

Appendix 1: Summary of Responses to the 'Preferred Approach' Consultation 2011

Organisation/Individual	Subject	Waste Core Strategy response
	General Comments - have we got it right?	
Harworth Estates & Eakring Farming Ltd	Generally support the proposed approach to waste management. A responsible approach to the recognised need for some disposal is welcomed.	Future waste disposal options are addressed in draft Policy WCS4 and WCS5.
IBA Planning	Generally support the strategy, particularly directing landfill to mineral and other voids/derelect land and a better distribution of inert disposal across the county. But need to be sure of a credible and robust evidence base.	We have worked with stakeholders to collect and improve the evidence base throughout the plan preparation process. Details of the evidence base will be available on the website.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Reads more like a land-use rather than spatial document. Should do more to encourage behavioural change - through an objective and policy on it. Links between spatial planning policy and other areas that reduce waste are not clear. Opportunities for growth and employment do not come across. There is need for up-front engagement - possibly facilitated through an open forum within the County.	Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste awareness, prevention and re-use. The supporting text explains that behavioural change cannot be delivered by land-use policies alone and highlights the role of other national and local organisation and initiatives. Growth and employment opportunities are recognised specifically in Chapters 2 and 3 and within the Strategic Objectives in Chapter 6. An informal stakeholder group was established in 2006 and targeted consultation has also been carried out with local councils, businesses and the waste industry.
Cllr Patricia Douglas (Bassetlaw)	Relying on incineration is a short term fix. It should only be allowed in restricted areas, away from population, on large industrial, sites or near power stations.	Suggested criteria in draft policy WCS7 guide larger energy recovery facilities to industrial estates and similar locations.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	The Waste Core Strategy should take account of policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.	Chapter 2 takes account of the emerging National Planning Policy Framework but this does not currently include waste.
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Greater emphasis should be placed on waste prevention and education. This is paramount to reducing household waste.	Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste awareness, prevention and re-use across all sectors but it is stressed that this needs to be a combined approach and cannot be delivered by the WCS alone. .
Friends of Kingsway Park, Caring About South Kirkby	Support Ashfield DC comments. Throughout document there are out of date comments. The waste tonnage figures should be revised even lower than suggested to stop problems in the future.	The data used for the WCS is the most up to date available in each case.
Nottingham Friends of the Earth	Broadly support the preferred approach. However there should be more emphasis on progressive reduction of residual waste and pre-sorting requirements and higher recycling rates and the WCS should plan for declining waste levels in the second half of the plan period.	Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste awareness, prevention and re-use across all sectors but much also depends on legislation or financial incentives at national level. Regular monitoring will show whether waste levels are declining and if the WCS approach should be revised.
Southwell Area Transition Steering Group	Insufficient clarity on environmental implications on various forms of waste and processes.	More detailed information is provided in the background papers and factsheets that were published alongside the consultation. Draft Policy WCS12 sets out strategic policy on environmental protection and quality of life.
Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association (STARA)	There should be a preference for rethink/reduce - should include the pyramid from Waste Regs 2011.	This diagram was included at earlier consultation stages and is shown in the final document.
David Robinson	Foundations of strategy are good but concerned that facilities will be imposed on the public to achieve 70% (both recycling and energy recovery). The obsession with recycling should not result in threat to rural areas. Should consider use of on site bio digesters at schools/universities. Education on cost of waste management would be good. Suggest power station sites.	Any proposals would need to go through the normal planning application process including public consultation. Draft policies on broad locations and site criteria aim to protect rural areas from inappropriate development whilst allowing for some local level facilities in certain circumstances. Power station sites could theoretically be used - depending on their location and proposed use. At present the operators have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste.

Mr Paul Gibbons	A tunnel could be created at Bentinck Void to capture leachate. Like to see more reuse, rather than recycling.	The WCS is not promoting any site specific options. Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste awareness, prevention and re-use across all sectors but much also depends on legislation or financial incentives at national level.
Mrs A Bragg	Concerns about Elkesley and that the WCS principles should have prevented the Elkesley development - i.e. sites should be away from residential areas, should minimise impact on health and quality of life of people, should be sensitively located, protect countryside, protection of water table.	The proposal at Elkesley is a planning application that is currently under consideration - it is not part of the WCS. The Strategic Objectives within the draft WCS take on board the general principles listed.
Norman Biggs	Reflect sentiments from Elkesley resident. In general, CS is poorly thought out, short sighted, endorses/committed to incineration due to PFI.	The draft WCS considers all forms of energy recovery and does not favour any specific technology.
Steven Richardson	Definition of terms, reuse, recycle, recover, energy recovery would be useful. Support waste prevention.	A glossary of definitions has been included in the final document. Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste prevention.
Tony Wakefield	The use of the Eastcroft incinerator for waste from South Nottinghamshire has to be the best option. Could another such plant be built to take waste from the north of the county?	The WCS supports energy recovery (including incineration) where this can divert waste from landfill and promotes broad locations where facilities could potentially be developed.
Petition signed by 137 members of the public	Require no incineration, land-filling or unlined land-raise. Require full and complete recycling 'where practical' and use of dry tomb storage on appropriate sites.	Policies within the WCS, subsequent development management document and the saved Waste Local Plan policies will be used to impose appropriate planning conditions on sites.
Alison Loydall	All possibilities for sites should be explored, including power stations.	Power stations have been considered but the operators have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites, relative to the main sources of waste, would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipments.
BP Marshall	Dealing with waste close to population is not best environmental option for the community - tension will be caused, resulting in planning objections and refusal, making aims of WCS unachievable.	PPS10 stresses the importance of communities dealing with their own waste and managing waste close to where it is produced. The WCS has to strike an appropriate balance between sites that are close enough to meet needs without causing an unacceptable impact on environment or quality of life. Draft Policy WCS6 details appropriate site-selection criteria to help achieve this balance.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	The MoD has no safeguarding objections to the preferred approach consultation.	Noted.
Highways Agency	Locations should be consistent with sustainable principles and supported by transport policies to minimise future traffic growth and encourage sustainable travel modes.	The broad locations identified in draft Policy WCS3 seek to minimise the need to transport waste. Draft Policy WCS10 promotes sustainable forms of transport.
Inland Waterways Association	Does not take enough account of water transport and its benefits.	Draft policy WCS10 promotes alternative forms of transport, including water, where viable.
Spatial Portrait		
Newark and Sherwood DC	Much improved and welcome the mention of Newark's Growth Point status.	Noted.
Selston Parish Council	Support wording of the spatial portrait.	Noted.

