

WASTE - SPATIAL VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Key Issue – General:

Whether the Spatial Vision and Waste Development Objectives are sufficiently focussed, aligned to the RSS, spatial and locally distinctive; also whether they give adequate direction to the strategic policies. (National Policy, PPS 12, Paras 4.1-4.3)

Specific Issues and Matters for Discussion:

Whether the spatial vision is sufficiently aligned with national and regional policy

1. *Should the spatial vision refer to energy recovery?*

The third bullet point of the Spatial Vision 'less reliance on landfill' effectively encompasses energy recovery because reduction, reuse and recycling are covered previously. This could be made more explicit without altering the spirit and intention of the spatial vision. Agree to add text of 'by increasing energy recovery' after 'landfill' in last bullet point.

2. *Should the spatial vision refer to making provision equal to the amount of waste generated and requiring management within Leicestershire and Leicester?*

In effect it does with the text 'to provide.....sufficient waste facilities to manage the area's waste.....'. The Councils believe the vision adequately reflects the intention to provide adequate sites. However, it is accepted that the wording of the vision can be interpreted as going beyond making provision of an 'equal amount'. Recommend text is amended to '...of waste facilities with capacity equal to the amount of waste generated and requiring management within Leicestershire and Leicester in.....'.

Whether the vision is expanded into the key specific objectives that need to be addressed

3. *What are the policies that flow from promoting waste minimisation initiatives and the use of waste as a resource (such as aggregate)? Are the related objectives directed at other plans or programmes? [GOEM]*

Policy DC1: Design has flowed from objective 1 of waste minimisation, by requiring applicants to demonstrate how the impacts of their development can be reduced, be that materials or other resources (power, water). A number of other policies pick up the objective of waste minimisation (resource efficiency) to varying degrees, for example CS10 and CS14. A specific policy on waste reduction was considered but not included in the submission DPD because of the superseding of waste audits by Site Waste Management Plans and reflection of representations received at the preferred options stage.

The objectives are not directed at other plans or programmes but are reflected in the MDF and it is expected that Districts will have supporting waste reduction policies in their LDFs.

4. *Should there be reference to facilitating the timely delivery of waste management facilities such as by the key dates of 2009/10, 2014/15 and 2019/20?*

The addition of the word 'timely' within Objective 2 between 'the' and 'delivery' would enhance the objective without altering its aim. Likewise the reference to the key dates would only clarify the stated position of meeting the apportionments in the draft RSS (WCD 4). Therefore, agree to add 'timely' and 'at the key dates of 2009/10, 2014/15 and 2019/20'.

5. *Should there be reference to encouraging facilities that would actually lead to a reduction in waste?*

Objective 4 states encouragement of facilities which reuse waste. Such facilities would lead to a reduction in waste and therefore, no change is proposed.

6. *Should there be reference to securing a centralised pattern of large facilities?*

Councils believe Objective 7 in its current form is sufficient in that it states that the intention is to provide facilities that '.....meets the needs of communities.....' which has ultimately led to Policy CS2 which seeks to locate large strategic sites in the main urban areas.

7. *Should there be reference to meeting the needs of different sized communities?*

Councils believe Objective 7 is sufficient as it states that the intention is to provide facilities that '.....meets the needs of communities.....' be they of any size.

8. *How meaningful is the objective of encouraging transportation of waste other than by road?*

This reflects PPS10 (page 11-12) (WCD 2) which advises the use of modes other than road transport when assessing sites. This objective is 'carried through' to Policies CS14 and DC10. The policies encourage transport other than by road where practicable. The objective is aspirational to a large extent but it is important to support sustainable solutions to waste management.

9. *Should there be reference to avoiding effects on the River Mease SAC?*

PPS9 (WCD 13) states that specific policies should not be included in development frameworks regarding internationally important sites, such as the River Mease SAC, as they enjoy statutory protection. The Council does not therefore consider it appropriate to make particular reference to the SAC in the objectives.

10. *Should there be reference to promoting increased woodland cover in the area of the National Forest as well as facilitating biodiversity, recreation and amenity provision? [CBC]*

The Council does not consider that it is necessary to include the National Forest as a specific objective. Objective 8 makes general reference to the

protection of the natural environment from the effects of waste management development. Objective 10 promotes delivery of environmental, recreational, economic and community gain in mitigation for waste management development. These objectives are developed in Policy CS10 which sets out the strategy for environmental protection and Policy CS11 which sets out the strategy for waste development within the National Forest.

11. *Should the protection and enhancement of Charnwood Forest be a specific objective? [CBC]*

The Council does not consider that it is necessary to include the protection and enhancement of Charnwood Forest as a specific objective. Objective 8 makes general reference to the protection of the natural environment from the effects of waste management development. Objective 10 promotes delivery of environmental, recreational, economic and community gain in mitigation for waste management development. These objectives are developed in Policy CS10 which sets out the strategy for environmental protection and Policy CS12 which sets out the strategy for waste development within or adjacent to Charnwood Forest.

12. *Should the objectives refer to protecting people (or safeguarding their living conditions) rather than communities?*

The intention of objective 8 is to protect social and economic aspects of communities as well as people per se. This could be clarified by referring to 'people and local communities'.

13. *Should there be objectives relating to minimisation of waste in the construction of and operation of new development; encouraging on-site management facilities; restoration; and aftercare?*

Objective 1 relates to minimisation of waste and applies to new and existing development. Policy DC1: Design deals with waste minimisation and resource efficiency in new developments. On site waste management facilities may not always be the most sustainable solution and, therefore, such proposals should be considered against other DC policies, such as DC9 and 10. Objective 10 promotes delivery of environmental, recreational, economic and community gain in mitigation for waste management development and the Councils believe this objective covers restoration and aftercare to a sufficient degree.

Main contributors:

WPAs

GOEM

Charnwood Borough Council (CBC)