

WARWICKSHIRE WASTE DEVELOPMENT FORUM

Manor Hall, Leamington Spa, 17th March 2006

Warwickshire's Waste Development Forum met for the second time on the 17th March 2006. 18 representatives attended and 9 sent their apologies.

Present:

Arbury Estate, Hugo Mallaby
Biffa, Mary Tappenden
Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Ltd., Richard Scawin
Environment Agency, Debbie Jones
Environment Agency, Lindsay Mann
Friends of the Earth - Nuneaton and District, Keith Kondakor
Hyder Consulting, Prof. Adam Read
Hyder Consulting, Kate Heath
Merevale and Blythe Estate, Philip Blackman
New Earth Solutions, Ted Bleszynski
Sita UK Ltd, Shaun Denny
Smallbrook Environmental Business Consultancy, Richard Lucas
Studley Parish Council, Cllr. Bill McCarthy
Veolia ES Birmingham Ltd, Steve Mitchell
Warwick District Council, Cllr. Margaret Begg
Warwickshire County Council, Jo Ingle
Warwickshire County Council, Jon Radley
Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Anne Forwood

Cllr. Chris Saint, 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:

Chartered Institute of Waste Management, Judith Harper
Countryside Agency, Nick Young
Green Party, Janet Alty
Marton Parish Council, Cllr. Vaughan Owen
Regional Technical Advisory Body, Bruce Braithwaite
Warwick District Council, Cllr. Michael Kinson

Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Local Councils, Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt
Waste Recycling Group, Paul Green
Senior Ecologist, WCC, David Lowe

1. Presentations:

Cllr. Chris Saint opened the meeting, followed by an introduction to the morning's agenda by Mikka Styles. Derek Greedy then gave his presentation on Key Issues 1 to 6, 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 2, Mikka Styles, Arup
- Setting the Scene: Key Issues 1-6, Derek Greedy, Principal Waste Management Advisor, WCC

2. Breakout Session:

The object of this session was to discuss the options proposed in the first 6 issues of the Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options Report, and attempt to reach a consensus on the Forum's preferred option.

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. All groups discussed issues 1 and 6, 2 groups discussed issues 3 & 5 and only one group discussed issues 2 and 4. Following these discussions, each group fed back their key points to the meeting, as summarised in tables 1-6.

TABLE 1: ISSUE 1- Delivering Sustainable Waste Management Practices			
OPTION	COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Support a site selection approach that conforms to the requirements of applicable legislation and good practice only (including the UK Waste Strategy and PPS 10 Planning and Sustainable Waste Management)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should be taken as given, as something that should be done. • This is something that it would be sensible to continue. • This is the baseline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very reactive, need a proactive framework. • Not holistic, looks only at waste management. • Only refers to PPS10. Fails to consider all relevant legislation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites would need to be supported by industry.
B: Allow waste management facilities to be brought forward by waste management companies/developers and respond to individual merits on a case by case basis.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purely industry led. • Doesn't allow for community engagement. • Doesn't provide certainty for developers. • Only looks at what is acceptable, doesn't look at what is best. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This tends to happen in practice.
C: Pursue a site selection approach that fully integrates other planning policy considerations including transport, protection of the environment and a desire to secure economic prosperity. This approach would aim to deliver sites based on a quantified need linked to geography and waste production.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most holistic approach, but still needs input from industry and environmental groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites still have to be identified. • Too utopic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must include flexibility to be included within Framework. • Could be improved by bringing in parties at early stage of say, site selection. Allow Framework to develop and react to progress as planning process continues. • Need to pursue a 'consultative' site selection approach.
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC should select the sites. • Proximity Principle needs defining. More emphasis needs to be given to PPS 10. • Don't like the term "quantified need" – you must identify more than you need • Need to allow a flexible approach to allow companies and developers to put forward sites that meet the criteria/size of development 		

TABLE 1: ISSUE 1- Delivering Sustainable Waste Management Practices <i>(continued from page 3)</i>		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS
Sustainability Appraisal	C	The cumulative effects of Option C are significantly positive in the medium and long-term, and this option therefore is considered to be the most sustainable option.
Group 1	D	A combination of elements from Options A + B + C.
Group 2	C + ...	Option C, plus improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must include flexibility to be included within Framework. • Could be improved by bringing in parties at early stage of say, site selection. Allow Framework to develop and react to progress as planning process continues. • Need to pursue a ‘consultative’ site selection approach.
Group 3	C + A + industry input	A combination of Option C with input from Option A and industry. A more integrated approach is supported but it is acknowledged that it would take time to tick all the boxes.

