



meeting **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

date **16 MARCH 2004**

from: **Director of Environment**

agenda item number

**5**

**BASSETLAW DISTRICT APPLICATION NUMBER 1/2/99/179  
PROPOSAL: WASTE TRANSFER STATION  
LOCATION: SANDY LANE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, WORKSOP  
APPLICANT: WORKSOP WASTE SERVICES LTD**

### **Purpose of Report**

1. To consider a planning application for the use of the site as a Waste Transfer Station (WTS). The recommendation is to refuse planning permission on highways grounds.

### **The Site and Surroundings (See plan attached)**

2. The site is located on Sandy Lane Industrial Estate which is located approximately 1km to the north west of Worksop Town Centre. It occupies 0.4ha of land and is bordered to the north by a glassworks and beyond that a railway line. To the south the site is bordered by another industrial unit. The site is surrounded by 2m high palisade security fencing, apart from the western end of the site (which backs onto the cooling water pond for the glassworks) which is secured with chain link fencing.
3. The site is presently operated mainly as a transfer and bulking facility for discharge, bulking and reloading of recycled paper. The site also acts as a base for the Worksop Waste Services Limited (WWSL) transport business, which operates a fleet of 10 skip and multi-collection vehicles. These currently make an average of 77 trips per day (154 movements in total) associated with paper and some glass recycling. In addition, recycling of a small quantity of inert wastes also takes place on the site, which includes the crushing of concrete and brickwork.
4. The nearest residential properties are located on Sandy Lane, approximately 130m to the south of the site opposite the entrance to the estate. There are presently two buildings on site: an office/mess/store situated next to the weighbridge and, immediately adjacent, a large shed, where paper is presently stored and bulked before it is delivered to paper recycling outlets. To the rear of the site, there is a newly erected garage building, which is used as a fitting shop for the transport business.
5. The site presently employs 10 people associated with current operations, although an additional 3-4 have recently been employed to assist with proposed expansion.

6. Sandy Lane Industrial Estate is accessed from Sandy Lane by means of an unadopted section of highway, which was constructed by Bassetlaw District Council when the industrial estate was constructed, in the early 1960's, to accommodate their Industrial Units. The access has not been adopted by the County Council, as Highways Authority, because it was not constructed in accordance with the County Councils Highway Design Guide and General Specification for road works in force at the time. Under current standards that apply, the access remains sub-standard, in terms of its design and dimensions.

### **Planning Background**

7. Originally, the site was a small semi-inert landfill. Planning permission was granted for use of the site as a scrapyards in October 1962, and it has since also been used as a vehicle breakers. Various permissions were granted from this date for built development on the site including: a store/workplace in connection with collection of scrap materials; an office, toilet and washhouse; extension of workplace building and alteration of plant layout; and installation of a kiosk. This application, to amend the site layout and plant to allow the operation of the site as a waste transfer station, was originally submitted in September 1999. Further revisions to the application refer to the proposed development as being a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). However, from the details submitted, it is clear that the development is essentially concerned with waste transfer operations.
8. A waste management licence was granted for a scrapyards at the site in 1995. Since then, the licence has been modified to allow the present paper and glass recycling. A further modification to the Waste Management Licence has recently been issued by the Environment Agency, for use of the site as a "materials recycling facility". This states that the site should not start operating until the relevant planning permission has been granted.

### **Description of Proposal**

9. It is proposed to rationalise the operations presently carried out on site to use the area as a waste transfer station, to increase the range and percentage of waste recycled, and allow the discharge and recycling of construction and demolition waste, and the sale of products, from those waste streams. It is proposed that the site will accept cardboard, wood, paper, metal, plastic, glass, polythene, brick, soil and concrete, and it is hoped to recycle 75% of builders waste and 25% of industrial/commercial waste that passes through the site. It is anticipated that the site would be able to receive process and recycle some 25,000 tonnes of material per year when the site is operating at maximum capacity. Any residual waste will be taken to either a licensed waste disposal site or, for example, in the case of paper and glass, to recycling facilities.
10. The site will house items of equipment in the form of a loading shovel, excavator and screens. There will be a concrete discharge/picking area, which will be covered by a mobile shelter (described below) for use during inclement weather. There will also be a small screening, picking and sorting plant on the northern side of the site. This plant will consist of either a feeder or a covered screen (for initial sorting of fines from the waste) which will feed

a picking belt. Covered concrete based bays will be constructed to deal with hand sorted waste.

