

Bath & North East  
Somerset Council



North  
Somerset  
Council

South Gloucestershire  
Council

---

# The West of England Partnership

---

## The West of England Partnership – Joint Waste Core Strategy Progress Update

5<sup>th</sup> June to 10<sup>th</sup> August 2009

### **Summary Report of the Progress Update**

August 2009

## **Contents**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Development Industry Workshop</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Public Engagement</b>	<b>5-7</b>
3.1 Progress Update Process	
3.2 Overview of Responses	

## **Appendices:**

<b>Appendix 1: Workshop Report</b>	<b>8 -11</b>
------------------------------------	--------------

# 1. Introduction

1.1 Councils in the West of England (Bath & North East Somerset, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire, and Bristol) are working together to produce a Joint Waste Core Strategy that will set out policies to help planners make decisions about where waste facilities could be located.

1.2 From June to August 2009, The West of England Partnership undertook a progress update of the Joint Waste Core Strategy; stakeholders and consultees were invited to submit comments on a number of technical reports.

1.3 All stakeholders and consultees were notified of further technical work undertaken to support the evidence base and were given an opportunity to provide further views on:

- Statement on Scope of the Joint Waste Core Strategy
- Sustainability Appraisal (interim comment)
- Feasibility Study – potential for exporting non-hazardous waste to landfill
- An Assessment of the current and future waste management capacity needs
- Revised Detailed Sites Assessment (of sites for the location of facilities to treat residual waste)
- Habitats Regulation Assessment of the Joint Waste Core Strategy
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the potential locations for waste facilities

The Progress Update was published on the West of England partnership website and advertised in the local press. The running of the Progress Update was extended from the 31<sup>st</sup> July to the 10<sup>th</sup> August to incorporate further views on the updated Scope and Policy document.

1.4 This report contains:

- A short summary of the industry workshop on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009
- An overview of the results of the progress update
- Appendix of industry workshop

The schedule of representations made to the Progress Update is available separately at <http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning>

## 2. Development Industry workshop

- 2.1 The Development Industry workshop, held in parallel with the progress update brought together members of the development industry with in depth, specialist and technical knowledge of the issues pertaining to the Joint Waste Core Strategy to:
- Provide participants with an opportunity to hear more technical detail.
  - Provide participants with an opportunity to question, challenge and explore any issues arising from the technical documents.
  - Increase mutual understanding between stakeholders with different knowledge and interests by listening to each other's perspectives.
  - Stimulate creative, innovative thinking in relation to the problems highlighted in the documents.
- 2.2 The workshop was held on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009 (10am to 1pm) in Bristol. Approximately 27 delegates attended, which enabled quality discussions on a range of topics. A team including representatives from WEPO and ERM consultants was available to answer questions from participants.
- 2.3 Presentations were given on the key points raised in the Preferred Options Consultation; the scope and technical work in the Progress Update; and the key considerations resulting from the technical work. After each presentation there were question and answer sessions.
- 2.4 The workshop report is attached in appendix 1 and is available for download at <http://www.westofengland.org/waste>.

## 3. Public Engagement

### 3.1 Progress Update process

#### Progress Update-related documents

3.1.1 A number of technical documents to support the evidence base of the Joint Waste Core Strategy were available for download from the partnership website; hardcopies of these documents were sent out on request.

3.1.2 The technical documents available for comment were as follows:

- Statement on Scope of the Joint Waste Core Strategy
- Sustainability Appraisal (interim comment)
- Feasibility Study – potential for exporting non-hazardous waste to landfill
- An Assessment of the current and future waste management capacity needs
- Revised Detailed Site Assessment (of sites for the location of facilities to treat residual waste)
- Habitats Regulation Assessment of the Joint Waste Core Strategy
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the potential locations for waste facilities.

In addition to the technical documents a number of reports on the Preferred Options consultation were also made available.

- Summary Report of the Preferred Options Consultation
- Representations to the consultation by question
- Representations to the consultation offline

3.1.3 An updated version of the Scope and Policy Document became available 22<sup>nd</sup> July, consequently the opportunity to comment on all documents was extended to the 10<sup>th</sup> August 2009.

#### Marketing

3.1.4 A written invitation to participate in the Progress Update was sent by post or email to more than 2,400 individuals and organisations. The invitation pointed to the partnership website where all documents could be downloaded. Hard copies of the documents were also made available upon request.

