

Matters and Issues for Examination

The Council has requested the Inspector to recommend whatever main modifications are required to make the Plan legally compliant and sound. This document lists matters (topics) and issues (points for consideration), which reflect the content of her report, and are aimed at assisting her with this task. It sets out questions to which participants are invited to respond, some of which are for clarification only and which are aimed at obtaining a better understanding of the Plan.

All questions should be answered by the Council, although if the Council does not have the information, it should say so. Other participants should only respond to issues relevant to points they have made in their earlier representations, and are not expected to respond unless they have additional relevant information to give.

Northamptonshire County Council may wish to comment further on the soundness of the Plan's policies with respect to hazardous waste and radioactive waste. Likewise, Natural England and the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust may like to comment further on provision affecting the natural and built environment, and in particular on the Council's suggested amendment to Policy DM1 (in the submission document September 2012).

In some circumstances it may be appropriate for a participant and the Council to reach an agreed position and to set this out in a Statement of Common Ground. Such a Statement might contain the wording for a main modification. Participants are urged to read the Guidance Notes, which have already been sent out, and which can be downloaded from the examination website www.warwickshire.gov.uk/wasteplanexamination. Statements should be received by the Programme Officer no later than midday on Monday 31 December 2012.

Matter 1 - Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy

Issue 1 – Whether the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy are the most appropriate to meet the waste management requirements of the County, and whether they are effectively and positively reflected in the Plan policies and in accordance with national policy.

Q1 Whilst figure 7.1 provides a diagram of the Spatial Strategy, other than a sentence within the vision, there is no text explaining what the Spatial Strategy is. Whilst Policies CS2, CS3 and CS4 address location, these policies are not the Spatial Strategy, although it is appropriate that they reflect it. Consequently, section 7 of the Plan does not make it clear that the Spatial Strategy is the most appropriate. Should text be added to this section to reflect chosen Option 5 (p.50 Emerging Spatial Options March 2011) as this is the Preferred Option (as referred to in Preferred Options and Policies September 2011 p.43)? If so what text should be added?

The Spatial Strategy for Warwickshire is a Settlement Hierarchy approach based on enabling waste development in areas of higher population and /or existing waste management capacity.

New waste facilities will be developed on industrial estates, brownfield industrial land and existing waste management facilities within the following locations:

i. priority given to within and/or in close proximity to the 'primary' settlements of Nuneaton, Rugby, Leamington Spa, Bedworth, Warwick, Stratford-upon-Avon and Kenilworth; or within 5km of the Coventry Major Urban Area (MUA); or

ii. within and/or in close proximity to the 'secondary' settlements of Atherstone, Coleshill and Southam where it is demonstrated that the development provides significant transport, operational and environmental benefits; or

iii) sites outside primary and secondary settlements where specific types of waste development might be acceptable where there are no unacceptable adverse environmental effects.

This chosen Spatial Strategy was one of the five options which were developed and consulted on through the Emerging Spatial Options stage and which was then taken forward as the Preferred Option. The strategy seeks to locate the largest new waste developments in and around (within 5km) of the main towns in the county (those with a population larger than 20000).

Secondary settlements were also proposed from a number of smaller settlements (over 6000 in population) which had a good waste infrastructure and were well located to the major road network. These can also accommodate large waste developments which were defined as sites with over 50000 tonnes capacity, where it could be justified that there were significant transport, operational and environmental benefits. Evidence shows that the largest concentrations of waste arisings for C and I waste are produced in these Primary and Secondary locations and similar patterns are expected for other waste streams.

Smaller waste facilities under 50000 tonnes capacity can be located outside primary and secondary locations where it could be justified that there were significant transport, operational and environmental benefits.

Matter 2- waste arisings and management requirements

Issue 2 – Whether the baselines used to quantify waste arisings for the three main waste streams are the most appropriate and, whether the assumptions and methodologies used to calculate future waste projections and management requirements are justified.

Q2 What is the date of the *Waste Background Technical Document (WBTD)* and who are its authors?

The date of the Waste Background Technical Document is March 2012 and the Authors are Adam James, Tony Lyons, Eva Neale and Derek Greedy.

Local Authority Collected Municipal Waste (LACMW)

Q3 The WBTD (p25) says that Table 4.4 includes an aspirational landfill diversion target. However, landfill diversion includes energy recovery and the table only appears to include re-use, recycling and composting. Please confirm that this is the case.

Yes - Table 4.4 does only include re-use, recycling and composting. The table was produced by the Waste Management team to report progress against the Waste Strategy 2007 municipal waste 'recovery' rate targets (i.e. waste re-used, recycled or composted) as set out in para. 4.17 of the Submission document. The 'residual waste' column would include waste sent for energy recovery or landfill. The proportions between waste going to energy recovery and to landfill would largely depend on contracts, but it is now understood that a contract to send between 35,000-50,000tpa of the residual waste to the Coventry EfW was signed in 2010 for 6 years, with scope for a possible 2 year extension. This waste going to energy recovery would therefore account for a proportion of the 'residual waste' in the table.

Q4 Does the Warwickshire Waste Partnership have comparable aspirational targets to the Waste Strategy 2007, which include energy recovery? If so, what are they?

It is understood that the Warwickshire Waste Partnership have not published aspirational targets over the plan period for landfill diversion that include energy recovery as the proportions of 'residual waste' going to energy recovery and landfill would depend on contractual arrangements. However, the Partnership has recently published short term targets which aim to send less than 18% of LACMW to landfill by 2013/14. It is understood that contracts have now been signed to enable the authority to meet these targets.

Measures	Aim	2010/11 Actual	2011/12 Target	2012/13 Target	2013/14 Target
Residual household waste per household (formerly NI 191)	Low	564.4kg	0.538kg	0.485kg	0.473kg

Household waste re-used, recycled and composted (formerly NI 192)	High	49.20%	50.29%	54.72%	55.94%
Municipal waste landfilled (formerly NI 193)	Low	40.00%	34.11%	34.03%	17.28%
Household waste that has been used to recover heat, power and other energy sources (formerly LI 721)	High	18.50%	19.46%	17.27%	20.68%
Percentage recycling and composting of "household waste" at Household Waste Recycling Centres (formerly LI 725)	High	66.60%	66.62%	67.97%	69.68%

Source: WCC Waste Management team - Warwickshire Waste Partnership Report – 6th December 2011

Q5 Section 4.14 of the WBTD (p19) considers composition of waste and says that in 2010 66.1% was recycled, composted or went to energy recovery. Does this include re-use?

Yes, it does include re-use.

Q6 To what extent is the aspirational target being met?

At a Waste Partnership meeting on the 27th September 2011, Members asked for a review of the key targets within Warwickshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, as the present targets had been exceeded. Following a review, the Partnership has published short term targets (see above table) which aim to send less than 18% of waste to landfill by 2013/14. It is understood that contracts have now been signed to enable the authority to meet these targets.

Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste

Q7 The Plan bases its capacity requirements on the RSS Phase 2 Revision Preferred Option aspirational targets for reducing the quantity of waste going to landfill. I note that with LACMW there is also a County aspirational target. Is there any similar County target for C&I waste?

The authority has far less control over the management and disposal of C&I waste than for LACMW as C&I waste is largely managed by the private sector. The landfill diversion targets provided in the RSS Phase 2 Revision Preferred Options are considered to be both aspirational and deliverable, surpassing the landfill diversion targets in the Waste Strategy 2007. The targets are therefore considered to be the most appropriate for calculating the County's treatment capacity requirements for LACMW and C&I waste.

Matter 3- Capacity

Issue 3 – Whether there will be sufficient waste management capacity provided within the County during the Plan period to manage the equivalent of Warwickshire's waste arisings, thereby contributing to achieving equivalent self sufficiency.

LACMW and C&I waste

Q8 Section 4.54 (1st paragraph) of the WBTD has three bullet points, each of which refers to operational and permitted capacity. For each of the three categories of HCI, has any of the permitted capacity become operational? If so, give brief details.

The only site that has become operational is Palm Recycling, which offers HCI treatment. The EA Waste Data Interrogator return for 2011 provided a throughput of 18,944 tonnes.

Q9 For those permitted facilities in each category which are not operational, how much capacity (tpa) has been implemented? Are these facilities expected to be built out?

Nearly all of the non-operational sites have never been implemented. The only exception is the Palm Recycling MRF which is now operational and processed 18,944 tonnes during its first year of operation (2011).

Q10 For each of the three categories of HCI permitted capacity that has to date not become operational, how much is considered to be deliverable?

For 'HCI treatment', the 365,000tpa at Malpass Farm and the 50,000tpa at Palm Recycling are both considered to be deliverable. See Q16 for the latest update for Malpass Farm. The Palm Recycling site is now operational with 18,944 tonnes throughput (EAWDI2011) observed during the plant's first year of operation. It is likely therefore that the facility could process 50,000tpa in the future.

The deliverability of the 50,000tpa at Horizon Recycling and the 5,000tpa at the Dunchurch Trading Estate are not known, but no information has been received to suggest that they are not deliverable- in fact, as both are changes of use, the opposite

maybe true. If these capacities are not deliverable, the County is still able to meet its treatment capacity requirements.

In terms of 'organic treatment', the 25,000tpa approved for in-vessel composting at Brinklow quarry is considered to be deliverable as the operator has begun work on site. The deliverability of the 50,000tpa in-vessel composting facility at Kingston Grange Farm is not currently known, but the Council has not received any information to suggest that the facility is not deliverable and conditions have been discharged.

It should be noted that 50,000tpa of anaerobic digestion capacity has been approved at Packington- this was not included in the WBTD site information. This was approved at the August 2012 Regulatory Committee and although the planning permission has not yet been issued, it is considered that there is a strong chance that the facility will be deliverable.

In terms of scrap metals, the only non-operational scrap metal site appears to be Watts Rugby Ltd, which is only permitted to handle 300 tonnes. The Council has not received any information to suggest that this development is not deliverable.

Q11 What is the current total operational transfer/sorting capacity for LACMW/C&I waste? What is the total permitted capacity?

It is estimated that there is 269,569 tonnes of permitted 'HCI transfer' capacity. However, as per Q13, an additional 321,710 tonnes of 'sorting' capacity is available for facilities listed as 'HCI treatment' (i.e. waste transfer or MRF).

Q12 The third bullet point relating to metal recycling refers to 735,432 tpa operational/permitted. When looking at the totals (in bold) for both operational and permitted capacity, this figure appears to have been counted into both. Please explain. Also clarify how much metal recycling capacity is operational.

In this context, the term "HCI treatment" refers to all processing technologies for household, commercial and industrial wastes that exclude scrap metal processing and organic treatment. This would include recycling/recovery, MBT etc. It was considered that scrap metal processing and organic treatment should be differentiated as the types of processing would be different from the other HCI treatment technologies. However, scrap metal processing can be included with 'HCI treatment' if this is considered to be more logical.

Based on the EA Waste Data Interrogator site returns since 2008, approximately 272,000 tonnes of scrap metal capacity has been operational. However, the limitations of the Waste Data Interrogator (paras. 4.44-4.47 of the WBTD) must be acknowledged.

Even if this is the case and 463,462 tonnes is not operational, other operational HCI waste management capacity is available to meet the County's waste arisings and treatment capacity requirements.

Q13 For each of the three categories, how much of the treatment capacity consists of 1) sorting (eg waste transfer stations; MRFs), 2) pre-treatment (primary), 3) final treatment (secondary)? Are Household Waste Recycling sites counted as treatment capacity?

The total treatment capacity for each of the three categories is as follows:

- 1) Sorting (321,710)***
- 2) Pre-treatment (742,365)***
- 3) Final-treatment (826,075)***

No, Household Waste Recycling sites are not counted as treatment capacity.

Q14 Section 4.9 of the WBTD refers to 9 Household Waste Recycling sites spread between 5 districts and boroughs. How many are in each district/borough? Are there sufficient sites to meet requirements?

There are nine Household Waste Recycling Centres spread across the county, with at least one site located in each district/borough area which ensures a good geographic spread:

This ensures that there is sufficient capacity at each site to ensure that all waste which is collected or deposited can be treated or sorted on site. Generally all the HWRS are located in urban centres close to larger facilities where sorted material can be sent on for energy recovery, landfill or recycling.



North Warwickshire Borough - Grendon HWRC

- **Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough – Judkins HWRC**
- **Rugby Borough – Hunters Lane HWRC**
- **Stratford District – Burton Farm, Stockton, Wellesbourne and Shipston HWRC's**
- **Warwick District– Cherry Orchard and Princes Drive HWRCs**

During 2010, a fundamental review of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) in Warwickshire was carried out. All aspects of the HWRC's were looked at including cost, number of visits, tonnages in order to ascertain the best way to provide the HWRC service. The review showed that there were more than sufficient sites to meet the requirements and as a result a number of proposals were put to Members in relation to the HWRC service these including shutting sites, closing for 2 days a week and reducing the hours.

As a result of the review, it was decided that eight of Warwickshire County Council's nine HWRCs would remain open seven days a week. The other site, Stockton, near Southam, would only open three days a week (Sat, Sun and Mon) and, along with Wellesbourne HWRC, would become one of Britain's first recycling centres run entirely by the voluntary sector (Warwickshire Community Recycling). This type of service delivery embraces the

Government's Big Society agenda and has enabled seven day opening to remain at Warwickshire's eight busiest sites.

The decisions made have ensured that the Authority has retained the geographic spread across each Borough and District.

Q15 Section 4.9 of the WBTD refers to a MRF processing up to 150,000tpa of recyclates – is 150,000tpa also its capacity? What MRFs are there within the County for sorting LACMW and at what capacity?

