceptance by surrounding residents and villages now.	See above.
3.	Highways	Unlikely to be acceptable locally as all traffic would need to approach through Anstey, Thurcaston or Cropston. The site was previously subject of application for industrial development and local objection was very strong. Any material increase in commercial traffic using Anstey Lane, the roads in Thurcaston and the junction at the Anstey end would be unacceptable in view of the nature of those roads and junctions.	The highway safety concerns are one of the reasons that this site has not been selected as a preferred allocation.
<b>Newhurst Quarry (Waste recycling, composting and treatment facilities with landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site is underlain both by non aquifer and major aquifer. Appropriate protection measures would needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination, including drainage to a sealed system. The site is a granite quarry which has been subject to past	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.

		proposals for a licensed integrated waste management centre including landfill. There are no current waste management activities being carried on.	
3.	Highways	Acceptable in principle but is likely to require access improvement off the A512. Access off Ingleberry Road is unlikely to be acceptable, if nett increase in traffic is high. The access would need to be signalised. Depending on the scale and type of development, other improvements may be required to the A512 (including possible additional signing) but until a transportation assessment is produced, these are not identifiable.	As a preferred allocation highway measures are a site planning requirement.
<b>Mountsorrel Quarry (Waste recycling and transfer facilities)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The sites are a currently licensed closed landfill site and a licensed waste transfer station, which are situated on a non aquifer, but there are waterbodies in the vicinity and measures to mitigate pollution from the site would be requested.	As preferred allocations appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
3.	Highways	Acceptable in principle in view of previous permissions and provided accessed via main Quarry Access. Unacceptable if intended to access via Bond Lane. Additional signing may be required.	Noted.
<b>Wanlip Sand and Gravel, Syston (Construction &amp; demolition waste recycling facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	This site is in Flood Zone 3 and at risk of flooding. The site may be within the functional floodplain and a Flood Risk Assessment is required to demonstrate the suitability of the site. The site is on a minor aquifer, is close to several surface water bodies (ex gravel workings) and is 60 m from the River Soar. There is a licensed abstraction 60 m to the north-west of the site. Appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination, and likely to include drainage into a sealed system.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
3.	Highways	If access is directly onto the A46 Highways Agency should be consulted. Noted Highways Agency concerns that the potential increase in numbers of slow moving heavy vehicles joining and leaving the dual carriageway would be likely to create highway safety issues.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation on the grounds of highway safety.
<b>Loughborough RHWS (Extension of facility)</b>			

1.	Environment Agency	The site is a recently extended and upgraded household waste disposal site. The site only accepts household wastes for disposal / recovery.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
<b>Northfield Farm, Cotesbach (Inert landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	An unnamed 'ordinary watercourse' runs across the site. Flood risk issues could be addressed by condition. Appropriate design/ conditions would be required to safeguard water quality.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
12.	Cotesbach Parish Council	Proposal appears to involve the 'industrialisation' of a large tract of agricultural land. Site is too close to residential properties, and there would potentially be adverse impacts on the environment and residential amenity by virtue of noise, smell, dust, litter, and intensification of traffic movement. There is potential for escalation of activity and no indication of any timescale, with no perceived end to the possible 'intrusion'. Land which has been restored to County Council standards should not again be used as landfill. Inert landfill should be carried out in quarries, of which there are two nearby.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation on the grounds of highway safety, and the loss of agricultural land.
13.	Mr & Mrs Chapman, Cotesbach	This proposal must fail. Brings into question whether the original reclamation of the site was satisfactorily overseen and controlled.	See above.
3.	Highways	There have been historical problems with the access and turning slow moving traffic off the A426. Access off the A5 is very unlikely to be acceptable. The initial indication was for Landfill. The transportation assessment (TA) refers to green waste recycling (GWR) and construction waste recycling (CWR), and to a planning inspector considering 44 trips per day acceptable, but the calculated total for GWR & CWR is between 102 & 199 per day. The TA suggestion that these increases are "relatively small" is challenged. In any case, the Inspector only approved the operation for a two-year period, not as a permanent operation. The additional information provided demonstrates a material increase in traffic turning onto/off the A426. There is no indication of the provision of a right-turning lane which would be required to safely cater for such an increase in traffic levels. It is likely that lighting would be needed, which in view of the open countryside location may not be acceptable.	The highway safety concerns are one of the reasons that this site has not been selected as a preferred allocation.

