



Sustainability appraisal of the Bedfordshire & Luton Waste Development Plan Documents

Report of Issues and Options Consultation

ENVIRON®

December 2007

Bedfordshire County Council Report of Issues and Options Consultation


A report by **CAG Consultants** as part of the ENVIRON / CAG / MVA consortium

December 2007

CAG CONSULTANTS
Gordon House
6 Lissenden Gardens
London NW5 1LX
Tel/fax 020 7482 8882
hq@cagconsult.co.uk
www.cagconsultants.co.uk

for direct enquiries about this report please contact:

Tim Maiden
CAG Consultants
8 Broxholm Road
Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE6 5RL
tm@cagconsult.co.uk



Contents

Contents	1
1. Introduction	2
1.1 Purpose of the consultation	2
1.2 Stakeholder workshop	2
1.2.1 Stakeholders	3
1.3 Public workshops	4
2. Findings	7
2.1 Stakeholder workshop	7
2.1.1 Which targets are appropriate for use in projecting waste arisings for the plan period?	7
2.1.2 Approach to site allocations	8
2.1.3 Capacity extensions	8
2.1.4 Site appraisal	9
2.2 Public workshops	18
3. Next steps	28
Appendix A: List of sites	29
Appendix B: Map of sites	33

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the consultation

Bedfordshire County Council and Luton Borough Council are producing a new plan for minerals and waste, known as the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF).

The government require a sustainability appraisal of the MWDF to be carried out, and the appraisal process is central to the process of preparing the plan. It involves testing the framework against an agreed set of economic, social and environmental criteria throughout the preparation process. A wide range of stakeholders were involved in the scoping phase of the appraisal, which enabled us to identify what these criteria should be. The next stage of the process (Issues and Options) involves using the criteria to test the key options for two of the key parts of the MWDF - the Waste Core Strategy and the Site Allocations document. The purpose of the consultation was to facilitate input from key stakeholders and the public into this process, through involving them in the appraisal of key waste planning policy options and potential new sites for waste management in the County.

The consultation carried out during this stage of the sustainability appraisal consisted of a workshop for key stakeholders and four public workshops.

If you have any comments on the issues covered in this report, please send them to:

Tim Maiden
CAG Consultants
8 Broxholm Road
Newcastle upon Tyne NE6 5RL
tm@cagconsult.co.uk

1.2 Stakeholder workshop

This facilitated appraisal workshop provided representatives from key stakeholder organisations the opportunity to input into the appraisal of key policy options and proposed new sites for waste management. The workshop involved a mix of plenary discussion of key policy issues and options, and small group work on the appraisal of proposed sites for mineral extraction.



1.2.1 Stakeholders

A list of key stakeholders was drawn up for the purposes of this stage of the consultation, all of whom were invited to the stakeholder workshop. The list consisted of:

- representatives from various teams and departments at Bedfordshire County Council, including Heritage and Environment, Strategic Planning and Transport, Regeneration and Sustainability, Economic Development and Access Development;
- representatives from various departments of Luton Borough Council;
- representatives from Bedford Borough Council, Mid-Bedfordshire District Council and South Bedfordshire District Council;
- representatives from the following statutory and other public agencies
 - English Heritage
 - Natural England
 - The Environment Agency
 - Government Office for the East of England
 - The Highways Agency
 - East of England Development Agency
 - East of England Regional Assembly
 - Bedfordshire Heartlands Primary Care Trust;
- the chairs of the five Local Strategic Partnerships in Bedfordshire;
- representatives of the British Aggregates Association, Quarry Products Association, Environmental Services Association and Chartered Institute of Waste Management; and
- representatives of the following non-governmental organisations
 - Friends of the Earth
 - Council for the Protection of Rural England
 - Bedfordshire Wildlife Trust
 - Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity
 - Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.

The following people attended the stakeholder workshop on Thursday 1 November 2007:

- Robert Asquith, Waste Recycling Group Ltd
- Donald Bowler, Regeneration, Luton BC
- Kay Champion, Environment Agency



- John Comont, Ecology, Bedfordshire CC
- Simon Deards, Beds Freight Strategy, Bedfordshire CC
- Benjamin Finlayson, Waste Services Team, Bedfordshire CC
- Robert Firbank, Dunstable Waste Group
- Sue Frost, LDF Team, Mid Beds DC
- Stuart Harrison, Countryside Access Service, Bedfordshire CC
- Ali Hines, South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth
- Mike Hitchcock, Forest of Marston Vale
- Adam Ireland, Environment Agency
- Laurie Jackson, Bedfordshire Wildlife Trust
- Melanie MacLeod, Transport Planning, Bedfordshire CC
- Stephen Mooring, Sustainability Team, Bedfordshire CC
- Peter Mulvihill, Environmental Services, Luton BC
- Martin Oake, Archaeology, Bedfordshire CC
- David Oakley-Hill, Luton Friends of the Earth
- Anita Taylor, Minerals & Waste, Bedfordshire CC
- Martin Tidy, Planning, Bedford BC
- Martin Towlson, Council for the Protection of Rural England
- Georgina Toye, Minerals & Waste, Bedfordshire CC
- Anna Wlodarczyk, Luton Borough Council

1.3 Public workshops

Alongside the formal consultation on the Council's Issues and Options report, four public consultation workshops were held. The workshops were targeted on those parts of the County where proposed new sites are concentrated, whilst also ensuring a good geographic spread across the county. They were held in Bedford, Biggleswade, Dunstable and Stewartby.

An introduction to the Minerals and Waste Development Framework and the Sustainability Appraisal process was provided. This was followed by small group work in which attendees carried out appraisals of the proposed waste sites which they were most interested in.

For the purposes of all of the consultation workshops, the sites put forward for inclusion in the plan were divided in to the following geographic clusters:



1. Sites around and to the north of Bedford
2. Sites in the Lower Marston Vale
3. Sites in East Bedfordshire
4. Sites in South Bedfordshire

The table below includes the site numbers and name for all of the sites included in the Issues & Options consultation document. Appendix A provides further details of the proposals for each site and Appendix B contains a map showing their location. Maps and further details of individual sites can be found in part 2 of the Issues and Options Consultation Paper which can be viewed on the Bedfordshire County Council website (www.bedfordshire.gov.uk - Have Your Say - Consultations).

Clustering the sites helped make consultation on the sites manageable, since it allowed general comments to be made about the cluster areas whilst also providing scope for site-specific issues to be identified. All four clusters were analysed in the stakeholder workshop, whilst each of the public workshops focused on the cluster(s) most relevant to the area in which it was held.

