



**Leicestershire & Leicester Waste
Development Framework:
Core Strategy & Development Control
Policies DPD
(Preferred Options)**

**Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic
Environmental Assessment (SEA)**

**Sustainability Appraisal Report
(Appendices)
June 2006**

Prepared for Leicester City &
Leicestershire County Councils by:

Atkins Ltd
Axis 6th Floor West
10 Holliday St
Birmingham
B1 1TF

Tel: Nicki Schiessel 0121 483 5986
Email: nicki.schiessel@atkinsglobal.com

This document is copyright and should not be copied in whole or in part by any means other than with the approval of Atkins Consultants Limited. Any unauthorised user of the document shall be responsible for all liabilities arising out of such use.

Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
Appendix A: List of Consultees and Interested Stakeholders	1
Appendix B: Summary of the Consultation Responses on the Scoping Report	15
Appendix C: Baseline Tables	21
Appendix D: Assessment of draft final Preferred Core Strategy & Development Control Policies	37

APPENDIX A: LIST OF CONSULTEES AND INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS

SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BODIES

GENERAL:

East Midlands Regional Assembly
Melton Mowbray

Countryside Agency,
East Midlands Region,
Nottingham

Environment Agency,
Peterborough / Anglian Region,
Northern Area / Tewkesbury /
Trentside Offices, Nottingham

English Heritage ,
East Midlands Region
Northampton

English Nature,
Grantham

Network Rail,
Temple Meads,
Bristol

Highways Agency,
Programme Planning & Development,
Birmingham

East Midlands Development Agency
Nottingham

Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust,
Leicester

Coventry Airport,
Coventry

East Midlands Airport
Divisional Standards Manager
(Environment),
Castle Donington

Ministry of Defence,
Defence Estate Organisation,
Sutton Coldfield

British Waterways,
East Midlands Office,
Nottinghamshire

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES AND COUNTY COUNCILS:

Blaby District Council,
Chief Planning Officer,
Narborough

Charnwood Borough Council,
Head of Planning Services,
Loughborough

Harborough District Council,
Development Control Manager,
Market Harborough

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council,
District Planning Officer,
Hinckley

Melton Borough Council,
Chief Planning Officer,

Melton Mowbray

North West Leicestershire District
Council,
Chief Planning Officer,
Coalville

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council,
Assistant Director (Planning),
Wigston

Cambridgeshire County Council,
Environment and Transport Department,
Cambridge

Derby City Council,
Development and Cultural Services
Department,

Derby	Head of Planning and Engineering Services, Burton on Trent
Derbyshire County Council, Director of Environmental Services, Matlock	Erewash Borough Council, Director of Technical Services, Long Eaton
Lincolnshire County Council, Head of Planning and Conservation, Lincoln	Kettering Borough Council, Director of Development Services, Kettering
Northamptonshire County Council, Head of Sustainable Development, Northampton	Lichfield District Council, Director of Planning, Lichfield
Nottingham City Council, Director of Development, Nottingham	Newark and Sherwood District Council, Director of Development, Newark, Nottingham
Nottinghamshire County Council, Director of Environment, Nottingham	North Warwickshire Borough Council, Borough Planning Officer, Atherstone
Peterborough City Council, Head of Planning Services, Peterborough	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Director of Planning and Development, Nuneaton
Staffordshire County Council, Director of Development Services, Stafford	Rugby Borough Council, Head of Planning Services, Rugby
Warwickshire County Council, Warwick	Rushcliffe Borough Council, Director of Development, West Bridgford, Nottingham
Corby District Council, Director of Development Services, Corby, Northants	South Derbyshire District Council, Planning Dept., Swadlincote, Derbyshire
Daventry District Council, Director of Development Services, Daventry, Northants	South Kesteven District Council, District Planning Officer, Grantham, Lincs.
East Northamptonshire District Council, Chief Planning Officer, Thrapston	
East Staffordshire Borough Council,	

PARISH COUNCILS:

Clerk to Aston Flamville Parish Council,	Clerk to Countesthorpe Parish Council,
Clerk to Blaby Parish Council,	Clerk to Cosby Parish Council,
Clerk to Braunstone Parish Council,	Clerk to Croft Parish Council,

Clerk to Elmesthorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Hathern Parish Council,
Clerk to Enderby Parish Council,	Clerk to Hoton Parish Council,
Clerk to Glen Parva Parish Council,	Clerk to Mountsorrel Parish Council,
Clerk to Glenfield Parish Council,	Clerk to Newtown Linford Parish Council,
Clerk to Huncote Parish Council,	Clerk to Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council,
Clerk to Kilby Parish Council,	Clerk to Queniborough Parish Council,
Clerk to Kirby Muxloe Parish Council,	Clerk to Quorndon Parish Council,
Clerk to Leicester Forest East Parish Council,	Chairman of Ratcliffe on the Wreake Parish Council,
Clerk to Leicester Forest West Parish Council,	Clerk to Rearsby Parish Council,
Chairman of Lubbethorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Rothley Parish Council,
Clerk to Narborough and Littlethorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Seagrave Parish Council,
Chairman of Potters Marston Parish Council	Clerk to Sileby Parish Council,
Clerk to Sapcote Parish Council,	Clerk to Shepshed Parish Council,
Clerk to Sharnford Parish Council,	Clerk to South Croxton Parish Council, Chairman of Swithland Parish Council,
Clerk to Stoney Stanton Parish Council,	Clerk to Syston Parish Council,
Clerk to Thurlaston Parish Council,	Clerk to Thrussington & Cropston Parish Council,
Clerk to Whetstone Parish Council,	Clerk to Thurmaston Parish Council,
Chairman of Wigston Parva Parish Council,	Chairman of Ulverscroft Parish Council,
Clerk to Barkby Thorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Walton on the Wolds Parish Council,
Clerk to Barkby Parish Council,	Chairman of Wanlip Parish Council,
Clerk to Barrow upon Soar Parish Council,	Clerk to Woodhouse Parish Council,
Chairman of Beeby Parish Council,	Clerk to Wymeswold Parish Council,
Clerk to Birstall Parish Council,	Chairman to Allexton Parish Meeting
Clerk to Cossington Parish Council,	Clerk to Arnesby Parish Council,
Clerk to East Goscote Parish Council,	Clerk to Ashby Magna Parish Council,
	Chairman of Ashby Parva Parish Council,

Clerk to Billesdon Parish Council,	Clerk to Great Bowden Parish Council,
Chairman of Bittesby Parish Council,	Clerk to Great Easton Parish Council,
Clerk to Bitteswell Parish Council,	Clerk to Great Glen Parish Council,
Chairman of Blaston Parish Council,	Chairman of Gumley Parish Council
Chairman of Bringham, Drayton & Nevill Holt Parish Meeting,	Clerk to Hallaton Parish Council
Clerk to Broughton Astley Parish Council,	Horninghold Parish Council
Clerk to Bruntingthorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Houghton on the Hill Parish Council
Clerk to Burton Overy Parish Council,	Clerk to Hungarton Parish Council
Chairman of Carlton Curliou Parish Council,	Clerk to Husbands Bosworth Parish Council
Chairman of Catthorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Illston on the Hill Parish Council
Clerk to Claybrooke Magna Parish Council,	Chairman of Keyham Parish Council
Clerk to Claybrooke Parva Parish Council,	Clerk to Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council
Cold Newton Parish Council,	Clerk to Kibworth Harcourt Parish Council
Harborough District Council,	Norton Parish Council
Clerk to Cotesbach Parish Council,	Clerk to Knaptoft Parish Council
Chairman of Cranoe Parish Council,	Chairman of Laughton Parish Council
Clerk to Dunton Bassett Parish Council,	Clerk to Launde Parish Council
Clerk to East Langton Parish Council,	Clerk to Leire Parish Council
Chairman of East Norton Parish Council,	Chairman of Little Stretton Parish Council
Clerk to Fleckney Parish Council,	Clerk to Loddington Parish Council
Clerk to Foxton Parish Council,	Chairman of Lowesby Parish Council
Chair of Frisby Parish Council,	Clerk to Lubenham Parish Council
Chairman of Frolesworth Parish Council,	Clerk to Lutterworth Parish Council
Clerk of Gaulby Parish Council,	Chairman of Marefield Parish Council
Clerk to Gilmorton Parish Council	Clerk to Medbourne Parish Council
Chairman of Glooston Parish Council,	
Chairman of Goadby Parish Council,	

Clerk to Misterton with Walcote Parish Council	Clerk to Willoughby Waterleys Parish Council,
Clerk to Nevill Holt Parish Council	Clerk to Wistow Parish Council,
Chairman of Mowsley Parish Council	Withcote Parish Council,
Clerk to North Kilworth Parish Council	Clerk to Bagworth & Thornton Parish Council,
Chairman of Noseley Parish Council	Chairman of Shearsby Parish Council,
Chairman to Peatling Magna Parish Council	Chairman of Skeffington Parish Council,
Chairman of Peatling Parva Parish Council	Clerk to Slawston Parish Council,
Clerk to Rolleston Parish Council	Clerk to Barlestone Parish Council,
Saddington Parish Council	Clerk to Burbage Parish Council,
Clerk to Scraftoft Parish Council	Clerk to Cadeby Parish Council,
Clerk to Shangton Parish Council	Clerk to Desford Parish Council,
Chairman of Shawell Parish Council	Clerk to Earl Shilton Parish Council,
Clerk to Smeeton Westerby Parish Council	Clerk to Carlton Parish Council,
Clerk to South Kilworth Parish Council,	Clerk to Groby Parish Council,
Chairman of Stockerston Parish Council	Clerk to Higham on the Hill Parish Council,
Clerk to Stonton Wyville Parish Council,	Clerk to Market Bosworth Parish Council,
Clerk to Stoughton Parish Council,	Clerk to Markfield Parish Council,
Clerk to Swinford Parish Council,	Clerk to Nailstone Parish Council,
Clerk to Theddingworth Parish Council,	Clerk to Newbold Verdon Parish Council,
Chairman of Thorpe Langton Parish Council,	Clerk to Osbaston Parish Council,
Clerk to Thurnby Parish Council,	Clerk to Peckleton Parish Council,
Clerk to Tilton Parish Council,	Clerk to Ratby Parish Council,
Clerk to Tur Langton Parish Council,	Clerk to Shackerstone Parish Council,
Clerk to Ullesthorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Sheepy Parish Council,
Chairman of Welham Parish Council,	Clerk to Stanton-under-Bardon Parish Council,
Chairman of West Langton Parish Council,	Clerk to Stoke Golding Parish Council,
	Clerk to Sutton Cheney Parish Council,

Clerk to Twycross Parish Council,	Chairman of Bardon Parish Council,
Clerk to Witherley Parish Council,	Clerk to Belton Parish Council,
Clerk to Asfordby Parish Council,	Clerk to Ashby Woulds Parish Council,
Parish Hall, 24 Main Street,	Clerk to Breedon on the Hill Parish
Chairman to Barkeston, Plungar and Redmile Parish Council,	Clerk to Castle Donington Parish Council,
Clerk to Belvoir Parish Council,	Clerk to Charley Parish Council,
Clerk to Bottesford Parish Council,	Clerk to Ellistown and Battleflat Parish Council,
Clerk to Buckminster Parish Council,	Chairman of Chilcote Parish Council,
Clerk to Croxton Kerrial Parish Council,	Chairman to Coleorton Parish Council,
Clerk to Eaton Parish Council,	Heather Parish Council,
Clerk to Freeby Parish Council,	Clerk to Ibstock Parish Council,
Clerk to Frisby and Kirby Parish Council,	Chairman of Isley cum Langley Parish Council,
Clerk to Gaddesby Parish Council,	Clerk to Kegworth Parish Council,
Clerk to Garthorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Lockington-Hemington Parish Council,
Clerk to Grimston, Saxelbye & Shoby Parish Council,	Clerk to Long Whatton Parish Council, Parish Manager of Measham Parish Council
Clerk to Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council,	Clerk to Normanton le Heath Parish Council
Clerk to Scalford Parish Council,	Clerk to Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe Parish Council
Clerk to Somerby Parish Council,	Clerk to Ravenstone with Snibston Parish Council
Clerk to Sproxton Parish Council,	Clerk to Osgathorpe Parish Council,
Clerk to Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council,	Clerk to Packington Parish Council
Clerk to Stathern Parish Council,	Clerk to Snarestone Parish Council
Clerk to Waltham & Thorpe Arnold Parish Council,	Chairman of Staunton Harold Parish Council,
Clerk to Wymondham Parish Council,	Chairman of Stretton en le Field Parish Council
Clerk to Appleby Magna Parish Council,	
Clerk to Ashby de la Zouch Town Council,	

