

**WEST OF ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP  
JOINT WASTE CORE STRATEGY**

**MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION**

**PROCEDURAL AND CONFORMITY MATTERS**

**Key Issue:**

**Whether the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the relevant legal requirements**

1. *Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the local development schemes of the Partnership authorities?*

The Joint Waste Core Strategy (JWCS) has been prepared in accordance with the Partnership Authorities' Local Development Schemes (LDS) and Statements of Community Involvement.

The JWCS timetable was changed to consider representations following further consultation on the JWCS.

The timetable of remaining key milestones to the adoption of the Joint Waste Core Strategy has been formally submitted to Government Office for the South West (GOSW) and has been endorsed as an addendum to the Authorities' Published LDS.

The timetable is as follows:

- Submission to Secretary of State. 30th July 2010
- Examination. 16th - 23rd November 2010
- Adoption of the JWCS, anticipated by April 2011.

2. Has the Partnership had regard to:

<i>national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;</i>	Yes - set out in policy context section of the JWCS at Section 5.
<i>the need for development plan documents (taken as a whole) to include policies designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change;</i>	Yes - set out at Sections 3.3, 4.3, 4.4, 5.6.10, 5.6.11, and Section 6.2. of the JWCS.
<i>the RSS for the region;</i>	Yes - this was set out in Section 5.4 of the JWCS submission document July 2010, however following the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.
<i>the RSS for any adjoining region;</i>	Yes - considered in evidence preparation when considering current waste management context and exportation of waste.
<i>the community strategies of the Partnership authorities;</i>	Yes - set out at paragraphs 5.6.8 and 5.6.9 of the JWCS.
<i>any other local development documents that have been adopted by the Partnership authorities;</i>	Yes - set out in Section 5.6 of the JWCS.
<i>the resources likely to be available for implementing the proposals;</i>	Yes - set out in Monitoring and Implementation Section 7 of the

	JWCS.
<i>the strategy prepared for the region under Section 7 of the Regional Development Agencies Act 1998<sup>1</sup>;</i>	Yes - considered in evidence preparation, when assessing economic growth RES strategy of 3.2% considered.
<i>any local transport plan, the policies of which affect any part of the Partnership area;</i>	Yes - set out at paragraph 5.6.12 of the JWCS.
<i>any other policies prepared under Section 108(1) and (2)<sup>2</sup> of the Transport Act 2000 which affect any part of the Partnership area;</i>	Yes - as required.
<i>the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents;</i>	Yes - as required when considering policy on operational requirements.
<i>the long-term need to maintain appropriate distances between establishments<sup>3</sup> and residential areas, buildings and areas of public use, major transport routes as far as possible, recreational areas and areas of particular natural sensitivity or interest;</i>	Yes - as required in evidence preparation.
<i>the need, in the case of existing establishments, for additional technical measures in accordance with Article 5 of the Council Directive 96/82/EC on the control of major accident hazards involving dangerous substances so as not to increase the risks to people; and</i>	Yes – as required in evidence preparation.
<i>the national waste strategy?</i>	Yes - set out at Section 5.3 of the JWCS.

3. *Have the Partnership authorities adopted statements of community involvement and, if so, does the Core Strategy comply with those statements?*

Yes, these are included in the evidence base.

4. *Has the Partnership carried out an appraisal of the sustainability of the proposals and prepared a report of the findings of the appraisal?*

Yes, these are included in the evidence base (Evidence Base File 1 documents 3.1-3.4).

5. *Is the Core Strategy in general conformity with the RSS?*

Yes- this was confirmed at the publication (pre-submission) consultation stage (January 2010) by the letter of conformity received from SW Councils and also the representation from Government Office for the South West.

6. *In so far as the Core Strategy contains policies that are intended to supersede other policies, is that fact stated in the Core Strategy and are the superseded policies identified?*

Yes - at Appendix 3 of the JWCS.

7. *In respect of such of the “specific consultation bodies”<sup>4</sup> as the Partnership considered may have had an interest in the subject matter of the proposed Core Strategy, did the Partnership notify those bodies of the subject of the Core Strategy that it proposed to prepare; also invite representations about what the Core Strategy ought to contain?*

<sup>1</sup> RDAs are required to formulate strategies relating to their purposes

<sup>2</sup> Relating to policies and functions of local transport authorities

<sup>3</sup> Under Council Directive 96/82/EC, “establishment” means the whole area under the control of an operator where dangerous substances are present in one or more installations, including common or related infrastructures or activities. See Article 3 for the various definitions.

<sup>4</sup> and <sup>5</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 (as amended), Regulation 2(1)

Yes - The Partnership Authorities informed statutory consultation bodies and other stakeholders and consultees on the proposal to prepare a Joint Waste Core Strategy in accordance with the Authorities' Statement(s) of Community Involvement. This process started in 2007 at the Issues and Options stage and further rounds of consultation followed including; Preferred Options stage (2009), various Progress Updates (2009-2010), and Publication (pre-submission) stage (2010). Consultation statements confirming who was consulted, how and at what stage, are included in the evidence base. Please see evidence base documents (File 1 document 2.1 West of England Consultation Statement in accordance with regulation 25 and document 2.2 West of England Consultation Statement in accordance with regulation 28).

8. *In respect of such of the "general consultation bodies"<sup>6</sup> as the Partnership considered appropriate, did the Partnership notify those bodies of the subject of the Core Strategy that it proposed to prepare and invite representations about what the Core Strategy ought to contain?*

Yes - The Partnership Authorities informed statutory consultation bodies and other stakeholders and consultees on the proposal to prepare the Joint Waste Core Strategy in accordance with the Authorities' Statement(s) of Community Involvement. This process started in 2007 at the Issues and Options stage and further rounds of consultation followed including; Preferred Options stage (2009), various Progress Updates (2009-2010), and Publication (pre-submission) stage (2010). Consultation statements confirming who was consulted, how and at what stage, are included in the evidence base. Please see evidence base documents (File 1 document 2.1 West of England Consultation Statement in accordance with regulation 25 and document 2.2 West of England Consultation Statement in accordance with regulation 28).

9. *Did the Partnership consider whether it was appropriate to invite representations from persons who were resident or carrying on business in the Partnership area? If so, did the Partnership make arrangements for the purposes of inviting representations from such persons of those descriptions as they thought appropriate?*

Yes - The Partnership Authorities informed statutory consultation bodies and other stakeholders and consultees on the proposal to prepare a Joint Waste Core Strategy in accordance with the Authorities' Statement(s) of Community Involvement. This included consultation with Parish and Town Councils, and Neighbourhood Partnerships, Public drop in sessions, development industry workshops, regular progress updates on the Partnership website. At each stage of consultation, how to make a representation and other relevant information was advertised in the local press, on the website and at libraries, council offices and one stop shops. Representations were welcomed by post or on-line. The JWCS was regularly reported to Public meetings of the West of England Partnership Board, Planning, Housing & Communities Board and Joint Scrutiny Committee. Consultation statements confirming who was consulted, how and at what stage, are included in the evidence base. Please see evidence base documents (File 1 document 2.1 West of England Consultation Statement in accordance with regulation 25 and document 2.2 West of England Consultation Statement in accordance with regulation 28).

10. *Has the Partnership taken into account the representations made in response to the invitations referred to in the three preceding questions?*

Yes - All representations received were considered in the preparation of the JWCS. A summary schedule of representations and officer responses to those representations was prepared at each stage of consultation (and presented as appropriate to the West of England Partnership Board, Planning Housing & Communities Board and Joint Scrutiny Committee). A summary schedule of representations to the JWCS Pre-submission (publication version), and a schedule of changes to outline how the Partnership Authorities have addressed those representations is contained in the evidence base.

11. *Prior to preparing and submitting the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State, did the Partnership consult each of the "specific consultation bodies" (to the extent that the Partnership thought that the proposed subject matter of the Core Strategy affected the body)?*

Yes - Please see evidence base documents (File 1 document 2.1 West of England consultation statement in accordance with regulation 25 and document 2.2 West of England consultation statement in accordance with regulation 28).

12. Prior to submitting the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State, did the Partnership:

<p><i>make a copy of the proposed submission document and a statement of the representations procedure available for inspection during normal office hours at its principal offices and at such other places within the area that it considered appropriate; and, on the same day, did it request the opinion in writing of the RPB as to general conformity of the Core Strategy with the RSS?</i></p>	<p>Yes. On 4<sup>th</sup> January 2010, copies of the Pre- submission document were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area, along with the statement of representations procedure and representation form. All were placed on the website and all Stakeholders and Consultees were notified.</p> <p>The opinion of the RPB as to general conformity of the Core Strategy with the Draft RSS was requested in writing on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2010.</p> <p>From 18<sup>th</sup> May to 28<sup>th</sup> June further consultation was undertaken on the Section 6.10 of the JWCS, in regard to landfill provision and policy 8. Copies of this material were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area, along with the statement of representations procedure and representation form. All were placed on the website and all Stakeholders and Consultees were notified on the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010.</p>
<p><i>publish on its website the proposed submission document; a statement of the representations procedure; and a statement of the fact that the proposed submission document was available for inspection and the places and times at which it could be inspected;</i></p>	<p>Yes - the WoE Partnership websites has a dedicated JWCS section which is updated according to the stage of preparation of the JWCS.  <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planing/joint-waste-core-strategy">http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planing/joint-waste-core-strategy</a></p> <p>Further, each of the four Unitary Authorities' websites link to the WoE Partnership website:</p> <p><b>B&amp;NES</b>  <a href="http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/planning/localdevelopmentscheme/Pages/Joint%20Waste%20Core%20Strategy.aspx">http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/planning/localdevelopmentscheme/Pages/Joint%20Waste%20Core%20Strategy.aspx</a></p> <p><b>Bristol City Council</b>  <a href="http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment-and-planning/planning/local-development-framework/?jsessionid=F2DC7F301BC424F24C6567021A3A515A.tcwwwaplaws2">http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment-and-planning/planning/local-development-framework/?jsessionid=F2DC7F301BC424F24C6567021A3A515A.tcwwwaplaws2</a></p> <p><b>North Somerset Council</b>  <a href="http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/Environment/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework">http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/Environment/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework</a></p>

	<p><b>South Gloucestershire</b>  <a href="http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/8aa42f49-c98d-4b70-9b9c-11bb51e63546">http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/8aa42f49-c98d-4b70-9b9c-11bb51e63546</a></p> <p>On 4<sup>th</sup> January 2010 the Pre-submission document was published on the website, along with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.the JWCS timetable,</li> <li>2.supporting evidence base documentation,</li> <li>3.the statement of representations procedure</li> <li>4. a list of locations where the documents could be inspected.</li> </ol> <p>From 18<sup>th</sup> May to 28<sup>th</sup> June further consultation was undertaken on the Section 6.10 of the JWCS, in regard to landfill provision and policy 8. Copies of this material were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area, along with the statement of representations procedure and representation form. All were placed on the website and all Stakeholders and Consultees were notified on the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010.</p>
<p><i>send to the specific consultation bodies who were invited to make representations a copy of the proposed submission document and a statement of the representations procedure;</i></p>	<p>Yes. On 4<sup>th</sup> January 2010, copies of the proposed submission document the statement of representations procedure and representation form, were sent to all the specific consultation bodies.</p> <p>From 18<sup>th</sup> May to 28<sup>th</sup> June further consultation was undertaken on the Section 6.10 of the JWCS, in regard to landfill provision and policy 8. Copies of this material were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area, along with the statement of representations procedure and representation form. All were placed on the website and all Stakeholders and Consultees were notified on the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010.</p>
<p><i>send to the general consultation bodies who were invited to make representations a statement of the representations procedure and a statement of the fact that the proposed submission document was available for inspection and of the places and times at which it could be inspected; and</i></p>	<p>Yes. On 4<sup>th</sup> January 2010, copies of the proposed submission document were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area, along with the statement of representations procedure and representation form. All information and links to the documentation, were placed on the Partnership's website and all Stakeholders and Consultees were</p>