STARA	Should be re-titled 'The geography of Nottingham(shire). References to other counties should be removed as they are irrelevant. Term 'growth point' should not be used - vague and mischievous. River Trent should not be used for transport due to environmental considerations. Population, business and industry are not distributed in the same way. Nottinghamshire should not import waste. References to power stations, employment and income should be deleted. Groundwater/surface water have nothing to do with waste. Agricultural land, woodland, country park and historic houses have nothing to do with the Green Belt. Should be re-written to encourage green business and new technologies. Climate change has nothing to do with waste - there should be an explanation of how it will affect design/location of new plants.	National planning policy guidance in PPS12 states that Core Strategies should be supported by an analysis of the local characteristics and key features that will influence future developmen, including what is happening in adjoining areas and possible movements of waste. Chapter 3 of the draft WCS meets this requirement. Sub-headings and additional text have been added to improve the clarity.
27 local Ashfield residents	Unfair focus on Ashfield. The legacy of Ashfield as an ex-coal mining area is mine-water rebound which will make placing strategic waste disposal sites here problematic.	The draft WCS provides a factual description of the different parts of the plan area that has been drawn from published local development plan documents and statistics.
English Heritage	Welcome additional refs to historic environment. Could be strengthened further with reference to environmental qualities of Nottinghamshire. Prefer 'historic market towns' to 'Georgian market towns'.	Wording has been expanded to take account of suggested changes.
Natural England	Welcome the spatial portrait - useful summary of key characteristics and issues.	Noted..
Veolia	Broadly support. Adequately highlights diversity of County and challenges facing it. Concur that it is important to recognise challenges and opportunities to Nottinghamshire by activity/growth in neighbouring authorities.	Noted..
Vision		
Peel Environmental Ltd	Generally agree with broad points. But rural facilities should not be limited to community led or farm-based as goes against flexibility expressed later in relation to rural land.	Draft Policies WCS3 (broad Locations) and WCS6 (site-selection criteria) and supporting text have been drafted to balance the need for essential facilities with the need protect the character of rural areas. This includes the re-use of land and buildings as set out in PPS10.
Welbeck Estates	Supportive of the broad thrust, managing locally and not attempting to restrict import/exporting. Merit in managing waste in halves of the county - preventing long distance distribution. Agree RRP should use excellent transport links - highlight opportunities at Welbeck Colliery.	Noted.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Climate change mitigation should be included (as per SA). Innovation and the local economy should be included (as per SA).	These issues are addressed within the Strategic Objectives in Chapter 6 and a specific policy (WCS13) on climate change has been included.
Gedling Borough Council	The vision and objectives seek to move waste up the hierarchy, accords with PPS10 and are generally supported.	Noted.
Leicestershire County Council	Agree that the vision should not prohibit imports/exports and with the focus on urban areas.	Noted.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ambitious but achievable and mirrors aspirations of recent Waste Review (DEFRA)	Noted.
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Support the vision, particularly the focus on waste prevention where possible, followed by recycling/recovery and disposal as last resort.	Noted.
Selston Parish Council	The vision is supported.	Noted.

Friends of Kingsway Park	2031 is too long a period, Should be 2026 or even 2021. Do not support a large facility in Ashfield as the town is already too crowded.	The WCS will look ahead to 2031 in line with the current East Midlands Regional Plan and national policy set out in PPS12 but will be subject to regular monitoring and review. The draft WCS identifies broad locations for new development within Policy WCS3 and this is supported by detailed site selection criteria in Policy WCS6 but specific sites will only be allocated within the later site allocations document.
Ramblers Association	Vision is good. Districts need to do more to improve collection to make recycling easier.	Noted.
STARA	Should restrict waste movements into Nottingham(shire) - with evidence to show implementation of best available technology and evolving waste management procedures. Waste should not be decoupled from economic growth. Term 'waste growth' should be dropped. Prevention and reduction should be emphasised. Unavoidable waste should be recognised as a resource and not an excuse for incineration.	Policy WCS11 addresses waste imports and recognises that some cross-boundary movement of waste is inevitable and may be the most sustainable option in some cases if a facility in an adjoining area is closer or more appropriate for that waste type.
27 local Ashfield residents	Unfair focus on Ashfield and Mansfield. Should focus on existing power stations instead. Object to the vision.	The broad locations identified are based on population and geography.
English Heritage	Presevation' is better than 'respect' in terms of waste related development preserving the environment.	Noted.
Environment Agency	Should promote the waste sector and highlight potential benefits of well-designed/planned facilities on economy and environment. Should be aspirational and avoid phrases that dilute ambition.	Draft Policy WCS14 promotes high quality design and operation of facilities. The potential benefits to the local economy and environment are recognised within the Strategic Objectives in terms of ensuring an appropriate range of waste management facilities and promoting innovation, job and skills creation.
Highways Agency	Support broad thrust of vision, particularly emphasis on managing waste locally - linked to large population centres. Should be expanded to seek minimisation of vehicle trips.	This has been incorporated into the Strategic Objectives and draft Policy WCS10
Inland Waterways Association	Does not take enough account of benefits of water transport. Nottinghamshire has an extensive and vastly underused waterways network.	Draft policy WCS10 promotes alternative forms of transport, including water, where viable.
Natural England	Support the vision.	Noted.
Veolia	Broadly support vision. Express caution over 'disposal will be last resort once options to reuse, recycle or recover have been exhausted'. Long term is applauded, but highly aspirational and unlikely to be deliverable. Should be reworded to 'maximise where feasible the reuse, recycling and recovery management routes'. Support emphasis on sustainable waste management, but dependent on	The approach of the draft WCS reflects the waste hierarchy. The need for appropriate funding to ensure delivery is recognised within the WCS and highlighted within Chapter 8 (monitoring and implementation).
Objectives		
Peel Environmental Ltd	Energy and climate' should go further to reflect importance of waste management for energy provision. Government support for AD in the Review of Waste Policy 2011 should be reflected in the WCS. Support the sustainable transport objective.	The supporting text to draft Policy WCS2 recognises the potential role of energy recovery and references to the Defra Review of Waste Policy 2011 and the National Policy Statement on Energy have been included within the draft WCS.
Welbeck Estates	Support 'sustainable transport' objective - it supports and encourages re-use of Welbeck Colliery where there is an existing rail head terminal. Support specific ref to 'strengthen our economy' and 'community well being' - in tune with dNPPF. Highlight the work of Meden Vale- The Future in this respect.	Noted.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Should be more explicit about how the WCS contributes to reducing and adapting to the impacts of climate change. Needs to be clearer on the role that EfW can have in relation to climate change and energy.	This is addressed within draft Policy WCS13.

