

# **Sustainability Appraisal of Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy**

## **Non-Technical Summary**

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. Gloucestershire County Council is the Minerals Planning Authority and Waste Planning Authority for Gloucestershire, which means that it has to prepare the Minerals & Waste Development Framework (MWDF) that will replace its currently adopted Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan. The MWDF will comprise a range of planning documents containing policies relating to minerals and waste development in the county. To date, Gloucestershire County Council's Minerals & Waste Planning Policy Team has been working on the preparation of the following documents within the MWDF:
  - A Supplementary Planning Document on Waste Minimisation in Development Projects (Adopted September 2006)
  - The Minerals Core Strategy (Consultation completed on Preferred Options, January 2008)
  - The Waste Core Strategy (Consultation completed on Preferred Options, January 2008, and Site Options 2009)
2. The preparation of the MWDF documents is required to be subject to a full Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and current Government planning policy (PPS 12<sup>1</sup>). The preparation of the MWDF documents must also be in accordance with the requirements of European Directive 2001/42/EC (known as the Strategic Environment Assessment, or 'SEA' Directive).
3. The difference between Strategic Environment Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal is that, where SEA is more focused on identifying environmental impacts of a plan, Sustainability Appraisal addresses wider ranging considerations, including social and economic impacts. This summary and the full SA report describe the joint SA/SEA process that has been undertaken in line with the government guidance on SA<sup>2</sup>. Throughout this summary and the full SA Report, the term "SA" is used to mean "Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of SEA".
4. Land Use Consultants (LUC) was appointed by Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) in February 2009 to undertake the next stages of the SA of the Waste Core Strategy. Initially, this comprised two main components:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning*. Communities and Local Government, 2008

<sup>2</sup> *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks*. ODPM, November 2005 – See the Planning Advisory Service website: [www.pas.gov.uk](http://www.pas.gov.uk).

- SA Report for the 106 potential waste site options being considered for allocation as Strategic Waste Sites in the Waste Core Strategy (Stage 1, completed in April 2009); and
  - SA Report for the short list of site options and the options being considered for the spatial distribution of waste sites for the Waste Core Strategy Options consultation held in October 2009 (Stage 2, completed in September 2009).
5. Following the Site Options Consultation in October-November 2009, the Waste Core Strategy has now been brought together in one document, taking account of the three main consultation phases: Issues and Options, Preferred Options and Site Options. Following a final six week consultation period starting in December 2010, and provided no major changes are needed, the Waste Core Strategy will be formally submitted to the Secretary of State for adoption.

## **SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL STAGES**

6. The ODPM Sustainability Appraisal Guidance specifies a number of stages of work that have to be undertaken. The first three stages of the SA have been completed (i.e. Stages A, B & C). These involved the following:

### **Stage A – Setting the context and scope**

7. Gloucestershire County Council undertook the Scoping stage of the SA for the Waste Core Strategy in-house. The Scoping stage involved gathering baseline evidence for the SA and developing a framework of sustainability objectives against which the documents in the MWDF could be assessed. The Council prepared two reports (Context and Scoping Reports) containing all of the information gathered during this stage. The “SA Context Reports” prepared by the Council set out the review of all international, national, regional, county and local plans or programmes that are relevant to the MWDF, including the Waste Core Strategy. The latest update of the SA Context Report (Update 3) was produced in January 2009.
8. In addition to the SA Context Report, the latest update of the SA Scoping Report (Update 3) was also produced in January 2009. This report describes the baseline information and sustainability issues for Gloucestershire in relation to minerals and waste, as well as setting out the SA Framework. The SA Framework consists of a set of sustainability objectives which state desired outcomes<sup>3</sup>. The SA objectives are distinct from the objectives of the Waste Core Strategy – the potential sustainability effects of the Waste Core Strategy are assessed against the SA objectives.
9. The original SA Framework that was developed and used during the appraisal of the emerging Waste Core Strategy policies at both the Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages comprised 15 SA objectives. However, prior

---

<sup>3</sup> The ODPM SA Guidance explains that SA objectives should focus on outcomes, rather than how the outcomes will be achieved. For example, they should focus on ‘improved biodiversity’ (the outcome), rather than ‘protection of specific wildlife sites’ (a means to achieving it).

to the SA of the Waste Site Options, the SA Framework was amended to ensure that it was appropriate for the appraisal of specific sites, rather than overarching policy approaches. As such, an amended list of 22 SA Objectives was produced and used for the SA of the Site Options. The original intention was that at the Publication stage, the SA of the Waste Core Strategy would revert back to using the initial list of 15 SA Objectives; however following discussions between LUC and Gloucestershire County Council it was decided to continue using the amended SA Framework of 22 objectives as it was felt that this list was more comprehensive, and because the Waste Core Strategy now includes site allocations.