11. Originally, the application proposed substantial access alterations to satisfy concerns raised by the Highways Authority regarding the suitability of the access for this development, and to accommodate the then projected number of vehicle movements associated with the development. These plans illustrated proposed widening of the existing carriageway, repositioning of kerbs to provide increased junction radii, increased visibility splays and various alterations to the boundary walls of the industrial estate, with associated re-positioning of utilities. The proposals would have involved felling of a number of semi-mature trees planted along the boundary of the estate to Sandy Lane which, when in leaf, further restrict visibility at the junction. These amendments satisfied the Highway Authority's initial concerns, but it was calculated that they would cost in the region of £35,000-£40,000 to implement. A large proportion of this cost was attributable to the relocation of utilities (a telecoms junction box) located alongside one of the kerbs.
12. The applicant considered the initial improvements prohibitively expensive and, as a result, carried out investigations regarding possible sources of contributory funding. When these did not appear to be forthcoming, further investigations were made regarding revised access alterations. Following this work, an alternative junction layout was proposed in March 2003 which would allow kerbs to be realigned and the road width adjacent to the junction being increased, without disturbing the service ducts or accesses around the junction. The revised works would not involve rebuilding the whole of junction as required by the Highway Authority (and initially shown on the original plans). The applicant considered that it was only the position of the kerbs that caused a problem, and that it was unreasonable to request them to pay for any additional works. It was estimated that the revised amendments would cost approximately £10,000, and it was proposed to pay for this through a grant under the DTI Enterprise Grant Scheme.
13. The revised application also proposed the removal of trees behind the brick boundary walls for the first 10 metres from the junction, to improve visibility, and to re-mark the access with a solid stop line. The site layout was redesigned to allow for vehicles using the site to turn within its perimeter, so that they could enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The site entrance was also shown to be widened slightly to give a better angle for HGV's coming into the site.
14. It was originally envisaged that a total of 25 HGVs would visit the site during a normal working day (50 movements) as a result of the development, with 10 other vehicles (20 movements) also visiting the site (not including staff vehicles). This would have proposed a total of 70 vehicle movements associated with the development. Since the application was submitted, the applicant has taken on a number of new contracts, which have resulted in actual increased vehicle movements, and a substantial increase in the proposed number of vehicle movements, from that originally proposed.
15. The applicant now states that waste traffic associated with the operation amount to some 154 daily vehicle movements, with an average of 18

additional car movements. There are, in addition, some 2 to 4 articulated lorry vehicle movements per day. A traffic count undertaken by the applicant in December 2002 concluded that there were a total of 503 vehicle movements into and out of the industrial estate over a 10 hour day. Present vehicle movements clearly exceed those originally anticipated to be associated with this proposal. On this basis, and once the transfer station comes on stream processing 25,000 tonnes of waste per annum, it is anticipated that the site would generate a total of 200 waste vehicle movements a day. This represents an increase of 46 vehicle movements per day over the current levels. However, it represents a much more significant increase over the 50 vehicle movements anticipated to be associated with operations at the site under the proposal as originally submitted.

16. Staffing numbers have also been revised. It was originally envisaged that the site would employ 5 new staff additional to the 15 existing staff. However, this figure was revised to some 10 new jobs over and above existing numbers of staff.
17. It is proposed to operate the site between 07.30 am to 5.30pm on Monday to Friday and from 07.30am to 1.00pm on Saturday. No waste will be accepted on site outside these hours. However, the applicant anticipates that some vehicle movements may take place prior to 7.30am. No working will take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays, except in exceptional circumstances.

