

WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
MINERALS AND WASTE
DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

WASTE CORE STRATEGY:

MOVING TOWARDS THE IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED OPTIONS



September 2005



worcestershire
countycouncil

For Consultation

**Preparing the waste core strategy for Worcestershire:
Moving toward the identification of preferred options**

September 2005

এই দলিলটি বুঝতে আপনার সাহায্যের দরকার হলে দয়া করে এই নম্বরে ফোন করুন: 01905 25121

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز سے متعلق مدد درکار ہو تو براہ مہربانی 01905 25121 پر فون کریں۔

如果你在明白這份文件方面需要幫助的話，請致電 01905 25121。

ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਬਾਰੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਨੰਬਰ 01905 25121 'ਤੇ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Se con questo documento avete bisogno di aiuto pregasi telefonare a 01905 25121

Jeżeli potrzebujesz pomocy w zrozumieniu tego dokumentu, zadzwoń pod nr tel.: 01905 25121

CONTENTS PAGE

1. Introduction
2. Issues raised through the Evidence Gathering Stage
3. Moving Towards the Identification of Preferred Options
4. Vision and Objectives of the Waste Core Strategy
5. How and When to make your Views Known

Annex A Issues and Options Table

Annex B Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE PROCESS OF PRODUCING A WASTE CORE STRATEGY AND PROGRESS TO DATE

Worcestershire County Council is committed to producing a waste core strategy to provide the framework required to enable the sufficient and timely provision of waste facilities in Worcestershire, ensuring that national targets can be met within the County. The waste core strategy should

'...set out a planning strategy for sustainable waste management which enables adequate provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations.' ⁽¹⁾

Furthermore, there has been a shift in the emphasis of planning policy documents. Instead of only being focussed on land use concerns, the government is looking for local authorities to adopt a spatial planning approach to ensure the most efficient use of land by balancing competing demands within the context of sustainable development. This will include policies that can impact on land use, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting of planning permission. An example specific to waste management would be the drafting of a policy to promote waste minimisation. If successful, this policy might reduce the need for additional facilities, as less waste was being produced that would require management.

The policies prepared by Worcestershire County Council should be founded on a thorough understanding of the needs of their area and the opportunities and constraints which operate within that area. As such, the first task undertaken in preparing the waste core strategy has been to gather evidence about the County, and its residents' aspirations for waste management. This task has been completed and is summarised below.

1.1.1 Evidence Gathering

Key stakeholders and residents of Worcestershire have been involved in preparation of the waste core strategy from the beginning, the evidence gathering stage. A series of workshops held at locations throughout the County, as well as postal and web based surveys were undertaken in the autumn of 2004. A report documenting the work undertaken and received comments can be viewed at <http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/strategicplanning>. Through this early engagement, the County Council has been made aware of what are considered to be the key issues for waste management and options for dealing with those issues.

Most of the issues raised are common throughout discussions of waste management, including the waste hierarchy, the proximity principle and net self-sufficiency. Several other issues were also identified as important to residents in Worcestershire, including education and public awareness raising on waste matters, and packaging. Whilst the issues were considered important there was not always agreement regarding the options available to deal with those issues.

The next step in the process is to move forward from the evidence gathering stage by considering the issues that have been raised and seeking views on the options for dealing with them.

(1) Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks. Paragraph 2.11/ii. ODPM. September 2004.

1.1.2 Consideration of Options

This report builds directly upon previous work, having been informed by the comments received through the evidence gathering. *Section 2* discusses the issues and options raised through evidence gathering, and identifies areas of conflict and agreement. It is important to note however, that the waste core strategy must be in compliance with the regional spatial strategy and national policy, including the recently published Planning Policy Statement 10: Sustainable Waste Management (PPS 10) and revised Waste Strategy 2000 (revisions published July 2005). Reference to these policy documents often resolves conflict where it has arisen in regard to issues and options, and ensures that the core strategy is produced in compliance with these policy statements.

A key requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is that the core strategy must be subjected to sustainability appraisal (SA). SA is a systematic and iterative appraisal process that incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.⁽²⁾ The main purpose of SA is to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects of plan strategies and policies, from the outset of the preparation process, so that decisions can be made that accord with the objectives of sustainable development. The SA has been used to assess the sustainability implications of each of the options. This, in turn, gives direction on what should be the preferred options for dealing with waste management in Worcestershire. A summary of the SA process and the work undertaken to date is given at *Section 3*, along with a discussion of the options.

The aim of public participation at this stage is to give you the opportunity to comment on how the Council is approaching the preparation of the waste core strategy and to ensure that we are aware of all the possible options. The Council will then develop preferred options for further consultation next year (April/May 2006).

The consultation period runs from 19 September to 28 October 2005. Please refer to *Section 5* to find out how to get involved.

1.2 CONTEXT DOCUMENTS

The recent revisions to *Waste Strategy 2000* and the publication of PPS10 make alterations to the waste management policy context since the evidence gathering undertaken in the autumn of 2004. These include removal of the concept of BPEO, and changes to the way in which self-sufficiency and proximity are employed. BPEO is replaced with Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for both regional spatial strategy and local development plan documents such as the waste core strategy. Self-sufficiency and the proximity principle have been replaced with a new objective and broader consideration of disposing of waste at the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies. PPS 10 also increases the focus on the waste hierarchy to provide the overarching framework for waste management.

Other context documents that have been referred to include:

- Worcestershire County Structure Plan 1996 – 2011;
- Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Herefordshire & Worcestershire 2004 – 2034;
- Partnership Towards Excellence - A Community Strategy for Worcestershire 2003 – 2013 and

(2) European Union Directive 2001/42/EC.

- BPEO Assessment of MSW, C&I and C&D, adopted by Cabinet July 2003.

Regional Planning Guidance 11 (RPG 11) was adopted in June 2004 and is the regional spatial strategy for the West Midlands. The waste core strategy must comply with the policy and objectives of the regional spatial strategy, as it is now a statutory document forming part of the development plan. RPG 11 establishes that national targets for the diversion of waste from landfill will apply at the Regional level. A partial review of the waste strategy within RPG 11 will be undertaken later this year, which will be informed by research to understand the existing capacity of waste facilities within the region and to estimate future requirements.

A new purpose of the regional spatial strategy is to apportion the tonnage of wastes required to be managed by each waste planning authority within the Region. This applies only to municipal solid waste (MSW) and commercial and industrial (C&I) waste. The apportionment should be expressed in annual rates, but these may vary over the plan period. The rates are not intended to be a detailed forecast but to provide a benchmark for the preparation of local development documents. Essentially, the review of RPG 11 should comprise a distribution of waste tonnage requiring management and a pattern of waste management facilities of national, regional or sub-regional significance.

PPS 10 expects the adopted regional spatial strategy to be carried forward into local development documents. Consequently, in preparing the waste core strategy, there will not be a need to reopen consideration of either the principles of the policy or the annual rates of waste to be managed.