10. It should also be noted that two of the SA objectives that had been 'scoped out' of the SA Framework prior to the SA of the Site Options consultation, as they were not considered to be useful for the appraisal of specific waste sites, have been 'scoped back in' to the SA Framework as they are considered to be relevant to the appraisal of the policies within the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy. These have been referred to throughout the appraisal as 'original SA objectives 1 and 2', and relate to promoting sustainable communities through sustainable design and provision of affordable housing, and safeguarding waste sites from other proposed development.
11. The 22 Headline SA Objectives used for the appraisal of the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy, including the strategic waste site options allocated within the plan, are listed in **Table 1** below. The development of the SA Framework and the specific assumptions used for the appraisal of the Waste Core Strategy, including the allocated waste sites, are discussed further in **Chapter 3** of the full SA Report.

**Table 1: SA Headline Objectives used for the appraisal of the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy**

<b>SA Objectives</b>
<b>Social</b>
1. To promote sustainable development and sustainable communities and improve the <b>health and well-being</b> of people living and working in Gloucestershire as well as visitors to the County.
2. To <b>educate the public</b> about waste issues and to <b>maximise community participation</b> and access to waste services and facilities in Gloucestershire.
3. To safeguard the <b>amenity of local communities</b> from the adverse impacts of waste development.
Original SA Objective 1: To promote <b>sustainable development</b> and <b>sustainable communities</b> in Gloucestershire in particular giving people the opportunity to live in an affordable and sustainably designed and constructed home.
<b>Economic</b>
4. To promote <b>sustainable economic development</b> in Gloucestershire giving opportunities to people from all social and ethnic backgrounds.
5. To manage waste in an <b>economically sustainable</b> way through means that represent good value for tax payers in Gloucestershire.
6. To provide <b>employment opportunities</b> in both rural and urban areas of the County, promoting diversification in the economy.
7. To ensure that waste sites do not compromise the <b>safety of commercial or military aerodromes</b> .
Original SA Objective 2: To <b>safeguard sites</b> suitable for the location of waste management facilities or future mineral development from other proposed development.
<b>Environmental</b>
8. To protect, conserve and enhance <b>biodiversity</b> in Gloucestershire.
9. To protect, conserve and enhance the <b>landscape</b> in Gloucestershire.
10. To ensure that waste sites have the potential for adequate <b>screening and / or innovative design</b> to be incorporated.
11. To protect conserve and enhance Gloucestershire's <b>material, cultural and recreational assets</b> .
12. To protect conserve and enhance <b>geodiversity</b> in Gloucestershire.
13. To protect conserve and enhance <b>townscapes</b> and Gloucestershire's <b>architectural and archaeological heritage</b> .
14. To prevent <b>flooding</b> , in particular preventing inappropriate development in the floodplain and to ensure that waste development does not compromise sustainable sources of water supply.
15. To <b>prevent pollution</b> and to apply the precautionary principle in consultation with waste regulation authorities.
16. To protect and enhance <b>soil / land quality</b> in Gloucestershire.
17. To protect and enhance <b>air quality</b> in Gloucestershire.
18. To protect and enhance <b>water quality</b> in Gloucestershire.
19. To reduce the adverse <b>impacts of lorry traffic</b> on the environment and communities through means such as: a) reducing the need to travel b) promoting more sustainable means of transport e.g. by rail or water c) sensitive lorry routing d) the use of sustainable alternative fuels e) promoting the management of waste in one of the nearest appropriate installations.
20. To <b>reduce waste to landfill</b> and in dealing with all waste streams to actively <b>promote the waste hierarchy</b> (i.e. Prevent, Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, Recover, Dispose)

<b>SA Objectives</b>
to achieve the sustainable management of waste.
21. To reduce the global <b>use of primary materials</b> and minimise net energy balance requirements.
22. To reduce contributions to and to <b>adapt to Climate Change</b> .