### **Planning Policy**

18. The distinction between waste transfer stations and materials recycling/recovery facilities is becoming increasingly blurred as many transfer stations now incorporate some recycling operations. This proposal is essentially concerned with sorting a range of wastes, from various sources, for onward transfer, for either recycling or disposal. It is most appropriately described as a Waste Transfer Station, rather than a Materials Recycling Facility, which is how it is described on the Waste Management Licence and referred to by the applicant. The following policies are therefore relevant.
19. The Waste Local Plan (WLP) aims to encourage more waste transfer stations within Nottinghamshire, and Policy W9.1 identifies areas of search. Although this site is not located within such an area, it falls under a second element of that policy. This indicates that proposals for new facilities outside these preferred areas will also be permitted on other employment sites provided there is no unacceptable environmental impact. Policy W3.14 of the WLP states that permission will not be granted for a waste management facility where vehicle movements cannot be satisfactorily accommodated by the highway network or would cause unacceptable disturbance to local communities.
20. Other planning policies of relevance to this proposal are as follows:
  - Policy W2.1 defines a hierarchy for waste management proposals.
  - Policy W3.3 and W3.4 cover issues regarding visual Impact, screening and landscape proposals.
  - Policy W3.6 seeks to protect groundwater resources.

- Policies W3.8, W3.9 and W3.10 apply to measures to deal with noise and dust.
  - Policy W3.15 is concerned with routing of waste vehicles.
21. The Bassetlaw Local Plan, Deposit Draft 1995 allocates the site as “Protected Employment Land” under policy 2/13.

### **Consultations**

22. Bassetlaw District Council - raise no objections to the proposal.
23. The Environment Agency - raise no objections to the proposal, but recommends that any permission impose planning conditions to prevent pollution of the water environment. They also note that an application which covered the south-west corner of the property for the disposal of construction, demolition, excavation and refractory wastes was refused in 1982. The EA are unable to confirm whether any waste was deposited at the site after this date. Given the previous use of the site they advise that a condition also be imposed which requires the applicant to carry out a detailed scheme for the investigation and recording of contamination at the site.
24. The Coal Authority - report on the mining circumstances in the area which raise no concerns regarding this proposal.

### **Publicity**

25. The application was publicised by means of an advertisement in the Worksop Guardian and a site notice was placed at the entrance to the site. No representations have been received as a result.

### **Observations**

#### Highways Issues

26. Given the status of the access road (as described above), the Highway Authority raised concern regarding the acceptability of the original proposal. As a result, objections are raised on the following grounds:
- a) the junction of the Industrial Estate road with Sandy Lane does not provide adequate visibility, under standards as incorporated in the Highways Design Guide;
  - b) the kerb radii at the junction are insufficient to allow heavy goods vehicles to manoeuvre in and out safely: and
  - c) the width of the carriageway of the access road is not to an appropriate standard.
27. It was considered that the proposed waste transfer trips (50 HGV movements) would lead to an intensification of use of an existing sub-standard access to the detriment of highway safety. The Highways Authority advised that in order to bring the industrial access road up to an adoptable standard, the road would have to be completely reconstructed in accordance with the relevant standards, with 2 metre wide footways and a 7.3m wide carriageway.

Visibility splays of 4.5m x 70m would be required in each direction from this access along Sandy Lane, within which there should be no obstruction to vision above 1.05m in height taken from the channel level of the adjacent carriageway. Appropriate national highways design guidance states that, where large goods vehicles comprise a significant proportion of turning movements, a compound curve should be used, which equates to 15m kerb radii.