1.3 HOW MUCH WASTE IS PRODUCED IN WORCESTERSHIRE?

1.3.1 Municipal Solid Waste ⁽³⁾

318 614 tonnes of MSW were generated within Worcestershire during 2003/04, which comprised of waste:

- collected by your local district rubbish collection service;
- taken to household waste sites;
- taken to district council bring recycling schemes; and
- collected by third party bring and recycling schemes.

The District Councils are responsible for collecting waste from householders, and sometimes businesses. The County Council is responsible for treating and disposing of that waste once it has been collected, but also for providing civic amenity sites to deal with larger items of household rubbish.

About two-thirds of the MSW is collected by the District Councils as part of their rubbish collection service to households.

Table 1.1 below shows how much waste is collected this way by each of the districts within Worcestershire.

(3) Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Herefordshire and Worcestershire 2004 - 2034. October 2004.

Table 1.1 Tonnages collected within each District

District	Tonnes of MSW Collected during 2003/04 (tonnes)
Bromsgrove	31 085
Malvern Hills	23 016
Redditch	33 133
Worcester City	34 227
Wychavon	42 906
Wyre Forest	37 728
Total	202 905

1.3.2 Commercial & Industrial and Construction & Demolition Wastes

The most recent assessment of C&I and C&D waste tonnages dates from 1998/99. These tell us that 810 000 tonnes of C&I waste⁽⁴⁾ and 640 000 tonnes of C&D waste were produced in Worcestershire that year.⁽⁵⁾

Unfortunately, we do not know how much of each of these wastes were generated in each district/borough. This is because C&I and C&D wastes are generally managed through private contracts and therefore the Councils do not have records of wastes collected or disposed.

(4) Worcestershire County Structure Plan 1996 - 2011. Adopted June 2001.

(5) Strategic Waste Management Assessment (SWMA) report. Environment Agency, October 2000

2 ISSUES RAISED THROUGH THE EVIDENCE GATHERING STAGE

2.1 WHICH WASTES SHOULD THE CORE STRATEGY BE RELEVANT TO?

One of the issues raised at the workshops was in regard to the type of waste that should be managed through the core strategy. Many people focussed on household and municipal waste, whilst some comments were received to the effect that C&I and C&D waste does not need to be covered as it is already controlled by other legislation. However, Government direction requires that the core strategy must provide a framework for the effective and sustainable management of all waste streams, including:

- municipal solid waste (MSW);
- commercial and industrial waste (C&I);
- construction and demolition waste (C&D);
- agricultural waste; and
- hazardous waste.

2.1.1 The Waste Hierarchy

The waste hierarchy is an abstract framework that prioritises the options for waste management. The hierarchy represents a sliding scale starting with the preferred option (reduction) and ending with the least sustainable option (disposal).

Implementation of the waste hierarchy is promoted through national and regional policy and is supported at the local level. A key planning objective from PPS 10 is to *'help deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy, treating waste as a resource and looking to disposal as the last option, but one which must be adequately catered for.'* The community engagement undertaken so far has raised a range of ideas and concerns in regard to implementing the waste hierarchy within Worcestershire.

Table A1 in Annex A outlines the options for implementing the waste hierarchy raised through the evidence gathering phase and discusses how these might be used to inform development of the core strategy.

2.1.2 Self-Sufficiency in Managing Waste

Whilst self-sufficiency is a principle that the core strategy could seek to implement, it does not mean that Worcestershire should be considered in geographic isolation; this was a concern expressed in consultation responses. The term *net* county self-sufficiency allows for both exports and imports. The principle of self-sufficiency was promoted in previous national policy⁽⁶⁾ to encourage responsibility for waste within the locality that it is produced. Early consultation indicated strong support for this principle.

The recently adopted PPS 10 does not refer directly to 'self-sufficiency'. Instead, it expects all planning authorities to prepare and deliver planning strategies that *'provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities'* to the extent appropriate to their responsibility.

(6) Planning Policy Guidance Note 10: Waste Management, 1999. Now superseded by PPS 10: Sustainable Waste Management, 2005.

Some concern was raised about the potential for future over-capacity in facilities that were intended only to accept waste having arisen in the County, rather than in the whole Region. Hence, there was strong support for regional waste facilities, which were thought to be defeated by the concept of net county self-sufficiency. The role for regional facilities is recognised and they are particularly relevant for managing specific waste streams such as hazardous waste.

Currently, the regional spatial strategy makes it the responsibility of each County within the West Midlands Region to contribute to regional self-sufficiency by being net self-sufficient themselves in managing waste (RPG 11, policy WD2). This does not necessarily mean Worcestershire dealing with *all* of its own waste. Net self-sufficiency occurs where the County deals with a quantity of waste which is equivalent to the amount generated within its boundaries; rather than managing all, or only, the waste generated within its boundaries.

The forthcoming review of RPG 11 is expected to include an apportionment of the tonnage of MSW and C&I wastes that should be managed within Worcestershire. Development of the core strategy will be informed by this review, as it must be in conformity with the regional spatial strategy.

2.1.3 Proximity Principle

Reference to the proximity principle has been removed from PPS 10. The financial and environmental effects of transporting waste, including the mode of transport to be used, are still important aspects of a waste management facility; but these should be considered alongside other material considerations and focussed on disposal facilities rather than those offering recovery of waste. The key planning objective from PPS 10 requires a planning strategy that '*enable[s] waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations.*'

Table A2 in Annex A outlines the options for implementing the proximity principle raised through the evidence gathering phase and discusses how these might be used to inform development of the core strategy, taking on board the key planning objectives of PPS 10.

2.1.4 Provision of Additional Waste Treatment Facilities

Guidance from Central Government states that the core strategy cannot be site specific – instead it provides key policies to guide new development proposals. This will include a series of criteria against which any particular proposal would be assessed, and which consider the suitability of the proposed location, case-by-case as applications are received.

The adopted BPEO strategy for Worcestershire establishes the broad mix of technologies for managing waste within Worcestershire and has identified that additional facilities will be required. The adopted BPEO strategy has been effective in providing a framework within which to assess planning applications for waste management facilities. The recent revisions to *Waste Strategy 2000* and the publication of PPS 10 have removed the concept of BPEO, replacing it with a combination of SA and SEA for regional spatial strategy and local development frameworks for waste, and SEA, together with some form of wider options appraisal, for municipal waste management strategies. Nevertheless, the adopted BPEO strategy remains a valid document in preparation of the waste core strategy for Worcestershire. As such, it has been assessed through the SA in order to understand the sustainability implications of implementing the adopted BPEO strategy. (Section 3 following).

The West Midlands Regional Assembly has produced reports outlining current waste management capacity and forecasting future requirements for each authority within the Region. This is expected to be further developed through the forthcoming review of RPG 11. It is also important to note that it is common for MSW and C&I waste to be treated in the same facility. Therefore, in practice the number of facilities indicated might actually require location on a lesser number of sites. The co-location of waste management facilities together and with complementary activities is promoted in PPS 10.

Table A3 in *Annex A* outlines some of the key options for providing additional waste management facilities raised through the evidence gathering phase and discusses how these might be used to inform development of the core strategy.