<b>Shawell Quarry (Waste recycling facility and landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	An unnamed 'ordinary watercourse' runs across the site and Shawell Brook, which is designated an 'ordinary watercourse', runs along the southern tip. A full Flood Risk Assessment to ascertain the extent of flooding that could affect the site would be required. Flood risk issues could be addressed by condition. Appropriate design/conditions would be required to safeguard water quality.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment and floodplain are site planning requirements.
14.	Shawell Parish Meeting	Working should be confined to current operating hours at the quarry. Vehicle movements on Gibbet Lane should not be allowed to exceed current levels.	The basis of the proposal is a continuation of existing operations.
12.	Cotesbach Parish Council	Operations should be regulated at least to the level of existing operations. Concerned about closer proximity of proposals to village.	See above.
13.	Mr & Mrs Chapman, Cotesbach	Opposed to landfill of Site 1 due to smell and additional traffic.	The site has been selected as a preferred allocation as it proposes to co-locate complementary waste management facilities in support of the Preferred Options Strategy.
3.	Highways	More information is required regarding the access. Visibility splay requirements could mean the removal of a significant length of roadside hedge. VAS {Vehicle Actuated Sign} may be required. Acceptable for the site on the south side to use the existing quarry access. Details are needed of the access to the north side. In either case, there should be no traffic through Shawell.	As a preferred allocation highway measures are a site planning requirement.
<b>Kibworth (Waste recycling, treatment and transfer facilities)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for surface water management and any loss of floodplain will require flood compensation. There should be no overall increase in surface water discharge. Agency consent will be required for any culverting/diversion of watercourses and for the installation of any devices with an effect on water flows.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
15.	Dr K Feltham, County Councillor	The A6 has recently been detrunked and so the road is a heavily used single carriage road which is very busy during rush hours. Increasing the	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation because the additional traffic

		number and size of lorries using the site would put a great strain on local routes. Kibworth is not near any major east-west routes through Leicestershire. Concerned about constructing an incineration plant so close to the residential parts of Kibworth Harcourt and Kibworth Beauchamp. The site is at some distance from the villages, but there are already vociferous complaints each summer from the odour and smells of composting, rotting rubbish etc emanating from the site. An anaerobic pilot plant has improved odour matters only slightly. The proposed site was the end point of the last consulted red route Kibworth bypass, and building anything substantial here could restrict the choice of future routes. This site has many disadvantages for either a MRF or incineration facility but there are no advantages with building a facility on the proposed site. Has no guidance measurements for a municipal incinerator, but imagines much of the Kibworth proposed site would be swallowed up by the building and sorting facilities.	generated would be significant and there is insufficient information available to be able to properly assess whether satisfactory access arrangements could be provided.
16.	Mr R Garratt, District Councillor (Ward Member for Kibworth)	The site is inappropriate in terms of access, the A6 having been detrunked, the concept of transport corridor having been removed, and the lack of any firm proposal for a by-pass around the villages of Kibworth Harcourt and Kibworth Beauchamp plus, sadly, the numbers of RTAs within the adjacent area over recent times. The site is inappropriate in terms of quality of life, due to its close proximity to built-up and expanding areas, especially bearing in mind noise and the major smell problems experienced locally over several years.	See above.
17.	Kibworth Harcourt Parish Council	Would have liked more detail on what is proposed. The area appears to be about 3 times the size of the existing site. The A6 is unsuitable to handle the heavy traffic likely to use the site. There is no indication of the capacity of the new site. There are regular complaints from residents regarding unpleasant odours from the existing site and concerned about this if the site is enlarged. Concerned about traffic management for the larger site, particularly as it is also to include commercial and industrial waste, given the problems at the existing site entrance. Noted that it is the only site to include an incinerator proposal	See above.
18.	Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council	Has concerns regarding significant traffic problems which would arise with a new site. The site is on the proposed red route for a by-pass, and this chosen route should be preserved until future consultations on the by-pass	See above.

