

# Waste Core Strategy

Technical Paper WCS-J

Waste Industry Involvement

Living Draft

January 2008

# **Waste Core Strategy**

Technical Paper WCS-J

Waste Industry  
Involvement

**Living Draft**

November 2007

## **Contact Details for Gloucestershire County Council**

**Minerals & Waste Planning Policy:**  
Tel: 01452 425704  
[m&wplans@gloucestershire.gov.uk](mailto:m&wplans@gloucestershire.gov.uk)

**Minerals & Waste Development Control:**  
Tel: 01452 425704

**Waste Management Unit:**  
Tel: 01452 426601

 **Council Direct:**  
Tel: 01452 505345

# Contents

**Section 1:** Introduction

**Section 2:** Brief Overview of the Waste Industry in Gloucestershire

**Section 3:** Policy Requirements for Waste Industry Involvement

**Section 4:** The Waste Core Strategy Issues & Options Paper

**Section 5:** Summary of Meetings with Waste Operators

Appendix A: Notes of Meeting with Smith's (Gloucester) Ltd

Appendix B: Notes of Meeting with Cory Environmental Ltd

Appendix C: Notes of Meeting with Grundon Waste Management Ltd

Appendix D: Notes of Meeting with Key Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste Operators in Gloucestershire

Appendix E: Notes of Meeting with CEMEX – at Frampton Landfill site

## Section 1

### Introduction

1. The aims of this report are to:

- (a) Demonstrate the extent to which key waste operators in Gloucestershire have been provided with the opportunity to be appropriately involved in the preparation of Gloucestershire's Waste Core Strategy.
- (b) Record the concerns and various initiatives put forward in evidence gathering meetings and consider them in terms of Core Strategy policy formation.

## Section 2

### Brief overview of the Waste Industry in Gloucestershire

2. We are a wasteful society and we continue to produce more and more waste. There are numerous requirements through EU Directives, National legislation and policy, aiming to move waste up the hierarchy away from disposal.

3. But however stringent the legislative requirements, and the quality and coverage of waste plans and strategies, it is the waste industry who ultimately have to manage waste 'on the ground' through sites and facilities. How they operate and the levels of competition etc clearly has a bearing on the Council's abilities to meet targets as well as people's perceptions of the waste industry.

#### How much is handled?

4. Approximately 1.37 million tonnes of waste is handled in Gloucestershire every year. In terms

of the wastes for which targets are set in the South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) the following is a brief breakdown of the most up to date figures. (Note: See Technical Evidence Paper (WCS-A) Data and Technical Evidence Paper (WCS-G) Waste Facility Types for more details).

Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)	In 2004/05 the total MSW arisings was <b>312,000 tonnes*</b> up from 309,000 tonnes in 2003/04. Year on year a greater proportion is being composted and recycled.
*(Figures are without any material being transferred)	
Commercial and Industrial Waste (C&I)	In 2004/05 the total C&I waste arisings in Gloucestershire was <b>536,000 tonnes*</b> down from 596,000 tonnes in 2003/04.
*(Figures are without 75% double counted transfer and including metals)	
Construction and Demolition Waste (C&D)	In 2005 the total C&D waste arisings in Gloucestershire was <b>402,000 tonnes*</b>
*(Figure = with 50% transfer. The 50% transferred figure is included in the total to reflect the material that is transferred to recycling facilities and not double counted. The remaining 50% is assumed to be landfilled and already counted in the overall landfill figure)	

### Gloucestershire Licensed Waste Sites & Facilities

Materials Recycling / Recovery Treatment Facilities	8 sites and 8 operators
Composting facilities	c. 6 sites and 6 operators
Household Recycling Centres (HRCs)	6 sites and 2 operators, 1 being Cheltenham Borough Council
End of Life Vehicle Dismantlers & Metal Recycling Facilities	35 sites and 35 operators
Waste Transfer Stations	27 sites and 23 operators
Hazardous Waste Treatment Facilities	1 site and 1 operator
Non-Hazardous Biodegradable Landfill	4 sites and 3 operators
Non-Hazardous Inert Landfill	6 sites and 6 operators
Hazardous Landfill	1 site and 1 operator
(Data from Appendix B Minerals & Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2005 – 2006)	

Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and other documents within Minerals & Waste Development Frameworks (MWDFs).

### SCI

6. Gloucestershire's SCI was adopted in December 2005. It outlines the methods by which the community will be involved in the preparation of the MWDF.

7. On page 15 the document states:

*“One to one meetings with selected stakeholders are a useful means of getting key people involved and achieving alignment with other strategies and initiatives.”*

8. Para 3.13 states:

*“Our strategy [for community involvement] is likely to comprise holding focus groups and expert groups, comprising a small number of interested parties.”*

### PPS10 – Planning for Sustainable Waste Management

9. One of the key planning objectives of PPS10 in terms of the requirement for planning authorities to prepare and deliver planning strategies is to:

*“Reflect the concerns and interests of communities, the needs of waste collection authorities, waste disposal authorities and business, and encourage competitiveness.”*

(PPS10 Para 3 – underlining emphasis added)

## Section 3

### Policy Requirements for Waste Industry Involvement

5. The following is a brief summary of the requirements in Gloucestershire's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant National policy statements relating to the need to involve the waste industry in preparing waste

## PPS12 – Local Development Frameworks

10. PPS 12 (Para 3.2) makes clear that:

*“Local planning authorities should involve the community at an early stage in the preparation of local development documents. This is essential to achieve local ownership and legitimacy for the policies that will shape the future distribution of land uses and development in an authority’s area. Where this is successful in relation to the preparation of development plan documents, it will help to minimise the need for a lengthy and controversial examination process.”*

11. Para 3.3 states:

*“Local planning authorities should continue to involve the community throughout the process of preparing local development documents and should tailor the techniques to engage the appropriate parts of the community at the various stages.”* [Emphasis added].

12. This is the approach that has been taken in relation to the key waste operators in the County, who clearly have a vital role to play in the delivery on the ground of waste plans and strategies in Gloucestershire.

## Section 4 The Waste Core Strategy Issues & Options Paper

13. The Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options Papers (both Part A and Part B) were consulted on from the 17<sup>th</sup> July to the 15<sup>th</sup>

September 2006. The consultation exercise took the form of a mailed out letter to over 1400 local, regional and national stakeholders.

14. Initially very few waste operators responded in any detail to the consultation and this was disappointing given the obvious potential value of their input. Responses were received at a later date from some of the major operators.

15. On the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2006 the Minerals & Waste Planning Team received a response from Government Office for the South West (GOSW) which included a number of recommendations including the need for more engagement and discussions with the waste industry.

16. On the 17<sup>th</sup> November 2006 the team met with GOSW to discuss the issues raised in their response. It was agreed that a number of meetings would be arranged targeting key waste operators.

## Section 5 Summary of Meetings with Waste Operators

### ■ Smiths (Gloucester) Ltd

17. Founded in 1982, and with its main operations at Moreton Valence just off Junction 13 of the M5 Motorway, Smiths is a significant handler of construction and demolition (C&D) and commercial and industrial (C&I) waste in Gloucestershire operating sites at Tewkesbury, Moreton Valence and Avonmouth.

18. On the 30<sup>th</sup> March 2007 officers from Gloucestershire's Minerals and Waste Planning

Policy Team met with representatives from Smith's (Gloucester) at their Eastington offices.

**19.** Below is a summary of the key points of the meeting: (The full notes of the meeting are available in Appendix A of this report).

