

**DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE WASTE CORE STRATEGY  
BIG CHOICES  
ISSUES STAGE**

**REPORT OF CONSULTATION**

**MARCH 2011**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>Page</b>
Introduction	3
Consultation Methods Used	3
The Big Choices Report and background papers	4
Responses received	5
Responses to Big Choice A: More treatment, less landfill	6
Responses to Big Choice B: The pattern of development	7
Responses to Big Choice C: Urban or rural	9
Responses to Big Choice D: Promoting Derby and Derbyshire	11
Responses to Big Choice E: Local challenges	13
Responses to Question 1: Criteria for selecting sites	14
Responses to Questions 2 & 3: Expansion of existing sites	14
Responses to Question 4: Future waste management sites	15
Responses to Question 5: What else?	16
Other comments	17

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Derby and Derbyshire Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document will be a planning policy document that will guide the scale and locations of waste management developments in Derby and Derbyshire to 2030 and beyond.

The Derby and Derbyshire Joint Advisory Committee met on 27 November 2009 to consider a draft issues report (entitled “Big Choices”) for the Waste Core Strategy. Members made a number of suggestions and these were incorporated into the final Big Choices Report.

### **Involvement of the public**

We published the Big Choices Report for a period of public involvement between February and August 2010. We consulted widely, using a number of techniques to ensure as many people as possible were aware of the process.

### **Consultation Methods**

#### **Direct Mail**

At the start of the public involvement initiative, we sent out 736 emails and letters, comprising;

- 325 to councils including Derbyshire parish and district councils and neighbouring parish and district councils.
- 411 to people who had previously expressed an interest in waste planning and to other interested parties, including private individuals, businesses and interest groups.

We also informed by email the 64 County Councillors and the 51 City Council Councillors, in advance of the consultation.

During the consultation period, we sent, to a wide range of interested people, 76 sets of the consultation documents.

#### **Website**

Big Choices was on the councils’ websites, available to download, throughout the consultation period. The Big Choices page had 1568 hits, of which 612 read or downloaded the documents.

#### **Newspaper Articles**

We sent press releases to newspapers and other media across the county and an item was included in “Derbyshire First”. They were followed by in-depth articles and interviews in the press and on radio.

#### **Posters**

We displayed posters in all the city and county libraries and in the public offices of the county, city and district councils.

We invited all the parish councils to place posters on parish notice boards.

We sent posters to each of the 54 largest supermarkets in Derbyshire with a request for them to be displayed in their public areas.

We invited the members of the Derbyshire community forums to display posters locally and we put posters on notice boards across Derby City.

### **Community Forums & Local Area Forums**

We asked the members of the Derbyshire community forums and the Derby local area forums to make local people aware of the public involvement initiative and distribute the documents.

### **Citizens' Panel**

In February 2010, we informed the 9000 members of the Derbyshire citizens' panel about Big Choices and, as a consequence, over 900 citizens expressed an interest in seeing the consultation documents and having an opportunity to get involved.

### **Social Media**

We placed a message on the Derbyshire County Council Twitter Page informing people of the beginning of the consultation. At the time, the Derbyshire County Council page had more than 1,000 followers.

### **The consultation period**

We originally planned to run the consultation period for nine weeks, from February to April but in effect it continued until August. The reasons included:

- Some councils could not process their comments within the initial period and sought extensions of time.
- The timing of community forum meetings across the county meant that some did not meet until late March or April and so their members were not in a position to respond within the nine weeks.
- After the consultation period had started, there were requests for Big Choices to be translated into Polish, Urdu and Punjabi. There was considerable time taken in the process of procuring translations and allowing those to whom we sent them to respond.

Those elements are likely to recur when we initiate future public involvement initiatives.

### **The Big Choices Report and background papers**

The Big Choices Report explained that the councils are jointly preparing a core strategy and discussed a number of issues which waste planning and the core strategy must address. It asked people to comment on five of those issues (Big Choices A-E). It also asked five further questions, the first four of which were about identifying sites for waste management development. The fifth question invited people to mention any other concerns that they might have about waste management.