	<p>notified.</p> <p>From 18<sup>th</sup> May to 28<sup>th</sup> June further consultation was undertaken on the Section 6.10 of the JWCS, in regard to landfill provision and policy 8. Copies of this material were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area, along with the statement of representations procedure and representation form. All were placed on the website and all Stakeholders and Consultees were notified on the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010.</p>
<p><i>give by local advertisement notice which set out a statement of the representations procedure and a statement of the fact that the proposed submission document was available for inspection and of the places and times at which it could be inspected?</i></p>	<p>Yes. Adverts were produced setting out: the Representations procedure (regulation 27), where documents could be inspected; a link to further information on the Partnership website and a contact telephone number. The adverts were placed on or after the 4<sup>th</sup> January 2010, in local press covering the Plan area including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bristol Evening post</li> <li>-Bristol Observer</li> <li>-The Bath Chronicle</li> <li>-Gloucestershire Gazette Series</li> <li>-Somerset Guardian and Standard</li> <li>-Weston &amp; Somerset Mercury</li> </ul> <p>From 18<sup>th</sup> May to 28<sup>th</sup> June further consultation was undertaken on the Section 6.10 of the JWCS, in regard to landfill provision and policy 8. This was advertised in the local press as above on or after 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010.</p>

13. Has the Partnership sent to the Secretary of State in paper form and, if practicable, electronically (in addition to the Core Strategy), the following "Core Strategy documents":

<p>the sustainability appraisal report for the Core Strategy;</p>	<p>Yes. Please see evidence base file 1 documents 3.1-3.4.</p>
<p>a submission proposals map (if the adoption of the Core Strategy would result in changes to the adopted proposals map);</p>	<p>The JWCS contains a Key Diagram which presents important spatial details such as designations and the location of the sites/areas proposed to be allocated. This is supplemented by the detailed maps prepared for each site/area, which are accompanied by key development criteria. The Proposals Map prepared by each Partnership Authority will be updated with such relevant information when submitted as part of their LDF.</p>

the statements of community involvement (if adopted);	Yes. Please see evidence base file 4.
a statement setting out which of the specific and general consultation bodies were invited to make representations; how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations; a summary of the main issues raised by the representations; and how representations have been taken into account;	Yes. Please see evidence base file 1 documents 2.1 and 2.2.
a statement setting out the number of “duly made” <sup>6</sup> representations (or that no representations were made); and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations;	Yes. Please see evidence base file 1 documents 2.1 and 2.2.
copies of the “duly made” representations; and	Yes. Please see evidence base file ‘consultation representations’.
such supporting documents as it considers relevant to the preparation of the Core Strategy?	Yes. A list of the documentation supplied can also be seen on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy/evidence-base-">http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy/evidence-base-</a>

14. Has an Appropriate Assessment been undertaken under the Habitats Directive (and sent to the Secretary of State)? If not, has a scoping exercise shown that there is no need for such an assessment?

The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been carried out in accordance with statutory requirements (please see evidence base file 2 documents 8.1-8.2).

15. In respect of the documents sent to the Secretary of State, has the Partnership:

made available a copy of the Core Strategy and the Core Strategy documents during normal office hours at the places at which the proposed submission document was made available;	Yes. On 30 <sup>th</sup> July copies of the Core Strategy Submission document were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area. A copy was placed on the Partnership website along with a full list of locations as to where documents could be inspected. All stakeholders and consultees were notified by email or letter on 30 <sup>th</sup> July of the submission of the JWCS to the Secretary of State.
published on its website the Core Strategy and the Core Strategy documents; the Core Strategy matters; and a statement of the fact that the Core Strategy and the Core Strategy documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected;	Yes. The West of England Partnership’s website has a dedicated JWCS section which is updated according to the stage of preparation of the JWCS. <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy">http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy</a> . The Partnership website is linked to from the four Unitary Authority websites.
sent to the specific consultation bodies who were invited to make representations a copy of the Core Strategy and relevant Core Strategy documents; and a statement of the fact that a copy of the Core Strategy and the Core Strategy	Yes. On 30 <sup>th</sup> July all specific consultation bodies were sent a copy of the Joint Waste Core Strategy and supporting evidence base on CD, along with a list of locations as to where

<sup>6</sup> Representation made in accordance with Regulation 28(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 (as amended)

documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected;	documents could be inspected, and a link to the Partnership's website.
sent to the general consultation bodies who were invited to make representations notification that copies of the Core Strategy documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected;	Yes. On 30 <sup>th</sup> July copies of the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission document were made available at main council offices and libraries/one stop shops across the Plan area. A copy was placed on the Partnership website along with a full list of locations as to where documents could be inspected. All stakeholders and consultees were notified on 30 <sup>th</sup> July by email or letter of the submission of the JWCS to the Secretary of State.
given notice by local advertisement of the title of the Core Strategy; the subject matter of, and the area covered by, the Core Strategy; and the fact that a copy of the Core Strategy and the Core Strategy documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected; and	Yes. Adverts were produced setting out: in accordance with Regulation 30; that the JWCS had been submitted, where documents could be inspected; a link to further information on the Partnership website and a contact telephone number. The adverts were placed on or after the 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2010, in local press covering the Plan area including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bristol Evening post</li> <li>-Bristol Observer</li> <li>-The Bath Chronicle</li> <li>-Gloucestershire Gazette Series</li> <li>-Somerset Guardian and Standard</li> <li>-Weston &amp; Somerset Mercury</li> </ul>
given notice to those persons who requested to be notified of the submission of the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State that it has been so submitted?	Yes. Email notification and letters were sent out on 30 <sup>th</sup> July.

16. Where any person requested the opportunity to appear before the Inspector, did the Partnership (at least 6 weeks before the opening of the independent examination):

publish on its website the time and place at which the examination is to be held together with the name of the appointed Inspector;	Yes. The West of England Partnership's website has a dedicated JWCS section which is updated according to the stage of preparation of the JWCS. <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy">http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning/joint-waste-core-strategy</a>  Latest updates are also advertised on the homepage: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/">http://www.westofengland.org/</a>
notify any person who made "duly made" representations of those matters (unless they withdrew their representation); and	Yes. Email and letter notifications were sent to all Stakeholders and Consultees on 1 <sup>st</sup> September setting out details of; the appointed Inspector, the pre-hearing meeting and examination dates, and, that further correspondence should be made through the Programme Officer.
given notice by local advertisement of those matters?	Yes. On or after 1 <sup>st</sup> September 2010 a local advertisement was placed in press covering the

	local Plan area including; -Bristol Evening post -Bristol Observer -The Bath Chronicle -Gloucestershire Gazette Series -Somerset Guardian and Standard -Weston & Somerset Mercury.
--	--

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership  
GOSW

## MISCELLANEOUS POINTS

### Key Issue:

#### Whether the Core Strategy is justified, effective and consistent with national policy

1. *To what extent is it intended to adhere to the provisions of the former draft Regional Spatial Strategy?*

Section 5.4 of the JWCS sets out the relationship between the JWCS and the former draft Regional Spatial Strategy. The Partnership Authorities commissioned the WEP Needs Assessment to test apportionments in the former draft RSS to ensure that the Authorities could plan for the capacity required to meet the West of England's needs.

2. *What changes to the Core Strategy are suggested as a result of the demise of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy?*

The references to Regional Policy and the RSS at Section 5.4 could be removed given that the JWCS provides its own evidence base that sets out the future capacity requirements to be planned for, and the framework for waste policy is set at the European and national level. Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

3. *Will the content of the Plan enable the Core Strategy to look forward for a period of at least 10 years from the date of adoption? (PPS 10, Para 16)*

Yes - The JWCS, at paragraph 1.1.5, sets out that the plan period is up to 2026 and that its implementation will be monitored, to identify if an early review is necessary.

4. *How is it envisaged that necessary changes to the Proposals Maps of the Partnership authorities will be brought about?*

The JWCS contains a Key Diagram that gives the location of proposed site allocations for residual waste treatment facilities and other important spatially related information, eg designations. Each site proposed to be allocated is presented in a detailed map and accompanied by key development criteria. The Proposals Map prepared by each Partnership Authority will be updated with such relevant information when submitted as part of their LDF.

5. *In Paragraph 1.1.2, and regarding the scope of the DPD, would it be better to say "The Joint Waste Core Strategy applies to all waste, with the exception of most radioactive waste the policy for which is dealt with at a national level"; similarly in Paragraph 2.2.1?*

Radioactive waste is dealt with at the national level, the Partnership Authorities do not consider it appropriate to use the term 'most' radioactive waste in this context in the JWCS

6. *Under the heading of municipal waste, and in the table under Paragraph 2.2.1, there is reference to a contract to supply municipal waste treatment capacity. Has any related provision yet been made? If so, how much, where and of what type? What provision is still to be made?*

The contract to supply 120,000tpa is expected to commence on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011. There may be an interim period from 1<sup>st</sup> April where a reception hall is in place, with the plant becoming operational shortly afterward. Construction is underway on site of an MBT facility.

7. *The same table, in regard to waste water treatment, refers to a commissioned Infrastructure Study (see also Para 6.11.1). Are the results available? What provision is needed? What are the policy implications?*

The West of England Partnership commissioned an infrastructure study from Roger Tym and Partners, (May 2010<sup>7</sup>) to identify and appraise the infrastructure requirements to support the growth of homes and jobs in the Partnership area until 2026. With regard to conclusions on the provision for waste water treatment the study indicated the following; "Discussion with Wessex Water indicates

---

<sup>7</sup> West of England Partnership: Responding to Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Issues in the West of England. Roger Tym and Partners with transport inputs from URS. Final Report May 2010.

that strategic improvement will be needed in response to the development planned for the West of England, with the preferred strategic solution for development in and around Bristol of taking additional sewerage to the Avonmouth Sewage Treatment Works, and with development in the north of the sub-region served by major improvements in trunk sewerage. There are no sewerage capacity growth barriers to the development proposed that are sufficiently serious to halt development entirely over the plan period, although there will be a set of investments required to facilitate all of the growth”.

The Partnership Authorities will produce infrastructure plans to support their emerging Core Strategies, which will include further engagement with service providers.

8. *In Para 5.3.1, would it be useful to refer to the Companion Guide to PPS 10?*

Paragraph 5.3.1 of the JWCS sets out national policy, and does not therefore make reference to the PPS10 Companion Guide, which is considered guidance and not policy. The document has however assisted in providing guidance and methodology for preparation of the JWCS, and it is proposed that Para 5.3.1 refers to the PPS10 Companion Guide.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

9. *How useful are Tables 5.2 and 5.3 on renewable heat and electricity targets? Are they the subject of monitoring provisions?*

Section 5.5 of the JWCS sets out the synergies between waste policy and objectives to mitigate the effects of climate change, in particular through the provision of combined heat and power and renewable energy supply. The targets in Table 5.2 and 5.3 were set out in the former draft RSS, as an indication of the targets for renewable heat and electricity. It is proposed that these tables are removed from the JWCS now that the RSS has been revoked.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

The targets in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 were not subject of monitoring provisions. Instead monitoring indicators for Policies 5 and 6 (at page 46 of the JWCS) include:

- Percentage of applications approved for energy recovery facilities incorporating electricity and/or heat generation
- Electricity and/or heat output as a result of residual waste treatment.

It is intended that these targets should remain in order to enable these elements to be appropriately monitored over time.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership

GOSW

## KEY ISSUES, CHALLENGES, VISION AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

### Key Issue:

**Whether the Vision and Strategic Objectives are sufficiently focussed, spatial and locally distinctive; also whether they address adequately matters of self-sufficiency and timely provision**

1. *At the end of Para 3.2.2, should there be recognition that additional landfill / landraising capacity will also be needed?*

The requirement for additional landfill/landraise capacity is recognised at Paragraph 6.10.5. Paragraph 3.2.2 could also acknowledge this need, if felt appropriate by the Inspector, as follows; "This is a key challenge facing the sub-region. Whilst additional landfill capacity will be required, the JWCS needs to provide a positive policy framework that promotes the diversion of waste from landfill. Practically this will be achieved through the delivery of the waste management infrastructure needed to meet the demands of a growing sub-region".