Yes. It has capacity of up to 150,000tpa.

Ettington is the only MRF in the county for sorting LACMW.

Q16 Section 4.9 of the WBTD refers to planning permission having been granted for a MBT plant to treat 300,000tpa. Is this Malpass Farm? What is the current position with Malpass Farm?

The Malpass Farm application was approved on the 17th November 2009. The applicant has submitted details to discharge pre-commencement conditions and has indicated that they hope to be on site doing development works during the first quarter of 2013. At a Community Cement Engagement Group meeting on 29th November 2012, Cemex provided the following update in writing for the meeting:

“With the agreement with SITA now officially finalised, the SITA plant in Birmingham is due to come on stream early in 2013. Work on the Malpass Farm should commence early in the New Year and the new plant commissioned in 2014.”

Q17 Section 4.10 of the WBTD also refers to planning permission for a 50,000tpa anaerobic digestion plant for treating food waste. What is the current position?

The plant referred to is Kingston Grange, Gaydon. Planning permission has been granted for the establishment of an indoor IVC and ‘Wet’ Anaerobic Digestion facility, designed to treat up to 50,000 tonnes per annum of organic waste, plus ancillary development. Permission was granted on 27th June 2011. The plant would handle Organic Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Waste together with suitable waste food stuffs and surplus or spoiled vegetable products. There are no formal conditions restricting throughput or vehicular movements.

Organic LACMW and C&I Waste

Q18 Section 4.54 of the WBTD (last paragraph on p.43) refers to 249,000 tonnes of deliverable capacity with planning permission. From Table 4.19, which indicates 249,000tonnes of capacity from 2014/15, it would appear that only 75,000 tonnes is currently not operational (249,000 -174,000).

Is this correct and does this relate to one facility? Please provide details of the up to date position relating to this new capacity.

Currently 75,000 tonnes is not operational. This relates to two facilities, Kingston Grange, Gaydon at 50,000 tpa and Brinklow at 25,000tpa.

Q19 Is any of the current 174,000tpa operational capacity likely to cease within the Plan period? If so, give details.

Yes – the Packington open windrow composting permission for 60,000tpa is due to expire on the 18th November 2013. However, this potential 'lost' capacity is likely to be replaced by the 50,000tpa of approved (non time-limited) capacity for the anaerobic digestion facility at the Packington site – this was granted on 17th July 2012.

Landfill

Q20 How much of the 9 million m³ of remaining operational landfill void will become time expired within the Plan period?

The 9 million m³ of remaining operational landfill void was taken to be the total voidspace available at Packington (Sita), Bubbenhall (WRG/Smith's Concrete), Ling Hall (Veolia), Ufton (Biffa) and Kingsbury (Biffa). Based on 2009 inputs taken forward (as a worst case scenario over the first 5 years and the maximum landfill tonnages thereafter), the evidence appears to indicate that Packington Landfill has a lifespan of 2.7 years, Bubbenhall Landfill 3.57 years, Ling Hall 7.81 years, Ufton 6.62 years and Kingsbury 32.2 years. So of the 9 million m³ of operational landfill void, approximately 4.43 million tonnes of the remaining landfill void is time limited.

Q21 What is the current position with Dunton Landfill? What is its capacity? Where is Dunton?

Dunton Landfill is situated along Lichfield Road in Curdworth, North Warwickshire. Planning permission has been granted for the remaining sand and gravel deposits on site (approx. 107,000 tonnes) to be extracted and exported from the site, the remaining previously landfilled materials to be excavated and processed into secondary/recycled aggregate, and the continued use of the site for the recycling of imported waste materials (including construction and demolition wastes and Incinerator Bottom Ash sourced for the Coventry Energy from Waste Plant) into secondary/recycled aggregates.

Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E)Waste

Q22 The Plan refers to the WRAP voluntary target of halving the amount of CD&E waste going to landfill by 2012. It would appear from paragraph 4.48 of the submission Plan that Warwickshire has taken this on board as a County target. Is this correct?

Yes- this is an aspirational target for the County and is reflected in the proposed monitoring framework.

Q23 Section 4.86 of the WBTD uses the EA's 2008 waste data interrogator as a baseline for calculating the amount of reduction to meet WRAP's halving target. Is 2008 WRAP's baseline date from which the reduction is to be quantified?

Yes – the 2008 data will be used as the baseline data to assess C&D landfill diversion based on the WRAP voluntary target of halving the volume of waste send to landfill by 2012, compared to 2008.

Q24 Why was the interrogator used, given its identified shortcomings? Is it because it is the best comparative information available to monitor progress between 2008 and 2012?

Yes – at present, using the EA Waste Data Interrogator is considered to be the best way of monitoring C&D landfill diversion, despite the acknowledged limitations of the tool. In the short term, it appears unlikely that any other methods of calculating C,D&E waste arisings, movements and disposal will become available so the Interrogator is considered to provide the most robust method of calculation when assessed against the potential alternatives. These are provided in the WBTD.

Q25 Why does the submission Plan show the EA's 2008 interrogator figure for CD&E waste as 327,253 (paragraph 4.48) when the WBTR (section 4.86) shows it as 328,254? Which is correct? What are the latest figures on the amount of Warwickshire's CD&E waste that went to landfill?

The correct figure is 327,253. The latest figure for 2011 using the same methodology and the EA 2011 Interrogator is 281,193.

Q26 Section 4.87 of the WBTD indicates that about 571,708 tpa of CD&E treatment capacity will be required to meet the Waste Framework target of 70% of non hazardous CD&E being recovered. What is meant by "recovery" in this regard? Does this mean that about 571,708 tpa equates to the quantity of waste that needs to be recovered? How is this figure calculated? (It does not seem to be 70% of the estimated 858,461 tpa of arisings).

"Recovery" is taken do be waste diverted from landfill. Para. 4.63 of the WBTD provides guidance on how recovery operations will be interpreted. The 858,461tpa figure is an average for the 15 year plan period, based on the C,D&E waste arisings projections set out in Appendix C (page 54) of the Scott Wilson Landfill Capacity Update Report – June 2009. The 571,708 tpa figure is arrived at by taking 70% of the C,D&E waste arisings figure for 2020/21 – i.e. 816,727tpa.

	2013/ 14	2014/ 15	2015/ 16	2016/ 17	2017/ 18	2018/ 19	2019/ 20	2020/ 21	2021/ 22	2022/ 23	2023/ 24	2024/ 25	2025/ 26	2026/ 27	2027/ 28
Scott Wilson Update report – Scenario 1	829 767	827 783	825 841	823 940	822 079	820 257	818 473	816 727	815 017	813 343	811 704	810 100	808 530	806 992	805 487
Max Landfill (tpa)	281 193							245 019							80 458

Source: Scott Wilson (June 2009) - Landfill Capacity Update Report – Appendix C

Q27 Section 4.84 of the WTBD indicates that the County currently has 17 facilities with permission to manage primarily inert and CD&E waste, although paragraph 4.43 of the submission Plan refers to 25. Which is correct and what type of facilities does this include (eg reuse, recovery etc).