### **Stage B – Developing and refining options and assessing effects**

12. Sustainability considerations have been taken into account throughout the development of options for the Waste Core Strategy. Gloucestershire County Council prepared SA Reports at both the Issues & Options and Preferred Options stages and published them for consultation (as set out in Table I.1 in the Introduction to the full SA Report). In addition, on behalf of the Council LUC produced two SA Reports (Stage 1 and 2) in relation to the Waste Core Strategy Site Options consultation.
13. The SEA Directive requires “reasonable alternatives” to be taken into account during development of a plan such as the Waste Core Strategy, and so not every possible alternative (or option) needs to be considered. In some instances, other policy considerations (e.g. government’s Planning Policy Statements) will pre-determine which policy approach needs to be adopted, effectively ruling out some options.

### **Issues and Options**

14. The initial Issues and Options stage began in 2005 with evidence gathering and data collection exercises. In March 2006 a forum event was hosted by the Waste Planning Authority and the Waste Disposal Authority at which broad strategic options for future waste management in Gloucestershire were considered. The outcomes of this event were drawn together and the views and ideas expressed were compiled into two Issues and Options consultation papers which were published in July 2006. The consultation responses received in relation to these papers during the period July-September 2006 were summarised in an evidence report entitled ‘Stakeholder Responses to the Issues and Options Papers’ (March 2007).
15. A further waste forum event was held in October 2007 at which the key emerging options for the Waste Core Strategy were discussed and debated. Land Use Consultants facilitated this event on behalf of GCC and reported on the outcomes in the ‘Report of Waste Core Strategy Stakeholder Forum Event’ (November 2007).

### **Preferred Options**

16. The Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options document was published in January 2008, based on the outcomes of the Issues and Options consultation and the evidence gathered to date. This document set out Preferred Options for an overarching vision and five strategic objectives, as well as 33 Preferred Options for the Waste Core Strategy policies, grouped into topics such as Waste Minimisation, Recycling and Composting, Recovery and Locational Strategy. A public consultation on the Preferred Options version of the

Waste Core Strategy and the accompanying SA Report took place between January and March 2008 and the responses received during that period were used to inform the development of the publication version of the plan.

### **Site Options**

17. The Government Office for the South West's consultation response to the Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options document required GCC to consider options for Strategic Waste Sites. The GCC Minerals & Waste Planning Policy Team carried out a comprehensive exercise to identify all sites in the County with some potential for waste use, and then to refine the list down to a set of 106 'reasonable' options, which were appraised in the Stage 1 SA Report for the Site Options. The selections were made based on factors including the size of potential sites and their relative locations, in order to ensure that potential sites would be able to accommodate waste facilities of an adequate size and that they would be appropriately located in relation to the main settlements within Gloucestershire (Cheltenham, Gloucester, Cirencester, Coleford, Tewkesbury, Stroud and Lydney).
18. Following the production of the Stage 1 SA Report, which appraised this long list of 106 sites, the list was further reduced by GCC on the basis of the SA findings, technical input and deliverability investigations. As well as detailing the reduced list of potential waste sites, the Site Options consultation document which was produced set out four potential spatial options centred on the designation of 'Zone C', which is an area running through the Central Severn Vale close to Gloucester and Cheltenham. This area was identified following the Preferred Options consultation in 2008, which discussed the broad locational strategy for waste treatment facilities. The four spatial options set out were:
  - Focus strategic sites within Zone C;
  - Allocate sites outside of Zone C for smaller-scale facilities/transfer;
  - Incorporate waste treatment into the urban extensions to Cheltenham and Gloucester proposed under the Regional Spatial Strategy; or
  - A combination of the above options.
19. Within the context of these spatial options, the original list of 106 potential sites was further reduced to 13 potential sites: ten within Zone C and three outside of Zone C. The Stage 2 SA Report comprised the appraisal of these four broad spatial options as well as the reduced list of specific waste site options, and the findings helped to inform the selection of the four strategic sites which have now been allocated in the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy.

