Gloucestershire
COUNTY COUNCIL

Waste Core Strategy

Technical Paper WCS-E

Hazardous Waste

Living Draft

January 2008

Waste Core Strategy

Technical Paper WCS-E

Hazardous Waste

Living Draft

January 2008

Contact Details for Gloucestershire County Council

Minerals & Waste Planning Policy:
Tel: 01452 425704
m-wplans@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Minerals & Waste Development Control:
Tel: 01452 425704

Waste Management Unit
Tel: 01452 426601

Summary

S1. Key planning issues for the management of hazardous waste in Gloucestershire are set out below. These include a combination of factors identified in the National Waste Strategy for England, Planning Policy Statement 10 ' Planning for Sustainable Waste Management' (paragraphs 20-21), the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (Policy W3) and the current situation for hazardous waste management in the County:

- Reducing the production of all types of hazardous waste at source as part of implementing the waste hierarchy;
- Seeking management on the site where it is generated, where this is not practicable disposing of waste at the nearest appropriate installation by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies;
- Making an appropriate contribution to local, regional and national need for managing hazardous wastes - determining what type/types of facility is appropriate in Gloucestershire;
- Gloucestershire has one of only two landfill sites in the South West where hazardous waste can be landfilled. However the site is time limited to 2009;
- Determining what constitutes 'environmental acceptability' for an existing or proposed new site, including cumulative impact on communities (see issue W7 from the Waste Core Strategy Issues & Options papers, July 2006);
- The physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses and the proximity of environmental receptors that are sensitive to the particular waste;
- Specialised treatment to reduce hazardous properties even if this results in an increase in the quantity of waste;
- The availability of existing and alternative management practices, including the use of existing non-hazardous landfills for stabilised non-reactive hazardous waste cells;
- Give priority to the re-use of previously-developed land, and redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages and industrial sites;
- Opportunities to co-locate facilities together and with complementary activities reflecting the concept of resource recovery parks;
- The capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.

Contents

Section 1 Introduction

1. This report sets out the work carried out by Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), acting as the Waste Planning Authority (WPA), in respect of considering the planning issues for managing hazardous waste in Gloucestershire.

2. Hazardous wastes arise all across the country, including in Gloucestershire. In comparison with other waste streams managed in the County hazardous waste constitutes around 3% of the total. Despite this relatively small percentage these wastes still need to be managed somewhere and they need to be managed safely.

3. Different kinds of hazardous waste require different types of specialised facility to handle them. However, as tonnages across the country are relatively small this has lead to a proportionally small number of facilities serving a wider market area.

4. The Waste Core Strategy (WCS) needs to provide a criteria based policy approach for assessing the suitability of any future planning applications that may be made for facilities to manage hazardous wastes. The term 'manage' encompasses facilities that transfer/bulk-up, reprocess and/or dispose of such materials.

5. There are a number of options as to how such an approach could be framed (see Section 5). The overarching factor being the issue of making appropriate provision in Gloucestershire for managing hazardous wastes.

Section 2
Evidence Gathering

6. This section sets out a summary of the evidence gathering undertaken by the WPA in respect of hazardous waste issues that relate to the county.

7. The Issues & Options consultation (Sept 2006) on the Waste Core Strategy set out issues in respect of hazardous waste in Gloucestershire. The analysis of hazardous waste management data was supported by the Environment Agency.

8. A number of questions were put to stakeholders relating to hazardous waste:

   a. Is seeking to minimise hazardous waste at source an appropriate objective for the WCS?

   b. Is it appropriate to safeguard existing hazardous waste management facilities provided that they are environmentally acceptable?

   c. what criteria should be used to determine the acceptability of a facility for dealing with hazardous waste?

   d. Stakeholders were asked to rank, in terms of importance to them, the criteria for considering where existing and proposed hazardous waste facilities should be located (see table 1, below).

Table 1 – Ranking the 'Environmental Acceptability' of Hazardous Waste Facilities

The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings
The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access;
The availability of sustainable modes of transport nearby (e.g. rail or water rather than road);
The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents);
The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc.;
The impact of the facility on listed buildings, conservation areas and ancient monuments;
The compatibility of the facility with neighbouring land-uses
The visual impact of the facility;
The need for the facility;
Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activities;
The pollution control record of the facility.
The effect of not having the facility on the environment (e.g. derelict land issues, waste traveling to different facilities);

9. The responses to these questions are set out in a detailed schedule of responses (available on the County Council website), which are summarised in Evidence Paper 'Stakeholder Responses to the Issues & Options Papers' (March 2007).

10. In brief, 86% of responses received agreed that minimising hazardous waste is an appropriate objective for the WCS. And 83% of responses agreed that it is appropriate to safeguard existing hazardous waste facilities provided that they are environmentally acceptable.

11. The following criteria represent the main issues that respondents considered could be used for guiding whether proposals/

existing sites are 'environmental acceptable'.

1 Impact on neighbouring land-uses;

2 The need for the facility;

3= Location of the site in relation to local, regional, or national hazardous waste arisings;

3= The pollution control record for the facility;

5 Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activities;

6= The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access;

6= The effect of the facility closing will have on the environment.

12. However, there was concern that the ranking is meaningless and that criteria should be relative to the type of hazardous waste being managed.

13. Additionally, there was a representation stating that hazardous waste management sites must not be allowed within 1 or 2 km of residential areas.

Stakeholder Meetings

14. Meetings have been held between the WPA and the waste industry, district councils and community groups in respect of hazardous waste management facilities. Some of the key issues raised during those meetings are:

- Minimising hazardous waste at source of production– prevention better than cure.
- The RSS sets targets for MSW, C&I and C&D waste over the next 20 years. GCC need to look at the 'capacity gaps'. In certain areas there is enough provision and in others there are significant gaps. GCC need to make up these gaps by making 'provision' either through sites or through a criteria based approach. No target figures for hazardous waste.
- RSS Hazardous Waste Policy W3 - The WPA is currently working with a draft version of the RSS, which could change following the panel report. The Panel report into the draft RSS expected by end 2007, the revised RSS will be published mid/late 2008, and this will ultimately replace structure plans. SW Region prepared a paper on hazardous waste requirements which assumed a level of APC arisings and thus a need for facility(ies) but not clear yet which way authorities will go with their MSW strategies - Cornwall/Devon going for energy from waste technology therefore APC arising at other end of the region. Cllr Jones considered that the lack of debate at the RSS EiP on waste issues was scandalous.
- EA provide data on hazardous waste stream. Most recent data returns from EA relate to year 2004/05. Operator information is also sought to provide additional evidence. Import and export of waste (including hazardous waste) takes place to/from Gloucestershire. Up to 2004 much of Gloucestershire's arsings leave the County yet there is also a significant importation figure. 2006 (Grundon's data) shows that APC inputs have reduced, but the input of contaminated soils has increased. This has resulted in an

increased tonnage because soils are more bulky.

- Hazardous waste data is very complicated. After treatment the material at the Grundon's site is landfilled, but it gets recorded under the category of what happens to it first. There is a danger in looking at the old figures (2004) from the EA – not as up to date as Industry. In 2006, 10,000 tonnes of APC came in for treatment. 41,000 tonnes of hazardous waste was landfilled & 62,000 tonnes of non hazardous waste. These figures have increased in 2007. Grundon's are taking 30,000 tonnes of APC through the gate but the figures show 60,000 tonnes because liquid is added. There was also 40,000 tonnes of 'other' hazardous waste landfilled. Therefore the total to landfill is 100,000 tpa in 2007 including the liquid treatment of APCs. Everything that comes into the Grundon's hazardous waste site (treated or not treated) goes into the landfill.
- Wingmoor Farm takes APC residues. The Purton site (Wilts) doesn't take APCs. SNRHW cells could be used to minimise transport distances. APCs are likely to increase as a result of the Colnbrook EfW facility (near Heathrow) coming on stream. APCs are currently coming from the South East. No longer any hazardous waste sites in Wales so quite a lot of contaminated soils are coming from there.
- No municipal waste from Gloucestershire going into Grundon's non-hazardous site. Non – hazardous waste in coming from all over, but only relatively small amounts of inert material for engineering etc. Most is biodegradable, not inert. Voidspace figures are:
    - Wingmoor West = 2.5 million cubic metres (hazardous).
    - Wingmoor East = 2.5 million cubic metres.
    - Wingmoor Quarry (former Gloucester Sand & Gravel site) = 900,000 to 1.2 million cubic metres.

  Wingmoor East and Wingmoor Quarry are about to be combined, under one license – site to be known as 'Wingmoor Quarry'.
- Grundon's currently preparing application to extend sites' life - already done some of the community consultation. Mid to late summer the draft application will go to community groups etc. Submission to the County Council in the autumn. Secretary of State is likely to be interested in Wingmoor Farm application because of its Regional and National implications – being located at the extreme boundary of the SW region is not helpful for the SW but is potentially for wider WM/SE regions - Cllr Jones stated that he was particularly unhappy that the decision could be taken out of local hands – issue of democratic accountability. The new Independent Planning Commission (IPC) is unlikely to be active in immediate future - Planning white paper provides thresholds for the IPC to get involved.
- Other sites on non-green belt land have been considered by Industry, but Bishops Cleeve considered to be the best site. Landowners generally do not want to know about waste. And general industrial estates do not want to accommodate waste uses.
- Local concern that gradual increases at a site eventually become too much. Whilst each new issue doesn't breach

acceptability on its own - together they do. In Bishops Cleeve it is not just a case of waste traffic but anything else that generates traffic - extra housing creates more traffic - therefore need to look at a wider area. The impact on the community grows over time. We wouldn't put a hazardous waste site where it is now, so why not treat it as if it is new site? The whole package of impacts can provide 'stresses' to the community.