Site No.	Site Name
01	Elstow North
02	Thorn Turn
03	Sundon Landfill
05	Dairy Farm, Renhold
06	Octagon Farm South
07	Black Cat
08	Sand House Quarry
09	Elstow Rail Depot
10	Willington Quarry
11	Stone Lane Quarry
12	New Trees Quarry
13	Brogborough
14	Stewartby
15	Arlesey
16	Elstow
17	Land off Woburn Road
18	Land off Bedford Road
19	Old British Rail Goods Yard
20	Manor Road
21	Cow Close
22	Landpark Wood Quarry
24	Herne Grange Farm
25	Etonbury Farm

Site No.	Site Name
26	Land at Brooklands Farm
27	Fox Corner Quarry
28	Twinwoods Airfield
29	Land opposite Wigney Wood
30	Winter Woods Farm
31	Stewartby Sidings and adjacent Land
32	Oakley Road
33	Chelveston Airfield
34	Rookery South
35	Quest
36	Kempston
37	Lysander Place
38	Goosey Lodge Farm
39	Lodge Farm
40	Arlesey Road
41	Haynes Composting Site
44	College Farm Salford
45	Lodge Farm Salford
46	Roxton Recycling Facility
47	Wood End, Marston

2. Findings

This section summarises the findings from the five workshops.

2.1 Stakeholder workshop

The first part of the stakeholder workshop involved a plenary discussion of three of the key issues identified in the Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options document. They were as follows:

1. Which targets are appropriate for use in projecting Waste Arisings for the Development Plan Period?
 - a) Waste Strategy 2007 Targets
 - b) Regional Waste Management Targets
 - c) Best Value Performance Indicators

If none of the above are appropriate, what do you suggest?
2. The Council intend to identify specific sites for strategic and large waste facilities and to use a criteria-based approach for all other sites. Do you agree with this approach?
3. Is it more desirable in principle to permit capacity extensions to existing sites or seek the identification of new sites?

The discussion of these issues is summarised in the following sections. **Please note that the views expressed are those of the stakeholders involved in the discussion. None of the facts put forward have been checked at this stage.**

2.1.1 Which targets are appropriate for use in projecting waste arisings for the plan period?

The key points made by the stakeholders in relation to this issue were:

- The Plan does not necessarily have to comply with regional targets, providing there is sufficient evidence to justify the approach.

- Bedfordshire & Luton local data may be more accurate. It was pointed out that the regional figures assume a blanket increase in waste arisings but local data shows a drop. A balance between regional and local projections may be most appropriate.
- It was suggested that we should not use the regional assumption that there will be an annual increase of 3% in waste arisings because of the impact of the Recycling Act. There is said to be lots of potential for recovery of different materials which may mean a considerable reduction and this should be reflected in the projections.
- The question of whether we should expect recycling rates to go down was raised. It was suggested that regional figures assume a 3% increase in household waste but reducing packaging, for example, has the potential to significantly reduce the recycling required.
- It was suggested that the BVPI targets should be discounted as they have already been exceeded.
- It was suggested that recycling and recovery figures should fit with the Waste Strategy 2007.

2.1.2 Approach to site allocations

The key points made by the stakeholders in relation to this issue were:

- The inclusion of strategic sites was seen to be important in terms of securing confidence in the process and attracting investment in sites. It was also suggested that this would enable a geographic approach which fits more closely with transport routes and other strategic considerations.
- However, it was also suggested that any criteria developed for the smaller sites should also be applied to the strategic sites. It was suggested that all proposals should be subject to the same criteria-based assessment since, particularly with changes in technology, the appropriateness or otherwise even of strategic sites may change over time.
- It was suggested that there may be a need for further cross-boundary cooperation to determine the need for strategic sites, whilst recognising the need to apply the proximity principle.

2.1.3 Capacity extensions

The key points made by the stakeholders in relation to this issue were:

- The principle of preferring capacity extensions over new sites was supported by some stakeholders on the basis that these sites are likely to be best served by existing infrastructure.

- However, it was emphasised that there is a need for good management and effective enforcement of existing operations for such an approach to gain public confidence.
- Other stakeholders felt that a principle for preferring capacity extensions over new sites should not be established in the plan. Instead it was suggested that each site should be judged on its own merits and its current performance against set criteria.
- The use of the term 'capacity' extensions was considered to be misleading seen it is seen to suggest a bias towards landfill. 'Throughput' was suggested as a more appropriate term.

2.1.4 Site appraisal

In small groups, the stakeholders carried out appraisals of the four clusters, using a simplified version of the site appraisal framework set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The appraisal topics and objectives are shown in the tables below. For each cluster, the stakeholders were asked to consider:

- Is this topic a significant issue for this cluster and, if so, how significant?
- Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?

The discussion of these questions is summarised in the tables below. **Please note that the views expressed are those of the stakeholders involved in the discussion. None of the facts put forward have been checked at this stage.**

Cluster 1: Sites around and to the north of Bedford			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Biodiversity, flora & fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat creation & site biodiversity. Designated (e.g. SSSIs) & non-designated sites of importance. 	Yes, particularly linked to the River Great Ouse valley. The mineral sites once restored will also be significant. Woodland areas in the north are also of value.	Sites 5, 6 & 10 rich in biodiversity related to the river. Particular potential for growth of native species near the Great Ouse.
Archaeology & cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic character & designated & non-designated sites of importance. 	Yes, particularly in the sites to the east of Bedford where there are Scheduled Ancient Monuments.	Likely to be a major constraint in relation to sites 6, 10, 28 & 29. Small medieval settlement at site 29.
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape quality. Sensitive landscapes. Local recreation, access & biodiversity. 	Landscape access and amenity particular important in the River Ouse corridor – the water way is navigable and there are footpaths and a cycle way.	Sites 5 & 10 – potential impacts on Bedford River Valley Park 33 has landscape value and is a flat area so would be difficult to screen. The site is visible from the A6 38 – potential impacts on Bronham Country Way
Air quality, noise & human health & amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of pollution caused by waste management. Amenity & health impacts from waste operations. Provision of community services. 	No comments were made in relation to this topic	
Conservation & protection of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of resources in construction & use, particularly water & aggregates. Impacts on resources, such as water sources & valuable/sensitive soils & geology. Risks of flooding. 	Potentially significant impacts on water quality in Willington area – will depend on management. No Special Protection Zones that we are aware of.	Sites 4, 5, 6 & 10 are sensitive in terms of impacts on the water table. May also affect creation of Bedford River Valley Park. They also offer the potential to reduce the risk of flooding if restored (10 particularly).
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HGV movements, particularly those affecting communities, areas of environmental 	Yes, because many of the sites are remote, with poor quality access roads. None are accessible by rail.	5 & 10 – not on strategic highway, poor access 33 – poor access, vehicles would need to travel through several villages