### **Publication version**

20. All of the responses received in relation to the Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation were summarised in a Consultation Response Report (Summer 2008). Now that the Site Options consultation has been

completed, the wider consultation responses from the Preferred Options stage have also been taken into account and the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy has been produced. Four strategic site allocations have been incorporated into policy WCS4 'Other Recovery (including energy recovery)', and were selected on the basis of the findings of the SA of the Site Options consultation document, as well as the responses received to that consultation and practical deliverability considerations.

### **Assessing Sustainability Effects**

21. At each stage of the development of the Waste Core Strategy, a Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out and SA Reports produced, as set out in **Table I.1** and **Chapter I** in the full SA Report.
22. As described above and in **Chapter I** of the full SA Report, the SA reports for both the Issues and Options and Preferred Options versions of the Waste Core Strategy were produced in-house by GCC. The SA report for the Issues and Options version was published alongside the two consultation documents in July 2006 and the SA Report for the Preferred Options was published in January 2008 alongside that consultation paper. At each stage, the likely effects of the emerging options were appraised against the SA Framework (the original 15 SA Objectives, before the SA Framework was amended for the SA of the Site Options consultation as described above) and the findings were summarised in the SA Reports published.
23. The Waste Core Strategy Site Options consultation was also carried out and subject to SA. For each of the original 106 potential waste sites, GCC's planning officers carried out a detailed Site Assessment, collating information and visiting the sites to consider a number of criteria such as landscape, green belt, transport, biodiversity, flood risk etc.
24. Site Assessments were developed by GCC for all of the original 106 potential waste sites, setting out the results of the assessment against each criterion, photos of the site and a short description of its location and characteristics. The GCC Site Assessments can be found within the evidence base, which is made up of Technical Papers.
25. In addition to the detailed site selection process undertaken by GCC, as required by the SEA Directive and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, all of the 106 potential waste site options were appraised by the LUC SA team against the SA Framework, and the sustainability implications and likely effects were predicted and assessed. During Stage 1 of the SA process, all 106 of the original potential site options were appraised through a desk-based exercise which drew on our own Geographical Information Systems (GIS) analysis and the extensive data collected and assessments undertaken by the Council and its experts. The findings are contained in the Stage 1 SA Report (April 2009). During Stage 2 of the SA, the reduced list of site options was appraised, drawing upon the Stage 1 appraisal findings and additional information provided by the Council, and presented in the Stage 2 SA Report (September 2009).

26. The publication version of the Waste Core Strategy has now also been subject to SA and the detailed method used for this appraisal (including the site specific allocations set out in policy WCS4) is described in **Chapter 3** of the full SA report. The findings are summarised in **Chapter 4** and the full appraisal matrices can be found in **Appendix 3**.

### **Stage C – Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report**

27. This document is a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal report for the SA of the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy. It summarises the information contained in the full SA Report, which sets out the likely significant effects on the environment, and the likely social and economic implications of the policies and the waste site allocations. It outlines the method used for developing and refining the policies and site options and the measures that are envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan. It has been written to meet all the requirements of the SEA Directive for an environmental report (see **Table 1.2** in the full SA report), as well as the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requirement to prepare a report setting out the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal.

### **Stage D – Consulting on the DPD and Sustainability Appraisal Report**

28. The Sustainability Appraisal Report (for which this is the non-technical summary) has been produced to inform the development of the Waste Core Strategy. It will be available during the consultation on the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy in December 2010. At this stage, responses are invited only in relation to the soundness of the plan. Following the consultation, GCC will consider whether any major changes to the plan are required, and if not, will formally submit the Waste Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.

### **Stage E – Monitoring Implementation of the Plan**

29. Stage E will follow adoption of the Waste Core Strategy. LUC has not been commissioned to undertake the SA monitoring. However, the SEA Directive and SA guidance require that the Sustainability Report includes a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring. This is discussed in **Chapter 5** of the full SA Report.

## **CHARACTERISATION OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE**

30. A summary of the characteristics of Gloucestershire and the local environment is provided in the SA Report for the Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options<sup>4</sup>. The key sustainability issues identified are:
- High house prices

---

<sup>4</sup> *Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report*: Gloucestershire County Council, January 2008.