3 MOVING TOWARD THE IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED OPTIONS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 2 and Annex A outline the key issues and options that were raised through the evidence gathering stage. They identify those issues for which the options are very limited or even non-negotiable (for example that the core strategy must be relevant to all waste types) and those for which options are quite wide ranging (for example centralised or dispersed facilities). Where a number of reasonable options have been identified these have been taken through the Sustainability Appraisal to demonstrate the likely sustainability implications of the options.

This section discusses those options and the preliminary conclusions that have been drawn from the SA to give direction to the proposed preferred options. The full SA report is titled Sustainability Appraisal of Waste Core Strategy: Issues and Options and can be viewed at <http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/strategicplanning> Section 4, following, presents a draft vision and initial strategy objectives for the core strategy. These have been prepared on the basis of the issues raised at the evidence gathering stage, and the SA of those issues where options existed on how to move forward.

It is these preliminary conclusions and proposed vision & objectives that we are now seeking your views upon.

Your opinions will inform the County Council in concluding on what will be its preferred options for the waste core strategy. In turn, the core strategy vision, objectives and preferred options will inform the drafting of core strategy policies.

3.2 ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Four key issues where different options exist on how to move forward have been identified. These relate to the location of facilities in the Green Belt; location within urban or rural areas; the size of any facilities; and whether locations should be centralised or dispersed. The options for each issue subjected to Sustainability Appraisal are set out below. Additionally the adopted BPEO strategy was subjected to Sustainability Appraisal in order to demonstrate the likely sustainability impacts of the strategy:

A) Greenbelt

1. Any new Waste Management Facility is inappropriate (unless exceptional circumstances are justified).
2. New waste development in the greenbelt is appropriate when i) on previously developed land and ii) accordance with the objectives of Planning Policy Guidance 2:Green Belts.
3. New waste development is appropriate anywhere when in accordance with the objectives Planning Policy Guidance 2:Green Belts.

B) Urban/Rural

1. Focus is on development in urban locations throughout Worcestershire with justified/minimal development in rural locations.
2. Focus is split evenly between urban and rural development.
3. Focus is on development in rural locations with justified/minimal development in urban locations.

C) Small/Large Facility

1. Primarily large waste management facilities.
2. Even split of large and small waste management facilities.
3. Primarily small waste management facilities.

D) Central/Dispersed

1. Focus on centralising facilities but with dispersed facilities if justified.
2. Even split between central and dispersed facilities.
3. Focus on dispersing facilities but with a county wide/central service facility if justified.

E) BPEO

1. Sustainability impacts of the adopted BPEO strategy.

3.2.1 Preliminary conclusions from the Sustainability Appraisal

A set of sustainability objectives has been developed to help appraise the options for the Waste Core Strategy. By appraising the performance of the options against the sustainability objectives decision makers and the community can gain an appreciation of the sustainability implications prior to selecting a preferred option. Further information on how the sustainability objectives were developed is contained in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report which can be viewed on the Council's website planning pages (see above). The sustainability objectives (highlighted in bold) along with their sub objectives that are specific to waste are listed below in priority order (high priority at the top of the list):

1. Waste

Manage the waste streams in accordance with the waste hierarchy, encouraging reuse and recovery addressing waste as a resource.

1. a) To minimise the production of waste generated.

2. Climate Change

Reduce greenhouse gas contributions.

2. a) Minimise biodegradable waste going to landfill.
2. b) Maximise the opportunities to generate power from methane at landfill sites.

3. Transport

To reduce traffic volumes.

3. a) Ensure the disposal of waste as close to the point of origin as practicable and promote transfer of waste by rail or water transport where appropriate.

4. Growth with prosperity for all

Develop a knowledge-driven economy, the infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all have access to the benefits.

- 4. a) To encourage business development within the waste sector to achieve Government targets for waste
- 4. b) To encourage rural regeneration.

5. Participation by all

To provide opportunities for communities to participate in and contribute to the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods and quality of life.

- 5.a) To provide opportunities for communities to participate in and contribute to waste planning decisions within Worcestershire.

6. Technology, Innovation & inward investment

Promote and support the development of new technologies especially those with high value and low impact.

- 6. a) To make an economic gain from the recovery and treatment of waste streams wherever this is environmentally acceptable.

7. Energy generation and use

To increase the proportion of energy needs met from renewable sources.

- 7. a) In accordance with waste hierarchy support the generation of energy from waste.

8. Natural resources (air, water, soil)

Protect and improve standards of air, water and soil quality ensuring prudent use of natural resources.

- 8. a) Minimise the creation of dust, odour and noise and other pollutants in the vicinity of waste station/facilities.

9. Access to services

To improve the quality of and accessibility to local services and facilities.

- 9. a) To improve accessibility to kerbside recycling and civic amenity sites.

10. Landscape

Safeguard and strengthen landscape character.

- 10. a) Encourage design that reduces visual intrusion and is sensitive to the local vernacular, as defined by the county landscape character assessment and conservation area appraisals.

11. Biodiversity/Flora/Fauna

Seek net gain to biodiversity at all levels.

- 11. a) To assist in meeting Worcestershire Biodiversity Action Plan targets during the lifetime of the Waste Core Strategy.

12. Health

To improve the health and well being of the population and reduce inequalities in health.

- 12. a) To reduce respiratory diseases/allergy related illness.
- 12. b) To limit environmental impacts of waste treatment facilities on the local population including pest species at landfill sites.

13. Provision of housing

Provide housing of the right quantity, type and tenure ensuring affordability for local needs, in a clean, safe and pleasant local environment.

- 13. a) Encourage the use of sustainable buildings technologies in new housing developments in particular the re-use of construction and demolition waste.
- 13. b) Promote the provision of recycling facilities within new housing developments.

14. Population 1 (Learning and skills)

To raise the skills level and qualifications of the workforce.

- 14. a) To encourage engagement in community/environmentally responsible activities.

15. Culture Heritage, Built Design and Archaeology

Conserve and enhance the historic environment and encourage the re-use of existing buildings.

- 15. a) Promote design concepts for new buildings that are informed by the local vernacular. The siting of new waste management facilities should not have a detrimental effect on the setting and in-situ conservation of historic buildings, areas, landscapes or archaeological remains.

16. Material Assets

Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of minerals reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands and land of local amenity value and maximise use of previously developed land.

- 16. a) To support the reuse of construction materials.
- 16. b) To protect land from contamination arising from waste.
- 16. c) To restore landfill sites to amenity purposes.

17. Population 2 (Anti social behaviour, crime, litter and graffiti)

Encourage pride and social responsibility in the local community.

- 17. a) Reduce the number of fly tipping incidents.

The Sustainability Appraisal report provides details of how all the options performed against all these objectives. In many instances it was not possible to identify significant differences between the impact of the options. For others it was possible and for these the **key differences** between the options emerging from the appraisal are set out below. In assessing the possible impacts the likelihood of the impact occurring has been assessed and where appropriate is referred to in the text. A matrix illustrating the conclusions on how the options perform against all criteria is included in **Annex B**.

