

**Notes of West of England Joint Scrutiny Committee  
Workshop 15<sup>th</sup> August 2008**

**Attendance**

Barbara Lewis, BCC Councillor  
Charlie Bolton, BCC Councillor  
Claire Young, SGC Councillor (sub Pat Hockey)  
Gary Hopkins, BCC Councillor (sub Jon Rogers)  
John Bull, BNES Councillor  
Mike Kellaway-Marriott, NSC Councillor  
Roger Symonds, BNES Councillor  
Tony Moulin NSC Councillor  
Val Jenkins, BCC SDT Scrutiny Commission Co-optee  
Pete Taplin, BCC SDT Scrutiny Commission Co-optee

Allan Davies, West of England Partnership  
Beth Seddon, ERM  
Hilary Livesey, ERM  
Natalie Maletras, ERM  
Chris Marks, Clive Miller Associates, representing BNES  
David Jellings, NSC Democratic Services Officer  
Dick Sage, BCC  
Kay Hobday, West of England Partnership  
Mary Page, SGC  
Siân Parry, BCC Scrutiny Officer  
Stuart Hook, SGC Head of Democratic Services  
Terry Wagstaff, West of England Partnership Chief Executive  
Richard Jones, BCC Democratic Services

**Apologies**

Ian Smith, SGC Councillor

**1. Preferred Options**

Allan Davies (AD) gave a presentation outlining the policy proposals in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options pre-Consultation Document (presentation available from BCC).

Natalie Maletras (NM) outlined ERM's role as consultants to WoEP: they carried out a detailed site assessment, a sustainability

appraisal of the options and have started a landfill capacity search. The Sustainability Appraisal is available on the [www.rubbishorresource.co.uk](http://www.rubbishorresource.co.uk) website.

NM discussed the site strategy options, pointing out the reasons why Option C was the preferred option. She highlighted that the Joint Waste Core Strategy did not involve an appraisal of technologies and that tonnages/capacities were indicative. The Joint Waste Core Strategy will focus on both Commercial and Industrial waste as well as Municipal residual waste.

18 discrete sites have been put forward, based on criteria relating to delivery, land contamination and current land use. Options were assessed for the short, medium and long term. Various pieces of work are outstanding, such as an assessment of biodiversity impacts in relation to internationally designated wildlife sites (as required by the Habitats Directive) and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessments.

NM pointed out that site requirements and capacity are not necessarily correlated, the choice of sites is more likely to be linked with road/rail networks. Issues for deliverability include priorities for the industry, sites and cost.

### **Action**

Members wanted the assumptions in the WRATE analysis of transport impacts circulated.

## **2. Sustainability Appraisal**

Hilary Livesey (HL) gave a presentation on the Sustainability Appraisal ERM had undertaken on the Preferred Options document. This process had concluded that Option C would provide most benefits overall as the more sites there are, the more adverse impacts there would be. The technology impacts on the overall picture, but Option C still came out as the best option.

Uncertainties flagged up were around issues such as air quality, biodiversity and flood risk, on which more work needed to be done. Costs were not a central concern as it was a planning document.

## Issues Raised

Option D did not perform well, due to economies of scale, costs and flood risk. It was suggested that there could be two facilities on one site, although this didn't appear in the strategy.

The possibility of both C&I and MSW being co-located was discussed. NM said that the Plan has to deliver the sites which could potentially deliver C&I capacity. She suggested that Option C could deliver this, especially as it was in line with government policy. The industry was looking at co-location issues due to this shift in policy. Option B would be more difficult to deliver.

Existing waste sites already used were discussed and whether they were included within the Strategy.

Cross boundary issues with other authorities outwith the West of England were raised and it was suggested that links with Somerset, particularly the Mendips and Midsomer Norton should be explored. It was questioned why sites being constructed in these areas weren't being included in the Strategy. AD pointed out it was the role of the RSS to examine these issues at a regional level, but WoEP had to deliver for this sub-area.

The decision-making process and timescales were queried. The consultation process was described and decisions would be taken by each authority individually, with decisions on a "published" Submission Version taken by Councils in Summer 2009.

