



Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

York, North York Moors and North Yorkshire County Council Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Working Group Meeting Agenda

Monday 6^h July 2015, 10am

Room 59, County Hall, Northallerton

1. Appointment of a Chair
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Agree minutes of meeting held on 24th March 2015.
4. Discussion on Draft Waste Polices
5. Discussion of Preferred Sites for Minerals and Waste Development
6. Duty to Co-operate (verbal update)
7. Date for Next Meeting
8. Any Other Business

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, Planning Services, North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall,
Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AH Tel: **0845 8727374** Email: mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk

City of York
Council

North York Moors
National Park Authority

North Yorkshire
County Council

Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Working Group Meeting

Notes of Meeting held at County Hall 6th July 2015

Present

David Hugill	North York Moors National Park Authority
Alison Fisher	North York Moors National Park Authority
Cllr Robert Packham	North Yorkshire County Council
Cllr Chris Metcalfe	North Yorkshire County Council
Cllr Ann Reid	City of York Council
Cllr Tony Richardson	City of York Council

In attendance

Rob Smith	North Yorkshire County Council
Vicky Perkin	North Yorkshire County Council
Rachel Pillar	North Yorkshire Country Council
Caroline Skelly	North York Moors National Park Authority
Rebecca Harrison	City of York Council

1. **Appointment of Chair**

Cllr Chris Metcalfe was appointed as Chair for the meeting

Introductions were made

2. **Apologies for absence**

All present

3. **Agree Minutes of last meeting**

The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record subject to correction of spelling error under the vision and objectives subheading.

4. **Progress of the Plan to Date**

Caroline Skelly gave a brief verbal update on the preparation of the plan to date.

5. **Discussion on Draft Waste Policies**

Rob Smith gave a brief overview on the waste policies, which included an outline of National Policy principles. The main point to note was that the policies at this stage are still in draft as some evidence is yet to be finalised, although the principles are expected to remain the same. Rob outlined the waste hierarchy which is fundamental to waste management. Planning Authorities have a role in a range of waste stream activities, however role is limited in terms of waste minimisation.

Moving waste up the hierarchy - Policy WO1

Rob Smith confirmed that there is unlikely to be a need for any new energy recovery capacity as long as recent permissions are implemented. However there may be a need for landfill capacity particularly with regard to extending the time of existing permissions. Further capacity for recycling is also likely to be needed. The Plan is limited in its ability to address waste minimisation.

Cllr Richardson asked how businesses fit in with this? How are the authorities able to encourage repair of domestic appliances rather than replacement?

Rob Smith clarified that although this point is clearly important the Planning Authorities only have a role in the use and development of land rather than waste reduction. Where development is proposed development can seek to minimise waste generation through the design and materials used. This is covered in the development management chapter of the Plan.

Cllr Metcalfe queried whether paragraph 2 meant that if further capacity or large scale waste facilities were identified that they would only be supported if waste heat could be generated?

Rob Smith confirmed that national policy currently seeks this approach. The case for new facilities will be less strong where waste heat cannot be developed.

Cllr Metcalfe pointed out that Allerton Park had capacity for the generation of waste heat however there is no market for this. This is particularly the case where sites are located in rural locations, which due to their nature they are more likely to be.

Cllr Reid asked why further facilities would be required if Allerton Park is expected to deal with all waste arisings from the plan area, does this mean that if a new facility comes forward it would be dealing with imported waste?

Rob Smith indicated that capacity may also be required to deal with commercial and industrial waste. Importation from outside the Plan area may not be an appropriate approach however it does not conflict with the requirements of national policy.

Alison Fisher suggested that word “will” is shifted further up the sentence to make this clearer.

Cllr Metcalfe referred to cases in the south of the plan area where there were significant traffic movements resulting from waste movements which was to the detriment of local communities. It is not clear what future requirements will be and therefore the policy needs to be more flexible in order to support the principle of development in locations where use of heat cannot be delivered.

Cllr Packham pointed out need to be wary about having too much capacity so that sites with permission become uneconomical.

Action Point – revise policy to be more flexible.

Strategic Role of the Plan Area – WO2

Rob Smith gave a brief outline of the need to achieve “net self-sufficiency”. There is limited data about some types of waste and difficulties in anticipating future

requirements. Therefore the approach has been to plan for the total scale of waste arisings in the Plan area regardless of known imports and exports. Evidence suggests other neighbouring authorities are following a similar approach. Outlined relationships with Redcar and Cleveland and Yorkshire Dales even though they are not within the plan area, it is important to work closely through Duty to Co-operate.