There are currently 20 facilities, primarily treating C&D waste, however this does not include HCl facilities that may handle C&D waste for transfer.

Q28 Section 4.85 of the WTBD refers to capacity of 540,000tpa being time limited. It goes on to refer to a facility capable of processing 400,000tpa which is time limited to 2012 but which is applying to process up to 250,000tpa. From Tables 4.34 and A.1 this would appear to be Dunton’s MRF. What is the current position with its planning application to process 250,000tpa?

This is the MRF at Dunton. Planning permission was granted for the consolidation of existing planning permission’s under one consent to facilitate the continued processing of recycled aggregates and the extraction of sand and gravel on 11th May 2012.

Q29 Section 4.85 says there is currently recycling/recovery capacity of 615,250 tpa. If 540,000tpa of this is lost, 75,000tpa would be left. Taking average arisings of 858,461tpa and the WRAP target of no more than 164,127tpa going to landfill, 694,334tpa of capacity would be required to meet this target. Does the Council agree? The Council appears to have accepted this target. However, the Plan refers to between 103,450 and 496,458tpa being required. How is this calculated?

It should be noted that the method for calculating the treatment capacity shortfall used the County’s predicted C,D&E arisings figure for 2020/21 (816,727tpa) and applied the 70% ‘recovery’ requirement for this total based on the EU Waste Framework Directive requirement. This would equate to 571,708 tonnes of recovery/recycling capacity.

It is understood that the '540,000tpa' figure of potentially 'lost' capacity is taken to be 400,000tpa at Dunton, 90,000tpa at Weavers Hill Aggregates (expires Oct. 2014) and 50,000tpa at Whites of Coventry (Aug 2015). This would leave the remaining capacity as 75,250tpa; i.e. 30,250tpa at the Hammonds Skiphire MRF and 45,000tpa at the Brinklow Quarry. Therefore the potential shortfall in capacity is calculated as 571,708tpa (i.e. the amount of C,D&E recycling/recovery capacity) minus the 75,250tpa of permitted recycling/recovery capacity that is unlimited over the plan period.

It must be noted, however, that an application was approved in April 2012 for the Dunton site for continued aggregate recycling. The planning application provides no throughput limit but it is considered that it would be limited to the EA permit (which is likely to be 250,000tpa) for a period of 10 years. Permission has also been granted in July 2012 to MAC Construction for 75,000tpa of C,D&E recycling capacity (not time limited). A further 25,000tpa of recycling capacity was approved in October 2012 for a MRF at Griff IV quarry (not time limited) and to Parkstone Environmental Ltd in July 2012 for processing up to 65,000tpa of C&D waste, although this has a temporary permission, expiring 31st December 2022.

Q30 WTBD table 4.34 refers to Southfields Farm MRF being non operational. Does this mean that its 3,000tpa capacity is not available for use?

We have checked this information again and according to the latest information the MRF is still operational and still processes approximately 3000 tonnes per annum.

Q31 Table A.1 (no.11) refers to Brinklow Quarry MRF and questions whether it is operational. Is this 45,000tpa facility available for use?

This facility is available for use and in its first year, the throughput was 11,960 using the EA Waste Data Interrogator for 2011. However, the permitted capacity for this site is 45,000tpa.

Q32 Taking the above into account, how many MRFs are operational? Is the current treatment capacity still 615,250tpa? If not, what is it?

There are currently 6 MRFs that are operational.

<i>Dunton</i>	<i>250,000 tpa</i>
<i>MAC</i>	<i>75,000 tpa</i>
<i>Griff IV</i>	<i>25,000 tpa</i>
<i>Parkstone</i>	<i>65,000 tpa</i>
<i>Hammonds</i>	<i>30,250 tpa</i>
<i>Brinklow</i>	<i>45,000 tpa</i>

Total	490,250 tpa
--------------	--------------------

The current treatment capacity is 490,250.

Q33 The submission Plan at paragraph 4.50 says that the treatment gap does not relate to CD&E, and it refers to the RSS Phase 2 Revision Preferred Option in support. Whilst the RSS reference to treatment gap might not refer to CD&E, does the Council accept that national policy does not restrict self sufficiency to LACMW and C&I?

The County Council accepts that national policy does not restrict self- sufficiency to LACMW and C and I waste. Although we have used the RSS treatment gap for C and I and LACMW we have also tried to work out the treatment gap for C D and E Waste and Hazardous waste.

The West Midlands Regional Strategy for Waste Policy was based on an assumption that those waste types are the main waste streams that can be quantified accurately and that there was too much uncertainty to be able to calculate the total figures in terms of arisings in enough detail for C,D and E because of the difficulty in monitoring arisings due to recycling on construction sites and large scale on exempt sites.

However, several scenarios for calculating the treatment gap for this waste were compared in the Waste Background Technical Document. The preferred methodology for calculating a treatment gap was the Scott Wilson Landfill Capacity Update Report – June (2009) with RSS housing projections included. Based on the EU WFD target of 70% recovery rate for CD and E we have tried to calculate where there is a shortfall in treatment capacity and approximately how many facilities we might require over the plan period.

Q34 Does the Council agree that there might potentially be a significant CD&E treatment gap within the Plan period?

Based on the latest information, this may not necessarily be the case. Significant C&D treatment capacity has been permitted in recent months – see answer to question 29 above. If implemented, this would mean that 490,250tpa of C&D treatment capacity is available to 2020, excluding any potential extensions to time limited operations (i.e. Whites of Coventry – 50,000tpa, or Weavers Hill Aggregates – 90,000tpa). This would leave a potential shortfall in treatment capacity of 81,458tpa to meet the target of recovering 70% of the County’s C&D waste by 2020. Again, this would exclude any additional C&D treatment capacity approved up until 2020, or any C&D waste that this recycled or recovered on site.

Q35 With respect to landfill, does Dunton take both LACMW/C&I and CD&E type waste?

Dunton landfill deals with Construction and Demolition Waste and Incinerator Bottom Ash. Waste may also include an importation of Local Authority Waste.

Q36 Table 4.34 refers to Griff IV landfill – void 5.6 million m³ - permission not yet implemented. What is the current position? When will the permission expire if not implemented?

The application was approved in October 2012 subject to a legal agreement (now signed in December 2012) which will enable the void to be filled until 2032 with 8.4 million tonnes of inert waste. However this may be ambitious given the size of the void and given the fact that there is an element of recycling involved in the application which will process up to 25000 tonnes per annum.

Hazardous Waste

Q37 On page 38, paragraph 4.40 of the submission Plan, an additional modification has been made giving figures for 2010. Do these figures come from the EA's 2010 Waste Data Interrogator?

Yes these figures were taken from the EA 2010 Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator.

