

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

### **Matter 2: Waste – Waste Management Allocations in General**

Question 79 - 87

#### *Waste management allocations in general*

79. Besides the SA and *Notes from Site Panel Assessment Sessions*, October 2016, are there any other overall assessments in the evidence base for each of the individual sites put forward?

As detailed in response to Q.4, the *Introduction to sites and areas assessment (October 2016) (SD14)* is an overview of the site assessment process background papers and includes reference to:

- *Initial screening of submitted sites and areas, October 2016 (SD16)*
- *Identification of areas of search for concreting sand & gravel, October 2016 (SD19)*
- *Discounted Sites Summary Document, October 2016 (SD18)*
- *Interpretation of Level 1 SFRA sequential test findings, October 2016 (SD23)*
- *Impact of Site Submissions on Agricultural Land, October 2016 (SD20)*
- *Traffic Assessment of sites, October 2015 (SD21)*
- *Traffic Assessment of site appendices, October 2015 (SD22)*

In addition, there is the *Audit Trail of sites from Issues and Options to Publication (SD13)*.

80. In general how have waste management sites been assessed for allocation in the MWJP? In a few paragraphs please provide a brief overview including the methodology, how constraints and opportunities have been considered, and how allocations have been chosen over omission sites. References (with page and paragraph numbers) may be given to relevant evidence.

Identification and consideration of constraints have been built into the steps of assessment of sites set out in *Site Identification and Assessment Methodology and Scope (SD15)* and used within the sustainability appraisal of sites (*Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 1 (CD27)* and *Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 2 (CD28)*). The same constraint information has informed the identification of key sensitivities and development requirements for individual sites and areas of search, proposed for allocation as set out in *Appendix 1 – Allocated Sites, November 2016 (CD18)*, for example in connection with WJP11 (Harewood Whin, Rufforth) on pages 147-149 and the

identification of key sensitivities and development requirements for individual sites that ultimately have been discounted as set out in the *Discounted Sites Summary Document*, October 2016 (SD18). For example, the key sensitivities for the discounted site MJP13 (Whitewall Quarry, near Norton – recycling) are set out on page 65 of SD18 and the development requirements for MJP13 are on page 115 of SD18.

Matters identified during the Site Panels were also factored into the process. For example, flood risk was identified in a panel session by the Environment Agency for WJP05 (Field to the north of Duttons Farm), page 46 of *Notes from site assessment panels* (SD17) which, in combination with the *Strategic flood risk assessment* (pages 73-76 of CD30), led to the identification of the flood exclusion zone on page 146 of CD18. The results of the *Habitats regulation assessment* (CD29) were also taken into consideration; for example that, in terms of Policy W05 on page 31 of CD29, a number of allocations were identified as being predicted to not have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites.

The overall process, including identification of constraints and opportunities, has also been informed by the consultation responses received at the various stages of consultation; e.g. Historic England's support for the alerting of potential developers to the presence of heritage assets that might be affected (PPC16 *Summary of responses to preferred options consultation*, p.12) leading to enhanced text in WJP08 (Allerton Park, near Knaresborough, page 49, CD18) that was supported (CD37 Publication draft responses p.229).

Where possible and appropriate, opportunities for enhancement as part of the development requirements have been identified, for example: appropriate site design and landscaping to mitigate impact on heritage assets, as illustrated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point regarding site WJP08 (Allerton Park, near Knaresborough, page 49, CD18) and habitat creation and to a use consistent with the purposes of Green Belt as part of a restoration scheme, as illustrated by the last bullet point regarding site WJP11 (Harewood Whin, Rufforth, pages 147-9, CD18). Other opportunities have also been flagged, such as the control of invasive species at sites such as WJP18 (Tancred, near Scorton, page 56, CD18).

The reasons for the allocation of a site, or the discounting of a site, are set out in respect of each site within CD18 and SD18 respectively. For each site, the contribution to Policy requirements has been considered including, where appropriate:

- Retention of existing facilities, e.g. WJP17 (Skibeden, near Skipton, page 13, CD18) as an HWRC beyond the life of the landfill site) and WJP21 (Bortherton Quarry, Burton Salmon, page 122, CD18) as a recycling/transfer facility beyond 2025
- Meeting capacity requirements, e.g. WJP24's (Potgate, (former plant site), North Stainley, page 52, CD18) contribution to CD & E waste Policy W05 (CD18, page 53), whereas there was a lack of need for the capacity of additional landfill that was proposed by WJP04 (Old London Road Quarry, Stutton (SD18, page 86).
- Type of waste facility proposed, etc.