Gedling Borough Council	The vision and objectives seek to move waste up the hierarchy, accords with PPS10 and are generally supported.	Noted.
Newark and Sherwood DC	Understand why previous recommendations have not been included, no further comments to make.	Noted.
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Welcome the objectives, support for emphasis on local decision making and ensuring residents have opportunity to be involved in decisions.	Noted.
Selston Parish Council	Support the revised objectives. 'Meet our Future Needs' - important not to over provide sites for landfill in order that existing capacity is used more efficiently.	Noted.
People Against Incineration	Should aim to meet/exceed targets, not just meet them.	The draft WCS sets out an aspirational target to recycle 70% of all waste by 2025 which exceeds all national and regional targets.
Ramblers Association	Agree recycling plants are needed, but passionate about countryside and green belt protection. Developments must fit their surroundings and not interfere with enjoyment of the countryside and RoW network.	Draft Policies WCS3 and WCS6 and their supporting text seek to achieve this balance. Detailed policies on environmental protection will be included in the separate development management policies document. Existing policies within the Waste and Development Management Policies
Southwell Area Transition Steering Group	Insufficient emphasis on reducing waste at source - WCS should be more assertive on the issue.	Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste awareness, prevention and re-use. The supporting text explains that behavioural change cannot be delivered by land-use policies alone and highlights the role of other national and local organisations and initiatives.
Sneinton Tenants and Residents Association	'Community well being' needs to state that the incinerator will be shut to protect Sneinton, St Anns, The Meadows and Lady Bay. Community groups should be kept informed of changes to incinerator. Should specify that recycling does not include incineration. Independent monitoring should be carried out. References to energy, CHP and offsetting fossil-fuel should be removed. References to the impacts of climate change should be removed. Reference to sustainable transport encourage the sneaking in of waste from elsewhere. Should state moving away from landfill <u>and incineration</u> .	In line with national policy, the draft WCS seeks a balance of appropriate waste management facilities. This gives priority to recycling and composting but recognises that energy recovery technologies, including incineration, have a role to play in diverting waste from landfill, in accordance with the waste hierarchy.
Selston residents, SARA, Notts Independent Group	Agree with 'sustainable transport' objective. 'Meet our future needs' - disagree as effects on human element are too great - it must be managed away from population at power stations. 'Climate and energy' - disagree with 'reduce the need to transport waste' as by taking advantage of infrastructure already in place at power stations, it will ameliorate community unrest and aid goals of WCS. Contradicts the transport of waste from the n/w/se of the county for disposal in Ashfield/Mansfield.	Overall approach would allow for the use of power stations, where appropriate, but the power station operators have indicated that they have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipments.
English Heritage	Care for our environment' should 'protect' not 'look after' our heritage assets - stronger and consistent with other objectives.	Text has been amended accordingly.
Environment Agency	Ensure first consideration is given to avoidance, then mitigation. Possibly consider carbon capture's role in eliminating effect of CO2 emissions from CHP plants. Should seek to include policies that encourage national targets to be exceeded. Consider the monitoring of the objectives.	Draft Policies WCS1 and WCS2 reflect these principles. EA views on carbon capture will be sought when determining relevant planning applications and in developing the detailed development management policies document.
Highways Agency	Pleased to see specific reference to sustainable transport and intention to locate waste site to reduce transport distances, encouraging alternative to roads.	Noted - Policy WCS10 promotes sustainable transport.
Inland Waterways Association	Do not take enough account of the benefits of water transport. Nottinghamshire has an extensive and vastly underused waterways network.	Draft policy WCS10 promotes alternative forms of transport, including water, where viable.

Natural England	'Care for our environment' - informed by LCA and contribute to LBAP targets. 'Community well being' - green spaces are important, development should bring benefits to environment and people together. Support 'energy and climate' and 'sustainable transport' objectives. 'High quality design and operation' - buildings should re-connect their design and construction with the environment.	Noted.
Timescale		
Newark and Sherwood DC	Timescale seems logical.	Noted.
Selston Parish Council	Support proposed timescale and lesser detail in latter years to allow for flexibility.	Noted.
Ramblers Association	20 years seems appropriate.	Noted.
STARA	Shouldn't shackle waste policy for next 20 years. Should be revised every 3-5 years on a rolling basis.	A 20 year timescale is in line with national policy and the current Regional Plan albeit the WCS will need to be regularly reviewed as suggested.
Veolia	15-20 year life is appropriate. Should provide flexibility to accommodate change picked up through AMR. Data and legislative changes will have to be updated throughout the plan.	Noted.
Current waste estimates		
Newark and Sherwood DC	Concerns raised about over estimation have been addressed whilst still making provision for worst case. Much more balanced approach that fits with the more fluid document.	Noted.
Ramblers Association	Great deal of improvement is needed in construction and demolition sector.	The available evidence suggests that a high proportion of this waste is re-used on site or recycled.
STARA	Colliery tailings should not be included in figures. Pie chart shows reduction of 35% so there will be no demand for increased incineration capacity. Pie charts should be sized proportionately. Recycling of building materials is well known to be predicted to vastly increase also.	Colliery waste is not included in the total shown in the pie charts. The evidence shows that most construction and demolition waste is already re-used or recycled.
Steven Richardson	Does the increase in C&I waste from 42-52% include incinerator ash? And is it included in the estimated production for Nottinghamshire?	This figure is taken from a national survey carried out by Defra. It is understood that incinerator ash may be included in the total but very little commercial and industrial waste is thought to be incinerated.
Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	In the past 3-4 years waste volumes have decreased and only the last 1-2yrs could be down to the recession. An increase in recycling is not mentioned at all, therefore object.	The consultation text did acknowledge that the decrease could be partly due to behaviour change. Recycling increases are highlighted within the WCS text.
Environment Agency	Significance of C&I waste in the context of the WCS has been overstated. Would like a clearer indication of what evidence was used and how it was applied to arrive at figures and decisions.	This forms part of the evidence base for the Waste Core Strategy. Sources for survey data are included in the consultation material and within the WCS, including references to Environment Agency and Defra C&I survey data.
Future waste estimates		
IBA Planning	The Core Strategy will not be sound as it is not in line with the annual rates set out in the RSS. It should plan for a worst case scenario - using the RSS which would be robust and credible. There is a serious risk to the delivery of the whole strategy if the authority underestimates disposal provision.	Rates in the RSS are indicative. The level of provision proposed in WCS will meet these rates in any case but go much further in terms of recycling and landfill reduction.

Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Need to validate and explain assumptions used. No evidence to show a reduction in waste being a result of negative or minimal growth. Should be aspirational with an emphasis on a lower growth figure. The number of sites required for different options (from I&O) should have been carried forward to bring together targets over the plan period and implications of failing to meet them in regard to facilities. Agree that assumptions have to be made and they should be reviewed regularly. But this should reflect either a low initial growth figure or policy which allows overall assumption for growth to be reduced if evidence shows lower requirement.	WCS approach is based on the lower growth estimate/best case from the Regional Plan. A more detailed explanation of the figures has been provided.
Selston Parish Council	Welcome lower future growth rates than previous stage. Believe this is behavioural change not recession. Authority should be concerned with likely downwards trend not 'normal economic circumstances'. Should not plan for worst case and do not agree 4-5 mt will be produced annually. Should assume minimal growth and restrict supply of landfill sites.	In making estimates of future growth, the WCS follows national policy guidance and advice from the Planning Inspectorate. It is acknowledged that levies will fluctuate and the WCS includes a robust monitoring framework.
Nottingham Friends of the Earth	Support use of current arising (rather than overinflated projections of exponential growth).	Noted.
People Against Incineration	Should take into account local circumstances and relevant commercial and legislative drivers.	Regular monitoring and review will help to ensure any changes in local circumstances or legislation are taken into account.
Selston residents, SARA, Notts Independent Group	Basing estimates on 2006 figures is unrealistic as they don't take account of recent recycling rates - no point in having 70% target and not factoring this into the calculation.	Recycling rates do not affect the estimate of arisings as they reflect how the waste that is produced is then managed, not how much waste is produced.
Veolia	Agree with the proposed approach and that RTAB data is best current available data. However, growth scenarios should be estimated and then reviewed through AMR throughout the plan period. Failing to consider growth scenarios as part of CS development could question its robustness.	WCS includes a comparison of Regional Plan estimates and more recent estimates.
Building in flexibility		
Gedling Borough Council	Basing future arising on most recent growth assumptions (2009) is sensible. The flexibility wording is supported as it should avoid potential for over provision.	Noted.
Leicestershire County Council	Agree to not precluding the ability to deal with a rise in arisings.	Noted.
Nottingham Friends of the Earth	Support restricting release of sites, depending on actual trends, whilst allowing for new evidence of unforeseen need.	Noted.
Environment Agency	The preferred approach in para 3.15 needs clarifying.	More information has been provided in the WCS text.
Existing capacity		
Leicestershire County Council	Agree that EA data shows a sites possible capacity but it should be used in conjunction, where possible, within what permission(s) allow.	The evidence base includes both EA data and relevant details from planning permissions.
Selston Parish Council	Notes that not yet possible to determine where waste comes from - not sure if this is due to lack of resources or not being able to get it. Government should provide money if it is the former - need it to accurately predict future needs.	Future monitoring and review will take account of any new information as it becomes available.
Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	More reliable estimates of waste production would be more realistically calculated using figures of how much sites currently manage rather than figures from 2006. There should be an audit trail from councils.	Local authorities are only responsible for municipal waste. Other wastes are privately managed and operators are not currently obliged to provide this information.
Managing MSW and C&I		