- There was a general view from Smith's representatives that only strategic sites should be identified in the forthcoming DPDs. For other sites (i.e. local sites) it was considered that a criteria based approach is the best way forward.
- Stroud's recently initiated 'Y-Waste' scheme is proving to be very successful and very popular and there is the potential for expansion e.g. with Cotswolds District Council showing some interest.
- There are real 'issues' in the County and generally in terms of finding markets for recyclables. This needs to be addressed.
- Consolidation and expansion of the Moreton Valence site is Smith's preferred way forward.
- Moreton Valence is Smith's hub but may need more facilities for transfer across the County e.g. Cirencester / Tetbury – the Central Severn Vale area is covered.
- It is likely that there will be a gradual move of Smith's business focus from C&D (inerts) to C&L (biodegradable) waste and higher end, business collections including mixed recyclables.
- Smith's are interested in expansion into green waste composting.

### ■ **Cory Environmental Ltd**

**20.** Cory Environmental has been operating in one form or another since 1896. It has its origins in London's coal trade. Today it is one of the UK's largest waste management companies. Cory operates two major landfill sites in Gloucestershire, one at Hempstead, west of Gloucester and one at Bishops Cleeve, north of Cheltenham.

**21.** On the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2007 officers from Gloucestershire's Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team and the Waste Management Team met with representatives from Cory Environmental at County Council offices.

**22.** Below is a summary of the key points of the meeting: (Some of the notes of the meeting are available at Appendix B of this report. Cory wanted certain points / discussions to be regarded as confidential).

- There is a capacity gap in the county particularly for recovery of C&I and MSW. The County is likely to need:
  - Larger recovery facility for MSW/C&I
  - Recycling transfer
  - Composting – split between green waste and co-mingled
  - IVC with capacity for 80,000 tonnes

### **23. Cory sites**

#### Hempstead

- Green waste/Windrow composting – used for restoration approx 10,000 tonnes.
- Fridge storage area
- Landfill
- HRC
- Inert processing – crushing & screening

(Additional Hempstead information - Cory are currently redesigning Hempstead, making the best use of what space and time is left and to potentially create additional void space. Various options being considered).

#### Wingmoor Farm

- Green waste composting
- Fridge storage
- HRC
- Landfill
- Possibly some inert processing
- Some wood shredding
- Small amounts of hazardous waste

(Additional Wingmoor information - MBT application held in abeyance / IVC application submitted).

#### **■ Grundon Waste Management (Ltd)**

**24.** Grundon (Ltd) was founded in 1929. It is a family owned company and is the largest privately owned waste management group in the UK. Grundon operates two major sites (landfills) in Gloucestershire.

**25.** On the 1<sup>st</sup> May 2007 officers from Gloucestershire's Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team met with representatives from Grundon Waste Management at County Council offices.

**26.** Below is a summary of the key points of the meeting: (The full notes of the meeting are available at Appendix C of this report).

**▪ Hazardous waste at Wingmoor Farm site:**  
2006 = 10,000 tonnes of APC came in for treatment. 41,000 tonnes of hazardous waste was landfilled & 62,000 tonnes of non hazardous waste. These figures have increased

in 2007. Taking 30,000 tonnes of APC through the gate but the figures show 60,000 tonnes because liquid is added. There was also 40,000 tonnes of 'other' hazardous waste landfilled. Therefore the total to landfill is 100,000 tpa in 2007 including the liquid treatment of APCs.

**▪ Other current activities:**

- At Wingmoor Farm no municipal waste is handled from Gloucestershire.
- Wingmoor East and Wingmoor Quarry are about to be combined, under one license – site to be known as 'Wingmoor Quarry'.

**▪ The voidspace figures are:**

- Wingmoor West = 2.5 million cubic metres (hazardous).
- Wingmoor East = 2.5 million cubic metres.
- Wingmoor Quarry (former Gloucester Sand & Gravel site) = 900,000 to 1.2 million cubic metres.

**▪ Latest position on the life of the site – currently time-limited to 2009:**

Currently preparing the application, some of the community consultation already done. Mid to late summer the draft application will go to community groups etc. Submission to the County Council in the autumn.

**▪ Position on a MRF**

A MRF is essential at Wingmoor site, we are considering a permanent application whether the landfill stays or not. There is a clear need for a good quality MRF.

**▪ Markets for recyclables**

Steel: Corus [Tata] in South Wales  
Aluminium: Banbury  
Plastic: Stratford on Avon – for pipe manufacture.

Paper: Abroad (China or Holland) or UK – market led. The process in Holland is a secondary industry to resort paper into more 'pure' fractions.  
Glass: Brentford / Bristol – to create light weight aggregate.  
Bristol / Avonmouth & Liverpool - docks are for heavy materials such as recycled glass.

There is a need for plastic recycling facilities – sub regional 8000 – 9000 tonnes is required to be viable. HDP – milk bottles / PET – coke bottles – international markets currently exist for both.

▪ Position on sites or a criteria based approach  
Land ownership is a key issue, but a balance between site specifics and criteria may be the best approach.

## ■ Key Construction & Demolition (C&D) Operators

**27.** The C&D waste stream (along with C&I) is very significant in terms of the tonnages produced. (See Technical Evidence Paper (WCS-A) for information on waste data). On the 12<sup>th</sup> June 2007 officers from Gloucestershire's Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team met with representatives from the following key C&D operators and mineral operators involved in the recycling of C&D materials for aggregate at County Council offices.

Smith's (Gloucester) Ltd  
Allstone  
Keyway  
Elliot's  
Cullimore  
Huntsmans Quarry  
Hills Minerals & Waste Ltd  
Tarmac Ltd

**28.** Below is a summary of the key points of the meeting: (The full notes of the meeting are available at Appendix D of this report).

The meeting incorporated the following:

- Presentation 1  
Gloucestershire's current situation / Waste Core Strategy preparation / National & Regional policy.
- Presentation 2  
Construction & demolition waste data and future provision issues.
- Workshop 1  
Data issues
- Workshop 2  
Sites vs. criteria.
- Workshop 3  
Inert landfill / mineral restoration issues.
- Following Presentation 2, there were a number of questions about the accuracy / usefulness of the Regional capacity figures. It was noted by the Team Leader for Minerals & Waste Policy that the Regional figures are a minimum not a ceiling and that there is a real need to address the exemption issues.
- Sites vs. criteria no clear view expressed, but maybe a hybrid approach is favoured for a future policy framework.
- Mineral restoration – the need for large void spaces. These are present but not well located to main arisings. Transport is currently not the most sustainable option. A suggestion was

made that the material is available. A small-scale dispersed pattern was suggested.

### ■ CEMEX – at Frampton Landfill Site

**29.** CEMEX is the world's largest producer of cement. A decision was made to meet with CEMEX, who operate the landfill site at Frampton upon Severn, as there was some uncertainty about how much void the landfill had remaining and when the site was proposed to shut. This uncertainty partly stemmed from the fact that there had been a number of takeovers (i.e. of companies operating the site) in recent years.

**30.** On 10<sup>th</sup> July 2007 officers from Gloucestershire's Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team met with the Unit Manager at the landfill site offices in Frampton.

**31.** Below is a summary of the key points of the meeting: (The full notes of the meeting are available at Appendix E of this report).

- The current activities include the landfill of C&I wastes e.g. plastics, cardboard – mostly locally derived.
- The landfill was closed between July 2005 and May 2006 for the construction of a new cell.
- By the end of 2008 the landfill will close and be restored. It will then be handed back to the landowners.
- Regarding Wickwar Quarry in South Gloucestershire: The void is about 7 million cubic metres - but CEMEX may choose to sell it on rather than conduct waste disposal operations.