- The findings of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Report will probably state that better communications (especially from the EA) are needed from the beginning to allow more stakeholder input – needs to be taken more seriously. It should also set out what processes must be followed when finding a site.
- GCC officers attended the South East RSS EiP (Dec 2006) on hazardous waste issues as they cannot guarantee capacity outside the region – especially given the Wingmoor Farm planning permission end date of 2009. Panel recommended that the SE region needs to look at wider SE region rather than just Kent/Sussex area.
- In terms of cumulative impacts the traffic impact is particularly significant. The proximity to housing is also a key issue (new housing adjacent to waste site shouldn't be permitted - in Europe it was believed that they use a 200m buffer zone but UK Government rejected this) - we need to get sites away from population – potential for spillage/accidents. There shouldn't be impacts from sites (noise, dust, smell) they should be controlled, but this isn't the case. Perceived health impacts are also important - links to fear/perception of risk - not just big health issues (e.g. cancer) but smaller ailments e.g. headaches, sore throat etc.
- 'Environmental acceptability' is a very difficult issue. Industry believes that as long as the site is not polluting the air or water then it could be described as environmentally acceptable – provided the facility/site complies with its PPC permits then it should be deemed to be acceptable. It's important to look at Policy W3 in its entirety. What is the environmental cost of not having the site? The next hazardous waste site is in Liverpool. The Wingmoor site meets a regional need – certainly for the disposal of asbestos. SWARD however considers that the PPC permit is not acceptable as it allows a particular level of emissions – none should be allowed. All impacts should be 100% contained within site e.g. shouldn't have dirty hedges a mile away.
- The technology being employed is considered by SWARD to be fairly primitive – the process is not good enough but realise that this is a market issue – investment needed in plant.

Section 3 Hazardous Waste Policy Context

15. This section sets out the limited amount of planning policy guidance that is available for preparing policy for managing hazardous waste at a local level. The section is divided into three levels:

- National policy
- Regional policy
- Local policy

National Policy

16. National policy in England for planning for hazardous waste management facilities is contained in three main documents: PPS12; PPS10; and the National Waste Strategy 2007 (annex C9).

17. PPS12 (paragraph B17) notes that the Seveso II Directive requires Member States to ensure that land use policies and the procedures for implementing them, take account of the need to maintain appropriate distances between establishments where hazardous substances are present and residential areas, areas of public use and areas of particular natural sensitivity or interest. See appendix B of this evidence paper for the full text of this paragraph.

18. PPS10 requires RSS to take account of opportunities to accommodate new or expand existing facilities for the disposal of the residues of treated wastes. Criteria for identifying suitable sites and areas are set out in PPS10 (paragraphs 20-21). These will form an important point of reference for preparing policy options for managing hazardous waste.

19. PPS10 (paragraph 7) requires Regional Planning Bodies (RPB), and in turn WPA's (as sub-regions, of which Gloucestershire is one), to develop a realistic approach to future waste management, including for hazardous wastes. In doing so RPB's are required to take account of the likely demand arising from neighbouring regions, where meeting that demand would be consistent with PPS10.

20. The revised text to the National Waste Strategy (July 2005) indicates that Defra and the EA are working towards preparing a methodology for determining the most sustainable options for particular hazardous wastes. However, despite this there remains an absence of detailed national guidance on this topic.

National Waste Strategy 2007

21. National Waste Strategy 2007 Annex C9 'Hazardous Waste' raises some key points:

- The Government will continue to encourage policies which lead to reductions in hazardous waste arisings.
- Air pollution control residues are one of the problermatic waste streams identified by the Landfill Regulation Group, under

the chairmanship of the Environment Agency

- Mixing hazardous and non-hazardous waste simply in order to dilute hazardous waste is not an acceptable treatment option.
- There are currently no specific targets on hazardous waste. However, targets for reducing hazardous waste could be set once a baseline for arisings is established following the change in the definition of hazardous waste in July 2005.
- Targets should not be set before 2008, when full year data for 2006 and 2007 should be available.

22. Waste collection authorities are required to provide for the collection of all household waste, including HHW and waste disposal authorities are required to provide household waste recycling centres for the deposit of all household waste including HHW. More can be done to improve the segregation and management of household hazardous waste within the new controls applying to hazardous waste.

23. Nationally current permitted and available hazardous waste landfill capacity, including separate cells for stable non-reactive hazardous waste, is 3.4 million tonnes per annum, which is sufficient for current need. However, regional and local plans should consider future void space capacity over a 10–20 year period and ensure it continues to meet need.

24. The National Waste Strategy (para.24) states that the regional distribution of facilities is not matched to regional arisings. While hazardous waste has always traveled across regional boundaries, there is scope for minimising this with a regional distribution of facilities more closely matched to regional arisings.

25. The precursor to the 2007 Waste Strategy was the July 2005 revision to the National Waste Strategy, which set out eight issues that need to be considered when developing the most sustainable option for managing hazardous waste:

- Re-use, recycling or reclamation of waste either at the site of generation or elsewhere[3];
- Reclamation of energy from waste;
- Incineration without energy recovery. This may remain appropriate for certain waste streams such as polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs), chloroflourocarbon (CFCs), pesticides and halogenated and non-halogenated solvents;
- Constraints on landfill (including the implications of the Landfill Directive). Landfill may remain the appropriate option for some waste streams such as asbestos and some treated timber;
- Specialised treatment to reduce hazardous properties even if this results in an increase in the quantity of waste;

[3] Re-use and recycling will not be appropriate for all hazardous wastes. Banned substances should not be re-used when they arise as waste and recycling should not result in the *spreading* of contaminants for example asbestos should be removed from feedstock for the crushing of demolition waste to prevent it spreading amongst recycled aggregates.

- Disposing of waste at the nearest appropriate installation, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies;
- Environmental receptors sensitive to the waste;
- Existing and alternative management practices

26. Whilst the 'waste hierarchy' remains a key principle to follow, in terms of implementation for hazardous waste management it is not always applicable. Methods such as re-use, recovery or recycling might not be appropriate for many hazardous wastes.

27. Whilst recovering oils, metals and certain chemicals may be possible, the financial cost of doing so in relation to the likely quantities is a key factor. Fundamentally reducing production of hazardous wastes has to be the preferred option (see section below).

28. The National Waste Strategy considers that deriving energy from waste may be a viable option (incineration without energy recovery may be appropriate for certain waste streams such as PCBs, CFCs, pesticides and halogenated and non-halogenated solvents).

29. Landfill may remain the appropriate option for some waste streams such as asbestos, some treated timber, and air pollution control (APC) residues, but acknowledging that the Landfill Directive has constrained the market for landfill options. The final disposal should however be at the nearest appropriate facility. Given the nationwide nature of limited arisings this leads into locational issues of regional significance.

30. The Environment Agency's position on hazardous waste is set out in Appendix C of this evidence paper.

Regional Policy

31. The South West Regional Planning Body is currently preparing a Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the Region, which will include a specific policy on 'hazardous waste'. The supporting text to the hazardous waste policy in the emerging RSS outlines the position with regards hazardous waste management regionally. It states that the region is broadly self-sufficient in waste treatment capacity and has facilities for the transfer, treatment and recycling of hazardous wastes that are an integral part of a wider national network of facilities. However, it goes on to conclude that that the region needs an annual disposal capacity in the range 65,000 to 80,000 tonnes per annum. This effectively means landfill voidspace is required.

32. The proposed Regional policy for developing capacity for hazardous waste management facilities is set below. There are no indicative allocations for hazardous wastes. This will be critical in preparing a realistic approach for managing hazardous waste in the South West. Additionally, what constitutes 'environmental acceptability' needs to be determined (see section below).

Draft RSS Policy W3 Hazardous Waste

Waste Planning Authorities should recognize the need for the development of capacity for the disposal of Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Wastes at existing or proposed new landfill facilities (identified in Policy W1) and safeguard capacity for the disposal of other hazardous wastes at existing sites permitted and authorised as hazardous waste landfill sites provided they are environmentally acceptable. Provision should also be made in Waste LDFs for hazardous waste transfer, treatment and disposal facilities.

33. A technical paper, South West Hazardous Waste Treatment and Capacity Report 2005, has been prepared by the EA for the South West RTAB to inform regional spatial planning policy for hazardous waste. This paper provides some of the detail that was absent from The Regional Waste Strategy for the South West 2004-2020. It identifies the likely capacity requirements across the South West for hazardous waste management facilities (including disposal).

34. The Capacity Report states that the current pattern of hazardous landfill sites reflects the commercial viability of the hazardous waste landfill market. Consequently hazardous waste disposal is now a highly specialised activity that operates in a market of at least regional and more probably national scale. It is in this context of a wider regional/national need that hazardous waste policies for Gloucestershire must be developed.

35. Due to the lack of detailed national guidance on hazardous waste planning, the emerging RSS policy W3 provides the basis for deriving an appropriate policy.

36. Paragraph 7.4.12 of the Draft RSS states, "*it is not considered appropriate for each waste planning authority to identify specific sites for the management and treatment of hazardous waste in the same way they are expected to identify sites for other waste facilities*". In support of this, national guidance warns against spatial precision at core strategy level.

37. However, as hazardous waste provision in the County predominantly, though not exclusively, relates to one disposal site there is the potential that any discussion around the issue will end up relating to that site. Notwithstanding this, it is important to develop a clear policy against which any site that may come forward (existing or new) can be appropriately judged. The policy needs to be in conformity with general PPS guidance (in particular PPS10), Waste Strategy 2000 and the RSS.

