

PMM1**1049****Object****Respondent:** Susan Edwards**Summary:**

Irresponsible planning decisions have resulted in an extra 732,100 tonnes per annum incineration capacity being permitted in the local plan area. There never was a need for this additional capacity - only a need for short term capacity which was being addressed by transport to nearby authorities. The overcapacity of incineration facilities is contrary to government legislation against incineration overcapacity both locally and nationally. This has not been addressed within the local plan and is a serious problem that should be at least mentioned as such. A solution should be found or at least proposed.

Change suggested by respondent:

Plans should be made for separate food waste collection, as well as for composting /anaerobic digestion of this food waste. This composting/anaerobic digestion should be separate from facilities attached to waste treatment so that the resultant products can be used as fertiliser without any risk to public health.

Plans should be in place to address the permitted overcapacity of incineration facilities.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Attachments:** None**PMM4****1056****Support****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

We are supportive of Main Modification PMM4 to Objective 4 of the Plan and welcome the amendment.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

PMM11**1057****Object****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

PMM11, we recognise the benefits of co-location of facilities but also welcome the caveat with regards to the cumulative effects of a number of waste facilities in the same location and would seek to ensure that the significance of heritage assets and their setting, are protected.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**PMM12****1050****Support****Respondent:** Tarmac**Agent:** Heaton Planning Ltd**Summary:**

Tarmac supports the proposed modification as it brings Policy SP4 into greater alignment with Policy DM12 of the adopted Minerals Local Plan

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**1058****Support****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

PMM12 clause 3, we welcome the amendment

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

PMM19**1051****Support****Respondent:** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust**Summary:**

NWT strongly support the inclusion of the reference to sites with extant restoration conditions being considered as greenfield sites under the NPPF, as this provides important clarity for both applicants and consultees.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**PMM23****1059****Support****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

PMM 23 clause c, we welcome the amendment.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**PMM26****1060****Support****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

PMM26, we support this amendment.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

PMM27**1052****Support****Respondent:** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust**Summary:**

NWT support the inclusion of "avoid" to improve clarity over the necessary level of emphasis required and to guide what weight should be properly applied to such material considerations. It is essential that the mitigation hierarchy is applied in relation to impacts on biodiversity ie. that impacts should be first avoided , rather than seeking to minimise them through mitigation as a first step.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**PMM31****1061****Support****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

PMM31, we welcome these amendments and are supportive of their inclusion within the Plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**PMM32****1062****Support****Respondent:** Historic England (Midlands)**Summary:**

PMM32, we support these amendments

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

PMM40

1053

Support

Respondent: Environment Agency

Summary:

We welcome the inclusion of PMM40 & PMM41 which will "ensure continued engagement with key bodies within the monitoring process".

Change suggested by respondent:

None

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None

PMM41

1054

Support

Respondent: Environment Agency

Summary:

We welcome the inclusion of PMM40 & PMM41 which will "ensure continued engagement with key bodies within the monitoring process".

Change suggested by respondent:

None

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Attachments: None