## Appendix A: Notes of meeting with Smith's (Gloucester) Ltd - Friday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2007

### **Attendees:**

#### **Smiths (Gloucester) Ltd:**

Alan Smith (AS)  
Peter Martin (PM)  
Pam Broomfield (PB)  
Matt Hankins (MW)  
Lucy Binnie (LB)  
Trevor Radway (TR)

#### **Gloucestershire County Council:**

Nick Croft (NC)  
David Ingleby (DI)

### **Introductions**

Introductions were made and respective roles / positions etc outlined.

(NC) Introduced purpose of the meeting i.e. evidence gathering for the Waste Core Strategy on GOSW advice.

(NC) National and Regional Policy requirements and new planning system – we are currently preparing a Waste Core Strategy which will not be site specific but will indicate broad locations. Preferred Options is the next stage – a whole range of waste categories being considered under Regional policy requirements.

(NC) We have the data from the EA but it would be useful to have the latest data from you.

(PM) We provide returns to the EA every quarter.

(NC) What are the main wastes you are handling?

(PM) Industrial and Commercial and Construction and Demolition – the only Municipal is from CA sites mostly timber and hardcore. We also have permission to handle bonded asbestos classified as 'Hazardous waste'. We also handle some liquid sludges from gullies etc.

(PM) Smiths 3 facilities are at Avonmouth, Tewkesbury and Moreton Valence (MV).

(NC) EA returns show 3 separate waste mgt licences, one in Tewkesbury, one in Stroud and one in Gloucester.

(TR) The Stroud and Gloucester sites reflect the 'new site' and the 'old site', which are effectively the same 'old airfield' site.

(PM) Back in 2005 we only ran one site.

(PM) All 3 sites were handling about 300,000 tpa in 2006.

(NC) What about your markets?

(PM) Mostly in Gloucestershire but a small amount (only c.4000 tonnes a month) comes from Bristol. The MV site is basically a strategic facility serving Gloucestershire.

(NC) MV site operations/tonnages? [NC gave description of the site from a recent site visit with Kevin Phillips (Team Leader Minerals & Waste Policy)].

(PM) The new plant – the automated picking station is now running. It can process c.1000 tonnes per day but is doing about 500 at the moment.

(MH) It recovers mainly hardcore, wood – clean and not clean, cardboard, ferris scrap, but not plastics. In general terms the recovery rate is about 75% - so 25% un-recovered out the back and this goes to landfill - generally to Cory at Wingmoor Farm because it is more cost effective as they are saving Hempstead void for MSW.

(PM) What about Frampton, what's the situation?

(MH) They are currently engineering the last cell. It temporarily closed. When it was operative we used it because it was close and economic.

(NC) We saw Smiths lorries taking inert to Hempstead as we drove down this morning.

(MH) Yes, just cap and cover – about 4 loads per week.

(TR) Made the point that 25% of what goes through MV is not recyclable.

(NC) What is the content of this 25%?

(PM) A variety of things, mattresses, MDF, plastics etc...

-----

(NC) Cotswold Hill Quarry – have Smiths bought it?

(LB) Yes but there are certain issues in terms of the economics.

(NC) Our colleague Robin Drake needs the latest return for the quarry.

(TR) Should be the same as the year before.

(PB) We have taken over the previous company so technically it is up to us to provide it.

(NC) In terms of your 25% or 15-25% / un-recycled residual what is the landfill strategy? What is the Cotswold Hill link?

(LB) Cotswold Hill is linked to the inert stream but not specifically to Moreton Valence.

(NC) C&I waste collection. The 'Y-Waste' scheme with Stroud?

(MH) We have entered into an agreement with 'Y-Waste' taking commercial and business waste. (Carol Garfield is the contact). Smiths is the service provider. Funding for the scheme is through Stroud District Council. Looking at Cotswold District as well and could additionally collect from Wycliffe College. We would need to use compaction vehicles due to additional tonnage. Basically the scheme operates a bag / bin exchange system. The bags are pre-bought (the price included the whole collection / management / disposal costs) Bags contain mixed recyclables (paper, cans, card, plastic bottles etc) bins contain non-recyclable waste. Everything comes back to MV for processing. The residual goes to landfill at Cory Wingmoor Farm.

(NC) What sort of tonnages are coming from Stroud?

(MH) Not sure as the scheme has only been going 2 months, but it is popular and growing week on week.

(NC) What sort of tonnages were you envisaging?

(MH) Not sure but it is clear that every business has a 'waste problem'.

(NC) to MH – for our meeting at Gloucestershire First seminar in Cheltenham (3/11/06) you're aware of C&I civic amenity site style schemes in Oxfordshire using BREW funding. Have you considered this idea?

(MH) There is potential to open a business / commercial focused CA site on the front end of MV, but there are issues with this e.g. with people needing waste carriers licenses etc. The 'Y-Waste' scheme is proving to be very effective with good take up.

(NC) Is it a single weekly collection?

(MH) 2 days a week, but everyday for a few customers. CDC are interested – Cirencester & Tetbury. We want to take this forward bit by bit i.e. not extend it to the whole County. Gloucester City are not interested at the moment, they have their own arrangements.

#### Future aspirations

(MH) MV is designed for both C&D and C&I but in future we are looking more at the higher value end – C&I.

(NC) What does this mean in terms of what you would wish to see in the WCS.

(MH) We are looking at different waste streams – mixed recyclable waste, from a commercial point of view this makes sense, looking to the more valuable streams. But problems with end markets for certain recyclables e.g. our cardboard from MV goes to China and plastics – some go to Kent but they are really not that commercially viable at the moment.

(TR) Are you moving out of plastics?

(MH) Certainly downsizing. Prices for plastics have dropped from £120 per tonne to about £5 -10 pounds.

(TR) The County needs to work on the creation of markets e.g. for plastics.

(MH) This can be done for e.g. wood – taking scrap back to the mills to be made into chipboard etc. The problem has been that the mills created too big a demand and now no longer need the volume of scrap wood. We currently sell about 400 tonnes of chipped wood per week.

(MH) We should be considering biomass Combined Heat & Power (CHP) schemes in Gloucestershire e.g. for the Gloucester Business Park. The whole of the huge Slough Industrial Estate is powered through this technology.

(PM) In terms of the County taking a lead, what about Gloucestershire Highways and their use of recycled aggregate?

(NC) They do use a high proportion – Smiths rep (Verity Small) attended a presentation in Sept 2005 by Nigel Overall (GCC highways officer) who outlined what the County currently aim to do with highway maintenance contracts.

(MH) Generally there is a problem with a lack of waste facilities in the County. Materials are being transported too far and in terms of the economics of recycling – this does not add up.

(NC) Do you envisage Smiths coming forward with proposals for additional waste transfer facilities?

(MH) This is a matter for others e.g. Alan Smith.

(NC) Under the new planning system (PPS10) there really needs to be landowner agreement, so if we are to identify sites we are now more reliant on landowners and industry.

(MH) We need more sites for gasification – that is the way ahead.

(TR) A criteria based approach rather than a site based approach is what is needed. The current system where proposals on sites are compared against sites in the plan is not effective [echoed by LB].

(NC) Would you be supportive of this approach if it was advocated in the WCS.

(TR) Yes, but the lead must come from the County Council - again the point about markets.

(NC) We can include (in the WCS) that following discussions with industry that there is a need for more waste transfer stations.

(MH) Again gasification is the way ahead, but in saying this Smiths are committed to pulling all the recyclables out.

(NC) Where would Smiths need transfer capacity?

(MH) We don't have a clear picture of the markets at the moment. The biggest opportunities are within Gloucester and also with the Cirencester and Tetbury area. The M5 corridor is basically covered – need to focus either side.