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

2. *In reducing the impact of climate change, is sustainable design a relevant factor (Para 3.3.1)?*

Paragraph 6.2.5 of the JWCS sets out how sustainable design is a relevant factor in contributing to adapting and mitigating the impacts of climate change, and how this relates to the JWCS. "The JWCS seeks to encourage sustainable development in terms of the prudent use of resources such as water, minerals, land and energy. Sustainable design principles make efficient use of resource through location, design, positioning, specification and sourcing of materials, as well as improving the quality of development and enhancing their environmental performance".

The factors presented in the bullets at para 3.3.1 are included as they present the most significant ways in which waste management can contribute to climate change objectives. Consequently, and as supplementary text is provided elsewhere with the JWCS, it is suggested that reference to design is not required at this point of the JWCS, unless the Inspector considers it would be beneficial.

3. *Should the Core Strategy recognise that the relocation of existing waste facilities could be more environmentally harmful than expansion or redevelopment? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

The merits of relocation versus expansion or redevelopment would be site and/or project specific and a general statement would therefore not be helpful policy in the JWCS.

4. *In what ways will communities be able to take responsibility for the waste produced (Para 4.1.1)?*

The JWCS, in accordance with the waste hierarchy, seeks to promote public awareness towards a shared commitment to waste prevention, re-use and recycling. Communities are asked to take responsibility for the waste they generate by moving waste management as high up the hierarchy as possible. This will assist the West of England, as a community, to meet its own needs in providing sufficient waste management infrastructure to deal with waste arising in the area.

5. *Should the Vision be amended to make it locally distinctive (PPS 12, Para 2.1)?*

The Vision is intended to be locally distinctive and reflects that the natural and built environment of the West of England are considered its most distinctive, unique and valuable assets and that these need to be protected by ensuring that the necessary and planned significant growth in the area is managed. This will require the provision of sustainable, resource efficient waste management infrastructure. If felt appropriate by the Inspector, additional text could be provide in the Vision as follows: .."the needs of the West of England to enable sustainable economic growth will be met whilst ensuring the protection of the natural and historic environment which are its most distinctive and unique assets".

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

6. *Is it intended that the sub-region should be self-sufficient and that waste facilities should be provided with capacity equal to the amount of waste generated and requiring management within the area? If so, should this be reflected in the Vision? [Natural England]*

Yes, this is the intention of the JWCS and this commitment is set out in the Vision as “ ..that serves the needs of the West of England” and in the Strategic Objectives of the JWCS as follows: “To deliver the timely provision of an integrated network of waste management facilities to meet requirements in the West of England”. If felt appropriate by the Inspector, this could be made more explicit in the Vision as follows: “By 2026 the West of England will be resource efficient with waste generation minimised, in line with the waste hierarchy, and operating a waste management infrastructure, with sufficient capacity to deal with the amount of waste generated in the West of England. The needs of the West of England to enable sustainable economic growth will be met whilst ensuring the protection of the natural and historic environment which are its most distinctive unique assets”.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

7. *The Vision indicates that the West of England will be resource efficient by 2026. With timely provision, won't the Partnership wish to secure on-going provision such that improvements in resource efficiency can be achieved over the Plan period and demonstrated at key dates?*

The Vision sets out the overall aim by the end of the plan period (2026). It is the intention that within that Plan period timely delivery of infrastructure will mean on-going provision and improvements in resource efficiency.

8. *Is the promotion of public awareness a valid strategic objective in a spatial plan?*

As noted at paragraph 6.2.1 of the JWCS, spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to seek to influence the nature of places and to include policies that can impact on land use, not simply direct it. Promotion of public awareness is a contributor to the reduction of waste, and has synergies with ambitions contained in Sustainable Community Strategies and the West of England Joint Residual Municipal Waste Management Strategy, 2009. This objective also recognises the JWCS' role in seeking to change attitudes to necessary but often unwelcome waste management infrastructure.

9. *Is there a strong enough commitment to infrastructure delivery (Strategic Objectives, fourth bullet)? [Strategic Land Partnerships]*

The Partnership Authorities recognise the importance of and the requirements for waste management infrastructure to support sustainable economic growth of the area. The Partnership Authorities are committed to the delivery of the waste management infrastructure to meet the West of England's needs and this is set out as one of the Strategic Objectives (bullet point 4). Commitment is also demonstrated through the positive wording provided in relevant policy “ *Planning permissions for development ... will be granted ...*”.

10. *Strategic Objectives, 5th bullet: Are there other ways of contributing to the reduction of climate change and adapting to its impacts (as in Para 3.3.1)? Would it be better to omit the examples given and stick to the key objective?*

There are other ways of contributing to the reduction of climate change and mitigating its impact, this strategic objective seeks to set out the high level objective and acknowledge the particular challenge in the West of England in locating facilities at appropriate location having regard for flood risk. If felt appropriate by the Inspector this Strategic Objective could omit the examples given and end at “...provision of waste management facilities at appropriate locations”.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

11. *Strategic Objectives, final bullet point: For the avoidance of doubt, would it be better to refer to locating waste development in accordance with land use priorities?*

This would be a welcome text edit change; “To locate waste development in accordance with land use priorities, giving preference to previously developed land and/or urban areas.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

12. *In the Strategic Objectives, should there be reference to reducing waste miles and using more sustainable modes for transporting waste? [Highways Agency; Strategic Land Partnerships]*

Whilst the distance that waste travels is a consideration, a specific reference to reduction in waste miles would fail to incorporate other factors that contribute to delivery of sustainable waste management and identifying appropriate locations for such development. Similarly, whilst the use of transport modes other than road are to be encouraged, they are unlikely to be useful for the majority of waste movements within the West of England Plan area. It is therefore considered inappropriate to specify a potentially undeliverable objective, instead the JWCS sets out the need to ensure facilities are located at the most appropriate locations.

Further, concerns in regard to sustainable waste transport are incorporated into the matters of the objectives presented at paragraph 4.3.1 such as:

To help enable communities and business in the West of England to take responsibility for the waste they generate (ie by providing infrastructure in the Plan area for these waste producers, waste miles can be reduced);

To deliver a timely provision of an integrated network of waste management facilities to meet requirements in the West of England (ie by providing infrastructure in the Plan area for waste arising in the Plan area waste miles can be reduced); and

To ensure that waste management facilities do not harm the environment or endanger human health and where possible provide benefits (ie the development control criteria expand on this objective by requesting information that will enable the decision maker to understand the benefits and burdens presented by each application, including those in relation to transporting waste).

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership  
Gazelle Properties Ltd  
Strategic Land Partnerships

GOSW  
Natural England  
Highways Agency

## FUTURE CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS

### Key Issue:

**Whether there is clarity over the amount and type of waste management facilities that are likely to be required and the timing of their provision; also adequacy of coverage within the Core Strategy and justification through a robust and credible evidence base**

1. *Is there adequate coverage of “what”, “where” and “when”? [GOSW]*

The JWCS sets out the future capacity requirements of the West of England at Section 6.4. These include; Recycling/Composting capacity of some 800,000tpa, Residual waste treatment capacity of some 800,000tpa, and additional landfill/landraise requirement of some 5.9-6.5 million cubic metres over the plan period to 2026.

A topic paper titled Future Waste Management Capacity Requirements for the West of England 2010 (the Topic Paper) has been prepared to update the evidence base for the JWCS and to clarify how it has informed its development. The Topic Paper updates the information outlined above. Three years have passed and in some cases more capacity has been permitted since the original calculations were conducted in the WEP Needs Assessment. It is estimated from the updated information that 725,000 tpa of non-hazardous residual recovery capacity; 4.8 million tonnes (approx 5.6 million cubic metres) of non-hazardous landfill capacity; 3 million tonnes of CD&E recycling capacity and 8.65 million tonnes of CD&E landfill capacity are required until the end of the plan period. Full details of the updated information can be seen in the Topic Paper, compiled with assistance from the Environment Agency.

The waste prevention and recycling/composting achievements of the Authorities and the need to divert as much waste away from landfill as possible, has led the Partnership to identify that the provision of residual waste facilities is the strategic issue that must be addressed in the spatial strategy. The JWCS identifies in the spatial strategy and at policy 5 sites that are critical to the delivery of the JWCS and proposes that those sites are allocated for the location of residual waste treatment facilities. Policy 5 identifies 800tpa of residual waste treatment capacity is required over the plan period. Whilst the Topic Paper notes that from updated information 725,000 tpa is required for the residual waste treatment, it is not considered necessary to change this figure in the JWCS. Future waste arisings and required capacity can only ever be forecast estimates and additional recovery capacity, in the right location, may be welcomed in order to divert waste from disposal to landfill.

2. *Is there clarity over the basis of the needs assessment? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

The WEP Needs Assessment is part of the evidence base that supports the JWCS, it was undertaken to provide a greater level of understanding of the factors that will influence waste management capacity requirements over time and to identify appropriate targets for the management of waste. The Needs Assessment researched baseline waste arisings in the West of England and considered future growth scenarios and waste management targets appropriate to the Plan area so as to forecast future capacity requirements (as advocated in the PPS10 Companion Guide). Further discussion on the growth scenarios is included in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.7 in the Topic Paper.

3. *For all waste streams, what are the baseline figures (preferable for 2010) for current arisings?*

The information is summarised in Tables 1 and 2 of the Topic Paper.

4. *Does more accurate baseline data need to be established for commercial and industrial (C&I) waste? [Natural England]*

The provision of data on commercial and industrial waste arisings is a national issue and is not consistent or timely and there are therefore data issues which are not unique to the West of England. The JWCS has been prepared with the best available data and the Partnership Authorities await the outcome of, and will continue to participate in, any further work with the EA and other partners in improving the quality of waste data. Monitoring of the JWCS will ensure that when data becomes

available the Authorities will be able to ensure the right level of waste management capacity is being planned and provided for.

5. *For municipal solid waste (MSW), how much is currently composted and how much is recycled?*

For the baseline year 2007/08 26.5% of MSW was recycled and 14.5% composted. This gives a total of 41% of MSW recycled/composted. For the year 2009/10 a breakdown is not available but MSW recycled/composted was 42%.

6. *For commercial and industrial (C&I) waste, how much is currently recycled?*

For the baseline year 2007/08 34% of C&I waste was recycled.

7. *For key future dates (say 2015, 2020 and 2025), what are the target percentages for the amount of MSW and C&I that will be recycled and recovered. For the recycled component of MSW, what percentage should be composted? Similarly, what percentage of construction and demolition (C&D) waste should be used productively? What is the basis of the targets and the justification for choosing them?*

The waste management targets that are set out in the JWCS for the waste streams and their justification can be viewed by key years in Table 5, 6, and 7 of the Topic Paper. As outlined above in Question 5 a separate break down of recycling and composting is not possible, therefore targets can only be set for them combined.

8. *For all waste streams, what rates of growth have been selected and used? What is the justification for choosing those particular growth rates?*

Discussion on the growth scenarios selected and their justifications are included in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.7 in the Topic Paper.

9. *What are the latest capacity calculations (recycling, composting, treatment and incineration)? In respect of existing capacity, are there any "lifespan" issues?*

This information has been considered and is set out in the Topic Paper. Section 5 outlines the existing capacity in the Plan area and what will be required in the future. Of particular relevance are Tables 8 and 9 that display this information.

10. *What is the assumed recycling capacity at Waste Transfer Stations and how robust is that assumption (further evidence needed)? Have appropriate assumptions been made? [Environment Agency]*

The assumption of recycling capacity at waste transfer stations is discussed in Section 6 of the Topic Paper.

11. *What inert and non-inert landfill capacity is available within the sub-region? How is that capacity being reduced year by year?*

The current capacity is set out in Table 8 of the Topic Paper. Tables 13 and 14 of the Topic Paper also illustrate when and how much capacity will need to be delivered at key years in the Plan period.