Cluster 1: Sites around and to the north of Bedford			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> importance of local roads. • Shift from road freight to other forms of freight. • Mileage travelled per tonne. 		38 – poor access because of a deep cutting Salford area – roads inadequate 28 & 29 – vehicles would go through villages & dangerous junctions 32 – poor access
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting recycling & recovery targets. • Capacity to deal with waste. • Reduction of waste. 	Good management and enforcement essential for achieving truly sustainable approaches	33 – likely not to be used very much by Beds CC but would be by Northants.
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green house gas emissions. • Development of renewables & energy efficiency within waste sector. 		33 - this site could be used for wind power generation.
Education & employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people directly employed in waste industry. • Co-location of waste management facilities with other industries & impacts on existing/proposed employment areas. 	No comments were made in relation to this topic	

Cluster 2: Southern Marston Vale			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Biodiversity, flora & fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat creation & site biodiversity. • Designated (e.g. SSSIs) & non-designated sites of importance. 	Yes. As well as there being significant existing biodiversity value (including some European protected species), all of the former clay pits in the area have significant restoration potential. There are potential problems in terms of the fragmentation of habitats and green corridors.	20 – great crested newts present. 34 – County Wildlife Site and a crucial site in terms of birds and invertebrates. 47 – greenfield site adjacent to Marston Thrift SSSI

Cluster 2: Southern Marston Vale			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
		There are a number of water courses in the area which are likely to support valuable habitats	44 – potential for restoration 16 – County Wildlife Site 36 – parts of the site are of interest
Archaeology & cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic character & designated & non-designated sites of importance. 	<p>A large Energy from Waste plant could affect the general setting of the area.</p> <p>The cultural legacy of the brick works and other industries in the area is significant</p>	<p>35 - presence of dinosaur fossils in the area</p> <p>34 – impacts on Amptill House</p>
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape quality. • Sensitive landscapes. • Local recreation, access & biodiversity. 	<p>All of the sites would be visible from the Greensand Ridge.</p> <p>Although the area is currently quite degraded, once restored, many of the sites will be significant in landscape terms. Any development should enhance the local landscape.</p>	1, 16 & 36 – in the process of being suburbanised by Wixams development
Air quality, noise & human health & amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of pollution caused by waste management. • Amenity & health impacts from waste operations. • Provision of community services. 	<p>The cumulative effects of minerals and waste sites in this area are significant.</p> <p>There is a perception that this area has suffered a 'raw deal' because of the history of minerals and waste activity in the area</p>	
Conservation & protection of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of resources in construction & use, particularly water & aggregates. • Impacts on resources, such as water sources & valuable/sensitive soils & geology. • Risks of flooding. 	<p>The Internal Drainage Board have produced guidance for the whole of Marston Vale.</p> <p>The sites around Stewartby are all in the flood plain and particular uses may worsen flooding problems</p>	<p>34 – important to protect groundwater</p> <p>1 – may be issues of land stability</p> <p>1, 16 & 36 – potential impacts on watercourses</p>
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HGV movements, particularly those affecting communities, areas of environmental 	This is probably the best of the four clusters in terms of access, particularly once the new road (A421) and the improvements to A61 are	13 – vehicle access may be restricted by low bridges and won't benefit from new road. Also who would it be serving? May not fit with the

Cluster 2: Southern Marston Vale			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> importance or local roads. Shift from road freight to other forms of freight. Mileage travelled per tonne. 	<p>completed.</p> <p>The sites around Stewartby are well served in transport terms.</p> <p>Potential for rail transport.</p> <p>There are canals in the area and potential to enhance them but they may not be suitable for waste transportation</p>	<p>proximity principle</p> <p>47 – well served by transport infrastructure</p>
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting recycling & recovery targets. Capacity to deal with waste. Reduction of waste. 	<p>The need for an Energy from Waste facility is questionable. It is more efficient to recycle plastic than to burn it.</p> <p>Facilities which generate energy should be sited near to heat users</p>	
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green house gas emissions. Development of renewables & energy efficiency within waste sector. 	<p>Proposals could conflict with reforestation projects in the area</p> <p>Potential to transfer waste from road to rail (particularly the residual waste coming from London).</p>	
Education & employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people directly employed in waste industry. Co-location of waste management facilities with other industries & impacts on existing/proposed employment areas. 	<p>Part of an active growth area therefore provision of employment is important</p> <p>MRF facilities could be useful to provide low skilled employment in the area</p>	<p>35 – if it goes ahead as a waste facility, it would scupper the employment opportunities associated with Nirah</p> <p>1 – potential to increase educational visits to this site</p> <p>34 – large enough to co-locate waste management with other industries</p>

Cluster 3: East Bedfordshire			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Biodiversity, flora & fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat creation & site biodiversity. Designated (e.g. SSSIs) 	<p>Ivel Valley not as sensitive as other areas. Although designated sites may be unaffected, all of them</p>	<p>Site to the south of 26 once restored from its current minerals use will have high biodiversity value</p>

Cluster 3: East Bedfordshire			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> & non-designated sites of importance. 	present opportunities for improving biodiversity.	7 – close to river 15 – boundary trees may support some biodiversity 40 – some interest around fringes 46 – no biodiversity interest but opportunities for improvement 25 – adjacent to lake & river
Archaeology & cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic character & designated & non-designated sites of importance. 	Some significant archaeological interest related to specific sites	26 – significant archaeological interest including Scheduled Ancient Monument 7 – significant interest 25 & 46 – some archaeological interest
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape quality. Sensitive landscapes. Local recreation, access & biodiversity. 	Some low landscape value although dominated by the A1. There is potential to improve green infrastructure, particularly in Broom valley. River Ivel is the most significant feature.	26 – high recreation and amenity value. Visible from Biggleswade & A1 although screened from the west by the A1. 7 – could impact on aspirations for country park in the area 46 – very degraded site although a footpath from the village to the shop is adjacent to the site
Air quality, noise & human health & amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of pollution caused by waste management. Amenity & health impacts from waste operations. Provision of community services. 	Yes, significant cumulative impacts on amenity particularly in the Broom area	26 – major issues for residents in centre of site 1 – possible amenity issues in relation to new housing 40 – adjacent to Henlow Grange Health Farm 15 – potential odour issues 7 – close to local residents
Conservation & protection of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of resources in construction & use, particularly water & aggregates. Impacts on resources, such as water sources & valuable/sensitive soils & 	River Ivel floodplain is prone to flooding. Disposal of biodegradable waste in the area could have impacts on aquifer. There is important agricultural land in the area.	40 – composting may not be suitable because of porous substrata 21 – grade 1 soils 26 – high grade soils, flood risk issue 25 – close to lake/water course 7 – high grade soils and within flood zone 46 – grade 1 agricultural land currently overlain by concrete