38. The options for managing hazardous waste relate primarily to selecting those criteria that the policy (and it's supporting text) should contain. The emerging RSS requires planning applications for hazardous waste facilities to be considered in the context of *"their contribution to national and regional need, and not just local need.*" In addition, provision needs to made in the policy's criteria for the potential for stable non-reactive hazardous wastes (SNRHW) cells at existing non-hazardous landfills (see section below).

39. The critical issue from the emerging RSS policy W3 is how the WCS should address the issue of environmental acceptability. Potential options as to how this can be done are set out in Technical Evidence Paper WCS-M 'Environmental Acceptability', which should be read alongside this paper.

Local Policy

40. The detailed development plan policy for hazardous waste is Waste Local Plan (WLP) Policy 16 (see below).

Policy 16 'Special Waste Facilities'

Facilities for the additional handling, treating, processing or disposal of special* wastes will be permitted if it can be demonstrated -

- That it would form part of a sustainable waste management system; and
- That it would meet the relevant policies and criteria of the development plan.

***** Please note: Where reference is made to 'special' waste this has now been superseded by 'hazardous' waste, as identified in the Hazardous Waste Regulations (2005) which replaced the Special Waste Regulations (1996).

41. In order to align with regional and national planning policy statements the Minerals & Waste Development Scheme proposed to replace this policy in the WCS.

Stabilised Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW)

42. The Landfill Directive prevents disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous materials in the same landfill site. Prior to 2004, provided a site that held both an appropriate planning permission and waste management license that covered both waste streams it could accept either category of waste into the same landfill. This is no longer the case, which has rationalised hazardous waste management across the country. The decision to accept either hazardous or non-hazardous waste, subject to the above approvals, has been a commercial decision for the operator of affected sites.

43. Some wastes that are hazardous can be stabilised and then landfilled in designated cells at a non-hazardous landfill site, provided the leaching characteristics are similar to non-hazardous wastes (subject to EA approval). These are referred to as Stabilised Non-Reactive Hazardous Wastes (SNRHW).

44. However, where there is a designated hazardous waste landfill site that can accept those materials the issue is whether it is appropriate to make separate provision for such operations. To do so could restrict the non-hazardous voidspace available in such circumstances and could result in additional non-hazardous landfill capacity having to be identified.

45. Although tonnages of hazardous wastes are relatively small, they have a high

disposal cost (specialist treatment, site engineering, transport etc.). Conversely, non-hazardous wastes arise in greater amounts but the need for specialist handling facilities means that management costs are less. As a consequence, the former requires fewer facilities, but greater transportation distances, whereas the latter attracts waste from a closer catchment area.

Section 4
Health Issues

46. This section sets out issues in relation to heath matters arising from the management of hazardous waste. It is the role of the Environment Agency to monitor and regulate the pollution control regime.

Wingmoor Farm Task-Group

47. In 2006 the County Council's Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee set up the 'Wingmoor Farm Task-Group'. Its purpose was to investigate and understand the existing arrangements for long-term health monitoring in the area around the Wingmoor Farm and the Park waste management sites.

48. The Group also determined to consider the adequacy of these arrangements, and where necessary make recommendations about future monitoring and the further development of the Neighbourhood Health Profile.

49. The Group consists of 9 members, including the two co-opted members. Membership should be based on interest in the subject, but should aim to include at least one member from each of the three main political groups. The Group would then invite people to speak on specific topics at its meetings.

50. The Group agreed that in order to achieve this it would be necessary to:

- Establish baseline information about existing monitoring arrangement of the Wingmoor Farm and the Park waste management sites
- Clarify the responsibilities of the different agencies/organisations involved in the monitoring of waste management sites
- Understand the full range of possible related health conditions from major diseases to relatively minor issues such as skin complaints
- Report on its findings and where appropriate/necessary make recommendations about future monitoring and the further development of the Neighbourhood Health Profile.

51. To date there have been six meetings of the Group (notes from which are set out in Appendix A of this Evidence Paper). At its' meeting in April 2006 the Team Leader for Minerals and Waste Planning Policy provided a briefing on the waste management operations in the Bishops Cleeve and Stoke Orchard area.

Section 5
Policy Options

52. This section sets out the policy options for managing hazardous waste at the local level. The purpose of such a policy(ies) is to set a framework for determining planning applications for development involving the management of this waste stream.

Reducing Hazardous Waste Production

53. A key aspect of the new style 'spatial' plans is that they go beyond traditional land-use planning. In doing so they can include policies which indirectly impact on land-use, for example by influencing the need for development. Minimising the production of hazardous waste reduces the need to have facilities to manage it.

54. The County Council has prepared a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for dealing with waste minimisation. One aspect of the SPD is to minimise the generation of waste during construction and demolition activities (including hazardous materials such as asbestos and paint). This comprises the most direct link between land-use planning and minimising hazardous waste production at source.

55. If hazardous waste was not generated, or in smaller quantities, then there would be a reduced need for facilities to manage it. This could provide the basis for a policy to encourage industry to produce less hazardous waste. However, a potential difficulty here is that some of the residues disposed of in Gloucestershire, for example from power plants and facilities that thermally treat waste, do not arise in the County. Therefore, the effectiveness of a policy in Gloucestershire's WCS to reduce the generation, or the hazardous nature, of these waste types at source in other Regions (for example the South East, West Midlands, and North West) is likely to be difficult to implement.

56. It should also be noted that only policies which can be implemented through the granting of planning permission can form the framework for making planning decisions[4]. Therefore, if a broader policy were introduced into the WCS to seek the minimisation of hazardous wastes at source, this may require other mechanisms for its implementation, for example more detailed policy in the Development Control/Management DPD.

57. The National Waste Strategy 2007 retains, as a process to be explored, the thermal treatment of waste to generate energy (Energy from Waste EfW). Currently around a tenth of waste handled in England is managed in this way. Depending on the process involved some EfW plants may produce small tonnages of hazardous wastes, particularly APCs. These residues from EfW plants will

[4] Under section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

therefore continue to require treatment and final disposal.

58. Gloucestershire's municipal waste management strategy residual procurement plan is currently being written and the process options it sets out could influence the type or types of waste that need to be managed.

Determining 'Environmental Acceptability'

59. The County has a designated hazardous waste landfill site which is time limited through condition to remain operational up to 2009. This is a significant strategic issue to be addressed by the WPA and the South West Regional Assembly due to waste importation being in excess of 10,000 tonnes from a single Region (see emerging RSS paragraph 7.4.4, as set out above in Section 3). In addition, any proposal which comes forward to retain disposal capacity beyond 2009 will require careful assessment of environmental acceptability in line with the policy context in RSS Policy W3.

60. The emerging RSS policy W3 refers to the need to safeguard existing hazardous waste sites provided they are 'environmentally acceptable' (please refer to Section 3 above). The WCS needs to examine the options for determining what constitutes 'environmental acceptability'. Detailed information on this issue is set out in the Technical Evidence Paper WCS-M 'Environmental Acceptability'. Please refer to the options set out in that paper in Section 9.

61. In summary, potential factors could include: the type of facility; the material being handled; the existing topography; surrounding land uses; proximity to designated areas (such as SSSI's, AONB or Green Belt etc.); highways/access etc. Another aspect of 'environmental acceptability' could relate to the potential of the site to be satisfactorily restored.

Import and Export of Hazardous Wastes

62. With regard to what may be the most appropriate type(s) of facility for Gloucestershire, consideration should be given to the categories of hazardous waste currently being produced in the county, and also to the 'waste hierarchy'. Technical Evidence Paper WCS-A outlines the types of hazardous waste that arise most prevalently in the county.

63. Hazardous waste that arises in Gloucestershire is produced by householders and businesses. Hazardous waste comprises numerous different types of materials, many of which require specialised facilities for their management. It is likely that only disposal facilities would be able to manage 'hazardous waste' in its generality, and even they may require specialised 'front-end' treatment equipment to stabilise particular elements of the waste. Consequently, it is necessary

to be clear what is required in terms of specific types of hazardous waste.

64. The countywide arisings of most types of hazardous waste are small, particularly in comparison with other waste streams. As a result it is unlikely to be economic for a number of different operations to be set up to individually handle only those arising from the County. However, this will result in potentially large amounts of our own hazardous waste being managed and disposed of outside Gloucestershire. This is borne out by the currently national market for managing these wastes, stated in the South West Hazardous Waste Treatment and Capacity Report 2005.

65. To make a hazardous waste operation commercially viable it is likely to be necessary for it to accept waste from a wider catchment. The issue for Gloucestershire is what type, or types, of facility it is appropriate to accommodate in light of this national picture. In order not to perpetuate particular approaches to managing this waste stream, the emerging RSS suggests time-limiting permissions, but not so as to restrict the commercial viability of the operations.

66. The import/export of hazardous waste to and from Gloucestershire through existing sites is a commercial matter. However, when planning applications are submitted for new facilities these need to be considered in light of the wider (regional/national) picture.

67. If hazardous wastes are to be sent to regional or national facilities then potentially a number of transfer operations could be required to facilitate this. The options relating to determining how appropriate a site is should be similar to those for disposal facilities, but would need to consider the temporary nature of the materials being on site and the smaller tonnages involved.

Appendix A
Health & Scrutiny Working Group Notes

Gloucestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee: *Wingmoor Farm task-group*

14th February 2006

A1. The group agreed that the task group should meet in public whenever possible, but recognised that on occasions it might need to consider information in private.

A2. Lead Officer – It was agreed that as the task group would be focusing largely on health issues, the lead officer should be the County Councils Health Scrutiny Officer, Richard Thorn.