Clerk to Swannington Parish Council	Chairman of Westrill and Starmore Parish Council
Clerk to Swebstone Parish Council	
Vice Chairman to Worthington Parish Council	Clerk to Broughton , Old Dalby & Ab Kettleby Parish Council
Clerk to Thurcaston and Cropston Parish Council	Clerk to Burton and Dalby Parish Council
Clerk to Kimcote and Walton Parish Council	Clerk to Clawson, Hose and Harby Parish Council
Chairman of Owston & Newbold Parish Council	Clerk to Knossington and Cold Overton Parish Council
Clerk to Tugby and Keythorpe Parish Council	Clerk to Normanton-on-Soar Parish Council
ADJOINING PARISH COUNCILS:	
Alverton and Kilvington Parish Meeting	Sutton Bonington Parish Council
Colston Bassett Parish Council	Thrumpton Parish Meeting
Costock Parish Council	Upper Broughton Parish Council
East Leake Parish Council	West Leake Parish Council
Gotham Parish Council	Whatton in the Vale Parish Council
Granby cum Sutton Parish Council	Widmerpool Parish Council
Hickling Parish Council	Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council
Flawborough Parish Meeting	Wysall and Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council
Elton on the Hill Parish Meeting	Ashley Parish Council
Kingston on Soar Parish Council	Brampton Ash Parish Council
Kinoulton Parish Council	Braybrooke Parish Council
Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council	Clay Coton Parish Meeting
Normanton on Soar Parish Council	Clipston Parish Council
Orston Parish Council	Cottingham Parish Council
Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting	Dingley Parish Council
Rempstone Parish Council	East Carlton Parish Council
Stanford on Soar Parish Council	East Farndon Parish Council
Staunton Parish Meeting	

Great Oxendon Parish Council	Thistleton Parish Meeting
Gretton Parish Council	Uppingham Parish Council
Lilbourne Parish Council	Wardley Parish Meeting
Marston Trussell Parish Meeting	Whissendine Parish Council
Middleton Parish Council	Atherstone Town Council
Rockingham Parish Meeting	Austrey Parish Council
Sibbertoft Parish Council	Bentley and Merevale Joint Parish Council
Stanford on Avon Parish Meeting	Burton Hastings & Stretton Baskerville
Sulby Parish Meeting	Caldecote Parish Council
Sutton Bassett Parish meeting	Churchover Parish Council
Welford Parish Council	Clifton upon Dunsmore
Weston-by-Welland Parish Council	Copston Magna Parish Council
Wilbarston Parish Council	Grendon and Dordon Parish Council
Ashwell Parish Council	Harborough Magna Parish Council
Barrow Parish Meeting	Hartshill Parish Council
Baleythorpe Parish Meeting	Mancetter Parish Council
Belton in Rutland Parish Council	Monks Kirby Parish Council
Braunston in Rutland Parish Council	Newton & Biggin Parish Council
Brooke Parish Meeting	Newton Regis and Seckington Parish Council
Caldecott Parish Council	Pailton Parish Council
Greetham Parish Council	Polesworth Parish Council
Langham Parish Council	Wibtoft Parish Council
Lyddington Parish Council	Willey Parish Council
Market Overton Parish Council	Withybrook Parish Council
Oakham Parish Council	Wolvey Parish Council
Ridlington Parish Council	Aston upon Trent Parish Council
Stoke Dry Parish Council	Castle Gresley Parish Council
Stretton Parish Council	
Teigh Parish Meeting	

Elvaston Parish Council

Hartshorne Parish Council

Linton Parish Council

Melbourne Parish Council

Netherseal Parish Council

Overseal Parish Council

Rosliston Parish Council

Shardlow And Great Wilne

Smisby Parish Council

Ticknall Parish Council

Weston upon Trent Parish Council

Woodville Parish Council

Skellingthorpe Parish Council

UTILITIES:and OTHER BODIES

Anglian Water Services Ltd,
Spalding,
Lincolnshire

British Telecommunications,
Hanley,
Stoke-on-Trent

Energis Communications Ltd,
Dartford

National Grid Company Plc,
Hams Lane,
Coleshill

Severn Trent Water Ltd,
Sheldon,
Birmingham

Transco West Midlands LDZ,
Wolverhampton

East Midlands Electricity Plc,
Castle Donington

Powergen,
Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station,
Nottingham

Transco East Midlands LDZ,
Mansfield,
Nottinghamshire

Central Networks
Derbyshire

British Waterways,
East Midlands Office,
Nottinghamshire

Coventry Airport,
Coventry

East Midlands Airport
Divisional Standards Manager
(Environment),
Castle Donington

GENERAL CONSULTATION BODIES

GENERAL:

Forestry Authority
East Midlands Conservancy,
Lincolnshire

British Geological Survey,
Onshore Minerals and Energy Resources
Programme,
Nottingham

The Coal Authority,
Department of Mining,
Projects and Property,
Nottinghamshire

Health and Safety Executive,
Field Operations Division,
Northampton

Sport England - East Midlands,

Nottingham

Ministry of Defence,
Defence Estate Organisation,
Sutton Coldfield

Department of Trade & Industry,
Minerals Team,
London

DEFRA,
Government Office for the East
Midlands,
Nottingham

Council for the Protection of Rural
England,
Thurnby

Country Land & Business Association,
Sutton Bassett,
Market Harborough

Leicestershire Bridleways Association,
Loughborough

Leicestershire Footpaths Association,
Oadby

Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust,
Oadby,

Loughborough Friends of the Earth,
Quorn,
Nr. Loughborough

National Farmers Union,
Uppingham,
Rutland

The National Forest,
Swadlincote

The Ramblers Association,
Coalville

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds,
Banbury

The Woodland Trust,
Grantham

Leicestershire Representative, c/o
CABE,
London

HBF Midland Region Contacts,

Birmingham

Ketton Conservation Trust,
Ketton, Stamford

National Playing Fields Association,
Coventry

NFU East Midlands Region,
Rutland & Stamford Branch,
Stamford

Collyweston Stone Slaters Trust,
Estate Office,
Peterborough
Age Concern,
Leicester

CEH Directorate,
Abbots Ripton,
Huntingdon

CRE,
Birmingham

Leicestershire Representative,
c/o DRC Helpline,
Stratford upon Avon

Leicestershire Representative,
c/o DPTAC ,
London

Housing Corporation
Leicester: Attenborough House,
109/119 Charles Street,
Leicester

Leicestershire Representative,
c/o The Gypsy Council,
European and UK office,
Aveley,

DTZ Pieda Consulting,
Birmingham

Jones Day,
London

National Federation of Builders,
Midland Region,
Melbourne

Friends of the Earth (Leicester Branch,)
Leicester

Environ,
Leicester

MPs AND MEPs:

Mr. S. Dorrell MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. D. Taylor MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. A. Duncan MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. D. Tredinnick MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. E. Garnier MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. K. Vaz MP,
House of Commons,
London

Ms. Patricia Hewitt MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. N. Clegg MEP,
Nottinghamshire

Sir Peter Soulsby, MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. C. Heaton-Harris MEP,
Blaby Conservative Association

Mr. A. Robathan MP,
House of Commons, London

Mr. R. Helmer MEP,
Blaby Conservative Association

Mr. A. Reed MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. W. Newton-Dunn MEP,
Lincoln

Mr. P. Whitehead MEP,
Regional European Centre,
Notts

Ms. M. Read MEP,
Regional European Centre,
Notts.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS:

Leicestershire Local Strategic Partnership
c/o Leicestershire Council Council,
Leicester.

Hinckley And Bosworth Local Strategic
Partnership,
Leicester

Blaby Local Strategic Partnership,
Leicester.

Melton Community Partnership,
Leicestershire

Charnwood Local Strategic Partnership,
C/o Charnwood Borough Council,
Charnwood

Director Of Public Health, Charnwood
And Nwleics Pct,
Loughborough

Harborough Local Strategic Partnership,
Harborough District Council,
Harborough

Oadby And Wigston Local Strategic
Partnership,
Leicester

Leicestershire And Rutland Association
Of Parish And Local Councils,

Melton Mowbray	Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce & Business Link, Leicester
Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce, Leicester	Acting Chief Executive, Blaby District Council, Narborough
Leicestershire And Leicester City Learning Partnership, Melton College, Melton Mowbray	Chief Executive, Charnwood Borough Council, Loughborough
Local Learning Partnership, Leicester	Chief Executive, Harborough District Council, Market Harborough
Leicestershire Learning And Skills Council, Leicester	Acting Chief Executive, Hinckley And Bosworth Borough Council, Hinckley
North West Leics Lsp And Chairman, Charnwood And North West Leics Pct, Ratcliffe On The Wreake	Chief Executive, Melton Borough Council, Melton Mowbray
Enable, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester	Chief Executive, North West Leicestershire District Council, Coalville
Leicestershire Cultural Strategy Forum, C/O Community Services Dept, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester	Chief Executive, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Wigston
Leicestershire Rural Partnership, Glenfield, Leicester	Jobcentre Plus, Leicester
Leicester Racial Equality Council, Leicester	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Combined Fire and Rescue Service, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester
Leicestershire Constabulary, Force Headquarters, Enderby	Chief Executive, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester
Chairman, Leicestershire Police Authority, Quorn, Leicestershire	Government Office For The East Midlands, Nottingham
(Leics Cvs Community Partnership Representative), 'Coping With Cancer', Leicester	Melton Borough Councillor (Observer), Melton Mowbray
Board Of Social Responsibility, Leicester	Policy Team Leader, Chief Executive's Dept., Leicestershire County Council, Leicester
Loughborough University, Loughborough	

Assistant Chief Executive (Community Planning),
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Policy Assistant, Chief Executive's Dept,
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Environmental Management Section,
Community Services Department
Leicestershire County Council
Leicester

Leicester Partnership Development
Manager,
Leicester City Council,
Leicester

'Care And Repair (North West Leics)
Ltd',
Coalville, Leicester

Children And Young Persons' Strategic
Partnership For Leicestershire (Cypspl),
C/O Social Services Department,
Leicestershire County Council

Director of Community Safety,
Leicestershire Fire And Rescue Service,
Glenfield

Leicestershire and Rutland Association
of Parish and Local Councils,
Leicestershire

CITY COUNCIL CONSULTEES:

Aylestone Village Society,
Aylestone

Braunstone Community Association,
Leicester

Capitec (Trent),
Sheffield

Chaos Enterprises (Leicester),
Tudor Centre,
Leicester

CPRE Leicestershire,
Leicestershire

De Montfort University,
Director of Estates,
Leicester

Leicester City plc,
Leicester

Leicester City West Primary Care Trust,
Leicester

Leicester Civic Society,
Leicester

Leicester College,
Leicester

Fosse Golf Co (Leicester) Limited,
Leicester

Hamilton Trustees,
Loughborough,

Leicestershire Asian Business
Association,
Leicester

Lafarge Aggregates,
Melton Mowbray

University Hospitals of Leicester,
Director of Estates,
Leicester

Leicester Chamber Of Commerce,
Leicester

Leicester Friends Of The Earth,
Leicester

Leicester Regeneration Company,
Leicester

Leicestershire County Cricket Club,
Leicester

Leicestershire Footpath Association,
Nottingham

Leicestershire Golf Club,
Leicester

Leicestershire T2000,
Leicester

Biffa Leicester Ltd,
Leicester

Leicestershire Business Voice,
Leicester

Open Spaces Society,
Henley-on-Thames,
Oxon

Powergen Uk,
C/o Dtz Pidea Consultants
SecondSite Property,
Basingstoke

Leicester Rugby Football Club,
Leicester

The University Of Leicester,
Director of Estates,
Leicester

The Woodland Trust,
Grantham

Voluntary Action Leicester,
Leicester

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE SCOPING REPORT

Table A: Summary of Consultation Responses on the Scoping Report

No	Consultee	Comments on additional information sources	Further Comments	How Comments Have Been Dealt With
1	English Nature	SEA and Biodiversity: Guidance for Practitioners, RSPB Local Geodiversity Action Plan for Leicestershire & Rutland: Contact British Geological survey Keith Ambrose, Kinsley Dunham Centre, Keyworth, Nottingham NG12 5GG Tel 0115 936 3100, Fax 0115 936 3200	Overall EN is pleased and supportive of the emphasis put on biodiversity in the report. % of SSSI in favourable conditions not included in Appendix A in the document.	Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. SSSI data to be included in Appendix C of WDF. Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. "To conserve geodiversity" has been added as an objective to the WDF SA Framework as objective 19.
2	English Heritage	European Landscape Convention could be added	EH recommends to designate heritage quarries	Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document.
			Table 6-1. After care and after use of the waste disposal sites could be added.	LCC advises that heritage materials quarries are present in Rutland but that the resource is not generally available in Leicestershire
		National documents: 'The Historic Environment - a Force for our Future (DCMS 2001) ...' Planning for the supply of natural building and roofing stone in England and Wales ' by the Symonds group, ODPM March 2004.	Table 7-1. Objective 5: Early assessment of archaeological potential is essential for new or expanding sites.	Noted as an issue. This is reflected in the issues and options of the WDF preparation. Effects of proposals will be assessed against the SA framework Documents included in Table 3.1 in WDF document.
	Regional Documents: Regional Environment Strategy and 'Viewpoints on the historic Environment of the East Midlands'.		Table 4-2 in the document should refer to 'protecting <i>and enhancing</i> the historic environment.'	Documents included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Comment to be taken into consideration in development of WDF policies.
			Landscape change and the erosion of landscape quality and traditional character and the issue on aftercare and after use.	Comment to be taken into consideration in development of WDF policies.