28. In the light of this, and of the then projected vehicle movements associated with the proposal, access alterations were submitted in January 2000 which were considered to be acceptable in highways terms. However, the estimated cost of these works are considered by the applicant prohibitive to fund without a supporting contribution and, following investigations, funding options did not appear to be forthcoming.
29. The revised proposals submitted in March 2003, which now form the application, although cheaper to implement, are considered unacceptable in highways terms. They do not propose the lowering of the existing wall, and do not improve the existing visibility splays of 4.5m x 31.6m (west) and 4.5m x 23.9m (east). These are clearly sub-standard and the intensification of use of the junction on any level would be detrimental to highway safety. The revised proposals also illustrate junction radii of 10.3m. This is clearly below the guidance figure of 15m. The proposal could therefore compromise highway safety, as HGV's may be forced to cross onto the wrong side of the carriageway when entering/leaving the industrial estate.
30. In addition to this, the vehicle movements associated with the site have increased significantly since the application was first submitted, and an average of 200 vehicle movements per day is now proposed. Given the increase in vehicles using the site, it is considered that, without the full range of improvements put forward in January 2000, the proposal would result in an unacceptable intensification of the use of an already sub-standard access. This would be to the detriment of highway safety. It is understood that Bassetlaw District Council remain responsible for the maintenance and repair of the access. The District Council has been approached regarding potential contributions towards the upgrade of the access, but they are of the view that the state of the road is acceptable for its current use, and have no intentions nor accept any responsibility for its upgrading.
31. As it stands, and on the currently estimated vehicle movements associated with the development of the site, the access is considered unacceptable in highway terms. Accordingly, it would be necessary for junction improvements to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority such that its objection can be withdrawn. The proposal as it stands is contrary to WLP Policy W3.14, in that vehicle movements cannot be satisfactorily accommodated by the highway network. Since there is an unacceptable environmental impact, it does not satisfy the requirements of the second part of WLP Policy W9.1 in this respect.

#### Visual Impact

32. In terms of visual impact, it is unlikely that this proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding environment. As already identified, the

site is located in an existing industrial estate which supports a mix of industrial and employment uses and is well suited to the proposed use. In order to lessen any visual impact the applicant agreed to undertake some planting along the northern border of the site, in the form of a hedge, to mitigate views for rail users to the north. This requirement could be covered by a condition attached to a permission, if one were granted.

#### Dust, Noise and Litter

33. The applicant proposes to use mobile water sprays, to dampen exposed surfaces and stored/stockpiled material, to ensure that dust arising from operations is minimised. All vehicles entering and leaving the site will be sheeted. Sales stockpiles will be stored in bays and where material is less than 3mm in size they will be covered with removable sheeting to prevent windblown dust generation. All stockpiles will be maintained at below 4m in height and banked down to the 3m high retaining walls around the storage bays. Such matters could be covered by planning conditions.
34. The applicant proposes that the loading area will be covered with netting on a permanent basis, to prevent any litter escaping from operations. The site will also be fenced off, which should trap any windblown litter. A condition could also be attached to any permission granted, requiring the operator to undertake to retrieve any litter that escapes from the site, should this occur and be the subject of complaints to the County Planning Authority (CPA).
35. The nearest residential properties are situated opposite the junction at the entrance to the industrial estate, approximately 130m away from the site. Given the proximity of Sandy Lane to these houses and the existence of other industrial estate users between these properties and the site, it is not considered that noise arising from operations at this site would cause any undue impact. In any event, plant and machinery have been designed with noise suppression cowling and appropriate silencers.

#### Impact on Surface and Ground Water

36. Given the existing use of the site and the previous site history, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact on the existing water environment. However, the Environment Agency recommend that a contamination investigation survey be undertaken on the site to assess the degree of contamination. They also recommend a number of conditions be imposed on any permission granted. These would refer to arrangements for storage of oils and chemicals, measures for dealing with surface water drainage and discharge of foul or contaminated drainage.

#### Waste Management Licence

37. Although the development is not considered acceptable on highways grounds, the Environment Agency are unable to refuse the modification to the Waste Management Licence application on these grounds. However, the approved modification does state that the site should not start operating until the relevant planning permission has been obtained.