With the Big Choices Report, there were two background papers. One discussed the question of need – how do we calculate what further provision of waste management

facilities will be needed in the period to 2030? The paper drafted an assessment of need based on the data currently available to local authorities. The other background paper described a wide range of different types of waste management facility and highlighted the main impacts that each type may have on the local environment.

## **RESPONSES RECEIVED**

We received 424 responses to the Big Choices initiative. Respondents included local businesses, district and parish councils, local interest groups and major waste firms. There were many comments from individuals responding on their own behalf (in this paper, they are called “members of the public”).

The responses, including 202 responses from people who are concerned about incineration in Derby, and 30 responses from people who are concerned about incineration in Chesterfield, are summarised in the following pages of this report.

The summaries analyse the responses to each Big Choice in the order in which the Choices were set out in the Report. Some of the responses were complex and offered a range of ideas and opinions and some respondents did not directly answer the questions. The summaries seek to provide a true flavour and not just a numerical record of those who directly answered the questions and the figures included in the summaries do not always total 424. They indicate levels of support for particular options and include many of the comments made by respondents. They will inform further public involvement initiatives.

## **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE BIG CHOICES REPORT**

### **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO BIG CHOICE A**

#### **BIG CHOICE A      MORE TREATMENT, LESS LANDFILL**

Big Choices said:

There are government targets which set minimum levels of composting, recycling and other forms of treatment of waste. The residual waste (that which the targets do not require to be treated) may be landfilled. However, it does not have to be landfilled. We could plan for higher levels of treatment, which would postpone the need to find more landfill space and would agree with the waste hierarchy. But it may be unrealistic to expect so much new treatment capacity to be built so soon.

Big Choices asked:

What proportions of recycling & composting and other forms of treatment should the plan aim for?

Option 1 is “Aim for the minimum regional and government targets and those recently achieved for recycling, composting and recovery of value.”

Option 2 is “Aim for higher levels of recycling & composting and other forms of treatment.”

Seven respondents supported Option 1. 304 were in support of Option 2, although more than 200 of those qualified their choice by adding that the “other forms of treatment” should not include incineration or gasification and/or any form of thermal treatment.

Some responses suggested alternative options, the majority of these urging the Councils to strive for a zero waste or zero residual waste policy.

There were fewer respondents than expected from the localities which are close to the landfill sites of Erin and Arden, so we did not receive strong messages about local people’s current opinions of those sites.

However, opposition to continuation of the reliance on landfill was expressed by those whose homes are distant from the current landfill sites. There was a clear sense of citizens expressing a desire for less waste, more recycling and composting and less landfill. Some pointed out that landfill can be beneficial in some circumstances: that it can assist with the restoration of derelict or disused land and that, for plastics disposal, landfill may be a better solution than incineration.

Other comments included:

- Big Choice A is badly worded because it does not explain “recovery of value” and “other forms of treatment”.
- There should have been a separate Choice asking about thermal treatment.

## **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO BIG CHOICE B**

### **BIG CHOICE B      THE PATTERN OF DEVELOPMENT**

Big Choices said:

There will always be some small-scale waste management developments, to provide waste transfer facilities and to service particular local needs. For example, the government is keen on anaerobic digestion, which can be viable at quite small sizes on farms and sewage works. Indeed, it may be possible for most waste management development to be local, with a large number of small-scale treatment facilities processing most of the waste. Local provision may provide a sustainable pattern which reduces the waste management industry's carbon footprint but may not be practicable because it may lack the economies of scale that large facilities may offer – and the economics of development is a crucial factor for the waste management industry. Whilst the plan should guide the waste management industry towards a sustainable pattern of development, it should not be trying to limit the industry to any particular technology that may become out-dated during the plan period. So, whatever pattern of facilities the plan proposes, it must not be too prescriptive.

Big Choices asked:

What should be the overall pattern of waste management facilities in the plan area?

Option 1 is “A few, large facilities, mainly in the Derby and Chesterfield areas, with various transfer stations serving them.”

Option 2 is “A more diverse pattern, with local areas taking responsibility for their waste.”

