Waste Development Plan Document, Plymouth’s Waste DPD

Additional points relating to information submitted by Geraldine Lane (3205)

I would like to make a preliminary point about the software on the submission site, as a number of submissions were punctuated by unwanted symbols which made reading the content difficult. This, in addition to the lack of consultation and the difficulties for the layman to understand and contribute to the process, only increased the feelings that everything was being done to make involvement in the process as difficult as possible.


The Entec report which first listed Ernesettle as a reserve site (number 13 on a list of possible sites) made no mention of the option of an incinerator, nor has there been any assessment of the impact of an incinerator in this valley; this meant that no objections could have been made at the 2005 consultation to this particular issue. The strength of feeling expressed during the recent “tests of soundness” exercise by residents living in Ernesettle and Higher St Budeaux and in the Saltash area reflects the feeling that the consultation in no way reflected that required by Plymouth City Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.

2. (re ID 33)

The Local Strategic Partnership has used the The Index of Multiple Deprivation (2004) to rank neighbourhoods in Plymouth (Plymouth 2020 Index of Deprivation) – Ernesettle ranks 10th out of 43 areas, 13th most deprived in terms of health of the population. A Plymouth Health Development Unit report published in November 2007 indicated a vast disparity in life expectancy between the most and least deprived areas of the city.

The paper “Review of Environmental and Health Effects of Waste Management: Municipal Solid Waste and Similar Wastes” ([http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/research/health/pdf/health-report.pdf](http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/research/health/pdf/health-report.pdf)) raises concerns about the health effects of composting in particular in relation to respiratory conditions such as bronchitis. These problems are likely to be exacerbated in a river valley prone to low-lying fog. In relation to the possibility of composting, the closest houses to the south (Ernesettle Crescent) are within 250 metres which also contravenes the Environment Agency guidance on such provision.

Plymouth’s Waste DPD – Submission Stage SEA/SA Summary (para 1.25) states

“If major new waste facilities are located in a neighbourhood experiencing health
inequalities, then there may be a risk that a perceived and/or measurable decline in local environmental ‘amenity’ may negatively affect well-being and inequalities in such areas."

Placing such a facility in Ernesetle would be likely to increase the deprivation suffered in the Ernesetle area and would surely run counter to Plymouth’s Sustainable Community Strategy 2007-2020 which states "We will work together to improve our city but we will particularly target the most deprived neighbourhoods to reduce the gap in the quality of life, prosperity and well being between those neighbourhoods and the rest of the city."


Plymouth Sustainable Neighbourhoods Study (November 2005) predicts under Environmental Health issues that an area within at least 1 km suffers from odours from the sewage processing site at Ernesetle Lane. There is a strong feeling in the area that the placing of a sewage treatment works at Ernesetle is considered by Plymouth City Council to be a licence to add any other similar development without considering the effects on the residents.

The Preferred Options Report 2005 states that Ernesetle would only come forward if other options were not available. Council officers, during the consultation event at Ernesetle Library in October, stated that the only reason Ernesetle had been brought forward was because Imerys had not indicated that they would be releasing the site at Coypool and it was a matter of expediency that the waste facilities would be developed at Ernesetle as it is already in the ownership of PCC, despite their own acknowledgement that Ernesetle was far from an ideal site. I note that Imerys Minerals (3227) in comment ID21 have stated the plan relating to Coypool is sound and that Imerys feel that “The waste allocation represents an appropriate choice of site having considered all the relevant alternatives.” This should surely clear the way for the Council to use their preferred site of Coypool.

3. (re: ID33)
The Defence Estates objected two years ago to the 2005 document which, at that stage, did not mention an incinerator. The fact that there is no statement relating to the “soundness” or “unsoundness” of a plan that proposes to locate a high-temperature incinerator adjacent to a Ministry of Defence ammunition storage facility, suggests a lack of consultation with the MoD as well as local residents. Have the MoD been asked for, and contributed, views on the proposed development at Ernesetle since it was changed from a reserve site?

Please also find attached photographs of traffic in Ernesetle Lane (representative of queues on weekday afternoons).