Cluster 3: East Bedfordshire			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> geology. Risks of flooding. 		
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HGV movements, particularly those affecting communities, areas of environmental importance or local roads. Shift from road freight to other forms of freight. Mileage travelled per tonne. 	Generally good access in the area provided by A1 and the railway but the A1 junctions can be extremely busy and dangerous and there is already a significant level of HGV movements associated with minerals operations	<p>7 – difficult and dangerous access for HGV's</p> <p>37 – poor access involving unmanned level crossing</p> <p>15 – on railway line but continued access by HGVs through the village would be controversial</p> <p>21 – would have impacts on Biggleswade</p> <p>46 – constrained by difficulties with A1 roundabout</p>
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting recycling & recovery targets. Capacity to deal with waste. Reduction of waste. 	There is less potential for strategic sites in this area although they are good in terms of providing local amenity sites	<p>37 – although it appears small, the throughput may be quite significant</p> <p>40 – significant potential in terms of scale</p> <p>7 – recycling of aggregates would be positive</p> <p>46 – positive use although small facility</p>
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green house gas emissions. Development of renewables & energy efficiency within waste sector. 		<p>40 – could increase vehicle trips</p> <p>21 – potential to reduce the number of road movements through compaction, bulking etc.</p> <p>7 & 26 – recycling of aggregates would be positive but would generate significant road transport</p>
Education & employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of people directly employed in waste industry. Co-location of waste management facilities with other industries & impacts on existing/proposed employment areas. 	Most of the sites could only be accessed by car so any jobs would not be particularly accessible	<p>15 – potential for significant number of jobs</p> <p>40 – on a bus route for access</p> <p>21 – close to industrial area of Biggleswade</p> <p>7 & 46 – well located for providing local employment</p>

Cluster 4: South Bedfordshire			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Biodiversity, flora & fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat creation & site biodiversity. Designated (e.g. SSSIs) & non-designated sites of importance. 		<p>8, 11 & 27 – impacts on Kingswood & Stockgrove Country Park – with potential strategic importance for biodiversity</p> <p>22 – valuable biodiversity associated with woodland. Impacts would depend on nature of operations</p> <p>2 – close to SSSI</p>
Archaeology & cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic character & designated & non-designated sites of importance. 	No comments were made in relation to this topic	
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape quality. Sensitive landscapes. Local recreation, access & biodiversity. 	Yes, Chiltern AONB could be affected and most sites in greenbelt. There is a need to improve green infrastructure in this area	<p>11, 12 & 27 – lots of recreational visits, potential impacts on Stockgrove Country Park</p> <p>22 – within AONB and Area of High Landscape Value, potential impacts on Dunstable Downs & Heath</p> <p>17 – very popular area although may not be too negatively affected by a composting plant</p>
Air quality, noise & human health & amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of pollution caused by waste management. Amenity & health impacts from waste operations. Provision of community services. 	Yes, because of cumulative impacts from previous minerals operations	<p>2 – may be needed for the provision of expanded water/sewage treatment works associated with the growth area. Also, in close proximity to potential new housing</p> <p>17 – would need to be very well managed because of proximity to housing</p> <p>24 – close to a school so HGVs could be a problem</p>
Conservation & protection of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of resources in construction & use, particularly water & aggregates. Impacts on resources, such as water sources & valuable/sensitive soils & geology. Risks of flooding. 	Yes, there are groundwater protection issues in this area, including major aquifers – the locations of the aquifers keep moving	<p>11 & 12 – groundwater protection issues particularly significant. Sites are on the Greensand Ridge.</p> <p>2 – prone to flooding, accentuated by climate change</p>

Cluster 4: South Bedfordshire			
Appraisal topic	Key appraisal criteria. Impacts on:	Is this an issue for this cluster? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HGV movements, particularly those affecting communities, areas of environmental importance or local roads. • Shift from road freight to other forms of freight. • Mileage travelled per tonne. 	Transportation infrastructure is stretched in places, e.g. A4012	<p>2 – well linked to strategic routes because of A505 extension (providing that came first). Also proximity to Dunstable</p> <p>12 – transport infrastructure stretched in this area</p> <p>22 – too remote</p> <p>8, 11, 12, 19 & 27 - narrow access roads</p> <p>18 – close to major highways but the adjacent roundabout is very congested</p> <p>24 – very poor links past a school</p>
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting recycling & recovery targets. • Capacity to deal with waste. • Reduction of waste. 	Generally, the sites in this area will not provide the necessary facilities for the sustainable treatment of biological waste from Luton & Dunstable. A biodigestion facility of some description on the Sunden landfill site should be considered	<p>2 – proximity to growth area, therefore sustainable in that sense</p> <p>22 – very limited capacity and the plan shouldn't support general waste disposal</p> <p>17 – good site for composting</p>
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green house gas emissions. • Development of renewables & energy efficiency within waste sector. 	No comments were made in relation to this topic	
Education & employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people directly employed in waste industry. • Co-location of waste management facilities with other industries & impacts on existing/proposed employment areas. 		2 – range of facilities which could be accommodated may generate jobs.

2.2 Public workshops

In small groups, the participants carried out appraisals of the four clusters, using a simplified version of the site appraisal framework set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The appraisal criteria are shown in the tables below. For each cluster, the participants were asked to consider:

- Is this topic a significant issue for this cluster and, if so, how significant?
- Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?