Thirty-four respondents, most of them being members of the public, supported Option 1. 75 were in favour of Option 2. Most respondents did not select either option and many suggested a combination of the two options

The advantages of Option 1 were seen as being economies of scale and that most of Derby and Derbyshire's waste comes from urban areas.

Supporters of Option 2 were predominantly members of the public but there was also support from parish councils and waste firms. A number of supporters of this Option said, “Every single community is responsible for creating waste and therefore each community needs to take responsibility for waste disposal. People need to be fully engaged in this and understand their responsibilities.” They suggested that this could be assisted by a rewards scheme such as the recycle bank option. They made the plea that disadvantaged communities should not be overburdened with waste facilities by targeting waste disposal in these areas.

There is evidence in their replies that some of the respondents, when talking about local responsibility, were thinking mainly or solely of household waste. But household waste is only about 10% of all waste. The comments that clearly related to household waste or waste collections are being considered by the Derbyshire councils in the context of their waste management responsibilities.

Chesterfield Borough Council support the approach outlined in Option 1, i.e. fewer, larger facilities, but would be opposed to a strategy which focused on treatment plants in Derby and Chesterfield to serve the whole county. This is because waste is generated from across the county which, the Borough Council says, should be

reflected in the distribution of facilities. The council consider it more appropriate to develop a strategy around key transport corridors, such as the M1 and A38 where access from the rest of the county would be most convenient and cause least disruption to local communities.

Other comments included:

- There should be a combination of Big Choices Options 1 & 2, with large facilities in larger centres and a network of smaller local facilities.
- There should be facilities in Derby and Chesterfield for general waste with smaller local facilities for recyclable and local waste.
- The Core Strategy should reflect the regional plan with larger settlements outside of the Park accommodating small scale facilities (comment by the Peak District National Park Authority).
- The pattern of facilities should reflect the distribution of the population and pattern of waste arisings for the individual waste streams (comment by a waste company).



## **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO BIG CHOICE C**

### **BIG CHOICE C      URBAN OR RURAL**

Big Choices said:

All types of waste management development have environmental impacts, particularly if not well designed and run. On the other hand, many carry out their business in urban areas and raise few complaints from neighbouring firms or homes. There are no government policies that require development to be located in towns. Such locations are usually more sustainable for all types of development and most waste comes from those areas. However, the development of large waste management facilities in areas where population densities are high can cause much anxiety for the people who live and work near them and, if there are adverse impacts, they will affect more people. Rural locations may be remote from the sources of the waste, with greater travel distances adding to climate change, and may result in more lorries on country roads. However, rural locations might reduce the anxieties and avoid adverse impacts on people's homes and workplaces.

Big Choices asked:

Should the plan aim for some new facilities to be in rural areas? If so, what types of facilities?

Option 1 is "Yes. As many types as possible, to minimise impacts on peoples' homes and workplaces."

Option 2 is "Yes, but restricted to the types of facility that can comfortably be accommodated amongst or near farm or other rural buildings."

Option 3 is "No. The plan should protect the countryside from the impacts of waste developments."

The support for Option 1 (17 responses) was relatively evenly split between members of the public, waste firms and parish councils. A majority of responses (66 people) was in favour of Option 2. Composting and anaerobic digestion were particularly referred to. A comment made in response to both Options 1 and 2 was that waste is everyone's problem and that rural communities cannot expect their waste to be imported into urban areas. Option 3 gained the support of 24 respondents, particular concerns being with transport and traffic impacts.

Alternatives put forward included combinations of Options 1 and 2 and of 1 and 3.

Other comments included:

- There are many different types of wastes and some sites can only cope with certain wastes.
- The requirement for smaller facilities could be publicised such that rural communities can offer a business plan to accommodate them to gain the benefits which would result.
- Composting and anaerobic digestion could assist with farm diversification.
- In some cases, rural locations could reduce transport and CO2 production.
- There should be environmentally friendly options.
- Brownfield sites in rural areas, for example mines, quarries and industrial sites should be used.

- The pattern of facilities should reflect the distribution of the population and pattern of waste arisings for the individual waste streams (comment from a waste company).
- Option 2 should include sites that could be adequately design and screened.
- As we have not had an incinerator in Derby since [the former] WRG we do not need one now especially since waste arisings are falling.