		take place.	
19.	Foxton Parish Council	<p>This is the only site proposed for incineration. Given the nature of such sites, this would mean the importation of significant amounts of waste daily from all across Leicestershire and possibly neighbouring counties for the unit to be viable. The highway capacity, locally and further afield would be unable to cope with the intensified use that would be generated by this use. The nature of the local road infrastructure, especially given the accidents (including three very recent deaths) along the recently de-trunked A6, suggest that as Leicestershire is a large predominately rural area it should be possible to locate such a facility away from the small villages within South Leicestershire, on good transport corridors (including possibly rail lines) to provide the possibility of a fully sustainable solution capable of further expansion. Much the same applies, albeit to a lesser extent, to the other proposed uses. Given very close proximity to the existing Kibworth tip, the best possible use of the new site might be for composting purposes.</p> <p>Objections must be registered at this very early stage, not least because more information is required on what is actually being planned and its potential impact on the local communities and environment before making more definitive comments.</p>	See above.
20.	Smeeton Westerby Parish Council	No objection to an incinerator provided that it does not release obnoxious smells or gasses into the atmosphere. Serious concerns about increased heavy traffic through the village. Incinerator should only be built in conjunction with a Kibworth bypass and have access only from the bypass.	See above.
21.	H & RD Franks, Kibworth Harcourt	The site is within one mile of the Kibworth villages and unsuitable for extension and incinerator chimney and buildings. Although well used it is a blot on a very pleasant rural area. Potential pollution of emissions from the incinerator. A6 is a busy road and as yet no by-pass is likely all waste will travel through the village with associated pollution. A more suitable site with better road links and further away from village or urban areas should be found. The increase in heavy traffic is unthinkable, and the site would encourage further industrial growth to the detriment of the peaceful, rural and beautiful countryside surrounding the village.	See above.
22.	GD Arthur,	The proposal effectively constitutes an extension to the existing facility. It	See above.

	Smeeton Westerby	will need to operate 24 hours a day and receive waste from a very wide area to be viable. This would mean a very large number of heavy vehicles movements, which would need to pass through Kibworth Harcourt. The A6 has poor sight lines in the vicinity of the site and a recent history of fatal accidents. The road is inadequate for the current level of use, let alone a larger numbers of heavy vehicles. The proposal would close off one of the principal options for Kibworth bypass. The facility would be better sited in or close to an existing quarry with good road links and some distance from residential areas.	
23.	HT Baker, Kibworth Harcourt	The A6 is already incapable of coping safely with the existing traffic and there should be no question of expanding and developing the waste management site until Kibworth has a bypass.	See above.
24.	Mrs E Roeber, District Councillor (Ward Member for Kibworth)	Disappointed that the only incineration plant site proposed for Leicestershire is located so close to a residential conurbation. Suggests that siting a potentially large-scale plant within half a mile of two residential conurbations is not the best solution. Concerned that the highway capacity locally might be unable to cope with such an intensification of use as would be generated. There may also be noise issues to address. Residents living on that side of the village suffer dreadfully from noise from the nearby Gun Club and these proposals could increase the noise pollution. Considers in relation to increasing composting, there is a balance to be struck as to where composting should take place in relation to residential amenity. Supports a small site at the Kibworths for local green waste, especially if it is managed well to lessen the impact on villager's lives. There are however other local sites sited away from conurbations for the green bin waste. One is at Theddingworth farm, further away from residential properties, that has not caused objections/complaints from residents regarding smell, vehicular movements etc. Understands that the site has been proposed, but disappointed to note that it is not being considered at this time. Considers that a lot more evidence is needed to substantiate the validity of the proposals. Leicestershire is a huge area, predominantly rural in nature. Harborough itself is large at 151 square miles. Believes it is possible to locate such a facility further away from residential areas, on good transport corridors to create a long-term sustainable solution, able to be expanded as	See above.