(MH + TR) Any prospect of a junction of the M5? Not such an outlandish idea as the infrastructure is there and because of its advantages it would make a lot of sense to expand the footprint of MV – moving into handling other waste streams and increasing the size of the gasification plant.

(NC) In the Core Strategy we can identify broad locations e.g. a hatched area south of Gloucester, but we are not talking about red lines on maps. What is the situation in terms of C&I waste from Gloucester City?

(MH) They were not keen to talk – had other arrangements.

(NC) There are difficulties with the two-tier local government system – waste collection and waste disposal being split between authorities.

(MH) The Y-Waste initiative is good because people talk to local authorities rather than to private waste companies. People believe because it is local authority led that the ethos is recycling.

(NC) Any other areas other than south of Gloucester for the location of facilities?

(MH) Maybe for green waste but the problem is that with the high cost of land this is not sustainable – so we have to look to agricultural land.

(NC) Windrow composting can visually link with agricultural activity (IVC is different altogether). Unless someone comes forward with an appropriate site it is likely to be a criteria based approach.

(TR) There should be a presumption in favour of the proximity principle.

(NC) This is no longer in guidance (not in PPS10) but the idea is still reflected in policy for final disposal. The PPS10 wording implies if waste is being recycled/re-used it could acceptably travel further because of it being diverted from landfill.

(TR) Situation complicated by high land values.

(NC) We are aware that there are problems in terms of identifying sites in plans and we need waste operators / industry to back us up if we are to go ahead and advocate a criteria based approach.

(LB) Just identify the strategic sites.

(MH) This approach is how CHP & gasification plants e.g. at Slough have been able to progress.

(LB) Yes but whatever progress there is in this area there will always be a need for a landfill element to any strategy.

(NC) Agreed, there is currently about 9 million cubic metres of void space left in the County split between 4 sites. Clearly this is decreasing steadily.

(TR) On a related issue: The EA are requiring virgin dug clay e.g. for flood defences. Smiths has volumes of recycled material that could be used for such defences but the EA will not recommend its use because of specification issues. Someone needs to pressurize the EA to use more recycled clay.

(NC) This is a matter for engineers who are fully aware of the specific properties of material they need. The County Council is not in a position to question the EA on this matter, but we could put text in the WCS to the effect that positive use should be made of a variety of recycled materials such as clay. We have been proactive in this respect in terms of the adoption of our SPD on Waste Minimisation in Development Projects and the positive and substantial use Gloucestershire Highways make of recycled aggregates etc.

(TR) [General points about the SPD and the sorting and reuse of materials on site]. TR asked for 2 copies of the SPD, DI agreed to send.

(TR) In terms of the impact of the SPD and moves to manage waste on-site, have you an estimate in mind as to there being less volume coming through MV?

(NC) Difficult to say e.g. for the GCHQ development most material was reused on site. We need the 'reused on-site' figures from these sites, which if they were taken into account would indicate that our recycling figures in the County are actually very good.

(TR) There are certain materials which Smiths are just not touching because it is uneconomic to do so – costs money just to pick them up. Again it comes back to the lack of markets for recycled products.

(NC) We can be positive about markets in the WCS document.

(PM) At MV 100 –120 tonnes per week of materials are removed from the waste stream for which there are no markets, and this just sits in a big pile on the site.

(PM) The County needs to show credibility in terms of using recycled products.

(NC) We do have the OHIO (Own House In Order) scheme operational at the County Council and in terms of the WCS it does have a much wider 'spatial' remit - wider than traditional land plans.

(PM) The County should take the lead in using recycled materials in products e.g. for street furniture.

(NC) We will be supportive of this 'markets for recyclables' approach in the document.

(NC) For you to be aware of: consultation on the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) has just finished, but there will be further consultation and also a specific consultation on a residual treatment strategy. They are looking at 3 technologies: Energy from Waste (EfW) Autoclaving and MBT. The WCS document we prepare will be informed by their strategy.

(TR) Whatever is proposed the NIMBY problem is still strong in the County.

(LB) Also designations such as Green Belt and AONB make it difficult to get waste facilities on the ground. There needs to be a better balance and an understanding of the commercial needs and constraints of operators.

(NC) People responded to the Issues & Options consultation saying that we needed local sites in the AONB so if you think there is a market and a need e.g. in the north Cotswolds then let us know. We need to be advised.

(TR) A point about highways: County Highways don't recognise that Gloucestershire is a predominantly rural County with a rural road network and they shouldn't always be objecting to proposals on highways grounds.

(NC) A balance between issues needs to be struck when determining planning applications. We are advised on high way matters by the County Council's highways unit.

(NC) Thanks for the meeting – it has been very useful. To briefly summarize your position: You want strategic sites identified but otherwise a criteria based approach is more pragmatic. You see Morton Valence as the hub of Smiths activity and are interested in expanding the footprint potentially along the lines of an eco recovery park.

(PM) Yes, agreed.

---

### **Key Points:**

- Only strategic sites should be identified – other than this a criteria based approach is the best way forward.
- Stroud Y-Waste scheme very successful and room for expansion e.g. with Cotswold interested.
- Issues with markets for recyclables.
- Consolidation and expansion of Moreton Valence site is Smith's preferred way forward.
- Moreton Valence is Smith's hub but may need more facilities for transfer across the County e.g. Cirencester / Tetbury – the Central Severn Vale area is covered.
- Gradual move of Smiths business from C&D (inerts) to C&I (biodegradable) -higher end, business collections mixed recyclables.
- Smiths are interested in expansion into green waste composting.

**Appendix B: Notes of meeting with Cory Environmental Ltd Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> April 2007**

**Attendees:**

**Cory Environmental:**

Jenny Doyle (JD)  
Steve Rogers (SR)

**Gloucestershire County Council:**

Nick Croft (NC)  
Lorraine Brooks (LB)  
Amanda Sutton (AS)  
Tony Childs (TC)

**General Introductions:**

NC provided summary of new LDF system and publications of draft WCS indicating that there had been no formal response received as yet from Cory.

GOSW has asked the WPA to gather further evidence from key stakeholders.

Cory indicated that they had probably misplaced the WCS - hence no response.

(NC) The formal I&O consultation for WCS was last year, currently undertaking additional evidence gathering, preferred options due end of year and public consultations to begin early 2008.

(TC) Municipal waste management strategy to be adopted Autumn 2007. Residual strategy is aimed to be published for consultation also Autumn 2007.

(NC) There is a capacity gap in the county particularly for recovery of C&I and MSW

(TC) Emerging national waste strategy may say more on commercial waste.

County likely to need:

Larger recovery facility for MSW/C&I

Recycling transfer

Composting – split between green waste and co-mingled

IVC with capacity for 80,000 tonnes is required.

---

Note: The rest of the notes are not included as some parts are commercially sensitive and Cory requested that they remain confidential. (Please contact the County Council if you require further information on this matter).

---

## Appendix C: Notes of meeting with Grundon Waste Management Ltd - Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> May 2007

### **Attendees:**

#### **Grundon Ltd:**

Neal Grundon (NG)  
Andrew Short (AS)  
Steve Roscoe (SR)  
Richard Skehens (RS)

#### **Gloucestershire County Council:**

Kevin Phillips (KP)  
Nick Croft (NC)  
David Ingleby (DI)

### **Introductions**

Introductions were made including respective roles, responsibilities etc.

### **Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy**

(KP) [Introduced background] Waste Local Plan (WLP) adopted 2004, we are progressing with the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) which along with other DPDs will eventually replace the WLP. One of the reasons for this meeting is that Government Office for the South West (GOSW) advised that we do more evidence gathering (particularly with key stakeholders) before we progress to Preferred Options. We have met with other waste operators and Districts etc. We also held a forum for all stakeholders – jointly with the County's Municipal Waste Management Team.