TABLE 2: ISSUE 2 - Municipal Waste Management Practices				
OPTION		COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Whereby the provision of sub-regional municipal waste facilities is determined by a consideration of waste management developer proposals on a case by case basis but in accordance with legislation and good practice.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parts of this policy need to be retained, as waste developers may have valuable information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This does not progress matters. Doesn't address the need to consider the waste hierarchy and imposes targets. Doesn't take into account the regional context. 	
B: Whereby a quantitative approach based on the proximity principle and the sub-regional need for municipal waste strategies is used to determine the location and mix of municipal waste treatment facilities.				
C: Where the provision of municipal waste facilities is also allied to the waste hierarchy with a view to imposing targets on the volume of each type of waste treated and that disposed.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology should lead site selection. 		
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proximity Principle should be replaced by PPS 10. The Sustainability Appraisal is disliked. It presents the analysis as if it were scientifically derived, rather than qualitatively assessed. The Sustainability Appraisal is useful for raising issues and ideas. The Plan should not give preference to certain types of technology. The plan should quantitatively assess parcels of land required and allocate them. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	C	Option C performs in closest adherence to the sustainability objectives.		
Group 1	B + C	Favour B + C, and want to substitute the Proximity Principle with environmental principles of PPS 10.		
Group 2				
Group 3				

TABLE 3: ISSUE 3 - Industrial and Commercial Waste Management Practices			
OPTION	COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Whereby the provision of sub-regional industrial and commercial waste management facilities is determined through consideration of waste management developer proposals on a case by case basis and in accordance with legislation and good practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be the most appropriate for industry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan needs to be more proactive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It needs to take into account the waste hierarchy.
B: Whereby criteria is established through policy aimed at delivering the proximity principle but where no specific targets are set in respect of recovery and reuse and there are no restrictions on waste being disposed to landfill.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This doesn't reflect targets for landfill reduction and other legislative requirements. 	
C: Strategies aimed at delivering the waste hierarchy with limitations placed on the amount of industrial and commercial waste that is sent to landfill. Limits placed on the total treatment and disposal capacity.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no legislative mechanism to support this approach. It would impose inappropriate solutions and inhibit employment. There are already economic limitations on the activities of industries. You can't put hard limits on total treatment, you can only discourage it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is only possible as a short-term solution.
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan needs to provide for an <i>oversupply</i> of sites The Plan needs to make a link between commercial and industrial waste and facilities, and those created to manage municipal waste. Sites should be identified for shared waste facilities. 		

TABLE 3: ISSUE 3 - Industrial and Commercial Waste Management Practices (Continued from page 6)		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS
Sustainability Appraisal	C	Option C performs in closest adherence to the sustainability objectives.
Group 1		These options don't cover commercial and industrial waste adequately.
Group 2		
Group 3	A	Favour Option A, although the discussion demonstrated some support for option C.

TABLE 4: ISSUE 4 - Construction and Demolition Waste Management Practices			
OPTION	COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
A: Provision of sub-regional construction and demolition waste facilities determined through a consideration of developer proposals on a case by case basis but in accordance with legislation and good practice.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will not deliver. 	
B: Policy delivered with the aim of delivering waste management practices in accordance with the Proximity Principle. No targets established in respect of delivering the waste away from landfill.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will not deliver. 	
C: Strategies aimed at delivering the waste hierarchy and limits placed on the amount of waste sent to landfill with targets set for treatment (recovery and re-use) to encourage developers to re-use construction and demolition wastes in new build where practicable.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is only a description of what is already happening, and therefore isn't progressive enough. Need to include something within the option that designs for de-construction; that designs in standard lengths to reduce the amount of waste produced in the first place. The focus is too much on demolition and needs to look more at construction techniques to reduce the amount of waste produced as part of demolition.
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should meet or exceed targets for re-use of demolition waste or stipulate the percentage of recycled materials to be used in construction activities – there was some uncertainty over whether the Framework was best placed to include these targets. 		

