

Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy Preferred Options and Proposals Forum  
Manor Hall, Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> September 2006 17:30 – 20:00

Attendees:

Ms Kalen Wood	Warwickshire County Council
Paul Green	Waste Recycling Group
Anton Irving	English Nature
Martin Pollard	Sita UK
Janet Alty	Green Party
David Johnson	Rugby Borough Council
Richard Scawin	CSWDC Ltd
P Blackman	Merevale
David Tipton	Simpro Ltd
Sid Lambert	Crestwood environmental
Patricia Wyatt	WALC
Bill Mccarthy	Studley Parish Council
Dave Lowe	WCC Ecology
Andrew Ambrose	A.L.P.A

Apologies:

Richard Lucas	Smallbrook Environmental Ltd
Steve Mitchell	Veolia Environmental Services
Adam Read	Hyder Consulting Ltd
Mary Tappenden	Biffa Waste Services Limited
Ted Bleszynski	New Earth Solutions
Jon Radley	Warwickshire County Council

Introduction to Waste Development Framework: Pam Neal

A presentation was then given by Derek Greedy giving an overview of the Preferred Options consultation and the policy principals. It was suggested that the breakout sessions could follow the format of the presentation unless there was a more logical suggestion.

The forum group then split in to two breakout groups lead by Pam Neal (GP1) and Derek Greedy (GP2).

Main Discussion:

Vision

GP1: It was suggested that the words “human health” do not need to be used in the vision as they are already embedded and implied throughout the vision statement. Also the words “Reduce, Recycle and Reuse” could be included as at the moment they are hidden in the term “sustainable”

GP2: The group suggested the ‘vision’ was about deliverability rather than a vision. The statement should refer back to the requirements and the priorities should be removed.

Add ‘where practical’ at the end of the vision statement.

Key Objectives

GP1: The use of the phrase “to have regard for” was discussed and it was asked “does the wording need to be more focused/forceful?” as the phrase is a bit like saying “I hear what you’re saying, but...” However, It was felt that this could create problems, as we could end up with too much emphasis on one objective. They shouldn’t all be categorical statements.

The Green Belt objective (Bullet point 6, on page 7) was then discussed and it was suggested that in order to be less onerous it should be amended to reflect PPS10, as it is not only “inappropriate development” that needs to be taken into account – there are other considerations also.

GP2: It was pointed out that the price of Diesel will dictate location, rather than whether it be urban or rural. Large facilities with hubs will lead to effective and efficient transport.

#### Key Issue 6

GP1: The diagram was found to be quite effective by the group. It was appreciated that it is difficult to set out precisely due to the nature of the different technologies. However this version “hits the spot”.

It was noted that Biomass is missing from the diagram. It is a renewable energy so could be added in with composting and AD as it is not really a waste to energy technology. It is becoming more important as it is a by product of an industrial process.

The key issue needs to demonstrate that our influence on reduction is limited.

A discussion on technologies could be added including the following points:

- Technology is always moving so not all technologies can be explained right now in the plan as new things will come forward in the future.
- The long life of the plan means we can't be too specific on new technology.
- The economic climate in which we are working needs to be mentioned. As technology is driven by economic instruments – This point is not explicit enough at the moment.
- Steer from the government will influence which technologies will be pushed forward in the future.
- There is a difficulty with needing to demonstrate one choice of technology over others.

It was pointed out that developers need to know what the playing field for development is, that is, what they can and can't do. At the moment it is quite bland. There is a difficulty with needing to demonstrate one choice of technology over others.

Option D on page 17 is too wordy and hierarchy occurs twice – one could be taken out.

One forum member explained that if decisions are plan lead then the hierarchy of technology will cause problems with applications and enforcement due to things in the diagram not being new technology. For example Biomass is only

emphasised because of an EU directive – It is just an economic instrument forcing people to think about this old technology and therefore a way of enforcing the hierarchy.

There was consensus over the point that facilities will only be supplied if money can be made.

