



Development Control Committee – 15 August 2012

Local Impact Report for 12/00555/EXT, Proposal for Development Consent Order for extensions and alterations to the on-site facilities and to allow hazardous waste, low level radioactive waste landfill and soil treatment operations to take place until the end of 2026.

Purpose of report:

1. This Local Impact Report (LIR) has been prepared in accordance with Section 60 of the Planning Act 2008, in order to assist the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID) in determining this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
2. This LIR represents this authority's formal response to the application by Augean for the Development Consent Order (DCO) for extensions and alterations to the on-site facilities and to allow hazardous waste, Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLW) landfill and soil treatment operations to take place until the end of 2026.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Development Control Committee endorse the LIR, as the formal response of ENC to the NID.

Attachment(s)

Appendix 1: Northamptonshire County Council LIR Report Agenda Item 5a

Appendix 2: Northamptonshire County Council LIR Report Agenda Item 5b

1.0 Background

- 1.1 East Northamptonshire Council (ENC) was consulted by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) on the original planning applications which proposed storage of hazardous waste at the site (ref: 05/01264C in 2005) and soil treatment facility (ref: 07/01838/NCC in 2007), and ENC did not object to these proposals. ENC did object to the LLW proposals in 2009 (ref: 09/01269/NCC). However, the development was granted by the SoS and the permission for LLW has been implemented. The Council did not object to the most recent three County Council consultation applications (ref: 12/00744/NCC, 12/00745/NCC and 12/00746/NCC) which proposed to extend the operation of the site to 2016.
- 1.2 The relevant planning history for this site is detailed in NCC's LIR.

2.0 The Site

- 2.1 The site is located approximately 2.2km to the southeast of the village of Duddington and 2.5km north of Kings Cliffe. Collyweston Great Wood is adjacent to the northern boundary and to the north east of the site is an area of woodland known as Easton Hornstocks. Parts of these areas of woodland are SSSI's and National Nature

Reserves. Access to the site is gained from the primary road network, via the A47, which lies approximately 1 km to the north of the site via Stamford Road. The A47 connects to the A43. The premises of P.C Howard Ltd, a haulage and warehousing firm, lies approximately 40 metres south of the site. Westhay Cottages are located approximately 25 metres to the east and are the closest residential properties. Westhay Farm is located approximately 70 metres east and is operated as a haulage yard and a farm with associated agricultural and commercial buildings. To the west, beyond the landfill site there is open agricultural land and North Spinney Wood. RAF Wittering lies approximately 2 km to the north west of the site. No public rights of way cross the site.

3.0 Comments on NCC's LIR

3.1 ENC has taken into account NCC's LIR in the production of this LIR. To avoid repetition and in order to assist the Examining Authority (EA) in the consideration of the application, ENC has set out issues which it wishes to support NCC on. These are set out below:

1. The proposed LLW would occupy part of the void space and concerns that LLW would proportionally reduce the overall capacity of the site for hazardous waste disposal has been raised by NCC (NCC LIR Agenda Item 5a, paragraph 8.4). ENC support these concerns. The EA is requested to take into consideration the fact that there are few sites available nationally for hazardous waste disposal and the site is the only one in the region (as recognised in the MWDF Core Strategy) and the significance of ensuring that the site remains principally available for this purpose.
2. NCC has queried the sustainability of transporting LLW to a site which is distant from large sources of LLW (NCC LIR Agenda Item 5b, paragraphs 6.5 – 6.10) and the significant LLW input rates proposed in the DCO application of 150,000 tpa (NCC LIR Agenda Item 5b, paragraph 6.4). ENC share these concerns.
3. NCC has queried the sustainability of creating new voids at the site (which would involve extraction) where there are existing voids elsewhere in the country that could be filled with sustainability benefits, (NCC LIR Agenda Item 5b, paragraph 6.13). ENC shares this view.
4. No specific limits have been included within the draft DCO which limits radioactivity. This concern is highlighted by NCC (NCC LIR, Agenda Item 5a, paragraph 10.18). A condition was imposed on the SoS's Decision for the 2009 permission which limits the radioactivity of the LLW imported and deposited at the site at 200 Bq/g (Condition 3). In light of the perceptions of fear from the local community surrounding the new proposals, a similar requirement within the DCO would help to address these concerns and ensure that a safe level of LLW would be deposited.
5. The anticipated input rates for the 2009 application for LLW were between 25,000m³ to 50,000m³ per annum (Augean PLC Volume B1 2009 application, paragraph 7.2.8) and the current application proposes a higher LLW input rate of up to 150,000 tpa. ENC has concerns regarding the increase in the amount of LLW stored at the site and the health risks from radiation exposure that could be associated with this. The SoS decision does not specify or limit the input rates for LLW, although the disposal of LLW was limited to three cells (4B, 5A and 5B) (Condition 2 of the SoS's decision). At the time of the 2009 LLW application, as four out of the five phases (10 cells) were designated for the disposal of hazardous and other wastes, where only three cells would be used for LLW, input rates for LLW was less of an issue. However, the new proposals are for disposal of LLW in 6 new phases (and potentially up to 12 cells) and there is the issue that a substantial portion of the site could be use for the deposit of LLW. This raises concerns about reduction of the overall capacity of the site for hazardous waste disposal (significance of the site is set out in the MWDF Core Strategy) and the potential health and safety risks that

could be associated with the proposed amount of LLW. The EA is requested to consider imposing restrictions on input rates for the LLW.

6. The Health Protection Agency's (HPA) representation to this application considers that there is insufficient information to enable a full assessment of the impact of the proposals on public health. Discussions are currently ongoing between the applicant and the HPA. It is requested that the views of the HPA be taken into account by the Examining Authority.
7. ENC support the restrictions on the draft DCO (14, 15 and 17) and the recommendations made by NCC Local Highway Authority regarding (1) ongoing transport assessments being undertaken so that the impacts of the proposal on the highway network can be monitored and so that appropriate measures are put in place to minimise any issues; (2) that HGVs be controlled from leaving the site during the early morning peak period; (3) that the existing routing agreement (which requires all HGVs leaving the site to turn left onto Stamford Road to access the A47) be secured; and (4) that measures be undertaken to prevent the deposit of mud and debris on the highway.
8. ENC wishes to endorse the recommendations made by the Environment Agency regarding changes being made to the draft DCO to allow for additional infrastructure to be installed if necessary to minimise dust emissions from the processing plant at the treatment facility. This is given the exceedance issues that have been known for the site.

4.0 Development Plan Policies

- 4.1 The minerals and waste policies relevant to this proposal are discussed in NCC's LIR. As part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the area, *The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy(NNCSS)* adopted 2008 and *Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan (RNOTP)* adopted 2009 are also relevant. Both of these documents are currently undergoing review, and the relevant policies are set out below:
 - 4.2 North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (NNCSS)
 - 4.2.1 The NNCSS sets the vision for high quality development and the protection and enhancement of valuable built and natural resources to ensure that growth has brought opportunities and benefits to existing communities and provide a safe, health and attractive area for new residents, visitors and businesses to invest in, (NNCSS, page 19).
 - 4.2.2 Objectives six and seven seeks to secure the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities needed to sustain and enhance existing communities and support the development of North Northamptonshire, including establishing the priorities for future public and private investment and collaboration, to build confidence in North Northamptonshire for investors and others, and to build a more diverse, dynamic and self reliant economy.
 - 4.2.3 Policies 1 and 9 seek to direct new developments to sites within existing settlement boundaries and restrict new development in the open countryside. The proposal is for extension to the existing waste management site located in the open countryside and the national significance of the site is recognised in the minerals and waste Development Plan Documents.
 - 4.2.4 The NNCSS shows the site falling within the 'Willow Brook' Sub-regional Green Infrastructure Corridor (SGIC). Policy 5 seeks to obtain a net gain in Green Infrastructure (GI) and safeguard existing SGIC by not permitting development that would compromise their integrity and to invest in enhancement and restoration where the opportunities exists. ENC notes that environmental and ecological restoration proposals are included within the draft DCO.

4.2.5 Policy 13 (h) seeks to ensure that development be of a high standard of design, architecture and landscaping, respect and enhance the character of the surroundings and be in accordance with the environmental character of the area. Policy 13 (l) seeks to ensure that development proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution. Policy 13 (m) states that development should be constructed and operated using a minimum amount of non-renewable resources including where possible the reuse of existing structures and materials. Policy 13 (n) states that development should not have an adverse impact on the highway network and will not prejudice highway safety. Policy 13 (o) states that proposals should conserve and enhance landscape character. Policies 13 (p) and (q) seeks to ensure that development should not sterilise known mineral reserves or degrade soil quality and not cause a risk to the quality of underlying ground water or surface water.

4.3 The Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan (RNOTP)

4.3.1 Located approximately 2 miles south of the site, is the village of Kings Cliffe. King's Cliffe is recognised as a 'Local Service Centre' within the RNOTP with a role in providing services for villages in the rural north. The village has a doctor's surgery, primary school, middle school, village hall, and post office. These services are used by the surrounding network of villages.