## **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO BIG CHOICE D**

### **BIG CHOICE D      PROMOTING DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE**

Big Choices said:

There are advantages in promoting a vibrant waste industry. They include attracting modern technologies to the area and also opportunities for manual employment. The plan might try to capitalise on the potential economic benefits which the waste management industry can offer to Derby and Derbyshire. Perhaps it might put forward proposals for specialist technological sites or resource recovery parks, which may bring benefits not just to the waste industry but to the wider economy of the plan area.

Big Choices asked:

Big Choice D: Should the plan try positively to attract waste management firms to Derby and Derbyshire, for example by providing for the development of specialist technological sites or resource recovery parks?

Option 1 is “Yes, as much as possible.”

Option 2 is “Yes but not to the extent that it would make Derby and Derbyshire a net importer of waste.”

Option 3 is “No, because any economic benefits would be outweighed by the problems it would bring.”

Option 1 received the lowest level of support (16 people). Waste firms constituted about a third of the support. The support for Options 2 and 3, predominantly from members of the public, was more or less equal (45 for Option 2 and 42 for Option 3).

The reasons for the support for Option 1 were largely socio-economic – attracting waste management firms would lead to additional jobs and money in the local economy.

In relation to Option 2, the comments included that there was potential to introduce innovative, clean technologies putting Derbyshire at the forefront of the field.

The concerns raised in support of Option 3 included:

- Positively attracting waste management firms would not increase recycling rates.
- Attracting more waste management firms would potentially lead to environmental damage and negative health impacts.
- The presence of such facilities would deter other higher added-value and higher skilled investment.
- The benefits are killed off by incineration.
- Before any consideration is given to attracting waste companies, there should be clarity about the overall strategy and sense of direction the people of Derbyshire wish to pursue. The waste industry companies should only be engaged once the gaps in waste treatment and therefore the need are clear.
- The level of opposition to a “Sheepbridge Resource Park” demonstrates the negative economic consequences from locating the type of ‘resource park’ proposed next to incompatible businesses.

References were made to the potential for cross boundary provision, which, according to some consultees, means that there is not a clear need for facilities in Derbyshire. For example, it was said that the waste treatment facility in Sheffield is importing waste

from North East Derbyshire and there may be a similar option in the south of the county. Particularly in relation to certain types of waste and larger facilities, there should be cross boundary provision, potentially limited to industrial areas just over the county boundary.

Other responses included:

- Waste should be dealt with locally.
- Larger facilities may have disadvantages which would outweigh any advantages.
- Creating jobs in the waste industry could help raise its profile and make it a more attractive career option.
- Derby should promote renewable energy to provide a self sufficient industrial area to generate interest in the area drawing in new environmental industries.
- Greater support should be given to private enterprise in helping to find suitable sites and backing them when they find one, in that most entrepreneurial companies will not want to deal with local opposition and leave the problem of finding sites to the authorities.

## **SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO BIG CHOICE E**

### **BIG CHOICE E**

### **LOCAL CHALLENGES**

Big Choices said:

In some parts of the plan area, it will be difficult or impossible to provide sufficient landfill space or processing facilities. The difficulties may be greatest in the North-Western Derbyshire and City and Southern Derbyshire areas. To avoid impacts on the Peak District National Park, North-Western Derbyshire should, preferably, have only small-scale processing facilities serving the area's needs. In City and Southern Derbyshire there may be a major and perhaps impossible challenge to find sufficient landfill space.

Big Choices asked:

How and where should the plan make the necessary provision to address the local challenges?

Option 1 is "Despite the challenges, make the provision locally."

Option 2 is "Rely on other areas to make the provision."

Option 3 is "For City and Southern Derbyshire, plan for enough treatment facilities to deal with more waste than is produced in this part of the plan area."

Option 4 is "For North-Western Derbyshire, plan for enough landfill provision to take more waste than is produced in this part of the plan area."

The option with the greatest degree of support was Option 1, with 54 respondents supporting it. They were predominantly members of the public but there was notable support from waste firms.

