

5 WASTE CORE STRATEGY

PROVISION FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

- 5.1** In order to achieve the suggested objectives the plan should identify sufficient sites to manage all the wastes that arise in Cumbria. These sites should be adequate for the facilities needed to manage wastes as high as possible up the waste hierarchy.
- 5.2** It is proposed that the plan will identify a range of possible sites and areas throughout the county where the additional facilities which will be required for waste management could be developed. The identified sites will be differentiated by their suitability for different uses. This will depend on their size and the nature and characteristics of the types of facility. Considerations will include the distance from sensitive receptors and environmental impact. It is not intended to propose specific waste management technologies. Sites will be suggested where a range of facilities using different technologies could be developed.
- 5.3** The question of how many facilities are needed is covered in this chapter, and issues around siting policy are considered in Chapter 7.
- 5.4** Current development policies that could be considered for the Core Strategy are set out in Box 3 after paragraph 5.28.

QUESTION 2

A. Do you agree that the plan should try to make provision for all of the wastes that arise within Cumbria?

If not,

B. What other option do you consider would be appropriate?

AND

Do you consider that the plan should only consider proposals that take waste solely or mainly from Cumbria?

- 5.5** The Regional Spatial Strategy's predicted requirements for Municipal and Commercial and Industrial waste were discussed in Chapter 2. The County Council does have reservations about these figures but Planning Policy Statement 10 requires the plan to demonstrate how capacity equivalent to at least ten years at the annual rates set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy could be provided. The figures will be kept under review as more detailed and improved information becomes available.

WASTE CORE STRATEGY

Facilities for Municipal, Commercial and Industrial Waste

- 5.6** It is not intended that the plan should differentiate between sites for managing municipal waste from those for commercial and industrial wastes. Their siting requirements should be similar. The number and type of sites that are required will depend, in part, on the waste treatment technologies that are adopted and, of course, on their capacity.
- 5.7** There may be advantages if facilities can be provided which will manage both the municipal and the commercial and industrial waste streams. A summary of the main available technologies was included in Box W1 in Chapter 2.

QUESTION 3

Do you agree that the plan should identify sites suitable for both municipal and commercial and industrial waste?

If not,

What other option do you consider would be appropriate?

- 5.8** On the basis of the Regional Spatial Strategy's estimates it is likely that by the end of the plan period the following may be needed for municipal and commercial and industrial wastes:-
- Materials Recovery Facilities for at least 115,000 tonnes/year. On the basis of each having a capacity of around 50,000 tonnes/year two or three will be needed.
 - Composting facilities for 55,000 tonnes/year, this is probably within the capacity of the existing facilities. However, it is considered that the Regional Spatial Strategy underestimates the capacity needed for composting because it only considers green garden waste.
 - Facilities to treat/recycle around 730,000 tonnes of waste/year (345,000 tonnes of municipal and 385,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial) On the basis of Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) plants or alternative technologies, modules having capacities of around 50,000 tonnes/year up to fifteen treatment facilities will be needed.
 - Thermal capacity for at least 15,000 tonnes/year of commercial and industrial waste.
 - Two or three Energy from Waste plants, preferably combined heat and power plants. The capacities of these could range from 20,000 to 200,000 tonnes/year.
 - Around 2 million cubic metres of additional landfill capacity. Less may be needed depending on the technologies that are used higher up the waste hierarchy. For example, an Energy from Waste plant would produce only small volumes of ash that would need to be landfilled.

Suggested Assumptions

5.9 Assumptions have been made for the purposes of determining the numbers of facilities for which the Development Framework should seek sites. These assumptions are :-

- That existing Materials Recovery Facilities are at full capacity and that new capacity will be needed for the whole of the estimated throughput.
- That more composting capacity is needed than estimated in the Regional Spatial Strategy. For flexibility in the choice of technologies and to give potential for treating some commercial and industrial waste it is suggested that two more facilities may be needed.
- That 50% of the treatment/recycling capacity needed for the commercial and industrial waste stream will be accommodated on the site where it arises. This would be equivalent to four treatment modules of 50,000 tonnes/year.
- That separate provision does not need to be made for the thermal treatment of 15,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste.