12. *On the basis of the above figures, is there a current shortfall (quantify) in facilities for the management of all waste streams? What facilities would be needed to plug the current capacity gap?*

The current capacity gaps for the waste streams are shown in Table 9 of the Topic Paper. Tables 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 of the Topic Paper also illustrate when and how much capacity will need to be delivered at key years in the Plan period.

13. *If the current and on-going capacity gap were met at key dates, what would be the position in 2015, 2020 and 2025 given the assumed arising growth rates and recycling and recovery targets?*

Tables 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 of the Topic Paper, illustrate when and how much capacity will need to be delivered at key years in the Plan period.

14. *In place of Table 5.1, would it be sensible to show in tabular form the indicative scale and number of facilities required, at 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2025, for (1) recycling MSW and C&I waste; (2) composting MSW; (3) recovery of MSW; (4) infilling of non-inert (MSW and C&I) waste; (5) recycling of C&D waste; and (6) landfilling of inert (C&D) waste?*

If felt sensible by the Inspector Tables 5, 6 and 7 of the Topic Paper could be combined to illustrate this information.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

15. *What changes to the Core Strategy would be necessary to summarise the above information?*

It is proposed that Table 9 of the Topic Paper is inserted into the JWCS. It is further proposed that Tables 5, 6 and 7 of the Topic Paper are referenced in the monitoring framework.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

16. *What is the source of the figures in Table 6.1? Is the indicated capacity distribution reflected in the spatial provisions of the Plan?*

The figures in Table 6.1 are the former draft RSS apportionment distributed across the Authorities based upon the current amount of waste arisings across the area, and the existing recycling/composting provision. These indicative distributions were provided as a guide for authorities and as stated at paragraph 6.4.3 should not be seen as a ceiling to recycling and composting, which are promoted and would contribute to a reduced need for residual treatment or disposal facilities.

17. *Should Table 6.1 be removed from the Core Strategy? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

If felt appropriate by the Inspector, Table 6.1 could be removed from the JWCS.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

18. *In the Core Strategy, should there be some explicit consideration of the present and future need for facilities that will secure the productive use of C&D waste (as well as its disposal to landfill)? (Para 6.4.4)*

The most up to date waste arisings of CD&E waste is 2,300,000tpa, (2007/08), of which 60% is recycled. Para 6.5.5 of the JWCS acknowledges that in order to achieve the targets for the diversion of CD&E waste from landfill increased recycling and/or beneficial uses for CD&E wastes is required. A proposed change has been submitted to include more information in the supporting text to outline the role that exempt disposal and temporary inert recycling facilities play. Further details on CD&E waste can be found in the Topic Paper (paragraphs 5.11 -5.13).

19. *What is the source of the figures in Table 6.2? How do the figures compare with those shown in the Capacity Needs Study at Table 2.3?*

The source of the figures in Table 6.2 are those used within the WEP Needs Assessment in Table 2.3. However, the figures only include the projected recycling component of the overall diversion requirements and do not include the diversion of CD&E waste to other beneficial uses, such as engineering works. It is acknowledged that this may be unclear to the reader and a proposed change

has been submitted to include the overall diversion capacity requirements in Table 6.2 in line with the targets set. These can also be seen in Table 5 of the Topic Paper.

20. *Should there be express recognition that the sites included in Policy 5 represent the minimum necessary level of provision – that the capacity requirement is a minimum, not a ceiling? [Gazelle Properties Ltd; Viridor Waste Management Ltd]*

The JWCS clearly states that the capacity requirements in policy 5 are indicative. The provision of residual facilities ultimately will lead to the diversion of waste away from landfill, and in this sense the capacities are not a maximum ceiling. However, the West of England is committed to meeting its own needs, and it is not intended to be an importer of waste from outside the Partnership area. The spatial Strategy illustrated at Figure 6.1 of the JWCS illustrates the requirements for a distribution of residual waste management facilities across the area. Para 6.8.9 acknowledges that where there is more market potential than that indicated in figure 6.1 a judgement will need to be made when considering the benefits of the Sustainability Appraisal and the potential for in-combination effects.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership  
Gazelle Properties Ltd  
Environment Agency

GOSW  
Natural England  
Viridor Waste Management Ltd

## WASTE PREVENTION

### Key Issue:

**Whether the provisions in respect of waste prevention, including the use of Waste Audits, are clear, focussed and spatial; also whether they would help in the achievement of the Strategic Objectives in a direct and effective way**

1. *Do Paras 1, 2 and 3 of Policy 1 cover matters that are inappropriate in a spatial plan?*

Paragraph 6.2.2 of the JWCS recognises that waste prevention has clear links to spatial planning policy. If communities are successful in reducing the amount of waste produced, then the need for additional waste management facilities can be reduced. Cutting down the amount of waste produced will also have a direct and positive impact on climate change. Policy 1 bullets 1, 2 and 3 are therefore considered appropriate in a spatial plan.

2. *To what extent should the matters set out in the final sentence of Para 6.2.4 be explicitly referred to in Policy 1?*

The requirements for Waste Audits are encapsulated in Policy 1 to ensure the best planning outcome from development proposals and to provide the Partnership Authorities with sufficient information to assess development proposals. It is considered appropriate for the matters set out in the final sentence of paragraph 6.2.4 to be included in Policy 1, so as to ensure that the information is available to the planning decision maker in considering the benefits and burdens of the proposal and that these are being appropriately managed.

3. *Should Waste Audits be required to demonstrate that the proposals put forward represent the most sustainable solution?*

The requirements for Waste Audits should assist the Partnership Authorities in assessing whether development proposals represent an appropriate planning outcome and contribute to the wider policy objective of reducing the impacts of and mitigating and adapting to climate change. To set a test of demonstrating most sustainable solution is considered to be too onerous.

4. *Should Waste Audits be required for developments smaller than 0.5 ha? [English Nature]*

The threshold of waste audits for all developments over 0.5 ha is supported by the definition of 'major development'. The requirement for a waste audit on all development below 0.5 ha was considered too burdensome on the development industry. The text could be amended to include residential development of 10 units and more.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

5. *Should Policy 1, and a contributions policy, apply to all residential developments? [Persimmon Homes]*

Policy 1 is intended to apply to all development over a site size of 0.5ha, including residential, to ensure that all major development is resource efficient and appropriately contributes to waste prevention objectives. The policy is intended to enable an appropriate role to be played by all development, not just waste management facilities, to contribute to climate change objectives, deliver the waste hierarchy and divert waste from landfill.

6. *As a minimum, should there be a demonstration of satisfactory arrangements for the storage of waste for disposal and recycling in all new premises?*

The appropriate minimum will depend on the proposal being submitted, but satisfactory arrangements for the storage of separated wastes would generally be applicable.

7. *Policy 1 4b: In providing details of on-site recycling facilities, is this a requirement that relates to both the construction and operational stages?*

Yes, but the facilities provided would be expected to be different.

8. *Policy 1 4c: What about steps to reduce waste in the operation of the development eg water harvesting?*

Policy 1 4c was prepared to seek to deliver waste prevention through a focus on reduced raw material use in construction, recognising the established market for relevant materials eg secondary aggregate. Policy 1 4f provides for the waste hierarchy during operation of the development.

Water harvesting is considered to be more aligned to concerns of resource use (which might also include concerns around how a building may be heated). Whilst important, these concerns are not directly related to waste management and so might be more appropriately set within a general Core Strategy or other development plan document, rather than the JWCS, which has a specific role to fulfil.

9. Policy 1 4e: Is “distance” the only relevant consideration?

Policy 1 4e is intended to be relevant to the construction phase only and should be amended to clarify this distinction. Construction, demolition and excavation wastes can often be used on site through the use of mobile crushers. Where it is intended to be taken off site for disposal the distance is a relevant consideration as there will be a burden generated by that transport that may not be outweighed by benefits such as material or energy recovery (benefits that are otherwise taken into account for the transport of other wastes). It is appropriate therefore that the decision maker understands whether that distance is appropriate in relation to the alternatives available.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

10. Should Policy 1 require assessment of impact on the road network? [Highways Agency]

This matter is more appropriately addressed at Development Management Policy 12 bullet 13, which requires development proposals to provide information on traffic generation, congestion, access and the suitability of the highway network in the vicinity of the site. This text is proposed to be amended to incorporate text suggestions from the Highways Agency.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

11. Policy 1 5: “Leading by example” – by whom?

In this context the JWCS refers to the Partnership Authorities leading by example.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership	GOSW
English Nature	Persimmon Homes
Highways Agency	

## DISTRIBUTION AND LOCATION OF NEW FACILITIES

### Key Issue:

**Whether there is an appropriate spatial strategy which sets out clearly where future waste management facilities of all types are intended to be located**

1. *Is there adequate articulation of the approach to the spatial distribution of sites? [GOSW]*

The JWCS has articulated the spatial distribution of those sites that are of strategic importance to the delivery of the JWCS. This is achieved in the JWCS through: Policy 5, which allocates those sites/areas considered of strategic importance; Figure 6.1, which illustrates the zones and indicative capacities sought; and Figure 7.1, which presents the phasing of the sites proposed to be allocated.

With regard to where other types of facilities are required; developments such as open windrow composting, waste transfer, materials recycling and household waste recycling facilities can be more readily provided at other locations including on industrial estates and other urban areas as identified in the evidence base general areas report. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to promote these facilities on the sites of strategic importance, and a separate policy framework is provided in the JWCS. Text at Section 4.4 of the JWCS addresses the points raised by GOSW and sets out the overall framework of the JWCS, explaining the approach the JWCS provides with criteria based policy to present opportunities for recycling/composting and landfill/landraise facilities.

With regard to the provision of landfill/landraise there are environmental constraints that are illustrated at Figure 6.2 of the JWCS, which provides further guidance as to where it would be appropriate for landfill/landraise facilities to be located.

2. *Should there be clarification on the capping of development when given areas reach their net capacity levels? [Avon Wildlife Trust]*

The capacities indicated at Policy 5 for residual waste treatment facilities are not a maximum, the JWCS clearly states that the capacity requirements in Policy 5 are indicative. The provision of residual facilities ultimately will lead to the diversion of waste from landfill, and delivery of the Waste Framework Directive. There is insufficient data available and uncertainty in forecasting to be able to set a defined figure for the amount of waste management capacity that will be required, instead, policy is informed by the evidence base that considers reasonable assumptions. The West of England is committed to meeting its own needs, and it is not intended to be an importer of waste from outside the Plan area. The purpose of the spatial areas is not to prescribe the amount of residual waste capacity that should be provided; but to indicate the level of capacity required and its distribution across the sub region. This provides the local spatial framework. Text is provided at paragraph 6.8.9 of the JWCS to acknowledge that where there is more market potential than that indicated in Figure 6.1 a judgement will need to be made in considering the benefits of the Sustainability Appraisal and the potential for in-combination effects. Monitoring of the permitted and operational capacity within the Plan area will be considered when assessing development proposals.

3. *Should there be a hierarchy of sites such that areas of greater biodiversity would be retained and protected? [Avon Wildlife Trust]*

A hierarchy of sites is not considered helpful as a range of locations across the Plan area is sought in order to provide a network of waste management infrastructure for the West of England. The phasing over which the sites are expected to be delivered is provided at Figure 7.1. A range of sites is proposed to be allocated to bring flexibility and to enable the delivery of the residual waste treatment facilities required in the Plan area.

Development Management Policies 11 and 12 provide for ensuring protection where necessary and proposed site allocations are supplemented with key development criteria that highlight site specific issues to be considered in development proposals, including findings from the Habitats Regulation Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal. Finally, the site allocations have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment themselves, in order to ensure an appropriate level of protection for important areas and habitats. In all these ways protection of designated sites and areas of greater biodiversity is enabled.

4. *Does the Core Strategy need to make explicit the capacity of waste management facilities that will be required in each zone? [Natural England]*

At Figure 6.1 and at Policy 5 the JWCS presents the indicative capacity of residual waste management facilities expected to be delivered at each zone.

