



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB
Telephone 01453 766321 • Facsimile 01453 750932
www.stroud.gov.uk

Agenda
Item

4

Members of the Public's Questions to Environment Committee

Questions from Gareth Robins

On the official Stroud District Council Twitter Account a Tweet dated 02/07/2019 stated "Stroud District Council leaders oppose waste from our district being burnt at the new Javelin Park incinerator 'thumbs down emoji' ". I responded to this tweet various times asking the following questions but have been constantly ignored, so am asking via this more formal route.

1. Could you confirm if the appropriate waste from Stroud District will be sent to the Incinerator?

Reply

Residual waste collected by the District Council is currently being delivered to the incinerator as this is where the County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority, directs the District Council to send it.

Waste collection and disposal responsibilities are provided for in the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and are referred to respectively in relation to Waste Collection Authorities (WCA) and Waste Disposal Authorities (WDA).

Section 30 (3) of the Act provides that, in England, a District Council is a Waste Collection Authority. The duties for a WCA are set out (materially) in Section 45 which states that:
"1) It shall be the duty of each waste collection authority—
(a) to arrange for the collection of household waste in its area"

Section 30 of the Act also stipulates that a County Council - in this case Gloucestershire County Council - is a Waste Disposal Authority.

Section 48 sets out the duties of the WCA which are, that it must deliver the waste collected for disposal to such places as the WDA directs.

This is replicated in Section 51 (4) (a). This duty does not apply to household waste or commercial waste for which the WCA decides to make arrangements for recycling.

However, since the incinerator started operating, there have been a number of problems and for the period from 5th to 23rd August 2019, residual waste was delivered to Smith's Gloucester Limited and then sent to landfill.

2. If you don't send the waste to the incinerator what would the proposed or actual alternative be?

Reply

At the Development Control Committee on the 24th April 2012 the District Council raised a number of objections to the incinerator at Javelin Park including:-

'More efficient means of advanced thermal treatment are available which provide for a lower environmental impact, can be part of a dispersed solution and are scalable.'

Following the refusal of the planning application by the County Council's Development Control Committee on the 21st March 2013, a planning appeal commenced in late 2013. The District Council's case in opposition to Javelin Park identified that there was harm to the rural landscape, the character of the nearby Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and that it would impede the delivery and quality of the Hunts Grove strategic housing allocation. In making its detailed case the District Council was of the view that the harm identified was not mitigated by the need for, nor the type of the proposed energy from the waste facility - large scale incineration.

In November 2012 the site was identified amongst others in GCC's Waste Core Strategy for 'strategic waste management facilities'. The strategy identified that the technical solutions would need to be a matter for evaluation by the Waste Disposal Authority (the County Council) through the residual waste contract process. Uses which would have been compliant with the Waste Core Strategy would have included technologies for the pre-sorting of waste prior to residual treatment, anaerobic digestion or a more efficient means of thermal treatment.

The District Council's case at the appeal, accepted that the thermal treatment of residual waste was likely to be necessary (and SDC's expert witnesses expressed this view) but it was first necessary to pre-sort waste in order to remove recyclable and biogenic content for anaerobic digestion. The unrecoverable element should then be considered as a fuel where it would be transported to a location where its combustion would displace fossil fuelled sources in a facility optimised for energy efficiency and not waste disposal. This option would have generated less CO₂ than the new facility.

As the Council has consistently advocated, the focus has to be on moving waste up the waste hierarchy from disposal and inefficient means of recovery towards prevention, reuse and recycling.