

Cumbria County Council and the Lake District National Park Authority

Waste Update for Local Plans: summary of outcomes from Duty to Co-operate work 2016

As part of the review of the approach to waste management in Cumbria County Council's and the Lake District National Park Authority's Local Plans, and in line with the Duty to Co-operate, data was collected June/July 2016 on a range of issues, such as types of waste to be managed, waste management capacity and waste management facilities.

Whilst Cumbria strives to be net self-sufficient in its waste management, it is acknowledged that there will always be a need for the movement and treatment of waste across administrative boundaries, due to economies of scale on certain types of waste management and also due to commercial contracts. It is important to fully understand and plan for any capacity issues arising from these movements.

The Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator 2011 - 2014 and the Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator 2011 – 2014, were used to determine current and recent waste movements into and out of Cumbria. This led to many returns, therefore a threshold was set. As Cumbria is a rural area, thresholds for waste movements deemed 'significant' are set relatively low. The threshold for non-hazardous waste is 500tpa, and for hazardous waste is 100tpa.

Whilst these data sets provide the statistics, what is important to appreciate, is the background information that supports them. All authorities that sent waste to or received waste from Cumbria, and were over the thresholds identified, were contacted (Table 1).

Table 1: List of the 80 authorities contacted

Barking & Dagenham	East Riding of Yorkshire	Medway	Southwark
Barnsley	East Sussex	Middlesbrough	St Helens
Bedford	Flintshire	Newcastle Upon Tyne	Staffordshire
Birmingham City	Gateshead	Newham	Stockton-on-Tees
Bolton	Halton	Newport	Stoke-on-Trent City
Bromley	Hampshire	North Lanarkshire	Suffolk
Bury	Harrow	North Lincolnshire	Sunderland
Caerphilly	Hartlepool	North Tyneside	Surrey
Cambridgeshire	Hertfordshire	North Yorkshire	Tameside
Cheshire East	Inverness & Nairn (Highlands)	Northumberland	Trafford
Cheshire West & Chester	Islington	Nottinghamshire	Wakefield
City of Derby	Kent	Oxfordshire	Walsall
County Durham	Kingston Upon Hull City	Peterborough	Warrington
Croydon	Kirklees	Redcar and Cleveland	Warwickshire
Darlington	Knowsley	Rotherham	West Sussex
Derbyshire	Lancashire	Rutland	Wiltshire
Devon	Leeds	Salford	Wirral
Doncaster	Lincolnshire	Sefton	Wolverhampton
Dumfries and Galloway	Liverpool	Sheffield	Wrexham
East Ayrshire	Manchester	Somerset	York

44 (55%) authorities responded in full (**green**); 3 (5%) authorities got in touch to ask further questions or provide a holding response, but did not fully respond (**amber**); reminders were sent to

the remaining 33 (40%) authorities, but no response was ever received (**red**). A summary of the findings from the responses received is set out below:

- This waste exercise did not look at radioactive waste.
- The majority of responders did not know the reasoning behind the waste movements, particularly those further afield or ‘one-off’ movements. This is due to the movements likely being commercial, which local authorities are not privy to.
- Some authorities, particularly those in the south of England, are keen to discourage waste movements over such considerable distances.
- Some authorities did not agree with the WDI figures that Cumbria used and noted discrepancies. This is due to authorities having no consistency between using the ‘removed’ or ‘received’ function in the WDI tool.
- Some authorities do not view the threshold of significance used by Cumbria to be significant in their opinion, particularly the more urban authorities. Therefore, they did not feel the need to work together under the Duty to Co-operate.
- Authorities were asked to comment on hazardous waste.
- Very little hazardous waste is moved in or out of Cumbria; 22,336 tonnes arose in Cumbria in 2014, and 16,659 was deposited in Cumbria in 2014. The consultation exercise included questions on hazardous waste, but with very little information in the Hazardous WDI about the facilities, responses were limited in their detail.
- Most authorities are making their own plans for safeguarding waste management capacity, and expect to have sufficient capacity to meet their forecast needs.
- Due to waste movements being market driven, authorities were unable to speculate as to whether the waste movement trends were likely to continue.
- Most authorities were not aware of any other issues at this time that may prevent the provision of the planned capacity.

Going forward, many of the consulted authorities would like to continue to confer with each other with regards to developments with Local Plans and gave thanks to Cumbria for consulting them on this occasion. It is important to continue to work with neighbouring authorities, as well as those further away. It will be important to monitor waste movements in and out of Cumbria (through the annual Authority Monitoring Report), to and from other parts of the country, over the course of the Plan period.

August 2016