

## Matters, Issues & Questions:

### Matter 2: Waste – Overview

Question 73 - 78

#### Overview

73. Does the MWJP identify all the main challenges to providing sufficient, sustainable waste management facilities in the Plan area, and are these challenges properly reflected in the vision and objectives and incorporated in policy?

Yes. Chapter 3 of the Plan *Publication Draft (CD17)* clearly sets out the issues and challenges considered to be of most significance to the Plan area. Issues and challenges specifically relevant to waste have been identified through a combination of national planning policy, relevant local policies and strategies, review of information contained in the evidence base and comments received during consultation on the Plan. Through this process, the issues that are most relevant to the sustainable management of waste in the Plan area have been identified.

The issues and challenges have subsequently been reflected in Chapter 4: *Vision and Objectives*. The Vision clearly promotes delivering sustainable waste management in section i) and optimising the spatial distribution of minerals and waste development in sections iii-vi. Objectives 1, 2, 6 and 7 reflect the waste related elements of the vision sections referenced above.

Every policy in the Plan, including those within Chapter 6: Provision of waste management capacity and infrastructure, includes a section detailing the key links between the specific Policy and the Plan's objectives.

Appendix 4 of the *Publication Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report - Sustainability Appraisal contribution to the evolution of the vision (CD26)* found that no further changes to the Vision were necessary. Significantly, the Report also states that no negative impacts have been identified, primarily due to the vision being an overarching set of aspirations for the Plan.

74. How does the plan overall support the movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy?

In Chapter 3 of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* 'Promoting the management of waste further up the waste hierarchy' is identified as one of the key issues and challenges facing the Plan. This issue is referred to in Chapter 4 where the Vision states in i) 'Less waste will be generated and the Plan area will have moved substantially closer to a zero waste economy, with more waste being used as a

*resource and disposal of waste arising in the Plan area only taking place as a last resort.* Furthermore, Objective 1 of the Plan is *'Encouraging the management of waste further up the waste hierarchy'*. The link from the identification of the issue, to clear indication in the Vision, leading to designation as an objective demonstrates a strong commitment in the Plan to moving the management of waste up the waste hierarchy.

Policy W01 forms the key implementation of Objective 1 where it states in paragraph 1) *'Proposals will be permitted where they would contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy through:*

*i) the minimisation of waste, or;*

*ii) the increased re-use, recycling or composting of waste, or;*

*iii) the provision of waste treatment capacity and small scale proposals for energy recovery (including advanced thermal treatment technologies), which would help to divert waste from landfill.'*

Policies W03 – W09 also contain text which contributes towards supporting the movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy by way of supporting the allocation of sites and, where practicable, waste management methods which re-use, recycle and recover waste.

Further support is provided in Policy M11: *Supply of alternatives to land-won primary aggregates*, which promote the use of secondary aggregate, thus helping to minimise waste requiring further management, as well as the recycling of aggregate. Criteria 1) ii) and 2) i) and iii) of development management Policy D11 (*Sustainable design, construction and operation of development*) also support waste minimisation and use of alternatives to primary aggregate.

75. Does the MWJP seek to achieve the most appropriate spatial strategy for waste development? How is this reflected in the Plan?

Policy W10, as detailed in the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)*, sets out the overall locational principles for the provision of waste management capacity throughout the Plan period. This section of the Plan clearly sets out the nature and distribution of waste arisings and the existing network of waste management facilities in the Plan area. This Policy also takes into account important characteristics of the Plan area such as the location of main settlements, future growth, major environmental designations and transport networks in addition to adhering to national policy requirements relevant to locating waste facilities. The approach to Planning for waste promotes (through Policy W02) net self-sufficiency in capacity and, through Policy W10, the proximity principle.

A first draft of a Policy detailing the overall location principles for provision of waste management capacity (referred to as id51) which provided four distinct policy approaches was published in the *Issues & Options Consultation Document – February 2014 (IPC01)*. Having considered all responses to the consultation a preferred policy approach was published in the *Preferred Options Main Consultation Document (Nov 2015) (PPC01)* which generated further consultation responses leading to the finalisation of the Policy in the Plan

*Publication Draft (CD17)*. This iterative process has ensured that the Plan seeks to achieve the most appropriate spatial strategy for waste management.

Policy W10 clearly sets out the overall locational principles with which the allocation of waste sites and the determination of planning applications should be consistent. In combination with Policy W11, which sets out site identification principles for new waste management capacity, it is considered that the Joint Plan seeks to achieve the most appropriate spatial strategy for waste development in the Plan area.

#### 76. How does the Plan reflect the proximity principle?

The Plan reflects the proximity principle, with regard to waste management, primarily through the implementation of Policies W02: *Strategic role of the Plan area in the management of waste* and Policy W10: *Overall locational principles of waste management capacity*, in combination with the policies supporting text.

Paragraph 6.30 of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)*, which appears immediately prior to Policy W02, states that *Government policy encourages communities to take responsibility for their waste arisings and sets out a requirement to ensure that waste can be disposed of or, in the case of mixed municipal waste collected from private households, recovered at the nearest appropriate installation.*

Paragraph 3 of Policy W02 states that *'where a facility is proposed specifically to manage waste arising outside the Plan area it will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility would represent the nearest appropriate installation for the waste to be managed'*. This forms a key mechanism through which the Plan reflects the proximity principle.

