

**FD.EVR3**

## **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan**

### **Policy 3: Waste Management Needs**

(was predominantly covered in Policy 5: Providing for Waste Management at the Preliminary Draft stage)

March 2019

<b>Introduction and National Policy Context</b>	<b>2</b>
Introduction	2
National policy	2
<b>Local Context in Relation to Policy 3: Waste Management Needs</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan Policy</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Alternative Reasonable Options</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>4</b>

# 1. Introduction and National Policy Context

## Introduction

- 1.1. Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council are reviewing their joint adopted Minerals and Waste Development Plan and supporting documents. These comprise the following documents (with adoption date):
  - Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) (July 2011)
  - Site Allocations DPD (February 2012)
  - Block Fen and Langwood SPD (July 2011)
  - Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD (July 2011)
  - RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (February 2012)
- 1.2. The two above DPDs are to be replaced by a single Minerals and Waste Local Plan covering the period to 2036. The three SPDs are also being reviewed, potentially with some elements brought into the new Local Plan. The new Local Plan will set the overall spatial framework and development management policies for sustainable mineral and waste management development across the plan area.
- 1.3. This Evidence Report provides a narrative on the development of and justification for Policy 3: Providing for Waste Management in the emerging new Local Plan.

## National policy

- 1.4. A summary of the most relevant national policy applicable to Policy 3 is set out in a separate evidence document available on the website, entitled “Waste Needs Assessment”.

# 2. Local Context in Relation to Policy 3: Waste Management Needs

- 2.1. The local context applicable to Policy 3 is set out in a separate evidence document available on the website, entitled “Waste Needs Assessment”.

# 3. Minerals & Waste Local Plan Policy

- 3.1. The Preliminary Draft Plan was published on 16 May 2018 and consulted on over a six week period to 26 June 2018.
- 3.2. The purpose of including Policy 3 (was Policy 5 at the Preliminary Draft stage) in the new Local Plan is to set out clearly the two councils position on ‘need’ or ‘capacity gap’ for new waste facilities.
- 3.3. During the Preliminary Draft Consultation, there were several representations made on this policy, with a mix of views. In summary, the main issues raised were:

- WPAs should look to ensure that sufficient facilities are provided for to manage waste arisings and minimise the volume of waste to landfill. This should not be restricted by unnecessary politically motivated policies which restrict importation from other LPA areas under the false misconception that this is somehow in accordance with national policy objectives (relating to self-sufficiency)
- The spatial management of waste is, and will be, driven by market forces and the fact that the haulage of waste, together with landfill tax, are the most significant long-term cost in the management of waste. As such, these fiscal forces will prevent the unnecessary or unreasonable transportation of waste over long distance, unless there are sound economic reasons for doing so; and will drive the diversion of waste from landfill.
- London has neither the space, capacity, nor contractual arrangements to deliver all of its own waste management capacity.
- There needs to be more transparency on longevity on existing contractual and operational arrangements if over-provision is to be maintained in the later stages of the plan.
- Para 2.47 suggests a potential strategy for identifying industrial areas and suitable locations rather than specific sites. We do not believe this will provide the necessary certainty in terms of meeting waste needs. Strategic sites should be allocated followed by broad locations and criteria based policies.
- Several concerns about the separately published Waste Needs Assessment (first version as published). For example, the conclusions of the WNA is based on overly optimistic assumptions in terms of waste growth, optimistic assumptions in terms of existing capacity and pessimistic assumptions in terms of waste that could be managed at EfW facilities rather than to landfill.
- Commercial viability needs to be factored in.
- Additional flexibility is required over and above mineral sites already permitted to accommodate future inert waste demand within a growth area.
- Policy should refer to biodiversity gain / adverse impact on designated sites
- Sites should avoid pollution risk areas.

3.4. All representations were carefully considered.

3.5. As a consequence of the representations, as well considering any new evidence which may have emerged, the policy (and other linked policies) has been amended for the Further Draft Local Plan as follows:

3.6. The opening paragraph has been adjusted, but essentially retains the principle that net self-sufficiency is being sought, with an allowance for London. This is consistent with the evidence, national policy and the positions of our neighbouring authorities.

3.7. The various figures in the tables have been updated, to reflect the latest figures. In short, such figures point to a very limited 'capacity gap'.

3.8. The end part of the policy has been updated, primarily reflecting amendments to the approach of the plan set out in policy 4.

3.9. The supporting text of the policy has also been significantly updated and amended.

- 3.10. The Waste Needs Assessment has been updated, and many of the representations received are addressed by evidence in that report. A schedule of the councils detailed responses to representations made on the Waste Needs Assessment (at Preliminary Draft Plan stage), and consequential amendments to the Waste Need Assessment, has also been published separately.

## 4. Alternative Reasonable Options

- 4.1. The following alternative options have been considered (including in the Sustainability Appraisal Report):
- Option 1 (Preferred): A policy which clearly sets out the intention to seek net self-sufficiency, plus an allowance for London Waste, together with a detailed table setting out identified 'capacity gap' (based on evidence) for various waste streams. This is preferred, as it is consistent with national policy, is consistent with the conclusions of our discussions with DtC partners and will lead to appropriate, but not excessive, waste management capacity in the area.
  - Option 2: A more restrictive policy, which seeks only self sufficiency (i.e. not *net* self sufficiency) and makes no allowance for London Waste. This is rejected. Not only is this option contrary to national policy, it is an unrealistic proposition (practically and in terms of enforceability, and a burden for waste operators) to treat the plan area as an 'island' for the creation and treatment of waste. It also leads to unsustainable travel, because waste would be unable to travel short distance across borders, if such borders were falsely 'closed' to waste transfer.
  - Option 3: A more flexible, market driven policy, with no capacity gap identified (or a very large margin above capacity gap identified), and the market free, in principle, to increase provision of facilities beyond net need. This is rejected, as it is inconsistent with national policy, would be contrary to agreements with/policy of neighbouring councils, and could lead to excessive transferring of waste (and associated environmental, social and economic disbenefits) into the local area.

## 5. Conclusion

- 5.1. This evidence report demonstrates the rationale for the inclusion of this policy in the Further Draft Plan, and also demonstrates a summary of the issues raised at the earlier Preliminary Draft stage, and how the Councils have considered those issues raised.
- 5.2. Any representations received at the Further Draft consultation stage will be carefully considered, and this Evidence Report will be updated prior to the third and final consultation stage due in late 2019.