Issue A. Development in the greenbelt

Transport is a priority objective and the sub objective to treat waste, as close to its point of origin, is best served by options 2 and 3. Option 1 has a negative outcome as the major population areas and thus origins of waste within the County are adjacent to the greenbelt. Exclusion of the greenbelt as advocated by option 1 would therefore potentially increase travel distances for disposal of waste. The other sub objective relating to transfer of waste by rail or water is best

served by option 3 since it does not restrict the site selection for development of water and or rail infrastructure needed to transport waste, whereas options 1 and 2 impose restrictions, although it should be noted that the transfer of waste is not totally restricted by these options.

A neutral effect is anticipated for all options in relation to the priority objective of providing opportunity to participate in waste planning. However option 1 incurs a negative score, as there may be reduced awareness of those living within or near to the greenbelt of consultation activities that are being undertaken.

A similar outcome to that above is likely with the access to services objective whereby limiting development of waste management facilities within the green belt will reduce accessibility to civic amenity sites. Thus option 1 scores a negative response.

Options 2 and 3 offer positive contributions to the objective of reducing fly tipping as they provide facilities within the greenbelt that may counter incidences of fly tipping. Option 1 is classified as being uncertain in its contribution to the objective as locations are not known and could feasibly be found within close proximity to urban areas.

Growth with prosperity for all is a priority objective and is best achieved by options 2 and 3, which encourage business development within the green belt where appropriate. Option 1 however neither encourages nor discourages business development, it simply displaces the location of the enterprise. It is the same for the sub objectives to encourage rural regeneration. A similar outcome arises from the medium priority sub objective of making economic gain from the treatment of waste.

On balance the most sustainable option is: new waste development is appropriate anywhere when in accordance with the objectives of PPG2.

Issue B. Urban and Rural

For the high priority transport sub objective relating to disposal of waste as close to point of origin as practicable, options 1 and 2 are forecast as being significantly positive for sustainability due to their urban location and have a high certainty of the effect occurring. Option 3 in contrast is forecast as having a significantly negative effect on sustainability due to its rural location. The likelihood of it occurring is however medium, as the opportunity could exist to develop rural land in close proximity to urban areas.

The energy generation objective is of medium priority. Option 1 has a significantly positive effect upon the objective due to its market viability within an urban location and potential to connect to the national grid. Options 2 and 3 are also positive but the certainty and magnitude of the effect is less due to the rural components within the options lessening the market viability.

For the medium priority natural resources sub objective options 1 and 2 are forecast over the short and medium term to have a temporary negative effect but it is uncertain whether this effect would be lessened over the long term. Likewise

the effects of option 3 on the objective are uncertain due to low population density within rural areas.

The objective of access to services is ranked of medium priority for sustainable development. Option 2 scores very well for the sub objective, with medium certainty in its forecasting, due to no discrimination in favour of either rural or urban populations. Options 1 and 3 are positive for the populations they serve but do discriminate against those not within those areas.

For the Population 2 objective, which is of low priority, options 1 and 2 score significantly positive with medium to high certainty of this being realised due to the provision of waste management facilities in urban locations. However option 3 scores negatively due to the tendency to lead to an increase in fly tipping should waste management facilities be located at a distance from major centres of population.

On balance the most sustainable option is: Option 1, preference for urban locations with minimal rural locations for waste management facilities which is the option that reflects current practice.

Issue C. Small or/and large facilities

For the priority climate change objective of maximising opportunities to generate power from methane at landfill option 1 scored significantly positive, option 2 positive and option 3 negative. The transport objective is of high priority, but for all options there is uncertainty as to the impact of the sub objective relating to disposal of waste as close to point of origin as there are too many variables to make any prediction with any level of certainty. Regarding the other sub objective of the transfer of waste by rail and water, due to the economies of scale and investment needed, the fulfilment of the objective necessitates large facilities and option 1, with a high level of certainty, is forecast to be significantly positive in achieving the objective. For the same reasons option 2 is unlikely to realise the objective whilst option 3 is very unlikely to achieve this priority sub objective.

Option 1 scored negatively in terms of achieving the sub objective of cultural heritage, as there is increased potential for a large facility to impact on the townscape. However this will inevitably be a matter dependent upon site selection and all waste management facilities should mitigate their impact through appropriate design solutions. Option 2 also has potential to be negative but this is less certain as the option does not state a preference for large or small facilities. Subsequently option 3 in promoting primarily small facilities is less likely to have a negative impact on cultural heritage assets but as before this cannot be said with certainty until the site selection process.

Options 1 and 2 score positively in terms of meeting the objective of seeking the generation of energy from waste where this accords with the waste hierarchy. Option 3 scores negatively as small facilities are less likely to be economically viable in generating energy from waste on a sustainable commercial basis.

On balance the most sustainable option is: Primarily large facilities.

Issue D. Central and or dispersed pattern

Transportation is a priority objective. Option 1, the centralising of facilities, is forecast to have a significant positive contribution towards achieving the objective of transporting waste by rail and water since the cost of installing infrastructure to enable the transportation of waste by rail and water would be more economically viable when facilities are centralised. Option 3 is judged to be significantly negative for the opposing reason with option 2 being uncertain but with potential positive impact if site selection maximises available opportunities for transfer of waste by rail or water.

For the medium priority objective, energy generation from waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy, options 1 and 2 are positive, the former being significantly so on account of the anticipated economic benefits and volumes of waste which could be processed by centralised facilities. Option 3 is viewed as negative as a wider network of facilities would be unlikely to process sufficient volumes of waste at the individual waste management facilities to have viable energy generation.

Participation by all is a high priority objective and will be central throughout the preparation of the Waste Core Strategy. Option 3, promoting the dispersal of facilities, is likely to bring the issue of waste management to the attention of a greater number of persons through the media and consultation events, thus indirectly contributing towards the sub objective of involving communities in waste planning decisions. Accordingly it achieves a positive score. Option 1 by centralising facilities is assigned a negative score on the simple basis that fewer areas in the County would be subject to media coverage and consultation.

Accessibility to kerbside recycling and civic amenity sites is a medium priority objective that is forecast to be significantly achieved by option 3. This is on the basis that dispersal of facilities improves accessibility to civic amenity sites. The centralisation of facilities that is associated with option 1 may mean that those living at distance may be less well served if the transportation costs of kerbside recycling operators were to increase.

Option 3 is significantly positive in realising the sub objective of reducing the number of fly tipping incidents as dispersed facilities mean that there is greater opportunity to access and dispose of waste at near by civic amenity sites. Centralisation, option 1, has the opposite effect resulting in longer journeys and increased likelihood of occurrences of fly tipping.

On balance the most sustainable option is: Focus on centralising of facilities with few dispersed facilities

Issue E: Impact of the adopted BPEO strategy

The BPEO process considered the relative merits of various waste management options, taking into account the conservation of environment across land, air and water, to help identify the best option for the County. Adoption of the BPEO recommended solution has a significantly positive effect on the objectives of waste minimisation, minimising biodegradable waste going to landfill, supporting the reuse of construction materials, supporting the generation of energy from

waste, encouraging business developments within the waste sector and making an economic gain from the recovery and treatment of waste.