QUESTION 4

Do you think it is reasonable to assume that half of the capacity for new commercial and industrial waste treatment facilities will be provided in-house at the site where the waste comes from?

5.10 On the basis of the above assumptions the following Core Strategy option is suggested for consideration:-

QUESTION 5

To identify sites where the following new waste treatment facilities could be developed:

- Two Materials Recovery Facilities,
- Eleven treatment/recycling facilities (including thermal treatment),
- Three Energy from Waste plants,
- Provision of around 2 Million cubic metres of landfill in addition to existing permitted capacity towards the end of the plan period, depending on the type of waste treatment at earlier stages, and
- to investigate whether any waste management facilities provided for decommissioning operations at Sellafield and/or Windscale could be used for other waste streams.

Do you have any comments on this policy?

5.11 It is stressed that the above numbers of sites are only intended as an indication of what may be needed, much will depend on the technologies that are adopted. No sites are identified for composting for the reasons given in Chapter 7, paragraph 7.18.

WASTE CORE STRATEGY

Landfill

- 5.12** The reduction in the amount of municipal waste to landfill will have a profound effect on the economics of landfill, and probably prompt further reductions from the Commercial and Industrial sector. The landfill capacity that will be required will depend on which waste treatment methods are used at earlier stages. It will also be important to ensure there is sufficient capacity for different areas of the County.
- 5.13** Current policy (Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policy 62) states that proposals will only be permitted where there is seven years or less existing permitted capacity for non – inert waste and four years or less for inerts. This is also subject to availability of facilities to manage the wastes higher up the waste hierarchy and to proposals not prejudicing the infill and restoration of existing sites.
- 5.14** The following Core Strategy option, based on current policy, is suggested for consideration:-

QUESTION 6

Do you agree that new landfill proposals to serve an area should only be permitted if it has 7 years or less existing capacity for non- inert waste and 4 years for inert waste?

- 5.15** In order to achieve the objectives in question 1 it might be possible to encourage the highest environmental standards in our remaining landfills by only considering proposals when pre-treatment of wastes or other aspects met environmental standards even higher than new and emerging requirements

Energy from Waste

- 5.16** Current policy (POLICY 61 Minerals and Waste Local Plan) states that proposals for incinerators will only be permitted where the waste arises solely or mainly from within Cumbria. It also states that proposals for incinerators which include energy recovery, including the utilisation of waste heat, will be more favourably considered.
- 5.17** Given that several new waste technologies can involve energy recovery in some form it may not be appropriate to have a specific policy solely for incinerators.
- 5.18** The following Core Strategy option, based on current policy, is suggested for consideration:-

QUESTION 7

To only permit energy from waste plants only be permitted where they are for residual wastes arising solely or mainly from within Cumbria.

Do you have any comments on this and do you want to suggest another option?

Distribution of Waste Management Facilities

- 5.19** Applicants would be required to demonstrate that their individual proposals contributed to an “integrated and adequate network of waste management facilities to cater for wastes arising in the County” and to define appropriate locations in which these would be permitted in accordance with current policy 51 in Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
- 5.20** There are two main alternatives for providing waste management facilities:
- a) a decentralised network where responsibility for managing the waste is shared by each district within the county or
 - b) a centralised network of one or two "Green Resource Parks" (see Box 1, following paragraph 2.15), that could serve the whole county. They would probably need to be backed up by intermediate bulking stations or local transfer points, which could be rail linked.
- 5.21** At present it is not clear which of these would provide the more sustainable solution for Cumbria's waste management needs. Considerations include:
- the distances wastes would travel, "waste miles",
 - the overall environmental impacts,
 - the delivery of high quality services, and
 - development and operating costs.
- 5.22** It is suggested that both options should be kept open and sites for both are put forward for discussion.

QUESTION 8

A . Do you agree that the plan should identify a range of sites each district, and also for

B) one, or C) two "Green Resource Parks" to serve the whole of the county where a full range of waste management and recycling activities could take place.