A3. Terms of Reference – The group agreed that it should stick within the broad remit set by Scrutiny Management and Audit Committee, and focus on *the need for long term health monitoring and further development of the Neighbourhood Health Profile.* The group agreed that the investigation should consider both the Wingmoor Farm and the Park waste management sites.

A4. The group discussed the limitations of the existing neighbourhood health profile, suggesting that there was a need for a much broader range of information. The group agreed that one of the aims of the groups should be to establish baseline information about existing monitoring of the sites.

A5. Members asked for clarification about the existing organisations involved in the monitoring of the sites. It was explained that the Planning Authority was responsible for monitoring planning applications. The Environment Agency also conducted monitoring, as did the Environmental Health department at Tewkesbury Borough Council. In addition to this there was also a great deal of self-regulating carried out by the operators. Councillor Jones informed the group that nobody seemed to be sure of the boundaries to each organisations areas of responsibility, which was causing some confusion. The group agreed that it should aim to clarify these areas of responsibility during its investigation. Terry Smith agreed to provide a short briefing note on the different legal responsibilities of the various organisations involved in monitoring waste management sites.

A6. The group agreed that the aim of the investigation should be to understand the existing arrangements for long-term health monitoring in the area around the Wingmoor Farm and the Park waste management sites, consider the adequacy of these arrangements, and where necessary make recommendations about future monitoring and the further development of the Neighbourhood Health Profile. It was agreed that in order to achieve this the group would need to:

- Establish baseline information about existing monitoring arrangement of the

Wingmoor Farm and the Park waste management sites

- Clarify the responsibilities of the different agencies/organisations involved in the monitoring of waste management sites
- Understand the full range of possible related health conditions from major diseases to relatively minor issues such as skin complaints
- Report on its findings and where appropriate/necessary make recommendations about future monitoring and the further development of the Neighbourhood Health Profile.

A7. Methodology – The group agreed that there would be a number of stages to the investigation. The first stage would involve a series of presentations about existing monitoring arrangement. It was suggested that this should include:

- Information from the Environment Agency, including information about what can and cannot be disposed of at the sites.
- Information from Directors of Public Health/Health Protection Agency
- Information from the Environmental Health Department at Tewkesbury Borough Council
- Information from the Planning Authority

It was suggested that this could all be gathered during a single half day session.

A8. The second stage of the investigation would involve a number of witness sessions. A range of possible witnesses were discussed including SWARD, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Patient and Public Involvement Forum, the Environment Agency, the operators (Grundons etc), Stoke Orchard Parish Council, the Environmental Services Council, the NHS, and a nation expert on incinerator ash. The initial suggestion was that 3 separate witness sessions could be required:

- One for the public/SWARD
- One for the operators and statutory agencies such as the Environment Agency
- One for others, such as the NHS PPI Forum and Parish Council

A9. However, the group felt that the exact details would need to be worked out by the task group, and that additional organisations would probably be identified as the investigation developed.

A10. Members felt that a third stage involving site visits would also be vital. There was some discussion about whether the site visits should take place before or after the witness sessions. Again the group felt that the task group that would be undertaking the investigation should work out the exact details.

A11. The group agreed that the outcome of the investigation would be a final report setting out the task group's findings. The task-group might also have some recommendations to put forward, which would also be included in the report.

A12. Timescales – The group did not feel that it could set a definite start or finish time for the group. However, it was agreed that the investigation should begin as soon as practically possible, which was dependent on finding members for the group. An indicative timescale of 1 year was suggested for the investigation, although members suggested that if possible it would be good to complete the investigation by the end of 2006.

A13. Membership – The group questioned the guidance from Scrutiny Management and Audit Committee that said that members of Planning Committee should be excluded from the task group. Members felt that some Planning Committee members would have a better knowledge and understanding of the issues than other members, which would benefit the group. Barry King advised the group that in his view planning should be kept separate and that planning members should not be allowed on the task group. This would protect the interests of the Planning Committee members, and ensure that they did not lose their right to speak on planning issues. The group agreed to seek clarification from Legal Services.

A14. The group discussed the option of co-opting members onto the task group. Members felt that it could be useful to have two co-optees on the task group, one representing the local community and one representing the industry. Barry King agreed to approach the Environmental Services Agency to see if they could suggest an industry expert that might be willing to work with the task group.

A15. Members agreed that the maximum size of the task group should be 9 members, including the two co-opted members. Therefore the group should include up to 7 non-executive elected members. Membership should be based on interest in the subject, but should aim to include at least one member from each of the three main political groups. At least one member should be drawn from the membership of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee as that committee would be leading the investigation.

A16. Councillor Crowther agreed to be a member of the task group. Councillor Chamberlain expressed an interest in joining the task group, but as he was a member of Panning Committee the group recognised that he might not be able to join the task group. The group was also informed that Councillor Awford was interested in joining the task group. An additional 4 or 5 members would therefore need to be found.

20th April 2006

A17. Introductory briefing on the Wingmoor Farm Site – Kevin Phillips, Team Leader Minerals and Waste Planning Policy, provided a briefing on the waste management operations in the Bishops Cleeve and Stoke Orchard area. He explained that the operations could be divided broadly into two areas – Wingmoor Farm West (including the Park and all operations west of the Cheltenham/ Birmingham railway line), and Wingmoor

Farm East (all operations east of the railway line).

A18. Wingmoor Farm West – The site included a landfill operation for the disposal of non-hazardous waste (indicated as are A on the map provided with the briefing paper). This site also included a Household Recycling Centre, facilities for recycling inert material and for the composting of green waste, and storage of fridges and freezers. Wingmoor Farm West also included the Park (indicated as area B on the map provided with the briefing paper).

A19. Cory Environmental ran the waste management operations on Wingmoor Farm West. The planning consent did not place any restrictions on the lifespan of the site or on the rate that waste was imported onto the site. However the waste license put a limit on the volume of waste imported onto the site of 1,500 tonnes per day and 400,000 tonnes per annum. The current annual throughput was about half of that figure, and consisted of municipal waste, commercial/industrial waste, and construction/demolition waste.

A20. Cory Environmental have significant aspirations for the future of the Park site. Applications have been submitted for a Mechanical Biological Treatment Plant and for an Anaerobic Digestion plant, however both plans were currently in abeyance until the future contractual arrangements for Municipal Waste were resolved.

A21. Wingmoor Farm East – The Wingmoor Farm East site could be sub-divided into two areas (indicated as insert map 2 and insert map 17 on the map provided with the briefing paper). The part of the insert map 2 adjacent to the railway line to the northwest of the site has been nominated as taking hazardous waste, making it one of the few sites in the country able to take hazardous waste.

A22. The waste license permits 150,000 tonnes of hazardous waste to be disposed of at the site per annum, although throughput has consistently been significantly less than this. There is also an ash conditioning plant, which handles Air Pollution Control wastes from industrial processes such as incinerators, prior to disposal onto the landfill. This is licensed to handle up to 75,000 tonnes per annum, but again throughput has been below this level. The majority of the hazardous waste originates from outside of Gloucestershire. The term hazardous waste covers a range of different types of waste, and Wingmoor Farm only takes certain categories of hazardous waste. Consequently, much of the hazardous waste generated within Gloucestershire actually goes outside of the county for disposal. About 78% of the non-hazardous waste disposed of by Grundons comes from within Gloucestershire, with the majority of the rest originating from the Vale of Evesham.

A23. Members felt that they should have a list of all of the types of hazardous waste that could be disposed of at the site. Kevin Phillips explained that this would all be specified on the license and suggested that the Environment Agency would be able to offer information on this issue. He added that Air Pollution Control residues and contaminated soil could be disposed of at Wingmoor Farm, but that asbestos and

radioactive waste could not. The group agreed that it would need to fully understand what waste could be disposed of at the site before it would be able to go on to consider any possible health implications.

A24. Members were informed that the permission for the current landfill operation on Wingmoor Farm East expired in 2009. It was suggested that there was capacity at the site for landfill operations to continue well beyond 2009, and that Grundons would need to prepare a planning application if they wished to continue operating beyond 2009.

A25. The group acknowledged that local people simply did not believe that the site was safe, and that whatever conclusions the group reached might not be accepted by local people.

A26. Approach to the investigation – The group agreed that its meetings should be held in public unless there was a good reason to hold certain sessions in private. However public would only be allowed to attend as observers, they would not be able to ask questions. It was suggested that the meetings in phase 1 and 2 of the investigation should be held at a venue away from Shire Hall, and closer to the community affected. The Tithe Barn in Bishops Cleeve was suggested as a possible option, but the group did recognise that the meetings might need to be ticketed if such a venue was chosen.

A27. The group considered the focus, methodology and timescale suggested for the investigation by the scoping group. The group felt that the suggested approach appeared to be sensible. The group agreed that in phase 4 the words “if appropriate” should be removed as it was important that the group did produce some recommendations at the end of its investigation.

A28. Carolyn Roberts, Associate Dean of Faculty of Education, Humanities and Sciences, commented that she was not clear what the group meant when it referred to existing monitoring arrangements in the focus for the investigation. The group suggested that they were referring to monitoring arrangements such as lorry movements, internal processes, pollution, and health impact. Carolyn suggested that the monitoring arrangements should be broken down into 3 categories

- Operations – including lorry movements, materials, weights, and plant on the site
- Environmental quality – Water, air and soil
- Health – the frequency of various illnesses compared to average levels. The group would need to consider the area it would need to look at that would give meaningful results when considering health impact.

A29. The group agreed that the maximum time for the investigation should be one year, but that the group should endeavour to finish sooner if possible.

