

North Yorkshire Minerals & Waste Joint Local Plan

Examination in Public – Hearings Statement by W Clifford Watts

Matter 2: Waste

Issue: Whether the vision, objectives and strategic waste policies seek to manage waste sustainably and provide sufficient and appropriate waste management capacity in appropriate locations.

Meeting the Requirements for CD&E 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?

W Clifford Watts Statement

1. By way of introduction the company decided to present the site at Whitewall as an allocation even though it benefits from an existing consent, because it represents a doubling of capacity from 10,000 tpa to 20,000 tpa. However, the view could be taken that since the principle of development has already been established there is no need to do this.
2. The question is split into two parts; is there a need for further capacity, and are the reasons for discounting the site justified?
3. In terms of need, the company was surprised to see that the site was not listed in the background evidence for the plan as an existing site. This could mean that the overall capacity gap identified by the plan for CD&E waste recycling is much smaller than represented, but even if that were the case, the company would only have to show a need for an additional 10,000 tpa capacity for the proposal to be justified.
4. In the context of CD&E waste paragraph 6.70 of the plan states *"...the Waste Arisings and Capacity Assessment (2016) identifies an expected capacity gap for recycling under all scenarios considered, up to a maximum of approximately 470,000 tonnes per annum in the highest case scenario, based on available capacity for managing CD&E waste only. Recycling of CD&E waste tends to be more economically viable at localised facilities due to the costs of transporting lower value, higher density wastes."*

5. Moreover, paragraph 6.75 states, *“Where sites considered suitable in principle for recycling of CD&E waste have been proposed for consideration, these are allocated in the Plan to provide further opportunities for the delivery of additional capacity. The combined capacity in these allocations would significantly reduce the projected capacity gap.”* Therefore, even with these allocations there would remain a capacity gap.
6. The company submits that the size of the capacity gap, and the general suitability of a location such as a working quarry, fully justifies the modest proposal to increase the throughput at the site by 10,000 tpa. In addition, the suitability of the site for recycling has already been established through the existing operation. The company finds that its existing facility is overstretched and there is a clear need to increase capacity since we are turning work away. We only accept clean construction and demolition waste in the site and produce very little residue which is taken off site for disposal.
7. About half of the input comes from development projects within Malton and Norton which we remind the inquiry is planned to accommodate half of the development needs of the district. The rest comes from other towns in the area plus Scarborough. As such, half of the arisings must by necessity travel through Malton and Norton as the source area, if not to Whitewall then to some other facility.
8. Our submissions emphasised that the summary document was wrong and that the traffic associated with the proposal was exaggerated by an order of magnitude. The traffic consultants correctly determined that the material is being backhauled into the site and extra traffic would be would only be 40 tonnes a day, or two loads on average. This is so small as to be almost *de minimis* and we were surprised by the objection to it on traffic grounds. We do not intend to repeat the traffic arguments in favour of an allocation at this site but would refer the inquiry to our statement on Crushed Rock.
9. The activity is highly sustainable in that we manufacture an MOT Type 1 material from the waste, which not only uses waste most efficiently but also if it were not produced here, would have to be substituted with virgin mineral imported from long distances of up to 70 km away, as there are no local sources of MOT Type 1. The only other recycling site listed in the Plan locally is at Newbridge Quarry which we understand no longer takes in waste to

recycle. Even so, if any recycling did take place any imports and product must traffic through the centre of Pickering so there is no benefit in directing this activity elsewhere.

10. We also rehearsed the other potential environmental issues in our submission, which we showed were not an impediment to consent plus the compliance with policy of the proposals and therefore we ask for an allocation for the site as proposed. Accordingly, we seek the following changes to part 2 of Policy W05 (deletions in ~~strike through~~; new text in **bold**)

2) Provision of capacity for management of CD&E waste is also supported through site allocations for:

i) Allocations for recycling of CD&E waste:

Land at Potgate Quarry, North Stainley (WJP24)

Land at Allerton Park, near Knaresborough (WJP08)

Land at Darrington Quarry, Darrington (MJP27)

Land at Barnsdale Bar, Kirk Smeaton (MJP26)

Land at Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton (WJP10)

Land at Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (WJP05)

Land at Whitewall Quarry, Norton on Derwent (MJP13)