TABLE 4: ISSUE 4 - Construction and Demolition Waste Management Practices <i>(Continued from page 8)</i>		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS
Sustainability Appraisal	C	Option C would be most supportive of the objectives
Group 1		
Group 2	C	Option C, but felt it needed to be broadened and made more challenging.
Group 3		

TABLE 5: ISSUE 5 - Hazardous Waste Management Practices				
OPTION		COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
<p>A: Policy developed to guide future hazardous waste sites development through development control i.e. limited intervention other than a case by case consideration of planning hazardous waste facilities.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need for a regional solution due to the specialisation of each facility, in addition the benefits of economies of scale are needed to make facilities financially viable. 	
<p>B: A quantitative and geographic approach establishing the type of facility and general area for hazardous waste facilities.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for a regional solution due to the specialisation of each facility, although consideration should be given for the provision of some facilities in Warwickshire. 		
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a regional mechanism for allocation? • WCC should plan to accommodate the treatment of some waste streams within the county but focus on provision for transfer facilities. • Existing facilities should be protected . • Need to have regard for Hazardous Waste within Municipal waste as well as the separate category of Hazardous Waste as currently defined in the Issues and Options paper. • Use word ‘spatial’ rather than ‘geographic’ depending on the audience you are trying to reach. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	B	Option B would be most supportive of the objectives.		
Group 1				
Group 2	A + B			
Group 3	B			

TABLE 6: ISSUE 6 - Waste Management Treatment and Disposal Options

OPTION	COMMENTS FOR	COMMENTS AGAINST	OTHER COMMENTS
<p>A: Policy focused on the delivery of a predominantly landfill-based approach with some composting and recycling (largely municipal waste with limited adherence to the waste hierarchy). This option would provide a framework for the management of waste that would allow Warwickshire to achieve the targets set by legislative requirements. Although these legislative requirements are primarily focused on Municipal Waste there are certain targets in the Waste Strategy 2000 that apply to industrial waste. Although not strictly a legislative requirement Waste Strategy 2000 was used by the UK Government to demonstrate how it was going to comply with the provisions of the Landfill Directive. This option would rely on the continued use of landfill for industrial and commercial waste with reducing inputs to landfill of municipal waste. The reduction of municipal waste would come about as a result of on-going recycling initiatives and windrow composting.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost. • Does not follow European/national drivers. • Why have an option that contradicts PPS 10? 	
<p>B: Policy focussed on a mixture of alternative technologies, recycling and composting taking precedence ahead of landfill (delivery of aspects of the waste hierarchy). This option will allow for the achievement with legislative requirements but with a wide use of alternative technologies to deliver those requirements. Such an option will result in the provision of alternative waste management arrangements such as material recovery facilities, large-scale thermal treatment facilities (incineration), transfer stations and Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) plants.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to see a mix of technologies developed. • There needs to be a balance between viable technologies and workable techniques. • The only deliverable option. • Good that it promotes precedence ahead of landfill. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be broad and allow for any technologies. • It does, by implication, exclude the use of advanced thermal technologies as and when they come into use.

TABLE 6: ISSUE 6 - Waste Management Treatment and Disposal Options (Continued from page 11)

<p>C: Policy focused on predominantly advanced thermal treatment and recycling excluding landfill (full adherence to the principles of the waste hierarchy). Option C would provide for advanced technologies for the treatment of waste such as the production of refuse derived fuel, advanced thermal treatment and autoclaving.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unworkable and costly. • Shouldn't be technology specific. • Landfill can't be excluded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider timescale, with it taking about 10 years to open an energy from waste facility.
<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methane from landfill can be used to generate energy – there needs to be more information on landfill within the Issues & Options paper to give a balanced view. • Need to educate the public on waste treatment options. • The role of planning is to safeguard land from other development. 		
<p>CONCLUSION</p>	<p>OPTION</p>	<p>COMMENTS</p>	
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Option B performs in closest adherence to the sustainability objectives.</p>	
<p>Group 1</p>	<p>B + ...</p>	<p>Option B, but needs to be qualified: land will be made available to deliver; without prescribing which technology gets used.</p>	
<p>Group 2</p>	<p>B + ...</p>	<p>Option B, but needs to include advanced thermal treatment options as well.</p>	
<p>Group 3</p>	<p>B + ...</p>	<p>Option B, with the inclusion of energy from waste alongside large-scale thermal treatment facilities.</p>	

4. Date of Next Meeting

The third meeting of the Waste Development Forum will be held on Wednesday the 5th April, at the EPIC Centre, Nuneaton. For further details please contact mikka.styles@arup.com