- Low average income
- Crime levels (high in certain areas)
- Health (poor for certain segments of the population)
- Traffic impacts and congestion
- Rural economy (certain areas in need of support)
- Areas of deprivation and social exclusion
- Potential for flooding (high in certain areas of the County)
- Increasing levels of waste going to landfill

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

31. The findings of the full Sustainability Appraisal of the Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy are shown at the end of this non-technical summary, which sets out the predicted effects of each policy and allocated site against the 24 SA objectives (note that the four allocated sites have not been appraised against the 'original SA objectives 1 and 2' as they are not considered relevant to the appraisal of particular site allocations, as described above). Our appraisal has attempted to differentiate between significant effects and other more minor effects through the use of symbols (see **Table 2** below).

**Table 2 Key to the symbols used in predicting potential sustainability effects of the Waste Core Strategy**

Symbol	Type of effect
++	Significant positive effect likely
++ ?	Significant positive effect uncertain
+	Minor positive effect likely
+?	Minor positive effect uncertain
0	No effect likely
+/- or ++/-- etc	A mixture of positive and negative effects
-?	Minor negative effect uncertain
-	Minor negative effect likely
- -?	Significant negative effect uncertain
--	Significant negative effect likely
?	Effect uncertain due to lack of baseline information or detail regarding type of facility that would be developed
N/A	No effect has been assessed. This only relates to SA Objective 15 for the appraisal of the strategic sites allocated within policy WCS4, and is explained in the assumptions that were used for the appraisal of the strategic sites, as set out in <b>Appendix 2</b> of the full SA Report.

32. The SEA Directive requires that the assessment of effects should include “secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary effects” (SEA Directive Annex I). In the case of the strategic waste sites allocated in policy WCS4, the exact nature of their future use will be very dependent on the proposals that come forward from the waste industry. Therefore, at this stage in the SA it is difficult to be precise about when, where and in what form the effects will arise, and how one effect might relate to another. However, the combined effects of the vision, strategic objectives and policies (i.e. the Waste Core Strategy as a whole) and the potential for cumulative effects, has been considered.
33. While there are no fixed definitions of short, medium or long term, it is possible to draw some broad conclusions from the SA about the nature and interrelationship of the likely effects of the Waste Core Strategy:
- Most of the effects will be long-term, in that the Waste Core Strategy aims to provide a structure for waste management and waste development that will last over time. However, there will inevitably be some temporary and short or medium term effects during the construction or operation of individual waste facilities (see below).
  - The effects that have been identified in the appraisal of the strategic waste sites, both positive and negative, are likely to increase over time as the policies in the Waste Core Strategy are implemented and more waste-related development is delivered in Gloucestershire.

### **Short-term Effects of the Waste Core Strategy**

34. The policies within the Waste Core Strategy (excluding the development that will occur at the strategic sites allocated in policy WCS4) are generally unlikely to have short term impacts as they relate to the approach to be taken to waste management within the county up to 2027. Instead, the short-term effects associated with the Waste Core Strategy are generally related to the initial impacts of construction of waste management facilities where this occurs, either on one or all of the four allocated sites in policy WCS4, or other sites that come forward through the planning application process. This would include the removal of vegetation, top soil, sub soil, and the construction of any additional infrastructure required. Such work could have negative impacts on biodiversity, local amenity (possible disruption to Rights of Way, traffic flows, noise generation etc.), soil quality, and the landscape. However, these impacts would be temporary in nature and many are likely to be minimised through good design and successful implementation of development control policies.

### **Medium-term Effects of the Waste Core Strategy**

35. The medium-term impacts of the Waste Core Strategy relate to employment creation and other economic benefits of waste management. Potential negative impacts in the medium term include the possible effects of operational waste management facilities on health and local amenity (e.g. noise, dust and increased traffic).

## Long-term Effects of the Waste Core Strategy

36. Most of the likely effects of the Waste Core Strategy policies will be long-term as they provide the context for waste management within the county up to 2027. The long-term (i.e. longer than ten years) or permanent positive effects that could result from the Waste Core Strategy include the provision of sufficient waste management capacity to meet Gloucestershire's needs, and the associated benefits of diverting waste from landfill (e.g. reducing greenhouse gases and contributions to climate change). Long-term negative impacts of the site allocations could include climate change contributions from the energy required to operate facilities and vehicle movements to transport waste and minerals.
37. The overall significant effects identified during the Sustainability Appraisal are summarised below.