The discussion of these questions is summarised in the tables below. **Please note that the views expressed are those of the participants involved in the discussion. None of the facts put forward have been checked at this stage.**

Sites around and to the north of Bedford		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Protecting and enhancing plant and animal habitats	Yes, the sites in the Willington area are seen to be particularly important. The proposals for the river park will significantly enhance biodiversity in this area. Elstow Brook, in particular, is a very important wildlife corridor	33 – could affect rivers Ouse & Nene & Stanwick Lakes 38 – potential impacts on wildlife reserve & Odel & Harrold Country Park. There are also a number of horse paddocks nearby which could be affected 5 – impacts on River Great Ouse & River Valley Park, otter habitats on the river bank 6 – potential impacts on Elstow Brook which has been enhanced in terms of wildlife
Protecting archaeologically and culturally important areas	Yes, in the Willington area there are sites that need to be protected, although this could be addressed at the planning application stage	5 – potential impacts on Danish Camp Visitor Centre 33 – significant Roman & World War II era interest
Protecting the landscape and maintaining and enhancing access to it	Yes, this is a very significant issue around the sites to the east of Bedford, particularly because of the proposals to significantly enhance the landscape through the creation of a valley park	33 – a very big site in an open area on a plateau so could have a very significant visual impact. 4 miles of new rights of way were opened in the area last year 5, 6 & 10 – within the area designated for the River Valley Park,

Sites around and to the north of Bedford		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	In the north of the cluster, the landscape is very open so waste facilities could be very visually intrusive	including new footpaths 38 – would affect local footpaths
Minimising air & noise pollution & other health impacts	Would be an issue generally where incineration or landfill is proposed.	32 – very close to existing and proposed new housing 10 – concerns about noise & dust 38 – odours & noise are already an issue from existing operations (including incineration of animal carcasses) particularly when the wind is in a certain direction. Transport in and out of the site also impacts on Wymington 33 – residents about 1km from site – concerns about noise & light pollution
Conserving and protecting water, energy and other resources	Potential contamination of water supplies would be a particular issue in the Willington area which has a high water table and is criss-crossed by water courses.	6 – immediately adjacent to Elstow Brook 6 & 10 – both sites in floodplain
Minimising the impact of transport of waste	Particularly an issue for sites in the Willington area – HGVs would need to pass through small villages such as Great Barford	38 – could the railway be utilised? because the site is served by narrow access roads 28 – site access very difficult but could be improved 33 – B & C class roads serve the site currently. Direct access would need to be created from the A45 but concerns that this would push more traffic through the village 5 – would need to create access from A421 to north of site 6 – potential impacts on village unless lorries forced to enter from the west on A421
Helping to deal with waste sustainably		28 & 29 – composting & wood recycling would be welcomed, providing the facilities are well run
Minimising greenhouse gas emissions	No comments were made in relation to this topic	
Boosting local employment	Generally, the types of operations proposed would generate negligible employment benefits	

Sites in the Southern Marston Vale area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Protecting and enhancing plant and animal habitats	<p>The area is valuable because of the lakes, wasteland and the lack of people. Significant species in the area including a Barn owl population.</p> <p>Because of the proposed housing growth in the area, 'green lungs' are needed</p>	<p>34 – supports a protected species of newt, breeding colony of moths, Black Hair Streak butterfly, bee & spotted orchids. The north east corner of the site is used by migrating birds</p> <p>13/47 – potential impacts on Marston Thrift SSSI – important woodland</p> <p>31 – close to a nature reserve</p> <p>16 – nature reserve and county wildlife site</p> <p>36 – county wildlife site</p>
Protecting archaeologically and culturally important areas	<p>The area has some archaeological and cultural significance. Dinosaur remains have been found locally (Stewartby Lake). In addition, there could be impacts on the Millennium Country Park, Houghton House, Amphill Park, Katherine Cross and the John Bunyan Trail.</p>	<p>14 & 31 – impacts on Stewartby village conservation area</p> <p>34 – overlooked by Amphill Park/castle</p>
Protecting the landscape and maintaining and enhancing access to it	<p>The proposals could affect views from the Greensand Ridge and the Millennium Country Park as well as affecting the safety of access to the country park (because of HGV traffic)</p> <p>There are also lots of rights of way in the area which could be affected by the proposals, particularly those for 13, 47, 34 & 35.</p>	<p>34 – would affect 3 footpaths</p> <p>35 – current planning conditions require restoration of site</p> <p>14, 31 & 34 – proposed canal from Milton Keynes will run close to these sites</p> <p>47 – part of the Forest of Marston Vale project</p> <p>13 – would conflict with plans for restoration to provide open space & public amenity</p> <p>30 – very attractive site</p> <p>1 – expansion of this waste transfer facility could have negative impact on landscape</p>
Minimising air & noise pollution & other health impacts	<p>Yes, potentially very significant impacts on settlements already impacted by existing minerals and waste operations. Air, noise, light pollution and dust could all be significant particularly because most of the sites are close to residential areas and because so much new</p>	<p>14 & 31 – housing, school & employment development proposed immediately adjacent</p> <p>34 – Stewartby is downwind of this site and the site is close to a school and old people's home. Potential air & noise pollution & health impacts from Energy from Waste facility. Very high stacks may be necessary to take pollution away from the surrounding area because the site itself is very low</p>

Sites in the Southern Marston Vale area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	housing is planned (Wixams & Marston Moretaine). Management & monitoring of facilities is very important.	9, 16, 35 & 36 – Wixams development (4,500 homes) adjacent
Conserving and protecting water, energy and other resources	Yes, particularly in terms of flooding. The lakes are connected and balanced. Interference may increase flood risk. There are also concerns about potential impacts on water quality due to high water table.	34 – potential energy benefits from an Energy from Waste facility. Could Nirah scheme use it or could it be used to power homes in Stewartby? Marston Vale wetlands could be affected by development of this site. 16 – adjacent fishing lake & could affect Harridon Brook 14, 31 – potential impacts on water quality 13 – potential impacts on aquifer although it is a brownfield site 36 – adjacent to vulnerable water courses which could be contaminated by leachate from landfill
Minimising the impact of transport of waste	Yes, particularly in terms of potential impacts of HGV movements on Stewartby & the Millennium Country Park. The roads in the area are already congested (A421, A530 & A6 particularly) and this will be made worse by the proposed housing growth. Major waste developments in the area will make the problems worse. The use of rail could be part of the solution in this area.	47 – the extension of the A421 will cross this site so there may be a conflict with this. There would be no access from the A421 however, only from a single track road 41 – well located close to the A6 34, 35, 14 & 31 – all traffic for these will come through Stewartby unless there were physical constraints 34 – movement of A421 may leave this site poorly served by road. Congestion likely to be a problem. Could this site be served by rail? 35 - insufficient road infrastructure particularly following Wixams development although it could be accessed by rail. Likely to be major increases in congestion on B530 if Nirah goes ahead 36 – could be accessed by rail 13 – no rail links to this site and road access would be via Brogborough village 9 & 16 – would need to use very congested A6 & junction 30 – concerns about frequency of HGV movements 20 – would utilise a very narrow road which may already be at capacity 47 – served by single track road and HGVs would pass through villages
Helping to deal with waste sustainably		41 – suitable site for the expansion of composting 34 – burning waste may not encourage recycling and may generate greenhouse

