**Waste Core Strategy- Preferred Option and Policies Forum Event**

**30th November 2012, Board Room, Barrack Street**

**Attendees:** Andy Ambrose **(ALP Ambrose Minerals Planning & Development Consultancy)**

Mr Richard Scawin **(Coventry & Solihull Waste Disposal Ltd)**

Linsey Luke **(Federation of Small Businesses)**

Mr Philip Johnson **(NISP)**

Michelle Spruth **(SITA)**

Glenn Fleet **(Waste Management, WCC)**

Matthew Williams **(Development Control, WCC)**

Jack Tregoning **(WRG)**

Sara Townsend **(Environment Agency)**

Noreen New **(Sustainable Rugby)**

Neil Sandison **(Sustainable Rugby)**

Neville Roberts **(CEMEX)**

**Introduction**

DG introduced everyone to the event and gave an outline of the day and what the event would cover. DG explained that there would be presentations on:

1. the NPPF and Localism Act and the implications for the Waste Core Strategy
2. progress to date and the development of the Preferred Option
3. updated waste arisings and future waste projections
4. capacity update

There would then be an opportunity for two group discussions, the first looking at Construction and Demolition Waste and the second looking at any issues raised during the consultation such as the Preferred Spatial Strategy, Draft Core Strategy Policies and Draft Development Management Policies. There would also be an opportunity at the end of the event for any further questions.

**Points raised during group discussions**

**Large scale waste facilities**

Core Strategy Policy 3 uses the wording ‘over 50,000 tonnes of waste per annum’ when referring to large scale waste facilities.The point was raised that as the industry is constantly changing, a facility accepting over 50,000 tonnes of waste per annum is not necessarily classed as a large facility anymore. DG said that this point was noted, however the 50,000tpa figure had been taken from the indicative threshold for Environment Impact Assessment contained in the EIA Regulations. The environmental impacts of such facilities are therefore likely to be of greater significance than for smaller scale facilities so that is why the figure has been used.

It was commented that larger scale recovery facilities may prevent local scale re-use and recycling. DG advised that the strategy and policies would not prohibit small scale facilities serving a local need – however, economies of scale may mean that larger scale facilities are viable, particularly those managing specific wastes.

**Communication**

It was queried whether Coventry City Council had provided a response to the Core Strategy consultation as the Coventry MUA had been referenced in the preferred option. It was confirmed that no response had yet been received. TL advised that the plan seeks to acknowledge the links with Coventry, but ultimately, Coventry City Council will be responsible for producing the waste plan for the Coventry area. Ultimately, both plans will need to be compatible.

A comment was made about improving communication between planning authorities, residents and waste operators/developers. It was suggested that planning authorities make Community Leaders aware of proposed developments and the potential effects on local communities, infrastructure, transport network etc. at the earliest possible stage. DG advised that although this would be ideal, there are no longer the resources available in planning departments to do this- meeting the statutory minimum for consultation is often proving difficult. Notwithstanding, parish councils are consulted and they are elected to represent local communities. It was commented that no matter how much engagement takes please, there is a stigma attached to waste developments and ‘NIMBY’s’ will never see the potential benefits that waste management facilities provide. AJ added that there is a responsibility on developers to engage with local communities-the document states that this takes place at the earliest possible stage of any proposal, particularly where it may be controversial in nature. Open communication will foster a positive attitude and co-operation between the waste management industry and local communities.

**Transportation of waste**

A question was raised around the transportation of waste and whether there is a more viable option of moving waste other than by road. There is concern that there will be a lot of travel on poor quality roads when accessing waste facilities. An industry representative stated that they had undertaken research on alternatives to road transportation, however they were not deemed to be financially viable at present. AJ added that Policy CS3 requires that alternatives to road transport are used where feasible – where road is the only option, developers will need to demonstrate that distances and emissions are minimised and there are no unacceptable impacts on the highway network. A suggestion was made to encourage more use of the A roads and the use of motorway links where there are new substantive developments which should result in the reduction of HGV in the local area. TL stated that the spatial strategy has been developed to take account of the principal highway network, including motorways, A roads and trunk roads. Things to consider should include whether there is good transport linkage which is acceptable to the local community within which a site will be located. This will mainly only be relevant for new facilities.

**Construction and Demolition Waste**

It was widely acknowledged that C&D waste data is not as comprehensive as for the other waste streams. There was a discussion around permitted capacity. For example, Packington has permission to process 200,000 tonnes of waste but actually only processes 30,000 – 40,000 tonnes. It was suggested that there should be a requirement to look at the actual permission length. If facilities do not appear to have much time left then they shouldn’t be included as it is most likely that they will be stalled on due to costs etc. More research is needed in terms of waste minimisation and reduction, particularly for C&D waste. No alternative methodologies for calculating waste arisings or monitoring progress in terms of C&D recycling/landfill diversion were put forward.

**Allocations**

A question was asked as to whether Warwickshire County Council was intending to allocate sites in the Core Strategy. DG explained that the key principle if deciding to allocate sites is to ensure that they are deliverable. An industry representative stated that allocating sites can lead to a lot of bad feeling amongst local communities and that it can actually be more of a hinder than a help. TL explained that given how much waste treatment capacity had been granted in recent years, it may encourage even more waste development in the County. Given that the County is well placed to meet its landfill diversion targets over the plan period, this might not necessarily be beneficial.

There should be more site diversification taking place, this is already happening but it should be made clearer as to what we actually mean by it.

DG thanked everyone for attending. The meeting closed at 1:00pm.