

**LEICESTERSHIRE & LEICESTER  
WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**CORE STRATEGY &  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

**HEARING AGENDA  
DISTRIBUTION AND LOCATION OF NEW FACILITIES**

**Whether there is clear evidence and guidance on what would constitute strategic waste sites and where they should be located**

1. Is there a need for a more precise definition of “strategic sites”? (Para 4.16) Would a strategic site have all or some of the characteristics listed in Para 4.17? Should key characteristics be included within the policy (CS2)?
2. What additional clarity should be provided in respect of the areas being considered under Para 4.9? [CBC]
3. In Para 4.18, where is the “previously identified preference” for a mix of large and small sites?
4. Should landfill sites be treated as strategic sites? Does the locational policy provide sufficient flexibility? What are the changes circumstances since the ENTEC study? (Para 4.11) [Ibstock; Lafarge; Viridor]

**Whether there is clear evidence and guidance on the locations that would be suitable for non-strategic sites**

5. Should Policy CS3 contain reference to locating non-strategic sites within or adjacent to existing waste facilities *where transport, operational and environmental benefits can be demonstrated as a consequence of co-location*? [GOEM]
6. With regard to Policy CS3(i), is the intention to locate non-strategic sites in the broad location *for strategic sites* in the Key Diagram?
7. Should Policy CS3 support non-strategic waste sites in sustainable urban extensions? [William Davis; Braunstone PC]
8. In respect of Policy CS3, what is the strategy for other urban areas shown on the Key Diagram such as Lutterworth?

**Whether there is an appropriate strategy for locating waste sites**

9. Does Policy CS4 contain sufficient clarity with regard to intended priorities? [Ibstock; Viridor]
10. In Policy CS4, should there be reference to land forming part of new major *employment* development proposals? [William Davis]
11. Is Policy CS4 flexible enough to take account of changing economic conditions? [SITA]

**Whether there is an appropriate strategy concerning re-use, recycling, waste transfer and composting facilities**

12. Would Material Recovery Facilities (Para 4.29) be better discussed in the context of strategic sites?
13. Does Para 4.32 contain adequate precision with regard to the coverage of waste transfer and materials recovery facilities?
14. Is Policy CS5 too weak and directionless?

**Whether alternatives to the strategy for recovering energy from waste have been given appropriate consideration and whether the policy is clear and justified**

15. Does the evidence base adequately support Policy DC6? Is this part of the strategy the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives? Has the matter been addressed adequately in the sustainability appraisal and public engagement exercises? [CBC]
16. To what "reasonable alternative strategies" is attention being drawn? [CBC]
17. Should Policy CS6 be re-written such that priority is give to pre-sorting; then maximising value recovery from by-products of the process; then energy recovery? [GOEM]
18. Should Para 4.35 / Policy CS6 contain reference to the production of energy from landfill gas? [Ibstock]
19. Could pre-sorting of waste take place at incinerator sites (Para 4.43)?

**Whether there is clear evidence and guidance on the locations where new or additional landfill could be acceptable**

20. Does Para 4.48 contain sufficient clarity with regard to the allocation of non-inert landfill sites?
21. Would not criteria (ii) and (iii) of Policy CS7 also apply to allocated sites?
22. Policy CS8 (inert waste landfill) implicitly accepts landraising. Is this intended?

**Whether there is a clear spatial strategy concerning other forms of waste management**

23. Does Policy CS9 provide adequate guidance to developers?

**Main contributors:**

WPAs  
GOEM  
Charnwood Borough Council (CBC)  
Ibstock Brick  
Lafage Aggregates  
William Davis Ltd  
SITA UK