3.1.5 In addition, the Progress Update was advertised in local newspapers and a number of press releases were issued.

#### Ways of responding

3.1.6 Participants were able to participate in the Progress Update by responding either:

- By post – written responses could be sent to the West of England Partnership Offices.
- By email – by emailing the dedicated email address [wepconsutation@westofengland.org](mailto:wepconsutation@westofengland.org)

### **Public access to view all submissions**

- 3.1.7 The responses received will be displayed back on the West of England Partnership website in September.

### **Participation statistics**

- 3.1.8 The West of England Partnership has received 38 responses to the Progress Update by the close of business 10 August 2009. The West of England Partnership will continue to accept responses after this date, and they will be considered separately.
- 3.1.9 It is important to remember, when seeking to interpret the results, that this is a qualitative consultation, not an objective survey of public opinion. Its primary purpose is to collect ideas, arguments and views on the Progress Update technical documents, which will help inform the further development of the Joint Waste Core Strategy.

## **3.2 Emerging Key Themes**

### **1, Approach to landfill**

Some representations strongly felt that the onus should be on waste reduction, reuse and recycling to divert waste away from landfill & that landfill should be a last resort. Other representations queried why no targets for landfill were being incorporated into the JWCS, others suggested that the JWCS should ensure that proposals for landfill operate to the proximity principle.

### **2, Spatial strategy for residual waste treatment facilities**

Overall representations were supportive of the spatial strategy adopted in the JWCS; however, there was some conflict in whether the JWCS should allocate on individual sites or broader locations for residual waste facilities.

### **3, Policy framework for non-residual sites**

Representations were interested on how the JWCS would tackle the issue of non-residual sites and were supportive of the approach proposed of criteria based policies.

### **4, Policy wording**

Some representations suggested alternative wording to some of the policies, this was mainly to increase clarity or to add weight to certain aspects of policy.

### **5, Site specific impacts and considerations**

Some representations expressed concern over some of the proposed locations with regard to environmental impacts, flooding, health impacts, transport impacts or existing highway congestion issues. Concern has also been expressed on the impacts recovery facilities will have on local amenities; this theme was closely linked to respondents who had concerns about sites near residential areas in terms of potential noise and pollution.

### **6, Approach to implementation and monitoring**

Some representations have highlighted that planning applications for residual facilities may exceed indicative capacities in catchment areas for example in the Avonmouth/Sevenside area; highlighting the importance of implementation and monitoring of the JWCS.

### **7, Sites – Inclusion & Removal**

Concern was expressed in some representations about the inclusion of some of the proposed sites for residual waste facilities particularly those located near residential areas, that it was requested they be removed from the JWCS. Other representations queried why certain sites had not been included, and requested they be (re)assessed for inclusion.

### **8, Phasing and deliverability of sites**

The deliverability of some sites has been queried in some representations, specifically to the availability of sites and whether they are achievable in terms of both planning and commercial considerations.

### **9, Role of urban extensions**

Some representations expressed concern that the JWCS would set a precedent for how urban extensions may be treated in other emerging core strategies; in addition to this, there was also concern that if waste facilities are required at potential urban extensions this may impact on other development uses, amenity and transport.

# Appendix 1: Workshop Report

## JOINT WASTE CORE STRATEGY FOR THE WEST OF ENGLAND

### Progress Update Stakeholder Workshop

Armada House, Bristol  
Telephone Avenue, Bristol

Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009, 9.30am-12.30pm

#### Workshop Report

This workshop, held in parallel with the Progress Update and ongoing public engagement, brought together stakeholders with in depth, specialist and technical knowledge of the issues pertaining to the Joint Waste Core Strategy, in order to:

- Provide participants with the opportunity to receive an update on the outcomes from the Preferred Options consultation.
- Provide participants with an opportunity to hear how further technical work has been undertaken on the supporting evidence base and how the Joint Waste Core Strategy submission document is being developed.
- Provide participants with a further opportunity to question, challenge and explore any issues arising from the Progress Update.
- Increase mutual understanding between stakeholders, the development industry and the Partnership Authorities, with different knowledge and interests by listening to each others' perspectives.
- Stimulate creative, innovative thinking in relation to how policy in the emerging Joint Waste Core Strategy may be developed to address the key issues and challenges facing the West of England.