No	Consultee	Comments on additional information sources	Further Comments	How Comments Have Been Dealt With
	<p>Existing and future baseline conditions: For general information on the state of historic environment- www.heritagecounts.org.uk. (includes a regional version which is updated annually) 'Turning the Plough' for identified key areas of ridge and furrow field systems.</p>	<p>Table 7-1. Objective 6: Considering air pollution causing damage to the bldg, the objective should be amended to incorporate that. Some previously developed land could be of natural or historic interest.</p>	<p>Documents included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Comments to be taken into consideration in development of WDF policies.</p>	
		<p>Opportunities for enhancement should be considered as well as the mitigation of adverse impacts. The appraisal should consider indirect impacts such as potential impact on the setting of historic sites. Non-designated features of local historic interest and value should be considered.</p>	<p>Include reference to opportunities for enhancement in the WDF. 'Other Comments' noted.</p>	
	<p>A gazetteer of sites is available on www.northamptonshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>New technologies, regulations, or enforcement measures could be introduced to give greater protection to the historic environs. Ridge and Furrow field systems are threatened yet characteristic landscape features of Leicestershire.</p>	<p>Include reference to ridge and furrow field systems in WDF document. Additional information source noted.</p>	
		<p>Other data sources: Extensive Urban Surveys, Conservation Area Appraisals, Buildings at Risk Leicestershire's heritage service team should be consulted about baseline data for historic environments, designated sites, relevant issues, appraisal of significant effects, mitigation and enhancement, and monitoring.</p>	<p>Update Figure 5.4 in WDF. Distinguish woodland types. Additional data sources noted. Comments noted. Number of listed buildings grades for each district to be listed in a table within the WDF document. Update Figure 5.4. Heritage Services to be included in the next round of consultation.</p>	
		<p>Changes to policy should seek to reduce future damage, provide appropriate mitigation, and to remediate existing damage to archaeological sites through waste operations. The sustainability framework will need to set out the monitoring network.</p>	<p>Comments noted and to be considered in the formulation of policies and proposals. Include a monitoring network.</p>	

No	Consultee	Comments on additional information sources	Further Comments	How Comments Have Been Dealt With
3	Environment Agency	Publication referred - 'Policy and Practice for the Protection of Flood Plains'	The source for identifying 'reducing flood risk' as a key issue should be PPG25, and not PPG23. EA is eager to discuss the issues and get engaged in considering core policies and options. SEA framework does not consider flood risk	Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Amend PPG reference. Include a flood risk objective and indicator in the WDF document. EA to be included in development of flood risk policies.
4	Biffa Waste Services		Impact on flooding by the disposal of waste in flood plains, associated bunding and finished ground levels should be considered. Proposed time period covered by the WDF in the paragraphs 2.2 and 3.5(2) is 10 years from 2006 to 2016, which is found to be too short. PPS 10 advises that regional waste strategies should cover 15-20 years. Now most municipal contracts are issued for 25 years. The plan should look ahead until 2021 and give further broad considerations to 2031. Biffa finds the report to be quite comprehensive in its approach.	Objective 20 added to consider flood risk in WDF. Noted. Comments noted.
5	Lafarge- UK aggregates		The issues relating to site viability and site safeguarding are of relevance to the Waste management facilities and should be considered in preparing the appraisals.	Acknowledge site viability and site safe-guarding in WDF document.
6	Nottingham East Midlands Airport	Table 4-1 can include: ODPM circular 1/2003- Aerodrome Safeguarding and ICAO Annex 14 Vol 1- provision of Bird Strike Hazard Reduction	Airport Safeguarding office is quite pleased to be consulted. They are concerned about the safe operation of aircraft and urges to take due regard of the potential for bird strike.	Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Ensure that ASO are included in next round of consultation.
7	Harborough Council	1. Core strategy Scoping Report, March 2005 and 2. Core strategy Issues and Options Report, May 2005	In the Plans and Programmes, the Local Plan should be referred to as Harborough District Local Plan. Initial SA report is no longer required. The SA/SEA work undertaken between the Scoping Report and the Preferred Options must be made available to the public for information e.g. on the county website. The report should refer to the MDF Scoping Report as a relevant plan. The co-ordination of both reports would be advantageous.	Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Amend title of Harborough District Local Plan. Action upon consultation responses to be displayed on LCC website. Noted.

No	Consultee	Comments on additional information sources	Further Comments	How Comments Have Been Dealt With
8	Warwickshire Council		<p>Any plans to test the compatibility of the objectives of the two plans?</p> <p>The framework is found to be very clear with appropriate objectives, indicators and targets.</p> <p>Table 9-1 lists some methodologies, but does not explain which methodologies may be more appropriate for certain types of policy. If they apply to every single policy, is there a resource implication?</p> <p>In Table 6-1 it is noted that 'minerals are transported by road...'. This should be expanded to include reference to congestion.</p> <p>Traffic issues are not sufficiently assessed until Stage C. This may be too late.</p> <p>In Table 7-1 objective no.16 should refer in particular to reduce the transportation of minerals by road and thereby vehicle omissions. The Agency supports this key objective.</p> <p>In Table 4.1, Regional Freight Strategy should be included.</p>	<p>No, not required.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal reports indicate the exact methodology utilised in the assessments.</p> <p>Amend Table 3.6 in WDF document.</p>
9	Highways Agency		<p>In Figure 5-5, A6 through Leicester and Loughborough is identified as a trunk road which is no longer the case.</p> <p>No comments on this occasion. Council wishes to continue to receive reports of this type.</p>	<p>Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document.</p> <p>Amend Table 3.6 in WDF document.</p>
10	Woodhouse Parish Council			<p>Amend Figure 5.5 in WDF document.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
11	National Farmer's Union	Regional document- 'Think Farming and Food' the action plan for the east Midlands region, published by the East Midlands Rural Affairs Forum. One of the issues discussed in it is 'Managing Rural waste'.		<p>Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document.</p>
12	Medbourne Parish Council		We have access but could not download. Send a print copy.	<p>Print copy to be sent.</p>
13	The Countryside Agency- Landscape Access	The State of Countryside Report (East Midlands) 2004 www.countryside.gov.uk/publications/index .	Tables 4-1, 4-2, 6-1 and 7-1 should include reference to the relevant character areas from Countryside Agency's Character Assessment Vol 4.	<p>Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document.</p> <p>Tables 3.2, 3.4 and 3.6 to be updated in WDF document.</p>

No	Consultee	Comments on additional information sources	Further Comments	How Comments Have Been Dealt With
	Recreation	<p>Countryside Character Volume 4: East Midlands www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/cc.</p> <p>Topic Papers to view on the Countryside Character Network www.ccnetwork.org.uk.</p> <p>National database for all landscape character assessment can be found at www.ccnetwork.org.uk/index</p> <p>Data from Countryside Quality Counts (CQC) project www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk</p> <p>Nationally designated Landscape Area www.countryside.gov.uk</p> <p>Maps of all open countryside and registered common land in England www.countryside.gov.uk</p> <p>Web based GIS data www.magic.gov.uk</p>	<p>Table E- further information could be obtained from RCC's LCA.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p> <p>Document/website reference to be included in WDF document.</p> <p>Include a map of local landscape character areas.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p>	<p>Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p> <p>Document/website reference to be included in WDF document.</p> <p>Include a map of local landscape character areas.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p> <p>Additional information source noted.</p>
14	Woodland Trust	<p>The regional forestry framework- Space 4 Tree (www.space4trees.org.uk)</p> <p>ODPM document 'The Planning Response to Climate Change</p>	<p>The importance of the ancient woodland is missing from the draft. The distribution of ancient woodland should be included on either Figure 5-2 or 5-3.</p> <p>Data on accessibility to woodlands in Leicestershire using the woodlands trust woodland access standard is available in map and numeric form, which the trust is happy and eager to supply.</p>	<p>Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Refer to ancient woodlands and climate change in the WDF policies.</p> <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in WDF document. Consider whether climate change should be included in WDF policies.</p>
15	British Waterways		<p>Fig 5.5 Principal transport routes does not show navigations, which are the principal transport routes for boats.</p> <p>Appendix A table B notes modal split for waste movement. Note that dredgings from waterways may be spread on neighbouring fields or moved by barge.</p>	<p>Include navigation routes for boats in Figure 5.5.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

APPENDIX C: BASELINE TABLES

Table A: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
No. & area of designated sites (& non-statutory local designations)	91 SSSIs in LCC & Rutland (4500ha) 0.4ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1000 population. 34 SINCS and one SSSI in Leicester No national parks. See maps in main report	No valid comparators	No trends identified at present	Lack of public knowledge & awareness of wildlife sites which may restrict access.	Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland BAP Leicester Environment report ENABLE
Quality of designated sites	66.67% of SSSI sites in Leicestershire meet PSA targets. Full condition survey data exists Full re-survey due in 2005.	Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010. England: 65.36% of sites meeting PSA targets unfavourable recovering Leicestershire: 43.84% England : 19.83% unfavourable no change. Leicestershire 22.86%. England 21.66% unfavourable declining Leicestershire 10.24%, England 12.89%	Leicestershire better than England as a whole. Overall there has been a decline in the quality and quantity of SINCS in Leicester.	Species-rich grasslands are Leicestershire's most threatened habitat.	Leicester environment report English Nature Regional Quality of Life indicators Leicester Environmental Statement 2002-3
Population of species and areas of priority habitat	Datasets for Leicestershire currently in unclassified form, pending computerisation. 19 Habitat Action Plans, 14 Species Action Plans. BAP for National Forest and for Charnwood. Lowland wet grassland in Soar valley declined from 3200ha in 1940 to 150ha in 1998.	To meet 100% of the objectives set out in the Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland BAP	A number of the last remaining old grassland sites have been safeguarded either by purchase or by designation as nature reserves, the creation of sand martin banks has led to 107 new breeding pairs in the county, and for the first time in many decades the other has once again been recorded as breeding in the catchment of the river Soar after decades of absence. Loss/fragmentation of habitat through modern agricultural practices leading to species decline.	Objectives in BAP are not quantified. Lack of baseline. Estimates of change not readily available. 'Unimproved' grassland, which once made up 90% of the agricultural landscape in the two counties, now considered 'extremely rare' by county wildlife experts	Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland BAP, English Nature, ENVIron http://www.environment.org.uk/issues/nature/Leicestershire/index.php?cid=121

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Area of woodland cover	3.8% of Leicestershire & Rutland is woodland cover (1% of this is ancient semi-natural woodland). 256km ² of National Forest is within LCC.	The county is one of the least wooded areas of England	Total non-deciduous area of woodland has increased in recent years.	The county is one of the least wooded areas of England	ENABLE 2004
Amount of new woodland planted	Woodland cover in National Forest area has doubled since 1991- 5 million new trees, and 575ha of derelict mineral workings & coalfield land planted.	National Forest area target of 1/3 woodland cover.	National Forest area is achieving and exceeding annual targets.		ENABLE 2004 www.nationalforest.org