4.3.2 Located on the northern fringe of King's Cliffe is Kingsmead Industrial Estate. The site is identified in the RNOTP as a 'Small and Medium Enterprise Site' (SME) and its role for providing premises for the establishment and expansion of small firms is safeguarded by Policy KCF1 in the Plan.

4.3.3 A site located towards the northwest of King's Cliffe village has been allocated for housing development for up to 150 units and this is secured by Policy KCF2 of the Plan.

4.3.4 There are no tourist attractions, hotels or public houses, within the immediate vicinity of the site. However, it is recognised within the RNOTP that there are many assets within the northern part of the district which attract visitors and contribute to the rural economy, (RNOTP, pages 18 and 19). The economy in the rural area is mixed, with an established agricultural and forestry base, now diversifying into the service and tourism industries, (RNOTP, paragraph 2.16).

4.3.5 Located approximately 2 miles north of the site are three other villages, which lie within the district of East Northamptonshire and these are Duddington, Collyweston and Easton on the Hill.

5.0 Local Issues

5.1 East Northamptonshire District remains attractive for house builders. Since the LLW proposals have been made public in 2009, the Council received a reserved matters application from Charles Church for the construction of 145 dwellings on the northern side of King's Cliffe village in 2010 (ref: 10/01277/REM). This application was granted permission and the dwellings are currently undergoing construction, although the rate of construction for these properties were known to have been slow initially.

5.2 An application was made for the construction of 145 dwellings at Land off Creed Road in Oundle (ref: 09/00611/FUL). Whilst this application was submitted before the 2009 LLW proposals, the planning permission was granted in 2011 and the Council received an application to discharge the pre-commencement conditions from Persimmon Homes in August 2011. The archaeological works started on site early this year in 2012.

5.3 More recently, the Council received an application from Linden Homes for the

construction of 25 dwellings in Warmington (ref: 11/1152/FUL).

- 5.4 Planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the former RAF storage area in Collyweston Great Wood into a storage and distribution facility in June 2009 (ref: 09/01000/FUL). Applications have been submitted to discharge the pre-commencement conditions in 2012. This planning permission is due to expire in August 2012 and the owner is actively pursuing measures to implement the permission.
- 5.5 The application site is located approximately 2 miles metres away from Kingsmead Industrial Estate. The site is identified in the RNOTP as a 'Small and Medium Enterprise Site' (SME) and is safeguard by Policy KCF1 in the Plan. Planning permission was granted for an extension to the site in 2008, to include 6 new industrial units. This permission was not implemented and expired in 2011. Asset reviews are currently being undertaken by the Council and the opportunities for this site are being explored. It is unlikely the deposit of LLW at the application site has had an adverse effect on local industrial sites such as this and the RAF storage site. National economic issues would appear to be the more significant contributing factor.
- 5.6 Within the wider district, a data centre application was granted by ENC at Gretton Road in March 2012 (ref: 11/01535/FUL) and applications were recently submitted to discharge the pre-commence planning conditions. Since the LLW proposals in 2009, the Council has received two food store proposals for Thrapston (ref: 11/01234/FUL and 11/01660/FUL) and an application for a food store has been recently received for Oundle (ref: 12/01051/FUL). Proposals for a storage and distribution warehouse at the Islip Furnace Site, comprised of 92,902 sqm of storage and distribution space with 4,645 sqm of office floor space was also submitted and granted permission by ENC this year (ref: 12/00417/OUT).
- 5.7 The Council was consulted by the neighbouring district, Corby Borough Council, on a number of significant housing development and infrastructure proposals at Priors Hall between 2009 and 2011, including a reserved matters application for 750 dwellings (ref: 09/01029/EXT), enterprise centre (ref: 09/01376/EXT), mixed use development (ref: 11/00123/EXT), major infrastructure proposal (ref: 11/01426/EXT); a large urban extension which comprised of a proposal for up to 5,100 dwellings, up to 14 hectares of employment space and other community facilities (ref: 11/01463/EXT); and more recently, in July 2012, ENC has been consulted on a reserved matters application for 96 dwellings (ref: 12/01210/EXT).
- 5.8 There are no tourist attractions within the immediate vicinity of the site and at the 2009 LLW appeal it was considered by the Planning Inspector that there would be a minimal effect from LLW deposits on the attractiveness of the district for tourism. The Council issued a Scoping Opinion for a forest holiday development with leisure, retail and tourism facilities at Rockingham Forest Park in August 2010. Whilst no formal application has so far been received, it is anticipated that one is to be submitted.
- 5.9 So far, there is limited evidence to suggest that the LLW proposals have had an effect on the attractiveness of the district for newcomers and wider economic issues have been recognised as a contributing factor.
- 5.10 Numerous representations were made in support of the proposals from employees at Augean, local businesses and residents. It is recognised that an extension of time to the landfill operations would continue to provide support to local businesses and communities in the district and the neighbouring Corby area.
- 5.11 It is noted that the community fund (secured by the S106) will provide financial support for various social and economic projects in the local community in order to counter-balance any perceived impacts of the development.
- 5.12 The contributions of the landfill operations towards the landfill tax credit scheme has

been noted by this authority.

6.0 Local Concerns

- 6.1 Issues around both real and perceived harm, from pollution; effect on the road network and the surrounding human and natural environment, were reflected in many of the objections in the 2009 LLW application and the new proposals. The local concerns to the most recent proposals have been summarised in NCC's LIR. ENC do not intend to reiterate these, but would make the following additional comments:
- 6.2 The local community had concerns during the 2009 application that a precedent would be set for the site to accept LLW and that further proposals would be forthcoming. A proposal has now been submitted for operations at the site to extend until 2026, and there are local concerns that permissions on the site would be extended from 'temporary' to 'permanent'. From NCC's LIR it is noted that the applicant has previously attempted to include the adjacent land to the west as a site allocation during the Minerals and Waste Development Framework process. As stated by NCC, this gives no confidence to the local population that this site would be restored as proposed in the application. The initial proposal was for the eastern part of the site to be restored by 31 August 2013 and the most recent proposal is for the site to be restored by 2026. ENC would query the long delay for the restoration of the areas of the site which have already been capped, as the environmental and ecological benefits should be delivered earlier, where possible.
- 6.3 Local residents and ENC have concerns about the health and environmental risks that would be associated with this proposal and this needs to be properly assessed by the Examining Authority.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 ENC does not wish to object to the planning proposals, but has highlighted various concerns within this LIR, which the Examining Authority is requested to take into consideration.

Legal	Power: Planning Act 2008 and Localism Act 2011			
	Other considerations:			
Background Papers: 12/00555/EXT				
Person Originating Report: Anna Lee, Development Control officer, 01832 742228, alee@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk				
Date: 1 August 2012				
CFO		MO		CX

(Committee Report Normal Rev. 22)



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

24 July 2012

REPORT BY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

Subject:	Local Impact Report on the application for a Development Consent Order to the National Infrastructure Directorate for the alteration of existing, and the construction of new facilities, for the recovery and disposal of hazardous waste and the disposal of low level radioactive waste at the East Northants Resource Management Facility, Stamford Road, Northamptonshire
Applicant:	Augean South Limited
Recommendations:	That the Committee agree the County Council’s Local Impact Report to the Development Consent Order application as set out Sections 4 to 11 of this report.

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with professional planning advice on the Local Impact Report prepared on the application by Augean South Limited for a Development Consent Order (DCO).

2. Relevant Priority Outcomes

- 2.1 As an organisation we have developed a set of principles which define what we are here for – our core purpose:
- We are here to help you help yourself
 - We are here to help you when you can’t help yourself
 - We want you to see us as a trusted advocate
- 2.2 Our perspectives and priority outcomes show how we will go about achieving our vision: “Proud to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work”

Perspective	Outcome
Customers - to achieve our vision, what will our customers see?	A cleaner, greener and more prosperous County

3. Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and Local Impact Reports

3.1 Until 1 April 2012 the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) was responsible for examining applications for development consent to build nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs). Applications that were the responsibility of the IPC were large projects that were considered to support the economy and vital public services, including railways, large wind farms, power stations, reservoirs, harbours, airports and sewage treatment works.

- 3.2 The IPC was abolished on 1 April 2012 and has been replaced by the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID). The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) now administers the application process for NSIPs on behalf of the NID. The final decision making powers on NSIPs have been passed to the Secretary of State (SoS).
- 3.3 The IPC produced a series of advice notes to help engage individuals and organisations more effectively in the process for deciding applications for development consent for NSIPs. Advice note one addresses Local Impact Reports (LIRs) and is summarised below.
- 3.4 Local authorities in whose areas applications for NSIPs are submitted are strongly encouraged to produce LIRs. The SoS must have regard to LIRs in deciding an application. LIRs are a local authorities own evaluation of the local impacts of a proposal. The definition of a LIR is given in Section 60(3) of the Planning Act 2008 as 'a report in writing giving details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority's area (or any part of that area)'. The content of the LIR is a matter for the local authority concerned as long as it falls within this statutory definition.
- 3.5 The LIR is intended to be used so that local knowledge and evidence on local issues can be fully and robustly reported. There is no set requirement for local authorities to have LIRs approved by members or to consult with the community. The advice note explains that a LIR should consist of a statement of positive, neutral and negative local impacts, but it does not need to balance these impacts as this is a matter for the Commissioner. Rather the advice note suggests the report should draw local issues to attention and provide the local authority's appraisal of the proposed development's compliance with local policy.
- 3.6 The LIR can include a view on the relative importance of different social, environmental or economic issues and the impact of the scheme on them. Similarly it is suggested that the LIR should take a view on provisions, requirements and development consent obligations and that the report should identify, comment and give appropriate weight to any specific mitigation or compensatory measures proposed. A LIR can refer to representations made to the local authority or applicant about the scheme where they are relevant to a particular local impact which the authority wishes to highlight.
- 3.7 There is no requirement for the local authority to undertake an assessment of compliance with National Policy Statements (NPSs). National Policy Statements may however provide a guide to matters of local impact that are likely to be relevant.
- 3.8 The deadline for submission of this LIR is 10 September 2012. A local authority can make representations about an NSIP application separately to a LIR. The County Council has made an initial representation and has the opportunity to make further representations. A report dealing with a further representation is agenda item 5b for this committee meeting.