5. *Should there be limits on future provision? [Avon Wildlife Trust]*

It is not considered appropriate to place a limit on future provision as the Waste Framework Directive seeks delivery of a network of waste management facilities and to enable waste to be diverted from landfill. The indicative capacities have been based on the evidence base, using reasonable assumptions to forecast the level of need in the future. However, this may change and the JWCS needs to incorporate flexibility to be able to respond to such situations. The waste management industry is constrained in its development aspirations by the need to gain capital investment to build and operate plant – the industry is therefore unlikely to bring forward more capacity than there is a market for.

In accordance with PPS12, all Core Strategies are required to have robust monitoring. The JWCS will be monitored and both permitted and operational capacity of residual waste treatment facilities within the Plan area will be considered when assessing development proposals. This is to ensure that the Authorities continue to plan and provide for the required capacity to achieve the Vision and meet the areas needs.

6. *Should there be express recognition that zoning is not intended to act as a constraint on provision? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

As discussed above, the provision of residual facilities ultimately will lead to the diversion of waste away from landfill, and in this sense the capacities are not a maximum ceiling. However, the West of England is committed to meeting its own needs, and it is not intended to be an importer of waste from outside the Partnership area. The spatial distribution of capacity is required to ensure the benefits as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal are recognised. The indicated capacities have been distributed based upon consideration of future waste arisings, growth in population, homes and jobs and as such the balance of waste management infrastructure across the Plan area should reflect this distribution of need and meet it at appropriate locations.

Paragraph 6.8.7 clearly states that the capacities are indicative. Paragraphs 6.8.8 and 6.8.9 present how the required capacity is expected to be delivered and what is expected to happen should greater capacity be proposed.

7. *Is the spatial distribution of sites under Policy 5 appropriate; also the way in which the sites have been tested? [South West RDA]*

The distribution of sites at Policy 5 has been based upon consideration of future waste arisings, growth in population, homes and jobs and as such the balance of waste management infrastructure across the Plan area should reflect this distribution of need and meet it at appropriate locations. The Sustainability Appraisal found that the Spatial Strategy (as presented within the JWCS) was the best performing spatial option.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership	GOSW
Avon Wildlife Trust	Natural England
Gazelle Properties Ltd	South West RDA

## RECOVERY FACILITIES, LOCATIONS AND SITES

### Key Issue:

#### **Whether justifiable and sufficient provision has been made for the development of waste recovery facilities of appropriate types and at appropriate preferred locations or strategic sites**

The detailed site assessment report assessed each site using consistent criteria, which included consideration of; representations, site visits, planning policy and site history, habitats regulation assessment findings, strategic flood risk issues, site availability and deliverability.

#### *1. Is allocation of the Broadmead Lane site appropriate? [Saltford Parish Council]*

The detailed site assessment report concluded that Broadmead Lane is an appropriate site allocation for the development of a residual waste treatment facility because it is well located in relation to waste arisings and transport links to the wider road network. It is also located within an area identified in B&NES Local Plan policy for development, including waste management infrastructure.

The report states that access to the site is a significant issue, and a feasibility study concludes that improvement works are possible to ensure suitable HGV access to the site. The estimated costs of these works are substantial of themselves, but are considered capable of being absorbed within the budget of a significant development proposal. Highways officers have also made further recommendations as to how best to accommodate access to the site taking into account the needs of pedestrian movement and avoiding Saltford and Keynsham.

The SFRA recommends that a corner of the site should not be developed, and recognises that Wessex Water may require expansion of their works in the southern corner of the site. However the site is considered large enough to accommodate flood mitigation measures, expansion of the sewage treatment works and a new waste development.

The detailed site assessment report recommended therefore that any proposal would need to give particular attention to; access to the site and Flood Risk mitigations. These recommendations have been carried forward into the Key Development Criteria for the Broadmead Lane site.

#### *2. Is allocation of the Fuller's Earth Works site appropriate? Are any additional safeguards necessary? [South Stoke Parish Council; English Heritage; Combe Hay Parish Council; Englishcombe Parish Council]*

The detailed site assessment report concluded that the Former Fullers Earth Works site is an appropriate site allocation for the development of a residual waste treatment facility because the site is well located to serve the needs of the south west of the Plan area.

The site has a long and complex planning history, and is currently owned and managed by a waste recycling company, it is currently operational but B&NES has issued two enforcement notices for alleged breaches of planning control. The notices have been appealed, but the appeal has been held in abeyance due to a claim for Judicial Review in the High Court. The site is situated in Green Belt so any development any proposals to develop the site would therefore need to demonstrate that very special circumstances. The site assessment process has identified very few opportunities for development of strategic waste management facility in this area, which is a relevant consideration for development in Green Belt. The site is being promoted by the owners for inclusion in the JWCS.

The report recommends and the Key Development Criteria of the JWCS state that any development proposal would need to give particular attention to:

- Green Belt designation
- High standard of design addressing nature conservation, geological interest on site and ANOB,
- Habitats regulations
- Flood risk mitigations
- Traffic movements and the relationship with adjacent development;

#### *3. Should the Fuller's Earth Works site be expanded? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

The spatial strategy indicates that the required capacity in this zone would be in the order of 150,000tpa, and the red line boundary as illustrated in the JWCS is considered an appropriate size to

meet this requirement. Added to this the constraints and site issues detailed above have led the Partnership Authorities to conclude that the Fullers Earth Works Site as it appears in the JWCS is appropriate for allocation and any proposed expansion would be considered inappropriate to promote through policy.

4. *Are allocation and safeguarding of the Merebank site appropriate? [Goodman]*

The JWCS has allocated more sites at Policy 5 than are considered likely to be required to ensure flexibility and the delivery of the residual waste treatment facilities required in the Plan area. The Merebank site benefits from dedicated access and has good links to the wider highway network. However, the site is not expected to be available in the short term, as it is already largely developed, with the remaining land benefitting from planning permission for a resource park. Should the resource park not be implemented, within the next three years, the allocation of Merebank is considered appropriate as a longer term potential. All sites allocated at Policy 5 are safeguarded for residual waste treatment to ensure implementation of the JWCS. Where it can be demonstrated that a site is no longer required, and where other development proposals are put forward on that site, the proposal could be permitted provided this did not jeopardise delivery of the JWCS. It is therefore considered appropriate that Merebank is allocated in the JWCS.

5. *Should thermal treatment of residual waste be excluded on any adopted urban extension area? [Hignett Family Trust]*

The JWCS is technology neutral and has no bias toward any particular technology type. The only exception to this technology neutral approach is in regard to energy recovery proposals, paragraph 6.9.3 recognises the beneficial role that the associated delivery of CHP can play. The potential to deliver CHP is increased if waste management is considered in association with new development in the urban extension areas. The Habitats Regulation Assessment has considered the suitability of all allocated sites for thermal treatment as a standard modelling scenario, and to assist in identifying the likely significant effects, not because thermal treatment is being promoted. The recommendations from the HRA and any issues for proposals to consider are listed in the JWCS at the Key Development Criteria for each site.

6. *Should there be greater specificity regarding sites and appropriate methods of waste treatment in Strategic Areas A and B? [Bristol & South West SERA; Hignett Family Trust]*

Paragraphs 6.8.10 and 6.8.11 of the JWCS set out the rationale for defining strategic areas at Yate and Weston–super-Mare (areas A and B). In both cases suitable sites have been identified within general industrial locations, but the turnover of these sites and the need to consider future regeneration plans of these respective areas, has led the Partnership Authorities to consider it inappropriate to give greater specificity on site locations. Both Strategic Areas have a red line boundary indicating the general area where a facility could be located.

The JWCS is technology neutral and has no bias towards or away from any particular technology on any particular site, which would be too prescriptive over the plan period up to 2026. The sites identified at the Strategic Areas have been identified as suitable for residual waste treatment facilities, the particular technology will be dependent upon many factors including the market, and will have to be submitted with any development proposals at the planning application stage.

7. *Is Zone A being positioned as a regionally strategic zone? [South West RDA]*

Zone A which incorporates the industrial areas of Avonmouth/Sevenside is not being positioned as a regionally strategic zone within the Joint Waste Core Strategy. The indicative capacity in the Spatial Strategy for this Zone reflects the industrial nature of Avonmouth /Sevenside, future waste raisings, and growth. It is considered that proportionally Avonmouth/Sevenside has more opportunities for the location of residual waste treatment facilities within the Plan area and a significant amount of future waste arisings will need to be met here at appropriate locations.

8. *Is there an adequate commitment to achieving a more coordinated approach to the delivery of development across the wider Avonmouth / Sevenside area? [South West RDA]*

The Partnership remains committed to delivering a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of development across the Avonmouth/Sevenside area. The Partnership Authorities have engaged with key agencies, including the Environment Agency and the Highways Agency on strategic cross-boundary issues and have been involved in considering sites for allocation within the JWCS. Bristol and South Gloucestershire have worked on proposals for Avonmouth/Sevenside to achieve an

Accelerated Development Zone (ADZ) status. The JWCS is a topic specific development plan document, which has had regard to other, relevant documents in identifying and allocating sites.

9. For proposals in and around Avonmouth / Severnside, has there been adequate assessment of the impact on the region's wider infrastructure requirements? [South West RDA]

The Sustainability Appraisal has considered the impacts of the proposed site allocations in and around Avonmouth as appropriate at plan-making level. Specific development proposals will be considered at the project stage ie submission of a planning application. The development industry is encouraged to engage in early pre-application discussions with the Partnership Authorities and statutory agencies including the Highways Agency and the Environment Agency prior to submitting development proposals. These relevant statutory agencies have also been involved in the preparation of the JWCS, enabling thorough consideration of relevant infrastructure requirements.

10. Has adequate provision been made for a site at Yate? [Yate Town Council]

Paragraph 6.8.10 of the JWCS sets out the approach for defining the strategic area at Yate to ensure adequate provision can be made for residual waste treatment facilities. Suitable sites have been identified within general industrial locations, but the turnover of these sites and the need to consider future regeneration plans of Yate, has led the Partnership Authorities to consider it inappropriate to give greater specificity on a site location. A red line boundary indicating the general area where a facility could be located has been provided at Appendix 1, Figure 12 of the JWCS and Policy 5 makes provision for opportunities to come forward within this Strategic Area.

11. *Should the Allmead recycling site be allocated? [New Earth Solutions Group Ltd]*

The detailed site assessment report recommended that the Allmead Recycling site could be allocated as a potential site for the location of residual waste treatment facilities. Bristol City Council has considered other aspects of allocating the site, in terms of representations from the local community and issues regarding its deliverability. The Council plans to use it, in conjunction with the adjacent SITA depot, for municipal waste collection and recycling operations. It is therefore considered to be unavailable for the delivery of residual waste facilities. Further, alternative locations exist within the Spatial Strategy at Zone D and the allocation of Allmead Recycling is not considered of critical importance to the delivery of the Core Strategy. On balance and on the basis of representations received and deliverability of the site, Bristol City Council has concluded that the Allmead Recycling site should not be allocated in the JWCS as a strategic location for residual waste treatment facilities.

12. *Should Stowey Quarry be allocated under Policy 5? [Matrix Movements]*

The site assessment process used a consistent method to identify those sites considered appropriate for inclusion in the JWCS. Following consideration of policy constraints, sites were subject to a drive-by assessment. At this stage of the assessment Stowey Quarry was excluded because its inaccessible location was considered to fundamentally affect its future deliverability.

13. *Are Policies 6 and 7 appropriate? [Gazelle Properties Ltd; Viridor Waste Management Ltd]*

Both policies 6 and 7 are considered appropriate.

Policy 6 is required to assist the decision maker to understand the benefits and burdens of the proposed development and to ensure that energy recovery facilities can be properly determined as such, ie that the waste is being diverted from disposal. The wording of the policy has been considered carefully. The application is not required to demonstrate the matters raised, but to present relevant information. In this way, the planning authority will have the relevant information to properly consider the proposal, and will have relevant information for monitoring of the JWCS.