Air quality was discussed and HL said that this was mainly related to transport at present; predictive modelling was being done for the site locations and further detailed work would need to be done at the planning application stage.

It was queried whether carbon emissions for each Option were analysed and HL replied that the figures are dominated by the facilities themselves, but there would be an overall benefit once the facilities are built offsetting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Transport figures are relatively low compared with facility emissions, e.g. less than 25% compared to overall emissions.

The outputs of EfW and MBT were queried, with a suggestion that MBT would have much more transport impacts. It was also

queried what would happen to the residual percentage from the C&I stream. NM said that there were no figures in the model for the latter, there were RSS assumptions of 800,000 tonnes, but there was scope for figures to go higher, it was assumed that they would be 55% at present.

It was queried what the split was between MSW and C&I and where C&I waste was going at the moment. NM said that residual waste was mainly going to landfill to existing sites, but these sites are not shown on map (not in the sub-region).

### **Action**

Figures on the split between MSW and C&I to be obtained and circulated by WoEP

Will CHP be explored within new RSS areas ? NM said that the Strategy does reflect this and pointed out the possible sites in these areas.

It was pointed out that the MSW figures were inaccurate as B&NES were not taking part in EfW. The composting site at Keynsham was discussed and the possibility of an IVC on this site was suggested. AD said that composting was treated separately from the residual waste issue but that anaerobic digestion technology could be included on the same site.

It was suggested that the RSS figures needed to be challenged and plans adjusted accordingly to take into account current practice. Dick Sage (DS) pointed out that the plans would be reviewed every 5 years to ensure they were fit for purpose. Higher proposed housing figures may work against the present downward trend. AD suggested that a change in policy wording could be put forward to ensure that up to date figures are used when waste planning authorities propose or consider proposals for new waste management facilities.

### **Action**

AD agreed that a change in policy wording could be put forward to the RSS consultation.

The OBC deadline was discussed and debate ensued regarding the incinerator preference in the OBC. NM said that the industry liked the economies of scale of such technology.

Transport and the weight given to such issues as material considerations were discussed. Rail v road v waterways were debated and their respective CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. HL spelt out the modelling that had been done and the assumptions made. It was suggested that rail and waterway possibilities should be taken into account, given that criteria can change over time given economic constraints. NM said that rail had not been considered for spatial options. AD spelt out the planning policy process and highlighted that the strategy would have considerable statutory weight, plus other material considerations such as government policy.

Given the RSS 2026 timescales, the prevention of waste production in the first place needs to be prioritised. NM said that nationally supermarkets are subject to landfill tax.

The figures for MBT were queried, and NM responded by saying that they are dependent on MBT configuration- the plan is technology neutral and Option C fits whatever technology is used. Assumptions have been made for each authority.

The economies of scale/fuel prices etc and their impacts on the possible options were discussed. NM said that the huge costs of construction offset the relatively small costs of transport. A detailed cost assessment will be done for the OBC.

Issues regarding hazardous waste were raised and NM said that there was an element of this in any waste stream; AD said there was a facility in Gloucestershire which was used.

The relationship with core strategies of other authorities in the region was queried. AD liaises with other authorities and has knowledge of other facilities e.g. landfill site in Wiltshire used by the West of England. As the Strategy was a strategic document, smaller facilities may be in local LDFs. It was requested that a map be produced showing the facilities in surrounding Council areas.

## **Action**

A map be produced showing the surrounding facilities in surrounding Council areas.

Regarding the OBC, it was raised that members had not yet seen this document. It was suggested that the strategy could not be divorced from the technology to be used. Smaller, more flexible facilities needed to be supported. TW said that the OBC was not yet completed. It had been scoped, and the affordability assessment would be available to scrutiny at its September meetings.

## **Summary of Action Points**

Members wanted the assumptions in the WRATE analysis of transport impacts circulated.

Figures on the split between MSW and C&I to be obtained and circulated by WoEP

AD agreed that a change in policy wording could be put forward to the RSS consultation.

A map to be produced showing the facilities in surrounding Council areas.