

## **Matters, Issues & Questions:**

### **Matter 2: Waste – Meeting Requirements for CD&E Waste**

Question 102 - 105

#### *Meeting requirements for CD&E Waste*

102. How does the evidence demonstrate that the allocated sites in Policy W05 (Meeting waste management capacity requirements – CD&E waste including hazardous CD&E waste) are appropriate to meet identified CD&E waste management requirements?

There are 8 allocated sites referenced in Policy W05. All these sites have indicated that they intend to manage CD&E waste, or if they are related to the retention of waste facilities, currently manage CD&E waste. In addition, no overriding constraints have been identified through the site assessment process to indicate that the sites could not be developed and operated in an acceptable manner. The *Publication Draft Plan Appendix 1: Allocated Sites (CD18)* provides details on the reasons why individual sites have been allocated.

In summary, the allocation of recycling capacity at Potgate Quarry (WJP24) (pages 52-54 of *CD18*), Went Edge Quarry (WJP10) (pages 113-115 of *CD18*), Darrington Quarry (MJP27) (pages 107-109 of *CD18*) and Barnsdale Bar (MJP26) (pages 110-112 of *CD18*) contributes to the provision of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01), facilitates net self-sufficiency in the management of waste (Policy W02) and contributes to meeting capacity requirements for CD&E waste (Policy W05). The allocations WJP24, MJP26 and MJP27 are located within existing sites and compliance with Policy W11 (*Waste site identification principles*) is subject to it being linked to the life of the existing activity.

With regard to the allocation of landfill/recycling capacity at Duttons Farm (WJP05) (pages 144-146 of *CD18*) the site does not conflict with the strategic policies in the Plan (Policies W01, W02, W10 and W11) and would contribute to meeting landfill and recycling capacity requirements for CD&E waste (Policy W05). This site is proposed as the means to enable the restoration of the allocated Duttons Farm MJP52 clay extraction site (pages 137-139 of *CD18*).

With regard to the allocation of Brotherton Quarry (WJP21) (pages 122-124 of *CD18*), importation of material for restoration of the eastern part of the site has been granted planning permission. The importation of further material would enable the completion of reclamation of the quarry, which has previously been the subject of permission for landfill. The development would not conflict with Policies W01, W02 and W11 and would provide additional capacity for the landfill of inert CD&E waste (Policy W05).

With regard to the allocation of Escrick Brickworks (WJP06) (pages 119-122 of *CD18*), the area may have some potential for inert landfill in order to achieve the reclamation of the site to an agricultural afteruse in association with any future working of clay as part of preferred area MJP55 (Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks, page 77, *CD18*) and in order to meet any longer term needs for landfill of CD&E waste. In these circumstances the allocation would be consistent with Policies W01, W02 and W11 and would also contribute to meeting capacity requirements for CD&E waste (Policy W05).

With regard to the allocation of Allerton Park (WJP08, page 48, *CD18*) please refer to the response to Q.97.

Furthermore, as stated in the response to Q.84 above, there are no outstanding objections to the allocation of any of the sites by regulatory bodies.

As set out in *Discounted Sites Summary Document (SD18)* a number of sites have been discounted that were being proposed for the meeting the requirements for the management of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste (CD&E waste). The reasons are on the following pages in *SD18*: Whitewall Quarry, near Norton (MJP13) page 64; Old London Road, Stutton (MJP31) page 77; Land to the north of Old London Road, Stutton (MJP53) page 80; Old London Road (MJP58) page 83; Old London Road, Stutton (East & West) WJP04 page 87. The relevant SA consideration of these sites is detailed in Appendix 3g for MJP13 starting at page 87; and Appendix 3i starting at: page 329 for MJP31, page 344 for MJP53, page 359 for MJP58 and page 373 for WJP04.

103. Nether Poppleton Parish Council and Upper Poppleton Parish Council object to the allocation in Policy W05 of Land at Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (WJP05) largely on the basis of its impacts on traffic, local communities, the environment, flooding, agricultural land and neighbourhood businesses. Can these potential impacts be acceptably mitigated? How has the balancing exercise justified the allocation?