(KP) Preferred Options due to be consulted on in January 2008.

(AS) Will you have a further round consultation between now and then?

(NC) Probably not formally, as Kevin suggested we are holding these meetings as a form of targeted consultation and if you want further meetings we can arrange them. It is basically an iterative process.

(RS) Will there be anything else published before the Preferred Options?

(KP) We are producing a series of Evidence Papers / Reports, but we can't really say at this stage when they will be published. They will be publicly available (on the internet) at some point. They are basically technical papers informing the Core Strategy. Whatever representations people / industry want to make it is best to bring them up at this early stage. Once we get to submission stage ideally new issues should not be being raised; they should have been dealt with earlier in the process.

(KP) There are a number of advantages in having a fairly recently adopted WLP, but officially it lapses in October and we have had to go through a process to save policies. Certainly we were keen to save site allocations until we commence on the waste sites DPD.

(AS) When are you looking to produce this sites document?

(KP) It will commence when the Core Strategy is adopted.

(RS) So in a sense you have a planning policy void until then?

(KP) No, the sites are there in the WLP, they are saved.

(RS) This could be the worst time to submit the Wingmoor planning application?

(KP) Not necessarily.

(AS) There is still National and Regional policy in place.

[General discussion about SW EiP and Gloucestershire representations].

(KP) At the EiP there is only half a day on waste and no minerals session.

(NC) Our Issues & Options Consultation – you received all the documentation, but I'm not sure we got anything from you?

(AS) We sent it in electronically.

(NC) We'll check what we have.

### **National and Regional Policy Requirements**

(NC) The Regional Requirements – The RSS sets targets for MSW, C&I and C&D waste over the next 20 years. We need to look at the 'capacity gaps'. In certain areas we have enough provision and in others there are significant gaps. For C&I waste there is a big gap in terms of recovery and treatment also in terms of recycling and transfer. We need to make up these gaps either through sites or through a criteria based approach.

(NC) The WCS will not contain 'sites' but it will contain broad strategic locations. RSS policy W2 sets the criteria for broad locations: A number of criteria are considered including for Strategically Significant Cities & Towns (SSCTs) and other named settlements a sequential approach

-Within

-On the edge of and/or

-In close proximity to i.e. within 16 km of the urban area primarily served by the facility.

The SSCTs in Gloucestershire are Gloucester and Cheltenham.

(RS) So must facilities be within the 16 km?

(NC) It's a sequential approach but that is what the policy suggests.

(RS) What about Green Belt?

(AS) This is covered in National PPS.

(KP) The RSS approach in this respect is slightly different.

(RS) Our last 3 MRF approvals were in the Green Belt.

### **Grundons' Operations**

#### EA Hazardous waste data

(NC) I need some clarification on data. I get data from the EA on hazardous waste. It seems from this that the landfill element has been reducing, but in 2004 treatment appeared to increase dramatically. Is there double counting of treated and landfilled material?

(SR) It's very complicated. Basically all the figures are from the weighbridge readings, so no it's not a matter of double counting. After treatment the material is landfilled, but it gets recorded under the category of what happens to it first. There is a danger in looking at the old figures (2004) from the EA – not as up to date as ours.

(NC) it would be useful for us if you could provide the figures for 2005, 2006 & 2007.

(SR) In terms of treatment, not sure why there has been this increase in EA figures – we only treat APCs.

(NC) [Went through spreadsheet containing data from the EA listing other treated materials].

(SR) Not sure why that is classified as such as everything that comes into the site (treated or not treated) goes into the landfill.

(NC) 2005 – 2007 figures?

(SR) 2006 – 10,000 tonnes of APC came in for treatment. 41,000 tonnes of hazardous waste was landfilled & 62,000 tonnes of non hazardous waste. These figures have increased in 2007. We are taking 30,000 tonnes of APC through the gate but the figures show 60,000 tonnes because liquid is added.

(RS) This is problematic for us because people latch on to the 60,000 tonnes figure when only 30,000 is coming in. There was also 40,000 tonnes of 'other' hazardous waste landfilled. Therefore the total to landfill is 100,000 tpa in 2007 including the liquid treatment of APCs.

(SR) APCs will increase as a result of the Colnbrook EfW facility (near Heathrow) coming on stream.

(SR) I can send you our latest figures as requested.

(NC) Just to clarify, are APCs the only treated material on your site?

(SR) Yes apart from some liquid wastes. Other waste may be treated but effectively treated to be landfilled.

(SR/KP) [Discussion re: problems with the EA and which office (Exeter or Tewkesbury) deals with the waste data].

(RS) Steve will get you the data you require.

#### Current activities

(NC) At Wingmoor Farm you are not taking municipal waste from Gloucestershire?

(NG) Correct.

(SR) Non – hazardous waste is coming from all over, but only relatively small amounts of inert material for engineering etc. Most is biodegradable, not inert.

(SR) Tonnages of inert have gone down.

(RC) Everything on our wagons, our own vehicles, is local.

(NC) So other operators' vehicles are coming from further a field?

(SR) Correct.

#### Void space

(SR) Our voidspace figures are:

- Wingmoor West = 2.5 million cubic metres (hazardous).
- Wingmoor East = 2.5 million cubic metres.
- Wingmoor Quarry (former Gloucester Sand & Gravel site) = 900,000 to 1.2 million cubic metres.

Wingmoor East and Wingmoor Quarry are about to be combined, under one license – site to be known as 'Wingmoor Quarry'.

(NC) In relation to the Wingmoor East / Wingmoor Quarry merging is there an issue with electricity pylons needing to be relocated?

(SR) This is happening now.

(RS) [Explained some of the history of the Wingmoor Quarry site – bought from Gloucester Sand and Gravel. Quite low levels of clay originally which have now been added to].

(RS) In terms of total void space we have about 6 million cubic metres in total.

#### Cross border movements

(SR) APCs are coming from the South East.

(RS) There are no longer any hazardous waste sites in Wales so quite a lot of contaminated soils are coming from there.

(RS) The Grundons site at Bishops Cleeve has always been a destination for hazardous waste from the South West, especially since 2005.

Latest position on the life of the site – currently time-limited to 2009

(RS) We are currently preparing the application. We have already done some of the community consultation.

(RS) Mid to late summer the draft application will go to community groups etc. Submission to the County Council in the autumn.

(RS) About 500 responses to consultation, some constructive, some not. The majority were quite good.

(AS) I have a meeting this afternoon with an analyst to go through the consultation responses.

(RS) It will be a difficult one for the County – a tough call in terms of the determination. And given the unresolved status of the RSS – when will we have the Panel report etc?

(KP) We will check on RSS timeframe and get back to you. (Note: The EiP will run until July 2007. The Panel report is expected in October 2007. Following that the Secretary of State will issue proposed changes to the RSS which will be the subject to 8 weeks consultation. Early to mid 2008 the RSS will be issued).

(RS) Do any of your members sit on the Regional Assembly?

(KP) Yes, but now it is essentially in the hands of the Panel with final approval of the RSS by the Secretary of State.

(RS) I suppose these RSS issues will potentially influence when we put the application in. I'm hopeful that it may go through and we may not have to go to appeal as there are then the obvious financial implications.

(KP) It may well be called in due to its wider implications (strategic hazardous site) and the fact that it is one application for both hazardous and non-hazardous elements covering the whole site.

## **Preparing the WCS**

### RSS Policy W3

(NC) [Went through Regional policy] the draft hazardous waste policy in the RSS states that existing hazardous waste sites should be safeguarded provided that they are environmentally acceptable. So what constitutes 'environmental acceptability' from your point of view?