4. Site Description

- 4.1 The East Northamptonshire Resource Management Facility (ENRMF) is located within the north east of Northamptonshire, approximately 6 kilometres (km) to the south of Stamford and approximately 2.5 km to the north of the village of King's

Cliffe. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the site are Westhay Cottages, a terrace of three dwellings, and Westhay Farm (and its associated agricultural and commercial buildings, from which a haulage business operates). These properties are all to the east of the site boundary to the far side of the access road. The only other property in the vicinity is Westhay Lodge which lies approximately 0.8 km to the south. The closest village is Duddington, approximately 1.5 km to the west. RAF Wittering lies approximately 2 km to the north west of the site. The site is not the subject of any landscape designation.

- 4.2 Collyweston Great Wood is an Ancient Woodland located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. To the east and north east of the site is the Easton Hornstocks woodland. Parts of both the Collyweston Great Wood and Easton Hornstocks comprise a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a National Nature Reserve (NNR). The north eastern part of the application site is itself designated as a Potential Wildlife Site.
- 4.3 The site lies within an area of relatively level to gently undulating land at an elevation of approximately 80 metres (m) Above Ordnance Datum. The geology of the site consists of clay strata to a depth of approximately 11.5 m, underlain by Jurassic Limestone. The limestone strata are defined as a major aquifer by the Environment Agency (EA).
- 4.4 Access to the site is gained from the primary road network, via the A47, which lies approximately 1 km to the north of the site via Stamford Road. Stamford Road is an unclassified road linking the A47 to the village of King's Cliffe, passing along the eastern boundary of the site. This is the access route used for the previous and current land filling operations on site. The access road enters the reception area adjacent to and south east of the landfill. Signs are posted for drivers to head for the A47 when leaving the site and not to go through the village of King's Cliffe.
- 4.5 The A47 connects to the A43 approximately 2 km west of the application site. Together the A43 and A47 serve as a strategic highway network forming links with the A1 to the north and east, the A14, A43, A45 and M1 to the south and the M1 and M6 to the west.

5. Site History

- 5.1 Planning permission for silica clay extraction at this site was first granted in the 1950s and there were several subsequent planning permissions for further clay extraction and for infilling the extracted areas with inert waste materials. In 1997 the old silica clay mineral permissions were subject to a planning application for modern planning conditions and these were approved. In 1998 (EN/88/833C) an application to deposit wastes, including hazardous wastes at the site was refused on grounds relating to landscape and amenity impact and no overriding need. This refusal was subject to a planning appeal which was originally dismissed by the Planning Inspector, but this decision was quashed following an appeal to the High Court.
- 5.2 The legal grounds upon which the Inspector's decision was quashed were fundamental to the principle of the development and when a further planning application was submitted for a smaller site with reduced capacity, the County Council Development Control Sub-Committee approved the application

(EN/99/844C). Subsequent to this decision further permissions were granted to enable asbestos to be tipped at the site (EN/02/166C) and for soil storage on land to the west of the landfill area (EN/02/78C). Permission was also granted for a material recycling facility at the site (EN/00/883C) although this did not include recycling of hazardous wastes. The waste recycling and storage activities were permitted for 11 years from the commencement of the development the subject of planning permission EN/99/844C. This activity has now ceased.

- 5.3 The operating company was originally Atlantic Waste Ltd, trading as Wastego, and there were issues which emerged relating to the discharge of planning conditions and the way the site was being managed. These matters were dealt with by the County Council and the EA and in the midst of this the site was sold to Augean. Following discussions with the new owners of the site a revised application and Environmental Impact Assessment was put forward under Section 73a of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act to deal with the planning issues which had emerged. This application to regularise the ongoing operations on the site was subsequently approved on 3 July 2006 (EN/05/1264C). This consent superseded all previous planning permissions.
- 5.4 Several other planning permissions have been granted in respect of the site. In 2006 planning permission (EN/06/01517) was granted for the installation and operation of a gas flare and a surface water pumping station in an area to the north west of the application site. In 2008 planning permission was granted for the installation and operation of a soil water treatment facility to process contaminated soils (07/00048/WAS and 07/081838/NCC).
- 5.5 An application (accompanied by an Environmental Statement) was submitted in 2009 to also allow the disposal of Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLW) in the last three phases of the permitted hazardous waste disposal area. The application was refused by the County Council Development Control Committee but subsequently approved by the SoS on appeal. The granting of this permission did not change the rate or volume of waste which could be deposited at the site (up to 250,000 tonnes per annum) nor the consented operational lifetime of the site (31 August 2013). The permission has been implemented and LLW waste has been deposited at the site. Augean notifies the County Council and EA prior to each consignment of LLW entering the site.
- 5.6 The extant planning permissions, save for the permission for the gas flare, are due to expire on 31 August 2013 by which time the land must be restored. Augean has applied to the County Council under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary the end dates of the three planning permissions relating to the soil treatment facility and landfill of both hazardous and LLW to 31 December 2016. These applications have come forward because Augean are concerned that the applications to the NID will not be decided by 31 August 2013 when the extant permissions expire. These applications are not addressed under this report but will be subject to a separate report to the County Council Development Control Committee in September.
- 5.7 The site is also subject to pollution control which is the regulatory responsibility of the EA. The existing operations are subject to controls under Environmental Permits and an authorisation under the Radioactive Substances Act 1993

respectively. The site is subject to monitoring by the EA and Health Protection Agency (HPA) as well as the operator's own monitoring.

- 5.8 Detailed procedures including waste pre-acceptance checks, waste acceptance checks and quarantine arrangements for unacceptable waste that may be delivered to the site are specified in accordance with a radiation protection plan for the site. This was established in accordance with the Authorisation in order to meet the requirements of the Ionising Radiation Regulations.
- 5.9 The management and engineering controls which are specified in the Environmental Permits would continue to apply following the cessation of waste acceptance and restoration at the site. In accordance with the legislation the Environmental Permits would remain in place until, in the opinion of the EA, the site no longer represents a potential risk to the environment. In accordance with the Environmental Permits the site is the subject of Financial Provision which is a bond provided by the operator for use in the event that the company no longer exists.
- 5.10 A local liaison group (LLG) meets approximately twice a year to provide a forum for regular discussions with the local community. The group includes representatives of King's Cliffe Parish Council and other nearby parish councils, as well as the operator, and officers from the County Council, East Northamptonshire Council and the EA as well as the local county councillor.

6. Proposals

- 6.1 Augean has applied to the NID for the alteration of existing, and the construction of new facilities, for the recovery and disposal of hazardous waste and disposal of LLW at the application site. The main elements of the proposals are broken down below:
 - a) Alteration of the operation of the soil treatment facility with an increase from the currently consented capacity of 100,000 tpa to 150,000 tpa of contaminated materials comprising predominantly hazardous wastes
 - b) Operations at the soil treatment facility include:
 - i) Screening
 - ii) Crushing
 - iii) Storage in stockpiles, bunkers and silos
 - iv) Material washing
 - v) Stabilisation
 - vi) Bioremediation
 - c) Construction of new landfill void for the disposal of hazardous wastes and LLW with an activity of up to 200 Bequerels per gram (Bq/g) at a direct input rate of up to 150,000 tpa
 - d) The continuation of hazardous waste and LLW landfill in the area subject of the extant planning permissions EN/05/1264 and 09/00053/WAS
 - e) A maximum input rate to the site for all wastes of 250,000 tpa

- f) Extraction and stockpiling of clay and other suitable materials for engineering purposes and the exportation of some clay and other suitable materials for use in landfill engineering at the nearby Augean Thornhaugh Landfill Site and for sale
- g) The phased restoration of the site to woodland and grassland following the completion of landfilling
- h) Completion of soil treatment and landfilling in 2026 with an aftercare period of 10 years to 2036
- i) Retention of existing ancillary infrastructure for the development period.

6.2 The application documentation itself is extensive and is available for Councillors to view at a number of locations, including County Hall and online via PINS at <http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/projects/east-midlands/east-northants-resource-management-facility/>

7. Consultation

7.1 The County Council has not undertaken its own consultation exercise with regard to this LIR. Officers have however reviewed the representations made to the NID and these have been taken into account in the LIR. The representations can be viewed at County Hall and online via the link in paragraph 6.2.