Q38 The same paragraph says that 76% was disposed of to landfill in 2009 and that there was a similar pattern in 2010. Does this mean that 76% was sent to landfill in 2010? If not, how much was?

The figure was 66.8% in 2010. However when added to the CSG figure from the Coventry HWDI it comes down to nearer 52%.

Q39 Is it predicted that progressively less hazardous waste will be sent to landfill throughout the Plan period? What are the predictions?

The West Midlands RSS predicted less hazardous waste produced due to increasing costs of hazardous waste disposal and more recycling of contaminated inert waste on site.

In 2010 of the waste received at the three hazardous waste landfills in Warwickshire it would appear that much of the waste is from outside the county but inside the West Midlands region.

Packington received all of its 4505 tonnes from the West Midlands (not codeable). Ufton Landfill received 11492 tonnes mainly from the East and West Midlands which was also non codeable. Southam Quarry received all of its 8040 tonnes of hazardous from within Warwickshire (Rugby Cement Plant). Given Southam has a capacity of 340000 tonnes at this rate it would have enough void space to last through the plan period.

Therefore in future years it is expected that Warwickshire landfills will receive much less waste as the landfills at Packington and Ufton will close probably within 3 years). Consequently, less hazardous waste will be managed in the county by landfill. The main producer of hazardous waste in the county (Rugby Cement) will carry on landfilling or recycling any hazardous waste in its quarry in the county at Southam.

Q40 Although the Council indicates that there are no national or regional targets for diverting hazardous waste from landfill, are there any such local targets for Warwickshire? If so, what are they?

No there are no targets within Warwickshire for diverting hazardous waste as such.

Q41 What are the drivers for pushing hazardous waste management up the hierarchy?

The main elements for driving hazardous waste up the waste hierarchy are the Waste Strategy for England 2007 and to a lesser extent the West Midlands RSS.

The Waste Strategy for England 2007 states that the control of hazardous waste is particularly important. The Government has continued to pursue policies which have led to reductions in hazardous waste arisings. In addition to the efforts to reduce the amount of hazardous waste, the Government has also sought to find ways to recover material and energy resources from hazardous waste as well as ensuring its safe treatment and disposal. The changes brought about by the Landfill Directive have led to a need for additional treatment facilities and infrastructure for hazardous waste. In terms of household hazardous waste better collection sorting and recycling at Household Waste Sites have been attained through the municipal waste targets set out in the Waste Strategy for England (2007) and cascaded down to the West Midlands RSS.

The West Midlands RSS did not require authorities to apportion totals for hazardous wastes as the region has always been a net importer of such wastes. The RSS Phase 2 Revision sought to safeguard existing hazardous waste sites through a safeguarding policy (W8) and to plan for Final Disposal sites in Non MUA's in policy W12. It was generally anticipated that the MUA's would continue to provide the bulk of the treatment capacity in the region whereas the counties would provide most of the landfill capacity.

Q42 What is the current capacity for hazardous landfill? Is this all contained within the 5 active landfills referred to in section 4.11 of the WBTD?

Although the Background states that there are five landfills in the county, a specialised site at Southam was not included, which therefore takes the total to six. The hazardous waste capacity for landfill is contained within three landfill sites. These are Ufton Landfill, Packington Landfill and Southam Quarry. Ufton and Packington have traditionally always taken bonded asbestos for landfill. The hazardous waste cell at Southam Quarry is a specialised landfill site which is used for the landfilling of cement kiln dust from the Rugby Cement Works. The other landfills in the county at Bubbenhall, Ling Hall and Kingsbury are all non-hazardous.

Q43 An additional modification to the Plan at paragraph 8.13 of the submission document says that two landfill sites (Ufton and Packington), which contain stabilised non-reactive hazardous waste cells, may not be available through to the end of the plan period at current rates. Explain the current rates/capacities and the reductions with reference to timescales.

Ufton Landfill

Biffa have told us that the wastes come from all over the country rather than from within the county or region as is the nature of hazardous waste. It is anticipated that the whole site will close in 2014 which will include the hazardous waste cell. It is unlikely that Biffa will open another hazardous waste landfill within the county in the future.

Packington Landfill – SITA have confirmed that there is an estimated lifespan of 3 years left at Packington with a void of 830 cubic metres which is required to be filled.

Southam Quarry - The latest figures from the hazardous waste data interrogator show that in 2011 there was a massive increase in hazardous waste arisings in the county and a consequent huge leap in hazardous waste treatment. The arisings figure of 223189 is matched by a similar figure of 220308 tonnes managed in 2011. This exceptional figure was the result of a planning permission in that year to remove the hazardous contents of waste arisings (cement kiln dust) from Parkfield Road Quarry in Rugby close to the Rugby Cement Works, where waste from the cement making process had been tipped for many years. The quarry was not properly contained and material had been leaching out in to adjacent watercourses. The material was taken to a landfill site in Southam also operated by Cemex which has permission for the tipping of hazardous waste and it appears that all the material was tipped in this landfill inside the county. The permitted capacity of Southam Landfill is 340,000 tonnes and with the current rate of tipping from the cement works it is probable that the quarry has a lifespan of

The other landfills in the county are non- hazardous. It appears that CEMEX may have found a way of re-using the cement kiln dust which would mean that the site would have a much longer lifespan if it were required for further tipping in the future.

Q44 The WTBD at section 4.11 says there are no merchant landfills for hazardous waste in the county, resulting in any hazardous waste that can be landfilled being exported. Does this mean that Warwickshire's capacity is only for LACMW?

This statement may not be factually correct as there are two merchant landfill cells in the county at Ufton and Packington. Southam Quarry for the landfilling of asbestos wastes and plasterboard. The third landfill is not a merchant landfill because it is owned by CEMEX for its own use ie for the landfilling of cement kiln dust from CEMEX's Rugby Cement plant.

Q45 Paragraph 8.44 of the submission Plan indicates that Warwickshire has sufficient landfill capacity for all waste streams. Will this be the case for hazardous landfill capacity for the lifetime of the Plan? What treatment facilities are there for hazardous waste in the County and what is the total treatment capacity in the County?

The figures appear to indicate that a relatively small amount of hazardous waste is produced within Warwickshire. Two of the landfills identified above (Ufton and Packington) will close within the next three years. Evidence from the HWDI appears to show that almost all the material landfilled in these two facilities come from outside the county. This is backed up by Biffa's Mary Tappenden (see answer to Q43). The third landfill at Southam Quarry deals exclusively with material defined as thermal process waste from Rugby Cement Ltd at Rugby. The landfill at Southam has a remaining capacity of 340,000 tonnes.

In terms of treatment there is one main treatment facility which does not appear on the Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator for Warwickshire but which has a postcode for Coventry so appears on their HWDI figures. This plant is for the treatment of liquid waste and there is a permitted capacity of 40000tpa. In 2011 the figure for treatment at this facility was only 14830 tpa.