Household Waste Recycling Centres

- 5.23** The number of these bring sites is related more to their network and coverage than to their actual capacity, as the amount of waste they can process can be increased by improvements to the sites. The Core Strategy therefore will only consider the key options around that network, and numbers of sites required will be considered in Chapter 7.
- 5.24** The background information in Chapter 2 made it clear that some of the twelve existing Household Waste Recycling Centres need to be replaced and others substantially improved.

WASTE CORE STRATEGY

- 5.25** Chapter 2 also highlighted the existing target of having HWRC within 5 miles of 90% of the population. The current 69% level will change when any replacement sites are identified but it is probable that new sites in Carlisle, Milnthorpe, Cockermouth, Brampton and Alston would be needed to meet the target. These would be additional to replacement sites for Kendal, Millom, Grange over Sands, Whitehaven (Frizington) and Workington, and enlarged or new sites for Kirkby Stephen, and Ulverston.
- 5.26** As part of the ongoing drive to increase recycling a new HWRC has already been completed next to Flusco landfill in Eden District, and there are plans to improve or replace 5 more. The 90% target is being reconsidered as part of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy review, in the light of increased kerbside recycling services, but comments on this are welcomed as part of this consultation exercise.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments on the existing number and locations of Household Waste Recycling Centres?

Other “Bring” Sites

- 5.27** Because of their small scale and association with other types of development it is not considered that the plan needs to make provision for the smaller type of bring site. Any sites that would need planning permission could be considered in the context of the generic development control policies

Other Development Plan Policies

- 5.28** Some of the current policies from the Structure Plan and Minerals and Waste Local Plan on landfill and incinerators have already been referred to above. The ones that could also be considered for this Core Strategy are shown in Box 3 .

QUESTION 10

If you have had any experience of these policies in action, would you like to make any comments about how relevant they are for this Core Strategy?

BOX 3

Current development plan policies that are relevant to the Waste Core Strategy

MWLP POLICY 50

Proposals for waste development will be considered in accordance with the hierarchy of options in the following order of preference:

- i. reduction in the amount of waste produced
- ii. re-use of waste without significant processing
- iii. recovery of value from the waste and volume reduction by any of the following:
 - recycling of material
 - composting or landspreading
 - energy recovery
- iv. disposal of waste by landfill and incineration without energy recovery.

Proposals which move the management of waste up the hierarchy will be favoured.

POLICY 51

Proposals for waste development which contribute to providing an integrated and adequate network of waste management facilities to cater for wastes arising in the County will be permitted in appropriate locations

POLICY 61

Proposals for incinerators will only be permitted where:

- i. the waste arises solely or mainly from within Cumbria; and
- ii. the residues can be disposed of safely; and
- iii. the proposed plant would be located on an industrial site or at the premises where the waste arises provided that it would not have an adverse impact on surrounding land uses and will not prejudice the overall development of the area.

Proposals for incinerators which include energy recovery, including the utilisation of waste heat, will be more favourably considered.

POLICY 62

Proposals for the disposal of waste by landfill will only be permitted where there is a demonstrable need for additional landfill capacity

In assessing whether there is a demonstrable need for additional landfill capacity the following will be taken into account:

- i. the availability of facilities to manage the waste higher up the hierarchy of options (Local Plan Policy 50); and
- ii. how the proposal contributes to providing an integrated and adequate network of waste management facilities to cater for wastes arising in the County (Local Plan Policy 51); and

WASTE CORE STRATEGY

iii. whether the proposal would seriously prejudice the infill and restoration of existing sites (Structure Plan Policy 60) and whether permitted landfill capacity comprises an adequate landfill capacity bank. It will be necessary to show that permitted landfill capacity is only sufficient for seven years or less for non-inert waste or four years or less for inert waste, or in the case of proposals to dispose of inert waste arisings from major construction projects at dedicated sites that there are net environmental and economic benefits compared with disposing of the waste at existing sites.