A30. The group agreed to follow the approach set out by the scoping group subject to the addition of clarification about what was meant by monitoring

arrangements, and the removal of the words “if appropriate” from phase 4.

A31. The University of Gloucestershire – Carolyn Roberts explained that she had been asked to attend the meeting to give an indication of the type of support that the University of Gloucestershire might be able to offer the group during its investigation. She explained that there would be a charge associated with any support that they provided. She explained that the University could offer a range of research and consultancy support and that it did have expertise in this type of issue.

A32. The University could provide specialist support in areas such as ground/soil contamination, water contamination, and atmospheric pollution. They could also offer less specialist services such as mapping services and support in managing community consultation activities. The University did not have expertise in specific health issues but could offer support in analysing epidemiologic information looking at the incidents rates of different conditions. This could be difficult as it would be dependent on the type of information that the Primary Care Trust was able to provide. It was possible that this type of information could take a long time to gather, whereas information on operational issues and environmental quality issues should be easier to come by.

A33. The group agreed that it would be useful to have some support from the University and questioned what budget the investigation would have. The group was informed that the Health Scrutiny budget was not finalised as it was dependant on contributions from the district councils, but that there should be approximately £20,000 available to support health scrutiny investigations in 2006/7.

A34. The group agreed that it would probably require some form of advisory support to give the group an independent experts opinion on the information that they were given, and possibly some support with analysing certain types of information. The group asked the University if it could provide a list of the types of services that it could offer, and some indication of the associated costs so that the group could begin to consider the details of the support that it would require, and then develop a clear brief for the University.

A35. Members agreed that a search should be carried out to find out if any other councils had attempted similar investigations, in order to see if anything could be learnt from their experience.

A36. Co-opted members – The group was informed that it was able to co-opt up to two additional members, and that the scoping group had suggested that they should consider co-opting one industry representative and one community representative. Unfortunately the Environmental Services Association did not feel able to offer any support to the group. Members agreed that the association should be approached again and asked to reconsider as they felt that it would be very important to have an industry representative involved in the group. Both Cory Environmental and Grundons should be informed that the group was trying to get an industry representative involved as they

may wish to lobby the association to ensure that the industry voice was heard.

A37. The group was informed that Christine Donald, Chair of the Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Patient and Public Involvement Forum had volunteered to be the community representative on the group. The group agreed that it would like to take up this offer and that an invitation should be extended to Christine formally inviting her to join the group.

A38. The group discussed the possibility of asking a health service representative to join the group. The group agreed to leave this option open for the time being until it was clear whether an industry representative would be prepared to join the group.

A39. Date of next meeting – The group agreed that it should not meet again until it was ready to begin work on phase 1 of the investigation, and that there was clearly some background work to undertake in the meantime. The group agreed that if possible they should aim to hold the next meeting in June.

27th July 2006

A40. Environment Agency – Stuart Baker explained that he would be providing an overview of the role of the Environment agency in general, and information about the monitoring of the Wingmoor Farm site. He explained that in terms of health the agency was not a leading body, but that it did have a statutory duty to protect the public from harm from pollution, including protecting their health, working in partnership with agencies such as the Health Protection Agency and the Primary Care Trusts.

A41. Stuart explained that he would focus on the Wingmoor Farm West site, as it was the only hazardous waste site in the South West. However, if members had questions about operations at the rest of the Wingmoor Farm site he would endeavour to answer them. He explained that planning permission for Wingmoor Farm West was granted in 1989. The site itself was an ideal location for a hazardous waste site as there were many metres of impermeable clay beneath the site, which meant that there was little risk of pollution getting into the ground water supply.

A42. Stuart explained that the philosophy behind the Pollution Prevention Control (PPC) rules was that the operators of waste disposal sites were the ones responsible for the safe operation of that site. Pollution monitoring was therefore undertaken by the operators, and paid for by the operators. He acknowledged that this did on occasion lead to questions amongst members of the public about the extend to which the operators could be trusted to monitor their own operations thoroughly.

A43. The PPC permit specifies what monitoring must be undertaken, and when. Monitoring in generally undertaken on a monthly basis. Emissions to service water are measured from one monitoring point on the site. There are also 6 points at which ground water pollution is monitored, and 15 sites where gas emissions into the air are

monitored. It was noted that there was not a lot of gas emission from Wingmoor Farm west; gas emissions is an issue for landfill sites rather than hazardous waste sites. Uniquely to Wingmoor Farm West there is also dust monitoring undertaken 24 hour a day. There were 4 monitors at the site which detect dust particles, and also dust scan monitors (sticky pads) around the site that were collected fortnightly. The site also had permission to take asbestos. Whenever the site takes in asbestos it must also have specific monitors in place to check for asbestos fibres.

A44. Trigger levels were set within the permit. If any were exceeded at any time the operators must inform the Environment Agency immediately. The operators must then investigate the incident and report to the Agency on any action that needed to be taken.

A45. Ground Water – Monitoring of ground water had found high levels of CO2 in the boreholes. However, no other gases associated with waste disposal have been detected. The Agency therefore believed that the CO2 is as a result of natural causes. Low levels of zinc and nickel have also been detected. This would continue to be monitored but as yet they were not seeing any trends. Ammonia was also present at fluctuating levels, but this could be as a result of historic contamination. The acceptable level of chloride in the water was being breached on a regular basis. This could be as a result of the high chloride levels found naturally in the type of clay that the site is based on. The Agency was in the process of assessing the clay to test this idea. Traces of certain insecticides were also found, but this is a common contaminant found in most boreholes so was not a major concern in terms of Wingmoor Farm.

A46. Surface Water – Monitoring had detected high levels of suspended solids in the surface water, however the monitoring coincided with a storm event so the Agency believed that this had natural causes.

A47. The overall picture therefore indicated that:

- There were no issues regarding landfill gas
- There is contamination in the clay, but this was probably due to historic landfill activities on the site so was not a cause for concern.
- There were incidents of dust exceeding limits. However, Wingmoor Farm East was the only site in the country with continual 24/7 air monitoring. Most incidents occurred last thing in the evening and first thing in the morning, and these were often due to monitors picking up mist. When this is not the explanation the sticky pads were collected and an independent body analysed the particles found. On a few occasions there have been concerns, and these concerns have led to changes in operations at the site.

A48. The Agency recognised that there was concern about Air Pollution Control (APC) residues and dust leaving the site. The Agency has therefore put up its own monitoring equipment outside of the site. There were very few sites in the country using this technology, and none where the Agency itself undertook the monitoring

except Wingmoor Farm. The Agency monitors dust particles from 8 sites around Wingmoor Farm. The Agency had been undertaking this monitoring for two years and thus far the results were inconclusive.

A49. Members referred to the incident in May 2004 when APC dust escaped into the atmosphere and asked the Agency for its comments. Stuart explained that about 2 tonnes of APC dust was lost in May 2004. The Agency immediately suspended APC work until it was satisfied that the problem had been rectified. APC work was suspended for 6 months.

A50. Members questioned how quickly the agency was able to respond to public complaints. Stuart explained that the agency aimed to respond to serious complaints within 30 minutes, and less serious complaints within 14 days.

A51. Members commented that there had been some complaints suggesting that it was difficult for people to get hold of the results of the Agency's analysis of dust particles. Stuart explained that the Agency had produced 3 reports on the results. Reporting was difficult as it was difficult for the Agency to understand what the results meant. He accepted that there had been concern about this, which was why they now involved a member of the Parish Council and SWARD in the group that considered the analysis. He also added that there was often a 6-month gap between the collection of the sticky pads and the analysis of the results. Although it was difficult to draw sweeping conclusions at this stage the Agency was satisfied that there were no serious problems.

A52. Members asked for details about Wingmoor Farm East and Quarry. Stuart explained that the main complaints about the quarry were regarding odorous gas and rubbish. There were also complaints about flies and dust. The odour was landfill gas. At the early stages of landfill operations it is not possible to use gas flares as the anaerobic conditions needed to develop first. Wingmoor Farm East and Quarry now share a flare so the problem has been addressed.

A53. Members asked for further details about the amount of time that the Agency spent monitoring the Wingmoor Farm site. Stuart explained that an Operator and Pollution Risk Appraisal (OPRA) system was used nationally. This system gave each site a score based on its activities, the operators performance, and compliance rating. The OPRA score dictated how much time the agency would spend monitoring the site. In total they spend about 100 hours per year on Wingmoor Farm West, including spot checks, planned audits, data monitoring, checking procedures, and reviewing the operator's data. The Quarry actually had a higher OPRA score then Wingmoor Farm West so the agency spent more time monitoring that site. Bringing all three together meant they had one full time equivalent monitoring the Wingmoor Farm sites.

A54. Members commented that one of the biggest problems was that houses had encroached on the site. Stuart agreed, and commented that the Planning Authority has decided to allow this.

- Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Primary Care Trust – Caryn Hall from Cheltenham and Tewkesbury PCT presented the neighbourhood health profile that the PCT had produced in 2005. Key points included:
- The profile considered the urban area of Bishops Cleeve and Woodmancote.
- The profile of the population of the area is very similar to the rest of the PCT are and the county.
- The area is one of the least deprived areas in the county. Life expectancy is above the county average for men and the same as the county average for women. The birth rate is the same and the rest of the county and the incidents of low birth weight babies was lower than the rest of the county.
- Rates of respiratory disease match the patterns seen across the PCT area and the county. Figures on cancer rates show incidents to be no higher than would be expected, and rates of Coronary Heart Disease were below average.
- Infant mortality rates were the same as for the county, as were in incidents of stillbirth. The PCT also looked at congenital abnormalities. There were less than 5 abnormalities in the area. In total there were 153 in the whole county. These were small numbers, but it was clear that there was no evidence of a cluster effect.
- The PCT was currently looking at asthma but it was difficult to get reliable data. GPs were now required to collect data on asthma so the PCT would now be able to begin to collect this. However, it may be difficult to match this information exactly to residents of the Bishops Cleeve/Woodmancote area.