Peel Environmental Ltd	Support approach to recycling. AD is key to achieving high rates, the plan should require additional AD facilities (not just for MSW). Agree there is need for additional energy recovery. The plan should not restrict the types of technology for this. Support the flexibility in 4.31 and the plan should not restrict scale of energy from waste facilities.	Noted.
Welbeck Estates	Agree with support for AD and support the use of large sites for energy recovery CS should indicate where such sites are likely to be considered acceptable in principle to encourage investment. A single site would not ensure flexibility and could discourage economic growth. Agree sites should be well located re roads and rail. Encourage rail linked sites. Welbeck Colliery sitewould comply with the defined strategic objectives of the CS.	Policy WCS6 sets out appropriate site-selections crieria for a range of waste management facilities, including anaerobic digestion and other forms of energy recovery.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	No clear distinction between MSW and commercial waste. 50% by 2020 = 'challenge', therefore 70% is very ambitious. Would require garden waste and weekly food waste collections. Untenable as would require additional £1.5m revenue provision and complete remodelling of collection services and structure. There is no evidence or methodology of how it will be achieved. Composting has valuable role - support in-vessel, but not open. Support recycling on existing industrial estates. Support AD for food and organic. Document is unclear abot the implications associated with various energy recovery facilities. The public tension re energy recovery should be explored before a single approach is adopted. Implications of EfW need to be understood by all. The practicalities of delivering the plan in light of tensions should be considered.	Consultation has been carried out with each of the Waste Collection Authorities. The WCS acknowledges the financial implications of the aspirational target which relies on the long term situaiton becoming more favourable.. The WCS looks at a range of different waste managment technologies and does not promote a single approach as suggested..
Cllr Patricia Douglas (Bassetlaw)	Strong opposition to an incinerator at Elkesley from Elkesley Action Group 3000+ signatures. There is no need for it as it can be recycled (as per para 4.37-4.41). No wood should be incinerated.	The WCS is not promoting any specific sites and does not state any preference for any specific technology.
Elkesley Parish Council	The amount of waste produced cannot be managed locally in a sustainable manner or environmentally sympathetic way. Landfill cannot and should not be sustained. Incineration does not have benefits - toxins, dioxins, chemical are of great concern. Does not consider public concerns.. At odds with Government environmental messages.	Health concerns are considered within the WCS and the role of local authorities, the Environment Agency and the Primary Care Trusts is explained in Chapter 7.
Gedling Borough Council	70% target is considered ambitious. Commitment given to work with District Councils and waste industry to monitor and review this target is welcome.	Noted.
Keyworth PC Planning Committee	The preferred approach accords with our previous comments. We support the increase in recycling but mindful of wider economic situation. Support energy recovery where replaces landfill, but must be closely monitored so it does not compromise recycling opportunities.	Noted.
Mansfield District Council	Economic situation would make this target uncertain - reservations about the financial contribution MDC would need to make to achieve the target. 70% is environmentally admirable, but would need significant expenditure to reach from current 40%.	Text within the WCS and specifically within Chapter 8 (monitoring and implmentation acknowledges the financial concerns of the Waste Collection Atuthorities.

Rushcliffe Borough Council	70% is ambitious and in current economic climate unable to substantially increase recycling rate without investing costs in additional collection methods. Support increasing sorting facilities at Manfield MRF to widen goods to be recycled, local composting facilities and investigating a shared facility to manage food waste. Endorse efforts to encourage commercial recycling and support action to make it financially viable. Would support another HWRC around Cotgrave and expanded capacity at Stragglethorpe composting. Use of methane gas from existing landfill should be investigated.	Text within the WCS and specifically within Chapter 8 (monitoring and implementation acknowledges the financial concerns of the Waste Collection Authorities. Support for additional facilities noted.
Selston Parish Council	Should encourage re use/reduction. Should lobby Government re laws on packaging and encourage local businesses to reduce packaging and reduce costs for them to recycle. Provide financial assistance to districts. Welcome 70% target. Support energy recovery but any energy recovery must be away from population. Power station sites should be considered. Welcome requirement to prove non recyclable nature of waste prior to recovery. Welcome lower estimate of future need. Old colliery tips should not necessarily be used – further blight to deprived communities.	Draft Policy WCS1 promotes waste awareness, prevention and re-use across all sectors but it is stressed that this needs to be a combined approach and cannot be delivered by the WCS alone. Power stations have been considered but the operators have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipments.
Bassetlaw Local Strategic Partnership	Welcome 70% target and see it as minimum for 2025. Support energy recovery for non-recyclable, but they should be as efficient and innovative as possible - including gasification and AD, rather than new incineration.	Noted.
Nottingham Friends of the Earth	Support higher recycling, but 70% should be before 2025, separate food/organic waste collection for AS/in-vessel for MSW and C&I, for incineration should be requirement to prove cannot be recycled.	Support noted. Draft Policy WCS2 promotes energy recovery only where this will divert waste from landfill.
People Against Incineration	Strong support for 70%, hopefully in advance of 2025. Authorities should pool resources to maximise recycling. Food waste should be sent to AD. Per-stream thinking should be adopted. Object to any facility covered by Waste Incineration Directive. CS should phase out existing and not introduce any new incinerators. As an absolute minimum, explicitly prohibit combustion of waste where heat is not harnessed. AD is better for food waste than composting (DEFRA) and is justified departure from waste hierarchy. Better use of HWRC for C&I waste should be made - RRP's could be supplied by them.	Support noted. Draft Policy WCS2 promotes energy recovery only where this will divert waste from landfill and requires heat and/or power utilisation. AD is recognised as appropriate for food waste.
Ramblers Association	Interesting to note that Rushcliffe think they can increase recycling since they charge for green collection and less than half of households are doing it. It should be made easier for people to recycle. The countryside/environment should not suffer.	Draft Policy WCS12 address protection of the environment and local amenity along with the saved policies from the existing Waste Local Plan.
Southwell Area Transition Steering Group	Agree to principle of energy recovery but need to be clear controls/incentives to ensure appropriate hierarchy is adhered to.	Draft Policy WCS2 supports this hierarchy.
STARA	Local tax should be introduced to increase cost of incineration and landfill. Funds could be used for new technologies to help re-thinking, reducing and re-use. Leachate bioreactors and similar should be encouraged. Exotic bacteria should be used to breakdown metal. Nottingham should actively pursue title of large green city by getting rid of the incinerator. Get the universities involved.	Policy WCS8 specifically supports new and emerging technologies and the WCS as a whole recognises the need for a combined approach.
David King	Pleased with positive attitude to disposal. Energy recovery will reduce need for landfill - solid waste could be used in soil improvement. Biodegradable waste should not be landfilled - pollution and loss of potential energy. Aware of overtipping due to living near Dorket Head.	Noted - no change necessary.

Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	A radical new approach is needed - namely development along railway lines taking residue to power stations. Health impacts need to be considered. Putting facilities near populations cause tensions. Contradictions re reducing/reusing saying it is outside remit, but then saying Councils will work with districts to reduce. Councils should lobby Government for law change re packaging and help local businesses to reduce packaging. Support 70%, but will be nothing more than an aspiration without financial support from Councils. Support use of new technology but only if in-vessel composting is used (not windrow) and burning is away from where people live. Dispute figures re arisings. Should make precise/correct decisions about best locations for facilities, amount of waste that needs to be deal with and limit unnecessary imported waste. Support the use of larger burning facilities, but they should be at existing power station sites, not be near where people live. Old colliery tips or voids should not be used – increase social injustice.	Power stations have been considered but the operators have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipment. WCS approach is to work with others on reduction and re-use as this cannot be delivered by land-use policies alone. Assumptions on waste arisings have been making using the best available data. Draft Policy WCS11 sets out a balanced approach to managing waste imports. The restoration of old colliery tips or voids is seen as sustainable but it is accepted that not every site will be suitable and applications will have to be judged according to their specific circumstances - the WCS can only set a general approach.
Rod Jones	Document only refers to food waste as way of increasing recycling. Should mention other measures - particularly batteries collections, growth in LCD screens, dealing with energy saving lightbulbs, separating skip rubbish, greater information on disposal of paint cans, fluorescent light tubes, fire alarms etc (education).	These issues will need to be addressed as part of wider efforts along with other stakeholders.
Steven Richardson	A chart of graph showing comparative costs and environmental impact of options A-D would be useful. Does 70% include incinerator ash?	The aspirational 70% target will be measured using the reporting criteria set nationally by Defra. It is understood that this currently includes incinerator ash.
Terry Coleman + petition from 137 local residents	Require no landfill, incineration and landraise without top liner. Require full and complete recycling of waste where practical and that residue of recycling is put in Dry Tomb Storage land-raise sites. Every effort must be made to recycle all waste, disposing of remainder in Dry Tomb Storage land-raise, possibly using colliery spoil tips. Energy from waste is a confusing term for the public.	Policies within the WCS, subsequent development management document and the saved Waste Local Plan policies will be used to impose appropriate planning conditions on sites. The Environment Agency also regulate most waste management sites and carry out regular monitoring.
English Heritage	No detailed comments to make - any developments should fully assess the historic environment impacts and demonstrate that it is suitable for the location.	Noted.
Environment Agency	More information needed to guide where development might be focussed - particularly taking into account flood risk issues. Transport infrastructure is also important when locating sites. Should be integrated into LDPs. Should deal with different waste facilities competing for same site. Need to secure sufficient suitable land from other industrial uses. Opportunities to improve quality of design should be considered, including enhancing existing facilities.	Draft Policies WCS3, WCS4, WCS5 and WCS6 set out the broad locations and site-selection criteria for waste treatment and disposal facilities. Both the WCS and the future site-specific document take account of the availability of industrial or other suitable land. Policy WCS14 specifically addresses design.
Natural England	Support the proposed approach.	Noted.
Veolia	Support the challenging recycling targets but should also include recovery targets. Important to consider financial implications of providing C&I facilities as this ultimately determines deliverability. The budgetary constraints of the districts should be recognised in the CS. This could be addressed with a flexible approach to technology choices. Not realistic for recovery facility proposals to demonstrate that 'waste to be managed cannot be recycled and would otherwise go to landfill'. It should instead seek to require demonstration that additional recycling is not economically feasible.	Policy WCS2 and supporting text acknowledge financial constraints but the approach does require energy recovery proposals to show that this will move waste management up the waste hierarchy.
Managing C&D		

Selston Parish Council	Better recycling of C&D will mean very little additional capacity being needed and it's important not to over provide. Support the approach as this offers maximum flexibility to adjust to demand.	The WCS policies allow for provision of additional recycling capacity if needed and aim to provide a better distribution of disposal facilities for residual waste.
Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	New C&D recycling facilities will be needed due to increased building in the country and recycling rates are not stretching enough. Disposal facilities will not be needed.	The WCS policies allow for provision of additional recycling capacity if needed and aim to provide a better distribution of disposal facilities for residual waste. It is assumed that even if 90% of this waste is ultimately recycled or re-used there will still be a need for some appropriate disposal. Inert waste disposal can also play a beneficial role in restoring old mineral workings for example.
Environment Agency	Identify types of facilities need to achieve recycling rates. Link policies to Municipal waste management plans. Clarify which definition of municipal waste used. Recovery as an option to divert from landfill should not undermine the rest of the waste hierarchy. Provide greater clarity re role of energy recovery and facilities needed to deliver. Role of landfill tax has been understated. Landraise has greater operational and amenity issues/impacts. Decisions should consider amount of haz waste produced in the county and if it is a net importer or exporter of haz waste.	A table of indicative capacity requirements by facility type has been included. The relationship between Municipal Waste Management Strategies and the WCS is explained. An explanation of the two different definitions of municipal waste has been included in the glossary. More detail has been provided on the level of hazardous waste.
Veolia	Support the approach proposed.	Noted.
Other wastes		
EDF Energy	Support the policy proposal for power station ash disposal.	Noted - Policy WCS5 refers specifically to power station ash recycling and disposal.
Cllr Patricia Douglas (Bassetlaw)	The incinerator at Elkesley would produce hazardous waste from the fly ash - with no sites to deal with such waste, the incinerator shouldn't be allowed.	The WCS does not promote any specific sites.
Mansfield District Council	Lack of waste water treatment infrastructure in Mansfield. NCC to keep up to date with Mansfield Infrastructure Study so NCC are aware of the most up to date position on this issue.	This has been acknowledged within the text.
Selston Parish Council	Residue ash from power stations should remain close to source and stockpiled for future use. Investment should be made in technologies to put it in productive use.	This approach is reflected in Policy WCS5 which prioritises recycling/stockpiling above disposal.
Ramblers Association	Any plant construction should be constructed and located in a manner sympathetic to the environment.	Draft Policy WCS12 address protection of the environment and local amenity along with the saved policies from the existing Waste Local Plan.
Southwell Area Transition Steering Group (David)	Should look at innovative Centrica AD sewage plant at Dicot with view to partnering with Severn Trent Water for scheme in Notts.	Noted
Environment Agency	Identify types of facilities need to achieve recycling rates. Link policies to Municipal waste management plans. Clarify which definition of municipal waste used. Recovery as an option to divert from landfill should not undermine the rest of the waste hierarchy. Provide greater clarity re role of energy recovery and facilities needed to deliver. Role of landfill tax has been understated. Landraise has greater operational and amenity issues/impacts. Decisions should consider amount of haz waste produced in the county and if it is a net importer or exporter of haz waste.	A table of indicative capacity requirements by facility type has been included. The relationship between Municipal Waste Management Strategies and the WCS is explained. An explanation of the two different definitions of municipal waste has been included in the glossary. More detail has been provided on the level of hazardous waste.
Broad locations		