		<p>needed and without creating the potential for conflict with neighbouring uses. Urges that a more suitable location is found.</p> <p>Reports the concerns raised by residents at a public meeting which approximately 150+ attended. These include worries about a substantial increase in large lorries through the villages and on the A6, mess from lorries, a dangerous road made worse and traffic hazards increased, concerns about air pollution, smell, that an incinerator would mean large unsightly pylons, and as so close to homes the proposals would add to the noise pollution already experienced. A local estate agent reported to the meeting that he polled 400 clients and they were unanimously opposed to the proposals. It was suggested that as an incinerator needs to generate heat as well as electricity and there was no case for heat. Better sites, away from residential conurbations, or in industrial zones, with good transport links should be sought, such as land near Magna Park. Such proposals should only be considered in industrial zones. Several residents also wanted to make clear that they suffer considerably from noxious smell from the current composting, especially during the summer, and are concerned that any increase would make their present situation worse. For these reasons attendees wished to object to the proposals. In addition 300 letters, emails, telephone calls and reply slips opposing the proposals have been received.</p>	
25.	RK Spinks, Kibworth	<p>Kibworth is the only site promoted for an incinerator and is unsuitable given the proximity of the site to the village and the poor transport facilities, with no bypass. Considers that there must be a remote quarry within Leicestershire that could be used for waste treatment without imposing this on a pleasant rural village. Suffers already from strong smells from the existing site.</p>	See above.
26.	Mr & Mrs Footman, Kibworth	<p>Object on the basis that smell from the existing facility would be made worse and the added problem of extra traffic on the A6.</p>	See above.
27.	Mr Pizzey, Kibworth Harcourt	<p>The A6 through the Kibworths has now been detrunked and is potentially very dangerous with frequent accidents including fatalities. In recent years the volume of traffic, particularly heavy transport lorries, using the road has increased significantly and more heavy lorries will create an additional hazard. Noise generated by traffic is considerable, and the solution of the</p>	See above.

		bypass will not be built until 2015. Other noise sources are the gun club adjacent to the amenity site and the flight path of planes to Nottingham airport. The existing composting and other waste operations generate bad smells, particularly in the summer. Litter is a problem along the A6. The proposals would only make matters worse with a serious negative impact on the local countryside. The proposed incinerator will require very high temperatures and no doubt operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. As it will not be 100% efficient some pollution must occur to the surrounding area. The transfer of power requires a generator which will add to the noise and pylons may be used which are unsightly. Realises that waste is a problem, but the solution is not a proposal that impacts so heavily on the area. The current recycling scheme should be continued, but enhanced to a greater percentage, making the population more aware of the need to recycle and to carry on with landfill, as many quarries are suitable, and in the meantime search for a suitable brownfield site far enough away from any populated area. If the proposed operations were all in an existing quarry the impact would be less intrusive with the final residue requiring no transfer.	
28.	E Fitzgerald, Kibworth Beauchamp	Already has to contend with smell from existing composting operation, the A6 is a very dangerous road, and quarry sites are more suitable.	See above.
29.	D Turner, Kibworth Beauchamp	Concerned about the local and global environmental impact of incinerating waste. Emissions will pose serious risk to health of local residents. Carbon emissions will add to pressures that lead to climate change and global warming. Increased traffic will stretch road infrastructure to the limit. Increased composting will have an even greater impact than existing regarding smell. More should be done to recycle waste.	See above.
30.	Ward, Kibworth Beauchamp	Smell from the existing composting site can already be very unpleasant. Litter problems will get worse. Transport links are poor. The proposal could possibly increase the number of traffic accidents, and impact on the line of proposed bypass. Incinerators should be close to good road infrastructure and on an industrial site where heat/electricity could be put to good use.	See above.
31.	Resident, Smeeton Westerby	Dangers associated with the existing site access would be exacerbated.	See above.

