

WARWICKSHIRE WASTE DEVELOPMENT PUBLIC CONSULTATION WORKSHOP

Manor Hall, Leamington Spa, 18th March 2006

Warwickshire's Waste Development Public Consultation Workshop took place on the 18th March 2006. 21 representatives attended and 2 sent their apologies.

Present:

Fern Hodges

Mr. D. M. Mothershaw

Pam Reason

Mr. N. C. Shannon

Roger Stone

Atd, Andy Taylor

Friends of the Earth - Stratford, David Passingham

Green Party, Ian Davison

Lapworth Parish Council, Cllr. Ms. Mary Toogood

Partner M.A.N Recycling, Mr. Newbrook

Partner M.A.N Recycling, Mrs. Newbrook

Warwickshire County Council, Carolyn Cox

Warwick District Council, Cllr. Alan Boad

Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Sarah Boad

Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. David Booth

Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Eithne Goode

Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Nina Knapman

Warwickshire County Council, Cllr. Sid Tooth

Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Local Councils, Alan Moore

Cllr. Brian Martin

Cllr. Ms. Karen Varga

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

Sheena Terrace, Planning Aid

Jo O'Brien, Planning Aid

Mikka Styles, Arup

Apologies:

Margaret Anderson

Rosie Coombe

1. Presentations:

Andy Cowan, Chief Planner at Warwickshire County Council opened the meeting, followed by an introduction to the day's agenda by Mikka Styles. Suzanne Osborn then explained Warwickshire County Council's aspirations for the public consultation workshop and Derek Greedy gave his presentations on waste development in Warwickshire.

The later gave rise to an impromptu question and answer session. This valuable opportunity to clarify and explain waste issues as they affect Warwickshire was allowed to run, but this then meant that the morning discussion session time was lost.

Copies of the following presentations are available at:

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

- Getting the Process Right, Mikka Styles, Arup
- Why have a Waste Development Public Consultation Workshop, Suzanne Osborn, Senior Planning Officer, WCC
- Setting the Scene: Waste Development in Warwickshire to 2021, Derek Greedy, Principal Waste Management Advisor, WCC
- Key Issues, Derek Greedy, Principal Waste Management Advisor, WCC

2. Afternoon Discussion Session:

The object of the discussion sessions was to discuss the issues proposed in the Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options Report, and attempt to reach a consensus on the Forum's preferred options. Following the changes to the morning's activities, the agenda was revised to allow meaningful discussion on four key issues to take place during the afternoon discussion session.

To facilitate these discussions the meeting was divided into two groups. Following these discussions, each group fed back their key points to the meeting, as summarised in tables 1-4.

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 is the minimum that should be done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too narrow. 	
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"> This is a recipe for disaster. Driven by financial objectives only. 	
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"> This takes into account all the important issues when deciding on sites Promotes waste reduction. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The phrase ‘desire to secure economic prosperity’ is too woolly.
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan needs to be flexible to allow for new technologies to be applied. The requirement for local facilities should be based on ‘quantified need’. The Plan must not be constrained by County boundaries. The Plan must take into account affordability. The Group wanted to make it clear that they weren’t specifying who would deliver the waste disposal options. 		

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	C	
Group 2	C	

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.				
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.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative approach could lead to larger facilities. This could be good as it would mean the achievement of economies of scale and being very effective in disposing of waste. Support the proximity principle, as this would hopefully reduce the need to transport waste. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative approach could lead to larger facilities. This gives rise to concerns that this option could be used to justify a large incinerator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A large facility to maximise the recovery of waste would only be supported if it encourages the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy.
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"> Looks at waste reduction first (in accordance with moving waste up the waste hierarchy). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of targets could mean that an incinerator would need to be fed in order to be economic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option should give an incentive to raise recycling targets, because the existing target is too unambitious. Support the use of the term 'volume' rather than weight, as this will include plastics rather than treating them as an insignificant waste item in terms of weight.
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan needs to be flexible to allow for new technologies to be applied. The Plan needs to avoid creating perverse targets to feed one particular technology option. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS		
Sustainability Appraisal	C	Option C performs in closest adherence to the sustainability objectives.		

Group 1	C + ...	Option C, together with an incentive to raise recycling targets.
Group 2	B + C (5) C (1)	Consensus not reached.

TABLE 3: 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"> • There is still a need for landfill. • This option supports anti-incineration position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains the status-quo. • Not suitable as a long-term strategy. 	
<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"> • Liked the idea of a materials recycling facility. • Supports a broad mix of waste treatment options, including landfill. • Excludes the option of advanced thermal treatment technologies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer not to see incineration because it is unlikely that public opinion will allow the planning process to deliver such a scheme in time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be more specific about the preferred size of developments and recycling targets.

TABLE 3: ISSUE 6 - Waste Management Treatment and Disposal Options <i>(Continued from page 6)</i>			
<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>			
GENERAL COMMENTS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any materials recycling facility should not reduce the incentive for kerbside collection. 	
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS	
Sustainability Appraisal	B	Option B performs in closest adherence to the sustainability objectives.	
Group 1	B + ...	Option B + a <i>preference</i> against incineration	
Group 2	A (1)	Consensus not reached.	
	B + C (10)	Option B + C would allow advanced thermal treatment technologies to be used as and when they became available, whilst minimising the use of landfill.	

TABLE 4: 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 Principal is adhered to).			
B: Policy developed to focus new waste management facilities within predominantly rural locations (where proximity principal is adhered to).			
GENERAL COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option should allow for development to take place wherever it is economically feasible, dependent on the scale of development. • The option should allow for urban or rural developments, based on the proximity principle. • No sites should be ruled out. • Why not consider the urban fringe? • The Plan should promote the use or development of existing sites. • Development should be encouraged on the edge of towns, focused on existing industrial estates and make use of disused quarries/landfills where they are unable to be restored. 		
CONCLUSION	OPTION	COMMENTS	
Sustainability Appraisal	A	Option A would be most supportive of the objectives.	
Group 1		Neither Option A nor B.	
Group 2		Neither Option A nor B.	

3. Evaluation Feedback

Seven evaluation forms were returned. Of these, five stated that the event had secured their interest to participate in future waste consultation meetings and one respondent didn't complete this section of the evaluation questionnaire.

4. Future Meetings.

All participants' contact details have been kept on file for the purpose of contacting them in the event of future waste development consultation events.

For further information on this or any other matter concerning the waste development consultation, please contact Suzanne Osborn at Warwickshire County Council. eMail: planningstrategy@warwickshire.gov.uk
Telephone: 01926 412538