Coal Authority	Broad locations should consider implications on mineral resources and the legacy of past mining activity. Land instability and mining legacy need not prevent development. New development can offer opportunities re community benefits, sustainability and public safety.	Noted - this will be addressed through Development Management Policies, the Site Specific Document and relevant planning applications.
Peel Environmental Ltd	Largely agree with site allocation approach, provided criteria-based and broad areas are sufficiently robust to deliver the strategy. Should provide clarity to public and industry. Support recycling and recovery prioritised in main urban areas and support the areas identified.	This approach is now embodied within WCS Policies WCS3 and WCS6.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Supportive of reducing travel distance due to reduced cost. But must be balanced against proximity to settlements. Does not specify site requirements - leaving it to developers which has risk of overcapacity and importing. Cross boundary issues need to be understood, should indicate facilities in surrounding areas.	Policy WCS11 addresses cross-boundary issues. Details of existing and relevant neighbouring facilities have been provided in Chapter 4.
Gedling Borough Council	If fresh evidence comes to light that strategic site(s) are fundamental to the overall strategy then these should be identified.	This will be addressed as part of the regular monitoring and review of the WCS.
Mansfield District Council	Support identifying Mansfield urban area as a broad location in principle. Sites should be as local as possible due to less environmental and financial cost implications.	These principles are embodied within the WCS approach and strategic objectives.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	The planning and licensing of new and extant facilities should be dealt with separately. Acknowledge that CS is a strategic document and it is necessarily the most appropriate document for identifying sites.	Noted.
Selston Parish Council	Power stations should be explored as potential sites as a matter of urgency. Assume that flexible approach would not rule them out. Rushcliffe has smallest population, but largest area and most waste - therefore focus facilities to south of county.	The WCS approach would allow for the use of such sites if available but this would depend on the type of facility proposed and the location of the power station. However, the power station operators have indicated that they have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipments.
Ramblers Association	Not a satisfactory solution.	The proposed approach is considered to give the best balance between competing land use interests whilst maintaining an appropriate level of environmental protection. No evidence has been put forward for a realistic alternative other than to use remote locations which would go against general sustainability principles.
SARA and 27 local residents	Councils have not looked into power stations, this must be done. This policy condemns the people of the Ashfield/Mansfield area to social deprivation and exclusion. It proposes facilities in residential areas and there will be unrest if the human aspect is not taken into account. Ashfield does not produce the most waste. Rushcliffe, with the smallest population and largest area, does. No consideration has been given to Newton Airfield development, which could easily be on par in size with Sutton-in-Ashfield.	The WCS approach would allow for the use of power stations if available but this would depend on the type of facility proposed and the location of the power station. However, the power station operators have indicated that they have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipments. Facilities are not proposed within residential areas - the broad locations within Policy WCS3 are focussed on the main urban areas. These broad locations are refined by the site-selection criteria in Policy WCS6 which promotes industrial and employment type locations and previously developed land for example.
Nottinghamshire Independent Group	Cannot support as against best interest of our constituents - they do not want facilities in residential areas. Proposals do not take account of large developments in the County (Newton Airfield).	The WCS does not propose facilities within residential areas - the broad locations within Policy WCS3 are refined by the site-selection criteria in Policy WCS6 which promotes industrial and employment type locations and previously developed land for example.

English Heritage	This is a logical distribution of facilities, but historic environment within and surrounding the areas need to be carefully assessed to avoid harming heritage assets.	Noted.
Environment Agency	Identify types of facilities need to achieve recycling rates. Link policies to Municipal waste management plans. Clarify which definition of municipal waste used. Recovery as an option to divert from landfill should not undermine the rest of the waste hierarchy. Provide greater clarity re role of energy recovery and facilities needed to deliver. Role of landfill tax has been understated. Landraise has greater operational and amenity issues/impacts. Decisions should consider amount of haz waste produced in the county and if it is a net importer or exporter of haz waste.	A table of indicative capacity requirements by facility type has been included. The relationship between Municipal Waste Management Strategies and the WCS is explained. An explanation of the two different definitions of municipal waste has been included in the glossary. More detail has been provided on the level of hazardous waste.
Highways Agency	Pleased to note consideration of potential impact on SRN and maximising opportunities to use rail and water transport.	Noted.
Inland Waterways Association	Should include specific reference to water transport, CS should seek to position sites to avoid use of road and prioritise use of water transport.	Draft policy WCS10 promotes alternative forms of transport, including water, where viable.
Natural England	Support the approach but see detailed comments on key diagram.	Noted.
Veolia	Support approach focusing on main arising areas. Provides flexibility to identify a list of sites for detailed appraisal. However, focusing development on west means a network of bulking in the north and east will be needed (for MSW and commercial). Strategic waste sites require larger sites - must be evidence that there are enough sites for the plan period. Appears extensive assessment has been completed to provide confidence. Sites must be fully assessed re planning constraints before submission.	A Sustainability Appraisal accompanies the Waste Core Strategy. However, individual sites can only reasonably be assessed at the site-specific stage.
Key diagram		
Coal Authority	Proposals west of Nottingham and Sutton-in-Ashfield need to consider implications of coal resource - prior extraction and sterilisation issues. West/north Nottingham, some Mansfield/Worksop areas have legacy issues re unsuitable land - to be considered at site allocation- mitigation may be needed.	Noted, further details will be sought where necessary
Peel Environmental Ltd	Should be more detailed to provide greater clarity of land incorporated in the proposed areas.	Based on the evidence provided at previous consultation stages, showing the broad locations in an indicative way is seen as the most appropriate approach and mirrors the approach of other Waste Planning Authorities whose Core Strategies are not site specific. The key diagram illustrates the overall strategy and should not be used as a detailed proposals map.
Welbeck Estates	Reiterate Welbeck Colliery as potential site for RRP. Option A (radius) would not adequately ensure the right sites come forward.	Noted - this will be considered at the site-specific stage along with any other sites put forward..
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Substantial concerns that the key diagram implies Mansfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Hucknall and Nottingham will be the location of new waste facilities. It is misleading - it should reflect the Nottingham and Mansfield-Ashfield sub areas of population instead.	This inference was not intentional as place names were intended as geographical reference. References within the text of the document and on the key diagram have been revised accordingly.
People Against Incineration	Rufford Colliery is unsuitable and should be ruled out.	No specific sites are being considered within the Waste Core Strategy.
Ramblers Association	We must protect our countryside and greenbelt. Object to the diagram.	The proposed approach is considered to give the best balance between competing land use interests whilst maintaining an appropriate level of environmental protection. No evidence has been put forward for a realistic alternative other than to use remote locations which would go against general sustainability principles.