Cllr Metcalfe asked what the fall-back position would be if waste development needed to go to a sensitive area?

Rob Smith clarified that all the policies including the Development Management policies would need to be considered in full when considering new proposals. The purpose of allocating sites is to provide a clearer steer for developers and identify key constraints early in the planning process.

Meeting Future Needs

Rob Smith gave an overview on the assumptions which have been made in terms of future development which has been supported through the work of consultants to identify if there are any gaps. Figure of 75% recycling are a step up from current practice for C&I and CD&E waste so these assumptions will be taken forward.

Cllr Richardson queried whether this included contaminated soil and Rob Smith confirmed that consultants have made allowances for hazardous waste in their figures.

Local Authority Collected Waste – Policy W03

Rob Smith confirmed that following commissioning of the AWRP facility landfill diversion and recycling targets in the partnership area should be met. However, this doesn't mean to say that provision of some further infrastructure may not be appropriate, for example in order to provide an adequate geographical network. An additional waste transfer station for the Selby area may be required as a known example.

Cllr Packham raised concerns about improvements to the household waste recycling centre network and sought clarity on the wording and interpretation of the policy. Rob Smith indicated that the intention was to support the principle of improvements to the network but this may not mean provision of additional overall capacity. The wording was intended to provide flexibility within an overall context of support for the network of HWRCs.

Cllr Metcalfe pointed out that the policy needed to comply with national requirements to meet capacity requirements however wording needs to be less stringent to account for different circumstances.

Action Point – Review text in light of these comments

Commercial and Industrial Waste - Policy W04

The policy sets out where there are predicted capacity gaps and how they will be addressed. Although there is no specific capacity gap for waste transfer stations these are important facilities in the overall network and it may be likely that more of these proposals come forward to ensure an adequate geographic coverage.

Cllr Reid raised concerns about the reference to export for landfill in the draft policy.

Rob Smith clarified that this was necessary to reflect the fact that although there are sufficient planning permissions to meet capacity for landfill of C&I waste some is at sites with temporary planning permissions and it is not yet known whether proposals for extensions of time will come forward (although the policy supports this). There may be difficulty in identifying new sites due to pollution control issues.

Action Point – Further text to be added as justification to export reference

Cllr Metcalfe questioned the use of terms such as ‘appropriate’ and whether there was too much scope for interpretation.

Action Point – Officers to review wording.

Agricultural Waste – Policy W06

Rob Smith outlined the policy and pointed out that the evidence suggested that a high proportion of the waste is managed on the farm where it is produced. Any new proposals would need to be appropriate in scale and there may be options for hub facilities as long as they are well located.

David Hugill questioned policies for anaerobic digestion but Rob Smith clarified that national policy supported this form of waste management and it is appropriate for the Plan to support it in the right locations. A number of proposals for this form of development have been coming forward recently.

Locational Principles – Policy W10

Rob Smith outlined that the policy aims to restrict new development proposals in the National Parks and AONB’s

Cllr Hugill raised concern about whether the major development test would provide sufficient protection for the National Park.

Caroline Skelly clarified that there may be cases where proposals could be compatible with National Park purposes, however where proposals are considered to be major development National Policy states that they must be considered in accordance with the major development test.

Cllr Metcalfe asked if the word “unacceptable” could be clarified further.

Action Point – Officers indicated that they would review the text to see if greater clarity could be provided.

Cllr Packham raised the question about adding the greenbelt into this policy. However Rob Smith clarified that there was clear national guidance that some waste facilities were considered compatible with greenbelt policies And this is reflected in the approach to Green Belt in the development management chapter of the Plan, as discussed at a previous meeting.

Site identification principles – Policy W11

Cllr Metcalfe raised concerns about whether the policy was sufficiently flexible should technology change. Vicky Perkin highlighted the fact the plan needed to be under constant review.

6. Discussion of Preferred Sites for Minerals and Waste Development

Rob Smith introduced the item and outlined how the sites have been assessed.

Cllr Metcalfe raised concerns in relation to site MJP23 and what would happen if area was mined all around.

David Hugill queried the absence of disused sandstone quarries. Rob Smith clarified that these will be protected through safeguarding policies.

7. Duty to Cooperate

Rob Smith confirmed that the Local Aggregate Assessment for the North Yorkshire Sub Region had been submitted. A report is to be taken to the LCR portfolio holders board considering connectivity between North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire in terms of aggregates supply and this was a positive step. Discussions have also taken place with the Tees Valley Authorities.

8. Date of next meet

Date to be agreed following consultation on Preferred Options but will be held at City of York Council Offices

9. AOB

None