(RS) Very difficult – very emotive. As long as the site is not polluting the air or water then it could be described as environmentally acceptable.

(SR) As long as the facility/site complies with its PPC permits then it should be deemed to be acceptable.

(AS) It's important to look at Policy W3 in its entirety. What is the environmental cost of not having the site?

(NC) Do we need to do some kind of comparative exercise?

(NG) Basically sites are driven by geological considerations – i.e. clay.

(RS) There is a need for these sites but people are not prepared to have them near them.

(SR) In terms of hazardous waste coming from the South West the next hazardous waste site is in Liverpool. The Wingmoor site meets a regional need – certainly for the disposal of asbestos.

(NC) What about the issue of EfW facilities treating APCs where they arise?

(SR) No one is doing this at the moment, it would be commercial suicide (due to high energy use).

(RS) We have to consider contingencies – should plants break down. There is a need for a 'bolt hole'.

**MRF**

(RS) A MRF is essential on our Wingmoor site, we are considering a permanent application whether the landfill stays or not.

(NG) As a result of the increases in the landfill tax, people are starting to burn cardboard, or taking commercial waste to the CA site in small vehicles.

(RS) So there is a clear need for a good quality MRF.

(NC) Have you looked at other sites on non Green Belt land?

(RS) Yes we have looked at various sites, but we considered Bishops Cleeve to be the best site. Backed up by assessment work Shanks did for the PFI.

(KP) Presumably because of the synergies with disposal?

(SR) Not necessarily, none of our other MRFs need to be proximate to landfills.

(AS) Problem we have is that landowners do not want to know about waste.

(SR) And general industrial estates do not want to know – do not want to accommodate waste uses.

(NC/SR) [General discussion about Green Belt policy and Mole Valley].

(SR) At Mole Valley we controlled the land and no one objected on the Green Belt issue.

(AS) Green Belt is not an automatic 'no'. It has to be looked at.

(NC) Are you looking at other sites in the County?

(RS) Bishops Cleeve is the focus of our activities.

(NG) We did look at Frampton – but they were not interested in selling. Bishops Cleeve is very valuable as a hazardous waste site, but our customers want something different from just putting waste in a hole in the ground.

(NC) Are you looking at a network of sites across the County to serve your main operations at Wingmoor?

(RS) We have looked around but nothing in Gloucestershire. Not looking for transfer facilities, not huge input, no food waste.

Markets for recyclables:

Steel: Corus in South Wales

Alluminium: Banbury

Plastic: Stratford on Avon – for pipe manufacture.

Paper: Abroad (China or Holland) or UK – market led. The process in Holland is a secondary industry to re-sort paper into more 'pure' fractions.

Glass: Brentford / Bristol – to create light weight aggregate.

Bristol / Avonmouth & Liverpool - docks are for heavy materials such as recycled glass.

There is a need for plastic recycling facilities – sub regional 8000 – 9000 tonnes is required to be viable. HDP – milk bottles / PET – coke bottles – international markets currently exist for both.

(KP) The RDA are more active on markets – a contact for these matters is Alistair Brown. The RTAB have discussed the issue. Gloucestershire First are also aware of the issues and looking at waste co- locating with others businesses.

Site specifics / criteria

(AS) Land ownership is a key issue.

(RS) A balance between site specifics and criteria may be the best approach.

(AS) as part of preparing Oxfordshire's WCS they have a list of 240 sites, this is being reduced down to 30.

#### Threshold for Local/Strategic Sites

(NC) Currently up to 50,000 tonnes for local sites.

(RS) Different ways of defining site sizes (market coverage, materials, specialist facilities, tonnages). We need plants with flexible capacity otherwise operations become outdated – demand issue. Customers want 24hr operations + C&I collections evenings and weekends. Operators need to be flexible.

#### Thermal treatment

(NC) JMWMS currently being drafted as well as the Residual Waste Procurement Strategy element. The WCS will be as prescriptive or open as those strategies allow it.

#### Regional hazardous waste

(KP) GCC objected to RSS Policy W3 – expressed concerns about how it was drafted and the lack of evidence to back up their approach.

(RS) Can representations still be made?

(KP) If Grundon wants to make any representation or statement, they should check with the RSS EiP Secretariat as to how this could be approached.

#### **AOB**

None.

**Appendix D: Notes of meeting with Construction & Demolition (C&D) Waste Operators - Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2007**

**Attendees:**

**Operators:**

Peter Martin (PM) – Smiths  
Alan Ball (AB) – Smiths  
Simon Ford (SF) – Allstone  
Brian McGurk (BM) – Keyway  
David Maslin (DM) – Cullimores  
David Glenn (DG) – Huntsmans  
Stephen Kew (SK) – Tarmac  
Stephen Palmer (SP) – Hills  
Nick Elliot (NE) – Elliots

**Gloucestershire County Council:**

Kevin Phillips (KP)  
Nick Croft (NC)  
Robin Drake (RD)  
Gavin Jones (GJ)  
David Ingleby (DI)

**Gloucestershire Highways:**

Nigel Overal (NO)

**Introductions**

(KP) Welcome – and thanks for attending. Introductions were made.

**Presentation 1**

(KP) Gloucestershire current situation / Waste Core Strategy preparation / National & Regional policy.

**Presentation 2**

(NC) Construction & demolition waste data and future provision issues.

**Workshop 1**

Data issues

(DG) Question about the capacity figures. The graphs showing regional capacity requirements for Gloucestershire seem to be indicating or assuming that there will be a substantial reduction in C&D waste arisings. Is it correct?

(KP) Figures are drawn from the Regional Waste Strategy ('From Rubbish to Resource' adopted October 2004) which uses data from pre 2003. Therefore based on old figures.

(NC) All the figures we use are provided by the EA as part of waste management license returns. The current management and existing capacity figures are drawn from recent work using:

- EA capacity from licenses
- EA returns data.
- Planning permission conditions and supporting information.
- A 2005 operator survey (sent to all operators in Gloucestershire).

But there are problems with the Region's definitions of 'treatment' and 'transfer', for example both include screening of inert material.

(KP) We don't need to slavishly stick to these figures. What do people think?

(SF) I think you are way off with the figures. With Aggregate Industries (AI) closing down Cleveland Farm – this has caused quite a few problems for operators in terms of the disposal of inert wastes.

(DG) You need to include, or acknowledge the exemption figures – the exempt sites otherwise it is meaningless.

(DM) Agreed, thousands of 'exempt' tonnes are being deposited.

(NE) Potentially more – hundreds of thousands of tonnes.

(KP) Potentially in the future there may be significant levels of sand and gravel extraction in the Upper Thames Valley and this may present opportunities?

(DM) I don't think there will be as much as in the past.

(KP) Issue of bird strike. We have to meet our aggregate apportionment for Gloucestershire but the resource areas are close to RAF Fairford - the MoD are generally pushing for dry restoration to level. You can't fill with putrescible so there may be opportunities for inert.

There was a bird strike working group looking at inerts e.g. MoD were not happy about the amount of water at Horcott, north of the airfield, and wanted to explore the potential to infill.

Do the economics stack up in terms of hauling waste to the Water Park from all over the County?

(NE) I don't think the economics have changed that much in terms of getting fill to the Water Park.

(KP) If some sites were required to be dry restored, would you welcome this?

(AB) We [operators] have to go there – all of us. Limited other options.

(BM) Why are the regional requirements less than the current throughput figures?

(NC) It stems from work SLR Consulting undertook for the Regional Assembly. We raised doubts about it at the time. The treatment and transfer capacities are not target ceilings. The Regional Waste Management Strategy seeks to increase inert recovery and recycling.