#### PROGRAMME

10am Welcome

Preferred options Consultation - summary of responses and key points raised.  
Questions & Comments

Summary of the Progress Update - Scope and further technical work recently completed.  
Questions & Comments

Key considerations from Technical Work - for the development industry and impact upon sites.  
Questions & Comments

Next steps- Timetable  
Questions & Comments

1pm Thank you and close

## **Comments from delegates**

### **Preferred options Consultation- summary of responses and key points raised.**

- The SFRA for North Somerset has still yet to be completed, will there be further re-assessment of sites once it has been completed and will there be a further round of consultation?
- The Habitats Regulations Assessment recommended that some sites were not suitable for some types of treatment facilities, therefore how can it be argued that the core strategy is technology neutral.
- Why hasn't the core strategy elaborated on why the proposed urban extensions are seen as suitable locations' for waste management facilities?
- How does the joint waste core strategy link to the Unitary Authorities policies on climate change?
- Why is there no tonnage limit on what's a residual waste site and what's a strategic waste site?
- What is residual; has the core strategy taken the environment agencies definition, if so what about the commercial/industrial take on the definition?
- Is there opportunity for existing recycling transfer stations to increase their capacity?
- What proportion of waste do we predict will continue to go to landfill?

## **Key considerations resulting from Technical Work**

### **Need & Capacity**

- The core strategy should refer to the recent Defra review of Commercial and Industrial Waste.
- Does the document take account of past housing completions in relation to an increase/decrease in waste?
- What is the definition of recovery?

### **SFRA**

- What were the criteria for the sequential test?

### **Habitats Regulations Assessment**

- Have the new sites, which came through the preferred options consultation been assessed in the Habitat Regulations Assessment?

- Have sites been identified in the broad areas for the proposed urban extensions, if so have these sites been assessed in the Habitat Regulations and the SFRA?
- Have sites that have been discounted been included in the report, with reasons for their exclusion given?
- Before discounting sites have possible mitigation measures been examined?

### **Revised Detail Site Assessment**

- Will the UAs be willing to use CPOs to attain sites to bring forward deliverability?
- Will only 5 sites be taken forward to the submission stage in accordance with option C, or will more sites be allocated to ensure deliverability and flexibility?
- Will there be some form of caveat included in the document, which will prevent unallocated sites undermining allocated sites?
- In areas, which have the potential capacity to deliver numerous sites, won't those that are allocated have priority/advantage over sites that are not allocated but are equally deliverable?

### **Landfill**

- Why aren't we allocating specific sites for landfill?
- What if proposals come forward for alternative uses for landfill, such as landfill mining?

### **General Comments**

- What is the programme for final comments etc?
- Once the RSS is confirmed what will the implications be on waste sites in urban extensions?

## **Participants**

### **Delegates**

Simon Bayliss	GVA Gimley on behalf of the Highways Agency
Chris Dadds	Baker Associates
David Davies	Clive Miller & Associates Ltd
Anne Dugdale	Cory Environmental
Rob Enticott	Bristol Environmental Technology & Services Sector
Mike Graham	Pelorus – on behalf of SITA
Amanda Grundy	Natural England
Philip Hale	Minerals Waste and Planning WP2
Ian John	Viridor
Gareth Philips	SITA UK
Karl Scholz	Alder King Planning Consultants
Hilary Severn	Avonside CPRE
Andrew Simpson	Baker Associates
Claire Southam	Indigo Planning
Brett Spiller	New Earth Solutions
Simon Steele-Perkins	Strategic Land Partnerships
Jane Stephonson	Resource Futures
Rick Twomey	Cyclamax Holdings Ltd
David Westbrook	Natural England

### **Chair**

Terry Wagstaff Chief Executive of the West of England Partnership

### **Presenters**

Natalie Maletras	ERM consultants
Kirsten Berry	ERM consultants
Beth Seldon	ERM consultants
Laura Grady	West of England Partnership Office

### **Officers**

Philip Anelay	North Somerset Council
Julia Dean	West of England Partnership Office
Charlotte Hopley	West of England

S:\WEP\Waste DPD\Project Management\Project Management ERM\Progress Update June 2009\Progress Update Summary Report.doc