## Significant sustainability effects

38. Most of the SA objectives against which the Waste Core Strategy vision, strategic objectives and policies were appraised against are likely to be significantly positively affected by at least one of the proposals within the plan. The following **significant positive** effects have been identified:
- Protecting the health and wellbeing of local communities (Strategic Objective 5);
  - Maximising the opportunities for education and public participation in waste management (Strategic Objective 1 and WCS1);
  - Safeguarding levels of amenity within Gloucestershire (Strategic Objective 5);
  - Conserving the quality of the landscape (WCS10, 11 and 13);
  - Maximising the opportunities available for screening waste sites and/or incorporating innovative design (WCS13);
  - Protecting Gloucestershire's material, cultural and recreational assets (WCS11 and 13);
  - Protecting townscapes and built heritage assets (WCS13);
  - Minimising the risk of flooding (WCS9);
  - Preventing pollution (WCS5);
  - Conserving water quality (WCS5);
  - Reducing the impacts of lorry traffic associated with the transportation of waste (Strategic Objective 5 and WCS4, 14);
  - Encouraging the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy (Vision, Strategic Objectives 1 to 3, WCS1, 2, 3, 4, 6);
  - Minimising the use of primary materials (Vision, WCS1, 2, 3, 6);
  - Adapting to, or mitigating the effects of, climate change (Strategic Objective 5, WCS2, 3, 14); and

- Safeguarding waste sites for waste management facilities (Strategic Objective 5 and WCS8).
39. The majority of the significant positive impacts identified are associated with the proposals in the Waste Core Strategy to move waste management practices up the waste hierarchy, minimise the use of primary materials and adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change.
  40. No **significant negative** effects were associated with the Vision or any of the Waste Core strategy strategic objectives or policies.
  41. In general, the four allocated strategic waste sites in policy WCS4 are likely to have the following **significant positive effects**:
    - Focusing development in areas at lower risk of flooding;
    - Reduction in the loss of good quality soil/land through the use of large previously developed sites;
    - Minimising lorry movements, particularly on local roads, and therefore having a further positive impact on air quality;
    - Reduced contributions to climate change through reductions in carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions; and
    - Reduced contribution to climate change if energy, including heat, were to be generated from the waste management process and used within nearby development as waste as a fuel can act as a substitute for fossil fuel energy generation.
  42. No potentially **significant negative** effects were identified in relation to the construction and operation of new waste management facilities on the four allocated sites. However, some minor negative effects were identified, as described in the summary of findings by SA objective which can be found in **Chapter 4** of the full SA Report.

### **Mitigation of potential negative effects**

43. It is likely that many of the potential negative effects would be reduced through the successful implementation of the policies contained within the Waste Core Strategy or an associated DPD requiring good practice techniques by the waste industry, the saved policies from the Waste Local Plan or through the Environmental Impact Assessment that may be required to accompany a planning application for a new large waste facility. It is therefore assumed that the planning application process should ensure that any proposals for waste management facilities on the allocated strategic waste sites will seek to enhance the significant positive effects and mitigate the potential negative effects through well designed and operated facilities.
44. Most waste management facilities will also need to meet high standards of design and operation in order to obtain an Environmental Permit (EP) (formerly Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) Permit) as regulated by the Environment Agency. The requirement to meet EP/PPC permitting standards (relating to emissions to air, land and water, energy efficiency, noise, vibration, heat and accident prevention) should ensure that the design and

operation of waste management facilities minimises most of the potentially negative effects.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

45. In general, the Waste Core Strategy is considered likely to be a positive plan in sustainability terms and it is expected to result in positive impacts on the sustainability objectives, with relatively few negative effects having been identified, none of which were significant. The generally robust development management policies (including the General Development Criteria for the strategic allocations in Appendix 5) within the plan should help to mitigate the potential adverse effects of waste management on areas such as health and amenity, biodiversity, landscape and flood risk; however the extent to which these policies can successfully deliver mitigation will also depend heavily on their appropriate implementation. In addition, some recommendations for further mitigation within the policies have been made below.
46. The four strategic waste sites that have been allocated within the Waste Core Strategy are expected to result in a wide range of positive and significant positive sustainability effects; reflecting the thorough site selection process that has been undertaken and the findings of the previous appraisals of site options. Where negative impacts have been highlighted, none of which are significant, these generally relate to issues which were likely to be scored as negative for all or the vast majority of the site options that came forward during the site options consultation. In addition, the appropriate implementation of the development management policies within the Core Strategy should help to mitigate the potential adverse effects of the sites on particular SA objectives such as geodiversity and the potential for screening waste facilities.
47. Past experience suggests that when development proposals are being considered, there will often be tensions when applying different policies and deciding where the most weight should apply. Despite the best intentions of the planning authority, it may not always be possible to deliver development that meets all policy criteria as well as good practice guidance, and difficult choices will often have to be made.

