

WARWICKSHIRE WASTE DEVELOPMENT FORUM

5th April 2006, EPIC Centre, Nuneaton

Warwickshire's Waste Development Forum met for the third time on the 5th April 2006. 16 representatives attended and 9 sent their apologies.

Present:

Arbury Estate, Hugo Mallaby
C L Associates, Paul Rainbow
Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Ltd., Chris Douglas
Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Ltd., Richard Scawin
Environment Agency, Debbie Jones
Friends of the Earth - Nuneaton and District, Keith Kondakor
Friends of the Earth - Nuneaton and District, Michele Kondakor
Hyder Consulting, Anna Wardell
Merevale and Blythe Estate, Philip Blackman
Sita UK Ltd, Shaun Denny
Smallbrook Environmental Business Consultancy, Richard Lucas
Studley Parish Council, Cllr. Bill McCarthy
Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Local Councils, Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt
Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Helen McCarthy
Warwickshire County Council, Jim Davies
Warwickshire County Council, Kalen Wood

Andy Cowan, Chief Planner, Warwickshire County Council (WCC), (Chair)
Suzanne Osborn, Senior Planning Officer, WCC
Derek Greedy, Principal Waste Management Advisor, WCC
Rebecca Bailey, Student Planner, WCC
Mikka Styles, Arup

Apologies:

Biffa, Mary Tappenden
Countryside Agency, Nick Young
Green Party, Janet Alty
New Earth Solutions, Ted Bleszynski
Veolia ES Birmingham Ltd, Steve Mitchell
Warwick District Council, Cllr. Michael Kinson
Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Margaret Begg
Warwickshire County Council, Jon Radley

1. Presentations:

Andy Cowan, Chief Planner at Warwickshire County Council, opened the meeting, followed by an introduction to the morning's agenda by Mikka Styles. Derek Greedy then gave his presentation on Key Issues 7 to 12, before the Breakout Session.

Copies of the following presentations are available at:

<http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/Web/corporate/pages.nsf/Links/41A0722569328C8E8025712400519A89>

- Introduction to Meeting 3, Mikka Styles, Arup
- Setting the Scene: Key Issues 7-12, Derek Greedy, Principal Waste Management Advisor, WCC

2. Breakout Session:

The object of this session was to discuss the options proposed for issues 7 - 12 of the Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options Report, and attempt to reach a consensus on the Forum's preferred options. As issue 13 does not have any options it was not included as a topic for the breakout session discussions. Instead comments were invited at the feedback session.

To enable all issues to be discussed in the time available the meeting was divided into three groups and each group was given 4 issues to discuss. Group 1 completed their set tasks early and used the remaining time to discuss issue 9 as their 5th issue. Group 3 also finished early and used their time to discuss issue 13.

To summarise, all groups discussed issues 7 and 8, two groups discussed issues 9, 10 and 11 and only one group discussed issues 12 and 13. Following these discussions, each group fed back their key points to the meeting, as summarised in tables 1-7.

TABLE 1: ISSUE 7 – Waste Management Location Options			
OPTION	COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Policy developed to focus new waste management facilities within predominantly urban locations (where Proximity Principle is adhered to).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes for invessel composting. • Yes for MRFs located in industrial areas. Supports Proximity Principle. • Yes for smaller, enclosed heat treatment facilities. • Yes for incinerators located in industrial areas, close to where heat produced can be used e.g. certain industrial processes/swimming baths. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not for landfill. • Not for MRFs due to transport issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectation: sites will be predominantly urban, as that's where most of the waste is produced. • Effective public education on the new technologies that would be suited to urban locations is essential.
B: Policy developed to focus new waste management facilities within predominantly rural locations (where Proximity Principle is adhered to).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes for landfill. • Yes for windrow composting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not for incinerators due to transport issues. 	
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of either/or, introduce a hierarchy of preferred criteria e.g. Brownfield, Employment land/Zoned development land, Greenbelt. • There was recognition that the above-mentioned criteria would most likely be introduced at the Site Allocation stage, but perhaps some broad criteria need to be agreed at Core Strategy stage? • It should be possible to integrate a strategic steer into the choice of appropriate sites through other policies e.g. policies on transport etc. • The term 'urban' needs defining/these options are too generic. • Location should be influenced by waste type and treatment option; tonnage output, markets for output and determined by the public health and environmental consequences of these. • Where do policies on brownfield sites and regeneration sit in relation to waste development? • Important that whatever site is chosen it ensures maximum benefit and minimum impact. • Need to learn from good practice in other countries. 		

TABLE 1: ISSUE 7 – Waste Management Location Options (*Continued from page 3*).

CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS
Sustainability Appraisal	A	Option A would be most supportive of the objectives.
Group 1	C	A mix of locations which allow the nature of activity to influence site allocation.
Group 2	D	Either rely on other policies or introduce concept of a hierarchy of preferred criteria.
Group 3	C	A different approach would be needed for each treatment option type.