Policy 7 is required to provide a positive policy framework for development proposals to come forward for residual waste treatment proposals on sites not allocated in the JWCS, to ensure flexibility and ultimately the delivery of the JWCS. This policy recognises that there may be sites that emerge in future that are suitable to locate residual waste treatment facilities and that they should be considered on their merits, whilst also demonstrating delivery of the Spatial Strategy that underpins the JWCS.

14. *Should Policy 7 be rephrased to make clear the aim of diverting waste away from landfill? [Yate Town Council]*

The JWCS should be read as a whole and the clear aim to divert waste away from landfill runs throughout the document. It is not therefore considered necessary to make cross reference to the objective of diverting waste from landfill within Policy 7.

15. *Is it inadequate to require a feasibility study on combined heat and power (Policy 12 5)? Should the distribution of power and heat be considered at the onset? Is the potential for combined heat and power being adequately explored and promoted? [South West RDA; Environment Agency]*

The JWCS should be read as a whole. At Section 6.9 the JWCS sets out the expectations of policy, which recognises that residual waste treatment facilities may incorporate mechanical or biological processes which may receive materials and or energy; and thermal processes which will receive energy through heat and/or electricity. Whilst energy is placed beneath materials recovery in the waste hierarchy the beneficial role it has to play is recognised in national policy and as such proposals incorporating combined heat and power or electricity generation will help other national policy objectives and are encouraged in the JWCS. Policy 6 seeks information on the level of energy recovery expected to be achieved and the market(s) for that energy.

Policy 12 advises that if a facility is to produce energy a feasibility study of CHP should be undertaken, this is to demonstrate the potential has been reasonably explored. It is therefore considered that both Policy 6 and 12 make appropriate provision for the exploration of CHP in the JWCS, without placing an unreasonable burden on the development industry.

16. *Should there be reference to the role of anaerobic digestion? [GENeco Ltd]*

The JWCS is technology neutral and has no bias toward any particular technology type. At Section 6.9 the JWCS sets out the expectations of policy, and recognises that residual waste treatment facilities may incorporate mechanical or biological processes which may recover materials and or energy; and thermal processes which will receive energy through heat and/or electricity. Future advancement and improvements in technology may entail different technologies emerging or changing over time and it is therefore not considered appropriate to make specific reference to the role of anaerobic digestion in the JWCS.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership	GOSW
Salford Parish Council	South Stoke Parish Council
English Heritage	Combe Hay Parish Council
Englishcombe Parish Council	Gazelle Properties Ltd
Goodman	Hignett Family Trust
Bristol & South West SERA	South West RDA
Yate Town Council	New Earth Solutions Group Ltd
Matrix Movements	Viridor Waste Management Ltd
Environment Agency	GENeco Ltd

## HAZARDOUS WASTE

### Key Issue:

#### **Whether adequate and robust provision has been made for the receipt, treatment and disposal of hazardous waste and for the consideration of related development proposals**

1. *What happens to hazardous waste at the moment? Where does it go? What types and quantities are involved?*

The WEP Needs Assessment (evidence base file 2 document 10) identified hazardous waste arisings to be 84,652 tonnes for the baseline year of 2007/08<sup>8</sup>. The growth scenario chosen for future waste arisings assumes that legislative drivers will succeed in at least a 10% reduction in hazardous waste going forward, generating some 77,000 tpa over the Plan period and beyond to 2028/29. Further information on forecast arisings of hazardous are shown in Section 3 of the supporting topic paper.

A range of different hazardous wastes will be produced. Many of these will be managed in facilities operating on industrial estates and similar locations. The disposal of hazardous wastes generated in the West of England currently occurs outside of the Plan area.

2. *To the extent that hazardous waste is and will continue to be exported from the sub-region, how robust are the arrangements for continued disposal. What is the response of the related waste planning authorities?*

The management of hazardous waste is arranged through private contracts between the waste producer and waste management industry. These contracts will have differing arrangements, not least in terms of their timeframes, which are unknown to the Partnership Authorities and commercially sensitive, the information is not available.

Discussions have been held with relevant waste planning authorities in regard to the export of wastes, hazardous and non-hazardous, for disposal. These authorities would like to see the West of England self-sufficient in providing appropriate disposal capacity

3. *Should additional work be undertaken on hazardous waste treatment capacity? [Environment Agency]*

The evidence base has not indicated a need for additional work to be undertaken on hazardous waste treatment capacity. As recognised at paragraphs 1.1.2 and 6.10.11, the JWCS is the relevant development plan document for hazardous waste management. The Partnership Authorities therefore consider that an appropriate, and positive, policy framework is provided for the management of hazardous wastes.

4. *Has appropriate provision been made for the transfer, treatment and disposal of hazardous waste within the sub-region? [Gloucestershire County Council; Strategic Land Partnerships; SITA UK]*

The evidence base has not indicated a need for additional work to be undertaken on hazardous waste treatment capacity. This matter is set out in supportive text of the JWCS at paragraphs 6.4.6-6.4.8. As recognised at paragraphs 1.1.2 and 6.10.11, the JWCS is the relevant development plan document for hazardous waste management. The Partnership Authorities therefore consider that an appropriate, and positive, policy framework is provided for the management of hazardous wastes.

5. *Should there be provision for new, stable, non-reactive hazardous landfill on windfall sites? [Matrix Movements]*

The development of windfall sites would be considered against relevant development plan policy, including the proposed policies 8 and 9 of the JWCS.

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: Environment Agency Hazardous Waste Interrogator

6. *Does the Core Strategy provide an adequate policy context for applications for hazardous waste sites including appropriate consideration of national and regional need?*

As recognised at paragraphs 1.1.2 and 6.10.11, the JWCS is the relevant development plan document for hazardous waste management. The Partnership Authorities therefore consider that an appropriate, and positive, policy framework is provided for the management of hazardous wastes.

The former draft RSS advised that the Region was broadly self-sufficient in the treatment of hazardous waste and that it was not appropriate for each waste planning authority to identify additional sites, explained at paragraph 6.4.6 of the JWCS. Whilst this document has been revoked, the evidence base that underpinned its preparation and conclusions remains a relevant consideration in preparation of the JWCS.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership  
Environment Agency  
Strategic Land Partnerships  
Matrix Movements

GOSW  
Gloucestershire County Council  
SITA UK

## NON-RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES

### Key Issue:

#### Whether there is clear and appropriate provision for the development of non-residual waste management facilities

1. *What provision has been made to secure a good network of household waste recycling centres and other recycle collection sites? (Para 6.5.1)*

The Partnership Authorities consider that criteria based policy provides a positive policy framework for such opportunities to be assessed, at policy 2 of the JWCS. Household waste recycling centres and other recycle collection sites (such as waste transfer stations) are infrastructure that deliver the top end of the waste hierarchy. Further, their delivery is driven by the Municipal Waste Management Strategy. Such facilities would be expected to be dispersed throughout the Plan area and able to make use of a range of sites and locations, the JWCS provides appropriate opportunities for this to happen. The evidence base demonstrates that they are not of strategic importance in terms of delivering the JWCS and so do not require site allocation to enable their delivery.

In addition, Policy 13 safeguards operational and allocated sites for all waste management facilities.

2. *What is the spatial strategy regarding non-strategic sites?*

The provision of non-residual waste management facilities is provided for as criteria based policy at policy 2 of the JWCS. The criteria presents the preferred locations for locating such facilities. Supportive text at paragraph 6.5.4 of the JWCS identifies that such facilities are suitable at a range of locations and that the location within the urban fabric would be preferred (for proximity to waste arisings). The evidence base General Areas Report (evidence base file 2 document 11) identifies that suitable locations for such facilities exist within industrial areas across the partnership area.

3. *Para 6.5.3: Is it appropriate to discuss technologies available for the treatment of residual waste in the section on non-residual waste?*

Paragraph 6.5.3 of the JWCS seeks to give an indication of the types of technologies that may be available and acknowledges that they may be co-located together or with another industry such that the outputs can be a useful resource. This is important in respect of paragraph 6.5.6, which states that sites identified within Policy 5 may also be suitable for the location of non-residual facilities (either co-located with residual facilities or just stand alone non-residual facilities), provided that this would not jeopardise the delivery of the required residual waste treatment capacity. The Partnership Authorities therefore consider the reference in paragraph 6.5.3 appropriate.

4. *Should there be reference to providing treatment facilities for multiple waste streams?*

The JWCS should be read as a whole and it is clearly stated that the JWCS relates to all waste streams. Paragraph 6.4.1 indicates that to meet future capacity requirements a range of facilities will be required to deliver the non-residual waste management capacity for municipal, commercial and industrial wastes. Paragraph 6.4.5 acknowledges the requirement for additional recycling capacity to manage future CD&E wastes.

5. *Has appropriate weight been given to the option of using existing recycling and processing sites (not necessarily within the urban fabric) (Para 6.5.4)? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

Policy 2 bullet 3 of the JWCS makes provision for proposals for non-residual facilities to come forward "at existing or proposed waste management sites". The Partnership Authorities consider appropriate weight has been given to this potential opportunity.

6. *Has adequate guidance been given on the role of mobile crushing and screening equipment and exempt disposal sites?*

Policy 4 provides specific policy for the treatment of construction, demolition and excavation wastes. Policy 8 and 9 provides the appropriate policy framework for the disposal of such wastes. Exempt disposal sites would be included in the description of "engineering operations".

If felt appropriate by the Inspector additional supportive text after policy 4 at paragraph 6.7.5 could be added as follows:

*"A significant amount of CD&E waste is also managed on site with mobile crushers, which reduces the requirement for off site treatment and disposal facilities. These mobile operations generally do*

not require express planning permission and therefore do not require a specific policy framework, but do contribute to management of the CD&E waste stream. Exempt sites may also be appropriate locations for disposal of inert waste, and may be subject to planning permission, proposals for which would be assessed with policy 8.”

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

7. *Is there clarity over whether Policy 2 covers in-vessel composting?*

Development proposals for in-vessel composting could be assessed against Policy 2 of the JWCS. This is also explained at paragraph 6.5.3 of the JWCS.

8. *Policy 2: 1: Are there likely to be any problems associated with non-residual waste treatment facilities on sites allocated for storage purposes?*

The supporting text at paragraph 6.5.4 of the JWCS acknowledges that the recycling and processing of waste is increasingly being carried out within enclosed, modern, purpose designed buildings that can be appropriately developed in a range of locations, this would include land allocated for storage purposes. Policy 2 bullet 1 of the JWCS is providing a positive framework for such proposals that may come forward. However the JWCS should be read as a whole and development proposals will also be assessed to ensure they conform with management policies 11 and 12, and alongside any other relevant local policies to ensure facilities are most appropriately located.

9. *Policy 2:2: NB “previously developed”, not “previously owned”.*

It is quite correct that Policy 2 bullet 2 should read “previously developed” not owned.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

10. *Are the criteria in Policy 2 unduly restrictive? [Gazelle Properties Ltd]*

The criteria in policy 2 provide a positive policy framework for development proposals to be assessed and are not considered by the Partnership Authorities to be unduly restrictive. A broad range of, in principle, appropriate locations are presented.

11. *Is there adequate justification for identifying the total area of adopted urban extensions for the location of non-residual waste treatment facilities? [Persimmon Homes]*

The West of England is committed to sustainable growth. In accordance with PPS10 and PPS12, the Partnership has sought, through the JWCS, that any adopted urban extensions provide opportunities to integrate sufficient waste management infrastructure. It is not appropriate for the JWCS to drive the master planning of the urban extensions by identifying discrete parcels of land within these areas; instead the approach is to ensure that waste management is integrated into future development proposals.