There is also a hazardous waste transfer station in the north east of the county off the A5 directly adjacent to Hinckley. This plant has a capacity of 25000 tonnes.

Q46 Does this result in a treatment gap? If so, should the Plan encourage facilities for the treatment of hazardous waste?

There is no treatment gap for hazardous waste when comparing total waste produced and total waste managed ie either landfilled or treated.

The HWDI shows that Warwickshire imports more hazardous waste than it produces when based on the figures with a Warwickshire postcode. When the Coventry treatment for Cleansing Services Group is added to the Warwickshire figures it shows that Warwickshire has a much larger treatment capacity than it requires for its own needs.

The conclusion is that there is more treatment capacity than the county needs based on the specialist function of treating waste liquids. There may be a shortage of merchant landfill but the HWDI shows that almost all the waste entering these landfills comes from outside the county.

but there is landfill capacity to deal with all the waste which is produced by Rugby Cement Works which is the main producer of hazardous waste for landfill.

Q47 Paragraph 8.15 of the submission Plan contains an additional modification which says that 43,000 tonnes of hazardous waste was managed in the County. Does this include disposal to landfill and treatment?

Yes the figure does include landfill and treatment.

Q48 Does this take account of the 10,000tpa Cleansing Services Group facility referred to in the letter of 3 August 2012 to Northamptonshire County Council?

No - added to that should be the figures for the Cleansing Services Facility near Coventry which had an operational treatment capacity of 10191 tpa in 2010 and 14830 tpa in 2011 (permitted capacity of 40000 tpa).

Q49 Regardless of capacity, how are the quantities of hazardous waste actually split between treatment and landfill disposal?

Because of the particular discrepancy in the arisings figure for 2011 (ie. the exceptional figures for Southam Quarry described above in question 43) the figures are based on the EA 2010 HWDI.

If the figures outlined in question 48 for CSG are added to the overall figures for Warwickshire for 2010 the total waste managed is 45895 tonnes. Of this figure 24037 tonnes were landfilled, 17694 tonnes were treated and the remainder was transferred.

Q50 The WBTD at section 4.95 refers to additional regional capacity of nearly 100,000 tpa being close to obtaining planning permission. What is

this facility, what is the current position and what amount of waste will Warwickshire send there?

This statement is inaccurate and should be deleted as it is likely to refer to regional 'transfer' capacity rather than 'treatment'. Notwithstanding the above, this does not undermine the Council's position in terms of net self sufficiency as the Council is able to provide sufficient waste management and waste treatment capacity to meet its own needs.

Other Waste

Radioactive Waste

Q51 Is the Council able to estimate the quantity of arisings produced in the County? (Please answer in annual tonnages if possible, otherwise in Becquerels).

The County has no evidence on any low level radioactive waste produced. There have been no planning applications over for low level radioactive waste in the past 20 years and no informal discussions from potential developers about the issue. In the light of this evidence it was considered that there was no requirement for a specific policy on radioactive waste as there is no treatment gap.

Q52 What capacity is available in the County to manage this waste? How and where in the County is this managed?

Further to question 51 there are no sites in the county which have permission for the treatment of radioactive waste so there is no current capacity as such. It was always the intention that the Core Strategy would be able to provide a common generic approach for the treatment or disposal of all wastes irrespective of the type of waste being managed. We have sought to adhere to the guidance given in the PPS 10 Companion Guide para 2.10 to make the Core Strategy positive but non-prescriptive in this respect.

Consequently, this is why no specific waste types are defined in Policy CS1. Therefore if a planning application were submitted for this type of waste it would be assessed against the overarching CS policies first and then the DM policies.

Sewage Sludge

Q53 Who is the water utility company for Warwickshire?

Severn Trent Water.

Q54 What and how much waste management capacity exists in the County?

The EA Waste Data Interrogator for 2011 shows that 66,473 tonnes of sewage treatment capacity was provided at the Finham Sewage Treatment works. 6,393 tonnes of sewage treatment capacity was also provided at the Coleshill Sewage Treatment works. Further capacity has also been permitted for the thermal treatment processing at the Coleshill plant, but this is not yet operational.

Q55 The WBTD at section 4.100 refers to 47,000 tonnes of dry sludge being incinerated. Is this per annum?

Yes.

Q56 Does the County's waste management capacity accommodate all sewage sludge produced in the County? If not, what is the capacity gap?

Yes. If Warwickshire's population is estimated to be 546,000 (based on mid 2011 population estimates), it is estimated that sewage sludge arisings would be approximately 13,650tpa. This is based on sewage sludge tonnage arisings being approximately 2.5% of the total population. This is based on the approach used by Worcestershire CC, which was based on a 2001 GOWM study. Based on the operational site capacity information for the County's sewage treatment works, the County is self-sufficient and also importing waste from other WPAs.

Agricultural Waste

Q57 What is the estimated annual quantity of organic waste produced?

It is estimated that Warwickshire's 'non-natural' agricultural waste arisings are approximately 3,896tpa (Enviros, 2005 – see Evidence Base Document REB9 - page 52.) In applying the methodology used for projecting commercial and industrial waste (i.e. 0% growth per annum for industrial waste) it is anticipated that arisings would remain static at 3,896tpa throughout the plan period.

Table 28 of the Enviros report shows that approximately 5,887,208 tonnes of 'natural' and 'non-natural' agricultural waste (including 'compostable and digestible', 'combustible', 'difficult and chemical' and 'other' agricultural wastes) arose within the West Midlands in 2003. No figures are available below regional level, however, based on Warwickshire's non-natural agricultural waste being 10.5% of the regional total, if the same methodology is applied to 'natural' wastes, this would equate to 618, 236 tonnes per annum of 'natural' agricultural waste. Again, this arisings figure per annum is expected to remain static throughout the plan period. Approximately 96% of this waste would be organic in nature and the majority, if not all, of this waste would be applied to the land as fertiliser.

Matter 4 - Cross boundary movements

Issue 4 - Are current and projected Cross boundary waste flows indicative of Warwickshire achieving net self sufficiency?

Due to the contractual nature of the waste business, cross-boundary waste flows are expected. However, national policy requires communities to take more responsibility for their own waste and the Plan's vision is to achieve equivalent self sufficiency. It is sometimes the case that the capacity permitted for a particular facility is greater than the capacity at which it is operating and, therefore, the facility's permitted capacity alone might not reflect what is happening in practice.

Accordingly it is instructive to examine the approximate quantities of waste imported into the County and exported out of the County. Information on these waste flows should help ascertain the actual situation in relation to net self sufficiency so that an informed stance can be taken within the Plan to seek to rectify any identified deficiencies.

Q58 For each waste stream, could the Council estimate approximate quantities of waste being imported and exported by completing the table below? (Please provide the most up to date information available indicating date and source).