Table B: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Air

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Assessment against UK National air quality targets	NO2 exceedances in 2004 by district: LC: Leicester 1N – 1 Leicester 2N - 1 B: 0 C: Loughborough 1N - 1 H: Harborough 1N – 1 Harborough 5N - 1 H&B: 0 M: 0 NWL: Coalville 10N - 1 O&W: 0	To achieve national air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide within Districts by end 2005 (defined in the Air Quality Regulations (2000))	Progress towards targets in most areas Air quality monitoring over the past few years has indicated that pollution levels have remained generally static or increased modestly.	Probability that many districts will not meet target for Nitrogen Dioxide - Annual mean not exceeding 40ug/m3 in certain areas. Possibility that short term standards for fine particle (PM10)1 concentrations may be exceeded around Croft Quarry in Blaby DC.	Local Air Quality Management Strategies/Action Plans www.airquality.co.uk data Stage 4 Review for: Harborough DC, Blaby DC, Leicester CC, NW Leics DC ENABLE
No. of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)	15 AQMAs Leicester: 1 Blaby: 3 Charnwood: 3 Harborough: 1 Hinckley & Bosworth: 0 Melton: 1 NW Leics: 2 Oadby & Wigston: 4	To achieve national air quality objectives for NO2 defined in the Air Quality Regulations (2000) by 2005	Leicester: no change from 2000 Blaby: 2004 review shows worsening. Possible extension of AQMAs Charnwood: no change. Harborough: Worsening. AQMA to be extended Hinckley & Bosworth: reduced from 2 following review in 2004 Melton: No data at present NW Leics: reduced from 6 following review 2003 Oadby & Wigston: no data at present	All AQMAs due to traffic. Limited potential to reduce road traffic in AQMAs.	Local Air Quality Management Strategies/Action Plans www.airquality.co.uk data Stage 4 Review for: Harborough DC, Blaby DC, Leicester CC, NW Leics DC
Modal Split for waste transport	100% road	No target identified	No trend identified at present	Limited infrastructure potential for non-road transport of waste	Atkins internal review.

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Traffic Volumes	Traffic on m1 J19-22 in Leicestershire 41,800-67,500ADT northbound, 45,000-68,700ADT southbound. Jan-Sep2004. HGVs form 18.5-27.4% northbound, 19.5-25.6% southbound	No target identified	Further growth anticipated	Anticipated traffic growth on motorways?	

Table C: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Climatic Factors

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
CO2 Emissions (By sector)	No data identified to date	Target to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions by 30% by 2011, from a 1996 baseline figure. No comparators identified	Not yet identified		
Energy consumption per sector	No data identified to date		E Mids Draft Sustainable Energy Strategy 2003 predicts that E Midlands total energy consumption (domestic, commercial industrial & transport) will increase by 15% by 2020. At present, Leicestershire unlikely to meet targets	Increase in energy use	ENABLE 2004
Renewable Energy	In 2003, for LCC: Wind power – none Biomass - none Landfill gas – 10.7MW Anaerobic Digestion - 1.34MW Photovoltaics - <0.2MW Total renewable energy <12.24MW Bradgate Landfill has approx 3MW capacity, Narborough 2MW and Cotesbach 3 MW. Landfill gas power generators also exist at Lount, Mountsorrell & Enderby	Gov't target to supply 10% of UK electricity from renewable sources by 2010. To be met for 2010 for LCC: Wind power – 22MW Biomass - 11.2MW Landfill gas – 18MW Anaerobic Digestion – 3.2MW Photovoltaics – 0.4MW Total renewable energy 58MW		Lack of renewable energy sources developed within the county. Growing timber economy – potential for wood heating.	ENABLE 2004 East Midlands Draft Sustainable energy strategy 2003 Atkins review.
Conservation of Energy	No data identified to date	National home-energy conservation target is 30% increase in domestic energy efficiency by 2010		Lack of data and monitoring for energy efficiency outside Council's own operations.	

Table D: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Water and Soil

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Contaminated Land	Charnwood : no sites identified 2003 Other LAs – no data identified No comprehensive register of contaminated sites in LCC exists	No targets identified	New contamination less likely than previously due to environmental controls	Historical land use in Leicestershire has resulted in the potential for further contamination, although the identification of sites is dependent on the development control process. Lack of data on sites Cost and lack of disposal facilities for hazardous waste may in some cases reduce attractiveness to developers of brownfield sites	District websites. Blaby Contaminated Land strategy ENABLE 2004 Regeneration & Renewal 4March 2005 p10
% of development on previously developed land (PDL)	Data incomplete for Districts No data for waste sites on PDL	60% of new dwellings on PDL by 2008 (PPG3). RPG 60% by 2021. Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland Structure Plan 50% of dwellings on PDL	Overall, targets appear to be being met.	Potential housing pressure for development on open spaces in the future	
% of best and most versatile agricultural land occupied by development	80% of land use in Leicestershire is agriculture	No targets identified at present	Decline in livestock farming.	Agricultural land is subject to loss due to competition from developments especially around peripheral urban areas.	
Improvement/worsening of soil quality	No data at present	No targets identified	No trends identified		
Water Quality (Biological and Chemical)	In 2003 94.2% of rivers in Leicestershire were classified as good or fair chemical quality. 87.1 % were classified as good or fair biological quality. 96.1% were classified as poor phosphate quality. 48.8% were nitrate poor or	In the UK, it is estimated that about 95 % of rivers were of good or fair chemical quality in 2003, and about 73 % of rivers in 2003 were of good chemical quality. In England: 93 % of river lengths were of good or fair chemical quality in	No trends identified	Focus on chemical quality tends to ignore phosphate and nitrate quality. Some downstream pollution on River Soar from discharges	www.defra.gov.uk, www.environment-agency.gov.uk ENABLE 2004 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/regions/eas tMidlands/activities/ /evidenceAndAnalysis/rsotc/ Natural_resources.asp

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
	bad.	2003, compared with 84 % in 1990. 62 % were of good quality in 2003, compared with 43 % in 1990. In the UK, it is estimated that about 96 % of rivers were assessed as being of good or fair biological quality in 2003 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In England, 95 % of river lengths were of good or fair biological quality in 2003 compared with 89 % in 1990. 69 % were of good biological quality in 2003 compared with 60 % in 1990. 			
Nitrate vulnerable zones	All of Leicestershire declared NVZ in 2002	55% of England designated NVZ in 2002	In 1996 only 2 NVZs – area has increased		ENABLE 2004
Groundwater vulnerability	EA data received but not yet mapped	No targets identified	No trends identified	Groundwater quality generally good in Leicestershire and aquifers of low vulnerability to pollution	ENABLE 2004
No of properties at risk of flooding	15700 properties in Flood Zone 3 (>1% chance of river flooding, pa) Naborough landfill is in a flood risk zone	Flood Zones show where flood waters would go if no defences (PPG25)	Improved flood alleviation system near Melton Mowbray completed 2002/3.	Development Pressures on floodplain increase risk of downstream floods and damage to property. Potential increase in flood risk due to future climate change if adaptation measures not implemented	EA Data 2004 ENABLE 2004 ENABLE Draft Climate Change Strategy
Flood Zones	See attached mapping.	No targets identified	No trends identified, though improved flood control systems have minimised effects.	The River Soar valley in particular has suffered significant flooding since late 18 th C	ENABLE 2004
Pollution incidents investigated by Environment Agency	67 waste-management related incidents recorded by EA in 2003	No targets identified	No trends identified		EA data

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Fly tipping incidents by council	3220 incidents dealt with by local authorities Mar-Oct 2004. Total incidents per head of population were: Blaby 0.002 Charnwood 0.012 Harborough 0.002 Hinckley & Bosworth 0.003 Leics City 0.001 Melton 0.004 NW Leics 0.004 Oadby & Wigston 0.001	No targets identified	No trends identified	Charnwood had twice the total number of recorded incidences of fly-tipping than any other Districts during this period. This may be due to a short term anomaly in data collection, a specific clean-up 'drive' or an underlying problem which needs further investigation. Leicester City after Charnwood, had the second highest rate of fly-tipping per square km	EA data

Table E: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Cultural Heritage / Landscape

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
No. of Listed Buildings/scheduled ancient monument/historic parks/historic landscapes and proportion at risk	212 Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) 244 historic townscapes or villages 16 parks & gardens on English Register of Historic Parks & Gardens 1 battlefield on English Heritage Battlefields Register 4337 buildings listed for special architectural or historic interest. Risk unknown. See map in main report	Nationally 3.6% of Grade 1 and Grade II* listed entries at risk in England and Wales		Many features of cultural heritage significance are not registered and may therefore be overlooked. Leicester has a high level of community and voluntary support for cultural heritage	ENABLE, 2004
% of development on PDL		60% of new dwellings on PDL by 2008 (PPG3: Housing, 2000)	Continuation of 100% of development on PDL in Leicester City is predicted to continue	Potential housing pressure for development on open spaces in the future	Leicester City figures
Landscape character areas	43% Leicestershire is tilled agricultural land 35% managed grassland No AONBs or National Parks 18 Character areas	No comparators or targets identified. County Historic Landscape characterisation will commence in summer 2005.	Continued pressure from residential, industrial, power generation, mineral workings and transportation around margins of urban areas and major river valleys of Trent & Soar. Development pressure associated with East Midlands Airport	Lack of detailed mapping and characterisation to underpin planning decisions. No historic landscape classifications mean that significance can be overlooked Lobby continuing for Charnwood Forest to be designated an AONB	ENABLE 2004 Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland Landscape & Woodland Strategy
Changes in countryside character and countryside quality	Countryside Agency character profiles indicate a large number of East Midlands character areas show some or marked changes inconsistent with character		Gradual erosion of traditional character	Lack of local-level detail mapping and characterisation to underpin planning decisions – local character area descriptions are not much more detailed than regional ones.	ENABLE 2004 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/regions/ http://www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk/cap/eastmids/index_em.htm

Table F: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Population and Human Health

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Noise Levels	22% of Leicestershire residents surveyed 2002-3 concerned about noise in their area	No comparators or targets identified			Leicestershire Quality of Life indicators for 2002-3
Life expectancy	Data to be collected from census profiles	2000-2002 Females in England – 80.64 2000-2002 Males in England – 75.98			www.statistics.gov.uk
Proportion of people with self assessed good health	Data to be collected from Census profiles				
Employment Activity		The economic activity rate (working age population) for Leicestershire in 2003 (80.6%) was higher than the regional (80%) and national (79.5%) averages.		However, this disguises considerable differences, with Leicester City recording a very low activity rate (70.7 per cent). Overall, unemployment in Leicestershire is very low at 2.8% (just 1.5 per cent in the County). However, this masks significant variations; in the City a rate of 5.6 % was recorded in October 2003. Within specific communities there are pockets of very high unemployment such as in Wycliffe Ward and North Braunstone Ward in the City and Greenhill Ward, North West Leicestershire.	LSEP
Unemployment Rate	At September 2004: Leicester Shire: 2.3% Leicestershire County 1.2% Leicester City 4.6%	East Midlands 1.9% UK 2.3%	Continued decline in traditional manufacturing forecast. Increase in knowledge industries & service sector	Relatively low skills base restricts employment growth	http://www.lerp.co.uk/downloads/september%202004.pdf Source: Office for National Statistics (NOMIS)

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Employment in Waste industry	Leicester Shire: 982 employees (0.3% of all employees) in employment category 900: Sewage and refuse disposal, sanitation & similar activities.	No targets or comparators identified			NOMIS Data retrieved 16 Feb 2005
Deprivation	Leicester City is 29 th most deprived of 149 local authorities. Leicester County is 136 th most deprived.		No trends identified	According to the Government Indices of Multiple Deprivation, 13 of the City's 28 wards rank within the most deprived 10% nationally - 47.1% of the population of Leicester City live in wards which rank within the most deprived 10% of the wards in the country. None of the wards in Leicester County rank within the most deprived 10%. Within the County, Harborough District ranks within the least deprived 10% of districts nationally, with Blaby, Melton and Oadby & Wigston ranking within the least 20%. Leicester County is in the 10% least deprived of counties and unitary authorities nationally.	
Street cleanliness	LCC: In 2001/02 the Cleaning Index for the city centre was 69%, and in 2002/03 it had reached 75% LC: No data	To improve the cleanliness of Leicester city centre (Cleansing Index – PSA measure – in the city centre to be 75% or above by 2005)	Improving. Met target.		Leicester Environmental Statement. 2002-3
Statistics on complaints about waste sites (noise/odour/dust/vermin etc)	Data to be collected from District Environmental Health officers	No comparators identified	No trends identified		
Population density and rural population	Population density per square km for districts is : Leicester UA 3834 Leicestershire 339 Blaby 694 Charnwood 550	The proportion of the East Midlands' population living in rural districts rose from 38.47% in 1981 to 40.62% in 2001. This is the third highest proportion for any English			http://www.countryside.gov.uk/EvidenceAndAnalysis/state_of_the_countryside_reports/regionalSOCRdownloads.asp GOEM

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
	Harborough 129 Hinckley and Bosworth 337 Melton 99 NW Leicestershire 306 Oadby and Wigston 2324	region. Nationally, only 28.52% of the population lives in rural areas.			