These are all set in the context of the potential impacts of the development, including matters such as site access, leading to a conclusion as to whether other sites were, or were not, more appropriate to help meet requirements.

81. Are the reasons for selecting allocated waste sites/preferred areas over reasonable alternatives made clear in the SA? Have all reasonable alternatives been assessed and are reasons for rejection set out?

As with the process for mineral sites, the process for identifying and appraising potential waste sites is summarised in section 2.3 of *SA Report (CD23)* with further detail provided within the *Site Identification and Assessment Methodology Document (SD15)*. The process required the identification and *initial screening of potentially suitable sites and areas (SD16)*, the consideration of key constraints before applying the SA Framework for the sites, and the review of sites at panel meetings.

It should be noted that while the policy assessment considered policy alternative options as alternatives, sites were generated from a 'call for sites' (rather than the Plan identifying sites from the 'top down'). Alternatives were taken to be the full list of submitted sites, only some of which were taken forward on the basis of their overall sustainability and contribution to the Plan, while some proposed sites were also withdrawn from the selection process.

Full detail of the appraisal of waste sites against the SA Framework is provided in *Appendix 3 (CD27 and CD28)* which include the SA scores for each site, as well as the key issues and mitigation identified for each site. For example, the appraisal for WJP13 (Halton East, near Skipton) commences on page 4 of CD27 and the appraisal of WJP09 (Whitewall Quarry – recycling) commences on page 101 of CD28.

The SA of the sites/search areas were considered as part of the allocation process along with other matters including how they fulfil the policy requirements of the Plan. The allocated sites and reasons behind allocation/rejection are included in *CD18 (Publication Draft Plan – Appendix 1)*. The reasons for acceptance or rejection are also summarised in the *Discounted Site Summary Document (SD18)* and the *audit trail of progression of sites from Issues and Options Stage to Publication documents (SD13)*. As stated in the example used in Q.80 above (MJP13 Whitewall Quarry, near Norton – recycling), the key sensitivities and development requirements for the individual sites discounted are set out on page 64 in *SD18*.

82. How does the spatial distribution of allocations and the policy support given to other potential non-allocated development seek to optimise the location of facilities and travel modes and distances?

All allocated sites have been assessed against Policy W10 and Policy W11, as detailed in *Publication Draft Appendix 1 – Allocated Sites, November 2016 (CD18)* and the *Audit trail of progression of sites from Issues and Options Stage*

*to Publication (SD13), and any forthcoming detailed planning applications will be required to be in accordance with these policies. This approach is supported in Policy W02 of the Publication Draft Plan (CD17) where Part 4) of the Policy states that 'Proposals which would help meet unforeseen needs for the management of specific waste streams arising in the Plan area but not specifically identified or provided for in the Plan, will be permitted where they would be in line with the requirements of Policies W10 and W11.'*

Policy W10 sets out the Plan's approach to the overall locational principles for provision of waste management capacity and Policy W11 considers waste site identification principles. It is through these policies (and other policies specific to particular waste streams, where relevant) that allocated sites have been, and non-allocated potential development will be, assessed to ensure that the location of waste sites will be optimised with regard to travel modes and distances.

In summary, and with specific regard to the question posed, Policy W10 provides support to allocations and planning applications which are consistent with the following principles:

- Provide waste management capacity outside the North York Moors National Park and the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, unless the facility to be provided is appropriately scaled to meet waste management needs arising in the designated area;
- Maximise the potential of the existing facility network by supporting the continuation of activity at existing time limited sites with permission, the grant of permission for additional capacity and/or appropriate additional or alternative waste uses within the footprint of existing sites and, the extension to the footprint of existing sites; and,
- Support proposed new sites where the site is located as close as practicable to the source/s of waste to be dealt with.

In summary, and with specific regard to the question posed, Policy W11 provides support to allocations and planning applications which are consistent with the following principles:

- Siting waste management facilities on previously developed land, industrial and employment land, or at existing waste management sites, giving preference to sites where it can be demonstrated that co-locational benefits would arise;
- Where the site or facility is proposed to deal mainly with waste arising in rural areas then use of redundant agricultural buildings or their curtilages will also be acceptable in principle and, for agricultural waste, appropriate on-farm locations;
- Siting facilities to support the re-use and recycling of CD&E waste at the point of arising (for temporary facilities linked to the life of the associated construction project) and at active mineral workings where the main outputs of the process are to be sold alongside or blended with mineral produced at the site;
- Siting facilities to provide additional waste water treatment capacity, including for waste water containing Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials, at existing waste water treatment works sites as a first priority. Where development of new capacity on greenfield land is necessary then preference will be given to sites located on lower quality agricultural land.