## **Recommendations**

48. While the Waste Core Strategy is generally expected to have mostly positive sustainability impacts, some potential negative effects were identified in relation to biodiversity and the potential for areas of habitat within or adjacent to waste sites to be lost as a result of development.
49. Some of the 'saved' policies in the Gloucestershire Waste Local Plan (2004) are still valid, until they are replaced by the Development Management Policies DPD, which is due to be prepared after the Waste Core Strategy has been adopted. While it is recognised that saved policy 45 (Planning Obligations) includes habitat creation in the list of matters that may be appropriate for inclusion in a planning obligation related to a development proposal, it is recommended that a requirement is included in policy either within the Waste Core Strategy or the forthcoming Development

Management Policies DPD to consider implementation of more specific measures to create and enhance biodiversity in new waste developments where appropriate. This could include, for example, the establishment of green roofs, climbing plants on walls, individual trees and patches of grassland, and the use of sustainable drainage systems which can also help to create habitats for wildlife.

### **Monitoring of Sustainability Effects**

50. The SEA Directive requires that “member states shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans or programmes... in order to identify at an early stage, unforeseen adverse effects, and be able to undertake appropriate remedial action” (Article 10.1) and that the environmental report should provide information on “a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring” (Annex I (i)). The ODPM’s SA Guidance states that monitoring proposals should be designed to provide information that can be used to highlight specific issues and significant effects, and which could help guide decision-making.
51. The ODPM’s SA Guidance also states that it is not necessary to monitor all effects of a plan. Instead, monitoring should focus on the significant sustainability effects that may give rise to irreversible damage (with a view to identifying trends before such damage is caused) and the significant effects where there is uncertainty in the SA and where monitoring would enable prevention or mitigation measures to be implemented.
52. The effects of the implementation of the Waste Core Strategy will be influenced by the degree to which other plans forming the MWDF are successfully implemented. For this reason, monitoring the sustainability effects of implementing the Waste Core Strategy should be conducted as part of an overall approach to monitoring the sustainability effects of the MWDF as a whole, as well as taking account of broader social, economic and environmental trends. This approach is based on the ODPM’s Good Practice Guidance on monitoring Local Development Frameworks<sup>5</sup>.
53. The Council is required under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act to prepare an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to assess the extent to which policies in each MWDF document are being implemented. A framework for monitoring is set out within Chapter 6 of the publication version of the Waste Core Strategy, including targets and indicators that will be used to monitor how well the policies within the plan are being implemented. This includes targets and indicators that will also be relevant for monitoring the predicted significant sustainability effects of the Waste Core Strategy.
54. **Table 5.1** in the full SA report sets out the likely significant effects that were identified by this SA Report, and the corresponding indicators that are included in the Waste Core Strategy Annual Monitoring Framework. Additional potential indicators have been suggested where appropriate,

---

<sup>5</sup> *Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide*. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2004.

particularly where no indicators are currently included in the framework in relation to a particular likely significant effect.

55. As stated in the SA Guidance, the data used for monitoring will in many cases be provided by outside bodies (e.g. District Councils, the Environment Agency and Natural England). This has already been evidenced by the additional baseline information provided by the statutory environmental consultees during consultation on the Scoping Report for the SA. It is therefore recommended that Gloucestershire County Council continues the dialogue with statutory environmental consultees and other stakeholders that it began as part of the SA process and MWDF preparation, and works with them to agree the relevant sustainability effects to be monitored and to obtain information that is appropriate, up to date and reliable. It should be noted that the sustainability effects to be monitored may need to be revised at subsequent stages of the Waste Core Strategy preparation in response to consultation comments received and any revisions that are made to the DPD.