Option 2 received very little support, being from six members of the public and a waste firm, which said that, owing to the presence of the very large Erin void (near Markham Vale), it is not necessary to find new additional landfill.

15 respondents, mainly members of the public, supported Option 3. More than twice as many expressed disagreement with this option and suggested that each area should deal with its own waste.

Only three respondents supported Option 4. Comments included:

- Landfill should be the last resort.
- There are potential highways/transport problems.
- Each area should deal with its own waste.

Alternatives suggested included a combination of different options including, combinations of Options 1 and 2 and of Options 2 and 3. The support for a combination of Options 1 and 2, which seem to oppose each other, is from respondents who considered that small scale facilities can serve their locality with, where necessary, larger facilities being developed to serve a wider area.

Other comments included:

- Facilities should not be built in the National Park.
- The National Park can absorb sensitively designed facilities.

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

At the end of the Big Choices Report were five additional questions.

### QUESTION 1 CRITERIA FOR SELECTING SITES

#### **Big Choices said:**

In its Planning Policy Statement on “Planning for Sustainable Waste Management”, the government has made a list of the things that planners should consider when planning for waste sites. Perhaps you have views as to what the locational guidance should be.

#### **Big Choices asked:**

**Q.1 Are there any particular locational considerations which you think are especially important when planning for waste sites?**

Approximately one third of the respondents addressed this question, including eight waste firms, five parishes and four other councils. Whilst some of the answers simply repeated elements of the government’s Planning Policy Statement guidance, there were some interesting suggestions, with one respondent saying that NIMBYism would kill off most sites and so the councils should grasp every possible location.

One opinion was that cumulative impacts should be considered – areas that have experienced long-standing waste facilities should not have to endure new ones – although the counterview was put, that such areas might benefit from the regeneration that new waste development might bring.

The most consistently expressed concerns related to traffic impacts and the criterion that sites should be near major roads and transport interchanges.

Other locational considerations included:

- Sites should be camouflaged – “out of sight, out of mind” (suggestion by a parish council).
- Potential for the co-location of waste and related firms, through the provision of resource parks, and development adjacent to existing waste sites.
- Potential for connection to the national grid.
- Groups of parishes could cater for [some of] their own waste if sites were located centrally to a particular area (suggestion by an environmental group).

### QUESTIONS 2 & 3 EXPANSION OF EXISTING SITES

#### **Big Choices said:**

The plan might encourage the expansion of existing waste management sites. Expansion will not always result in greater impacts on the locality. Sometimes it can enable a site to have modern buildings and to operate more efficiently and, for example, quietly.

#### **Big Choices asked:**

**Q. 2 Do you know of any existing sites which you think should not be allowed to expand? If so, why should they not be allowed to expand?**

**Q. 3 Do you know of any existing sites which you think should be allowed to expand? If so, would you like to see the site improved and how?**

Respondents named nine sites which they thought should not be allowed to expand and 13 sites which should be. Some sites appear in both categories.

Those which should not be allowed to expand:

Melandra, Glossop, High Peak.  
Cammac, Sheepbridge, Chesterfield  
Erin Void, Chesterfield  
Aggregate Industries site, Hulland Ward, Derbyshire Dales  
Vital Earth, Ashbourne, Derbyshire Dales  
Corbriggs, North East Derbyshire  
Spondon, Derby  
Raynesway, Derby  
Grove Farm Tip, Stanton, Erewash.

One respondent said that no landfill sites should be extended because they are hazardous to health, with a number saying that no incinerators should be extended for the same reason.

Those which should be allowed to expand:

Waterswallows, Buxton, High Peak  
Erin Void, Chesterfield  
Peak Waste, Kniveton, Derbyshire Dales  
Ryder Point, Derbyshire Dales (for glass recycling)  
Hopton Wood quarry, Derbyshire Dales  
Ashbourne household waste site, Derbyshire Dales  
Slittingmill, Renishaw, North East Derbyshire  
Coalite, Buttermilk Lane, Bolsover  
Palterton, Bolsover  
Loscoe household waste site, Amber Valley  
Raynesway, Derby  
Swarkestone Quarry, South Derbyshire  
Albion Void, Leicestershire (to serve Derbyshire south of River Trent).