A55. Caryn Hall also commented the Tewkesbury Borough Council's Environmental Health department had done some monitoring of nitrogen dioxide levels from traffic. The monitoring had not revealed any incidents where acceptable levels were exceeded, and the monitor had now been removed.

A56. Members recognised that the profile did not seem to indicate any major problems at this stage.

A57. Caryn Hall explained that the PCT was working on a methodology for a full health impact assessment. A paper on the methodology was shared with members of the group. She explained that the PCT had been working on the possibility of undertaking a health impact assessment for the last 3 months, and that there proposed methodology included active public involvement. She explained that the PCT was looking at a 6 to 9 month timescale for the assessment and that they were hoping to start around September.

A58. Members expressed their total support for the planned process and felt that the proposals for active community involvement were crucial in order to give the assessment credibility.

A59. Next meeting – The group agreed to hold its next meeting on Tuesday 19th September at 2pm. It was agreed that the Health Protection Agency would be invited

to the meeting to explain their role, and that SWARD would be invited to outline their concerns about the site.

19th September 2006

A60. Notes of the last meeting – SWARD had raised concerns about the accuracy of note 9.9. The notes suggested that after the incident in May 2004 all APC work was suspended for 6 months, however SWARD believed that whilst work at the silo that released the dust was suspended, APC work at the other silos continued. Stuart Baker would be asked to clarify this issue.

A61. Health Protection Agency – Dr Toyin Ejidoken gave a presentation on the role of the Health Protection Agency, and on its role in relation to Wingmoor Farm. Members were provided with a copy of the slides from the presentation.

A62. She explained that health protection covered a range of public health activities intended to help protect individuals, groups and populations from infectious diseases, from environmental hazards such as chemical contamination, and from radiation. The agency was set up on 1st April 2003 and was designed to be a one-stop shop for managing public health hazards.

A63. The agency provides impartial and authoritative information and advice to health professionals, the public and local public health organisations. They also monitor and respond to new threats to public health and provide a rapid response to health protection emergencies, including the deliberate release of microbiological or chemical agents. The agency is also able to improve knowledge about health protection through research, education and training.

A64. In relation to Wingmoor Farm the agency has a role in the Integrated Pollution Prevention Control (IPPC) regime. The agency provides advice on the potential health risks of sites to local people and can provide advice on the monitoring required, and assistance in the interpretation of results in partnership with the regulators and operators. She provided an example of the work that the agency did in response to an odour incident in September 2004. The agency designed a questionnaire to gather further details about the impact of the incident. They also formed an incident management group which included the Environment Agency, Primary Care Trust and national experts to look at what had happened and how to support residents into the future.

A65. She explained that the literature on the impact of living next to landfill sites and hazardous waste sites was inconclusive, and added that the agency needed to develop a method for capturing the concerns of people living close to the sites so that they could provide better advice in future.

A66. She reminded the group the PCT was now proposing undertaking a health impact assessment on the site. The assessment would have a strong community focus.

A67. In response to members questions about the powers of the agency Dr Ejiodoken explained that the agency could

offer advice to people but that it could not compel people to take that advice. In relation to Wingmoor Farm the PCT did tend to take the advice offered by the agency. If they ignored the advice the agency would have the option of taking it up with the Strategic Health Authority.

A68. Members commented that they were informed about the Health Impact Assessment at there last meeting and that they were told that the PCT was developing a methodology that would allow the assessment to be undertaken over a shortened period of 6 to 9 months, rather than several years. Members questioned whether the agency would be involved in the assessment. Dr Ejidoken explained that the agency was not directly involved and that the PCT was commissioning the assessment. However the agency was working with the PCT and was aware of what the assessment would involve. She added that although the PCT was proposing a shortened version of assessment it did not mean that the assessment would not be thorough; the aim was simply to make the best use of the resources available.

A69. Members noted that the three PCTs in Gloucestershire would become a single organisation on 1st October and that this could potentially threaten the future of the assessment, or at least delay it. Dr Ejidoken commented that the PCT was leading on this not the agency but that her understanding was that the existing PCTs would have to document all of the work that should be continued by the new PCT. She believed that the assessment would not be lost in the reorganisation. Members also noted that at the last meeting they had been told that the assessment would begin in September so it seemed the timetable was already slipping. The group felt that the results of the assessment would be very useful to them and agreed that they should write to the PCT to formally request details of when the assessment would begin.

A70. In response to a question about whether the agency provided advice to Local Authorities regarding planning permission for landfill sites Dr Ejidoken commented that there was no requirement to request health advice in the planning regulations. However, the agency did offer advice to the Environment Agency during the IPPC permit process.

A71. Members commented on a Reuters report that they had received prior to the meeting that indicated that research in America had concluded that living near a hazardous waste site containing persistent pollutants such as dioxins, polychlorinated biphenyls, and chlorinated pesticides, seemed to increase the risk of hospitalization from respiratory infections and asthma in children. Dr Ejidoken commented that they would need to look at the results in more detail, but that she was suspicious of the report and if it was accurate she was surprised that similar results had not been picked up in the UK.

A72. SWARD (Safety in Waste and Rubbish Disposal) – Barbara Farmer provided a presentation on SWARD's views on the Wingmoor Farm site. She explained that they had tried to commission Vivien Howard, a leading toxicologist to attend the meeting, but unfortunately she was unavailable. She added that she understood

that the group that would undertake the health impact assessment was in the process of being set up, but that SWARD did share the group's concerns over what would happen after the 1st October.

A73. SWARD had a number of concerns about the site, for example traffic. Both of the main routes into the site were bordered by housing and the level of traffic movements had increased substantially over time. Every time the level of traffic increases residents are told that it is by an insignificant percentage, but clearly over time this does lead to a significant increase in the level of traffic. Noise was another concern, as was dust and flies. SWARD were concerned about both the presence of large numbers of flies, and also about incidents when there was a sudden absence of flies as this would mean the use of insecticides which was also a worry. Hazardous waste disposal was one of the biggest concerns.

A74. SWARD claimed that when planning permission was granted in 1989 councillors had stated that hazardous waste should not be taken at the site, however this was later amended following a letter from Grundons. No health impact assessment was ever undertaken, and SWARD believed that the only reason for this was that as planning permission was not originally granted for a hazardous waste site the assessment was not required.

A75. In 1996 the site began to take Air Pollution Control (APC) residues. APC residue was a very fine powder, containing lime, dioxins, and heavy metals. All of the poisons from the incineration process were contained within the APC ash, although the Environment Agency claimed that the APC residue was not particularly hazardous and that it was only the heavy lime content that was of concern. It was added that the Government Committee on toxicity had recently reduced the recommended maximum level of exposure to dioxins, and that it was now considered that a safe lifetime dose of dioxin was smaller than a grain of salt.

A76. SWARD were concerned about what was released into the environment when APC residue was landfilled. The process of landfilling APC residue created steam, and SWARD were concerned that the steam also contained dust particles. SWARD were also concerned about incidents where they believed that APC dust was blowing about at the landfill site, although the Environment Agency had decided that there had been no breach of the rules.

A77. Members questioned whether the Environment Agency circulated the results of their dust monitoring to SWARD. Barbara Farmer explained that they had just received the first report on findings, but that it only included details from the Agencies own monitors in the village, not from the monitors managed by the operators on the site itself. Also the agency still had no way of analysing the dust that was collected to see what type of dust it was. Another problem was that the monitors did not collect finer dusts but these were perhaps of the most concern as they could most easily penetrate the lungs.

A78. Members commented that the Environment Agency viewed their

monitoring of the site positively and that they were satisfied that there were no serious problems, but clearly SWARD felt differently. Members therefore questioned what more SWARD felt should be done. Barbara Farmer commented that there were only two sites in the country that took such high levels of APC residue, and that therefore Wingmoor Farm was a nationally strategic site. Therefore the Agency should be doing far more monitoring then at other sites. SWARD felt that there simply were not enough dust monitors at the site and that the dust could easily escape those that were there. Therefore although they were being told there was no dust it did not necessarily mean that was the case. They also felt that the Environment Agency was unhelpful.

A79. Members expressed concern about the incremental increases in traffic flows, and questioned if any traffic impact studies had been undertaken throughout the life of the site. Barbara Farmer said that the operators had both commissioned traffic impact assessments, and that they should be able to provide further details.

A80. Concern was raised that unless confidence in the monitoring of the site was restored the proposed health impact assessment could lack credibility.

A81. It was noted that Grundons had been granted permission to exceed the European Union's recommended levels for leaching by a factor of 3. Members questioned the evidence that this decision was based upon. Barbara Farmer explained that it was based on Grundons Own risk assessment, and that it should be possible to get a copy of the assessment from the Environment Agency. It was suggested that the group could consider commissioning its own impact assessment of the whole effect of the continued operation of the site. However, it was recognised that this would be a major piece of work, and that perhaps it might be better if recommended that this action be undertaken by another agency in its final report, rather then trying to commission the work for itself.

A82. Date and focus of next meeting – It was agreed that Grundons should be invited to the next meeting. Members felt the meeting should probably take place in November, but that a date would have to be finalised once Grundons' availability was known.

A83. Barbara Farmer agreed to provide some written questions that the group might wish to consider putting to Grundons.