32.	D.Render, Kibworth	Concerned about increased number of lorries through the village, proximity of the site to residential property, odour problems from existing composting operation being exacerbated, and effect on the proposed route for Kibworth bypass	See above.
33.	E Simons, Kibworth	Objects	See above.
34.	R Clarke, Theddingworth	Could provide further waste facilities at Theddingworth composting site. Small scale waste to energy plants in each district would reduce traffic movements associated with one large central facility.	See above.
35.	Harborough District Council	Encloses comments of Council members and local residents and looks forward to receiving formal consultation at Preferred Options stage.	See above.
3.	Highways	A large scale increase in use of the access is unlikely to be acceptable as in principle is a new access on this fast rural section of a Class 1 road. Additional information suggesting a roundabout at Featherbed Lane would not have sufficient forward visibility/stopping-sight-distance available to operate safely, and would not be acceptable. A roundabout some 100 metres to the east of the existing site access would afford more appropriate visibility and a combined access to the existing and suggested sites there may be acceptable. Full design considerations would be required together with a transportation assessment before submission of any planning application. It is likely that lighting would be needed, which in view of the open countryside location may not be acceptable.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation on the basis of these highway concerns.
<b>Nailstone Colliery (Waste recycling, composting and treatment facilities with landfill)</b>			
36.	Nailstone Parish Council	There is a long history of opposition to use of the site for waste disposal with planning applications refused. There is no good reason to change this policy towards the location. Sites should be located close to those areas that produce the most waste, especially when incinerators are being considered.	The site has been selected as a preferred allocation as it proposes to co-locate complementary waste management facilities in support of the Preferred Options Strategy.
37.	Barlestone Parish Council	Greatly concerned about any plans for new waste facilities at Nailstone. Over the years, many objections have been raised against tipping proposals and these objections also apply if an incineration plant were proposed. The site should be redeveloped with small industrial units and public open	See above.

		recreational space.	
38.	Bagworth & Thornton Parish Council	Concerned about use of the site for an incinerator. This would be a scar on the landscape as well as a health hazard. Toxic fumes would affect several villages. It would mean a lot of heavy vehicles on roads not designed for that type of traffic. Development of small industrial units supported.	See above.
	Highways	Appears acceptable in principle on old mine site using right turning lane access, though this will need upgrading as it is currently sub-standard. There should be no traffic through Nailstone and care will be needed in the context of other routes. Additional signing will be need, possibly VAS (Vehicle Actuated Sign).	As a preferred allocation highway measures, including routeing of vehicles to avoid Nailstone, are site planning requirements.
<b>Leicester Road, Hinckley (Extensions to waste recycling and transfer facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The sites are on non-aquifer with various surface and groundwater features close by, including a tributary of the River Soar adjacent to the sites and a licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 600 metres to the north east. Part of the E Taylor site is at risk of flooding. No development should take place within the floodplain without the provision of appropriate mitigation/compensation. The G Taylor site is in Flood Zone 1 and not at risk of flooding. There should be no increase in surface water runoff from the sites.	The sites are not preferred allocations.
3.	Highways	There could be problems with slow moving lorries turning into and out of the access. A transportation assessment would be needed for consideration before the site is put forward formally.	The sites are not preferred allocations.
<b>Thornton Lane, Markfield (Inert landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	Although the site is underlain by a non aquifer, an un-named watercourse which feeds into the Thornton Reservoir lies immediately next to the site boundary and as such appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination, including drainage into a sealed system.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
3.	Highways	There are problems with the access caused by the M1 overbridge/road alignment and an appropriate access could not be achieved due to lack of	The highway safety concerns are one of the reasons that this site has not been selected