7.2 PINS received 201 initial representations to this application. The responses included more than 100 letters of support, predominantly from Augean employees at both the application site and other Augean facilities. A number of businesses which use or supply the site have also made representations in support of the development as have members of the public. Around 80 representations object to the proposals, including 11 parish councils and upwards of 65 members of the public and non statutory organisations. Responses from statutory consultees don't tend to object or support the proposal with but rather raise various issues and questions. Matters raised in representations are discussed broadly in Section 10.

7.3 A consultation exercise was undertaken by the County Council with regard to the three Section 73 applications that have been made to the County Council for the time extensions of the existing operations to 31 December 2016. As discussed in paragraph 5.6 of this report, these responses will be addressed in a separate report to the County Council Development Control Committee in September.

8. Development Plan Policies

8.1 The following Development Plan documents are considered to be most relevant to the proposal:

The Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) (May 2010)

Policy CS1:	Northamptonshire's waste management capacity
Policy CS2:	Spatial strategy for waste management
Policy CS3:	Strategy for waste disposal
Policy CS9:	Encouraging sustainable transport movements
Policy CS13:	Restoration and after-use of minerals and waste development
Policy CS14:	Addressing the impact of proposed minerals and waste development

The Northamptonshire MWDF Locations for Waste Development DPD (March 2011)

The Northamptonshire MWDF Control and Management of Development DPD (June 2011)

Policy CMD1:	Development criteria for waste management facilities (non-inert and hazardous)
Policy CMD2:	Development criteria for waste disposal (non-inert and hazardous)
Policy CMD4:	Development criteria for mineral extraction
Policy CMD7:	Natural assets and resources
Policy CMD8:	Landscape character
Policy CMD9:	Historic environment
Policy CMD10:	Layout and design quality
Policy CMD13:	Restoration and after-use
Policy CMD14:	Implementation

The Principle of the Development

- 8.2 The Northamptonshire MWDF Core Strategy (May 2010) states that the specialist hazardous waste management facility at King's Cliffe is of national significance, being the only one in the East Midlands, East of England, South East and London regions; that the current disposition of such facilities is leading to an undersupply and that the focus of the Northamptonshire facility should be one where its national specialism in hazardous waste is maintained and it continues to have a regional role (paragraph 6.28 of the Core Strategy).
- 8.3 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy addresses the development of a sustainable waste management network to support Northamptonshire and the recognised shortage of waste management capacity in the County. In respect of the principle of the management of hazardous waste, Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy identifies the capacity requirement for hazardous waste management in the County to 2026. Figures in Table CS4 of the Core Strategy show that total hazardous arisings in the County in 2026 would be approximately 81,800 tonnes per annum. If granted Development Consent, the extension of this site would more than fulfil the capacity requirement for hazardous waste in the County to 2026. Policy CS1 also provides some support for the principle of the extension of the existing site. It is stated in Policy CS1 that waste management capacity could come from a mix of extensions to existing sites, intensification or re-development of existing sites and new sites, provided they meet the spatial strategy and environmental, amenity and other requirements.
- 8.4 It is relevant that infilling the site partially with LLW would proportionally reduce capacity for hazardous waste disposal and impact on the capability of the site to fulfil its recognised role as a hazardous waste facility of national significance. A proposed requirement of the draft DCO restricts imports to 150,000 tpa at the soil treatment facility and 150,000 tpa directly to landfill with combined inputs not to exceed 250,000 tpa. The applicant is uncertain on what ratio of hazardous waste to LLW would be imported to the site and this would be influenced by market conditions for the respective waste types. Nevertheless, infilling the site with LLW would proportionally reduce the overall capacity of the site for hazardous waste disposal. Given the importance of the site as a hazardous waste facility as recognised in the MWDF it is considered that the impact on the hazardous waste facility should be a factor taken into account by the Examining Authority.

- 8.5 Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy states that waste management facilities, particularly for advanced treatment or facilities with a sub-regional or wider catchment should be focused within the central spine as identified in the Core Strategy. Policy CS2 also states that a facility in a rural area should, where possible, be associated with existing rural employment uses. The subject site is not located within the Central Spine but is an existing facility, albeit with a temporary planning permission, of recognised national importance for hazardous waste management and disposal in close proximity to the A43 and A47.
- 8.6 The Northamptonshire MWDF Locations for Waste Development DPD takes forward the vision, objectives, spatial strategy and policies for waste-related development in the MWDF Core Strategy by allocating sites for waste management facilities and identifying specific locations where waste management would be acceptable in principle. The subject site is recognised in the Waste Locations DPD as a committed site for the treatment of soils and hazardous waste management and disposal. This reflects that the activities had planning permission when the plan was adopted in March 2011. It is stated in the Locations for Waste DPD that proposals for extensions or change in waste related development on committed sites must be in accordance with the MWDF policies. It is accepted in the Locations for Waste DPD that a commitment confers a favourable status for a continuation of a waste use where this meets the intent of the MWDF strategy and policies, and is also in accordance with national planning policy. There are no specific policies in the Locations for Waste Development DPD that are directly applicable to this application.
- 8.7 The Northamptonshire Control and Management of Development DPD (paragraph 3.29) recognises that the national significance of the hazardous waste facility at King's Cliffe warrants a national catchment area and that the role of the facility should be maintained, subject to any extant planning permission. The Control and Management of Development DPD requires that proposals for additional hazardous waste management and disposal capacity robustly justify need, including the intended catchment area and specialism of the facility, and ensure that only residual waste is disposed of. It is also stated (paragraph 3.31) that determination of proposals for hazardous waste management and disposal would be made in line with Policy CMD1 and Policy CMD2 respectively.
- 8.8 Policies CMD1 and CMD2 of the Control and Management of Development DPD are important for considering the principle of hazardous waste development at the site. Policy CMD1 establishes the criteria under which proposals for waste management facilities (non-inert and hazardous) on non-allocated sites are assessed. Criteria around site location, need, the requirement for the specialist facility, catchment area and sustainability are particularly relevant to this proposal and address matters that are raised through many of the representations. Policy CMD2 sets out the development criteria for waste disposal, including hazardous waste. Applications are required to demonstrate need, catchment area, sustainability, and compliance with the waste hierarchy. Further to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy, it is stated in Policy CMD2 that preference will be given to extensions of existing sites unless it can be demonstrated that a standalone site would be more sustainable and better located to support the management of waste close to its source.

- 8.9 Policies CMD1 and CMD2 require applicants to have regard to the principles of sustainability, particularly regarding intended catchment areas. The MWDF acknowledges that the hazardous waste treatment and disposal at the site justifies a national catchment.
- 8.10 Policies CMD1 and CMD2 of the Control and Management of Development DPD in conjunction with Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy provide the framework for considering the principle of the DCO application so far as hazardous waste is concerned and there are considered to be no justifiable reasons to object to this aspect of the application in principle. The proposed LLW disposal would however occupy part of the proposed void space and raises questions around the intended catchment area. These matters should be explored by the Examining Authority.
- 8.11 With regard to the principle of LLW disposal, there are no MWDF policies relating specifically to the management of LLW. This was the situation when the application was granted on appeal by the SoS in May 2011 as there has been no revision of LLW policy in the MWDF since that time. Instead the principle of the proposal for LLW disposal must be assessed in accordance with national policy.

Other Relevant Policies

- 8.12 Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy requires that provision be made for recognised shortfalls in waste disposal capacity for non-inert and inert waste disposal. The policy does not extend to hazardous waste or LLW disposal but would be relevant to imported inert material required for restoration.
- 8.13 Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy requires minerals and waste related development to seek to minimise transport movements and maximise the use of sustainable or alternative transport modes. In this case there are no alternative modes of transport serving the site with all waste transported on the road network. As is acknowledged in the Core Strategy, the specialist nature of the hazardous waste facility means hazardous waste already travels large distances for treatment and disposal. Issues around the movement of hazardous waste and LLW over large distances are raised in a number of the objections made to this application (see Section 10).
- 8.14 Policy CS13 requires that temporary minerals and waste sites are progressively restored to an acceptable condition and stable landform. The applicant proposes to restore the site progressively to woodland and grassland with ecological benefit and public access in line with the restoration principles approved most recently by the SoS with regard to LLW disposal at the site.
- 8.15 Policy CS14 addresses proposals for minerals and waste development to demonstrate that the following matters have been addressed:
- minimising environmental impact and protecting Northamptonshire's key environmental designations,
 - protecting natural resources or ensuring that any unavoidable loss or reduction is mitigated,
 - ensuring built development is of a design and layout that has regard to its visual appearance in the context of the defining characteristics of the local area,
 - ensuring access is sustainable, safe and environmentally acceptable, and
 - ensuring that local amenity is protected.