15th November 2006

A84. Grundons Waste Management Limited – Richard Skehens, Managing Director of Grundon and Stephen Roscoe, Technical Director for Grundon introduced themselves. They explained that they would provide a brief history of the Wingmoor Farm site, details of monitoring arrangements, and some information on proposals for the future as had been requested. They explained that they intended to restrict their comments to issues that related to the terms of reference of the group and that they did not want to get into non-related issues such as planning issues.

A85. Richard Skehens explained that Grundons was a privately owned company with a turnover of £65 million per year. The core business of the company is waste management. The company's waste management activities did include some work with local authorities but the vast majority of its work was commercially based.

A86. Grundons operate two sites in Bishops Cleeve - Wingmoor Farm and Wingmoor Quarry, often collectively referred to as Wingmoor Farm. The Wingmoor Farm hazardous waste site is a site of strategic national importance. There was rigorous examination of the suitability of the site for hazardous waste disposal at the planning stage.

A87. Air Quality Monitoring – Steve Roscoe explained that air quality monitoring began in the late 1990's, although the system used was fairly basic. In 1998 Grundons started to research alternative approaches to improve the monitoring. This was something that they did out of choice, not because there were any statutory obligations to do so. In 2001 they made the decision to begin to use Topas Units, which were a type of pump sampler. Dust particles disperse the laser in the unit allowing it to detect any particles that are present in the atmosphere. The monitors were approved by the Environment Agency. The units operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The monitors were placed between the active areas of the site and the receptor areas (e.g. areas of housing).

A88. The units allow Grundon to measure the level of dust in the atmosphere but did not allow them to measure which direction the dust was coming from. Therefore in 2003 they also began using 'sticky pads' which helped them to determine which direction the dust was coming from. Together these two systems were able to give a good picture of the dust in the atmosphere. Over the course of a year the dust monitors would take over 420,000 separate dust samples. Grundons added that most of this monitoring had been undertaken out of choice not through compulsion.

A89. In 2004 the Pollution Prevention Control regime was introduced. This system effectively formalised the monitoring that Grundon was already undertaking and introduced the requirement that the results of the monitoring be sent to the Environment Agency. In 2005 the Environment Agency deployed 8 of the 'sticky pad' monitors outside of the Wingmoor Farm site in areas around the village of Bishops Cleeve. The Site now also took asbestos and therefore they had also introduced asbestos monitoring, the results of which were independently analysed.

A90. Occupational monitoring – Occupational monitoring is undertaken to ensure the health and safety of employees. The results of this monitoring showed that dust levels were at only 10% of the occupational limit in summer and only 3% in the wetter winter months. All the results suggest that the levels of dust were very low and were at a safe level.

A91. The Health and Safety Executive visited the site on a voluntary basis and have

looked at worker exposure to dioxins. They concluded that the workers at the site were not exposed to levels greater than the current recommended level, and that in fact the exposure was at a level lower than in several other industries such as in steel works. Therefore this monitoring had demonstrated that workers at the site were not at risk, and therefore those living near the site but still substantially further away from it than the workers must be at even lower risk.

A92. Occupational Health Investigations – Individual occupational health investigations are undertaken for members of staff involving a wide range of different tests. All results are reported to Grundon and each individual gets a personal report. These investigations demonstrated that there was no evidence that any Grundon worker was being exposed to dangers as a result of working at Wingmoor Farm.

A93. Annual Report 2005 – The annual report for 2005 for the hazardous waste site showed that the limits for heavy metals in ground water had been exceeded on one occasion over the year, but this was considered to be a spurious result. It also showed that there had been elevated chloride levels in one borehole, however there was a great deal of evidence to show that this was due to naturally occurring elevated chloride contamination in the clay. The report showed no evidence of problems with landfill gas or with surface water. Air quality monitoring showed that there were only 46 examples of limits being exceeded during the year. Of these 1 was due to neighbouring activities, 1 was due to a bonfire, and all the rest were connected to mist/fog – Grundon and the Environment Agency were confident that this was the explanation. Therefore there were not actually any examples of levels being exceeded throughout 2005, and the same was true for 2006 thus far. During 2005 the monitoring determined that there was no discernable off site impact from the activity at Wingmoor Farm, and that any higher levels of dust in the area were not at a nuisance level.

A94. Rick Assessments – In 2001 an Environmental Risk Assessment was undertaken, which concluded that there were no adverse effects for the neighbourhoods around the site. An Occupational Health Risk Assessment was also undertaken in 2001, which showed that dioxin exposure for staff was well below the occupational limits. The risk assessment looked at the worst possible case scenario by assuming that all of the dust found at the boundary of the site was the most hazardous, but even looking at this worst case scenario it showed that the site was safe. Grundon had since tested the air for dioxins and the results showed that the site was not contributing to dioxin levels present in the air as there was no difference between the dioxin levels upwind of the site and the dioxin levels down wind of the site.

A95. Independent Annual Dust Monitoring Reports – The independent annual reports produced in 2001, 2002, and 2003 validated the findings in the 2001 risk assessment showing that there was no impact beyond the site boundaries.

A96. Neighbourhood Health Profile – The Primary Care Trust had developed a

neighbourhood health profile, which the group had seen at a previous meeting. This also showed no evidence of harm.

A97. North Sheffield – The North Sheffield Primary Care Trust had already undertaken a full Health Impact Assessment on a landfill site in Sheffield and that showed that the site there was not causing any problems. The assessment did however demonstrate a reporting bias amongst those living near the site, and this was something to be aware of when the Gloucestershire PCT undertook its own Health Impact Assessment.

A98. Stephen Roscoe concluded by saying that the site was subject to constant review, and that they were absolutely confident that it was not contributing to ill health of staff or local residents.

A99. Members of the group expressed concern about lorry movements to and from the site and the possible negative impact of this. Stephen Roscoe commented that the vast majority of the traffic on the roads was not related to activity at Wingmoor Farm and suggested that it was not possible to look at this traffic in isolation. Excessive traffic was a national problem.

A100. Members asked how long Wingmoor Farm had been operating. Richard Skehens explained that Grundons had operated the site since 1989, but that it had been a waste disposal site operated by a different company before that. Grundon had a good idea of the types of waste disposed of at the site by the previous operators.

A101. Members asked about the level of importance that Grundon placed on protecting health. Richard Skehens commented that it was very important for them to protect the health of their staff, and that they felt that if it was safe for their staff who worked directly at the site then it must be safe for those living nearby who have a lower exposure to the site.

A102. Members asked for further details of how Grundon monitor the health of their employees. Stephen Roscoe stated that he was not sure exactly when the monitoring started but that it started at some point in the mid-1990s. Staff would each have a different monitoring programme that was tailored to their individual role. The frequency of the monitoring would depend on the individual's role, typically it would be annual but for those dealing directly with hazardous waste it would be more frequent. When employees left Grundon all of the results from the monitoring were made available to their GP.

A103. Members questioned whether Grundon had objected to housing being built near to the site during the planning process. Richard Skehens commented that Grundon did not make any formal objections but that it was the responsibility of the planning authority to make sure that there was a rigorous examination of all of the issues before granting planning permission. Therefore it was their responsibility to ensure that the issues were examined rigorously.

A104. Members commented on the need for a buffer zone between hazardous waste sites and housing. Richard Skehens pointed out

that the site was operating before the housing was built and that if this was an issue the planning authority should have taken it into account. He added that the active areas of the landfill that were closest to the Bishops Cleeve settlement in question would actually be filled in by the end of the year with operations moving to an area of the site further away from the housing. Therefore this would actually help to create more of a buffer zone between the site and the housing anyway. The area that was to be filled would be re-planted with trees.

A105. Members questioned whether Grundon would be involved in the PCTs Health Impact Assessment and if they had any views on it. Richard Skehens commented that they were not directly involved with the steering group as that would not be appropriate. They had no concerns about the impact assessment although they were aware of the problem of reporting bias that had been experienced in Sheffield.

A106. Members questioned whether enough data was available for them to start looking at trends. Stephen Roscoe explained that they did have a great deal of data but that as yet they have not done any trend analysis to see if dust levels in the environment had generally been increasing over time.

A107. Richard Skehens invited the members of the task-group to visit the Wingmoor Farm site.

A108. Next Steps – The task-group agreed that it would undertake a visit to the Wingmoor Farm site and then produce a report with its findings as it was not possible to do any further work until after the PCT had undertaken its Health Impact Assessment. The group could be reformed to look at the results of the assessment once it had been completed.

A109. The group agreed that planning officers should be asked to provide a short history of landfill operations at Wingmoor Farm, so that the group had a better idea of what took place at the site before Grundon took it over in 1989.

23rd February 2007

A110. Notes of the previous meeting – The information requested about landfill operations at Wingmoor Farm before Grundon took control of the site was still outstanding. It was noted that the information provided by the Planning Department in response to this request was simply a series of decision notices and other planning documents that related to applications prior to the purchase of the site by Grundon. The group felt that they needed information to improve their understanding of activity, particularly waste disposal activity, on the site, not planning details. The group agreed that it was disappointed with the information that had been provided thus far and agreed to request a clear summary of activity on the site prior to the purchase by Grundon.

A111. The group agreed that in addition to the information on activity on the site the Planning Department should also be asked to provide information on the traffic impact assessments that had been undertaken

during the planning process, and information on whether the traffic estimates in those assessments had proved to be accurate.