12. *Policy 3 3: When contemplating open windrow composting on sites in agricultural use, why is it necessary for the waste to be used within that agricultural unit? What about use of the compost elsewhere?*

Whilst open windrow composting is an, in principle, appropriate activity to occur on agricultural units, it is also appropriate to constrain the scale of development so as to prevent urbanisation of rural areas. By limiting the use of the compost to that agricultural unit, the scale of the operations can be appropriately constrained, without recourse to arbitrary definitions of size or small or large scale.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership	GOSW
Gazelle Properties Ltd	Persimmon Homes

## LANDFILL AND LANDRAISING

### Key Issue:

#### Whether there are clear, sufficient and robust arrangements for landfill, landraising and restoration with adequate spatial guidance and regard to the timeliness of provision

1. In the first sentence of Para 6.10.1, is the key aim clearly stated?

The paragraph sets out the importance of diverting waste from landfill and that this is reinforced through European and national policy. In acknowledging the Partnership Authorities aspiration to divert as much waste away from landfill as possible, it is also necessary to acknowledge that landfill will still be required, and that disposal capacity is expected to be met within the Plan area and within the Plan period. If felt necessary by the Inspector the paragraph could be amended to: “ *A key aim of the JWCS is to ensure that as much waste as possible in the West of England is diverted away from landfill*”

Please see Scheduled of Proposed Changes.

2. *When will disposal capacity be required, of what types and in what quantities (Para 6.10.1)? What will be the position at key dates? What is the spatial strategy with regard to the location of future landfill sites*

The current position regarding landfill and the requirement for additional capacity is outlined in Sections 5 and 8 of the Topic Paper. Tables 13 and 14 illustrate when and how much additional capacity will be required throughout the Plan period.

The spatial strategy for the location of future landfill sites is illustrated in Figure 6.2 and policy 8 of the JWCS. Figure 6.2 illustrates the areas of policy constraints where landfill/landraise locations may not be suitable and identifies the rest of the Plan area where potential opportunities could come forward.

Figure 6.2 has been prepared following Environment Agency guidance on landfill design and construction which effectively prohibits non-hazardous landfill at locations on or in major aquifers and sites covered by source protection zones. Figure 6.2 also indicates key environmental policy constraints which set out buffer zones around particular sites; RAMSAR, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation. Landfill proposals will not be permitted within these areas of constraint unless it can be demonstrated that there are no likely significant effects on those designations, or unless the Environment Agency or Natural England have no objection.

It is proposed to refer to Figure 6.2 within policy 8. Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

3. *What happens to non-hazardous waste, destined for landfill, at the moment (Para 6.10.4)? Where does it go and in what quantities? How robust are the arrangements. How long will they last? What is the response of the “importing” waste planning authorities?*

Similar to hazardous waste, the management of non-hazardous wastes, with the exception of municipal waste, is arranged through private contracts between the waste producer and waste management industry. These contracts will have differing arrangements, not least in terms of their timeframes, which are unknown to the Partnership Authorities and commercially sensitive, the information is not available. However, it is understood that the disposal of non-hazardous wastes occurs out of the Plan area. The Feasibility Study – Potential for Exporting Non-Hazardous Waste to Landfill, June 2009 (evidence file 2 document 12), sets out the current situation in each of the neighbouring authorities, Wiltshire & Swindon, Gloucestershire, Somerset and also Buckinghamshire where waste has also historically been exported to for disposal to landfill. The Feasibility Study concludes that in the short to medium term it is unlikely that there would be additional capacity at Wiltshire, Somerset or Gloucestershire to receive exported waste for landfill from the West of England.

However, the Feasibility Study did identify that Buckinghamshire is likely to have additional capacity beyond Buckinghamshire’s requirement and that whilst it is not seeking to import waste, it is possible that the permitted facilities would be able to continue to accept waste arising within the West of England in the short to medium term.

Discussions have been held with relevant waste planning authorities in regard to the export of wastes, hazardous and non-hazardous, for disposal. These authorities would like to see the West of England

self-sufficient in providing appropriate disposal capacity. To this end, the JWCS presents a positive framework for landfill proposals, at policies 8 and 9.

The Partnership has had recent discussions with Gloucestershire County Council, which has confirmed its position. Please see 'Statement of Common Ground'.

4. *Is there adequate articulation of the approach to landfill policy? [GOSW]*

The Partnership Authorities consider that the approach to landfill is clearly stated at section 6.10 of the JWCS. Section 4.4 sets out the approach to landfill provision in the context of the overall framework of the JWCS. As stated in paragraph 6.10.8 of the JWCS consultation opportunities with the development industry did highlight that it recognises landfill opportunities in the West of England that could come forward under a criteria based policy.

5. *Bearing in mind the capacity gap, does the Plan make clear and adequate provision for future disposal to landfill? [Gloucestershire County Council]*

A positive policy framework is provided for the development of new disposal facilities at a range of locations, whilst avoiding areas that should be protected. Additional consultation on policy 8 has led to an explicit recognition that green field sites may be required to provide the calculated capacity requirements. Further, the JWCS provides a positive framework within which additional recovery capacity can be provided, reducing the need for disposal facilities.

Please also see 'Statement of Common Ground'

6. *Is there a positive framework, with clear objectives, for delivering adequate landfill capacity? Are the stated requirements (Table 5.1) on the low side? [Strategic Land Partnerships]*

A positive policy framework is provided for the development of new disposal facilities at a range of locations, whilst avoiding areas that should be protected. Additional consultation on policy 8 has led to an explicit recognition that green field sites may be required to provide the calculated capacity requirements. The development industry has generally supported the criteria based approach presented in the JWCS. Further, the JWCS provides a positive framework within which additional recovery capacity can be provided, reducing the need for disposal facilities.

Table 5.1 is not the stated requirement - these are the indicative apportionments from the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy. If the Inspector considers it appropriate Table 5.1 could be removed from the JWCS.

7. *In terms of applying policy, should relevant outcomes of the Landfill Review be stated in the Core Strategy (Para 6.10.7)?*

The Partnership Authorities consider that relevant outcomes of the Landfill Review are stated in the JWCS, in particular the future capacity requirement at paragraph 6.10.5 and the additional environmental considerations for the location of landfill as illustrated at Figure 6.2

8. *In terms of inert landfill (Para 6.10.9), what provisions need to be made? What is the anticipated situation at key dates?*

Provision for inert landfill is expected to be met within the Plan area at the number of quarries that are required by condition to be restored and this is expected to be through the deposit of inert wastes. Exempt sites also accept inert wastes for various engineering and restoration projects.

The current position regarding inert landfill and the requirement for additional capacity is outlined in Sections 5 and 8 of the Topic Paper. Table 14 illustrates when and how much additional capacity will be required throughout the Plan period.

9. *Para 6.10.11: What is meant by "all waste disposal sites"? Is the meaning of the final sentence clear?*

For clarification in this context the reference to "all waste disposal sites" is inclusive of non-hazardous landfill (inert and non-inert) and hazardous landfill.

The final sentence of paragraph 6.10.11 provides further guidance that whilst Policy 8 is applicable to all waste disposal sites, it is also recognised that inert disposal facilities may be more easily located within the environmental constraints identified. Therefore if there are no objections from the Environment Agency or Natural England such proposals would be permitted.

10. *Policy 8: Can the Partnership afford to give priority to brownfield land? How would this work in a criteria-based policy as opposed to one prioritising site allocations? [Gloucestershire County Council; Strategic Land Partnerships]*

The Partnership is setting out the preference that development occurs first on previously developed land. This approach fits with national policy objectives and reflects the significant role that waste disposal has played in restoring brownfield land within the Plan area.

Due to the lack of opportunities identified, the Partnership Authorities have acknowledged, in Policy 8, that the use of greenfield land may be required. The Partnership considers this an appropriate approach for inclusion in Policy 8 against which to assess development proposals.

A lack of brownfield opportunities could be demonstrated by an applicant using similar techniques to those used in preparing the JWCS, ie through a review of voids remaining after mineral extraction and discussions with the local planning authority.

11. *Policy 8 1: Should waste used in mineral workings be subject to recovery and recycling?*

Policy 8 bullet 1 is in accordance with the principles of the waste hierarchy that all waste should be prevented, re-used or recycled, to divert as much as possible from landfill. Policy 8 states “the waste to be disposed of cannot practically or reasonably be reused recycled or processed... or may be required for the restoration of minerals workings.”

12. *Should there be explicit recognition that new landfill capacity will be required? How realistic is it (Policy 8 1) to require a demonstration that the waste could not have been treated otherwise? How would the requirement work in practice? [Strategic Land Partnerships]*

There is explicit reference at paragraph 6.10.5 for the need for additional landfill capacity. Policy 8 seeks to minimise the amount of waste disposed of to landfill so as to deliver the waste hierarchy. This is considered to be the correct policy approach, reflecting that disposal is the waste management option of last resort, and seeking to reserve landfill capacity for that waste that cannot be reused recycled or reprocessed and to gain benefits from waste management.

The requirement of Policy 8 bullet 1 can be readily demonstrated eg by reference to the source of the wastes to be disposed of, or through simple calculations to show that the capacity of the landfill is appropriate for the amount of waste remaining after recycling, composting and recovery has occurred

13. *Policies 8 2 and 9 1: If a good site has been found, and there is still a demand for landfill, why limit the quantities?*

The disposal of waste is the management option of last resort. Whilst there is a recognised need to provide for the disposal of waste that cannot otherwise be treated, it is considered that Policy 8 presents the correct policy approach ie to minimise the amount of disposal undertaken.

Policy 9 is primarily concerned with ensuring suitable restoration and landform than simply restricting the amount of waste to be disposed of.

14. *In Policy 8 4, is there adequate reference to ground water protection and flood risk? [Environment Agency]*

The Partnership Authorities consider that Policy 8 bullet 4 of the JWCS makes adequate reference to the ground water protection zones and other environmental considerations, such as those illustrated at Figure 6.2. If the Inspector feels it appropriate Figure 6.2 could be referenced at Policy 8 bullet 4, as set out in the proposed schedule of changes. Flood risk is a consideration of development management Policy 11.

Please refer to the Schedule of Proposed Changes.

15. *Should landfill be considered at sites where the recovery of landfill gas is not practical or economical? [Environment Agency]*

Policy 9 of the JWCS seeks “wherever practicable and economical” the recovery of landfill gas, If this is not practicable landfill proposals will be considered on the merits of the specific development

proposals. The ability to recover landfill gas will be dependent on the materials disposed of, rather than the location of the site.

16. *Is Policy 8 too permissive? Should there be greater safeguards? [Yate Town Council]*

The Partnership Authorities do not consider Policy 8 to be too permissive. Policy 8 provides a positive policy framework within which the industry can bring forward applications for disposal facilities, whilst identifying the necessary environmental safeguards to consider when assessing proposals.

17. *In Policy 8, should there be recognition of a need to be as close as possible to large centres of population? [Compton Dando Parish Council]*

Landfill is currently exported outside of the Plan area, which is not appropriate or sustainable in the long term. Landfill provision within the Plan area, is required to ensure the Plan area can meet its own needs.

As the waste is being disposed of, it would be advantageous to reduce the distance over which it would travel. However, to make this criterion a requirement of Policy 8 would be too onerous, would be difficult to measure and could prevent delivery of this piece of the waste management infrastructure. It would also go beyond the Waste Framework Directive, which seeks the provision of waste disposal at the 'nearest appropriate installation', as this incorporates more than just distance.

18. *Policy 9 1: To avoid confusion, would it be better to refer to "consolidation" rather than "settlement"?*

The Partnership Authorities consider settlement to be a more suitable term.

19. *Under Policy 9, should provision be made for recreational and amenity use; also appropriate restoration of the environment surrounding the site? [Yate Town Council]*

The Partnership Authorities considers that to specify recreational and amenity uses in Policy 9 would be too prescriptive and that text setting out as wide a condition as the 'environment surrounding the site' burdensome. Instead, Policy 9 makes provision for "an agreed afteruse" for the site (which may incorporate amenity or recreational uses) and requires restoration to be "compatible with the surrounding area" in order to ensure it fits within its surrounding environment.

20. *Has adequate recognition been made of the role of landraising? [Strategic Land Partnerships]*

Policies 8 and 9 are making explicit provision for landraising as well as landfill.