POLICY 59

Proposals for the physical, chemical or biological treatments of waste will be permitted where:

- i they reduce the potential of waste to pollute the environment; and
- ii they are situated on an industrial site provided that they do not have an adverse impact on surrounding land uses and do not prejudice the overall development of the area; or
- iii at a non-inert landfill site where required for pre-treatment of waste or treatment of leachate, where they can be accommodated without prejudicing the operation or restoration of the site

RADIOACTIVE WASTE CORE STRATEGY

High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes

- 5.29** The Committee on Radioactive Waste's (CoRWM) draft recommendations are for geological disposal for these wastes with several decades of secure interim storage while this option is developed and implemented. CoRWM recommends that community involvement in the process should be based on the principle of communities indicating their willingness to participate in the light of a package of community benefits.
- 5.30** Sellafield already stores the UK's High Level waste and much of the Intermediate Level waste. Because of this there may be an issue about whether this plan should make specific provision to facilitate continuing storage. Taking into account that there are already planning permissions for interim storage facilities at Sellafield; and the ongoing national policy review it is not considered that such provision should be made at this stage.
- 5.31** Once the national policy position has been clarified that would appear to be the appropriate time for a partial review of the Waste Development Framework. This would follow the Government's response to the publication of the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management's (CoRWM) final report (expected July 2006) setting out all the implementation approaches.
- 5.32** In the meantime the present equivalent to a Core Strategy Policy is Review Joint Structure Plan Policy ST 4 - Major development proposals: this policy is set out in the box below The Structure Plan states that proposals that arise from the nuclear industry and the associated waste it generates will be considered under this policy.

- 5.33** Whilst the context within which the policy was written has now changed it is suggested that the policy is adequate in the interim until this plan can address High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes.

BOX 4

Policy ST4: Major development proposals

Major development will only be permitted where:

- 1. the total benefit clearly outweighs the total detrimental effects,*
- 2. the proposal complies with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security, and where appropriate is independently reviewed; and*
- 3. alternative locations and methods giving rise to less harm have been fully considered and rejected.*
- 4. In addition in the case of the Lake District National Park and AONBs:*
 - a) there are no alternative sites available outside the designated areas,*
 - b) the need for the development cannot be met in any other way,*
 - c) the development has a proven case in the public interest,*
 - d) the development is designed and carried out to cause least practicable harm, and*
 - e) the development has no overall adverse impacts on the local economy.*

Permission will be granted only on condition that:

- i. all possible measures are taken to minimise the adverse effects of development and associated infrastructure, and where appropriate,*
- ii. provision is made to meet local community needs,*
- iii. acceptable measures are secured for decommissioning and site restoration, and*
- iv. arrangements are made for suitable local community involvement during the development, decommissioning and restoration.*

For the purposes of this policy 'major development' is defined as development that has significant environmental effects and is more than local in character.

WASTE CORE STRATEGY

QUESTION 11

Do you consider that Structure Plan policy ST4 is adequate as an interim Core Strategy policy for High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes? OR

Do you consider that the plan should make provision now for additional interim safe storage management of these wastes?

Low Level Radioactive Wastes

- 5.34** One option would be not to make any further provision at all for these wastes and a Core Strategy policy would simply need to reflect that approach. However, this is not considered to be practicable because of the amount of LLW that arises within the county itself, most of it from Sellafield.
- 5.35** Other options would need to consider the potential for managing these wastes within the Sellafield complex and the concerns about the long term integrity and radiological capacity of the site near Drigg. Other possible sites within and beyond Cumbria may also need to be identified and considered.
- 5.36** In addition account would need to be taken of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's aspirations, including site end-states, and of the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum's (NuLeAF) study of potential off-set packages of benefits and of local communities' rights to veto or volunteer to host sites.
- 5.37** Before setting out the Council's preferred option for submission to the Secretary of State further public and stakeholder consultation will be undertaken on radioactive wastes.

Core Strategy Policies

- 5.38** If it is considered that the plan should make provision for additional facilities needed to receive Low Level Wastes arising within Cumbria a possible policy could be :-

QUESTION 12

Additional facilities for storing or disposing of Low Level Radioactive Wastes should only be provided for wastes that arise from within the County?

Do you have any comments on this suggested policy?