- 8.16 Impacts associated with Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy are raised in many of the initial representations objecting to these proposals. Environmental impacts, natural resources, visual impacts, access matters and local amenity are particularly contentious amongst the opponents to the scheme and are discussed further in Section 10. While the site benefits from being an established site relatively remote from key environmental designations it is clear that matters addressed by Policy CS14 require careful consideration with regard to these proposals.
- 8.17 The proposed landfill extension includes the extraction of clay for use on site and off site. Paragraphs 4.18 and 4.19 of the Control and Management of Development DPD discuss the use of refractory minerals and clay and recognise that such materials within Northamptonshire are typically used for engineering works and fill, including the lining and capping of landfill sites. It is stated in the Control and Management of Development DPD that demand within the County for such material can be met through incidental working or the use of alternative materials. To this effect, no allocations for refractory minerals or clay have been made in the Locations for Minerals DPD. Proposals for such minerals are to be assessed having regard to Policy CMD4: Development criteria for mineral extraction.
- 8.18 Policy CMD4 of the Control and Management of Development DPD requires extraction of minerals from non-allocated sites (including extensions to existing sites and extensions to allocated sites) to demonstrate that the development:
- Does not conflict with the spatial strategy for mineral extraction
 - Is required to meet a proven need for materials with particular specifications that cannot reasonably or would not otherwise be met from committed or allocated reserves
 - Will maximise the recovery of the particular reserve whilst minimising waste through operational techniques employed
 - Promotes the most appropriate end-use of materials
- 8.19 With regard to CMD4 and the site location, the spatial strategy for mineral extraction focuses on sand and gravel extraction. The subject site benefits from having clay on site that is of a specification suitable for engineering landfill cells and would avoid the need to import such material.
- 8.20 Policy CMD7 of the Control and Management of Development DPD requires that minerals and waste development seeks to achieve a net gain in natural assets and resources. Particular concerns have been raised in representations regarding impacts on natural assets, especially water resources. These are assessed at length in the application and are discussed further in Section 10 of this report. The County Council considers that landscape and biodiversity enhancements can be secured in the long term through the requirements set out in the draft DCO. The restoration proposals include the provision of woodland and grassland which the applicant contends would create ecological benefits and improved public access. Policy CMD13 of the Control and Management of Development DPD provides more detailed criteria for restoration and afteruse of mineral and waste sites.
- 8.21 Policy CMD8 states that minerals and waste development should seek to reflect Northamptonshire's landscape character and mitigate potentially adverse impacts on the local character and distinctiveness of landscapes throughout all phases of

development. As required by CMD8 the application is accompanied by an assessment of landscape impacts. As discussed with regard to CMD7, in the long term the site would be restored to woodland and grassland. Visual amenity impacts, particularly during the proposed period of operation, are of local concern and are discussed further in Section 10 of this report.

- 8.22 Policy CMD9 requires that where heritage assets of significance are identified that proposals seek to enhance Northamptonshire's historic environment through careful management and enhancement. The site has low archaeological potential and no further archaeological investigation is considered necessary by the County Council.
- 8.23 Policy CMD10 addresses layout and design quality. Layout and design quality have been assessed with regard to previous applications and limited new built development is proposed under this application. A drum storage bay is proposed to the south of Phase 4 and the weighbridge and cabin are to be relocated to along the southern boundary to the south of Phase 5. Neither change is expected to materially impact on the previously approved layout and design of the site.
- 8.24 Policy CMD14 provides for control of minerals and waste development through various measures including planning conditions, planning obligations, legal agreements, monitoring and Local Liaison Groups (LLGs). The applicant has proposed requirements through the draft DCO and it is important to recognise that additional controls are in place through the Environmental Permits relating to the site. A draft S106 legal agreement has been provided and the County Council considers that it addresses the relevant topics. The draft S106 is similar to those previously entered into in 2006 and 2011 with minor changes only likely to be necessary should Development Consent be granted. The existing LLG provides a useful forum for discussion between various parties and should be continued.
- 8.25 The Development and Implementation Principles Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (September 2011) provides practical guidance relevant to this development, including matters relating to catchment areas and restoration.
- 8.26 The MWDF is currently going through a Partial Review. The Partial Review will bring together the four currently separate components of the MWDF (Core Strategy, Locations for Minerals, Locations for Waste and Control and Management of Development policy elements) into one combined plan. The Partial Review will focus on rolling forward the MWDF plan period by five years to 2031 and updating the annual provision figures for aggregates and the figures relating to waste capacity.
- 8.27 In light of the adopted MWDF it is considered that the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (NNCSS) should be given limited weight in assessing this application. The strategy does however provide a useful portrait of North Northamptonshire as a growth area (see paragraph 2.1 of the NNCSS) although it is acknowledged that the NNCSS is undergoing a review. With regard to the north east, the NNCSS recognises that growth will be directed to a rural service spine comprising the Rural Service Centres of Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston, with a secondary focus at the Local Service Centre of King's Cliffe.

9. Relevant development proposals

- 9.1 The applicant has provided discussion of development proposals in the area in paragraph 3.9 of the Environmental Statement.
- 9.2 The subject site is located in close proximity to a number of operational and permitted mineral and waste operations both within Northamptonshire and nearby Peterborough. Collyweston quarry near Duddington is located in Northamptonshire approximately 1 km north west of the site and is an active limestone and building stone quarry. A large limestone quarry at nearby Wakerley has also been approved by Northamptonshire County Council, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement. The quarry, associated with a former ironstone planning permission, would be located approximately 5 km south west of the application site and includes reserves estimated at 11 million tonnes. The site is not yet operational and it could take several years before this occurs.
- 9.3 There are also several mineral and waste operations in nearby Peterborough. The closest of these to the subject site is Cross Leys Quarry. As well as producing mineral the Cross Leys site is also a landfill facility. Slightly further east along the A47, the Thornhaugh landfill site is a primarily non hazardous landfill (also permitted to take asbestos and stable non-reactive hazardous waste) operated by Augean. Cooks Hole, an active quarry, is located adjacent to the south east of Thornhaugh landfill site and is also operated by Augean. These facilities are clustered within 5 km of the application site. Several representations to this application have raised concerns that this agglomeration of mineral and waste facilities would lead to further such developments in the area.
- 9.4 East Northamptonshire Council, and indeed other neighbouring local planning authorities are best placed to discuss other development proposals in the vicinity of the site. The applicant has outlined proposals in King's Cliffe for up to 150 dwellings, a storage and distribution facility on the site of a former ammunition storage area in Collyweston Great Wood and an application for a forest development with leisure, retail and tourism facilities at Rockingham Forest Park, King's Cliffe.

10. Local Impacts

- 10.1 There is a significant element of local opposition to these proposals. The majority of points raised in representations made to date relate to amenity, highways, health/pollution and socio-economic impacts. Many of these points are very similar to those raised in response to application 09/00053/WAS for the disposal of LLW at the site that was approved by the SoS on appeal.

Amenity

- 10.2 Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10): Planning for Sustainable Waste Management includes as Annex E a list of factors to be considered when assessing waste applications. The list includes air emissions (including dust), noise, odours and visual intrusion. Along with matters relating to traffic and access which are dealt with separately in this report, impacts from dust, noise, odour and visual intrusion are often the amenity impacts that cause the most local concern.

- 10.3 With regard to odour, the County Council is aware of odour complaints this year and odour has been raised as an issue in representations. The County Council understands that Augean investigated these complaints and traced them back to a particular waste stream that is no longer imported to the site. No specific requirements regarding odour are included in the draft DCO but additional controls exist in the various environmental permits for the site. Other impacts on air quality are addressed in the application and monitoring of air quality, including dust, are required under the Environmental Permits for the site. It is noted that the EA has requested in their representation that the draft DCO allows for additional infrastructure to be installed if necessary to minimise dust emissions from processing plant at the treatment facility. Exceedances of limits relating to dust set in the Environmental Permit for the landfill site have occurred in recent years.
- 10.4 Noise is also addressed in the application and the applicant has submitted a noise management and monitoring scheme. Requirement 4(2) of the draft DCO requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted scheme. Noise monitoring is ongoing under the existing permissions at the site and provides actual data on noise emissions from existing operations at the site. The applicant has stated that the predicted noise levels associated with these proposals comply with the existing noise limits as set out in the approved noise mitigation and monitoring scheme. Nevertheless amenity impacts, including noise have been raised through the consultation process. It is noted that the worst case noise level at Westhay Cottages equates to the maximum 55 db $L_{Aeq, 1h}$ limit set in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 10.5 Hours of working are proposed at requirement 18 of the draft DCO and are widely recognised as an important control on amenity impacts. Hours of working have not been raised as a significant concern in representations to this application.
- 10.6 Impacts on the character and visual amenity of a rural area of national and historic importance have also been expressed in representations. While the facility is an existing operation these proposals would extend the period for working and delay the proposed restoration by up to 13 years. To address these impacts the draft DCO includes controls on flood lighting and bund and stockpile elevations. Of potential local concern is soil storage on the restored areas of the site and the potential for subsequent increases in visual and landscape impacts. The draft DCO includes requirements that require further information to be submitted to address these impacts. In particular requirement 5 of the draft DCO requires the applicant to submit a detailed landscaping, restoration and aftercare scheme for agreement with the County Council and for it to be implemented and maintained (requirement 6). Requirement 7 of the draft DCO requires an ecological management plan and aftercare while Schedule A sets out the ten year aftercare and maintenance period to 2036. Any potential for long term improvements need to be balanced alongside the impacts throughout operations and having regard to any impacts that cannot be ameliorated.
- 10.7 The representation from Natural England establishes that there are no European sites or nationally designated landscapes located within the vicinity of the project that could be significantly affected. Natural England is also satisfied that the proposals are unlikely to have a significant impact on the nearby Collyweston Great Wood and Easton Hornstocks SSSI/National Nature Reserve or any other nationally designated wildlife sites.