		visibility. Therefore the site is unacceptable.	as a preferred allocation.
<b>Ulverscroft Road, Leicester (Construction &amp; demolition waste recycling facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The Willow Brook lies directly beneath the site and is probably culverted. The site is also underlain by a minor aquifer. Drainage would need to be to a sealed system to ensure that surface and groundwater are not at risk from contamination.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment are site planning requirements.
<b>Brooksby Quarry (Waste recycling and composting facilities with landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site is situated on minor aquifer and an un-named watercourse which feeds into the River Wreake runs through the middle of the site. Appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination, including drainage into a sealed system. Any development in the floodplain would require compensation for the lost floodplain and/or mitigation against the risk posed to the development. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for surface water management. Agency consent would be required for any culverting/diversion of watercourses and for the proposed installation of devices with an effect on flows.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment and floodplain are site planning requirements.
39.	Rearsby Parish Council	Main concerns centre on the Rearsby Brook, which flows through the site into Rearsby village. As the brook flows through the middle of the area suggested for landfill, it seems inevitable that it will be polluted with leachate. It also runs down the side and through the suggested recycling area, which again would have pollution implications. The original planning application for the quarry envisaged reinstatement to agriculture and the creation of four ponds. These ponds would act as a 'balancing facility' for Rearsby, collecting water run-off which would otherwise go in the brook and thus lessen the potential impact of flooding in the village, which has been a problem over the years. Charnwood Borough Council did a lot of work designing this facility, which unfortunately they cannot now progress as the Environment Agency has responsibility for the brook under 'enmainment'. However, we would not want to lose these ponds as, however designed, they will act as flood relief to Rearsby.	See above.
40.	Hoby with Rotherby	Concerned about the use of Brooksby sand and gravel works as a potential	The site has been selected as a preferred

	Parish Council	waste disposal site and feel most strongly that they were deceived, when planning permission was originally granted for sand and gravel extraction. The extent of local opposition would have been far greater, had the plans hinted at use as a land fill site. The misrepresentation by the County Council and LaFarge is quite unacceptable. The waste would be tipped onto a fairly shallow, porous bed. There would be potential for build up of methane and other gases, which could spread to the surrounding area, harming the environment and local communities. The villages of Rearsby, Hoby and Rotherby may be affected, as well as Brooksby itself, including the college. The site is bisected by Rearsby Brook, which would be at risk of pollution from waste products. There would be serious traffic implications on the already busy A607. Use as a waste treatment site would greatly delay the restoration of this scenic area and, depending on the nature of the waste, may make it impossible to achieve the anticipated landscape proposed by Lafarge for after the 13-year extraction programme, of a mix of agricultural land and small lakes for leisure use. Very much opposed to the use of the Brooksby site for waste management and confident that this is strongly backed up by local opinion.	allocation as it proposes to co-locate complementary waste management facilities in support of the Preferred Options Strategy.
41.	Gaddesby Parish Council	Strongly objects to landfill site so close to Gaddesby village. Flies and dust would pollute the air and noise would be intrusive in rural villages. The entire site is unsuitable for any type of landfill.	See above.
3.	Highways	Acceptable in principle. Additional signing may be required, possibly VAS (Vehicle Actuated Sign). A transportation assessment would be required.	As a preferred allocation highway measures are a site planning requirement.
<b>Little Wigston (Construction &amp; demolition waste recycling facility)</b>			
42.	North West Leicestershire District Council	The area forms an important 'gateway' to North West Leicestershire. It could intensify urbanisation of land around the M42 junction and have impact on adjoining residential property	The site has been selected as a preferred allocation, because it is suitably located some distance from sensitive properties (the adjoining unit is in commercial use), and there has been a limited number of such sites put forward.
43.	Appleby Magna P.C.	Objects, for the reasons given by North West Leicestershire District Council.	See above.
3.	Highways	A transportation assessment would be needed before the site is put forward	As a preferred allocation highway measures