Waste Stream	Waste Management	Exports 000s tonnes	Imports 000s tonnes
LACMW/C&I *	Landfill	79,750	812,419
	Treatment	59,108	185,674
	MRS	13,692	140,070
C&I	Landfill		
	Treatment		
CD&E	Landfill	48,706	247,469
	Treatment	8,003	8,208
	MRS	2,259	17,496
	Use of waste	9,860	9,258
Hazardous	Landfill	931	20,526
	Treatment	16,900	755**
Agricultural	Overall	Currently unknown	Currently unknown
Radioactive	Overall	Currently unknown	Currently unknown
Sewage Sludge	Overall	Currently unknown	Currently unknown
<p>* LACWM/C&I figures merged to align with EAWDI reporting which categorises waste as 'household, industrial and commercial' waste **Imports would not include the CSG facility which is located in Warwickshire but not included as a Warks facility on the EAWDI. This facility accepted 14,830 tonnes of waste in 2011.</p>			

Source: Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator 2011

Q59 How are levels of imports/exports expected to change over the Plan period, if at all? Please answer with respect to predictions for each waste stream.

There is an expectation that each Authority should provide for their own waste as enshrined in policy to provide net self-sufficiency. Therefore, the figures identified for imports/exports of waste are based on a worst case scenario at present.

LACW

Whitley

Given that "Project Transform" for a new Energy from Waste Plant has been abandoned, please provide the following information with respect to the existing EfW Plant at Whitley, Coventry:

Q60 Does the residual waste (RW) which it burns have to be pre-treated to provide Refuse Derived Fuel/Solid Recovered Fuel?

If so, what pre-treatment is required and where is the facility for pre-treating Warwickshire's residual LACW?

No the residual waste taken to the EFW Plant at Whitley, Coventry does not have to be pre-treated.

If the RW requires pre-treating before burning, please answer any quantification questions by referring to the quantities for both untreated RW and treated RW.

N/A.

Q61 What is Whitley's existing annual capacity?

240,000 tpa

Q62 What annual tonnages of Warwickshire's RW has Whitley taken over the last three years?

- ***01/04/2009 – 31/03/2010 = 29,367 tonnes***
- ***01/04/2010 – 31/03/2011 = 49,349 tonnes***
- ***01/04/2011 – 31/03/2012 = 37,816 tonnes***

Q63 What annual tonnages of Warwickshire's RW is it expected to take over the Plan period? Is this secured by contract and, if so, is there a maximum tonnage which it will take?

Warwickshire County Council has a contract to input a maximum tonnage of 50,000 tonnes of residual waste into the CSWDC EFW. The contract term is 01/04/2010 to 31/03/2016 with a possible extension to 31/03/2018.

Q64 What is the expected lifespan of the Whitley EfW?

The facility has an expected lifespan of approximately 28 years i.e. to 2040.

Q65 Is refurbishment likely to take place? If so, what will be refurbished? Will this refurbishment extend the lifespan of the facility and, if so, to when?

The plant has been systematically developed such that very little of the original equipment remains. The equipment is relatively new and well maintained and given reasonable levels of ongoing maintenance and investment, could allow the plant to operate till 2040.

Q66 What proportion of Warwickshire's residual waste remains as bottom ash within this facility? What happens to this bottom ash?

There is approximately 46,000tpa of incinerator bottom ash produced at this facility but this is a result of all of the waste managed at the plant. The proportion of Warwickshire's waste which is bottom ash is unknown.

Q67 What proportion of Warwickshire's residual waste is collected as fly ash within this facility? What happens to this fly ash?

It is understood that the plant produces approximately 8,000tpa of air pollution control residues but the proportion arising from Warwickshire waste is unknown. If it is taken to be 3% of the Warwickshire inputs, this would be approximately 1,134 tonnes for 2011/12.

Four Ashes

Q68 Does the current estimate of the plant being operational by autumn 2013 still hold good? If not what is the current position?

Yes.

Q69 Does the 300,000tpa capacity refer to treated or non-treated residual waste? If treated, what is the equivalent tonnage of non-treated waste that it will take?

Non treated.

Q70 What quantity of untreated residual waste (and treated residual waste, if applicable) will Four Ashes take from Warwickshire on an annual basis over the Plan period?

Between 29,600 - 40,500 tonnes.

Q71 What proportion of Warwickshire's residual waste will remain as bottom ash within this facility? What will happen to this bottom ash?

This is unknown as Veolia listed their Process Outputs Method Statement as being commercially sensitive and this sets out all the arrangements for the residues.

Q72 What proportion of Warwickshire's residual waste will be collected as fly ash within this facility? What will happen to this fly ash?

This is unknown as Veolia listed their Process Outputs Method Statement as being commercially sensitive and this sets out all the arrangements for the residues.

Remaining LACMW

Q73 What proportion of the remainder of Warwickshire's residual LACMW (after Whitley and Four Ashes) will be managed within the County?

The remaining proportion of residual LACMW will be managed at Bubbenhall landfill.

Organic Waste

Q74 Section 4.10 of the WBTD refers to planning permission being granted for a green waste composting facility which may obviate the need to export to Leicestershire. What quantity of green waste is sent to Leicestershire? What is the capacity of this proposed plant? What is the current position?

There are currently no contracts at present for organic waste treatment in Leicestershire- the statement was written when the Council had a contract with Envar, Caton but that contract has now expired. The biowaste IVC facility at Ufton (operated by Biffa) caters for co-mingled green waste and food waste from Warwick District, Stratford District and Rugby Borough. Meanwhile biowaste from Nuneaton & Bedworth is being treated at Earthworm IVC, Daventry. North Warwickshire green waste is being windrowed at Grendon House Farm until autumn 2013 - thereafter co-mingled green and food waste will be sent to Earthworm along with Nuneaton & Bedworth material.

Matter 5 - Plan Policies

Issue 5 - Whether the Plan's policies are sound, and whether they reflect its Vision, Objectives, and Spatial Strategy thereby addressing the County's Key Issues for Waste?

The Plan indicates that the RSS Phase 2 Revision Preferred Option requires treatment gaps to be identified for LACMW and C&I waste only,

and comments that, as a consequence, the treatment gap does not relate to CD&E waste or hazardous waste. However, PPS10 (paragraph 3, 2nd point), in requiring communities to take more responsibility for their own waste, does not restrict this requirement to certain waste streams. Furthermore, self sufficiency for each of the main waste streams is identified within the County's Key Issues. There should be clear and justifiable policies for the provision of facilities to meet any identified capacity gap in waste management, and it seems that there might be a treatment gap for CD&E and/or hazardous waste and/or low level radioactive waste.

Q75 Policy Principle 8 within the Emerging Spatial Options March 2011 refers to a policy principle being required that encourages the treatment of hazardous waste and to plan for the final disposal of stabilised non-reactive hazardous wastes (in particular asbestos). What, if anything, has changed since the consultation on this options document? Should the Plan encourage facilities to come forward to treat/dispose of hazardous waste?

