

West of England Partnership  
Partnership Board  
11<sup>th</sup> September 2009

## Joint West Core Strategy: Approval of Draft Submission Document VIEWS OF/ RESPONSES TO THE PLANNING, HOUSING & COMMUNITIES BOARD ON 7 SEPTEMBER

1. In developing the Joint Waste Core Strategy (JWCS) it is important to ensure that all individual UA Core Strategies are consistent with the JWCS.
2. Planning Housing and Communities Board (PH&CB) Members requested a specific policy that sought district heating schemes, based on heat from waste facilities in Urban extensions. The plan is technology neutral and this is not therefore possible. However, supportive text in the Draft JWCS outlines the expectation that applications must explore all practicable options to include combined heat and power schemes. If councils wished to have explicit policy on district heating infrastructure this would have to be addressed in individual Core Strategies or Area Action Plans.
3. A member asked why Hengrove Park was not included as a potential strategic waste recovery site. Officers Said they would respond.
4. The process of monitoring of the JWCS, will be annual and aligned with existing reporting mechanisms for Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Reports.
5. PH&CB Members requested that the phasing of delivery is expressed in two time periods short term and medium/long term, as opposed to the current proposal for three periods, short, medium, long term.
6. The Draft Submission Document is required to make available sufficient locations for the recovery of residual municipal, industrial and commercial waste – as specified by the Regional Spatial Strategy. Capacity requirements will be monitored and reviewed to ensure over-provision of locations is not made.
7. B&NES Members requested policy re-wording on Policy 13 as outlined below:  
  

Operational waste sites are safeguarded, ***except where other site-specific policies apply and where alternative facilities are to be provided as part of an approved or agreed strategy.*** The Specific sites listed within Policy 5 are safeguarded to deliver the Spatial Strategy. Where proposals would prejudice the implementation of the JWCS, consideration will be given to how they could be amended to make them acceptable, or, where this is not practicable, to refusing planning permission.
8. One member of the PH&CB expressed disappointment at the low attendance of the local drop in sessions and concern that some respondents had said the consultation was not well publicised. More would be done to ensure early engagement, and making better use of the media.
9. PH&CB Members requested that if information is sent to Parish Councils, they are asked to announce at meetings and to circulate papers wider as appropriate.

10. PH&CB Members should promote the four forthcoming workshops, one in each of the partner local authorities in September, to ensure good attendance.

The outcomes of these meetings will be circulated to the PH&CB, prior to the dispatch of papers to the first Council Cabinet. The views of Scrutiny and the Planning Housing & Communities Board will be put to the Partnership Board. The workshops in Councils will supplement the views from Scrutiny and the two Boards at the subsequent Cabinet Meetings.

LG/CH  
9.9.09

**West of England Partnership**  
**Partnership Board**  
**11<sup>th</sup> September 2009**

**Joint West Core Strategy: Approval of Draft Submission Document**  
**VIEWS OF/ RESPONSES TO THE JOINT SCRUTINY ON 4 SEPTEMBER**

1. In engaging and consulting with communities it is essential to draw a clear distinction between the partner authorities planning responsibilities, in drawing up the Joint Waste Core Planning Strategy, and its role in managing the disposal of municipal waste.
2. The independent planning application by EON for a biomass timber disposal facility at Royal Portbury Dock is nothing to do with the Joint Waste Core Planning Strategy.
3. Provision of district heating schemes, based on heat from waste facilities, in urban extensions would not necessarily have to be adopted by developers.
4. It is important to continue to emphasise to the public the practical local impact of the Joint Waste Core Planning Strategy as it determines the potential, preferred location of waste recovery facilities.
5. Joint Scrutiny Members should continue their scrutiny work in the four forthcoming workshops, one in each of the partner local authorities in September.

The outcomes of these meetings will be circulated to the Joint Scrutiny Committee, and an additional meeting of the Committee organised as necessary, prior to the dispatch of papers to the first Council Cabinet.

The views of Scrutiny will be put to the Planning Housing & Communities Board and the Partnership Board. The workshops in Councils will supplement the views from Scrutiny and the two Boards at the subsequent Cabinet Meetings.

6. The Draft Submission Document could be considered as a material consideration when assessing planning applications. More weight would be given after it has been approved by Councils for Publication.
7. The Draft Submission Document is technology neutral although it has been necessary to add relevant conditions based on the various technical assessments of the specific sites now recommended as potential locations for residual waste facilities. These conditions are contained in the JWCS as "Key Development Criteria" and must be addressed in planning applications.
8. The Draft Submission Document sets out criteria for assessing non-residual waste sites. In common with the strategic waste sites these criteria once adopted, would be part of each local authorities planning framework.
9. The Draft Submission Document is required to make available sufficient locations for the recovery of residual municipal, industrial and commercial waste – as specified by

the Regional Spatial Strategy. Capacity requirements will be monitored and reviewed to ensure over-provision of locations is not made.

10. When in future authorities receive planning applications against the sites included in the final Joint Waste Core Strategy the usual planning criteria, including impact assessments, will be applied.
11. One member of the Joint Scrutiny Committee expressed disappointment at the low response to some parts of the public consultation.
12. The same member welcomed the progress that had been made with the proposals as a means of ensuring better and proper control of waste disposal on existing and future sites.
13. Demographic factors taken into account in planning appropriate waste sites capacity include population and household projections. A breakdown of population by age/particular groups has not specifically been considered. The total capacity to be provided will meet that required by the Regional Spatial Strategy.
14. Overall, engagement and consultation with the public will have been in three phases:
  - consultation to develop the Preferred Options.
  - the most recent consultation on the Preferred Options to develop the Draft Submission Document.
  - consultation on the fit for purpose soundness of the Draft Submission Document once approved by Cabinets/Councils in October/November.
15. The outcome of the first phase of consultation directly influenced the development of the Preferred Options.
16. Today's report and background documents set out how consultation and 'Progress Updates' have influenced the scope of the Draft Submission Document.
17. The Development Management Policy will be amended to include de-commissioning of facilities, alongside the scope for limiting the duration of use.

TW/JM  
7.9.09