On balance the most sustainable option is: Proceeding with the BPEO strategy and principles is preferable to disregarding them.

3.3 ISSUES, OPTIONS AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Key Questions

1. Have all the key issues been identified?
2. Have all reasonable alternatives/options been considered?
3. Has the assessment been reasonable/used reasonable assumptions?
4. Do you have any additional baseline information that you think would be useful to the Council in preparing the waste core strategy or in appraising the performance of the options against the sustainability objectives?

4 VISION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WASTE CORE STRATEGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

A draft vision for waste management in Worcestershire and initial strategic objectives have been drafted based on the conclusions drawn from the work undertaken so far. They have not been adopted by the County Council, nor are they set in stone.

The County Council welcomes your comments on both the draft vision and initial strategic objectives. This is a key opportunity to inform development of the core strategy.

4.2 DRAFT VISION FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT IN WORCESTERSHIRE

4.2.1 Introduction

The principle of sustainable development underpins the vision of the waste core strategy. Within its document 'Securing the Future: Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy', the Government set out its principles for achieving sustainable development, including:⁽⁷⁾

- living within environmental limits;
- ensuring a strong, healthy and just society;
- achieving a sustainable economy;
- promoting good governance; and
- using sound science responsibly.

Planning Policy Statement 1 establishes the key principles for delivering sustainable development through the planning system.⁽⁸⁾ These principles and how they relate to waste planning are reproduced in *Table 4.1* over the page. Whilst tensions are recognised between each, sustainable development is reliant on the successful delivery of them all.

(7) Securing the Future: Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy. Cm 6467. March 2005. www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/publications/uk-strategy/uk-strategy-2005.htm.

(8) Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development. ODPM. 2005.

Table 4.1 Sustainable development principles and relationship to waste planning

Sustainable Development Principle	Relationship to waste planning
Social cohesion and inclusion	Delivery of safe and attractive places to live that are supported by readily accessible services and infrastructure
Protection and enhancement of the environment	Consideration of environmental impacts occurring from new development
Prudent use of natural resources	Recognising waste as a resource that is suitable for use in place of virgin materials
Sustainable economic development	Provision of facilities providing opportunities for growth and employment

Difficult decisions will need to be taken to balance these principles, incorporating the desire to enhance quality of life, today and for future generations.

New facilities are necessary to ensure the sustainable management of the waste we all produce. A vision for waste management within Worcestershire should conform to the regional spatial strategy, providing an overarching framework within which to develop the policies of the waste core strategy.

4.2.2 Proposed Vision Statements

Waste should be recognised as a resource with value

The waste core strategy should focus on the upper tiers of the waste hierarchy. Priority should be given to minimising the amount of waste produced and maximising the potential for the reuse and recycling of materials. Waste should become recognised as a resource with value.

The resource management approach seeks to de-couple economic growth from use of virgin resources and waste production. Waste management should no longer be considered in isolation but as an integral part of the overall life cycle of goods and products. There is a need to shift to an approach where the use and conservation of natural resources, reuse, recycling and recovery of materials are considered together.

Communities within Worcestershire should be responsible for their waste

We all produce waste. Self-sufficiency in dealing with waste means accepting responsibility for its management and ensuring that a range of facilities is provided throughout the County. The waste core strategy should not be

prescriptive about technology or scale of facility. It should be deliberately flexible to deliver an integrated network of waste management services.

Waste development should be integrated with other spatial planning concerns, ensuring it is placed in appropriate locations

Consideration of new facilities should be against a sequence of preferred locations. Wherever possible, waste should be managed on the site of its production; non-waste development proposals should incorporate waste management facilities into their design. This may not always require development (home composting) or it may have limited duration (crushing of hardcore on a construction site). As society moves away from a reliance on landfill, waste management will increasingly be carried out in buildings. These should be suited to development on industrial sites and in urban areas, where they can provide readily accessible services and be close to the source of waste. Opportunities should be explored for co-locating facilities with complementary activities (e.g. resource recovery parks). Where urban areas do not provide appropriate locations, priority should be given to the reuse of previously developed land, and in rural areas, redundant farm buildings and their curtilages, before greenfield sites.

Waste management should be conscious of the environment and human health

Modern, appropriately located, well-run and regulated, waste management facilities should pose little risk to human health. Future development should ensure that individuals, businesses and organisations act upon their environmental responsibilities, acknowledging the County's diverse characteristics and wider environmental, nature conservation, landscape, townscape and historically distinctive features.

As waste management becomes a more urban activity, within Worcestershire there will be strongly competing demands for industrial and urban sites. Some compromises will be necessary in regard to land use designations in order to deliver a sustainable waste management infrastructure. Protection of the Green Belt should continue, but the wider environmental and economic benefits (eg providing necessary infrastructure and reducing transport distances) of sustainable waste management should be material considerations in determining proposals for the development of waste management facilities.

4.3 INITIAL STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

The strategic objectives of the waste core strategy should be:

- Waste minimisation – reducing the amount of waste produced to the lowest possible
- Waste reuse, recycling and recovery – recognising waste as a resource and gaining value from it
- Developing waste markets – enabling waste to gain a value when put to beneficial uses

- Providing waste management capacity – taking responsibility for the waste produced and being self sufficient
- Proximate facilities – seeking to reduce transport impacts and retain local responsibility for waste disposal activities and larger waste management facilities
- Enabling development - through consideration of a sequence of preferred locations that may include the Green Belt
- Diversion of waste from landfill - focussing on using waste as a resource with disposal as a last resort
- Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the countryside, and existing communities
- Managing the effects of new development – ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design
- Integrated decision making – reflecting the concerns and interests of communities, the needs of waste collection authorities, waste disposal authorities and businesses

Delivery of these objectives should be monitored throughout the period of each of the waste development plan documents. A framework for monitoring is to be developed.

4.4 CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT VISION AND INITIAL STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Key questions:

1. Does the draft vision properly reflect the emerging options?
2. Have any matters been missed from the draft vision?
3. Have any matters been missed from the initial strategic objectives?
4. Do the initial strategic objectives provide an appropriate basis for the waste core strategy?
5. Would you like to rewrite, or make additions to, either the draft vision or initial strategic objectives? If so please provide alternative wording.

5 HOW AND WHEN TO MAKE YOUR VIEWS KNOWN

5.1 WORKSHOPS

Three separate workshop sessions have been set up to discuss the conclusions of the SA, the pilot vision and the initial strategic objectives. These are scheduled as follows:

- The Guesten, Worcester, on Tuesday 4 October 2005
- The Northwick, Evesham, on Wednesday 5 October 2005
- The Ladybird Lodge, Bromsgrove, on Thursday 6 October 2005

Invitations to attend a workshop have already been distributed. If you have not received one and wish to attend please contact Rosemary Willmore – telephone number 01905 766723.

5.2 VIEW INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET

We expect that many people will not be able to attend any of the workshops, but will still want to respond to the issues and options raised.

The full paper, as set out above, will be available on Worcestershire County Council's website (www.worcesteshire.gov.uk/strategicplanning). You will be able to go into the website and respond via email to wcs@worcesteshire.gov.uk.