Table G: Additional Economic and Social Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Areas of open space/outdoor recreation (ha of open space per 1,000 urban population)	In Leicester, approx 30% of land area is open space, including the riverside, woods, green wedges, country parks and local amenity spaces, as well as private open space such as gardens. 18% of city area classified as public open space. Oadby & Wigston Borough has 173 hectares of Outdoor Sports Playing Space which equates to 3 hectares per 1,000 population. (74% in private or educational use)	National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) recommends 2.43 ha of open space per 1000 population (1.6ha – 1.8ha should be for outdoor sport, 0.6ha – 0.8ha should be children's playing space (PPG17 – each borough is recommended to produce open space assessment to ensure validity of NPFA targets)	Leicester: There was an increase of 2.1 hectares of publicly accessible green space from 875.9 hectares in 2001/02 to 878 hectares in 2002/03. This target (863 ha by 2020) is currently being exceeded. Leicester is well provided for in terms of public open space, though some areas of the city are deficient in accessible local open space	Oadby & Wigston Draft SPG play & open space	http://www.environmentcity.org.uk/article.asp?ParentID=2&ArticleID=82
Access to rights of way and open space	Leicester: 2002-3 878ha of publicly accessible green space Leicestershire QoL indicator data – 74% of residents finding it easy to access publicly accessible green space (2002-3 data)	Leicester Environmental Statement Target 10.1 to maintain this level to 2020	Slight increase since 1997 (2.1ha)	Limited space for outdoor pursuits has placed visitor pressure on areas such as Charnwood Forest	Leicester Environmental Statement 2002-3 ENABLE
Economic growth					
Environmental awareness & education/waste minimisation	July 2003 14 Leicestershire schools had the Eco-schools award	20 further schools working towards accreditation		Objective: DES 2003 – all learners will develop skills, knowledge & value base to be active citizens in creating a more sustainable society	ENABLE Strategic overview of Leicestershire's 2004;

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
Waste Recycling (household/industrial/commercial)	District recycling performance for 2003/4 is: Blaby 21.2% Charnwood 16.5% Harborough 14.9% Hinckley & Bosworth 21.7% Melton 31.5% N W Leics 14.2% Oadby & Wigston 21% Leicester City 14.7%	Targets for 2003/4 and 2004/5 are: Blaby – 20% / 30% Charnwood – 33 / 36 Harborough – 10 / 18 Hinckley & Bosworth – 18 / 27 Melton – 33 / 40 N W Leics – 16 / 24 Oadby & Wigston – 33 / 36 Leicester City – 18 / 27 National recycling target in 2004/2005 at least 14% of household waste. Achieving the statutory target of recycling or composting 10% of domestic waste in 2003/04 18% 05/06 and 30% by 09/10; (2002/2003 just over 7% of household rate recycled);		Many districts did not meet 2003/4 targets. While significant investment has been made to improve performance, there is a risk some 2005/6 targets may not be met	LCC Data
Waste Transfer Streams (Internally in Council)	No data identified	No targets identified at present			
Waste disposal data (household/industrial/commercial)	With small exceptions, 100% of household, industrial and commercial waste landfilled. Tonnages for each disposal method are: Transfer station - 453,464 tonnes but most still ends up at landfill Licensed composting - 27,136 tonnes Exempt composting - No returns Materials Recycling Facilities - 4268t (Biffa Ball Mill start)	No comparators identified		Waste taken to transfer stations is largely landfilled rather than treated by other means	

General Indicator	Quantified Data	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues	Source
	Scrap Metal Recycling - 2345t (limited returns available) Waste storage - 1129t Sewage treatment - 24,170t Physical treatment i.e. screening of inerts - 55,645t (excludes exemptions) Landfill - 878,711tonnes. Dozens of exempt facilities for which there is no info on tonnes exist but EMIRWS estimates that 706,800 tonnes of Construction and Demolition Waste was processed by exempt facilities in Leics.				
Hazardous waste data	In 2002 Leicestershire imported 57,819 tonnes of hazardous waste and exported 25,927 tonnes (most recent data)	No comparators identified		Leicester now have no licensed hazardous waste sites and therefore all waste is now exported.	Atkins internal review.
% value recovered from waste	No data identified at present				
Amount of waste carried by road vehicle and by rail and other modes	100% transported by road	No comparators or targets identified	No trends identified	Little potential for non-road transport, though disused Ivanhoe rail line exists	

APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT OF DRAFT FINAL PREFERRED CORE STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

The Preferred Policies for Waste Management Provision

POLICY 1: Sustainable Waste Management Development		Provision will be made and proposals encouraged for new waste management facilities which move waste management up the waste hierarchy of waste reduction, followed by re-use, recycling and composting of materials, and energy recovery or alternative value recovery technologies that reduce the amount of waste that needs to be disposed, provided such proposals accord with other policies contained in the waste development framework.				
SAVSEA Objectives	Description of Effect	Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation	
		ST	MT	LT		
Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear						
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	The provision of new waste management facilities in greenfield or brownfield sites with biodiversity value is likely to have a negative effect on biodiversity and could result in damage and fragmentation. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	The provision of new waste management facilities in the countryside could have a negative effect in the quality of the countryside and landscape. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	The provision of new waste management facilities in areas of archaeological or cultural significance is likely to have a negative effect on these features. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.
04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	Treatment of waste may affect ground and surface waters, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. Effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics	-	-	-	Planning conditions and environmental regulations should control the storage of waste materials minimising potential impacts of pollution. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.

05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Leachate from the storage and processing of waste may cause contamination, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. However potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics	-	-	-	Planning conditions and environmental regulations and facilities design should control the storage of waste materials minimising potential impacts of pollution. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics. Transport to sites is a major contributing factor; transporting of waste between reprocessing sites can contribute to emissions.	-	-	-	Location according to proximity principle or where rail is an option would minimise transport and associated emissions.
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Cumulative, long-term impact of waste minimisation is that fewer sites are needed and hence there are fewer potential negative impacts associated with development. Recycling and reuse may lead to lower emissions through reducing the need for manufacture and transport of new goods.	-	-	-	New technologies may reduce the potential emissions in the long term
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed. Effects also dependant on effectiveness of waste minimisation and management strategies.	-	-	-	Measures can be incorporated into processes to minimise potential negative effects of noise, odour and dust
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	By diverting waste from landfill sites this policy is likely to have positive effects on human health	0	0/+	+	Tours of education links with waste facilities can improve perception and understanding, reducing uncertainty and NIMBYISM
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	Box 1 of Waste Development Framework Policy 28 requires locations to be sensitive to potential future mineral working sites.
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	Providing facilities addresses current identified lack of capacity for all types of waste management and reduces the current need to export controlled wastes out of county or the UK	+	++	++	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives through WM strategy reduces the amount of controlled waste needing to be managed.
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	No effect	0	0	0	

13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Policy facilitates development which achieves this objective. Greatest benefits seen in medium-long term	++	+++	+++	+++	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives reduces the amount of waste needing to be managed or disposed of by any means
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	No effect	0	0	0	0	Waste facilities should be accommodated within the urban area in order to deal with urban waste. Location should incorporate the proximity principle. Waste management strategy & minimisation initiatives as well as increased facility provision should lead to reduced quantities of waste needing to be transported
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	The policy encourages energy recovery and promotes the use of alternative technologies for the production renewable energy.	++	++	++	++	Long term benefits should increase the efficiency and production levels and adapt to the availability of new technologies
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	Moving waste up the waste hierarchy, the increase in waste re-use and recycling would generate more facilities, therefore generating employment opportunities. Recycling is a growth employment area. Long-term benefits increase over time and would eventually plateau.	+	++	++	++	
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	New business start-ups could increase employment opportunities in the waste industry – recycling and reprocessing is a growth industry nationally. New jobs would be dependant on the location of the waste facilities within the region.	+	++	++	++	Benefits would increase over time as the waste hierarchy becomes an established element of waste management
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	0	Provision of adequate and proficient waste facilities dealing with a wide range of recycling and re-use options would be dependant on commitment to reaching, maintaining and exceeding waste targets for the area. Planning applications for new housing or industrial developments could incorporate waste facilities into the design, as laid out in Policy 2, 31 and 32

19	To conserve geodiversity	No effect	0	0	0	0	
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	No effect	0	0	0	0	PPG25 and the EA regulate the location of new development to reduce the potential risk of flooding. Planning conditions or initial design could specify the incorporation of SUDS

POLICY 2: Waste Reduction	<p>The following measures will be applied:</p> <p>i. Applications for large scale developments of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100 dwellings or more; • Non-residential development of 5,000m² or greater; and • Waste management facilities processing 50,000 tonnes per annum or more <p>shall include waste audits to demonstrate how waste generated by the construction and subsequent use of the development will be minimised and managed. Planning permission will not be granted unless the proposal demonstrates sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>ii. Where required, temporary planning permission will be granted for the use of plant to recycle site clearance waste where the materials are to be used in further development of the same site, provided the environmental and amenity impact is acceptable. (The district planning authorities within the framework area will also be encouraged to adopt this approach.)</p> <p>iii. Other waste reduction initiatives will be encouraged and planning permission granted for development required to facilitate waste reduction initiatives, subject to meeting the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.</p>
----------------------------------	--

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; -- strongly negative; --- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation
SAVSEA Objectives		ST	MT	LT	
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	0	0	+	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be fewer negative effects on habitats and species.
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	0	0	+	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be fewer negative impacts on the quality of the countryside and landscape.
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	0	0	+	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be fewer negative impacts on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value.
04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	0	0	+	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be fewer negative impacts on the quality of ground and surface waters.

05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be fewer negative impacts on soil quality and quantity.	0	0	0	+		Potential short-term temporary local negative effects of construction waste management compensated by reduction in transportation to alternative facilities.
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be fewer negative impacts on air quality.	0	0	0	+		The construction stage of development may produce gas emissions via machinery processing of the aggregates and transportation of materials. Effective construction procedures can minimise on-site impacts
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Cumulative, long-term indirect effect of this policy is that fewer waste sites are needed and hence there are likely to be less contribution to adverse climate change from waste development.	0	0	0	+		Effects can be mitigated through effective site facilities design and operational controls, as set out in policies 31 and 32
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Public nuisance may arise during the construction stage of the development from temporary facilities, dependant on location. Policy would effectively reduce the potential of fly tipping, by dealing with waste on the site.	?	?	?	+		
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	No Effect	0	0	0	+		
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No Effect	0	0	0	0		
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives and waste audits should reduce the amount of controlled waste needing to be managed.	+	+	+	+		
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	The development of fewer sites for waste uses will lead to better use of developed land and less loss of agricultural land.	+	+	+	+		
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives and on-site processing reduces the amount of waste needing to be managed or disposed of	++	++	++	++		

14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	Implementing measures to deal with construction waste in situ reduces travel implications of the transportation of untreated waste by road	++	++	++	++	
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Minimisation of waste up the hierarchy contributes to energy efficiency in terms of manufacture, transport and disposal.	+	+	+	+	
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No Effect	0	0	0	0	
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No Effect	0	0	0	0	
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	Policy allows for waste management at source and at an appropriate scale, hence ensuring adequate access.	++	++	++	++	
19	To conserve geodiversity	No Effect	0	0	0	0	
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	No Effect	0	0	0	0	

POLICY 3 : Ensuring Sustainable Provision		Provision will be made for the period until 2021 for sufficient waste management capacity to accommodate a quantity of waste equivalent to the apportionment identified for the framework area by the Regional Waste Strategy.					
SA/SEA Objectives		Description of Effect			Scale of Effect		Comments/Explanation
		ST	MT	LT			
Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear							
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	0	0	0	0		
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	0	0	0	0		
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	0	0	0	0		
04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	0	0	0	0		
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	0	0	0	0		
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	0	0	0	0		
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	0	0	0	0		New technologies could be incorporated into designs to reduce the potential effects of emissions. The location of waste facilities would need to include the provision of the proximity principle in order to minimise impacts.
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	0	0	0	0		

