Matters, Issues & Questions:
Matter 2: Waste – Meeting Waste Management Needs

Question 88 - 95

Meeting waste management needs

88. Give a brief overview of the methodologies and sensitivities used for forecasting waste arisings over the Plan period. What assumptions have been used and are these the most appropriate? Do the four different recycling scenarios and three economic growth factors in the *North Yorkshire Sub Region Waste Arisings and Capacity Requirements* update report (September 2016) provide a robust evidence base to predict waste arisings for all waste streams?

The *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements report (October 2013) (WEB06)* and subsequent updates (WEB05, WEB04 and WEB03) set out the methodology used to forecast future waste arisings and how these would be managed in the Plan area. The reports utilise a range of growth scenarios (no growth, growth and minimised growth) and a range of waste management scenarios (Baseline, Maximised recycling and recovery and Median recycling and recovery). The most recent *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements update report (September 2016) (WEB03)* considers an additional waste management scenario (Alternative median recycling and recovery) utilising the most recent EU waste management targets developed as part of the Circular Economy concept. The four recycling scenarios reflect a range of possibilities that could be implemented based on different recycling and recovery practices and are considered to provide a robust evidence base on which to forecast future waste management in the Plan area.

Section 4 of the *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements update report (September 2016) (WEB03)* discusses the Growth Scenarios that were developed for the purposes of modelling waste needs in the Plan area. The three Growth Scenarios (no growth, growth and minimised growth) seek to reflect future economic activity, using historic trends and projections on Gross Value Added (GVA) outcomes and fiscal/financial/legislative factors which are likely to have an impact upon the growth of waste during the Plan period. The use of 33% of estimated GVA growth projections, which is approximately 0.8% per annum, is based on an analysis of historic trends for growth in industrial, commercial waste and construction, demolition and excavation wastes. The growth scenarios also utilise the Yorkshire Regional Econometric Model as the basis for growth projections, which is a model utilised by all District/Borough Councils in North Yorkshire to contribute towards calculating future growth and housing need. This is the standard approach adopted by most waste planning authorities across England when forecasting

future waste requirements and provides a credible and robust evidence base, with sufficient sensitivity testing, on which to predict future growth and waste management needs for the Plan.

As detailed in the 'Monitoring and Review' Section (Paragraph 4.11) of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* key policy areas will be monitored and in addition to the five year review, if a significant change in circumstance is identified this may also lead to a need to review the Plan. This would include monitoring any significant and unforeseen increase in waste arising in the Plan area to ensure that sufficient site allocations are identified to meet any resulting waste capacity requirements.

The scenarios used in the North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements reports provide an appropriate range of potential future outcomes on which to judge the most probable waste capacity requirements in the Plan area throughout the plan period.

In relation to waste movements, section 12 of the *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements update report (September 2016) (WEB03)* provides a summary of imports and exports of waste into and out of the North Yorkshire Sub-region. Information is sourced from the 2014 Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator and Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator, which were the most up-to-date source of data at the time of producing the Report. This is a standard approach utilised by other Waste Planning Authorities and is considered to be most appropriate method to project future trends.

89. Why does Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) remain constant for all scenarios and is this justified?

At the time of undertaking an assessment of need for the Plan, work had already been undertaken by colleagues in the York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership (YNYWP) for finding a long term solution for managing LACW. This work included detailed modelling of expected waste arisings over the Plan period, taking into account factors such as economic growth and increases in housing stock/population, and identifying a solution for future management of this waste stream. This included assessing how much landfill would be required and what facilities would be needed to recycle and recover value from this waste stream. As such, the LACW projected waste arisings across all growth scenarios are in line with projections used by the YNYWP, which have been utilised to inform the procurement of the Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility (AWRP). The AWRP facility has been designed to accommodate expected growth in arisings of residual LACW over the period to 2040.

One of the roles of the Plan is to aid the delivery of the *Municipal Waste Management Strategy for York and North Yorkshire (2006) (WEB13)* and the Plan intends the management of LACW to be in accordance with the existing and planned arrangements, including meeting agreed targets, set out in this Strategy, integral to which is the delivery of the AWRP facility.