Siting of facilities for management of waste water from hydrocarbons development will also be considered under the requirements of Policy M18 where relevant; and,

- Providing any additional capacity required for landfill of waste through preferring the infill of quarry voids for mineral site reclamation purposes.

Policy D03, as provided in the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)*, sets out the Plan's approach to the transport of minerals and waste and associated traffic impacts. In addition to the Policy W10 and Policy W11 detailed above, this policy seeks to optimise the location of waste sites with regard to travel modes and distances by encouraging alternative transport modes to the road when transporting minerals and waste. Where road transport is necessary certain requirements will need to be met, including: capacity within the existing network for the level of traffic proposed; the development would not have an unacceptable impact on local communities, businesses or other road users; access arrangements are appropriate; and, suitable arrangements for on-site manoeuvring, parking and (un)loading. For proposals generating a significant level of road traffic a *Transport Assessment* and *Green Travel Plan* will be required.

83. In general how does the Plan seek to ensure that any significant constraints/adverse impacts of development of waste allocations are overcome/mitigated to an acceptable level?

As referred to in Q.5 and Q.11 above, consideration of constraints has been built into the steps of assessment of sites set out in *Site Identification and Assessment Methodology and Scope (SD15)*, notably via Step 2 and Appendix 4. Constraints were also examined within the sustainability appraisal of sites (*Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 1 (CD27)* and *Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 2 (CD28)*). The *Publication Draft Plan Appendix 1: Allocated Sites (CD18)* identifies key sensitivities and development mitigation requirements for each allocation derived from the individual site assessments and consultation process. Paragraph 1.9 of *CD18* explains that the sensitivities and development principles should not be taken to be an exhaustive list, and that proposals need to take account of matters relevant at the time of the application (such as policy changes, designation changes, pre-application advice). It is therefore not considered that any of the specific allocations are likely to result in significant adverse impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated.

84. Do any of the regulatory bodies have outstanding concerns about any of the allocations? If so, what are these concerns and how have they been addressed?

There are no outstanding concerns about the waste site allocations from any regulatory bodies. Further detail is provided in Chapter 6 of the *Consultation Statement (CD02)* which sets out, amongst other elements, representations received by regulatory bodies in response to the *Publication Draft (CD17)* and its accompanying supporting documents.

85. Would any of the specific allocations result in significant adverse impacts that could not be acceptably mitigated? In such cases how have the benefits of allocation been demonstrated to outweigh the detriment?

As detailed in response to Q.12, it is not considered that any of the specific allocations are likely to result in significant adverse impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated, because the key sensitivities and development requirements for each allocation have been identified and it is not considered that these raise any circumstances that would not be possible to address within the Planning application proposals for a site, including through application of the development management policies in the Plan.

86. Should the policies state in which area (district/borough/national park/city) the allocation/preferred area/area of search is located to provide clarity and to facilitate where the allocations can be found within Appendix 1? Should any missing allocation references be added to the policies? (Policy W04 1) iii) does not give a reference for the Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility)

The first point raised in this question is accepted as a reasonable suggestion. Relevant modifications will be included in the '*Main Modifications*' document to reflect this.

However, *Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility (AWRP)* is not an allocated site because it has planning permission, with the benefit of a permanent permission and an expected life span beyond the end of the Plan period and the facility is currently being commissioned. Therefore an allocation reference is not applicable to AWRP in part 1) iii) of Policy W04. As detailed on page 48 of *Publication Draft Plan Appendix 1: Allocated Sites (CD18)* the site, Allerton Park (WJP08), includes land in close proximity to, but does not include the AWRP facility, has been allocated.

87. Are all allocations shown on the Policies Map, and to be effective should the Policies Map be referred to in the various policies that allocate waste sites?

Yes, all allocations are on the *Policies Map*. As detailed in response to Q.8, the Interactive map allocation references are revealed by clicking on the site, but references are currently not on the paper version of the Policies map but will be added.

However, the WJP22 (Land at former Pollington airfield, page 125, CD18) boundary on *Publication Draft Interactive Policies Map (CD22)* & *Publication Draft Paper copy of Policies Map (CD23)* needs updating to reflect areas as shown on

*Publication Draft Plan Appendix 1: Allocated Sites (CD18)*. Relevant modifications will be included in the 'Main Modifications' document to reflect this.

