

**LEICESTERSHIRE & LEICESTER
WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**CORE STRATEGY &
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

**HEARING AGENDA
NEW WASTE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY**

Whether the Background Section adequately informs the strategic policies

1. Are the proposals for new waste management capacity firmly based on securing capacity equal to the amount of waste generated and requiring management within the framework area? (Para 2.2)
2. (Was Q8) Is there any intention of making provision for waste arising from outside the county? (Para 2.35)
3. (Was Q9) What reliance is being placed on facilities outside the framework area? Is this appropriate? (Para 2.42)
4. (Was Q5) What is the basis of the 5% reduction for Rutland? (Para 2.19) Is this a 5% reduction of the local apportionment or 5% off the total for the region?
5. (Was Q2) In Para 2.12, would it be better to use the same target dates as in Para 2.10? How do these targets compare?
6. (Was Q3) Would it be better to include the municipal waste targets for Leicester City within the DPD? (Para 2.12)
7. (Was Q6) With regard to managing the municipal waste of Leicester City (Para 2.30), will there be shortfalls in the future in the capacity of available facilities (2.79% at 2014/15 and 9.24% at 2019/20) and should specific provision be made within the DPD?
8. (Was Q4) What is the DPD target for the reduction of C&I waste sent to landfill? (Para 2.13) What are the targets for managing C&D waste?
9. (Was Q7) In Para 2.34, would longer term projections be helpful if available?

Whether there is clarity over the type, size and number of waste management facilities that will be required and the timing of their provision

10. In Paragraph 4.2, what further capacity is required for recycling and composting municipal and C&I waste at the additional key dates of 2009/10 and 2014/15? At each key date (including 2019/20), what are the likely numbers and sizes of the different types of management facilities that are likely to be required and what is their estimated land take?

11. What is the source / basis of calculation for the tonnages of municipal waste requiring management? Is any recalculation of facilities provision necessary?
12. Should the alternative of small C&I recycling facilities be included in Table 4.1?
13. How many energy/waste recovery facilities would be required and what would be their land take (Para 4.3)? How many facilities would be required *at all the key dates*? Would as many as 3 smaller facilities be required at 2019/20 to manage 140,000 tonnes of municipal waste with a maximum land take of about 4.5ha? To handle the recovery shortfall of 938,095 tonnes (about 900,000 in the text), would some four larger or 19 smaller facilities be required with a maximum land take of approximately 28.5 ha?
14. Would greater clarity be achieved in Para 4.3 if specific mention were made of the possible types of facility envisaged, eg incineration, MBT, ATT?
15. In Para 4.4, should particular reference be drawn to the year 2015 when non-inert landfill capacity will fall to 460,000 tonnes leaving a shortfall of 540,000 tonnes? Do the figures assume that 20% of inert landfill will go into non-inert landfill sites?
16. Based on the existing non-hazardous sites, would it be better to assume that two new sites of 220-240,000 tonnes annual capacity may be needed at 2009/10 with one additional site at 2015?
17. In respect of C&D recycling (Para 4.5), is there going to be a requirement for between 12 and 39 facilities at 2009/10 with a land take of between 48 and 97.5 ha? What additional capacity would be needed at 2014/15 and 2019/20?
18. Para 4.5 refers to an "expected need for additional new inert landfill sites". How many sites will be needed at the various key dates and of what annual capacity?
19. Would a table of need for additional waste management capacity, indicating type of waste, category of treatment, required capacity at key dates and anticipated land take give greater focus to Policy CS1; other policies subject to a test of need; delivery; and monitoring? [GOEM]

Whether alternatives for the landfilling of inert waste have been appropriately considered

20. Should permission for inert waste landfill sites be granted where the prime consideration is the restoration of mineral extraction sites? To what extent should cross-boundary movements (for example to facilitate restoration projects in the Trent Valley) be a consideration? [DCC]

Whether the disposal of hazardous waste and non-nuclear industrial waste have been appropriately considered

21. Should management of hazardous waste from within the framework area be a specific policy consideration (Paras 2.2, 4.6 and 4.43)? Should there be greater certainty regarding existing capacity?

22. Should the strategy for managing non-nuclear industrial waste be included in the DPD? (Para 4.57)

Anticipated participants:

WPAs

GOEM

Derbyshire County Council (DCC)