Environment Agency	Identify types of facilities need to achieve recycling rates. Link policies to Municipal waste management plans. Clarify which definition of municipal waste used. Recovery as an option to divert from landfill should not undermine the rest of the waste hierarchy. Provide greater clarity re role of energy recovery and facilities needed to deliver. Role of landfill tax has been understated. Landraise has greater operational and amenity issues/impacts. Decisions should consider amount of haz waste produced in the county and if it is a net importer or exporter	A table of indicative capacity requirements by facility type has been included. The relationship between Municipal Waste Management Strategies and the WCS is explained. An explanation of the two different definitions of municipal waste has been included in the glossary. More detail has been provided on the level of hazardous waste.
Natural England	Support the approach but key diagram should include statutory designated sites of nature conservation to indicate areas where potential constraints exist.	Key constraints will be highlighted but it would be impractical and inappropriate to reproduce all of the statutory and other sites on the key diagram. This information has been included within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and is maintained on the larger-scale mapping produced by the District Councils. All environmental constraints will be taken into account when reaching any planning decisions.
Which parts of county/city are most appropriate?		
EDF Energy	Agree that it is not appropriate to highlight power stations as strategic sites due to uncertainty of future UK energy needs. Waste management has not been ruled out as a potential after use of sites.	Noted.
Harworth Estates & Eakring Farming Ltd	Approach to disposal provision is supported (reflects PPS10 and is practical to achieving community support). But care should be taken re extensions to ensure no adverse cumulative impacts. In some instances new, sustainably designed sites could be better alternative.	Policy WCS4 sets out an appropriate sequence of search for future disposal sites and recognises that not all sites may be suitable for extension.
IBA Planning	Support providing better range/distribution of sites for inert disposal - including Greenfield and Green Belt. The authority should prioritise waste management to address the inadequacies in the 'main shortfall area'.	Policy WCS4 sets out an appropriate sequence of search for future disposal sites and prioritises within the shortfall area
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Totally opposed to Bentinck Void for landfill. Power Stations could be utilised rather than colliery sites due to existing infrastructure.	There are no site-specific proposals within the WCS. The overall approach would allow for the use of power stations if available depend on the type of facility proposed and the location of the power station. However, the power station operators have indicated that they have no plans for co-location of waste facilities or to co-fire waste. The remote location of these sites would also significantly increase road transport of waste as rail transport would only be viable for long distance (i.e. out of county) shipments.
Gedling Borough Council	Employment sites (such as Colwick and Netherfield, as identified) can be redeveloped under Policy E3 of the Gedling Local Plan. DNPPF advises that LPAs should identify opportunities for development to use decentralised renewable/low carbon energy and encourages co-location. Housing allocations may present such opportunities (Top Wighay, Teal Close, Gedling Colliery). The Aligned Core Strategies are relevant when looking at future distribution of sites. The Gedling Colliery review should be reflected in the CS	Noted - the potential for energy from waste to contribute to decentralised renewable/low carbon energy solutions is recognised within the WCS and the closer integration of other development and waste management issues is promoted.
Leicestershire County Council	Useful to define small, med, large sized facilities. Care must be taken with endorsing the diversification of existing sites so don't end up with poorly located sites. Should be more definitive over usefulness of existing landfills for other forms of development. They should also be temporary permissions.	Clarity has been provided on the likely sizes of small, medium and large facilities. The re-use of landfill sites for other development will be considered in more detail within the separate development management policies.
Mansfield District Council	Rather Hill may be suitable for inert disposal, pending a review of NE4(B) and NE7 policies and consideration of need/deliverability of additional employment land in the area. Vale Road has access issues that should be fully considered, as well as visual impacts.	Noted.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Agree that landraise in the Green Belt is unlikely to be appropriate.	Noted - no change necessary.

Selston Parish Council	Oppose Bentinck Tip for any form of landfill/energy recovery scheme. Oppose unfair emphasis on Hucknall, Mansfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield as locations for large, centralised recycling/energy recovery facilities. No incineration should be in close proximity to residential homes. Recycling facilities could be located along railway lines with residue transported to new facilities at existing power stations. Power could go into National Grid. Support approach to RRP. Object to use/highlighting of former colliery tips in the Ashfield area. Exporting should not be discounted but assessed on merit. Former colliery sites in the Ashfield area should not be targeted for disposal. SA does not take account of rail transportation and is very rigid in looking at areas of population which are not necessarily the producers of most waste.	WCS is not promoting any specific sites. Facilities are not being promoted in residential areas as set out in Policy WCS6. Policy WCS10 promotes more sustainable forms of transport including rail. The WCS does not rule out the use of power station sites where viable but none of the operators are currently considering any potential waste use and most sites are relatively remote from the main sources of waste. Rail links could be utilised but this is unlikely to be economic for local sources of waste. Former colliery tips present one of the few possible options for disposal once existing void sites are exhausted and could offer environmental benefits in terms of restoration.
Bassetlaw Local Strategic Partnership	New recycling/composting/energy recovery should be small scale, close to areas where it is produced - to reduce transport and provide opportunities for integrated resource recovery. Support over-tipping of existing landfill. Mineral/other voids/colliery tips should only be used for inert waste where this can support appropriate habitat restoration. Support not transporting waste out of county.	WCS makes provision for a range of different scale facilities to serve different areas. This promotes managing waste close to where it is produced but does include provision for larger facilities where these are considered necessary and appropriate such as to serve major urban areas.
Nottingham Friends of the Earth	Support sequential approach for disposal, first preference for extensions and locating facilities near populations centres.	This has been embodied within Policy WCS5.
Ramblers Association	Green belt or greenfield should never be considered.	Such a restrictive approach would be at odds with national waste policy set out in PPS10 and Green Belt PPG2. The WCS therefore tries to strike an appropriate balance and only allow for facilities of an appropriate type and scale relative to their location.
Southwell Area Transition Steering Group (David)	New facilities should be on brownfield, not greenfield land.	The WCS gives priority to using previously developed land.
J Potter	Siting 'close to' Nottingham could be objectional if it doesn't protect the Green Belt.	Appropriate Green Belt protection will be maintained in line with national policy but this does allow for the development of some waste management facilities where clearly justified.
Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	Ashfield and Mansfield should not be identified as locations for large sites as they do not produce the most waste. It ignores other areas such as Chilwell, Beeston, Radcliffe and Bingham. Should locate recycling facilities along railway lines, with residue going to power stations and power to national grid. There needs to be a sea change in thinking but there are no new radical thoughts in the WCS and some populations are being targeted. To highlight colliery sites is wrong because yet again most of such sites are in the Ashfield/Mansfield area, it is unfair. No facilities should be close to homes. Under no circumstances will landfilling at Bentinck be supported. The SA seems not to have considered rail transport.	The broad locations identified are based on population and geography. The key diagram, Policy WCS3 and supporting text refer to the wider built areas around these areas to make clear that these are included. Colliery sites are amongst a range of sites considered within the site-selection criteria in Policy WCS6. Sites are not being promoted within residential areas. Policy WCS10 promotes sustainable forms of transport including rail. See earlier comments regarding the possible use of power stations sites.
English Heritage	Clarification of EH position set out in para 5.31 - easier to mitigate transport impacts than <u>land-raising</u> impacts.	Noted.