It was also suggested that sites that require a high capital outlay should be allowed to expand to their maximum throughput. Four of the above sites are or include county council sites (Ashbourne, Loscoe, Buttermilk Lane and Waterswallows [described by a respondent as “an excellent example”]).

## **QUESTION 4      FUTURE WASTE MANAGEMENT SITES**

### **Big Choices said:**

The plan might identify some crucial sites or areas for waste management development. “Crucial” sites will be those which the plan will need to identify in order to show that enough treatment or landfill sites can be provided in Derby and Derbyshire. They will mainly be for the facilities that will be essential for treating large quantities of industrial and commercial waste.

### **Big Choices asked:**

Q. 4 Do you know of any sites or areas which would be suitable for the essential development described above?

Respondents named 25 sites, some of which duplicate suggestions made under Question 3.

Turnlea Road, Glossop, High Peak  
Bowden Lane, Chapel, High Peak  
Newtown station yard, High Peak  
Bingswood, Whaley Bridge, High Peak  
Phoenix Brick, Chesterfield  
Markham, Chesterfield  
Pearsons pottery site, Chesterfield  
Middleton Mine, Derbyshire Dales (for sorting/recycling)  
Ashbourne airfield, Derbyshire Dales  
Heathcote Quarry, Derbyshire Dales/Peak District National Park  
Alfreton (north of, adj. sewage works), North East Derbyshire & Amber Valley  
Slittingmill, Renishaw, North East Derbyshire  
Coalite, Bolsover  
Oxcroft disposal point, Bolsover  
Doe Lea, Bolsover  
Coxbench Quarry, Amber Valley  
Tarmac, Mugginton, Amber Valley  
Raynesway Derby  
Stanton, Erewash  
Willington Quarry, South Derbyshire  
Staveley Works site  
Tetron Point, Swadlincote  
Albion Void, Leicestershire  
Gravel lagoons off M1, Leicestershire  
Wasteland near A610, Giltbrook, Nottinghamshire

Other suggestions included the use of quarries, disused mine shafts, roadside farms and industrial estates in Chesterfield and Derby.

## **QUESTION 5      WHAT ELSE?**

Big Choices said:

Words such as “waste”, “waste management”, “recycling”, “energy from waste” can raise a lot of issues in people’s minds. You may have concerns or interests relating to waste which we cannot address in this waste plan. Nevertheless, you may consider that the county or city council or the government should in some way be addressing them.

Big Choices asked:

Do you have other concerns or interests relating to waste development or waste management? What do you think we should be doing about them?

Some of the replies related specifically to waste management responsibilities. Where necessary, we have passed them to the relevant council or department to respond to them.

The other comments in response to this question are summarised in the next section of this report.



## OTHER COMMENTS

Two respondents made specific criticisms of the background paper, “Assessment of need for waste treatment and disposal capacity in Derbyshire, 2009/10 – 2029/30”. In summary, the comments were:

1. In order for the waste core strategy to be ‘sound’ it needs to be based on a robust and credible evidence base. To meet this requirement more detailed information needs to be included in the ‘Assessment of Need’ evidence paper. In particular, data needs to be collected on waste arisings and their management for the following individual waste streams: Municipal Solid Waste, Commercial and Industrial waste, Construction and Demolition waste, Agricultural and Hazardous wastes.
2. The baseline data and growth rates used to forecast MSW arisings in the ‘Assessment of Need’ paper are ‘out of date’ and do not take into account what has happened in reality. Furthermore, they fail to account of the impact that increases in the rate of landfill tax will have on the amount of MSW forecast to be landfilled. Additionally, the ‘Assessment of Needs’ paper ignores the Environment Agency’s annual regional waste statistics for 2008, which appear to show a much lower landfill rate for Household, Industrial and Commercial waste, 223,000 tonnes, than set out in the ‘Assessment of Need’ paper.

The Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) made a number of comments, including:

- As waste development is ‘major’ in terms of its statutory definition, national policy is that it should not be permitted in the National Park except in exceptional circumstances.
- The former regional plan policy which looked to the surrounding urban areas to meet the needs of the waste arising from within the National Park was soundly based on the local distinctiveness of the Park and the presence of nearby urban areas.
- Provision should be made in the Derby and Derbyshire waste core strategy to deal with Derbyshire’s waste arisings including those from the part of the National Park that lies within the County.
- The scale, type and nature of any facilities being permitted in areas close to the National Park, would need great care to be taken to respect the landscape and visual setting of the National Park.
- Large-scale development in north western Derbyshire could cause a material increase in cross-park traffic movements.

The majority of the 202 respondents concerned about incineration in Derby included the following in their response: Object to incineration plans being foisted on the community, especially those who don’t produce the waste in the first place. Derby is proposed to house the incinerator which will burn the rest of Derbyshire’s waste despite us having better recycling rates than other Derbyshire regions – why aren’t they improving? Why are authorities espousing incineration by funding the planning appeal? Incineration interferes with recycling because of a contract to provide as much waste as possible. There should not be thermal treatment of any sort. There should be weekly brown and blue bin collections and more waste reduction education.

The 30 respondents concerned about incineration in Chesterfield included the following in their response: Urge DCC to strive for a zero residual waste policy, a realistic goal that is based on a number of initiatives, including maximising recycling

rates, composting and anaerobic digestion but not any form of incineration or gasification. Every single community is responsible for creating waste and therefore each community needs to take responsibility for waste disposal. People need to be fully engaged in this and understand their responsibilities. This could be assisted by a rewards scheme such as the recycle bank option. A comprehensive range of recycling based facilities needs to be available to businesses. Would urge DCC not to overburden already disadvantaged communities with waste facilities by targeting waste disposal in these areas. Rural communities cannot expect their waste to be imported into urban communities. Composting and anaerobic digestion, for example, would make good sense in rural communities on existing farms and farmland; in addition this would provide additional revenue for local farmers wishing to diversify.

Comments by other respondents included:

- Agree with the city and county councils, which have already thought the process through.
- Big Choices as “a very informative document”.
- The information should be made more widely available to stimulate households and businesses to become more interested and treat waste and recycling more seriously.
- The consultation was not widely promoted in Derby, a document of this magnitude requiring far greater promotion.
- More information on the costs of the technologies should have been provided to help people give answers.
- Should ban plastic bags at shops for fruit and vegetables and plastic carrier bags and engage further with food producers to produce more realistically sized food portions ... in this age of obesity and ensuing health problems this must be made a top priority.
- General support for increased recycling with suggestions for greater promotion and of ‘carrot and stick’ methods of increasing it, including rewarding local communities for recycling to imposing penalties for not separating waste to minimise processing required.
- Waste facilities should be designed to cope with the future volume of waste over the next twenty years and should include facilities for commercial, municipal and industrial wastes (comment of an adjoining waste disposal authority).
- Whilst acknowledging that each district should be responsible for the waste it generates, there should be consideration of reciprocity with regards to future proposals for waste facilities which can take waste across boundaries (comment of a Derbyshire district council).
- The concept that materials are not waste and that they are raw materials that can be processed for use should be promoted. There are many preconceptions about waste that affect the attitude towards the industry as a whole (comment of a waste firm).
- Incineration, with district heating, should replace landfill.
- Incineration might be necessary for some wastes but it should be the last option for most, especially food waste due to its higher water content.
- Big Choices is being deceptive employing phrases such as “thermal treatment”, “energy from waste” and “other forms of recovery” when it really means “incineration”.
- To achieve higher recycling, composting and treatment rates there is still an essential role for landfill, to deal with residual wastes after all other processes have been exhausted. This is particularly so in respect of industrial and commercial wastes if industry and the local economy is to prosper (comment of a waste firm).

- Waste could be stored above ground level in colliery spoil heaps, with landfill sites being used for water storage to help with shortages.
- Waste facilities could be sited in areas near gaols and the prisoners used as staff.
- “Clustering” facilities in one area turns it into a ‘muck heap’.
- The Peak District National Park should provide sustainable facilities within its boundary for its residents as the adjoining (and equally as nice!) areas have to.