Sites in the Southern Marston Vale area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
		<p>gas emissions</p> <p>36 – has room for expansion and has good transport links</p> <p>16 – a civic amenity/ composting site would serve Wixams well</p> <p>13 – a civic amenity site here may be too far from a resident population</p> <p>1 – proposals to enhance recycling on this site are welcome</p>
Minimising greenhouse gas emissions	<p>Yes, concerns about greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed Energy from Waste plant</p> <p>To reduce emissions it would be better to locate facilities where they can be serviced by rail transport</p>	
Boosting local employment	<p>Few of the proposed facilities are seen to be significant in terms of the provision of employment but there may be some negative impacts on existing employment and on the ability of the area to attract new jobs and investment</p>	<p>14 & 31 – may impact on the new Stewartby brickworks headquarters which are being built adjacent to these sites</p> <p>36 – would affect carp fishery and recreational pursuits on the lake as well as adjacent business park/industrial estate</p>

Sites in the South Bedfordshire area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Protecting and enhancing plant and animal habitats		<p>2 – significant bird life on this site and Houghton Quarry SSSI is to the south east of the site and would need to be buffered from any waste operations. The site would need to be carefully designed and very well managed to not interfere with wildlife</p> <p>22 – includes some valuable woodland – mature oaks</p> <p>8 – close to a National Nature Reserve and may contain Purple Emperor butterflies</p> <p>8,11 & 27 – adjacent to woodland</p> <p>17 – very close to woodland, may be suitable for composting</p>
Protecting		<p>8, 11 & 27 – near Greensand Ridge which is of cultural importance and is well</p>

Sites in the South Bedfordshire area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
archaeologically and culturally important areas		used by walkers 22 – close to 4000 year old chalk walk
Protecting the landscape and maintaining and enhancing access to it		22 – would have a major impact on local landscape access and views 27 – could form part of adjacent woodland once filled in and restored 11 – once filled in and restored it could become an extension of the park
Minimising air & noise pollution & other health impacts		2 – this site may be necessary for an expansion of water/sewage treatment works to serve the growth area 12 – potential noise & dust issues in relation to Heath & Reach, both from the site and the HGV movements 24 – HGVs would need to pass by a school and through Toddington 22 – concern that it would attract seagulls which might affect operation of Luton Airport since the site is in the flight path
Conserving and protecting water, energy and other resources		2 – potential flooding issues 22 – on a hill so may be potential issues with run-off. May also affect water table which is high in this area. The food factory next door has a well which could be contaminated by waste operations.
Minimising the impact of transport of waste	Yes, because road infrastructure in the area is stretched. There is the possibility to restore the railway through South Beds, which could be utilised for the transportation of waste.	2 – the extension of the A421 would make the site even better in transport terms. The site is also adjacent to an old railway track which could be restored 19 – beside a stretch of very narrow road. Could be served by rail if the track were restored. 12 – would need to avoid access via Stockgrove. Also, the junction of A5 & Eastern Way is very dangerous. It has no light and is on a slope. Traffic is already having very negative effects on Heath & Reach 8, 11, 12, 27 – could serve Leighton Buzzard area well. There may be a need for considerable inert waste disposal because it's part of the growth area 11 & 27 – would use Heath Road which is narrow and bendy and may generate safety issues 8 – good access from A5 24 – access is quite good

Sites in the South Bedfordshire area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
		17, 18 – well located providing they would be serving the local area 22 – Land Park Lane is very narrow which would make access very difficult
Helping to deal with waste sustainably	Generally, the sites in this area will not provide the necessary facilities for the sustainable treatment of biological waste from Luton & Dunstable. A biodigestion facility of some description on the Sunden landfill site should be considered. Energy from Waste is viewed positively by some in that it could supply heat or energy. However, others expressed concern about such a plant reducing the drive for recycling.	2 – MBT would not be ideal particularly in that location. It may lessen the drive for recycling. However, it's in proximity to Dunstable & Houghton Regis and once the bypass is built, it could also serve Luton. 24 – would only be welcomed if it was a well managed site.
Minimising greenhouse gas emissions		2 – in-vessel composting plant would be welcome, particularly in this location since it is in proximity to the main towns and would therefore generate less transport emissions.
Boosting local employment	Generally there is a need to promote re-use projects, which are both sustainable and generate significant employment benefits. The core strategy ought to promote waste prevention and re-use in accordance with the waste hierarchy. It would also be good to promote linkages with the third sector/social enterprises. There is a need to promote employment to serve the large amount of new housing proposed.	2 – may provide limited employment opportunities for Luton & Dunstable particularly if business starter units could be promoted nearby to utilise the waste materials.

Sites in the East Bedfordshire area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
Protecting and enhancing plant and animal habitats	Yes, there are particular concerns about the cumulative impacts of past, current & proposed future minerals & waste operations on habitats & biodiversity in the Broom area	46 – badger habitats & crested newts identified during preparations for the Great Barford bypass (A421) 7 – contains Skylarks, river fowl, bats and otters 26 – supports deer, foxes, hedgehogs, pheasants, grouse, heron & sparrow hawks. There will also be a nature reserve on the other side of the road in the near future 40 – wildlife around the edges but not in the main part of the site
Protecting archaeologically and culturally important areas		7 – archaeological interest identified during minerals extraction earlier in 2007. Potential Roman & Bronze era artefacts found 26 – this area has been aerially photographed and is believed to contain Viking, Roman & Saxon remains 40 – adjacent to a grade 2* listed building (The Grange) – the end of the site near the Grange would need to be protected/ landscaped 46 – in area of archaeological interest
Protecting the landscape and maintaining and enhancing access to it		37 – overlooked by Everton 46 – previously used for caravans during the construction of the bypass – the planning conditions required the site to be returned to agriculture 7 – would affect Ouse Valley Way 26 – a public footpath & bridleway goes through the site & under the A1, providing local residents (including school children) access to Biggleswade from the west. It is also well used for recreation by walkers & cyclists 40 – site previously used for minerals extraction – the proposals involve reinstating half of the site (including footpaths) & developing the other half for waste operations
Minimising air & noise pollution & other health impacts		25 – open air composting on this site could cause odour problems in Etonbury 7 & 46 – increased HGV traffic would compound air & noise pollution problems in Roxton village & garden centre. The site may involve a ‘grader’ machine which would generate significant noise pollution 26 – site surrounds 4 cottages and would also impact on 2 properties at the corner of Hill Lane & Gypsy Lane as well as the adjacent golf driving range – concerns about diesel fumes, dust, noise from machinery