## **Statutory and Policy Implications**

38. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, personnel, Crime and Disorder and those using the service. Where implications are material, they have been drawn out in the text of the report. Attention if however drawn to the specifics as follows:-

## **Human Rights Act Implications**

39. The relevant issues arising out for consideration of the Human Rights Act have been assessed in accordance with the Council's adopted protocol. Rights under Article 1 of the First Protocol are affected. Members need to consider whether the highways safety issues outweigh the recycling and economic benefits of the proposal and the rights of the applicant to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

## **Conclusions**

40. In all respects except for highways, the proposal is acceptable. The proposed site is an employment site located in a purpose built industrial estate and surrounded by other industrial users, with a lengthy history of waste related uses. Under WLP Policy W9.1, the site is acceptable in principle, provided there are no unacceptable environmental impacts. In terms of noise, dust, litter and visual impacts, the proposal is, subject to the imposition of conditions, acceptable. Conditions can also be imposed to deal with any impact on the water environment. With regard to highways, however, the proposal anticipates an intensification of vehicle movements (some of which has already occurred during the period the application has been under consideration by the CPA) on the demonstrably sub-standard junction between Sandy Lane and the industrial estate access road. This would be to the detriment of highways safety and renders the proposal unacceptable and in conflict with WLP policies W3.14 and W9.1.
41. The CPA has allowed the application to run for some considerable time, in order that all possible options to resolve the highways objection can be explored. Discussions along these lines are still proceeding and the applicant has been advised that, if the highways issues can be resolved, a re-submitted application, rather than pursuing the matter through the appeal process, would be the appropriate course of action. However, without relatively major works to the layout of the junction, and associated works to the boundary walls to the industrial estate, together with felling of trees, it is difficult to see how the objection may be overcome. In the light of this, the recommendation must be for refusal of the application.
42. If amendments to the junction layout can be drawn up that do resolve the highways issues, these can be subject of a further application which should, all other things being equal, find a favourable recommendation from officers. Given the encouragement generally in planning policy and guidance for waste management for facilities of this sort, and in the interests of reaching an outcome that would satisfy the parties without recourse to the appeal process, the Committee may wish to give its backing to advice to the applicant along these lines



## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

43. It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be refused for the proposal on the grounds that it would result in an intensification of the use of the sub-standard junction of Sandy Lane and the industrial estate access road which, because of its inadequate visibility, width and kerb radii, would be to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal would be contrary to WLP policies W3.14 and W9.1.
44. It is FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the applicant be advised that, should amendments to the junction and associated works be carried out that address the grounds for the present highways objection, and all other matters associated with the proposal remain the same, any re-submitted proposals would be unlikely to raise further objection from the CPA.
45. Members will need to consider the issues set out in the report and resolve accordingly.

PETER WEBSTER  
Director of Environment

### **Head of Legal Services' Comments**

Planning Committee has power to decide the Recommendation. [SHB 4.3.04]

### **Director of Resources' Financial Comments**

As this report considers the planning permission only, there are no direct financial implications arising. [DJK 25.2.04]

### **Background Papers Available for Inspection**

1. Letter from Worksop Waste Services dated 10<sup>th</sup> September 1999
2. Letter from Coal Authority dated 20<sup>th</sup> September 1999.
3. Letter from Environment Agency dated 20<sup>th</sup> October 1999.
4. Letter from J C Adams (agent for Worksop Waste Services) dated 28<sup>th</sup> October 1999.
5. Letter from Bassetlaw District Council dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 1999.
6. Letter from J C Adams dated 14<sup>th</sup> March 2000.
7. Letter from Nottinghamshire County Council to Silkstone Environmental Ltd (agent for Worksop Waste Services) dated 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2002.
8. Letter from Nottinghamshire County Council to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 21<sup>st</sup> March 2002.
9. Letter from Nottinghamshire County Council to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 6<sup>th</sup> November 2002.
10. Letter from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2002.
11. Letter from Nottinghamshire County Council to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 14<sup>th</sup> February 2003.
12. Fax from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2003.
13. Faxed letter from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 5<sup>th</sup> March 2003.

14. Letter from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 5<sup>th</sup> March 2003.
15. Letter from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 10<sup>th</sup> March 2003.
16. Fax from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 7<sup>th</sup> April 2003.
17. Letter from Nottinghamshire County Council to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2003.
18. E-mail from Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 24<sup>th</sup> April 2003.
19. E-mail from NCC to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2003.
20. E-mail from NCC to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 13<sup>th</sup> November 2003.
21. Letter from NCC to Silkstone Environmental Ltd dated 7<sup>th</sup> January 2004.
22. Letter from Environment Agency dated 12<sup>th</sup> January 2004.
23. Facsimile from Silkstone Environmental dated 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2004.