A112. Parish Councils – The local Parish Councils of Bishops Cleeve, Elmstone Hardwicke, Stoke Orchard, and Woodmancote had been invited to the meeting to share any views that they had on the Wingmoor Farm site. Only Woodmancote Parish council had responded to the invite. Unfortunately they were unable to attend the meeting but did submit their views in writing. The group expressed its disappointment that the Parish Councils had not responded, but recognised that the timing of the meeting was difficult for them, and that they may have felt that SWARD would have already covered all of their concerns.

A113. The group discussed the written response submitted by Woodmancote Parish Council. The submission focused on concerns about traffic movements. The group felt that this tied in with other comments that they had heard, which seemed to suggest that the traffic issue was the biggest single concern for most local residents.

A114. Feedback from Wingmoor Farm visit – The Chairman commented that the visit to Wingmoor Farm had been useful to get a better understanding of the size of the operation. He felt somewhat reassured by the fact that there were 200 feet of clay below the site and 30 feet of clay above when it was in-filled. The biggest concern was perhaps around the process of getting the waste into the site to begin with, including the concerns about the level of traffic in the local area. The health of staff could also be a concern although it was noted that the monitoring undertaken by Grundon suggested that staff were not experiencing any problems.

A115. Councillor Crowther commented that the main business of Grundon was not the extraction of clay; it was waste disposal. The site looked much like a typical landfill site. After listening to the information provided by the guide there seemed little doubt that Grundon were following all of the necessary procedures and guidelines for their business. Potentially there was some concern around quality control. He acknowledged that this type of site was required. One concern was around the role of the Environment Agency as he felt that they were not very proactive. He added that he felt that the group needed to do some more work to look at off site traffic movements and that it was not yet time for the group to produce its final report.

A116. Councillor Nash expressed concern that Grundon were only doing enough to meet the minimum requirements, and concern that the Environment Agency were not proactive enough.

A117. Councillor Awford commented that he felt that the Health and Safety Executive should be asked to monitor the site on a more frequent basis as part of any new planning permission, and suggested that this could perhaps be one of the group's final recommendations.

A118. Members felt that there clearly was a problem around the lack of dialogue

between the operators and the local community. Some members felt that Grundon's approach to responding to concerns raised by the local community was not always the most helpful, and did not help to address people's concern.

A119. Final Report – The group agreed that the basic outline structure that had been proposed for the final report was sensible. However, they felt that there was still some further work to do before the group could produce its final report. The group agreed that it would probably need to hold two further meetings, one in early to mid-May to consider the information from the Planning Department on the traffic impact assessments, and another final meeting, probably in July, to consider the outcome of the Health Impact Assessment.

A120. The group agreed that the Parish Council's should be given a second opportunity to present their views to the group at the meeting in May. It was suggested that the meeting should be held in the Bishops Cleeve area to make it easier for the Parish Council's to attend, and that if possible it should be held in the evening.

A121. It was agreed that the Chairman of the task-group should prepare a short update report to present to the next meeting of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Appendix B
PPS12 (Paragraph B17 extract)

This section sets out the evidence for including a policy in the WCS that provides a stand-off distance between a hazardous waste site and areas of public use.

This section should be read in conjunction with the EA position statement on stand-off distances (set out in section 1 of this evidence paper).

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

B17. Council Directive 96/82/EC (the Seveso II Directive) came into force on 3rd February 1999. Member States are required to ensure that the objectives of the Directive: the prevention of major accidents involving hazardous substances and limiting their consequences for man and the environment are taken into account in land use policies. This will be achieved through controls on the location of new establishments where hazardous substances are present or are likely to be present; controls on modifications at existing establishments where hazardous substances are present, and controls on new developments in the vicinity of existing establishments where hazardous substances are present. The Directive also requires Member States to ensure that land use policies and the procedures for implementing them, take account of the need to maintain appropriate distances between establishments where hazardous substances are present and residential areas, areas of public use and areas of particular natural sensitivity or interest. These obligations have been implemented by the Planning (Control of Major-Accident Hazards) Regulations 1999.

B18. In preparing or reviewing local development documents, local planning authorities will need to ensure that they include a policy or policies relating to the location of establishments where hazardous substances are used or stored, and to the development of land within the vicinity of establishments where hazardous substances are present.

Appendix C
EA Position statement on the treatment and landfilling of hazardous waste

C1. The last two years have seen a significant step change in the management and disposal of hazardous waste as a result of changes to the law. The Environment Agency's (EA) priority has been to ensure the safe management of hazardous waste during this period of change.

C2. One of the key changes was the ban on co-disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous waste at landfills. The EA do not expect to see this replaced by treatment plants mixing hazardous and non-hazardous waste for the purpose of dilution or concealment of the hazardous waste and the subsequent mis-classification of outputs as non-hazardous waste. As a result of in-depth audits at hazardous waste treatment plant we have identified a number of poor, if not illegal, practices.

C3. Some treatment plant operators have been treating waste without knowing what the end result might be or whether incompatible reactions might occur during treatment. This note clarifies what the EA expect of all those treating and landfilling hazardous waste.

Overview

C4. Wherever possible, producers should ensure hazardous waste is kept separate from non-hazardous waste.

C5. Any hazardous waste that has been mixed with non-hazardous waste should be separated out at the first opportunity where it is safe and feasible to do so.

C6. Hazardous waste requiring treatment must be treated at appropriately authorised plant before it is landfilled and must meet the relevant waste acceptance criteria.

C7. The purpose of treatment of hazardous wastes should either be to render waste non-hazardous, or to reduce its impacts when disposed of in an appropriate landfill.

C8. Treatment plant operators must be clear as to why a particular treatment method is being employed on a particular waste. They should ensure maximum efficiency of the treatment process and ensure that incompatible mixtures do not occur that may damage the environment or human health.

C9. Hazardous waste can be treated by way of chemical processes to make it non-hazardous. Simple physical processes alone are rarely sufficient to render a hazardous waste non-hazardous.

C10. Mixing hazardous waste with non-hazardous waste with the purpose of diluting it or masking the hazardous components is not considered acceptable treatment. Pre-mixing of hazardous waste with a non-hazardous waste for example, to facilitate handling, can be carried out prior to treatment. Pre-mixed wastes

(whether from pits or vessels) should be classified and managed as hazardous waste.

C11. Sham treatment and the mis-description of hazardous waste as non-hazardous waste continue to be an enforcement priority for the EA.

Background

C12. The Landfill Directive aims to reduce the negative impacts of landfill. It does this, in part, by controlling inputs to landfill and particularly by requiring waste to be pre-treated and meet rigorous waste acceptance criteria (WAC). Most facilities treating hazardous waste are subject to the IPPC Directive which requires Best Available Techniques (BAT) to be employed and an integrated view to be taken of the environmental impacts of the activities undertaken at the installation.

Government Policy

C13. Government policy is that there is a presumption against the mixing of hazardous and non hazardous waste simply to dilute or conceal the hazardous waste. Further, where hazardous waste has already been mixed with other waste or non-waste materials, it must be separated where technically and economically feasible, or where necessary to comply with the relevant objectives of the Waste Framework Directive.

C14. The European Commission BAT reference document (BREF) on waste treatment also confirms that mixing must not lead to wastes being processed to a lower quality than is desirable, and that mixing in order to achieve dilution of a specific component to avoid more stringent regulatory control is prohibited. Where mixing of hazardous waste is necessary to improve safety during disposal or recovery operations and to prevent pollution or harm to health, it must be carried out under and in accordance with a permit.

Hazardous Waste Treatment

C15. Treatment methods should meet the above policy objectives. Simple physical treatment will not normally render a hazardous waste non-hazardous. Where the outputs of a hazardous waste treatment plant are to be landfilled, they must meet the relevant WAC, and the EA require this as part of the treatment plant PPC permit.

C16. The EA do not consider that simple mixing (whether in pits or vessels) where hazardous waste is mixed with other wastes or substances, with the purpose of diluting the hazardous components, is capable of rendering waste non-hazardous. It is, however, open to individual operators to demonstrate otherwise. The EA therefore generally expect the outputs of mixing pits to be hazardous. Where these outputs are destined for landfill they must go to a hazardous waste landfill and meet the relevant WAC. The appropriate code is partly stabilised hazardous waste (190304*). If the mixing pit output is subject to further treatment, then it should be coded as a premixed hazardous waste (190204*) prior to being subject to that treatment.

C17. The EA are requiring the current generation of mixing pits to cease

operating, by 30 June 2008. If operators wish to continue treating waste they will be required to do so in plant and equipment that meet the requirements set out in sector guidance note IPPC SGN S5.06.

The future for Hazardous Waste Treatment

C18. In the longer term, the EA expect treatment technology to further reduce the impacts of hazardous waste on the environment. The EA envisage that there will continue to be a role for the landfilling of hazardous waste residues that cannot be handled in any other way. Crucially, the EA expect that a new generation of waste treatment will produce outputs that are either:

- recovered
- non-hazardous - by stabilisation or appropriate treatment techniques or
- hazardous waste that has been solidified or partially stabilised such that it is capable of meeting the WAC for the appropriate landfills.

Environment Agency position (October 2006)

C19. The EA expect to see greater segregation and purposeful treatment of hazardous waste at source to minimise its impacts. The EA expect treatment plant operators to understand the inputs to their processes, the likely impact of that process on the inputs, and to exercise appropriate control over the output such that hazardous and non-hazardous wastes are appropriately disposed of. Landfill operators need to be equally vigilant about the waste that they are asked to accept. Producers or managers of hazardous waste that suspect others are incorrectly classifying or managing hazardous waste should notify us. The EA expect to see increasing dialogue between waste producers, the treatment industry and the landfill sector to ensure effective solutions to the safe management of hazardous waste. The EA will continue to focus our efforts on those who mis-describe hazardous waste and/or subject it to sham treatment.