Sites in the East Bedfordshire area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
		<p>37 – concerns about noise & visual impacts particularly for residents of Everton</p> <p>21 – wouldn't directly affect any homes but crushing is an 'impact noise' so it might carry across the A1 to the edge of Biggleswade</p> <p>40 – odour from composting could be an issue for the Grange (used as a health spa) & Henlow residents</p> <p>15 – odour from composting could affect Arlesey</p>
Conserving and protecting water, energy and other resources		<p>26 – concerns about impacts on the river which runs around the site & the underground spring which supplies water to Brooklands Farm cottage. There are also concerns about potential impacts on drainage from the site and potential flooding (the site is partly in the flood plain)</p> <p>26 – would result in loss of grade 1 agricultural land</p> <p>21 & 40 – potential impacts on drains next to site</p> <p>25 – close to lakes</p>
Minimising the impact of transport of waste	Yes, there are particular concerns about the cumulative impacts of minerals & waste operations on congestion & safety at key junctions, particularly on the A1	<p>15 – will generate HGV movements through Arlesey but there is a possibility of a new link road & a civic amenity site would be useful on this site for Arlesey residents</p> <p>21 – existing operations on this site already generate major transport issues affecting residents of Langford & Biggleswade. Traffic would need to avoid bridge by Jordan's Mill</p> <p>7 & 46 – on a rat run created by commuters seeking to avoid the Black Cat roundabout. Would compound air & noise pollution, vibration & dust problems. It would also worsen problems on the Black Cat roundabout</p> <p>26 – HGVs would have to use Gypsy Lane which has a 7.5 tonne limit & was once a covered cart track. The nearby A1 roundabout is also very dangerous & congested, problems which could be exacerbated by further minerals & waste operations in the area. The washing of trucks leaving the area causes problems with ice on the Hill Lane/Gypsy Lane junction</p> <p>37 – traffic would need to avoid going through Everton village. Access to the A1 westwards is better would involve crossing a level crossing & negotiating bends</p>
Helping to deal with waste sustainably	Yes, although there are concerns about some of the proposals, those for materials recovery facilities & civic amenity facilities would be	<p>15 – if restricted to a civic amenity site, it would be of benefit, particularly in reducing travel for Arlesey residents</p> <p>7 & 46 – not sustainable to transfer waste as far north as Roxton</p> <p>26 – not a large site so wouldn't last long but would have very significant negative impacts on local environment & amenity</p>

Sites in the East Bedfordshire area		
Sustainability Issue	Is this an issue for these sites? If so, how significant?	Are there any sites in the cluster for which the issue is particularly significant?
	welcomed as part of a sustainable approach to waste management	
Minimising greenhouse gas emissions		7 & 46 – concerns about emissions from transport of waste to these sites 26 - concerns about emissions from transport of waste to this site
Boosting local employment	Yes, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the types of operations proposed will generate few jobs; and with the very low unemployment in the area, the small number of jobs are likely to be filled by workers from outside the area which would be unsustainable 	7 & 46 – possible negative impacts on adjacent garden centre 26 – potential negative impacts on 2 businesses operating from the cottages surrounded by the site

3. Next steps

All of the comments received, which are summarised in this report, will be used to inform the sustainability appraisal process. The sustainability appraisal, along with the feedback on Issues & Options received in writing and via email and the Council's website, will inform the preparation of the Council's Preferred Options for waste planning policy and sites. The Preferred Options report is anticipated to be published for consultation in June/July 2008.

All of those who have provided feedback will be entered in to the Council's consultee database and will be notified when the Preferred Options report will be published. If you would like to be added to the database or if you have any questions or comments about the waste planning process, please email MWPlans@bedscc.gov.uk or write to:

Development Framework
Minerals and Waste Team
Bedfordshire County Council
County Hall
Cauldwell St
Bedford MK42 9AP

Appendix A: List of sites

The table below shows each of the sites put forward for potential waste management facilities by waste operators, landowners and other interested parties in the County. A map showing the location of each site is contained in appendix B. Maps and further details of each individual site can be found in Part 2 of the Issues and Options consultation paper, available on the County Council website (www.bedfordshire.gov.uk - Have Your Say - Consultations).

Site No.	Site Name	Type of Waste Facility	Operator	Location
01	Elstow North	Household Waste Recycling Centre	Bedfordshire County Council	Elstow
01	Elstow North	Composting (In vessel / windrow)	Bedfordshire County Council	Elstow
01	Elstow North	Transfer Station	Bedfordshire County Council	Elstow
01	Elstow North	WEE Facility	Bedfordshire County Council	Elstow
01	Elstow North	Leachate storage / treatment facility	Bedfordshire County Council	Elstow
01	Elstow North	Recycling Facility	Bedfordshire County Council	Elstow
02	Thorn Turn	Waste Treatment Plant	Bedfordshire County Council	Sundon
02	Thorn Turn	Transfer Station	Bedfordshire County Council	Sundon
02	Thorn Turn	Composting (In Vessel)	Bedfordshire County Council	Sundon
02	Thorn Turn	Vehicle Depot	Bedfordshire County Council	Sundon
02	Thorn Turn	Civic Amenity	Bedfordshire County Council	Sundon
02	Thorn Turn	Composting (Windrow)	Bedfordshire County Council	Sundon
03	Sundon Landfill	Composting (Windrow)	Bedfordshire County Council	Renhold
03	Sundon Landfill	Composting (In Vessel)	Bedfordshire County Council	Renhold
05	Dairy Farm, Renhold	Landfill (Inert)	Lafarge Aggregates	Renhold
06	Octagon Farm South	Landraise (agricultural improvement)	Lafarge Aggregates	Cardington
07	Black Cat	Inert Recycling Facility	Lafarge Aggregates	Roxton
07	Black Cat	Landfill (Inert)	Lafarge Aggregates	Roxton
08	Sand House Quarry	Inert Recycling Facility	Lafarge Aggregates	Heath & Reach
09	Elstow Rail Depot	Inert Recycling Facility	Lafarge Aggregates	Elstow
10	Willington Quarry	Inert Recycling Facility	Lafarge Aggregates	Cople
11	Stone Lane Quarry	Landfill (Inert)	Hives Partnership Planning	Heath & Reach
12	New Trees Quarry	Landfill (Inert)	Hives Partnership Planning	Heath & Reach
13	Brogborough	Civic Amenity	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington

Site No.	Site Name	Type of Waste Facility	Operator	Location
13	Brogborough	Materials Recovery Facility	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington
13	Brogborough	Any other suitable waste operations	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington
13	Brogborough	Transfer Station	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington
13	Brogborough	Waste Processing	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington
13	Brogborough	Energy from Waste	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington
13	Brogborough	Composting	Waste Recycling Group	Lidlington
14	Stewartby	Any other suitable waste operations	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
14	Stewartby	Civic Amenity	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
14	Stewartby	Composting	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
14	Stewartby	Waste Processing	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
14	Stewartby	Waste Recycling Facility	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
14	Stewartby	Transfer Station	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
14	Stewartby	Energy from Waste	Waste Recycling Group	Stewartby
15	Arlesey	Waste Recycling Facility	Waste Recycling Group	Arlesey
15	Arlesey	Waste Processing	Waste Recycling Group	Arlesey
15	Arlesey	Composting	Waste Recycling Group	Arlesey
15	Arlesey	Civic Amenity	Waste Recycling Group	Arlesey
15	Arlesey	Any other suitable waste operations	Waste Recycling Group	Arlesey
15	Arlesey	Transfer Station	Waste Recycling Group	Arlesey
16	Elstow	Waste Processing	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Transfer Station	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Energy from Waste	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Waste Recycling Facility	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Civic Amenity	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Any other suitable waste operations	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Landfill	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
16	Elstow	Composting	Waste Recycling Group	Elstow
17	Land off Woburn Road	Composting	Bedford Estates	Husbourne Crawley
18	Land off Bedford Road	Composting	Bedford Estates	Husbourne Crawley
18	Land off Bedford Road	Inert Recycling Facility	Bedford Estates	Husbourne Crawley
19	Old British Rail Goods Yard	Inert Recycling Facility	Metro Skip Hire Ltd	Hyde
19	Old British Rail Goods Yard	Transfer Station	Metro Skip Hire Ltd	Hyde
20	Manor Road	Materials Recovery Facility	G Moore Haulage	Stewartby

Site No.	Site Name	Type of Waste Facility	Operator	Location
20	Manor Road	Transfer Station	G Moore Haulage	Stewartby
21	Cow Close	Transfer Station	F D O'Dell & Sons Ltd	Biggleswade
22	Landpark Wood Quarry	Waste Disposal	Totternhoe Lime and Stone	Kensworth
24	Herne Grange Farm	Composting	Heathcote Farms Ltd	Toddington
25	Etonbury Farm	Inert Recycling Facility	Wheelform Properties Ltd	Arlesey
25	Etonbury Farm	Composting	Wheelform Properties Ltd	Arlesey
26	Land at Brooklands Farm	Inert Recycling Facility	Hanson Aggregates	Old Warden
26	Land at Brooklands Farm	Landfill (Inert)	Hanson Aggregates	Old Warden
27	Fox Corner Quarry	Landfill (Inert)	DB Standing & Son	Heath & Reach
28	Twinwoods Airfield	Composting and Wood Recycling	Bedfordia Biogas Ltd	Clapham
29	Land opposite Wigney Wood	Composting and Wood Recycling	Bedfordia Biogas Ltd	Milton Ernest
30	Winter Woods Farm	Wood Recycling Facility	Direct Pallets Ltd	Brogborough
31	Stewartby Sidings and adjacent Land	Mechanical and Biological Treatment	Shanks Waste Management Lyd	Stewartby
31	Stewartby Sidings and adjacent Land	Materials Recovery Facility	Shanks Waste Management Lyd	Stewartby
31	Stewartby Sidings and adjacent Land	Composting	Shanks Waste Management Lyd	Stewartby
31	Stewartby Sidings and adjacent Land	Transfer Station	Shanks Waste Management Lyd	Stewartby
32	Oakley Road	Landfill (Inert)	Thomas Beazley & Sons Ltd	Bromham
33	Chelveston Airfield	Energy from Waste	Chelveston Renewable Energy Ltd	Melchbourne & Yelden / Dean & Shelton
33	Chelveston Airfield	Anaerobic Digestion	Chelveston Renewable Energy Ltd	Melchbourne & Yelden / Dean & Shelton
33	Chelveston Airfield	Mechanical and Biological Treatment	Chelveston Renewable Energy Ltd	Melchbourne & Yelden / Dean & Shelton
33	Chelveston Airfield	Composting	Chelveston Renewable Energy Ltd	Melchbourne & Yelden / Dean &

Site No.	Site Name	Type of Waste Facility	Operator	Location
				Shelton
33	Chelveston Airfield	Sterilisation	Chelveston Renewable Energy Ltd	Melchbourne & Yelden / Dean & Shelton
34	Rookery South	Inert Recycling Facility	White Young Green Planning	Marston Mortain
34	Rookery South	Composting	White Young Green Planning	Marston Mortain
34	Rookery South	Materials Recovery Facility	White Young Green Planning	Marston Mortain
34	Rookery South	Waste Treatment/Energy Recovery facility	White Young Green Planning	Marston Mortain
34	Rookery South	Landfill	White Young Green Planning	Marston Mortain
35	Quest	To be discussed	Hanson Building Products	Houghton Conquest / Stewartby
36	Kempston	To be discussed	Hanson Building Products	Stewartby / Elstow
37	Lysander Place	Transfer Station	BSG Property Services Ltd	Everton
38	Goosey Lodge Farm	Inert Recycling Facility	Mr Clinton Dunmore	Wymington
39	Lodge Farm	Materials Recovery Facility	Ian Smith Construction	Hulcote & Salford
40	Arlesey Road	Composting	Henlow Building Supplies Ltd	Henlow
40	Arlesey Road	Transfer Station	Henlow Building Supplies Ltd	Henlow
40	Arlesey Road	Inert Recycling Facility	Henlow Building Supplies Ltd	Henlow
41	Haynes Composting Site	Composting	Material Change Ltd	Haynes
44	College Farm Salford	Landfill (Inert)	Bletsoes	Hulcote & Salford
45	Lodge Farm Salford	Inert Recycling Facility	Bletsoes	Hulcote & Salford
46	Roxton Recycling Facility	Materials Recovery Facility	Mick George Ltd	Roxton
47	Wood End, Marston	to be agreed	Hanson Building Products	Marston Mortaine