5.3 RESPOND BY LETTER

We realise that many people may not have access to a home computer, or may not wish to respond via the Internet. In this case please write to us with your response to the questions.

All written responses should be made for the attention of Paul Maitland, Planning Manager. A freepost envelope is provided.

5.4 TIMESCALES

The consultation period for this Paper will end on Friday 28 October 2005.

5.5 WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO YOUR COMMENTS?

All of the responses received will be read and considered. The County Council will review the conclusions and assumptions of the SA as necessary. Together these will help the Council develop a Preferred option for the Waste Core Strategy. This will include a vision, strategic objectives. The Preferred Option will then be formally consulted on in April/May 2006.

Annex A

Issues and Options Tables



Table A1 Issues and options relating to the waste hierarchy

Community Engagement Responses	How to implement through core strategy
Minimisation of product packaging	Packaging is largely beyond the scope of the core strategy. National legislation applies to manufacturers and supermarkets.
Waste minimisation is difficult to implement and to measure the effects	Whilst this comment is accepted, this does not diminish need to implement waste hierarchy through core strategy policy. National and regional promotion of waste hierarchy should be complied with.
Encourage reuse and recycling of demolition and construction waste	Use of secondary aggregate also a national, regional & structure plan goal. This should be included in the core strategy.
Incentive, or encouragement for both the public and manufacturers to minimise waste, and increase its reuse and recycling	Policy can encourage minimisation of waste but core strategy unable to require actions of public or manufacturers.
Dovetailing with other social strategies could be a way for the core strategy to address waste minimisation	Core strategy has a wider remit, including a responsibility to implement other strategies/programmes of the County Council, such as the Community Strategy.
Waste recycling should be a key objective and waste minimisation an utmost priority	Core strategy should include policy dedicated to move waste up hierarchy, with a focus on minimisation and recycling.
Enforcement of minimisation strategies	This is largely beyond the remit of core strategy as the responsibility lies with the waste collection authorities. However, core strategy should include a commitment to the waste hierarchy and include a focus on waste minimisation.
Education and awareness raising of both the general public and waste industry professionals	Core strategy should seek implementation of programmes such as those set out in Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy & Community Strategy.
Core strategy should be directional tool toward more sustainable practices	A new purpose of the core strategy is to include spatial policy to implement other strategies such as the Community Strategy. It has a role to play beyond just land use concerns. Core strategy also required to be, and is being, developed alongside SA. Reiteration and integration of SA means sustainable development objectives can be incorporated in policy and core strategy objectives.
Developers should be required to contribute to waste minimisation during the construction of new developments, and to incorporate recycling facilities in new developments	Also a policy issue for RPG 11 (policy WD3). The core strategy should pick up on these issues.

Community Engagement Responses	How to implement through core strategy
Local councils should lead by example through adopting in-house waste minimisation policies, for example through their purchase of services	Core strategy should pick up on green procurement principles such as those set out in Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
Objection to wasteful private finance initiatives which rebuild rather than reuse buildings	Consideration of PFI is beyond the remit of the core strategy. Through policy and objectives the core strategy can encourage sustainable waste management in demolition and construction projects.
Concern for increased number of fly-tipping incidents due to higher disposal costs	Moving waste up the hierarchy may well result in higher costs. Enforcement of fly tipping is a matter for the Environment Agency and WCA, but the core strategy can play a part through education on waste issues and enabling appropriate development.

Table A2 Issues and options relating to the proximity principle

Community Engagement Responses	How to implement through core strategy
Proximity principle should not be influenced by artificial boundaries such as political/administrative boundaries	<p>There is no prescribed application method for the proximity principle. Waste Framework Directive and PPS 10 focus on the Waste Framework Directive requirement to dispose of waste in one of the <i>nearest appropriate installations</i>.</p> <p>The principle should be included in core strategy policy, but its application should be flexible to ensure suitable proposals are not restricted by political, administrative or otherwise inappropriate boundaries.</p>
Proximity principle should be a material consideration, not an absolute condition	<p>There is no specific reference to the proximity principle in PPS 10, which instead refers to the disposal of waste in one of the <i>nearest appropriate installations</i>.</p> <p>RPG 11 seeks '<i>adoption of proximity principle where there is scope for this to be taken further in individual waste plans</i>.' This may change as a result of its forthcoming review.</p> <p>These policy documents indicate that consideration of the effects of transporting waste should be considered within the core strategy.</p>
- Subject for consideration through SA -	
Opinion divided on whether a maximum travel distance should be set in the core strategy. Responses recognise a preference for road travel to be minimised, but that core strategy policy should not set an arbitrary distance, or where it does then this should be applicable to different waste streams. Rail and canal transport more desirable than road transport.	<p>Consultation responses indicate that whilst a distance should not be set down in the core strategy as a policy; core strategy policy may indicate that a transport distance could be set in a condition for some developments, if appropriate. Responses also indicate that mode of transport is important, which suggests that mode of transport may enable a longer distance to be acceptable.</p> <p>Core strategy could state an intention to limit distance travelled as appropriate for each proposal, in consideration of waste type, waste source and transport mode.</p>
- Subject for consideration through SA -	
Opinion differed on issue of balancing the proximity principle against development of waste management facilities in, or close to, residential and commercial areas	<p>PPS 10 encourages site searches to consider opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises and a broad range of locations including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate facilities together and with complementary activities. A role of the core strategy is to provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of communities.</p>

Table A3 Issues and options relating to the location of new facilities

Community Engagement Responses	How to implement through core strategy
Waste development at industrial estates	
The term 'industrial estates' needs refining as it can refer to different types of industrial activity	Structure Plan policy WD2 establishes a preference for existing industrial estates with appropriate infrastructure. PPS 10 also identifies that industrial sites may be appropriate locations for waste management facilities. The core strategy should indicate opportunities at industrial sites, but should also identify development control requirements.
Concern raised in regard to the impacts of increasing traffic flows at industrial estates that would occur due to additional development	Core strategy should include policy regarding transport criteria such as Structure Plan policy WD3. This is an issue that should be considered on a site-by-site basis, but core strategy could include reference to intention to condition maximum number of lorry movements.
Support generally expressed for the use of industrial estates for new waste facilities, but some concern has been raised in regard to the use of business parks, as these are considered too high end for waste use	<p>PPS 10 requires waste planning authorities to consider opportunities for on-site management of waste and a broad range of locations including industrial sites. RPG 11 policy promotes new development in urban areas. Structure Plan seeks waste management development on industrial estates.</p> <p>Strong lead from context documents that waste development should be incorporated into urban scene. Modern facilities should be accommodated within purpose built buildings, designed to minimise potential for nuisance. Core strategy should continue promotion of use of industrial estates for waste management purposes.</p>

Development in Green Belt

Community Engagement Responses**How to implement through core strategy**

Opinion was split over development in the green belt.