09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	No effect	0	0	0	0	
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	0	
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	Policy allows for provision of facilities to deal with a wider selection of waste streams within the framework area	++	++	++	++	
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	No effect	0	0	0	0	
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Allows for provision of non-landfill sites	+	+	+	+	
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	Encourages cross LPA boundary transportation of waste if it results in a shorter journey and by rail. Conforms with proximity principle to highest degree	++	++	++	++	

15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	No effect	0	0	0	0	0
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	0
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	0
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	0	0
19	To conserve geodiversity	No Effect	0	0	0	0	0
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	No Effect	0	0	0	0	0

<p>POLICY 4: Allocated Sites and Areas for Waste Management Development</p>	<p>Specific sites and areas will be allocated to provide sufficient waste management capacity for a period of at least 10 years, where planning permission will be granted for proposals that accord with the type of waste management facility that is identified as being appropriate to the site or area, and provided the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.</p>
<p>POLICY 5: Waste Management Development Outside Allocated Sites</p>	<p>Outside allocated sites and areas planning permission will be granted for waste management development provided the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is for reduction, re-use, recycling, composting or value/energy recovery of waste and is equally sustainable as an allocated site, or ii. Offers a more sustainable option than an allocated site, <p>All proposals must demonstrate that satisfactory infrastructure arrangements are available, that mineral reserves would not be sterilised, and accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.</p>

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Comments/Explanation		
SA/SEA Objectives		Scale of Effect		
Description of Effect		ST	MT	LT
01	<p>Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</p>	?	?	?
02	<p>To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</p>	?	?	?
03	<p>To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value</p>	?	?	?
04	<p>To protect the quality of ground and surface waters</p>	?	?	?

05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	No effect	0	0	0	0	
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	Allows for provision of sites	+	+	+	+	Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.

12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts.
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Allows for provision of non-landfill sites	+	+	+	Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	The policy has incorporated the requirements of the proximity principle to reduce the need to travel	+	+	+	Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	No Effect	0	0	0	
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No Effect	0	0	0	
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No Effect	0	0	0	

18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
19	To conserve geodiversity	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Potential effect would be dependant on the eventual site selection	?	?	?	?	Criteria factors taken into consideration in the site search process minimise potential negative impacts and help avoid cumulative impacts. Site-Specific Allocations DPD SA will assess all of these SA/SEA objectives.

The Preferred Policies for Securing Waste Re-use, Recycling and Recovery Facilities

POLICY 6: Re-Use and Recycling Facilities	Planning permission will be granted for waste management development for the re-use and recycling of all types of waste product, provided the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.
POLICY 7: Composting	Planning permission for composting sites will be granted, provided the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.
POLICY 8: Waste Transfer Stations and Recycling and Household Waste Centres (RHWC)	Planning permission will be granted for the development of suitable proposals for new waste transfer and Recycling and Household Waste Centres (RHWC), provided that they are intended to meet an identified need that cannot be met by an existing facility, and that the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.
POLICY 9: Anaerobic Digestion (AD), Mechanical-Biological Treatment (MBT) and Other Energy/Value Recovery Technologies	<p>Planning permission will be granted for anaerobic digestion (AD) and mechanical-biological (MBT) plants and other emerging technologies that would provide for the recovery of energy from waste, provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. energy recovery is maximised, ii. value recovery from by-products of the process is maximised, iii. any residue of the process can be satisfactorily managed and disposed, and iv. the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.
POLICY 10: Incineration	<p>Planning permission will be granted for waste incineration facilities, provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. pre-sorting of waste is carried out ii. energy recovery is maximised, iii. value recovery from bottom ash is maximised, and iv. the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Description of Effect			Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation		
SA/SEA Objectives		Description of Effect			ST	MT	LT	Comments/Explanation		
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	The provision of new waste management facilities in greenfield or brownfield sites with biodiversity value is likely to have a potentially significant negative effect on biodiversity and could result in damage and fragmentation. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics	--	--	--	--	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.	These policies in combination with Policies 15 and 16 offer protection to designated sites and sites that support protected species. Policies 29-32 require consideration of habitats and species, including during restoration phase.		

02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	<p>The provision of new waste management facilities in the countryside could have a negative effect in the quality of the countryside and landscape. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific characteristics.</p> <p>Incinerators (policy 10) particularly likely to have adverse landscape effects due to chimneystacks.</p>	-	-	-	<p>Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.</p> <p>These policies in combination with Policies 15, 16 and 18 offer protection to landscape. Policies 29-32 require consideration of landscape, including during restoration phase.</p>
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	<p>The provision of new waste management facilities in areas of archaeological or cultural significance is likely to have a negative effect on these features. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific characteristics.</p>	-	-	-	<p>Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.</p> <p>These policies in combination with Policies 15 and 16 offer protection to cultural heritage. Policies 29-32 require consideration of archaeology, including during restoration phase.</p>
04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	<p>Treatment of waste may affect ground and surface waters, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. Effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics</p> <p>Composting (Policy 7), particularly runoff from an open-windrow site is more likely to create potential pollution.</p>	-	-	-	<p>Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.</p>
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	<p>Leachate from the storage and processing of waste may cause contamination, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. However potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics</p>	-	-	-	<p>Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.</p>

06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific characteristics. Transport to sites is a major contributing factor to emissions; transporting of waste between reprocessing sites can contribute to emissions.	-	-	-	Location according to proximity principle or where rail is an option would minimise transport and associated emissions.
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Cumulative, long-term impact of waste minimisation is that fewer sites are needed and hence there are fewer potential negative impacts associated with development. Recycling and reuse may lead to lower emissions through reducing the need for manufacture and transport of new goods. Increased local provision of HWRCs and Transfer Stations (policy 8) would decrease the need for long-distance of traffic movements and associated emissions.	-	-	-	New technologies may reduce the potential emissions in the long term
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed. Effects also dependant on effectiveness of waste minimisation and management strategies. Increased local provision of HWRCs (policy 8) would decrease levels of fly tipping due to availability of correct disposal facilities.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Measures can be incorporated into processes to minimise potential negative effects of noise, odour and dust
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	By diverting waste from landfill sites this policy is likely to have positive effects on human health	0	0/+	+	Tours of education links with waste facilities can improve perception and understanding, reducing uncertainty and NIMBYISM
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	Box 1 of Waste Development Framework Policy 28 requires locations to be sensitive to potential future mineral working sites.
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	Providing facilities addresses current identified lack of capacity for waste management facilities which divert from landfill and reduces the current need to export controlled wastes out of county or the UK	+	++	++	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives through WM strategy reduces the amount of controlled waste needing to be managed.

12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Policies facilitate development which achieves this objective. Greatest benefits seen in medium-long term	++	+++	+++	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives reduces the amount of waste needing to be managed or disposed of by any means
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	Small local plants likely to decrease long-distance travel. Provision of incineration (policy 10) likely to increase traffic movements in local area due to large capacity required to make operation viable. Waste facilities should be accommodated within the urban area in order to deal with urban waste. Location should incorporate the proximity principle. Waste management strategy & minimisation initiatives as well as increased facility provision should lead to reduced quantities of waste needing to be transported
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Policy 9 encourages energy recovery. Incineration (policy 10) can facilitate CHP or production of energy	++	++	++	Benefits may be enhanced by embracing new technologies incorporating energy recovery
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	Given PPS10's requirement to move waste up the waste hierarchy, the increase in waste re-use and recycling would generate more facilities, therefore generating employment opportunities. Recycling is a growth employment area.	+	++	++	Long term benefits increase over time and would eventually plateau

17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	New business start-ups could increase employment opportunities in the waste industry – recycling and reprocessing is a growth industry nationally. New jobs would be dependant on the location of the waste facilities within the region.	+	++	++	Benefits would increase over time as the waste hierarchy becomes an established element of waste management
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	
19	To conserve geodiversity	No effect	0	0	0	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location.
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. PPG25 and the EA regulate the location of new development to reduce the potential risk of flooding. Planning conditions or initial design could specify the incorporation of SUDS

<p>POLICY 11: Non-inert Waste Landfill</p>	<p>With the exception of site allocations, planning permission will not be granted for new or extensions to existing non-inert waste landfill sites, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the facility, ii. an environmental benefit is to be secured by the development, and iii. the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework. <p>Planning permission will be granted for new or extensions to existing inert waste landfill or landraise sites, provided:</p>
<p>POLICY 12: Inert Waste Landfill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it can be demonstrated that the waste cannot be managed in a more sustainable way, ii. an environmental benefit is to be secured by the development, and iii. the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Description of Effect			Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation
SA/SEA Objectives		ST	MT	LT				
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species; avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	-	-	-/+	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities with biodiversity value is likely to have a negative effect on biodiversity and could result in damage, and fragmentation. Long term, restoration of landfill sites can also create and improve habitat. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the location and site-specific characteristics.	-	-	Potential exists for cumulative effects due to extending landfill operations. Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of phasing and restoration conditions. Policies 29-32 can assist in effective control and mitigation
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	-	-	-/+	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities in areas of landscape value is likely to have a negative effect on the quality of the countryside. Long term, restoration of landfill sites can reverse this and enhance landscape. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the location and site-specific characteristics.	-	-	Potential exists for cumulative effects due to extending landfill operations. Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of phasing and restoration conditions. Policies 29-32 can assist in effective control and mitigation
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	-	-	-	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities in areas of archaeological or historical value is likely to have a negative, irreversible, effect on the cultural heritage. This is balanced by the potential for discovery and recording of new archaeological features. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the location and site-specific characteristics.	-	-	Potential exists for cumulative effects due to extending landfill operations. Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal. Policies 31 and 32 can assist in effective control and mitigation. Suitable mitigation measures would include archaeological watching briefs and recording of archaeological finds.

04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	Non-inert landfill in particular (policy 11) may have an adverse effect on the quality of ground and surface waters in case of pollution caused by leachate.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against through statutory controls on design and operation of facilities (PPC). However it is likely that some residual impacts may remain
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Non-inert landfill in particular (Policy 11) may have an adverse effect on the quality of ground and surface waters in case of pollution caused by leachate.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against through statutory controls on design and operation of facilities (PPC). However it is likely that some residual impacts may remain
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities is likely to give rise to increased traffic movements, leading to emissions of dust, smoke and fumes during the operation period of the site.	-	-	0	Adverse effects should be mitigated against through controls on design and operation of facilities. Policies 31 and 32 can assist with this. Mitigation in the form of planning conditions could limit traffic movements, hours of operation and provide measures to limit the amount of air born pollutants, for example by watering trucks, screening, bunding. However it is likely that some residual impacts may remain
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities is likely to give rise to increased traffic movements, leading to emissions of dust, smoke and fumes. Non-inert landfill (Policy 11) can provide landfill gas as a renewable resource, reducing emissions from a site while providing a renewable energy source	-/+	-/+	0	Once the site has been capped waste transportation would cease and the site could be harvested for methane
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities is likely to give rise to nuisance from traffic, odour, dust and vermin during operation	-	-	0	Adverse effects should be mitigated against through controls on design and operation of facilities. Policies 31 and 32 can assist with this. Mitigation in the form of planning conditions could limit traffic movements, hours of operation and provide measures to limit the amount of air born pollutants, for example by watering trucks, screening, bunding. However it is likely that some residual impacts may remain. Once the site has been capped, nuisance should be minimal.

09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	The provision of new landfill sites or extensions to facilities is likely to give rise to potential adverse impacts on human health from traffic and emissions, during operation. Post-restoration, landfill sites can provide benefits in terms of public facilities.	-	-	+	Adverse effects should be mitigated against through controls on design and operation of facilities. Policies 31 and 32 can assist with this Planning conditions could implement phased restoration throughout the lifetime of the site.
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	Provision of new landfill sites and extension to facilities has potential to sterilise minerals. However the voidspace would normally be worked out mineral reserves, leading to a neutral effect.	0	0	0	Policy 31 and 32 controlling development and Policies 4 and 5 covering site search criteria should avoid adverse effects
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	No effect	0	0	0	
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	No effect	0	0	0	Restoration of the site can include replacing the stored original top soil to prevent the irretrievable loss
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Policies do not contribute to minimising landfill.	---	---	---	However, Policy 1 and Policies 6-10 assist in ensuring priority is given to non-landfill means of waste management and that landfill is a last resort.
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	Effects would be dependant on the location of facility proposed.	?	?	?	