TABLE 2: ISSUE 8 – Scale of Waste Management Issues			
OPTION	COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Policy developed to focus on large, centralised facilities supported by sub-regional dispersed facilities dealing with all waste types in accordance with the Proximity Principle.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale means that you can bring in other waste streams and achieve greater economies of scale. • A large site can accommodate other technologies and waste streams within its operations, thereby making it more flexible. • The concept of a Resource and Re-use Park is better under an Option A scenario. • Yes for landfill, location determined. • Yes for hazardous wastes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't necessarily fit in with the Proximity Principle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could equate to a technology park with several smaller-scale waste facilities on site.
B: Policy focussed on smaller, dispersed facilities delivered in accordance with the requirements of the Proximity Principle.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale allows greater flexibility. • Yes for MRFs. Would meet local need and support positive public perception of progressive waste management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste producers will try to rule out small scale due to the cost of disposal. 	
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms 'large' and 'small' need to be qualified. • Industry will provide any scale provision that the waste producer is willing to pay for. • Small-scale generally works the higher up the waste hierarchy you go i.e. by the time you get to waste disposal its disbenefits outweighs its benefits. • Composting would require medium-scale sites to be economically viable. • In determining size economic benefits and environmental impacts need to be balanced. • Need for cross boundary consultation and discussion on the issue. 		

TABLE 2: ISSUE 8 – Scale of Waste Management Issues (*Continued from page 5*)

CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS
Sustainability Appraisal	A	Option A would be most supportive of the objectives.
Group 1	A	Assuming external factors are looked after by the EIA process.
Group 2	A (4) B (1)	Consensus not reached.
Group 3	C	A different approach would be needed for each treatment option type.

TABLE 3: ISSUE 9 – Utilisation of Existing Sites and Novel Sites				
OPTION		COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Policy focused on extending existing waste management facilities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes if suitable infrastructure is already there. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness depends on the previous/new waste treatment type and the compatibility of their location needs.
B: Policy focussed on encouraging the development of new sites.				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness depends on the previous/new waste treatment type and the compatibility of their location needs.
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option A should be re-written as, “Policy focussed on <u>utilising</u> existing waste management <u>locations</u>.” Instead of this either/or option, use a hierarchical approach of factors to consider when choosing a site e.g. waste technology, existing/proposed technology etc. It was felt that this hierarchy could never be exhaustive and therefore had some concerns around this approach. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	A	Option A would be most supportive of the objectives.		
Group 1	A	Dependent on the facilities proposed, technology used, waste type and the nature of the site.		
Group 2	Mixture of A or B or neither.	Generally felt that a mixture of Options A and B would be appropriate depending on the choice of waste technology on a particular site.		
Group 3				

TABLE 4: ISSUE 10 – Protection of Environmental Resources				
OPTION		COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Policy includes specific protection measures for sites afforded statutory protection at a national, regional or local level.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, this is entirely adequate. 		
B: Deliver policy that seeks to provide protection for sites of local significance as well as statutorily protected sites.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that waste disposal is such an emotive issue, it would be foolish not to consider all sites. • Allows local issues to be taken into account. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, this is likely to stifle development. • Warwickshire already has a large number of local designations. 	
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The difference between the two options was not clear. • It is not just about what mitigation should be undertaken, but also what the justification is for the need for each particular development. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	B	Option B would be most supportive of the objectives.		
Group 1	B	Option B wherever possible.		
Group 2	A			
Group 3				

TABLE 5: ISSUE 11 – Transport Infrastructure				
OPTION		COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Deliver policy aimed at minimising traffic impacts through siting waste management facilities in proximity to the source of waste.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option A is not logical. Local sites do not necessarily lead to lower transportation impact. 	
B: Set out specific requirements on a sustainable mix of transport strategies to be incorporated within site selection (allocation) policies but no restriction on siting waste management facilities in proximity to the source of waste.				
GENERAL COMMENTS				
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	B	Option B would be marginally more supportive of the objectives.		
Group 1	B	It is essential that transportation effects be considered in planning new waste management facilities.		
Group 2				
Group 3		Explore all transport options in allocating sites, including minimal road traffic where possible, but all transport distance and impacts should be minimised.		

TABLE 6: ISSUE 12 – Site Decommissioning and restoration				
OPTION		COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Policy to deliver a strategic approach to restoration in adherence to core principles for protection of natural, semi-natural and built environment.				
B: Policy aimed at delivering specific site decommissioning and restoration practices linked to the waste treatment and/ or disposal facility type.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each site should be considered on its own merit, with the aim of enhancing the environment and creating public benefit. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The previous land use should also be considered.
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restoration should be sensitive to surrounding areas and consider long-term consequences. Community Involvement is key. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	A	Option A would be the most supportive of the objectives.		
Group 1				
Group 2				
Group 3	B			

TABLE 7: ISSUE 13 – Monitoring Regime and Stakeholder Engagement	
CONCLUSION	GENERAL COMMENTS
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions should be monitored and up to date data should be readily available. This would create community confidence. • Real-time data should be provided so that issues can be picked up in a timely manner. • Residents liaison committees are supported. • Development should encourage community involvement and encourage communities to take ownership. • Best practice examples should be considered for adoption e.g. Isle of Man

4. Evaluation Feedback

7 evaluation forms had been returned by the 7th April. All 7 respondents confirmed that their attendance to date had secured their interest in participating in future Forum meetings, activities and events. The preferred method of consultation was the existing meeting format, with one person open to using online discussion forums.

The preferred day for Forum meetings was Wednesday, the time morning or afternoon, the duration four hours and the frequency monthly.

5. Date of Next Meeting

Warwickshire County Council intend to hold a meeting of the Waste Development Forum to discuss the Waste Development Framework: Preferred Options Report whilst it is still in draft. Invitations to attend this meeting will be sent out as soon as a date has been agreed.

For further information on this or any other matters of the Forum's work and progression, please call Suzanne Osborn at Warwickshire County Council. eMail: planningstrategy@warwickshire.gov.uk
Telephone: 01926 412538.