Key sensitivities have been identified, together with development requirements, for the site as part of the site assessment and consultation process. Therefore, it is considered that, subject to appropriate design and mitigation, any impacts on traffic, the environment, flooding, agricultural land and the neighbourhood can be acceptably mitigated and controlled with the use of relevant planning conditions. For example suitable arrangements for safe access, mitigation of ecological issues and appropriate landscaping and a design based on a site specific flood risk assessment, and arrangements to deal with noise, dust and road cleanliness. With regard to agricultural land this site is proposed as the means to restore site MJP52 (Field SE5356 9513, to north of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton, page 137 *CD18*) which has already been affected by past mineral excavation and would involve the import of material to return the site to original ground levels and ultimately to agriculture.

Given that, the landfill is a means to restore MJP52 to an agricultural afteruse and does not conflict with strategic policies in the Plan; the site would contribute to meeting capacity requirements for CD&E waste with recycling that would help

move waste up the hierarchy and no major issues have been raised by statutory consultees; it is considered on balance that the site should be allocated, but only in association with MJP52.

104. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust object to the allocation in Policy W05 of Land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks (WJP06) largely on the basis of the impact on the York-Selby cycle path SINC, agricultural land, traffic and the local environment generally. Can these potential impacts be acceptably mitigated? How has the balancing exercise justified the allocation? Escrick Parish Council objects to the large size of the site. Is the scale of the site justified?

Key sensitivities have been identified, together with development requirements, for the site as part of the site assessment and consultation process. Therefore, it is considered that, subject to appropriate siting, design and mitigation, any impacts on the Trans Pennine Trail, York to Selby Cycle Path SINC, Heron Wood SINC and local environment can be acceptably mitigated and controlled with the use of relevant planning conditions. With regard to agricultural land this site is proposed as the means to restore site MJP55 (Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks, page 77 *CD18*) and would involve the import of material to return the site to original ground levels and ultimately to agriculture.

The site is only proposed for allocation in association with site MJP55 (Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks, page 77 *CD18*) being developed as the long-term source of clay for the submitter's existing plant site at Heck and is not supported in isolation. It would be a site for longer term needs for landfill of inert waste.

105. Should the existing site at Whitewall Quarry (MJP13) in Ryedale be allocated in Policy W05 to enhance the network of recycling, transfer and treatment facilities for CD&E waste? Is there a need for further capacity in this area? Are the reasons given in the *Discounted sites summary document* of October 2016 relating to traffic justified?

The existing site for recycling at Whitewall currently operates under the terms of one of the conditions of planning permission C3/07/00937/CPO (regarding an extension to the site area for minerals extraction, online register record [NY/2007/0247/FUL](#)) within a defined site area on the quarry floor. The discounting of MJP13 (Whitewall Quarry near Norton (recycling), page 64, *SD18*) does not remove the right for that operation to continue until the current approved date in 2023 (the lifespan of the existing quarry). MJP13 does not have the benefit of any existing planning permission for the proposed enlargement of the area for recycling activity on the quarry floor. However, as acknowledged on page 65 of *Discounted Sites Summary Document, October 2016 (SD18)*, if MJP13 were developed it would potentially increase the throughput of CD&E waste at the site thereby contributing to the movement of waste up the hierarchy. However, there is not a specific identified need for additional capacity in this particular part of the Plan area although there is an identified need in terms of the Plan area as a whole.

The issue is that an expansion of the recycling operation would, in combination with the other permitted activities at the quarry, impact further on the local communities in the area, particularly in respect of the routing of vehicles and vehicle emissions in Norton which has a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), as referred to in the assessment of the site on pages 90-91 of the Sustainability appraisal report Appendix 3 assessment of sites part 2(g) (CD28). It is therefore considered that the discounting on the stated grounds in *SD18* is justified.

**Prepared by;**

**North Yorkshire County Council  
City of York Council  
North York Moors National Park Authority**