GP2: The group were not happy with “alternatives” - just refer to technologies. Also the group did not like the mixing of technology as it “muddies the water”. It should be expressed in terms of Objective 1.

This group was also concerned about the effort needed to discount the alternatives when making a planning application.

Alternative wording (?): “Policy based on a selection of technologies that demonstrate sustainability whilst adhering to the principles of the waste hierarchy”  
“Look at how we can add recycling in to this option”.

### Key Issue 7

GP1: It was felt that Key Issue 7 does not reflect Policy Principal 2 in respect of rural locations. In-vessel and AD facilities are allowed in rural areas according to policy principal 2 but are influenced by the proximity effect. So there needs to be a balance between pollution of the atmosphere against promoting and enforcing the waste hierarchy (reduce/recycle/reuse).

There is no description of what is meant by “new waste management facilities”.

Questions raised by this were:

- What does it mean?
- Will it cover all?
- Is urban locations correct?

It was suggested that an urban location was not practical for dealing with quarter of a million tonnes of quarry waste as there is not enough room. The possible expansion of Daw mill is not mentioned in the document.

Coal has been ignored. The key issue only looks at one area of waste and there is no joined up thinking.

There was a discussion as to whether rural/urban location needs to be mentioned at all. Whether we should break it down in to categories of urban/rural, or whether we should just look at how good the development is for the area. It was found that the key issue is a bit too engrossed in proximity when, with the new planning act, we are supposed to be getting away from this.

To overcome this it was suggested that reference to location should be taken out of the wording. This ties in with the idea of looking for the most appropriate location (see comment above) and the definition of proximity.

### Policy Principal 1

GP1: This should be tied back in with Key Issue 7 (appropriate locations).

In the first bullet point of the policy principal disposal is mentioned before any waste treatment – even though disposal is at the bottom of the waste hierarchy! Should be changed to “enable waste to be disposed of and treated in the appropriate location.” This needs to be lined up with PPS10.

The waste streams to be disposed of need to be illustrated, perhaps using a pie chart. We need to know the figures to decide what types of municipal sites we need. It was stated that predominantly urban is an illusion as it depends on whether it is public waste or industrial waste.

The policy principal states that “ applications must demonstrate an overriding need...” It was felt by the group that this is a bit over the top. This would not work in real life with competition as it would be ‘stifled’. PPS10 – paragraph 22 – “need”. They felt demonstration of “need” was reasonable but no “overriding need”. However, it was also pointed out that industry would not come forward in the first place unless there really was a need.

- GP2: “What appeals is that businesses manage own waste” – Easy when big.  
“Deal with waste as near as possible to source.  
Change “disposal” to “waste management”.  
Seems as if rugby has been picked out in isolation.  
Change ‘disposal’ to ‘waste management’.  
Remove any reference to alternatives.

### Policy Principal 2

- GP1: It was suggested that:
- Soil hospitals should be added into the policy principal .
  - The green belt point should reflect PPS10.
  - The Green belt point needs to reflect the objective.

A question was raised as to how land spreading will fit in with the green belt policy. This point needs to be clarified.

The term “Land Activity” was considered to be jargon and it was suggested that the wording be changed or explained.(4<sup>th</sup> bullet point).

It was felt that the restriction to redundant rural buildings was too restrictive and rural should be deleted. It was agreed that reusing old buildings for a purpose, rather than building a new one should be looked at as the first option.

It was suggested, the last bullet point should refer back to applicability to urban location first, the second bullet needs to say adjacent to minerals workings and the term sub-region needs to be explained with a map to accompany it.

### Policy Principal 3

- GP2: Split final bullet point to create a separate one for local liaison committees.

Policy Principal 4

GP1: It was suggested that WRAP protocol should be included as we don't know if composting is a residual waste and it would be a shame to exclude it.

There was also a suggestion that an 'aspirational' point could be included to encourage people to recycle and produce products of a better quality.

**The meeting then closed.**