In addition to this, Policy W10, as detailed in the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)*, supports the implementation of the proximity principle, primarily through Paragraph 3 of the Policy which states: *The allocation of sites and determination of planning applications should be consistent with the following principles: Supporting proposals for development of waste management capacity at new sites where ..... the site is located as close as practicable to the source/s of waste to be dealt with.*

In the policy justification to Policy W10 at Paragraph 6.103 the concept of the proximity principle is supported, where it states: *Supporting the management of waste near to where it arises, as well as encouraging communities to take responsibility for the waste arising in their area, are important components of sustainability. In particular it can reduce the amount of transport required, with corresponding benefits for local amenity and reduced environmental impacts in what is a predominantly rural area with a relatively sparse network of major roads. This suggests that, where practicable, new sites for waste management should be well-located in relation to the sources of the arisings to be dealt with.*

77. How does the Plan support the Authorities in maintaining net self-sufficiency over the Plan period?

In Chapter 3 of the Plan (CD17) '*Supporting the delivery of the additional waste management capacity expected to be required, in line with any identified needs*' is identified as one of the key issues and challenges facing the Plan. This issue is referred to in Chapter 4 where the Vision states in i) '*the Plan area will have delivered sufficient waste management capacity to meet needs equivalent to waste arising in North Yorkshire and the City of York, with waste only being exported out of the Plan area where necessary or more sustainable.*' Furthermore, Objective 2 of the Plan is '*Making adequate provision for the waste management capacity needed to manage waste arising within the sub-region and safeguarding important waste management infrastructure*'. The link from the identification of the issue, to clear indication in the Vision, leading to designation as an objective demonstrates a strong commitment in the Plan to maintaining net self-sufficiency over the Plan period.

The '*Strategic role of the Plan area in the management of waste*' section of the Plan (CD17) sets out the approach to the role that the Plan area plays with regard to waste management in the sub-region of North Yorkshire and the wider region of Yorkshire & Humber. Paragraph 6.30 of the Plan (CD17) states that the approach in the Plan is to seek a move towards a position of '*net self-sufficiency*' with regard to increasing the capability of the Plan area to manage the waste that arises within it. This is implemented through Paragraph 1 of Policy W02 which states '*Support will be given through the allocation of sites and the grant of planning permission for the additional waste management capacity needed to help achieve net self-sufficiency in capacity at a level equivalent to expected arisings in the Plan area, by 31 December 2030*'. This is the key policy mechanism through which the Plan supports the net self-sufficiency of the Plan area throughout the Plan period.

This approach is followed through in Policies W03, W04 and W05 which state that '*Net self-sufficiency in capacity for management of [LACW, C&I waste and CD&E waste] will be supported through*' followed by policy text which reflects meeting the identified waste management capacity gaps for the respective waste streams. This ensures that the equivalent of 100% of waste arisings within the Plan area is planned for whilst allowing for continued import and export of waste where this is the most sustainable option.

The Plan is informed by a *Waste Net Self-Sufficiency Paper (July 2016) (WEB07)* which assessed relevant waste policies within adopted and/or emerging Local Plans of WPAs adjoining the Plan area, or those which are 'significant' exporters of waste to the Plan area, with a view to determining the extent to which increased imports to the Plan area may be anticipated. It was concluded that the majority of WPAs assessed included in adopted and/or emerging strategic waste policies a reference to achieving self-sufficiency, in some cases net self-sufficiency for waste management (or statements which suggest a similar objective). On this basis, it was considered reasonable to assume that if WPAs were to permit waste management facilities in accordance local planning policy there would not be a significant increase in waste imports to the Plan area within the Plan period. As noted in paragraphs 7.50 and 7.51 of the *Duty to Cooperate*

*Statement, October 2017 (CD03)*, no concerns were raised regarding the approach set out in *WEB07* when this Paper was considered by the Yorkshire & Humber Waste Technical Advisory Body in March 2015 and September 2016.

78. MWJP paragraph 6.26 indicates that there has been significant variation in waste flows between areas within Yorkshire and Humber which account for the majority of import and export movements. It is important to have an understanding of the scale of import and export movements to gauge the level of net self-sufficiency in the Plan area. Given this variation, what weight can be given to only one year's figures (2014) in the Plan? Should there be information for other years to provide a more robust indication of overall waste flows?

Further information on the variations in the import and export of waste from and to the North Yorkshire Sub-region is detailed in the waste evidence base documents: *North Yorkshire County Council waste specific evidence base paper (WEB01)*; *North York Moors National Park Authority waste technical paper (WEB02)*; and, *City of York Council minerals and waste technical paper (MEB06)*. However, the point raised in this question is accepted as a reasonable suggestion. A relevant modification will be included in the 'Main Modifications' document to reflect this.

**Prepared by;**

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

## Appendix

### Matters, Issues & Questions:

#### Matter 2: Waste – Overview

Question 73 - 78

### Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission local plan, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
Q.78	114	6.26	<p>Revise Para:</p> <p>Environment Agency data indicates that in 2014 the North Yorkshire sub-region imported a minimum of 212,000 tonnes of waste (<u>251,000 tonnes in 2012 and 193,000 tonnes in 2013</u>). However, the actual figure is likely to be higher due to the lack of detail on the origin of some waste arisings. <del>In the same year</del> <u>In each year, from 2012-2014,</u> the sub-region is known to have exported over 300,000 tonnes of waste. The majority of import and export movements were from or to other locations in Yorkshire and Humber or the North East. However, <u>as indicated above,</u> data suggests that there are significant annual variations in the scale of movements between particular areas and this limits the potential to establish a comprehensive understanding of current and likely future waste flows.</p>