Inspector's Agenda and Supplementary Questions: Issue 2

Agenda

1 Opening remarks
2 Understanding the capacity gap
3 Municipal Solid Waste
4 Commercial and Industrial Waste
5 Hazardous Waste
6 Landfill Issues
7 Construction and Demolition Wastes
8 The Vision and Strategic Objectives

Having read the further submissions the following questions need to be addressed by the Council, and others as appropriate, **at the Hearing session. Unless specifically requested by the Inspector via the Programme Officer, no further written statements should be supplied in response and any that are will be returned by the Programme Officer.**

Agenda Item 2

1. I am not clear how existing but unimplemented planning permissions are taken into account in assessing the capacity gap that the plan needs to fill. Could the Council explain please?

Agenda Item 3

From the further statements two issues emerge. First, are the underlying and forecast waste figures robust and do they lead to the correct assessment of the residual waste management treatment facilities required (Question 2.1) and, second, are the household waste recycling/composting targets that underpin the plan appropriate for Gloucestershire (Question 2.3). Dealing with these in turn:
First issue

1. Table 3l in CD10.4 seems to be critical as the MSW figure in policy WCS4 appears to derive from it albeit with a slight upward but unjustified revision. Although I think I may have worked it out I need to be clear about this table. I see how the arisings figure in column 2 is generated, the 'residual treatment' figure in column 6 is about 40% of the column 2 figure on each row and I see the source for column 3. However, where do columns 4 and 5 come from and why does column 6 not equal column 2 minus the sum of columns 4 and 5?
2. Cory's point in CD13.41.1 on this matter would appear to have some substance. Given the way any alterations in assumptions at the start are compounded throughout what is the Council's response?
3. In CD13.12 at para 1.13 the Council says that the WDA's view is that it should link its long term forecasts to the growth in households. By long term it means post 2020. Up to that point, the 1.6% growth rate in waste appears to be an economic view unrelated to but including household growth. What then is the

actual rate of economic growth assumed, how does this compare with Office for Budget Responsibility or other forecasts and, if different, why is this justified locally?

Second issue

4. Representors refer to the achievements made in particular areas to argue that much higher rates could be achieved. To what extent are circumstances in those areas replicated in Gloucestershire?
5. What is the evidence that setting a high aspirational rate changes behaviour and leads to its delivery?
6. Conversely, what evidence is there that setting a lower target inhibits higher levels being achieved?
7. How should the plan be changed in this regard?
8. Finally, on both issues is there a consensus view as to a number to replace 150,000tpa in policy WCS4 which is where this all leads?

Agenda Item 4

1. Annex C of the Companion Guide to PPS10 (CD12.32) clearly envisages the evidence base consisting of **arisings** data available from the Environment Agency. Can the EA representative enlighten the participants on the extent to which that intention has been delivered either by the EA or others (eg Defra)?
2. Do any participants have alternative evidence to establish the **arisings** for this waste stream and thus derive a different figure for inclusion in WCS4?
3. Is it accurate to present the C+I waste figures in the key drivers, Vision and strategic objectives as Gloucestershire's 'need' when it is driven by management capacity existing now within the County and not arisings? Referring to CD13.12 para 3.7 final sentence, is this not exactly what the Vision is doing in respect of C+I waste?
4. Given the Council's own evidence that it has little confidence in the arisings data available from Defra how does it intend to achieve strategic objectives 1 and 3 for the waste not coming from Gloucestershire?
5. In Strategic Objective 3, what is meant by '…a proportion of…' and how does this relate to the figure given in policy WCS4?
6. Is it not possible that the non-hazardous C+I waste being exported to Gloucestershire is that which cannot be recycled/recovered in the area of origin and is therefore destined for landfill?

Agenda Item 5

In the light of the further statements from participants and the helpful explanation from the Council I do not need to take this matter further to assist me but will hear any contributions that others may wish to make.

Agenda Item 6

1. The landfill position statement (CD13.11) confirms that there remains uncertainty over the lifespan of the county's landfill capacity for the reasons set out. Disposal is the only level in the

waste hierarchy for which there is no policy in the plan, there is no saved policy and PPS10, although not being cancelled yet by the NPPF, will be revised and annexed to the national waste management plan that comes forward. Its future content is therefore unknown. There is therefore uncertainty at national level, a policy vacuum at the local level and there may be a need to prepare the promised landfill DPD and/or determine applications coming forward. In all these circumstances how would the plan be sound **without** the landfill policy now proposed (CD13.12 para 4.7 and additional clause in 6.20)?

2. While that policy might give adequate guidance for development management purposes, does it achieve the same for the preparation of a landfill DPD? Would the 50,000tpa limit in WCS4 also define 'strategic facility' for landfill purposes, would these also be restricted to Zone C and how would this sit with Green Belt policy?
3. What is the justification for the additional clause proposed in para 6.20?

Agenda Item 7

My current understanding of this matter is that Smiths believe the size of this waste stream arising in the County far exceeds that assumed by the Council, the availability of exempt and non-regulated sites is finite and, in the absence of additional recycling and recovery capacity being provided, this waste will either go to landfill or be taken out-of-county. Cory believes however for the reasons set out in CD13.41.1 that the amount of this waste stream going to landfill is overestimated supporting its view that non-hazardous landfill capacity is more than adequate for the plan period. These different views raise the following:

1. Is there any robust data for current arisings?
2. Does material now going to exempt and non-regulated sites do so because there is a lack of available recycling and recovery capacity or for other reasons?
3. Is there any robust data to suggest how much of this waste is suitable for recycling/recovery anyway?
4. Why is this waste being taken out-of-county if the void space is as large as Cory say and how does this impact on the assumptions underpinning the adjoining waste authorities' plans that Cory refer to?

Agenda Item 8

I need to be clear that the Vision/strategy has emerged through a process where realistic options have been put before the public and the chosen locational strategy is likely to be delivered by the sites identified either in CS itself or in a forthcoming sites allocations DPD. If it cannot, then the locational strategy will not be effective in delivering the Vision. There is therefore a circular or iterative nature to the process. From the further statements that have been submitted the following matters arise:

1. I am unclear from CD11.1 whether or not the Council intends to prepare a waste site allocations DPD. If it does then the CS needs

to give clear spatial guidance to allow the required sites to be allocated. If the Council does not, then the CS needs to give clear development management guidance in view of what is said about that DPD being much slimmed down which could be a further argument for a landfill policy. What does the Council intend?

2. Either way, what is said in CD13.12 para 6.2 is not strictly accurate. Policies WCS2, WCS3 and WCS3a all direct strategic scale facilities to Zone C although no such requirement or even distinction (strategic/non-strategic) is drawn in policy WCS13a which appears potentially inconsistent. Where is the evidence that such sites are likely to come forward in Zone C (we will consider whether the WCS4 sites are likely to come forward under Issues 3, 4 and 5)?
3. I remain unclear from CD13.12 paras 6.5 to 6.9 inclusive whether any area other than Zone C has been considered for the location of strategic sites and would welcome contributions from participants on this.
4. The Council's explanation of 'integrated sustainable waste management system' (CD13.12 para 6.18) is welcome and important for the effectiveness of the plan. Several policies (2, 3, 3a, 4, 10 and 13a) require applicants to show that their proposal contributes to such a system. Some clarity about the Council's understanding of the term and the way it will implement the policy is therefore necessary. As another term open to interpretation (environmentally acceptable) is defined in the policy in which it appears (WCS6) how does the Council intend to give the same clarity to the policies listed above?