## **Electoral Division(s) Affected**

Worksop West

***Please note. Copies of plans referred to in this report may be obtained from: John Sheffield, Environment, Trent Bridge House, Fox Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 6BJ, tel 0115 977 4499, email john.sheffield@nottscc.gov.uk or from Peter Barker at the same address, tel 0115 977 4416, email peter.barker@nottscc.gov.uk.***

EPD.AH/EP4491  
30 January 2004 (4.3.04)

**Planning Policies**

Nottinghamshire Waste Local Plan (Adopted January 2002):

**Policy W2.1**

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE THEY REPRESENT THE BEST PRACTICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL OPTION, BASED ON A HIERARCHY WITHIN WHICH THE ORDER OF PREFERENCE IS:

- REDUCTION
- RE-USE
- RECOVERY – COMPOSTING & RECYCLING
- RECOVERY – ENERGY FROM WASTE
- DISPOSAL WITH ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

**Policy W3.3**

WHEN PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY IS GRANTED, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED TO ENSURE ALL PLANT, BUILDINGS AND STORAGE AREAS ARE:

- (a) LOCATED IN SUCH A POSITION AS TO MINIMISE IMPACT ON ADJACENT LAND;
- (b) WHERE PRACTICABLE, GROUPED TOGETHER TO PREVENT THE CREATION OF AN UNSIGHTLY SPRAWL OF DEVELOPMENT AND TO AID THEIR SCREENING;
- (c) KEPT AS LOW AS PRACTICABLE TO MINIMISE VISUAL INTRUSION;
- (d) OF APPROPRIATE COLOUR AND CLADDING OR OTHERWISE SUITABLY TREATED TO REDUCE THEIR VISUAL IMPACT;
- (e) SATISFACTORILY MAINTAINED TO PRESERVE THEIR EXTERNAL APPEARANCE.

**Policy W3.4**

WHERE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY IS GRANTED, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED TO ENSURE THAT SCREENING AND LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS REDUCE VISUAL IMPACT. SUCH CONDITIONS MAY INCLUDE:

- (a) MEASURES TO RETAIN, ENHANCE, PROTECT AND MANAGE EXISTING FEATURES OF INTEREST AND VALUE FOR SCREENING AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE RECLAMATION OF THE SITE;
- (b) MEASURES TO SCREEN THE SITE BY THE USE OF WALLS, FENCES, EARTH MOUNDING AND/OR TREE AND SHRUB PLANTING;
- (c) DETAILS OF METHOD OF WORKING, AND PHASING TO CAUSE LEAST VISUAL INTRUSION;
- (d) DETAILS OF THE LOCATION, SIZE, SHAPE AND TREATMENT OF ANY TEMPORARY SOIL, OVERBURDEN, WASTE MOUNDS AND WASTE CONTAINER STORAGE AREAS;
- (e) DETAILS OF THE LOCATION, FORM, NUMBER, SPECIES, SIZE, METHOD OF PLANTING, SITE PREPARATION AND ANY NECESSARY MEASURES FOR REPLACING PLANT MATERIAL WHICH FAILS FOLLOWING INITIAL PLANTING.

### **Policy W3.6**

WHEN PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED, WHERE RELEVANT, TO PROTECT SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER RESOURCES. SUCH CONDITIONS MAY INCLUDE:

- (a) LINING AND CAPPING OF WASTE DISPOSAL SITES;
- (b) LEACHATE MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING SYSTEMS;
- (c) IMPERMEABLE HARDSTANDING WHERE WASTE IS TO BE STORED, HANDLED OR TREATED;**
- (d) MEASURES TO CONTROL DIESEL, OIL OR CHEMICAL SPILLAGE;
- (e) SEPARATE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS FOR CLEAN AND DIRTY SITE RUN-OFF;
- (f) RESTRICTIONS ON WASTE TYPES.