15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Non-inert landfill facilities can contribute to production of renewable energy supplies through landfill gas recovery during phases of operation and post-closure	0	+	+	
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	
19	To conserve geodiversity	No effect	0	0	0	
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Effect would be dependant on the location of proposed facilities	?	?	?	

POLICY 13: Other Forms of Waste Management Planning permission will be granted for other forms of waste management not covered by specific policies, provided that the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Description of Effect			Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation
SA/SEA Objectives	Description of Effect	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Collection of landfill gas, one of the uses specified in the policy supporting text, prevents emission to air thus giving a positive effect on emissions	+	+	+	+	+	

07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Collection of greenhouse gases for the production of energy recovery has a positive effect on this objective, reducing greenhouse gas emissions	+	+	+	
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	No effect	0	0	0	
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	Collection of Methane gas minimises adverse effects on human health and reduces the need for production of alternative forms of energy, with associated environmental effects.	+	+	+	Enhancement measures could incorporate public education facilities to maximise benefits and understanding.
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	No effect	0	0	0	
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	No effect	0	0	0	
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	No effect	0	0	0	

14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	No effect	0	0	0	0	
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	The provision of facilities for collection and recovery of landfill gas would contribute to the region's renewal energy quotas and provide energy recovery.	+	+	+	+	
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	0	
19	To conserve geodiversity	No effect	0	0	0	0	
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	No effect	0	0	0	0	

POLICY 14: Integrated Waste Management		Planning permission will be granted for proposals for the co-location of waste management facilities, where transport, operational and environmental benefits can be demonstrated, and the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.				
Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Description of Effect			Comments/Explanation	
SA/SEA Objectives		Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation	
		ST	MT	LT		
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	The provision of new waste management facilities in greenfield or brownfield sites with biodiversity value is likely to have a negative effect on biodiversity and could result in damage and fragmentation. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics	--	--	--	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain. This policy in combination with Policies 15 and 16 offers protection to designated sites and sites that support protected species. Policies 29-32 require consideration of habitats and species, including during restoration phase.
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	The provision of new waste management facilities in the countryside could have a negative effect in the quality of the countryside and landscape. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific characteristics. Incinerators (Policy 10) are particularly likely to have adverse landscape effects due to chimneystacks.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain. Policies 15, 16, and 18 offer protection to landscape. Policies 29-32 require consideration of landscape, including during restoration phase.
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	The provision of new waste management facilities in areas of archaeological or cultural significance is likely to have a negative effect on these features. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific characteristics.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain. Policies 15 and 16 offer protection to cultural heritage. Policies 29, 31, 32 require consideration of archaeology, including during restoration phase.

04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	Treatment of waste may affect ground and surface waters, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. Effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics Compositing (Policy 7), particularly runoff from an open-windrow site is more likely to create potential pollution.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Leachate from the storage and processing of waste may cause contamination, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. However potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Co-location of facilities should limit traffic movements and associated emissions.	++	++	++	Benefits can be enhanced by location on sites with good transport links including rail and waterway freight
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Co-location of facilities should limit traffic movements and associated emissions.	++	++	++	
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed. Effects also dependant on effectiveness of waste minimisation and management strategies.	-	-	-	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Measures can be incorporated into processes to minimise potential negative effects of noise, odour and dust
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	By diverting waste from landfill sites this policy is likely to have positive effects on human health	0	0/+	+	Tours of/education links with waste facilities can improve perception and understanding, reducing uncertainty and NIMBYISM
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	Box 1 of Waste Development Framework Policy 28 requires locations to be sensitive to potential future mineral working sites.

11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	Providing facilities addresses current identified lack of capacity for waste management facilities which divert from landfill and reduces the current need to export controlled wastes out of county or the UK	+	++	++	++	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives through WMI strategy reduces the amount of controlled waste needing to be managed.
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	?	
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Policy facilitates development which moves away from landfill as an option. Greatest benefits seen in medium-long term	++	+++	+++	+++	Implementation of waste minimisation initiatives reduces the amount of waste needing to be managed or disposed of by any means
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	?	
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	No effect	0	0	0	0	Benefits may be enhanced by embracing new technologies incorporating energy recovery
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	Co location of facilities would provide diversity of employment and maximise potential for ancillary employment in recycling and reuse operations	+	+	+	+	Benefits can be enhanced through local authority support and control of co-location proposals, using current examples of resource recovery parks in the UK

17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	Co location of facilities would provide diversity of employment and maximise potential for ancillary employment in recycling and reuse operations New business start-ups could increase employment opportunities in the waste industry – recycling and reprocessing is a growth industry nationally.	+	+	+	Benefits can be enhanced through local authority support and control of co-location proposals, using current examples of resource recovery parks in the UK
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	Effects would be dependant on the location and the type of facility proposed.	?	?	?	
19	To conserve geodiversity	No effect	0	0	0	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location.
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Effects would be dependant on the location and of facility proposed.	?	?	?	Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. PPG25 and the EA regulate the location of new development to reduce the potential risk of flooding. Planning conditions or initial design could specify the incorporation of SUDS.

The Preferred Policies for Protecting the Environment

<p>POLICY 15: Sites of International or National Importance</p>	<p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management development that would be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the character, appearance, ecological or geological value and/or setting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Ancient Woodlands, and sites that support protected species; ii. Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other nationally important archaeological sites; iii. Historic Parks and gardens, battlefields and historic landscapes; iv. Listed Buildings. <p>In circumstances where planning permission is to be granted measures in mitigation and/or compensation for any impacts caused will be required.</p>
<p>POLICY 16: Sites of Regional and Local Importance</p>	<p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management development which would have a significant adverse effect on the character, appearance, ecological, geological or amenity value and/or setting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sites of importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs); ii. Local Nature Reserves; iii. Priority habitats or species identified in relevant Biodiversity Action Plans; iv. Special landscape areas and landscape features of importance; v. Regionally Important Geological sites (RIGs); vi. Protected woodland areas; vii. Country parks, common land, village greens and other important areas of open space or green areas within built-up areas; viii. Conservation areas, and ix. Land or buildings in sport, recreational or tourism use, <p>unless it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the development and any impacts can be mitigated or compensated for.</p>
<p>POLICY 17: Archaeology</p>	<p>Proposals for waste management development which are likely to affect areas with potential archaeological interest will not be granted planning permission, unless</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. they have been the subject of a preliminary archaeological assessment to determine the nature and significance of any archaeological remains; and ii. adequate provision for preservation in situ, excavation or recording of any interest is made in accordance with the level of importance of the finds.

<p>POLICY 18: Green Wedges and the Countryside</p>	<p>Planning permission will not normally be granted for waste management development on greenfield sites within Green Wedges and the countryside, unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. there is an overriding need for the facility, and ii. the visual amenities of the area will not be harmed. <p>All proposals at any location within Green Wedges and the countryside must also accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework.</p> <p>Planning permission will not normally be granted for waste management development that would result in the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a), unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. there is an overriding need for the facility; ii. there is no suitable alternative site of lower agricultural quality that provides the same benefits in terms of sustainability, and iii. provided the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the waste development framework. <p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management development which is likely to generate significant adverse levels of disturbance from noise, dust, vibration, odour, fumes, illumination, visual intrusion or traffic to the detriment of adjoining land uses.</p> <p>Proposals for waste management development will be required to demonstrate that they have been designed to ensure impact on the environment is minimised by appropriate measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other forms of pollution ii. minimise levels of energy and water consumption; iii. minimise production of waste, and iv. maximise re-use or recycling of materials. <p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management facilities involving the transport of waste by road except where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there is no practicable alternative to road transport which would be environmentally preferable; (ii) the proposed access arrangements would be safe and appropriate to the proposed development and the highway network is able to accommodate the traffic that would be generated; (iii) the impact of the traffic generated would not be detrimental to road safety nor have an unacceptable impact on the environment or local residents. <p>Heavy lorry movements associated with waste management development will be restricted from using unsuitable roads by means of traffic management or other appropriate measures such as lorry routing agreements.</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management development that would adversely affect a public right of way, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the facility, ii. satisfactory proposals are made for its diversion or the creation of an alternative route, and iii. where appropriate, provision is made to increase opportunities for enhancing the rights of way network. <p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management development which would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. have a detrimental impact on the quality or flow of groundwater or surface water drainage, or ii. exacerbate flood risk in areas prone to flooding and elsewhere <p>Planning permission will not be granted for waste management development which would give rise to new or increased hazards to aviation.</p>
<p>POLICY 19: Agricultural Land</p>	
<p>POLICY 20: Amenity</p>	
<p>POLICY 21: Design</p>	
<p>POLICY 22: Transportation of Waste</p>	
<p>POLICY 23: Traffic Management</p>	
<p>POLICY 24: Rights of Way</p>	
<p>POLICY 25: The Water Environment</p>	
<p>POLICY 26: Air Safeguarding</p>	

POLICY 28: Landscaping and Woodland In granting planning permission for waste management development, opportunities for landscaping and new woodland planting will be sought, where appropriate.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

SA/SEA Objectives	Description of Effect	Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
01 Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	<p>Policies 15 and 16 prevent waste development on internationally, nationally, regionally or locally important sites. However non-designated sites and wildlife corridors are not given specific protection, leading to potential for fragmentation and damage.</p> <p>Policy 28 is likely to lead to the long-term creation of new habitat in certain circumstances. The level of protection for flora, fauna, habitats and species offered by these policies is judged as weak, leading to an overall neutral assessment.</p> <p>Policies 17-26 have no effect.</p>	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p>Although the policies endeavour to protect sites, the caveat that if permission may be given if mitigation and/or compensation measures are applied counteracts the positive effects. It is likely that residual impacts would remain after mitigation. Lack of reference to fragmentation may lead to potential for cumulative effects.</p> <p>Suggest incorporate 'unless there is a nationally or internationally significant overriding need for the development' into policy wording of Policy 15 at a minimum, or remove reference to option of compensation/mitigation in order to protect national/international sites.</p> <p>Suggest Policies 15 and 16 should pro-actively seek the protection of biodiversity through habitat enhancement and creation as part of waste management activities.</p>

02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	<p>Policies 15 and 16 prevent waste development on internationally, nationally, regionally or locally important sites, giving a positive effect.</p> <p>Policies 18 and 19 offer specific protection to Green Wedges and agricultural land. Overall the level of protection offered by these policies is seen as positive.</p> <p>Policy 24 offers effective protection to rights of way therefore giving positive effects on access to countryside</p> <p>Policy 28 may offer potential benefits in enhancing the quality of the countryside and landscape.</p> <p>Policies 17, 20-23, 25 and 26 have no effect.</p>	+	+	+	+	Although the policies endeavour to protect sites, the caveat that if permission may be given if mitigation and/or compensation measures are applied counteracts the positive effects. It is likely that residual impacts would remain after mitigation.
			++	++	++	++	Suggest remove word 'normally' from Policy 18 as this weakens policy protection
			+	+	+	+	Lack of reference to fragmentation in Policies 15, 16, 18 and 19 may lead to potential for cumulative effects.
			+	+	+	+	
			0	0	0	0	
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	<p>Policy 15 and 16 prevent waste development on internationally, nationally, regionally or locally important sites.</p> <p>Policy 17 offers strong protection to archaeological resources, giving positive effects on archaeology.</p> <p>Policy 24 offers effective protection to rights of way.</p> <p>Policies 18-23 and 25-28 have no effect.</p>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	Undesignated local historic elements and character are not offered protection; this leads to potential for fragmentation and cumulative effects.
			+	+	+	+	Suggest refer to avoiding fragmentation of and cumulative adverse effects on local landscape character, cultural heritage in Policy 16.
			+	+	+	+	Suggest incorporate 'unless there is a nationally or internationally significant overriding need for the development' into policy wording of Policy 15 at a minimum, or remove reference to option of compensation/mitigation in order to protect national/international sites.
			0	0	0	0	

04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	Policies 25 and 21 offer effective protection to the water environment. Policies 15-20, 22-24, 26 and 28 have no effect.	+	0	+	+	0	
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	By protecting agricultural land Policy 19 safeguards agricultural soil quality and quantity. Policies 15-18, 20-26 and 28 have no effect.	+	0	+	+	0	Suggest incorporate a policy related to soil contamination or reword Policy 20 to take this effect into consideration.
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Policies 21, 22 and 23 offer effective contribution to the air environment through controls on design and traffic measures. Policies 15-20, 24-26 and 28 have no effect.	+	0	+	+	0	
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Policies 21, 22, 23 offer effective protection to minimising emissions through controls on design and traffic measures. Policies 15-20, 24-26 and 28 have no effect.	+	0	+	+	0	
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Policy 23 offers effective protection from nuisance caused by waste-related traffic. Policy 20 offers general protection covering a range of nuisance types. Policies 15-19, 21-22, 24-26 and 28 have no effect.	+	0	+	+	0	Policy 20 does not specify what is meant by 'significant' – policy remains open to interpretation. Effects will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	Policy group collectively offers protection to the natural environment. This is likely to offer positive indirect benefits to human health. Policy 26 is likely to ensure no air crashes and hence have an indirect positive effect on human health.	+	0	+	+	0	Potential for cumulative positive effects

10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	0		
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	No effect	0	0	0	0		
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	<p>Policy 19 offers effective protection to best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Policies restricting location of development (Policies 15, 16, 18, 20, 24) are likely to encourage use of developed land, leading to positive effect.</p> <p>Policies 17-18, 21-23, 25-26 and 28 have no effect.</p>	+	+	+	+	+	Suggest remove the word 'normally' from policy 19 as this weakens the policy protection. The justification establishes a preference for a search sequence before the use of agricultural land.
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	No effect	0	0	0	0		
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	<p>Policy 22 encourages modal shift offering a significant positive effect</p> <p>Policies 15-21, 23-26 and 28 have no effect.</p>	++	++	++	++	++ 0	
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Policy 21's requirement for proposals to demonstrate measures to minimise energy consumption offers a positive effect	+	+	+	+	+	Policy 31 and 32 may also assist in delivering benefits.