(BM) So basically we are doing excellently?

(NC) We have to work with these regional figures and have to justify our performance in relation to them in front of an Inspector.

(SF) The capacity figures are wrong in my view. People round this table e.g. Nick Elliot and Brian McGurk are looking for sites to dispose of thousands of tonnes. I think operators have been quite restricted by the approach in the Waste Local Plan and by the EA, and added to this people don't want waste operations next to them.

(NC) Is a site-specific plan going to help or not? One important issue is that we need land-owner support and we know (from recent experience) that there is a real difficultly with this.

(NO) What about land that the County owns?

(GJ) The problem is we don't own that much land anymore apart from the County Farms.

(BM) Can I ask a question about the landfill figure on the slide? Are we doing better than required?

(NC) Yes, but there are questions over the figures – these figures are a minimum and not a ceiling. They are done in a very theoretical way in terms of 'the capacity gap'. Once you look at the detail the regional requirements become nonsensical.

(BM) There are problems with the transfer figure as well.

(NC) the definition of transfer is unclear as by definition such sites will pass the material on to other uses (either recycling/re-use or for disposal) so the figures will include double counted material. What would be your solution?

(BM) Bigger sites with more storage capacity.

(NC) Back to finding sites with landowner support.

(BM) The large quarries are the heavyweights in these matters.

(SF) In terms of capacity – the Cory price dictates that you take it elsewhere.

(NC) This is a market issue. Cory can husband the biodegradable landfill. 'Reuse' could include could include restoration of landfill - depends on EA region. Should we permit more void space or are there other opportunities e.g. golf courses? Although these would we done through District exemptions and we may never find out about them. When preparing the Waste Local Plan the EA advised us that there are about 450 exempt sites in the County.

(GJ) What about Abbots Court Farm?

(NE) They are only taking 5 loads per day.

(GJ) They are keeping to the number that they applied for and trying not to affect the local amenity.

(DG) I'm aware that the EA are increasingly limiting exemptions.

(NE) Difference between 'in the land' and 'on the land'.

(DG) The smaller exempt sites will be 'knocked off' – not cost effective.

(DG) The 500,000 exempt figures from the Feb 2007 Capita Symonds work is probably about right.

(RD) Capita Symonds work points to a figure of about 1 million tonnes – maybe more realistic figure. We do have a knowledge gap.

(SK) In relation to Tarmac and Issey Manor, we got exemptions (Paragraph 9s) but we can't accept certain wastes.

(KP) Basically a lot more material is being handled than the figures show because of the exempt contribution.

(All) [General agreement].

(RD) In terms of crushing and screening would you say that about 70 – 80% of material is being used on site?

(BM) Yes 80 / 20 is about right. In terms of exemptions the situation is complicated by the fact that some operators run licensed sites and exemptions together.

(DM) Storage capacity is a problem.

(SK) Even the quarries have problems in terms of lack of space.

(DG) The problem is with the recycling coming in and the primary material not going out. You can control what is coming off the face, but the incoming recycled material keeps coming. Size is important.

(KP) Any other issues in relation to the data?

(BM) I think you need to combine the exempt and licensed figures.

(GJ) This is quite hard to do in reality because we need to dig into the District permissions etc.

(DM) Ask the EA for the data.

(DG) I did not realise that there were so many exemptions . It needs to be worked out.

(DG) What about crossovers – i.e. materials crossing County boundaries?

(KP) Yes, this is an issue, for example Swindon is much nearer to the sand and gravel workings in the Water Park than the Cheltenham and Gloucester arisings.

(KP) If you have any further thoughts in terms of the data send them into us .

## **Workshop 2**

### Sites vs. criteria.

(DG) A mix of sites and criteria is preferable.

(KP) This is effectively what we have at the moment in the Waste Local Plan.

(DG) I'm a great believer in a criteria based approach even for minerals.

(NC) It's a flexibility issue?

(SF) Agreed – this is important.

(NC) The Waste Local Plan is a combination but it leans more to sites. Wiltshire have gone for the opposite approach, they have identified sites and proposals on those not allocated will fall.

(NC) What about if we were to identify a few strategic sites – leaving smaller operation to come forward on a windfall / criteria basis? In this respect we are really looking to the M5 corridor where a lot of the main sites already are.

(BM) A criteria based approach also creates problems. All the land along the M5 corridor has already gone to developers – they don't want waste treatment facilities. I want to ask about the land the Council is potentially in control of e.g. areas near the docks. C&D operators have nowhere to go because areas are being regenerated for 'pretty' development.

(NC) We understand your position.

(KP) We are working with the various regeneration initiatives and putting the waste case across.

(NC) We certainly have stood our ground. Clearly there would be a difference if you owned the land.

(BM) Can more be done e.g. through planning permissions and conditions to manage waste or set aside land etc?

(NC) We do object to non-waste proposals that come forward on sites allocated for waste uses in the WLP e.g. recent Javelin Park case.

(KP) That case was about as far as we can go in terms of defending allocated waste sites.

(NC) Part of the problem is, with waste, you will always get objectors.

(SF) If waste is really a government priority then you [the WPA] should get more effective powers.

(SF) The Landfill Tax – it was advertised that we would benefit from some of this money – we have seen none.

(KP) If there is land which you could potentially acquire then we need to be aware of it – bring it forward. But we need to meet the test of land ownership – now confirmed in Government policy (PPS10). If we did a review of the WLP there would likely be less sites because of this issue.

(KP) Central government has given limited powers to WPAs in this respect. Compulsory purchase is only likely if there is either WDA or operator interest.

(SF) We have a quarry at Bromsberrow, we have been advised that it needs to be filled to protect the motorway, but because of issues with the underlying aquifer we have had opposition to it on the planning (development control) front.

(NE) Agreed, there is a lot of negativity from planning.

(KP) I'm not sure that is the case as waste applications are being permitted – about 40 per year on recent figures.

(SF) People are very friendly here in this sort of meeting, but in pre-application discussion we have experienced quite a bit of negativity in terms of proposals.

(GJ) I think that is unfair, it is often the case in pre-apps that we are flagging up genuine concerns. Natural England have new powers e.g. under the Habitat Regulations and it is often they or other Agencies who will object.

(SF) Yes but you want good reasons – everyone is screaming out for inert landfill.

(NC) The Regional Spatial Strategy is pointing towards quarry sites for waste facilities.

(BM) I would suggest that unless you have landowner control you just go with a criteria based approach – otherwise there is no point.

(KP) You might come up with 100 sites in the County in an initial trawl and because of the landowner issues you might only end up with half a dozen that will satisfy all the policy / criteria.

(AB) We know the sites that are 'no go' and we discount them before we come to planning.

### **Workshop 3**

#### Inert landfill / mineral restoration issues.

(KP) [Introduction].

(PM) The EA are getting tighter and tighter on exemptions – so you need a massive void or else landraising.

(DG) And this will have complications in terms of costs / additional road movements.

(NE) There should be a lot more small exempt sites.

(DG) But this is not the way it is going.

(NE) There are enough lakes in the Cotswold Water Park – other mineral sites which come forward should be restored to level.

(RD) Yes but there is a significant lobby promoting water uses and biodiversity. We need to balance these competing interests.

(DM) Two issues: 1. The EA are adding more costs and 2. A water end use is more profitable in terms of attracting holiday homes = more money.

(KP) The MoD opposition to wet restoration near Fairford might be to your benefit? We are currently in discussions with the MoD and we may be able to do something through the MCS. We need to factor in what areas may need dry restoration to alleviate MoD concerns.