### **Policy W3.8**

WHEN PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED TO PREVENT LITTER NUISANCE. WHERE RELEVANT, SUCH CONDITIONS MAY INCLUDE:

- (a) PERIMETER LITTER-CATCH FENCING;
- (b) THE ENCLOSURE OF WASTE STORAGE AREAS;
- (c) SHEETING OF LORRIES;
- (d) COLLECTION OF WIND-BLOWN LITTER;
- (e) SECURITY MEASURES TO DISCOURAGE FLY-TIPPING;
- (f) DAILY COVER AT WASTE DISPOSAL SITES.

### **Policy W3.9**

WHEN PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED TO REDUCE THE POTENTIAL NOISE IMPACT. SUCH CONDITIONS MAY INCLUDE:

- (a) RESTRICTING HOURS OF OPERATION;
- (b) SOUND PROOFING OF FIXED AND MOBILE PLANT;
- (c) ALTERNATIVES TO THE USE OF REVERSING BLEEPERS;
- (d) STAND-OFF DISTANCES BETWEEN OPERATIONS AND NOISE SENSITIVE LOCATIONS;
- (e) NOISE BAFFLE MOUNDS AND SCREEN FENCES;
- (f) SETTING MAXIMUM NOISE LEVELS AT SENSITIVE LOCATIONS.

### **Policy W3.10**

WHEN PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, CONDITIONS WILL BE IMPOSED TO SUPPRESS DUST GENERATION. SUCH CONDITIONS MAY INCLUDE:

- (a) THE USE OF WATER BOWSERS ON HAUL ROADS;
- (b) SCREEN BANKS;
- (c) ENCLOSING DUST GENERATING FIXED PLANT AND MACHINERY;
- (d) SITING DUST GENERATING OPERATIONS AWAY FROM SENSITIVE AREAS;
- (e) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS WHEN NECESSARY;

- (f) THE USE OF TREE SCREENS WHERE RELEVANT.

#### **Policy W3.15**

IN GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY THE COUNTY COUNCIL WILL AS APPROPRIATE:

- (a) IMPOSE CONDITIONS REQUIRING THE POSTING OF SITE NOTICES AND/OR THE ISSUING OF INSTRUCTIONS TO LORRY DRIVERS DETAILING ANY ROUTES TO BE AVOIDED OR FOLLOWED;
- (b) SEEK TO NEGOTIATE PLANNING OBLIGATIONS IN ORDER TO SECURE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS.

#### **Policy M3.14**

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR A WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY WHERE THE VEHICLE MOVEMENTS LIKELY TO BE GENERATED CANNOT BE SATISFACTORILY ACCOMMODATED BY THE HIGHWAY NETWORK OR WOULD CAUSE UNACCEPTABLE DISTURBANCE TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES.

#### **Policy W5.5**

PROPOSALS FOR MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITIES WILL BE PERMITTED IN EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES OR THOSE DESIGNATED IN THE CITY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL'S LOCAL PLANS PROVIDED THERE IS NO UNACCEPTABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.

#### **Policy W9.1**

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR WASTE TRANSFER STATIONS WILL BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE FOLLOWING EMPLOYMENT SITES SUBJECT TO ADEQUATE ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS:

- (a) HARWORTH;
- (b) FIRBECK;
- (c) BOUGHTON;
- (d) BRAILWOOD ROAD, BILSTHORPE;
- (e) OLD MILL LANE, MANSFIELD;
- (f) BLEAK HILLS MANSFIELD;
- (g) LAND WEST OF FULWOOD;
- (h) BELVOIR IRONWORKS, BALDERTON;
- (i) NEWMANLEY ROAD, EASTWOOD;
- (j) COLWICK SITE NO.1;
- (k) COLWICK SITE NO.2;
- (l) EASTCROFT;
- (m) LANGAR.

PROPOSALS FOR NEW FACILITIES OR EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING SITES OUTSIDE THESE PREFERRED AREAS WILL ALSO BE PERMITTED IN OTHER EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES OR THOSE DESIGNATED IN THE CITY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLANS PROVIDED THERE IS NO UNACCEPTABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.

#### The Bassetlaw Local Plan, Deposit Draft 1995