16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	
17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	0	
19	To conserve geodiversity	Policy 16 (v) offers protection for RIGS	+	+	+	+	
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Restrictions on development imposed by policy 25 offer positive benefits.	+	+	+	+	

POLICY 27: Information in Support of Planning Applications	<p>Planning applications for waste management development will not be considered favourably unless they are supported by sufficient relevant drawings, plans and information, including details where appropriate of the matters listed in Box 1.</p>
---	---

Box 1 - Information Required in Support of Planning Applications
1. Type(s) of waste to be managed at the site;
2. Estimated annual throughput of waste materials and timescale of operations;
3. Estimated capacity of the site;
4. Method of working;
5. Markets to be served;
6. An assessment of the contribution that the proposed development would make to the waste hierarchy;
7. Transportation arrangements including the estimated volume, nature and routing of traffic;
8. Highway safety measures;
9. Present use, condition and ground levels of the site and its surroundings;
10. Site layout, means of access and the design and siting of buildings;
11. Fixed and mobile plant and machinery to be used;
12. Anticipated employment levels;
13. Hours of operation;
14. Likely sources of emissions of gases, dust, smoke, odours, fumes or any other form of pollution from the site and measures for minimisation;
15. A noise assessment and proposals for mitigation;
16. Measures for reducing energy and water consumption;
17. Measures to maximise the potential for re-use and recycling of materials;
18. A landscape assessment and landscaping proposals;
19. An assessment of the ecological and geological impact of the proposed development and proposals for mitigation or compensation;
20. An assessment of the impact of the proposed development on sites of conservation value;
21. An archaeological evaluation of the site and proposals for safeguarding remains;
22. Measures for protecting public rights of way;
23. An evaluation of the underlying geology and mineral reserves sterilised;
24. An assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological impact of the proposed development and proposals for mitigation;
25. A flood risk assessment and proposals for compensation;
26. Site drainage details;
27. Measures to prevent new or increased risk to aviation from the proposed development;
28. Proposals for the management of leachate and landfill gas;
29. Restoration proposals including finished levels, depths and source of soils and landscaping;
30. Aftercare proposals;
31. After-use and long term management proposals;

POLICY 31: Planning Conditions	In granting planning permission for waste management development, conditions will be attached to control the effect of the development on the environment and the local community. Matters to be covered by conditions may include those listed in Box 2 as appropriate to the development to be granted.
---------------------------------------	---

Box 2 – Matters for Control by the Imposition of Conditions
1. Commencement and duration of the permission;
2. Types of waste materials;
3. Throughputs;
4. Hours of working;
5. Working method and area;
6. Vehicle movements;
7. Site access;
8. Vehicle cleaning;
9. Location, design and size of buildings;
10. Site drainage;
11. Type of machinery;
12. Permitted development rights;
13. Noise generation;
14. Emissions of dust, smoke, fumes etc;
15. Visual intrusion;
16. Site illumination;
17. Screening and landscaping;
18. Protection of existing trees, shrubs, hedges and other landscape features;
19. Protection of the water environment;
20. Protection of ecological and geological interests;
21. Archaeological evaluation and safeguarding of remains;
22. Protection of public rights of way;
23. Soil management;
24. Restoration;
25. Aftercare;
26. After-use;

POLICY 32: Planning Obligations

Planning obligations will be sought where appropriate to achieve suitable control over and to mitigate or compensate for the effects of waste management development where such objectives cannot be achieved by planning conditions. Matters to be covered by such planning obligations may include those listed in Box 3 as appropriate to the proposed development.

Box 3 – Matters to be Covered by Planning Obligations	
1.	Waste minimisation initiatives;
2.	Delivery of facilities for managing waste up the waste hierarchy.
3.	Discontinuance of existing planning permissions;
4.	Traffic management measures including the routing of vehicles;
5.	Access and highways improvements
6.	Provision of infrastructure and public facilities;
7.	Establishment of a liaison committee;
8.	Protection of or mitigation for adverse effects on sites of international, national, regional or local importance;
9.	Management of sites with ecological or geological value;
10.	Archaeological investigation and safeguarding of remains;
11.	Protection and improvement of rights of way;
12.	Off-site monitoring of emissions and the water environment;
13.	Provision and management of off-site or advance planting and screening;
14.	Financial guarantees to ensure restoration is undertaken;
15.	Long-term management of sites following restoration and aftercare.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear					
SAVSEA Objectives	Description of Effect	Scale of Effect			Comments/Explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	+/?	+/?	+/?	Suggest Item 18 in box 2 amended to include habitat features to enhance protection Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures

03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	Imposition of conditions and obligations (box 2: 21 and Box 3: 8) is likely to offer protection for cultural heritage interests. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	Imposition of conditions and obligations (box 2: 10, 19, Box3: 12) is likely to offer protection for water quality. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Imposition of conditions and obligations (box 2: 23) is likely to offer protection for soil quality/quantity. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	Imposition of conditions and obligations (box 2: 6, 14, 23, Box 3: 4, 5, 12) is likely to offer protection for air quality. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Imposition of conditions and obligations (box 2: 6, 14, 23, Box 3: 4, 5, 12) is likely to offer protection for air quality. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Imposition of a range of conditions and obligations is likely to offer protection against nuisance. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+	+	+	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	Imposition of a range of conditions and obligations is likely to offer positive effects for human health and well-being. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+	+	+	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures

10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	Imposition of conditions and obligations (Box 2: 20, Box 3: 9) is likely to offer protection for mineral reserves.	+	+	+	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	No effect	0	0	0	
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	No effect	0	0	0	
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	Imposition of Planning obligations (Box 3: 1, 2) is likely to give positive effects on minimising landfill and maximising reuse, recovery and recycling	+	+	+	
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	Imposition of conditions and obligations (Box 2: 6, 7, Box 3: 4, 5) is likely to offer benefits in terms of reducing the need to travel. Scale and duration of effect will be determined by details, location and decisions on specific proposals	+/?	+/?	+/?	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	No effect	0	0	0	
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	

17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	
19	To conserve geodiversity	Imposition of conditions and obligations (Box 2: 20, Box 3: 9) is likely to offer protection for geodiversity.	+	+	+	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Imposition of conditions and obligations (box 2: 10, Box3: 12) and the requirement for flood risk assessment stipulated in Policy 27 is likely to offer protection for flood risk.	+	+	+	Site allocations DPD and project-level EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures

<p>POLICY 29: Reclamation and Aftercare</p>	<p>For waste management proposals where the development is not for a permanent use, planning permission will not be granted unless satisfactory provision has been made to ensure high quality reclamation of the site, including where appropriate the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Details of the proposed landform including pre- and post-settlement levels; ii. Types, quantities and source of soils or soil making materials to be used; iii. A methodology for management of soils; iv. Removal of all buildings, plant, structures, accesses and hardstandings not required for long term management of the site; v. Installation of drainage; vi. Details of grass seeding and planting of trees, shrubs and hedges; vii. A programme of aftercare.
<p>POLICY 30: After-Use</p>	<p>For waste management proposals where the development is not for a permanent use, planning permission will not be granted unless satisfactory provision has been made for after-use of the site and where necessary its long term management. The following after-uses will be sought in appropriate cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Woodland planting, particularly in the National Forest; ii. Creation of new wildlife habitats; iii. Water-based recreational schemes; iv. Public access and improvements to the public rights of way network.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear		Comments/Explanation		
SAVSEA Objectives		Description of Effect		
		Scale of Effect		
		ST	MT	LT
01	Conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	0	?	+
02	To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape	0	?	++
03	To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	0	0	0

04	To protect the quality of ground and surface waters	Policy 29 (v) covering the installation of drainage affords some benefits to protecting water quality. Effects in the medium term will be dependent on duration of the life of a facility and any phasing of drainage works.	0	?	+	Policies 27, 28, 31 and 32 offer support for mitigation and compensation measures. Medium-term benefits can be enhanced by inclusion of phasing in matters for inclusion in Policy 29.
05	To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity	Policy 29 (ii, iii) covering soil handling affords positive effects protecting soil quality and quantity. Effects in the medium term will be dependent on duration of the life of a facility and any phasing of restoration	0	?	+	Policies 27, 28, 31 and 32 offer support for mitigation and compensation measures. Medium-term benefits can be enhanced by inclusion of phasing in matters for inclusion in Policy 29.
06	To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health	No effect	0	0	0	
07	To minimise the contribution of waste development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions.	Restoration and of sites for nature purposes contributes to offsetting adverse effects of CO2 emissions during operation, offering a slight positive effect. Effects in the medium term will be dependent on duration of the life of a facility and any phasing of restoration to woodland or other habitat.	0	?	+	Policies 27, 28, 31 and 32 offer support for mitigation and compensation measures. Medium-term benefits can be enhanced by inclusion of phasing in matters for inclusion in Policy 29.
08	To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal.	Policy provisions should lead to a long-term neutral effect on public nuisance effects in the medium term will be dependent on duration of the life of a facility and any phasing of restoration.	0	0	0	These policies act as mitigating/compensation measures for short-medium term adverse effects created by provision of facilities.
09	To maximise the benefits to human health and well-being	Restoration of sites for any of the uses in Policy 30 will have positive effects on human health and well-being. Effects in the medium term will be dependent on duration of the life of a facility and any phasing of restoration.	0	?	++	The inclusion of provision for long-term management of sites offers strength to Policy 30. Medium-term benefits can be enhanced by inclusion of phasing in matters for inclusion in Policy 29.
10	To ensure waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves	No effect	0	0	0	

11	To facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of wastes controlled by EC Directives	No effect	0	0	0	0	
12	To encourage better use of developed land and to prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land	The after uses detailed in Policy 30 conform with LRSP priority after-uses to meet identified need; this is a positive effect on reuse of developed land. Effects in the medium term will be dependent on duration of the life of a facility and any phasing of restoration	0	?	+		
13	To minimise quantities of waste landfilled and to maximise re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	No effect	0	0	0		
14	To reduce the need to travel, in particular to reduce the transportation of untreated waste by road, and thereby vehicle emissions, in line with the proximity principle.	No effect	0	0	0		
15	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	No effect	0	0	0		
16	To promote stable employment and employment diversity in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0		

17	To promote sustainable economic growth in the Framework Area	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
18	To ensure adequate access to waste facilities appropriate in scale and type to local needs.	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
19	To conserve geodiversity	No effect	0	0	0	0	0	
20	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of waste development	Policy 29 (v) covering the installation of drainage affords some benefits to protecting from flood risk	0	?	+			Enhancement measures can be developed building on the requirement for flood risk assessment stipulated in Policy 27.