The point raised in this question regarding referencing the Policies Map in policies that allocate waste sites is accepted as reasonable suggestion. Relevant modifications 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 – Waste Management Allocations in General

Question 79 - 87

### 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
Q86	121	W03	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>1) <u>Identification of the Allerton Park (WJP08), in Harrogate Borough, and Harewood Whin (WJP11), in the City of York,</u> sites as strategic allocations over the Plan period for the management of LACW. Proposals to extend the time period for continued waste management operations at these sites over the Plan period and the development of other appropriate waste management infrastructure will be permitted subject, in the case of the Harewood Whin site, to compliance with relevant national and local Green Belt policy.</b></p>
Q86	124	W04	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) iii) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>iii) Providing large scale capacity for recovery of</b></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p><b>energy and anaerobic digestion for C&amp;I waste through a combination of spare capacity within the Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility and the Southmoor Energy Centre (WJP03), <u>in Selby District</u>, former ARBRE Power Station (WJP25), <u>in Selby District</u>, and North Selby Mine anaerobic digestion (WJP02), <u>in the City of York</u>, sites, which are identified in the Plan as allocated sites for these uses. The development of the WJP02 site will only be permitted where it would be consistent with the principles of including land in the York Green Belt;</b></p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>2) Provision of capacity for management of C&amp;I waste is also supported through site allocations for recycling, transfer and treatment of C&amp;I waste at:</b></p> <p><b>Land at Halton East, near Skipton (WJP13), <u>in Craven District</u></b>  <b>Land at Tancred, near Scorton (WJP18), <u>in Richmondshire District</u></b>  <b>Land at Skibeden, near Skipton (WJP17), <u>in Craven District</u></b>  <b>Land at Allerton Park, near Knaresborough (WJP08), <u>in Harrogate Borough</u></b>  <b>Land at Seamer Carr, near Scarborough (WJP15), <u>in Scarborough Borough</u></b>  <b>Land at Common Lane, Burn (WJP16), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Pollington (WJP22), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Fairfield Road, Whitby (WJP19), <u>in the North York Moors National Park</u></b>  <b>Land at Harewood Whin, Rufforth (WJP11), <u>in the City of York</u></b></p>
Q86	128	W05	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>2) Provision of capacity for management of CD&amp;E waste is also supported through site allocations for:</b></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p><b>i) Allocations for recycling of CD&amp;E waste:</b></p> <p><b>Land at Potgate Quarry, North Stainley (WJP24), <u>in Harrogate Borough</u></b>  <b>Land at Allerton Park, near Knaresborough (WJP08), <u>in Harrogate Borough</u></b>  <b>Land at Darrington Quarry, Darrington (MJP27), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Barnsdale Bar, Kirk Smeaton (MJP26), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton (WJP10), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (WJP05), <u>in the City of York</u></b></p> <p><b>ii) Allocations for landfill of CD&amp;E waste:</b></p> <p><b>Land at Brotherton Quarry, Burton Salmon (WJP21), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (WJP05), <u>in the City of York</u></b>  <b>Land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks, Escrick (WJP06), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p>
Q87		Policies Map – Paper Version	<p>Revise WJP22 site boundary on paper version of the following maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aerodrome Safeguarding - Policy No. = D10</li> <li>• Agricultural Land Classification - Policy No. = D12</li> <li>• Coal Mining Development Referral Area - Policy No. = D13</li> <li>• Water Environment including Flood Risk - Policy No. = D09</li> <li>• PEDL licences - Policy No.s M16, M17 &amp; M18</li> <li>• Environmental and Historic Designations - MAP EIGHT</li> <li>• Minerals Resource Safeguarding Maps – MAP EIGHT</li> </ul>
Q87		Policies Map – Interactive  WJP22 Boundary	Revise WJP22 site boundary on the interactive map

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
Q87	121	W03	<p>In Part 4) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>4) Proposals for development at the allocated sites referred to in 1) and 2) above, <u>and as shown on the Policies Map,</u> will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p>
Q87	124	W04	<p>In Part 3) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>3) Proposals for development of the allocated sites referred to in 1) and 2) above, <u>and as shown on the Policies Map,</u> will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p>
Q87	128	W05	<p>In Part 3) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>3) Proposals for development of the allocated sites for recycling or landfill referred to in 2) above, <u>and as shown on the Policies Map,</u> will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p>