Transport and Highway Safety

- 10.8 The site is an existing waste treatment and landfill site with permission to process up to 250,000 tpa of waste until 31 August 2013. The site benefits from existing access and established routes to the strategic highway network. A transport assessment accompanies the application.
- 10.9 There are no proposals to increase HGV movements above those previously assessed as acceptable at the site. The movement of HGVs associated with this development would be comparatively small compared to total movements on Stamford Road and in particular movements on the surrounding principal road network. It is acknowledged however that there are capacity issues in the area and that if permission is granted for these proposals then movements could continue for up to a further 13 years.
- 10.10 NCC as Highways Authority has made a representation to this application and recommended a number of requirements. In particular the Highways Authority has requested a requirement for ongoing transport assessments to determine impacts on the highway network and ensure appropriate measures are in place to minimise issues. In particular the Highways Authority promotes controls on HGVs leaving the site during the AM peak period. The Highways Authority has also requested conditions securing the existing routing agreement, which requires all HGVs leaving the site to turn left onto Stamford Road to access the A47, and conditions preventing the deposit of mud and debris on the highway. These matters have been addressed by the applicant in requirements 14, 15 and 17 of the draft DCO.
- 10.11 The Highways Authority has referred to the need for a new legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to provide for ongoing annual contributions toward highway improvement and maintenance works. The applicant currently pays £5,000 per annum under the existing agreement. The draft S106 agreement is included with the application and would oblige the owner to continue to pay Highway Contributions of £5,000 per annum.
- 10.12 The Highways Agency has registered their interest to this application but made no particular comments. It is relevant to point out that the Agency has no objection to the applications made to the County Council as they do not expect a material impact on the closest strategic route, the A1.
- 10.13 Matters raised in the Highways Authority response are also reflected in a significant number of the objections to this application. Of particular local concern are capacity issues, mud on the road and highway safety. Capacity concerns are shared by Rutland County Council who considers the Transport Assessment should extend beyond the A43 roundabout to include westerly traffic along the A47 through Rutland. Local concerns are more closely related to the rural roads in the area of the site and their suitability for the numbers and types of vehicles proposed. Mud on the road and highway safety issues have at times been raised directly to the County Council in response to operations on the site. Augean has investigated these complaints and taken steps to improve the wheel wash and drainage facilities on site. Measures to mitigate mud on the road now include a wheel spinner, a wash bath and two power washes. In addition a sweeper is used on the internal haul roads and the public highway. Criticism has been voiced in representations about the operation of the sweeper on the highway causing safety concerns. Other issues

of local concern include queuing of HGVs entering the site, HGV parking on the local highway network and potential parking of HGVs loaded with LLW or hazardous waste.

- 10.14 The County Council understands that the Highway Authority is reviewing the state of Stamford Road in the vicinity of the site with a view to required maintenance and use of previously submitted highway maintenance contributions. In addition, discussions are ongoing between the County Council and Augean regarding the provision of advisory speed limit signs on part of Stamford Road north of the site. These discussions have come about following concerns of a member of the public.
- 10.15 Wider concerns regarding the safety and sustainability of transporting waste large distances to this facility have also been raised in representations. The Highways Authority does not share the local concerns regarding highway safety but the County Council acknowledges the sustainability and proximity arguments and understands these local views. This is an important issue that needs to be examined. Recent notifications to the County Council as required under the Environmental Permit for the site show consignments of waste coming from as far as Fife in Scotland and Workington in Cumbria; both locations where there are facilities that could deal with LLW in far closer proximity than King's Cliffe.

Socio-economic and community matters

- 10.16 Issues around both real and perceived harm, particularly from pollution, are reflected in many of the objections and were expressed in response to the previous planning application for the disposal of LLW at the site. Local feeling on the application to deposit LLW at the site was also reflected in the 2011 local referendum on the matter. While a detailed assessment of impacts on health has been undertaken and included in the application, this has done little to ameliorate the concerns of local residents in respect of the potential health impacts of these proposals. The Health Protection Agency's (HPA) representation to this application also considers that there is insufficient information in the application to enable a full assessment of the impact of the proposal on public health. A similar response has been submitted to the County Council regarding the applications for variation of the existing permissions. The response points to matters which should be clarified in advance of any decision on this application. The applicant has responded to the matters raised by the HPA and it is expected that a reply from the HPA will be provided orally at the Development Control Committee meeting.
- 10.17 Another facet of local community concern is that the establishment of this facility as a hazardous waste and LLW facility of national importance to 2026 could lead to proposals coming forward for this to continue beyond 2026. This could be an extension to the end date because the site has not been completed or for a further extension to the facility. The applicant has previously attempted to secure a new adjacent area to the west to be included as an allocated hazardous waste disposal site in the MWDF process. Whilst there is never any guarantee of securing any further permissions, extensions to existing facilities are generally more likely to succeed in the planning process and indeed the MWDF policy stance is favourable towards extensions. This gives no confidence to the local population that this site would be restored as proposed in the application.

- 10.18 There are also concerns that should permission be granted future applications could be submitted to increase the level of LLW accepted on site. LLW proposed to be accepted on site is defined in Schedule A of the draft DCO as radioactive waste comprising solid radioactive waste up to a maximum specific activity of 200 Bequerels per gram (Bq/g). No specific requirement on the draft DCO limits radioactivity and if granted the DCO could not be varied under Section 73. The applicant's statements that they consider the market to be for LLW under 200 Bq/g and that there is no intention to amend this limit appear to have done little to alleviate local concerns.
- 10.19 Concerns regarding the future of the site partly reflect previous extensions to operations at the site under Augean and the previous operator. These concerns extend to the existing and future monitoring of the site by the operator and regulatory authorities which do not appear to address many of the local concerns regarding short to very long term health impacts. These concerns are increased by the proximity of the site to residential properties, villages and schools. Concerns regarding health are increased by the sites location overlying a major aquifer and the perceived potential for leakage from the site to groundwater and nearby watercourses. These matters were the subject of detailed examination at the 2010 planning inquiry into the LLW application. It is noted that the EA has made an initial representation which points out some matters for the applicant to address, including points relating to the assessment of environmental effects.
- 10.20 In contrast to the objections, other respondents consider the site a safe location and point to it as an important site for waste management and disposal in the UK. Numerous representations of support have been received from Augean employees in particular. In some instances these employees are based at the application site but many others are based at Augean facilities elsewhere. It is however clear that Augean's employees have a strong interest in the extension of the operations at this site. Local businesses and producers of LLW have also made representations to support the application.
- 10.21 Opponents to the proposals consider that any employment benefits, work and contracts for local businesses as well as financial contributions from the operator are outweighed by negative impacts on the local economy, in particular property values. The draft S106 legal agreement includes an obligation for Augean to continue the LLW community fund which was set up following the outcome of the appeal to planning application 09/00053/WAS and involves the applicant paying £5 per tonne of LLW accepted at the site. In conjunction with contributions through the landfill tax credit scheme the applicant's financial contribution to the local community is significant.
- 10.22 Other issues raised in representations include the potential impacts of climate change, long term protection of the landfill cap and site security. Several respondents express the opinion that granting of the Development Consent would infringe on their human rights. These matters were also examined with regard to the previous planning inquiry and are not addressed in detail here.

11. Conclusions

- 11.1 In policy terms these proposals should be assessed in light of the adopted Minerals and Waste Development Framework. A proposal for LLW disposal at the site was

most recently assessed by the SoS in 2011 having regard to the then current development plan, including the Core Strategy, Locations for Waste DPD and the emerging Control and Management of Development DPD. Since that time the Control and Management of Development DPD has been adopted. Relevant policies have been discussed in Section 8 of this report. Subject to the proposed draft DCO it is considered that there are no MWDF policies that would justify an objection to the principle of hazardous waste treatment and disposal at the site. The MWDF does not deal specifically with LLW which should be assessed by the Examining Authority in accordance with national policy.

- 11.2 As an existing site that was the subject of a public inquiry in 2010 many of the concerns raised in representations have been recently examined in detail. The issues of concern to the local community are therefore well publicised and there is not a lot of local knowledge or evidence that is not already in the public domain. Nevertheless the NID will need to analyse matters raised in representations to this application and in doing so they should have regard to Sections 4 to 11 of this report which comprise the County Council's LIR.
- 11.3 It is clear from representations that there remains significant local opposition to this proposal. In particular 11 parish councils have objected to the application. Some concerns have also been raised by technical consultees including the HPA and EA. Representations of support have also been significant and have come from members of the public as well as Augean employees, businesses and producers of hazardous waste and LLW.
- 11.4 It is apparent to the County Council that the local community considers the site would have a negative impact on the area, despite significant contributions from the landfill tax scheme and the establishment of a community fund. For the wider community there are however positives associated with employment and support for local business. For the UK as a whole there is the provision of a nationally significant waste treatment and disposal facility with related economic benefits.