The Emerging Spatial Options did seek to encourage the treatment of hazardous waste along with all other wastes. This as in the case of the other waste streams would have to depend on there being a treatment gap for that particular waste stream. From the work we have carried out it was concluded that Warwickshire did not have a capacity gap for the treatment of hazardous waste. Further work identified a site with a Coventry postcode that confirmed definitively that there could not possibly be a treatment gap for hazardous waste.

In terms of the final disposal of SNRHWs whilst the answers to questions set out above appear to show that any landfill capacity for this waste will run out in three years or possibly a bit longer, the majority of the waste going to these landfills is coming from outside the county.

Given that hazardous waste arisings in the county are generally low we now consider the best approach would be not to encourage more hazardous waste in to the county as this could create unsustainable movement of waste in to the county. Our preferred approach would be to make clear in the CS policies that all waste streams and that if an application were to be received then provided it complied with the CS locational strategy and the DM policies then it could be approved. We would not seek to refuse applications purely on the fact that there appears not to be a capacity gap.

Q76 Policy Principle 9 within the Emerging Spatial Options refers to the requirement for Warwickshire to make some provision for managing low level radioactive wastes. What, if anything, has changed since the consultation on this options document? There is no specific policy provision within the Plan for managing low level radioactive waste. Should facilities for its management be encouraged? If not, why not?

Since that time we have looked in to the evidence behind this waste stream and it appears there are no arisings in the county and there have never to our knowledge been any planning applications submitted for this waste stream. By the same logic as set out above in question 76, where there is no treatment gap it is considered that there should be no requirement to encourage such waste in to the county for reasons of sustainability. However, again as above if an application were submitted it should be treated on its merits and the CCs and DM policies as set out in the "Submission version" of the plan would enable any application to be assessed fully.

Q77 Should Policy CS1 make it clear that the Council aims to meet any capacity gap for CD&E and/or hazardous waste and/or low level radioactive waste, whilst seeking to provide equivalent self sufficiency for each of the waste streams? If not, why not?

We have concluded from the last two questions that if there is any capacity gap for any waste streams that it is incumbent on the County Council to ensure development could be encouraged to meet that gap. Where there is no treatment gap for a particular waste stream, it is appropriate not to encourage new development, but to have relevant policies which are able to be used to fully assess any future proposal and not to refuse any application purely on the basis of lack of need in the county. In summary, we are happy to include the above reference in policy CS1, but would wish to make clear in the text that there is no identified capacity gap for any of these waste streams ie CD & E, hazardous waste and low level radioactive waste.

Q78 Policy CS3(i) defines "close proximity", but CS3 (ii) does not; nor does CS4, thereby potentially leading to confusion. Should the meaning of "close proximity" be made clear whenever the phrase is used?

Yes agreed. A footnote can be added.

Q79 Whilst Policies CS5, CS6 and CS7 provide opportunities for facilities to come forward to manage all waste streams, there is no specific encouragement for facilities to meet identified waste management gaps. Is it appropriate for Policies CS5, CS6 and/or CS7 to contain positive wording to better encourage facilities to come forward to meet any particular waste management gaps such as treatment of CD&E/hazardous/low level radioactive waste?

Yes – appropriate wording will be included in Policies CS1, CS5, CS6 and CS7. However, permitted/operational capacity will change over time – this will be monitored annually through the Council's Authority Monitoring Report. As the AMR information will play an important role in decision making the Council consider that this will need to be highlighted in the policies.

Q80 Do the Council’s suggested amendments to Policy DM1 comply with national policy and, in particular paragraphs 113 and 152 of the National Planning Policy Framework?

Yes – the policy provides criteria based policies against which proposals for development on or affecting protected sites, species, habitats and heritage assets will be assessed. The policy accords with para. 113 in that the level of protection to be afforded to such assets should be commensurate with their designation and significance. Table 9.1 provides an indicative list of such assets and their hierarchy of protection. Further information on how the hierarchy of protection should be applied is provided in the supporting text of the policy. The policy also reflects the ‘avoid-mitigate-compensate’ hierarchy of protection in para. 152 of the NPPF.

Matter 6 - Implementation and Monitoring

Issue 6 – Whether there are clear and effective arrangements for implementing and monitoring the Plan

Q81 The Council has indicated that it will play a leading role in implementing the Plan Policies. Do any other bodies have a role to play, for example regulatory/advisory bodies such as the Environment Agency, Natural England, and English Heritage. Will any part be played by the Waste Industry, land owners, site operators, developers, and architects or others? If so, how will they contribute to implementation?

In terms of responsibility for monitoring, the County Council would fulfil this role. However, the Council would be reliant upon the various agencies, such as the Environment Agency to continue to provide data in the form of the Interrogator on an annual basis and both Natural England and English Heritage to provide constraints data in order for the policy implementation to be monitored. Although information from Waste Industry would be required for input into the Interrogator, this is unlikely to have a direct impact on the Council.

Q82 PPS10 paragraph 4 (3rd point) says that policy objectives should be linked to measurable indicators of change. The Plan sets out a table of performance indicators, targets, and information sources, which are linked to each of the Plan’s policies, but not to the Plan’s objectives. Should there be an addition to the table linking indicators to the relevant objectives?

Yes agreed. An extra column will be added to the table.

Policy	Performance Indicator	Target	Information Source	Objectives
CS1				1,2,4
CS2, 3 and 4				3,5,6
CS5				1,2,4

CS6				1,2,4
CS7				1,2,4
CS8				7
DM1				3,6,8
DM2				3,5,8
DM3				3
DM4				3, 5,6,8
DM5				2,6
DM6				8
DM7				6,7
DM8				1,6

Q83 PPS 10, paragraphs 1 and 2 refer to timely provision of new facilities and sufficient opportunities for new waste management facilities of the right types, in the right place and at the right time. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 177 also refers to delivery in a timely fashion. It would seem from the evidence that there might be a capacity gap for the treatment of CD&E/hazardous/low level radioactive waste. For CD&E, paragraph 4.47 of the submission Plan refers to a requirement of between 2 and 10 facilities at 50,000tpa. Although the Plan's vision statement refers to meeting Warwickshire's identified treatment gap by 2028, the implementation section does not refer to the broad types of facilities required to fill this gap for the identified waste streams, and nor does it refer to any targeted timescale for providing this additional capacity. Should the implementation section contain some reference in broad terms to the types of facilities required, together with targeted timescales/phasing?

We agree that 'timely' provision should be provided for each stream if there is an identified capacity gap. Permitted and operational capacity will be monitored annually and published in the Council's Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). The latest capacity gap information can be published, but it would need to be made clear that this is a 'snapshot' in time; the C,D&E treatment capacity context is a case in point – see Q34. Decisions will therefore need to be made based on the most up to date and credible evidence available (e.g. permitted/operational capacity information in the AMR). It is proposed that this will be made clear in the additional text.

Elizabeth C. Ord

Inspector