Land Use Consultants  
24<sup>th</sup> November 2010

## Summary of SA Findings by SA Objective: Waste Core Strategy Vision, Strategic Objectives and Policies

SA Objectives	Waste Core Strategy Vision, Strategic Objectives and Policies																			
	Vision	Strategic Objective 1	Strategic Objective 2	Strategic Objective 3	Strategic Objective 4	Strategic Objective 5	WCS1: Waste Reduction	WCS2: Recycling and Composting	WCS3: Inert Waste Recycling & Recovery	WCS4: Other Recovery	WCS5: Waste Water	WCS6: Hazardous Waste	WCS7: Cumulative Impacts	WCS8: Safeguarding Sites	WCS9: Flood Risk	WCS10: Green Belt	WCS11: AONBs	WCS12: Nature Conservation	WCS13: Design	WCS14: Sustainable Transport
1: Health & Wellbeing	+	+	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+
2: Public Education/Participation	+	++	+	+	0	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3: Amenity	+	+	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+
4: Sustainable Economic Development	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	-?	+	0	0	0	0	0
5: Economical Waste Management	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+/-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6: Employment	+	-	0	+	+	+/-?	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	0	+/-	0	-?	0	0	0	-?
7: Aircraft Safety	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8: Biodiversity	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+/-?	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	++/-?	0	0
9: Landscape	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	++	++	0	++	0
10: Screening & Innovative Design	-?	0	0	0	0	+/-?	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
11: Material, Cultural & Recreational Assets	0	+	0	0	0	-?	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	++	0	++	0
12: Geodiversity	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13: Townscapes and Heritage	0	+	0	0	0	-?	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	++	0
14: Flooding	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	++	0	0	0	++	0
15: Pollution Prevention	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
16: Soil/Land Quality	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
17: Air Quality	+/-?	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
18: Water Quality	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19: Impacts of Lorry Traffic	+/-?	+	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	++	0	+	+/-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	++
20: Waste Hierarchy	++	++	++	++	+/-	0	++	++	++	++	0	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
21: Use of Primary Materials	++	+	+	0	+	+	++	++	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0
22: Climate Change Adaptation	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	++
Original SA Objective 1: Sustainable Communities	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Original SA Objective 2: Safeguarding Sites	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0



## Summary of SA Findings by SA Objective: Strategic Sites Allocated in Policy WCS4

SA Objectives	Wingmoor Farm East				Wingmoor Farm West				Javelin Park				Land at Moreton Valance			
	Large Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Large Facility (not Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (Thermal Treatment)	Medium Facility (not Thermal Treatment)
1: Health & Wellbeing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-?	-	-?	-	-?	-	-?
2: Public Education/Participation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3: Amenity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-?	-?	-	-	-?	-?
4: Sustainable Economic Development	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5: Economical Waste Management	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6: Employment	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
7: Aircraft Safety	-?	0	-?	0	-?	0	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8: Biodiversity	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?
9: Landscape	-?	0	-?	0	-?	-?	-?	0	-?	-?	-?	-?	-	0	-	0
10: Screening & Innovative Design	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-?	-?	-?	-?	-	-	-	-
11: Material, Cultural & Recreational Assets	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
12: Geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13: Townscapes and Heritage	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
14: Flooding	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	++
15: Pollution Prevention	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
16: Soil/Land Quality	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
17: Air Quality	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+	++/-	++	++/-	++	++/-	++	++/-	++
18: Water Quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19: Impacts of Lorry Traffic	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	++/-	++/-	++/-	++/-	++/-	++/-	++/-	++/-
20: Waste Hierarchy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
21: Use of Primary Materials	++?	+	++?	+	++?	+	++?	+	++?	+	++?	+	++?	+	++?	+
22: Climate Change Adaptation	++	+	++	+	++	+	++	+	++	+	++	+	++	+	++	+

As described in the full SA Report, a score was not given to any of the four allocated sites in relation to SA Objective 15. This is because, in relation to the location of potential waste sites, potential pollution effects are covered under SA Objectives 1, 3, 16-18. The precautionary principle is inherently being applied to the site allocation process through the Council's own site assessment methodology and the independent SA of the site allocations.