- that the green belt should not take priority over the need for waste management facilities and that the green belt should have some economic function;
- that waste facilities should only be allowed in the green belt as a last resort. Since waste management facilities require infrastructure, green belt areas close to potential transport hubs, rail and motorway were considered the most appropriate; and
- that the green belt should be sacrosanct – that the core strategy should not be seen as suggesting that it is ‘OK to utilise green belt land’.

PPS 10 recognises that green belt designation should be balanced with other material considerations such as wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management. Structure Plan policy restricts development in the green belt, including a sequential test where green belt is the least preferred location.

- Subject for consideration through SA -

The regional spatial strategy should deal with the question of development in the green belt

In line with PPG 2, RPG 11 seeks to retain the green belt. However, it does not include any specific policy or guidance in relation to waste development and the green belt. This position may change as a result of the forthcoming review, but currently it is an appropriate question for to consider in developing the waste core strategy.

Miscellaneous

Whether a site is appropriate for a waste management facility is dependent on the type of waste to be treated in the facility

The context documents do not advise that different waste streams should be treated differently in terms of land use implications. As such, the waste core strategy should not distinguish between different waste streams, unless a specific need to do so is identified.

The specifics of each site should be considered

This comment is agreed with but the core strategy is not a site specific document. However, it can include development control or criteria based policy to guide decision making on submitted applications.

A range of sites for waste processing is needed

This comment is agreed with but the core strategy should not identify individual sites. Instead, it should contain clear and concise policy for delivering the strategy which applies to the whole of the County, enabling the required facilities to be developed on a range of appropriate sites.

Miscellaneous

Community Engagement Responses	How to implement through core strategy
<p>Objection to incineration and thermal treatment plants in or close to residential areas</p>	<p>None of the context documents suggest that the core strategy should eliminate any one treatment technology. The adopted BPEO strategy does identify preferred technologies, but it is also intended to be flexible, to be able to accommodate alternative, appropriate new technologies. The location of any thermal treatment plant that may be proposed would be assessed in terms of the development control policy in the core strategy.</p>
<p>Strong support has been raised for the need for farm diversification, including recognition for the potential use of redundant farm buildings for some types of processes, eg composting</p>	<p>The use of redundant farm buildings for waste use is given support through PPS 10, RPG 11 & Structure Plan policy. However, this needs also to be balanced with the policy focus on development within the urban hub.</p> <p>- Subject for consideration through SA -</p>
<p>Opinion was divided over preference for smaller, more dispersed facilities (including pilot plant & promotion of local responsibility) or larger, more centralised plant (more economical, able to compete for land value, reduced NIMBYism). Overall, a preference for a mix of facilities was expressed.</p>	<p>There are advantages and disadvantages to both smaller, more dispersed facilities and larger, more centralised facilities, and a mix of the two. The discussions around this issue also included site specific matters that are more appropriately managed through development control policy.</p> <p>- Subject for consideration through SA -</p>
<p>All respondents thought that all significant proposals for new, or enlarged waste management facilities should be required to show the level of contribution they would make in implementing the BPEO strategy</p>	<p>PPS 10 and revisions to Waste Strategy 2000 have both been published since the evidence gathering stage. Both these documents comment on the use of SEA and SA when developing planning policy. As SEA and SA are considered to perform a similar function to the BPEO assessment, the requirement to undertake such a BPEO appraisal has been removed from both PPS10 and the revised Waste Strategy 2000. However, the BPEO strategy adopted by Worcestershire County Council remains a valid document and will continue to be the basis on which waste planning decisions will be made, until the core strategy is adopted. The adopted BPEO strategy should be assessed through the SA.</p>

Community Engagement Responses**How to implement through core strategy**

previous comment continued

PPS 10 seeks sustainable waste management. Whilst reference to BPEO has been removed, the core strategy should still seek to understand the contribution made to County wide waste management needs, including: principles of waste management; location and distribution of facilities; and that sustainable development principles are still implemented through an understanding of what happens to secondary materials, for example refuse derived fuel from mechanical biological treatment plant or autoclave.

There was general agreement that areas with a current lack of waste facilities should not necessarily be preferred for the development of new facilities. It is appropriate to investigate/ reevaluate these areas, but they should not be 'preferred' locations.

The core strategy is not a site specific document and should not include reference to specific preferred locations. It needs also to consider PPS 10 advice regarding the cumulative effects of previous waste disposal facilities as a site identification criterion.

Issues regarding strategic location of facilities throughout the County should be assessed by the SA through consideration of urban/rural, large/small, green belt etc.

What about agricultural waste?

Agricultural waste has been recently included as a controlled waste, with Regulations in force from September 2005. The uncontrolled burning of waste (excluding wood and plant matter) and burial of waste in farm tips will be prohibited. This is expected to result in a greater amount of waste to be managed off the farm. Agricultural waste is likely to be treated in a similar manner as C&I waste and is not expected to have additional or significant implications for the core strategy.

Development in existing waste and mineral sites

Community Engagement Responses**How to implement through core strategy**

Strong support for the use of existing quarries and landfill sites was expressed. This was based on the existing physical and management infrastructure that is recognised as leading to efficiency and cost effectiveness. It was recognised that this may be a pragmatic, but also an unpopular solution.

Several concerns were also raised, including:

- environmental impact on the surrounding area, including AONB and sites capable of providing wildlife habitats;
- sites with a lack of adequate infrastructure; especially a problem with upland hard rock quarries that are often inaccessible;
- transporting waste to quarries/landfills may be contrary to the proximity principle;
- safeguarding of public health
- facilities would be hidden when their visibility could play an important role in terms of public education and raising the profile of waste management

Structure Plan policy supports the use of quarries and landfill sites for waste use. PPS 10 introduces a reference to considering the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well being of the local community. There are advantages to using existing quarries and landfill sites (use of existing infrastructure, husbanding of landfill void) but also disadvantages (additional traffic movements, extending life of landfill site).

There is scope with development control policy to ensure that site specific issues such as infrastructure requirements & local amenity impacts are managed on a site by site basis.

PPS 10 excludes reference to the proximity principle, instead seeking waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations.

Education and public awareness raising is a common theme raised through the evidence gathering stage. It should be possible to co-ordinate awareness raising initiatives even with facilities that may be hidden from many public views.

The SA can assist in identifying the benefits and impacts, in terms of sustainability objectives, in using quarries & landfill sites for waste facilities. These conclusions should be used to inform development of the waste core strategy on this issue.

Opinions were divided on whether new waste development should be limited to the operational life of existing development (restrict time of additional disruption, sites should be restored) or allowed to remain on site permanently (gain best practice and most investment from developer)

Mineral and landfill sites are predominantly located in the green belt and areas of open countryside where development is not normally permitted. To allow a permanent facility may be contrary to the purposes of national policy seeking to retain openness in the green belt and to protect the countryside for its own sake. Whilst they are often active for a very long time, both quarries and landfill sites are temporary activities. It is therefore considered inappropriate to allow permanent development in an operational quarry or landfill facility. Instead, new development should be restricted to the operational life of the quarry or landfill.