21. *In respect of landraising schemes, are the requirements of Policies 8 and 9 unrealistic? [Strategic Land Partnerships]*

The criteria in Policies 8 and 9 are considered by the Partnership Authorities to provide a positive planning framework against which development proposals for landfill and landraise schemes can be assessed. The criteria are considered realistic, and to present a positive framework within which proposals can be brought forward, balanced against the need to consider environmental considerations and to identify appropriate locations.

The development industry has generally been supporting of this criteria based approach and has not provided specific details of any sites or locations that it would want to see identified in the JWCS. If a scheme is being promoted, the Partnership Authorities would be happy to discuss it further to understand the perceived constraints at Policy 8 and 9.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership	GOSW
Gloucestershire County Council	Strategic Land Partnerships
Environment Agency	Yate Town Council
Compton Dando Parish Council	

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

### Key Issue:

**Whether there are clear and appropriate development management policies that, amongst other things, accord with and do not repeat or reformulate national policy**

1. *In Paras 3.5.1 and 6.12.1, would it be better to refer to the historic environment? [English Heritage]*

The suggested text edit is accepted and is set out in the Schedule of Proposed Changes.

2. *Is further guidance needed in order to ensure that decisions are made in the context of the sub-region? [Natural England]*

The JWCS should be read as a whole and alongside other relevant local plans and policies; it is not intended to repeat guidance or other local policies in the JWCS. The Partnership Authorities are committed to joint future monitoring of the JWCS to ensure that when development proposals are assessed the context of permitted and operational capacity across the West of England is understood and that decisions can be made in the context of the sub region.

3. *In Policy 12, should there be reference to enhancement opportunities? [Natural England]*

The Partnership Authorities have included, in the first paragraph of Policy 12 reference to “compensate for any loss and where appropriate achieve enhancement.”

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

4. *In Policy 12, is there appropriate reference to mitigation and compensation? [Persimmon Homes]*

The Partnership Authorities consider that the first paragraph of Policy 12 should be edited to make it clearer and to incorporate appropriate reference to mitigation and enhancement.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

5. *In relation to Policy 11 19 (Green Belts), should there be recognition of the locational needs of some types of waste management facilities and that these needs may be material considerations?*

To insert such text would repeat the policy position and wording established in PPS 10. Instead, Policy 11 bullet 19 refers to very special circumstances. It would be for the applicant to demonstrate those very special circumstances, but it is reasonable to assume that they would include the locational needs of some types of waste management, together with the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management

6. *Is the inclusion of Policy 12 appropriate? [Gazelle Properties Ltd; Viridor Waste Management Ltd]*

The Partnership Authorities consider that Policy 12 is required to provide a balance to the policy framework presented in the JWCS. The policy is appropriate in order to ensure that applicants can demonstrate sustainable and responsible development. Policy 12 is not intended to be onerous to the development industry, such that the requirement to submit information is required to be ‘appropriate to the development proposal’.

7. *In Policy 12, should there be reference to the enhancement of environmental assets?*

The Partnership Authorities consider that the Policy as drafted should be sufficient to ensure enhancement of environmental assets and have included in the first paragraph of Policy 12 reference to where appropriate achieve enhancement. However if the Inspector considers it appropriate the Partnership Authorities suggest the following wording and re-ordering of the first paragraph of Policy 12 may be suitable:

Planning permission for waste related development will be granted provided it can be *demonstrated, that any impacts of the development would not materially adversely affect people, land,*

infrastructure, resources and the environment and that, where appropriate, enhancement would be achieved.

Where necessary, appropriate mitigation should be identified so as to avoid or minimise any material adverse impact, and to compensate for any loss.

Information supporting a planning application must include, as appropriate to the development proposal, assessment of the following matters:

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

8. *Should Section 6.14 recognise that some proposals to meet local needs may be appropriate?*

Section 6.14 is supporting text relevant to the development management Policy 12. This is included in the JWCS to ensure that applicants can demonstrate sustainable and responsible development. It is not intended to make a distinction between local or not local facilities. This is there not considered to be an appropriate addition.

The Vision of the JWCS recognises that development will be required to meet local needs, and policies in the JWCS are drafted to ensure a positive framework for waste management infrastructure to be delivered at appropriate locations. Specific sites/areas are identified to delivery the strategically important residual waste management capacity required within the Plan area, whilst local facilities would be brought forward on sites that comply with the relevant criteria. The Partnership Authorities do not therefore consider it necessary for Section 6.14 to recognise that some proposals to meet local needs may be appropriate.

9. *Should there be specific reference to matters that will need to be addressed in planning obligations? (Circular 05/2005, Para B25)*

The matters that would need to be addressed in planning obligations are more appropriately considered at the project stage, ie on receipt of an application when the relevant issues have been identified.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership	GOSW
English Heritage	Natural England
Persimmon Homes	Gazelle Properties Ltd
Viridor Waste Management Ltd	

## SAFEGUARDING

### Key Issue:

#### Whether there is clear and effective provision for the safeguarding of existing operational waste sites and future waste management facilities

1. *Policy 13: Should operational waste sites be specifically listed / identified on a plan?*

Policy 13 has not specifically listed sites; waste sites may be permitted to be operational for varying time periods and listing sites at a point in time would not be appropriate. Instead the evidence base (WEP Needs Assessment) lists the strategic operational sites, and has been prepared with information gained from the Environment Agency.

2. *What is the position on safeguarding at non-specific sites?*

Policy 13 safeguards those sites identified at policy 5 for residual waste treatment. If the Inspector feels it appropriate additional supporting text at para 6.15.3 could be included:

*“6.15.3 “ Within the Strategic Areas and adopted urban extensions, the purpose of safeguarding is to ensure that delivery of the JWCS would not be prejudiced by development/re-development proposals.*

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

Operational waste sites would be safeguarded by Policy 13 whether or not they had been allocated in the JWCS.

3. *Should there be an exception to the safeguarding provisions for sites that are “inappropriately located”?*

The Partnership Authorities have made provision in Policy 13 for the re-location of facilities where an alternative location is found as part of an authority approved strategy and could therefore be used as the framework to consider proposals to relocate facilities at inappropriate locations. The evidence base for the JWCS has not considered whether existing facilities are inappropriately located or not: such facilities should already benefit from planning permission and this cannot be rescinded, if the development is unauthorised, expedient enforcement action should resolve the inappropriate location.

4. *Should land around the Avonmouth Sewage Treatment Works be safeguarded for future expansion? [Wessex Water]*

The Partnership Authorities understand that currently there are no plans for future expansion of the Avonmouth Sewage Treatment Works; rather that the representation to the JWCS sought to reserve this position for future consideration.

The Bristol Local Plan, adopted in 1997, allocated 25.3 ha of land adjacent to the sewage works for future operational growth. None of this has been taken up by Wessex Water. A small portion (2.53 ha) has been developed as a transit site for Gypsies and Travellers and is now proposed for allocation for residual waste development in the Joint Waste Core Strategy (Policy 5, Site DS14).

The undeveloped part of the 1997 Local Plan allocation has been identified as a potential allocation for Sewage Treatment Works expansion in a Bristol City Council Site Allocations and Development Management Options Document and Wessex Water has been invited to comment. Consultation closes on 29<sup>th</sup> October. The overall site area is similar to that being sought by Wessex.

Wessex Water has, to date, not been able to define its future operational needs and proposed development programme for the Avonmouth site, other than in very broad terms.

### Parties who may wish to contribute:

West of England Partnership  
Wessex Water

GOSW

## MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION

### Key Issue:

#### Whether there are clear arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the strategy

1. *To ensure timely delivery, is monitoring at key dates central to assessing the success of the Core Strategy?*

To ensure timely delivery it is essential that the JWCS continues to be monitored, informed and where necessary reviewed. Section 7.3 of the JWCS sets out the monitoring requirements. Paragraph 7.3.5 of the JWCS sets out the anticipation that the JWCS will be monitored annually as part of the authorities land use monitoring activities and that this monitoring is expected to be included in individual authorities' Annual Monitoring Reports.

In order to show that required capacity is being delivered, Tables 5, 6 and 7 of the Topic Paper could be referenced in the monitoring framework.

2. *What are the three areas of responsibility referred to in Para 7.1.3 (presumably those set out in Para 7.1.4 – but not clear when reading Para 7.1.3)?*

The three areas of responsibility at paragraph 7.1.3 are listed below in paragraph 7.1.4. If the Inspector considers appropriate the Partnership Authorities suggest the following clarification at paragraph 7.1.3:

*“As such implementation of the JWCS is primarily concerned with their three main areas of responsibility as set out below (in paragraph 7.1.4).”*

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

3. *With regard to delivery of the Core Strategy (Para 7.1.3), should specific reference be made to other key stakeholders and to the Highways Agency? [Highways Agency]*

Paragraph 7.1.3 is intended to refer only to those agencies primarily responsible for implementation ie the Partnership Authorities as local planning authorities, the Environment Agency as regulator and the development industry as provider/operator. The Highways Agency is like to be a statutory consultee on receipt of planning applications, and would consequently influence that development, but it does not have a regulatory role in the delivery of waste management capacity. If the Highways Agency is referred to, then other agencies could expect also to be referenced, which would take away the clarity of the supporting text.

If the Inspector feels it necessary the following clarification could be provided at Para 7.1.3: *The delivery of the JWCS will require Partnership Authorities to have continued engagement with all statutory bodies; but in particular the Environment Agency, as regulator of waste facilities, and in providing monitoring information, and the development industry, which ultimately delivers waste management facilities. As such, implementation of the JWCS is primarily concerned with their three areas of responsibility as set out below (paragraph 7.1.14). ”*

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

4. *Does Table 7.1 show the correct proposed quantitative provision?*

The key for Figure 7.1 is out of position and will be amended. The Figure 7.1 is intended to show the phasing of residual waste treatment, cumulatively in phases until 800,00tpa is reached.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

5. *How helpful is Table 7? Is the table too vague?*

Figure 7.1 and supporting text at paragraph 7.2.3 is intended to present how the required residual capacity is expected to be phased and delivered over the plan period, based upon future requirements, evidence relating to site availability, deliverability and market activity. Whilst indicative, the Partnership Authorities do not consider Figure 7.1 vague as it sets out the anticipated delivery of

residual waste treatment capacity by zone. The anticipated phasing is as follows: in the short term Zone A is anticipated to deliver 400,000tpa, in the medium term this is added to by provision at Zone C (150,000) and Zone D (60,000), and in the longer term this is added to again with further provision at Zone B (100,000) and E (100,000).

6. *Table 7: NB the left-hand key is out of position.*

Noted-the key for Figure 7.1 is out of position and will be amended.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

7. *Waste prevention target indicators: NB “kilograms” not “killograms”.*

Noted- this will be amended.

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

8. *How useful is it to know the percentage of approved developments that require a Waste Audit or waste management plan? What would be a more appropriate indicator?*

The indicators set out for monitoring the effectiveness of Policy 1 at page 44 of the JWCS require more than whether or not an approved development required a Waste Audit. Information is required to be monitored on the percentage of approved developments requiring a Waste Audit which makes provision for on site waste segregation, recycling and recovery. This is to understand future capacity provision on site. Another indicator is to monitor the percentage of approved developments requiring waste management plans which include clear actions for minimising waste on site. This is to understand the effectiveness of Policy 1 and waste audits in contributing to waste prevention. The Partnership Authorities do not therefore propose any additional indicators for Policy 1.

9. *Development Management, Policy 11 indicator: NB the need to know the type of designation affected.*

For clarification the Partnership Authorities suggest the 1<sup>st</sup> indicator for Policy 11 at page 47 of the JWCS is amended to: “area and type designations on which waste related development is granted”

Please see Schedule of Proposed Changes.

**Parties who may wish to contribute:**

West of England Partnership  
Highways Agency

GOSW

S:\WEP\Waste DPD\EiP Prep\Matters and Issues with draft Officer responses version 3.doc