

GLOUCESTERSHIRE WASTE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

Inspector's Issue 5: Specific Sites

Prepared by Cory Environmental (Gloucestershire) Ltd

January 2012

Question 1: Javelin Park

Q 5.1 – Focussed Change 44 of CD1.11 proposes changes to the boundary of the Javelin Park site and changes to the Strategic Site Schedule (Appendix 5 of CD1.1). Public consultation on this late proposed focussed change is proposed by the CC in CD13.2 and this is welcomed.

Q 5.2 – The representation made by the landowner of the 6ha part of the Javelin Park site in CD1.15 makes reference to their being five separate and alternative schemes permitted on the wider Javelin Park site. Although reference is made in Appendix 5 of CD1.1 to a maximum ridge height of 15.7m in terms of the extant outline permission it is unclear despite FC44 (CD1.11) whether this maximum height reflects the height permitted on each of these schemes and / or relates to the 6ha site owned by Consi or the 5ha site owned by the CC. Further clarification on this matter should be provided in the CS.

Q 5.3 – No comment.

Q 5.4 – Having regard to the comments made with respect to landscape and visual impacts associated with emissions stacks both for this site and for the Wingmoor Farm West sites in Appendix 5 of CD1.1 it would be considered relevant for this matter also to be discussed in relation to the deliverability of this site.

Question 2: Wingmoor Farm West

Q 5.5 – Cory considered the interpretation to be incorrect.

Firstly, Cory has concerns regarding the phrasing of the question. As stated in the CC's response to representation 60/13 in CD1.14 there are two separate sites at Wingmoor Farm West that are considered suitable strategic sites in their own right. On this basis we would suggest that the question should have been phrased as to whether the implication of the CS is that in the event that the Javelin Park site cannot deliver the residual MSW contract the only other sites being put forward for a 150,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) facility in the CS are either of the two sites at Wingmoor Farm West.

Regardless of the above point, as stated in the further submission provided under Issue 2 Cory considers that the 150,000 tpa level of residual MSW to be an overestimate and unjustified in the CS.

Cory also considers the interpretation to be incorrect on the basis that the CS does not suggest a suitable scale of waste facility at any of the identified allocated sites. Although it should be noted that the existing landfill facility at Wingmoor Farm West is permitted and takes in excess of 150,000 tpa. Furthermore, both identified sites at Wingmoor Farm West are considered suitable for accommodating large strategic waste facilities.

Finally, Cory considers that the references to the allocated sites being suitable primarily for MSW or C&I waste to be unjustified in the CS. As indicated in the CC's response to representation 60/13 in CD1.14 there are many similarities between MSW and C&I waste streams. Cory contends that there is no justification in allocating sites on the basis of suitability to accept MSW or C&I wastes and the CS should be amended to reflect this.

Q 5.6 – The commercial arrangements associated with the existing businesses on The Park site are managed by Cory. As such Cory can confirm that The Park (Area A) site can be developed as a strategic waste management site by Cory within the timeframe of the CS.

Q 5.7 – Cory can confirm, as stated in the evidence provided under Issue 2, that the life of the Wingmoor Farm West landfill is predicted to extend beyond the Plan period of the CS. The extant consent has no time limiting condition. Furthermore, the existing built development on the front part of the Wingmoor Farm West landfill site includes the landfill gas engines which will remain on-site well beyond the active tipping phase of the landfill.

Further to the evidence provided under Issue 3 Cory dispute the reference within the Strategic Site Schedule (Appendix 5 of CD1.1) to the possible requirement to develop demountable buildings on these sites. Such a statement is not consistent with national policy and / or with the allocation of these sites as being suitable for any waste management technology.

Q 5.8 – The landscape and visual impact considerations made in Appendix 5 of CD1.1 are considered if anything to be less of a restriction to delivery in terms of the two sites at Wingmoor Farm West than at other allocated sites where references are made to emission stacks being 'significant vertical features' and 'out of keeping' with the surrounding landscape.

Both sites at Wingmoor Farm West are considered to be suitable and deliverable in terms of accommodating large scale strategic waste management facilities within the Plan period of the CS.

Q 5.9 – Both identified sites at Wingmoor Farm West are considered to be suitable and deliverable in terms of accommodating large scale strategic waste management facilities within the Plan period of the CS.

Question 3: Wingmoor Farm East

Q 5.10 – No comment.

Q 5.11 – No comment.

Q 5.12 – No comment.

Q 5.13 – No comment.

Question 4: Land at Moreton Vallence

Q 5.14 – No comment.

Q 5.15 – No comment.

Q 5.16 – No comment.

Question 4: Land at Sharpness Dock

Q 5.17 – No comment.

Q 5.18 – No comment.