Environmental Criteria

Community Engagement Responses**How to implement through core strategy**

A number of environmental criteria were considered important including:

- air and land pollution (eg toxic emissions from transport and climate change implications);
- health and safety of people and wildlife;
- visual impact;
- natural habitat, features & biodiversity;
- the site and setting of Scheduled Monuments and other nationally important archaeological remains;
- Listed Buildings (Grades I, II* and II);
- Conservation Areas;
- Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (all grades);
- Registered Battlefields;
- hazardous substances in the environment;
- pollutant limits required to protect wildlife;
- restoration of land affected by waste disposal; importance of broadly defining the historic environment, and consideration of impacts beyond specific sites to include the character of the wider landscape and townscape
- noise and odour
- access infrastructure
- traffic
- site appearance
- local carbon economy
- EIA
- impact on social structure of towns & residential areas
- constraints on public space

Many of the proposed criteria are also land based designations set at European, national and regional level. As such, they would be picked up in development control policy.

The requirement to undertake environmental impact assessment in regard to proposed development is covered by separate legislation. It should not be included in policy of the core strategy.

Other criteria of significance can be identified through the SA.

Community Engagement Responses**How to implement through core strategy**

Social and Economic Criteria

There was a range of other criteria (including economic and social concerns) that respondents thought were important to be included in the core strategy:

- sustainable development principles;
- transport;
- human health and safety;
- emphasis on and investment in awareness raising and recycling (eg rewards for the public);
- creation of new jobs by reuse and recycling operations
- public consultation - not necessarily relying on advice from a waste collection company; and
- convenience of waste management for the general public (ie waste minimisation, reuse, recycling and composting).

When the County Council begins to develop its core strategy, it must also undertake a SA, which should incorporate the requirements of the SEA Directive.⁽⁹⁾ The SEA focuses solely on environmental impacts that may occur as a result of the policies contained in the core strategy. The SA is also concerned about economic and social impacts.

The Community Strategy establishes a commitment to the way in which waste is managed. This includes ensuring that new development enhances the environment and, where practical, that gains (such as landscape improvements or additional jobs) are delivered as an integral part of that development.

Human health and safety is an operational matter, to be assured by the site manager and regulated by the Health and Safety Executive. It is not a matter relevant for consideration in the waste core strategy.

It was felt that at present waste management is led by economic considerations, whereas environmental considerations need to be paramount.

Incorporation of the key planning objectives established in PPS 10 and SA throughout the process of developing the waste core strategy is undertaken to ensure that sustainable development is delivered that balances environmental, social and economic concerns.

⁽⁹⁾ European Union Directive 2001/42/EC. Commonly referred to as the SEA Directive. SEA stands for strategic environmental assessment.

Annex B

Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

ISSUES: GREEN BELT

Objectives	Option 1: *New waste management facility is inappropriate (unless exceptional circumstances are justified)			Option 2: New waste development in greenbelt is inappropriate when (i) on previously developed land and (ii) in accordance with the objectives of PPG 2			Option 3: New waste development is appropriate anywhere when in accordance with the objectives of PPG 2		
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long
1(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
3(a)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
3(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
15(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(c)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
10(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
11(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
7(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
8(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
5(a)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
(9a)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
12(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
12(b)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
13(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
13(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
14(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
17(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
4(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
4(b)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
6(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)

Key: Significant positive effect (++) moves towards objective
 Positive effect (+)
 Permanent effect (P)
 Temporary effect (T)

Significant negative effect (--) moves away from objective
 Negative effect (-)
 Neutral effect (O)
 Uncertain effect (?)

*Reflects current practice (business as usual approach)

ISSUES: URBAN/RURAL

Objectives	Option 1: *Focus is on development in urban locations throughout Worcestershire with justified/minimal development in rural locations			Option 2: Focus is split evenly between urban and rural locations			Option 3: Focus is on development in rural locations with justified/minimal development in urban locations		
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long
1(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
3(a)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)
3(b)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
15(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
16(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(c)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
10(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
11(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
7(a)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
8(a)	- (T)	- (T)	?	- (T)	- (T)	?	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
5(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
(9a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
13(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)
13(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
14(a)	+ (T)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (T)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (T)	+ (P)	+ (P)
17(a)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)
4(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
4(b)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)
6(a)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)

Key: Significant positive effect (++) moves towards objective
 Positive effect (+)
 Permanent effect (P)
 Temporary effect (T)

Significant negative effect (--) moves away from objective
 Negative effect (-)
 Neutral effect (O)
 Uncertain effect (?)

*Reflects current practice (business as usual approach)

ISSUES: SMALL/LARGE FACILITY

Objectives	Option 1: *Primarily large waste management facilities			Option 2: Even split of large and small waste management facilities			Option 3: Primarily small waste management facilities		
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long
1(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(b)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	- (P)	- (P)	-O (P)
3(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
3(b)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)
15(a)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
16(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(c)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
10(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
11(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
7(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)
8(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
5(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
(9a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
13(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
13(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
14(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
17(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
4(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
4(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
6(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)

Key: Significant positive effect (++) moves towards objective
 Positive effect (+)
 Permanent effect (P)
 Temporary effect (T)

Significant negative effect (--) moves away from objective
 Negative effect (-)
 Neutral effect (O)
 Uncertain effect (?)

*Reflects current practice (business as usual approach)

ISSUES: CENTRAL/DISPERSED

Objectives	Option 1: *Focus on centralising facilities but with dispersed facilities if justified			Option 2: Even split between central and dispersed facilities			Option 3: Focus dispersing facilities but with a countywide/central service facility if justified		
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long
1(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
2(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
3(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
3(b)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)
15(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(c)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
10(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
11(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
7(a)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)
8(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
5(a)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	+/? (P)	+/? (P)	+/? (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)
(9a)	- (P)	- (P)	- (P)	+/? (P)	+/? (P)	+/? (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)
12(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
13(a)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
13(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
14(a)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)	-/? (P)
17(a)	-- (P)	-- (P)	-- (P)	+/? (P)	+/? (P)	+/? (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)
4(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
4(b)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)	? (P)
6(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)

Key: Significant positive effect (++) moves towards objective
 Positive effect (+)
 Permanent effect (P)
 Temporary effect (T)

Significant negative effect (--) moves away from objective
 Negative effect (-)
 Neutral effect (O)
 Uncertain effect (?)

*Reflects current practice (business as usual approach)

ISSUES: BPEO

Objectives	Option 1: *Accept BPEO		
	Short	Medium	Long
1(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)
2(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)
2(b)	- (P)	- (P)	-- (P)
3(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
3(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
15(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)
16(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
16(c)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
10(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
11(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
7(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)
8(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
5(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
(9a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(a)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
12(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
13(a)	O (T)	+ (P)	+ (P)
13(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
14(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
17(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	+ (P)
4(a)	+ (P)	+ (P)	++ (P)
4(b)	O (P)	O (P)	O (P)
6(a)	++ (P)	++ (P)	++ (P)

Key: Significant positive effect (++) moves towards objective
 Positive effect (+)
 Permanent effect (P)
 Temporary effect (T)

Significant negative effect (--) moves away from objective
 Negative effect (-)
 Neutral effect (O)
 Uncertain effect (?)

*Reflects current practice (business as usual approach)