As a result of the considerable body of recent research that contributed to the development of the LACW projections used by the YNYWP, it was considered that sufficiently robust and proportionate evidence was available to inform preparation of this element of the Plan and therefore it was unnecessary to conduct similar waste projection modelling for LACW in the Plan. In addition, it would be counterproductive to utilise LACW projections in the Plan which differ from those utilised by the YNYWP, as this could result in inconsistency between the Authorities dual roles as Waste Disposal Authority and Waste Planning Authority. Therefore, it is considered justified to adopt this approach in the Plan.

90. Have the most appropriate scenarios been taken forward in MWJP Table 7 (Practice scenarios)?

Yes. The 'Meeting future waste management needs' section of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* provides details of the growth and waste management scenarios selected on which to base projected waste management capacity gaps throughout the Plan period and are considered to be a robust, and the most appropriate, approach.

As detailed in answer to Q.89, the LACW projected waste arisings are in line with projections used by the York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership, which have been used to inform the procurement of the AWRP facility. The AWRP facility has been designed to accommodate expected growth in arisings of residual LACW over the period to 2040 and is also expected to be able to provide some capacity for C&I waste over the plan period. The AWRP facility will enable targets agreed under the current *Municipal Waste Management Strategy for York and North Yorkshire (2006) (WEB13)* to be met.

Projections for other relevant waste streams are based on the 'growth' scenario modelled in the *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements report (October 2013) (WEB06)* and subsequent updates referred to above. This represents the highest assumed growth rate of the various scenarios considered in the report, in order to help ensure that adequate capacity is planned for.

Table 7 'practice scenarios' on page 119 of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* provides an overview of the waste management scenarios selected for Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW), Commercial & Industrial (C&I) waste and Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) waste.

As detailed above the LACW projected waste management scenario reflects the current approach by the York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership and the implementation of the AWRP facility.

With regard to C&I waste, projections reflect the 'alternative median' recycling and recovery scenario which is considered to represent a realistic target in terms of recycling performance, which is in line with the current EU 'circular economy' target, whilst reflecting the existence of significant permitted energy recovery capacity in the Plan area.

With regard to CD&E waste projections, the selected waste management scenarios provide a challenging maximum recycling scenario for CD&E waste, recognising the potential for more sustainable management of this waste stream, whilst also reflecting the need to consider requirements for landfill if high rates of recycling are not achieved. Paragraph 6.44 of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* provides further detail with regard to this matter, specifying that the projected capacity gap for recycling of CD&E waste is based on the 'maximised' recycling scenario, whereas the projected capacity gap for landfilling of CD&E waste is presented on the basis of the 'alternative median' scenario. This approach ensures that a high rate of recycling is supported, whilst reflecting a potential need for additional landfill capacity if a 75% recycling rate is not achieved.

91. Two recycling scenarios are shown in Table 7 for Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) waste presumably leading to different requirement figures for managing/treating this waste stream. However, MWJP Table 8 (Projected capacity gaps/surplus) does not indicate any variation the in gap/surplus for CD&E. Explain.

As detailed in response to Q.90, CD&E waste projections, are based upon the 'maximised recycling scenario' for recycling and treatment of CD&E waste whilst the landfill of CD&E waste is based upon the 'Alternative median recycling scenario'. Table 8 in the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* (page 120) provides separate waste management method requirements for 'Recycling (CD&E)' and 'Landfill (CD&E)'. Therefore, variation in the projected capacity gap/surplus for these waste management methods is not required.

The 'comment' column of table 7 in the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* (page 119) provides explanation of this approach, where it states that this provides a challenging maximum recycling scenario for CD&E waste, recognising the potential for more sustainable management of this waste stream, whilst also reflecting the need to consider requirements for landfill if high rates of recycling are not achieved. Paragraph 6.44 of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)* provides further detail with regard to this matter, specifying that the projected capacity gap for recycling of CD&E waste is based on the 'maximised' recycling scenario, whereas the projected capacity gap for landfilling of CD&E waste is presented on the basis of the 'alternative median' scenario. This approach ensures that a high rate of recycling is supported, whilst reflecting a potential need for additional landfill capacity if a 75% recycling rate is not achieved.

92. Are transfer stations included in Table 8? If so, under what heading and if not, why not?

Transfer stations, which function purely for the transfer of waste, are not shown within capacity requirements in Table 8, as these are considered to be an interim waste management route which does not provide a solution to managing waste up the waste hierarchy. The *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements update report (September 2016) (WEB03)* identified that

there was around 700,000 tonnes of capacity in transfer capacity managing all waste streams in the Plan area and there was no identified shortfall in capacity over the Plan period.