		formally. There could be problems with access/turning traffic off a fast section of Class II road with some restriction on visibility. More information is required regarding the access. Advanced warning signs and possibly VAS (Vehicle Actuated Sign) may be required.	are a site planning requirement.
<b>Hemington Quarry (Construction &amp; demolition waste recycling facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site is on a minor aquifer, is close to several surface water bodies (ex gravel workings), and is 35 m from the River Trent. Appropriate protection measures would be needed to ensure that ground and surface waters are not at risk from contamination, including drainage into a sealed system.	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the water environment and floodplain are site planning requirements.
42.	North West Leicestershire District Council	The site lies within the floodplain of the Trent. The possible impact on the setting of a listed building (Hemington Fields House), and the relationship of the proposal to Strategic River Corridors Strategy should be considered. Not convinced permanent facility is necessary at this location	Noted.
3.	Highways	Appears acceptable in principle. Additional signing, possibly VAS (Vehicle Actuated Sign), may be required.	As a preferred allocation highway measures are a site planning requirement.
<b>Lockington Quarry (Construction &amp; demolition waste recycling facility and inert landfill)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The sites are within floodplain. There should be no net loss of floodplain storage as compensation does not appear to be an option. Agency consent would be required for any storage/ mounding of material within the floodplain, culverting/diversion of watercourses, proposed installation of devices with an effect on flows, any bridges, and works with 8 metres of the Lockington Brook which is classified as Main River. Both sites are in an area of sand and gravel and are located upstream of a SSSI, designated for its wetland ecology. The sand and gravel geology provides a fairly free flowing connection to a sensitive receptor. Any site drainage associated with waste activities would need to be designed so as not to discharge to the underlying strata. In the case of landfill, the site may be deemed too sensitive for biodegradable material, although inert landfilling activities are already taking place in the area. There is no connection to the public foul sewer and appropriate infrastructure would need to be established for sites such as transfer stations. The sites are on non aquifer, though superficial alluvium deposits indicated for the site would be minor aquifer. There are	As preferred allocations appropriate measures to protect the water environment and floodplain are site planning requirements.

		various surface and ground water features located close to the sites including a tributary of the River Trent and a licensed groundwater abstraction.	
44.	Mrs L Pendleton, County Councillor	Imperative that the area is restored with inert waste. Would object to the area being left as a lake. Marsh Covert and Green Spot Wood should be protected as well as existing roads.	Noted.
42.	North West Leicestershire District Council	Continuation of existing recycling facility may be justifiable on a temporary basis if extension to mineral extraction proceeds. The site lies within the floodplain of the Trent/Soar. The wood at the centre of the site and immediately adjoining the southern boundary are subject to tree preservation orders (TPO). There is possible impact on neighbouring residential properties, and M1 widening on western part of the site	Noted.
3.	Highways	Access is off the A50 therefore the Highways Agency needs to be consulted.	Noted.
<b>Swainspark (Waste recycling and composting facilities)</b>			
42.	North West Leicestershire District Council	The proposal adjoins an existing employment land allocation that has yet to be implemented. Concerned about the impact of additional traffic on amenities of residents along Park Road/ Occupation Road and potential noise nuisance. Impact on proposals for the Heart of the Forest Park should be addressed.	The site has been selected as a preferred allocation because it proposes to co-locate complementary waste management facilities in support of the Preferred Options Strategy. Landscape considerations are a site planning requirement.
45.	Ashby Woulds Town Council	Agrees with the comments expressed by North West Leicestershire District Council.	See above.
46.	Derbyshire County Council	Would oppose any development that would prejudice the reclamation of the area for National Forest related amenity, recreation and ecological uses. Further detailed investigation would be needed to ascertain any possible detrimental impacts on the Park Road/A444 junction and the community of Overseal as a result of the additional HGV movements. Any potential noise, air quality, public health or landscape impacts need careful consideration	See above.
3.	Highways	Appears acceptable in principle with all traffic right in and left out. Additional signing, possibly VAS (Vehicle Actuated Sign), may be required.	As a preferred allocation highway measures, are site planning requirements.

<b>Ibstock (Landfill)</b>			
42.	North West Leicestershire District Council	The impact of similar proposals on the amenities of properties along Pretoria Road has been a concern in the past. Vehicular access should be via the private road to east of the site.	The site is not a preferred allocation.
3.	Highways	Appears acceptable in principle via access off Whitehill Rd, but only left in and right out.	See above.
<b>Coalville RHWS (Extension to facility)</b>			
1.	Environment Agency	The site has been recently enlarged and upgraded and is licensed to accept only household wastes for disposal or recovery. The adjacent waste transfer station is being re-built and a new waste management licence prepared to authorise waste deposit & recovery. The site is located on a non aquifer. There are no surface watercourses or licensed groundwater abstractions in the area.	The proposal has been withdrawn.
42.	North West Leicestershire District Council	The site adjoins an area which may have potential for redevelopment as part of the revitalisation of Coalville Town Centre.	See above.