(RD) Your views give us a particular steer in terms of your needs.

(KP) There have been questions / issues in the past about there not being enough inert material available. You seem to be indicating that the material is there.

(NE) Yes it is there.

(DM) I think that we are reaching a saturation point with these holiday homes in the CWP.

(KP) Another consideration in the Water Park is the Master Planning process which is currently underway. This should inform LDFs and MCSs and may give us some answers e.g. in relation to the level of residential / holiday uses. As RD has mentioned there is a strong biodiversity lobby, but the bird strike issue will need to be balanced alongside this.

(RD) There is also an emerging lobby for Tourism.

(BM) Can you put an emphasis on noise bunds (not in the Water Park).

(NE) Yes this is important because of the environmental impact of hauling waste all the way to the Water Park. We need small localised sites.

(KP) It is a problem in Gloucestershire because quarries have generally been peripheral – on the edges of the County.

(BM) One issue is that C&D operators are generally relatively small independent companies – the mineral companies are generally large multi-nationals.

(AB) Everything seems to be going to Clearwell. I want to ask Nigel Overal what extra protection or extra work will need to be done on the road as a result of all this extra traffic bringing material to the quarry? I agree with Nick Elliot.

(NE) Licensed sites don't want soils – they are protecting them for household waste. If the landfills in Gloucestershire took more soils they would be filled in 2 years.

(SF) If you can successfully wash the material the likes of Bromsberrow should work.

(GJ) No doubt we have problems in Gloucestershire:

- Extensive floodplain
- AONB
- No employment sites in the Cheltenham Local Plan.

(SK) The County needs to be talking to the Districts.

(GJ) This is made more difficult by the two-tier system of County and Districts.

(KP) We have been meeting with the Districts and GOSW has encouraged them to enter into dialogue with us.

(NC) Planning is a political process. The Districts are looking at housing and employment issues – these are their priorities. Our focus is on minerals and waste – development which people generally don't want near them.

National and Regional guidance guides us to industrial sites, but the Districts also require these sites for their employment uses. Brockworth Business Park allocation in the WLP was reduced in size during the WLP inquiry and is now a small allocation.

(NE) I enquired about Brockworth and they told me to go away – they were just not interested.

(NC) That is why we need the landowner interest in order to pursue a site based strategy in the WCS and subsequent plans.

(KP) [Summary]

- Data - The Regional figures are a minimum not a ceiling. We need to address the exemption issues.
- Sites vs. criteria – perhaps no clear view. Let us know about any potential sites. Maybe a hybrid approach is favoured for a future policy framework.
- Mineral restoration – the need for large void spaces. These are present but not well located to main arising. Transport is currently not the most sustainable option. You seem to be suggesting that the material is available. A small-scale dispersed pattern (as raised by NE) is also suggested.

(KP) Please comment on our Evidence Papers (when they come out), look out for newsletters and the Preferred Options consultation.

(SF) Would it be a good idea to set up some kind of sub-committee to deal with the issues raised today?

(NE) Something like this every 6 months?

(DM) This open forum style is favoured.

(KP) Yes it is potentially a good idea for a Panel / Advisory Group. The timing will be important.

(NO) Sometimes people do not want to be pinned down to something in writing.

(KP) You will get a copy of the notes of this meeting so let us know if you have anything further.

## Appendix E: Notes of meeting with CEMEX at Frampton Landfill Site - Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2007

### **Attendees:**

**CEMEX – Frampton Landfill Site**  
Neil Meredith (NM)

**Gloucestershire County Council:**  
Kevin Phillips (KP)  
David Ingleby (DI)

### **Introductions**

Introductions were made.

(KP) Introduced the purpose of the meeting i.e. evidence gathering for the Waste Core Strategy on GOSW advice.

### **Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy**

#### Background

(KP) Went through WLP process and requirement for WCS as replacement plan. Also went through key aspects of PPS10 by means of explanation and context.

#### Progress of WCS

(KP) Explained Timeframe for WCS i.e. working towards Preferred Options consultation starting in January 2008.

### **CEMEX Operations at Frampton**

#### Current Activities and Future Life of Site

(NM) C&I waste, plastics, cardboard etc – generally very dry wastes. The landfill was closed between July 2006 and May 2007 for the construction of a new cell (Cell 6) – started construction in November 2006. We begin infilling with waste on 14th May this year. Although there is no fixed date to close, there are (approx) 2 years remaining. The landfill will close when it is full and will be restored with inert material. The land will then be handed back to the landowners; CEMEX will retain the PPC Permit until which time the Environment Agency decide we can surrender it. The new cell has 68,000 cubic metres of void and so will be able to take about 80,000 tonnes of material. CEMEX (which is the World's largest producer of cement) is not interested in waste as a commercial activity (although RMC had considered an extension some years earlier). The interest it has at Frampton is not to be left with the liability of leachate and gas / other environmental management / monitoring issues.

(KP) In terms of current waste coming to the site, is it mostly locally derived C&I?

(NM) Yes most of it. Some is coming from Avonmouth and some used to come from Devon. Mainly supermarket wastes – generally a lot of plastic, wood and cardboard.

(KP) So when you were closed when constructing the final cell, where did the waste go? Presumably people were sending it elsewhere or more was being recycled?

(NM) A lot more was going through transfer stations and Smiths took a lot for processing.

(KP) Frampton only one of four landfills in the County and much the smallest.

(NM) The others being?

(KP) Hempstead (Cory), Wingmoor (Cory) Wingmoor-non-hazardous (Grundon), Wingmoor-hazardous (Grundon).

(KP) There are other inert sites e.g. in the UTV but these are exempt. [Issues with 'bird strike' – KP explained].

#### Waste disposal at Wickwar Quarry

(KP) Have you got any information about any plans for waste disposal at Wickwar Quarry (South Gloucestershire)

(NM) It did have a license from the EA but this was revoked in 2002. Now they only accept inerts. There is certainly a very large void and CEMEX are not unaware of the profit potential of this. 300,000 tonnes of inert material came from the Broadmead shopping centre redevelopment last year. This is not engineered in the void, just deposited. The void is about 7 million cubic metres – CEMEX may chose to sell it on? They do understand the potential of the void but probably not be interested in it as it is not part of the core business.

(KP) Could it be converted to take putrecible waste.

(NM) Potentially but there are water table issues – EU regulation.

(KP) This is potentially of interest to us given its relative proximity to Gloucestershire.

(NM) As I mentioned the deposited material has not been engineered.

(KP) Would this have implications for any future engineering work?

(NM) Not sure – depends what CEMEX wants to do with it.

(KP) Anything else in terms of future aspirations at Frampton.

(NM) Not really, what you see is what you get. When it closes the gates will be locked.

(KP) What about electricity generation from the Methane – will this continue for a number of years?

(NM) Maybe for 15 years – you would have to talk to our engineer about that.

(DI) How much electricity do you generate on site?

(NM) Its about a 1.4MW engine, but we generate about 1MW – started in 2004/5.

(KP) [General discussion re: Grundon end date of 2009 and the potential issues for landfill capacity in the County]. [General discussion re: hazardous waste coming into Gloucestershire and the contentious nature of it with local etc].

(KP) So when Frampton closes the waste will go elsewhere – potentially IVC at Sharpness (Biogantics) will take a proportion.

(NM) Yes potentially and its possible that a proportion will go to Swindon.

Meeting end – followed by a site visit.

----



Minerals & Waste Planning Policy  
Environment Directorate  
Gloucestershire County Council  
Shire Hall  
Westgate Street  
Gloucester  
GL1 2TH

[www.goucestershire.gov.uk](http://www.goucestershire.gov.uk)