A detailed analysis of transfer stations was undertaken as part of the Update Report *(WEB03)* which is provided in Appendix 5 of that document. This work looked at the function that transfer stations in the Plan area carried out locally and identified 21 sites which were also noted to undertake recycling. The recycling function of these sites is therefore picked up in the 'Recycling (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)' and 'Recycling (CD&E)' waste management methods in Table 8.

93. Have the waste arisings forecasts taken account of housing and employment growth and other waste producing activities?

As detailed in response to Q.89, the LACW projections have been based on work undertaken by YNYWP. The methodology used to calculate future requirements for LACW incorporates housing growth and also includes a review of economic factors which affect future waste arisings.

As detailed in response to Q.88 Section 4 of the *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements update report (September 2016) (WEB03)* discusses the Growth Scenarios that were developed for the purposes of modelling waste needs in the Plan area which were applied to C&I and CD&E waste streams. The three Growth Scenarios (no growth, growth and minimised growth) seek to reflect future economic activity, using historic trends and projections on Gross Value Added (GVA) outcomes and fiscal/financial/legislative factors which are likely to have an impact upon the growth of waste during the plan period.

The Growth Scenarios also utilise the Yorkshire Regional Econometric Model, which uses recent employment growth rates in specific industry sectors as a basis for projecting future sector specific employment growth rates. This data source has informed the rates of growth chosen for the projections waste arisings. Further detail of this approach is set out in the *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements - addendum report (May 2015) (WEB04).*

The use of 33% of estimated GVA growth projections, which is approximately 0.8% per annum, is based on an analysis of historic trends for growth in industrial, commercial waste and construction, demolition and excavation wastes. Similar data sources have been utilised by other Waste Planning Authorities and it is considered these provide sufficient sensitivity testing and a reasonable data source on which to base scenarios for the purpose of modelling projections of waste growth.

94. For clarity, consistency and effectiveness, should MWJP Table 4 (estimate of main waste arisings) state in the "Comment" column that the CD&E waste arisings exclude waste covered by Environment Agency permit exemptions?

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.

95. Is the planned provision of new capacity based on robust analysis of best available data and information, and an appraisal of options?

Yes. The planned provision of new waste management capacity detailed in the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)*, utilises the most appropriate and up-to-date sources at the time of production. Evidence sources, such as the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator, Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator, information sourced from planning permissions and direct correspondence with waste operators, were utilised when producing the *North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements update report (September 2016) (WEB03).* The evidence was robustly analysed, details of which are set out in *The North Yorkshire sub-region waste arisings and capacity requirements report (October 2013) (WEB06)* and subsequent updates (WEB05, WEB04 and WEB03).

To support the development of the waste arisings and capacity requirements reports, information was collected on existing waste sites in the Plan area and compiled to produce a waste capacity database. This database includes information on all operational and planned (i.e. permitted but not yet implemented) waste management facilities in the Plan area, including details of their waste management capacity, the waste streams managed and any end/start dates as applicable. The use of this database within the waste modelling work allows for the model to assess how much waste is being produced and how the Plan is seeking to manage it, i.e. recycling, treatment, recovery and matches this with the available capacity. The model will identify if there is sufficient capacity, surplus capacity or insufficient capacity for the intended management route. As the model contains data on when any changes in capacity will occur, it is able to assist in identifying when new capacity is required to come on stream.

As detailed in response to Q. 88 & 90 above, it is considered the resulting growth and waste management scenarios developed through the robust analysis of the best available evidence sources provides an appropriate range of potential future outcomes for waste management throughout the plan period. The resultant appraisal of options and selection of the most appropriate approach, reasons for which are detailed above and in the 'Meeting future waste management needs' section of the *Publication Draft Plan (CD17)*, is considered to be robust.

Prepared by;

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

Appendix

Matters, Issues & Questions:
Matter 2: Waste – Meeting Waste Management Needs

Question 88 - 95

Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and <u>underlining</u> 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
Q94	109	Table 4	Addition to the 'comment' column within the 'Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste' row: <u>Excludes waste managed at EA Registered Exemption sites.</u>