Author:	Name: Mark Laurenson Team: Development Control
Contact details:	Tel: 01604 367197 Fax: 01604 366065 Email: mlaurenson@northamptonshire.gov.uk
Background Papers:	N/A
Does the report propose a key decision is taken?	NO
If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan?	NO
Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here	NO
Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework?	NO
Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)? Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Capital Asset Investment Group (CAIG)	No. There are none relevant to this matter. Name of SFM: N/A N/A
Has the report been cleared by the relevant Corporate Director or ACE?	NO but cleared by Assistant Director Environment and Planning Name of Director:
Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted?	NO Cabinet Member:
Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted?	NO Scrutiny Committee:
Has the report been cleared by Legal Services?	NO Name of solicitor:
	Solicitor's comments:
Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?	N/A Name of officer:
Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out in relation to this report?	NO. There are no equal opportunity implications.
Are there any community safety implications?	NO
Are there any environmental implications:	YES. These are considered in the report.
Are there any Health & Safety Implications:	NO
Are there any Human Resources Implications:	NO
Are there any human rights implications:	NO
Constituency Interest:	NCC: Prebendal



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

24 July 2012

REPORT BY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

Subject:	Further representation on the application for a Development Consent Order to the National Infrastructure Directorate for the alteration of existing, and the construction of new facilities, for the recovery and disposal of hazardous waste and the disposal of low level radioactive waste at the East Northants Resource Management Facility, Stamford Road, Northamptonshire
Applicant:	Augean South Limited
Recommendations:	That the Committee agree the County Council's further representation to the Development Consent Order application as set out in Section 6 of this report.

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with professional planning advice on the further representation prepared on the application by Augean South Limited for a Development Consent Order (DCO).

2. Relevant Priority Outcomes

- 2.1 As an organisation we have developed a set of principles which define what we are here for – our core purpose:
- We are here to help you help yourself
 - We are here to help you when you can't help yourself
 - We want you to see us as a trusted advocate
- 2.2 Our perspectives and priority outcomes show how we will go about achieving our vision: "Proud to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work"

Perspective	Outcome
Customers - to achieve our vision, what will our customers see?	A cleaner, greener and more prosperous County

3. Background

3.1 Until 1 April 2012 the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) was responsible for examining applications for development consent to build nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs). Applications that were the responsibility of the IPC were large projects that were considered to support the economy and vital public services, including railways, large wind farms, power stations, reservoirs, harbours, airports and sewage treatment works.

- 3.2 The IPC was abolished on 1 April 2012 and has been replaced by the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID). The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) now administers the application process for NSIPs on behalf of the NID. The final decision making powers on NSIPs have been passed to the Secretary of State (SoS).
- 3.3 The initial stages of the NSIP application process require interested parties to register and provide a brief outline of their views regarding the application. With regard to the Augean application, this had to be completed by 1st June 2012. An officer delegated response was provided on behalf of the County Council and is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
- 3.4 The County Council has also produced a Local Impact Report (LIR) which sets out the authority's own evaluation of the local impacts of the proposal. This report does not duplicate the matters raised in the LIR, in particular the site description, site history, and details of the application for the DCO. A report dealing with the LIR is agenda item 7b for this committee meeting.

4. Consultation

- 4.1 The County Council has not undertaken its own consultation exercise with regard to this further representation. Officers have however reviewed the representations made to the NID and these have been taken into account. The representations can be viewed at County Hall and online via the following link:
<http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/projects/east-midlands/east-northants-resource-management-facility/>
- 4.2 Further details regarding the consultation responses received by PINS are provided in the report regarding the LIR.

5. Development Plan Policies

- 5.1 The Development Plan policies relevant to the DCO application are outlined and discussed in the LIR and it is not proposed to deal with the full list of policies in this report. However, to assist the committee in understanding the context of the representation proposed in Section 6 of this report, the issues around the principle of the development require some discussion.
- 5.2 In respect of the principle of the proposals relating to hazardous waste, the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) (May 2010) states that the specialist hazardous waste management facility at King's Cliffe is of national significance, being the only one in the East Midlands, East of England, South East and London regions; that the current disposition of such facilities is leading to an undersupply and that the focus of the Northamptonshire facility should be one where its national specialism in hazardous waste is maintained and it continues to have a regional role (paragraph 6.28 of the Core Strategy).
- 5.3 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy addresses the development of a sustainable waste management network to support Northamptonshire and the recognised shortage of waste management capacity in the County. In respect of the principle of the management of hazardous waste, Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy identifies the capacity requirement for hazardous waste management in the County to 2026.

Figures in Table CS4 of the Core Strategy show that total hazardous arisings in the County in 2026 would be approximately 81,800 tonnes per annum. If granted Development Consent, the extension of this site would more than fulfil the capacity requirement for hazardous waste in the County to 2026. Policy CS1 also provides some support for the principle of the extension of the existing site. It is stated in Policy CS1 that waste management capacity could come from a mix of extensions to existing sites, intensification or re-development of existing sites and new sites, provided they meet the spatial strategy and environmental, amenity and other requirements.

- 5.4 Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy states that waste management facilities, particularly for advanced treatment or facilities with a sub-regional or wider catchment should be focused within the central spine as identified in the Core Strategy. Policy CS2 also states that a facility in a rural area should, where possible, be associated with existing rural employment uses. The subject site is not located within the Central Spine but is an existing facility, albeit with a temporary planning permission, of national importance for hazardous waste management and disposal in close proximity to the A43 and A47.
- 5.5 The Northamptonshire MWDF Locations for Waste Development DPD takes forward the vision, objectives, spatial strategy and policies for waste-related development in the MWDF Core Strategy by allocating sites for waste management facilities and identifying specific locations where waste management would be acceptable in principle. The subject site is recognised in the Waste Locations DPD as a committed site for the treatment of soils and hazardous waste management and disposal. This reflects that the activities had planning permission when the plan was adopted in March 2011. It is stated in the Locations for Waste DPD that proposals for extensions or change in waste related development on committed sites must be in accordance with the MWDF policies. It is accepted in the Locations for Waste DPD that a commitment confers a favourable status for a continuation of a waste use where this meets the intent of the MWDF strategy and policies, and is also in accordance with national planning policy. There are no specific policies in the Locations for Waste Development DPD that are directly applicable to this application.
- 5.6 The Northamptonshire Control and Management of Development DPD (paragraph 3.29) recognises that the hazardous waste facility at King's Cliffe warrants a national catchment area and that the role of the facility should be maintained, subject to any extant planning permission. The Control and Management of Development DPD requires that proposals for additional hazardous waste management and disposal capacity robustly justify need, including the intended catchment area and specialism of the facility, and ensure that only residual waste is disposed of. It is also stated (paragraph 3.31) that determination of proposals for hazardous waste management and disposal would be made in line with Policy CMD1 and Policy CMD2 respectively.
- 5.7 Policies CMD1 and CMD2 of the Control and Management of Development DPD are important for considering the principle of hazardous waste development at the site. Policy CMD1 establishes the criteria under which proposals for waste management facilities (non-inert and hazardous) on non-allocated sites are assessed. Criteria around site location, need, the requirement for the specialist facility, catchment area and sustainability are particularly relevant to this proposal

and address matters that are raised through many of the representations. Policy CMD2 sets out the development criteria for waste disposal, including hazardous waste. Applications are required to demonstrate need, catchment area, sustainability, and compliance with the waste hierarchy. Further to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy, it is stated in Policy CMD2 that preference will be given to extensions of existing sites unless it can be demonstrated that a standalone site would be more sustainable and better located to support the management of waste close to its source.

- 5.8 These MWDF policies provide the framework for considering the principle of the DCO application so far as hazardous waste is concerned and there are considered to be no justifiable reasons to object to this aspect of the application in principle.
- 5.9 With regard to the principle of LLW disposal, there are no MWDF policies relating specifically to the management of LLW, although there are other more general policies which apply. This was the situation when the application was granted on appeal by the SoS in May 2011. There has been no revision of LLW policy in the MWDF since that time. The national policy position as set out in the 2007 'Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid LLW in the UK' remains. Therefore, there has been no material change in national or county level development plan policy to justify a reason to object to the principle of this aspect of the application.

6. Representation Comments

- 6.1 As there are considered to be no justifiable grounds for objecting to the DCO application for the King's Cliffe site in principle, the County Council's approach to representations should be one where it highlights matters which it considers should be specifically taken into account by the Examining Authority. In this respect it is not considered appropriate to raise objections to the DCO. The Examining Authority is advising the SoS on the determination of the application and it will take into account, as it considers appropriate, MWDF policies and national policy along with representations received. It is considered that focussing this representation on key issues will be of more assistance to the Examining Authority than raising objections and/or issues which cannot be justified in terms of MWDF policy. The following points are considered matters which the County Council should bring to the attention of the Examining Authority.