Environment Agency	Identify types of facilities need to achieve recycling rates. Link policies to Municipal waste management plans. Clarify which definition of municipal waste used. Recovery as an option to divert from landfill should not undermine the rest of the waste hierarchy. Provide greater clarity re role of energy recovery and facilities needed to deliver. Role of landfill tax has been understated. Landraise has greater operational and amenity issues/impacts. Decisions should consider amount of haz waste produced in the county and if it is a net importer or exporter of haz waste.	A table of indicative capacity requirements by facility type has been included. The relationship between Municipal Waste Management Strategies and the WCS is explained. An explanation of the two different definitions of municipal waste has been included in the glossary. More detail has been provided on the level of hazardous waste.
Inland Waterways Association	Should include specific reference to water transport and prioritise location that can utilise water transport.	Draft policy WCS10 promotes alternative forms of transport, including water, where viable.
Search sequence		
Peel Environmental Ltd	Important to ensure the sequence is compatible with criteria-based policies. Regard should be taken to proximity to end-markets to meet 'sustainable transport' objective. Sequential criteria should consider nature of activity and technology, potential end user of energy/by-products. It does not specify the approach to new facilities.	Policy WCS6 sets out site-selection criteria and WCS10 will deliver the sustainable transport objective. Where there is evidence of specific benefits from certain types of technology, this will be a material consideration.
Welbeck Estates	Willing to work with the councils to refine definition of large or small sites.	Noted.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Seems limited. Not clear where aspects such as giving preference to brownfield/urban land or use of good transport networks come in.	These elements have been incorporated into Policy WCS6 on site-selection and WCS10 on sustainable transport.
Gedling Borough Council	Any extension of Dorket Head into the Green Belt would be inappropriate, contrary to policies ENV26 and ENV32 and national policy in PPG 2.	Noted - the WCS does not favour any specific sites and any proposals would need to meet policy requirements in terms of environmental acceptability etc.
Ramblers Association	There should be no options to use greenfield or green belt.	Such a restrictive approach would be at odds with national waste policy set out in PPS10 and Green Belt PPG2. The WCS therefore tries to strike an appropriate balance and only allow for facilities of an appropriate type and scale relative to their location.
Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	The whole approach is wrong. There is nothing new, a radical approach is needed - namely development along railway lines taking residue to power stations. Health impacts need to be considered. Putting facilities near populations cause tensions. Once operating as a business, cannot control where waste comes from, which is unfair.	The WCS has considered the possible use of power stations and this has not been ruled out, as explained above, but would not provide an overall solution. Health impacts are considered within the WCS and would also be material consideration at the planning application stage. The WCS does not promote residential locations for new waste facilities.
Environment Agency	Identify types of facilities need to achieve recycling rates. Link policies to Municipal waste management plans. Clarify which definition of municipal waste used. Recovery as an option to divert from landfill should not undermine the rest of the waste hierarchy. Provide greater clarity re role of energy recovery and facilities needed to deliver. Role of landfill tax has been understated. Landraise has greater operational and amenity issues/impacts. Decisions should consider amount of haz waste produced in the county and if it is a net importer or exporter of haz waste.	A table of indicative capacity requirements by facility type has been included. The relationship between Municipal Waste Management Strategies and the WCS is explained. An explanation of the two different definitions of municipal waste has been included in the glossary. More detail has been provided on the level of hazardous waste.
Criteria based policies		
Coal Authority	Any assessment should include the presence of mineral resources and unstable land.	Noted - this will be a factor in site allocations and determining planning applications.

Peel Environmental Ltd	Agree with criteria-based approach, but also support flexible approach to assessing specific proposals. Agrees use of employment/allocated employment, but should also included employment allocation in mixed use allocations. Agree derelict and brownfield (incl colliery). Rural schemes should not be limited to community/farm based.	Noted.
Ashfield District Council, Annesley Parish Council	Should have identified the aspects to be taken into account in criteria based policies. The CS should identify inappropriate areas including land allocated for other uses, environmentally sensitive areas, sensitive built environment and sites away from the primary route network. The potential of an SPA should be considered.	The Waste Core Strategy has to strike an appropriate balance between strategic policy and the later, more detailed, development management policies. Inappropriate sites will be controlled under other separate policies on environmental protection and the saved policies within the Waste Local Plan. The potential impact of the SPA has been noted in the text.
Gedling Borough Council	Any future landfill proposals at Newstead, Gedling and Calverton Collieries should consider planning policies/other development. Support criteria seeking to protect open character of Green Belt - only small scale composting/transfer would potentially be appropriate.	Noted.
Mansfield District Council	Support in principle use of criteria-based policies to inform site allocations and planning applicatoins, subject to them covering full range of possible local environmental impacts.	Noted.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Spatial Policy 9 gives criteria for site identification. It should be used as a basis for the WCS policy for consistency (especially 4-9). At least the WCS policy should not contradict it.	Noted.
Selston Parish Council	Support this approach.	Noted.
Bassetlaw Local Strategic Partnership	Siting of facilities should follow SEA and EIA.	These will be applied where required. The WCS is subject to SA which incorporates the SEA Directive requirements but not all waste facilities will require EIA.
Nottingham Friends of the Earth	Support use of criteria based policies.	Noted.
Ramblers Association	Fully support brownfield site use.	Noted.
J Potter	Green Belt and/or greenfield land-raise is not really acceptable.	Such a restrictive approach would be at odds with national waste policy set out in PPS10 and Green Belt PPG2. The WCS therefore tries to strike an appropriate balance and only allow for facilities of an appropriate type and scale relative to their lcoation.
Selston residents, SARA and Notts Independent Group	To use small sites for recycling is acceptable but not on Green Belt land, however a perfectly good site at Huthwaite was closed.	Please see comments above.
English Heritage	Historic environmental issues need to be considered as part of any assessment.	Noted.
Highways Agency	Should include assessment regarding potential level of impact on SRN. Important to have a robust policy framework to control waste developments when they arise.	This can only reasonably assessed at the more detailed site specific stage.
Natural England	Sites need detailed assessment to take account of environmental issues. Welcome the consideration of the potential for an SPA at Sherwood. Assessment should include protection of biodiversity, landscape, access and impact of air pollution on sites of ecological and geological importance. Should safeguard statutory designated sites, legally protected species, Local Wildlife Sites and BAP habitats/species.	Policy WCS14 provides general protection and will be reinforced with more detailed controls in separate development management policies. Existing Waste Local Plan policies have been saved in the meantime.
Veolia	Support criteria based policies, welcome the details of it. Allocated employment land provides excellent opportunitiy for strategic sites. Suitably located colliery sites, such as Rainworth, should be suitable 'in principle' for large scale waste facilities.	Noted.

	Safeguarding	
Gedling Borough Council	No safeguarding at this stage, and no evidence provided that would justify such a safeguarding policy in any case.	On balance, a safeguarding policy is seen as appropriate as set out in PPS10. Existing facilities have been affected by the subsequent development of housing or other sensitive uses nearby.
Selston Parish Council	The general policy on safeguarding existing sites is approved.	Policy WCS9 seeks to safeguard appropriate existing sites and sites identified for future use.
Ramblers Association	Agree	Noted.
	Extensions	
Gedling Borough Council	The policy should be written to allow the decision maker to judge the extensions against the full range of planning considerations that may be wider than just environmental impact (i.e. on the same basis as a new site would be judged).	This is the approach taken within the WCS.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Generally in agreement. Any waste allocation developments should be reported to the district so they can factor it in to the production of their Allocations DPD.	Noted.
Ramblers Association	Support quarries becoming nature reserves.	Noted.
Selston residents, SARA, Notts Independent Group, Selston Parish Council	Extending existing sites should only be a short term solution with a new radical way of dealing with waste put in place.	The extension of appropriate facilities is supported where this would make the best use of existing infrastructure. Other policies within the WCS provide for a range of waste management solutions.
Environment Agency	More information needed to guide where development might be focussed - particularly taking into account flood risk issues. Opportunities to improve quality of design should be considered, including enhancing existing facilities.	This will be taken into account at the site-specific stage and in determining planning applications.