Impact on Hazardous Waste Disposal Capacity

- 6.2 The Northamptonshire MWDF Core Strategy recognises the application site as a specialist hazardous waste facility of national significance. In relation to its status as a committed site the Core Strategy specifically states that the focus of the role of the Northamptonshire facility should be one where its current particular national specialism in hazardous waste is maintained, and it continues to have a regional role by supporting the management of hazardous waste in the region.
- 6.3 Infilling the site partially with LLW would proportionally reduce capacity for hazardous waste disposal and impact on the capability of the site to fulfil its recognised role as a hazardous waste facility of national significance. A proposed requirement of the draft DCO restricts imports to 150,000 tpa at the soil treatment facility and 150,000 tpa directly to landfill with combined inputs not to exceed 250,000 tpa. The applicant is uncertain on what ratio of hazardous waste to LLW

would be imported to the site and this would be influenced by market conditions for the respective waste types. Nevertheless, infilling the site with LLW would proportionally reduce the overall capacity of the site for hazardous waste disposal.

- 6.4 Given the recognised importance of the site as a hazardous waste facility it is considered that impacts on this hazardous waste capacity should be a factor taken into account in the assessment of national policy by the Examining Authority. While the planning application is proposing to limit the total waste inputs to the site to 250,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) there could be a maximum of 150,000 tonnes of LLW imported directly for disposal. The applicant is uncertain how much of either waste type will be imported and this will clearly depend on the respective market conditions for the respective waste types. Nevertheless, infilling the site with any amount of LLW would proportionally reduce the overall capacity of the site for hazardous waste disposal. Given that there are few sites nationally for hazardous waste disposal it is considered that these impacts should be a factor taken into account by the Examining Authority.

Proximity Principle and Waste Management Plans

- 6.5 Spatially, the site is remote from sources of LLW from the nuclear industry and from high volume sources from the non-nuclear industry. The nearest source of LLW from the nuclear industry is the Harwell Research establishment in Oxfordshire, a distance of 90 miles from the application site. The nuclear power decommissioning sites are located on the UK coastline, the nearest being Sizewell in Suffolk at a distance of 118 miles. The DEFRA, DTI, and Devolved Administrations 2007 'Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid LLW in the UK' seeks (at paragraph 23) for LLW Management Plans (produced by waste consignors) to have regard to the proximity principle. The 2007 policy document goes on to say that the desire to avoid excessive transportation of materials (LLW) is an important consideration and it must be balanced with other relevant factors on a case by case basis.
- 6.6 Policies CMD1 and CMD2 require applicants to have regard to the principles of sustainability, particularly regarding intended catchment areas. The applicant deals with these matters in the Planning Statement at paragraphs 8.4.1 to 8.4.18. Reference is made at several points to the comments made in the Planning Inspector's report on the disposal of LLW. Whilst the MWDF acknowledges that the hazardous waste treatment and disposal at the site justifies a national catchment it does not address LLW which must instead be assessed in accordance with national policy.
- 6.7 Given that there are no LLW waste disposal facilities outside of north west England it is not difficult for the applicant to make the case that this site would satisfy a need relating to nuclear decommissioning sites in the southern half of England and Wales and to put this forward as the indicative catchment area for LLW wastes. However, there needs to be consideration to the sustainability of transporting LLW to a site which is distant from large sources of LLW, particularly the main nuclear decommissioning sites. It is therefore considered important that the Examining Authority carefully considers the proposed LLW disposal in the context of the proximity principle objectives in the 2007 national policy document.
- 6.8 If granted Development Consent, the site would continue to be considered by consignors undertaking their Best Available Technique (BAT) review of options for

the management of LLW. This could perpetuate sustainability and proximity principle issues. BAT reviews include consideration of the disposal options for management of LLW that cannot be managed higher up the hierarchy, including identification of the nearest appropriate installation. The options to be considered by the consignor would include disposal options at the site where the material is sourced.

- 6.9 Recent notifications (June and July 2012) to the County Council as required under the Environmental Permit for the site show consignments of waste coming from as far as Fife in Scotland and Workington in Cumbria despite closer facilities that could deal with LLW. This shows that the LLW disposal facility is acting as a national facility for LLW which the granting of Development Consent for this proposal would only perpetuate. If granted, the site would likely continue to attract LLW from a national catchment, especially as the only landfill facility that can accept LLW (up to 200Bq/g) without any restrictions on waste origin.
- 6.10 In addition, the granting of Development Consent could deter other waste management proposals coming forward through the development plan making or development management process and influence the approach of other Waste Planning Authorities towards the provision of both LLW and hazardous waste facilities. It is generally difficult in planning and permitting terms to bring forward new waste disposal facilities which give rise to general and often widespread opposition from local communities. If the site exists there will be a tendency to assume that it will be available on a national scale. The Duty to Co-operate will no doubt have a bearing on the views of Inspectors on future Waste Local Plans and it should be noted that the County Council is objecting to emerging Waste Local Plans across the country that are seeking to rule out both hazardous waste and LLW disposal. It is important that the Examining Authority considers what the impact of allowing the application would have on the approach taken by other Waste Planning Authorities towards the provision of both hazardous waste and LLW disposal facilities. The local communities near the site find it difficult to accept that waste should be brought such long distances to a facility which is perceived by some as having a negative impact on their wellbeing.
- 6.11 Local Communities Concerns
- 6.12 It was clear from the public inquiry in 2010 related to the deposit of LLW at the site, that a significant number of people in the local communities in the vicinity of this site perceived that there would be some harm caused to their health and wellbeing associated with LLW disposal at the site. This concern has not gone away. The Examining Authority needs to reconsider this matter on the basis of the DCO application which is proposing a 13 year extension to the site.
- 6.13 Another facet of local community concern is that the establishment of this facility as a hazardous waste and LLW facility of national importance to 2026 could lead to proposals coming forward for this to continue beyond 2026. This could be an extension to the end date because the site was not completed or for a further extension to the facility. The applicant has previously attempted to secure a new adjacent area to the west to be included as an allocated hazardous waste disposal site in the MWDF process. As there are no further mineral voids on the application site or other adjacent land any further landfill cells could only be created by the extraction of clay materials to create new voids. This could be considered

inappropriate bearing in mind there are existing voids elsewhere in the country that could be filled with sustainability benefits. Nevertheless extensions to existing facilities are generally more likely to succeed in the planning process and indeed the MWDF policy stance is favourable towards extensions. This gives no confidence to the local population that this site would be restored as proposed in the application.

- 6.14 The County Council is seeking, through representations to other emerging MWDFs, that other areas of the country and in particular those closer to where the greater amounts of hazardous waste and LLW are generated, are making appropriate provision for treatment and disposal of this waste. Acceptance of continuation at this site without clarification of when it will ultimately end is of real concern in the local community and is something which the Examining Authority should take into account.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 The County Council is able to make representations on this application for the alteration of existing, and the construction of new facilities, for the recovery and disposal of hazardous waste and the disposal of LLW. The Examining Authority is required to consider this representation in assessing the application.
- 7.2 Policies CS1 and CS2 of the MWDF Core Strategy and Policies CMD1 and CMD2 of the MWDF Control and Management of Development DPD provide the framework for considering the principle of the DCO application so far as hazardous waste is concerned and there are considered to be no justifiable reasons to object to this aspect of the application in principle.
- 7.3 With regard to the principle of LLW disposal, there are no MWDF policies relating specifically to LLW, although there are other more general policies which apply. This was the situation when the application was granted on appeal by the SoS in May 2011. There has been no revision of LLW policy in the MWDF since that time. The national policy position as set out in the 2007 'Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid LLW in the UK' remains. Therefore, there has been no material change in national or county level development plan policy to justify a reason to object to the principle of this aspect of the application.
- 7.4 As there are considered to be no justifiable grounds for objecting to the DCO application for the King's Cliffe site in principle, it is considered the County Council's approach to representations should be one where it highlights matters which it considers should specifically take into account by the Examining Authority. In this respect it is not considered appropriate to raise objections to the DCO. The Examining Authority is advising the SoS on the determination of the application and it will take into account, as it considers appropriate, MWDF policies and national policy along with representations received. It is considered that focussing this representation on key issues will be of more assistance to the Examining Authority than raising objections and/or issues which cannot be justified in terms of MWDF policy. The committee are therefore advised to agree the representation as set out in Section 6 of this report.

8. List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Initial representation by the County Council to the National Infrastructure Directorate (1 June 2012)

Author:	Name: Phil Watson Team: Development Control
Contact details:	Tel: 01604 366638 Fax: 01604 366065 Email: gpwatson@northamptonshire.gov.uk
Background Papers:	
Does the report propose a key decision is taken?	NO
If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan?	NO
Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here	NO
Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework?	NO
Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)? Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Capital Asset Investment Group (CAIG)	No. There are none relevant to this matter. Name of SFM: N/A N/A
Has the report been cleared by the relevant Corporate Director or ACE?	NO but cleared by Assistant Director Environment and Planning Name of Director:
Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted?	NO Cabinet Member:
Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted?	NO Scrutiny Committee:
Has the report been cleared by Legal Services?	NO Name of solicitor: Solicitor's comments:
Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?	N/A Name of officer:
Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out in relation to this report?	NO. There are no equal opportunity implications.
Are there any community safety implications?	NO
Are there any environmental implications:	YES. These are considered in the report.
Are there any Health & Safety Implications:	NO
Are there any Human Resources Implications:	NO
Are there any human rights implications:	NO
Constituency Interest:	NCC: Prebendal