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1 Introduction

1.1 What is this document

1.1.1 This is the opportunity for you to help plan where mineral resources can be extracted and where waste products should be managed, and in some cases landfilled, within the areas covered by the Councils of Lancashire, Blackpool, and Blackburn with Darwen (the Joint Authorities). Also, your help is needed to set out what should be taken into account when applications are being looked at, such as the impact on the environment.

1.1.2 This is the second stage of the consultation on the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development and Management Policies, and will make up part of the Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework.

1.1.3 The Joint Planning Authorities have responsibility to plan for minerals and waste developments in Lancashire, Blackburn and Blackpool (the Plan area).

1.1.4 We know that difficult and in some cases unpopular decisions will have to be made. We also know that if we do not plan to make these decisions there will be uncertainty for both developers and the public. No one wants this, as it can be costly and unsettling, with the best outcome often being missed.

1.1.5 We have a good idea of the amount and type of minerals that are required up to 2021. We also know the amount of waste that needs to be treated, recycled and finally, landfilled if there is no other option.

1.1.6 What we don't know is the best way to achieve this. This is why this document sets out a number of options that we consider could work. In some cases these options relate to specific sites, in others it relates to criteria to judge different types of development. Sometimes there is no realistic choice and there is considered to be only one option. In all cases as much information as possible has been provided to make sure that you are in the best position to comment and to put forward your views. We don't have all the answers so if you can bring forward alternatives these will be welcomed.

1.1.7 You will notice that each of the chapters is presented in the same way. That is:

- What the Core Strategy Says;
- What You Have Said;
- The Options (our favoured option is outlined in bold);
- The Sustainability Appraisal;
- The Favoured Option;
- Implementation and Monitoring.

---

1 Regulation 25
2 Generally for recovering, treating, storing, processing, sorting, transferring or depositing waste
3 This has been agreed in the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2009.
1.1.8 This format has been used as it makes clear how particular proposals have been arrived at, including how the sustainability appraisal (4) fits in, and allows us to demonstrate how the favoured option links back to the delivery of the Core Strategy's spatial objectives.

1.1.9 This document is your opportunity to get involved and feedback to us so that we are able to take your views into account before we consult on the more detailed formal Publication draft. This then will be followed by the submission document which is sent to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to be examined by an independent inspector. He or she will consider whether the development plan document is good enough. A plan which reaches a certain standard, and meets a number of requirements is considered sound and can be adopted to be used to manage development and to provide certainty to developers and the public alike.

1.1.10 Once adopted this will together with the Core Strategy, adopted in February 2009, replace the policies within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. (6)

1.2 Link with Core Strategy

1.2.1 Throughout this document there are references to the Core Strategy. This has been the subject of thorough consultation, and was examined by Stephen Pratt, one of the Government's Planning Inspectors.

1.2.2 It provides the basis for future minerals and waste planning up to 2021 within the Plan area. This means that any future plans need to fully accord with its policies. It takes into account the community strategies in place across the Plan area, as well as other relevant local and regional strategies and initiatives including the need to reduce carbon emissions as well as being founded on a sound evidence base (6). It also fully accords with national, and regional planning policies. As any proposed options must accord with the Core Strategy it can be assumed that they will not conflict with any of these strategies or policies.

1.2.3 It is vital that any option is in line with the Core Strategy and this is why each chapter refers to the relevant part of the Core Strategy.

---

4 The complete draft Sustainability Appraisal is available as a separate document.
5 Appendix 4 sets out in detail which policies are proposed to be replaced by which favoured option.
6 Appendix 1 Policy context provides more details on this.
2 How to respond

2.0.1 This document represents the second stage of the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document. If you think that something has been missed, can find a better way to plan for the area's minerals and waste requirements, or improve on the options set out then please let us know what the alternative is.

2.0.2 The consultation period for this document is from 7th January 2010 to 19th February 2010. All responses will be considered in the preparation of the submission version of the development plan document to be published in autumn 2010.

2.0.3 If you would like to comment on this document please respond by any of these means:

1. online at http://lancashire-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal
2. by email to lmwf@lancashire.gov.uk
3. by post to
   - Waste and Minerals Policy Group
   - Lancashire County Council
   - Freepost PR844
   - Winckley House
   - Cross Street
   - Preston PR1 8RD
4. or by fax to 01772534178

2.0.4 All documents are available on www.lancashire.gov.uk under minerals and waste development framework. It can also be made available, on request, in alternative formats: large print, different languages and Braille.
3 Story so far

3.1 Your input

3.1.1 After the successful adoption of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy we asked the public, representatives of the minerals and waste industries, local politicians, district authorities, community groups and Government agencies and others to get involved in the next stage of planning for minerals and waste in the Plan area.\(^7\)

3.1.2 We asked what should be important when allocating specific sites for minerals and waste, and which criteria are important to use when a planning application is submitted.

3.1.3 Three workshops took place. These were well attended by over one hundred people. The conclusions drawn from these and the responses to the consultation have influenced the draft options and the choice of the favoured approach. Each of the various options refers to this feedback.

3.1.4 We have also been asking for people and interested parties to bring forward sites that they think are appropriate for minerals and waste uses. Over eighty sites have been suggested and these were made available on the Joint Authorities' websites, and at the workshops.

3.1.5 Not all of these sites have been considered suitable to be brought forward into this document as they are not required by the Core Strategy, or they were ruled out by other considerations. These are set out in Appendix iii. A detailed accompanying document sets out why the sites have not been taken forward.

---

\(^7\) Further details can be found in the draft Pre-Submission Consultation Statement
3.1.6 All of these sites have had a sustainability appraisal undertaken on them. This is available separately.

3.1.7 Input from stakeholders, the public and the minerals and waste industry is referred to, and has been considered when referring to the possible options, under the "What you have said" headings.

3.2 Evidence

3.2.1 In addition to the body of evidence that the Core Strategy has relied on, and the evidence set out in i.3, we are required\(^8\) to carry out a sustainability appraisal of the proposals in each development plan document. This performs a key role in providing a sound evidence base for the document and provides a powerful means of ensuring the proposals are the most appropriate given reasonable alternatives.
4 Implementing the Core Strategy Vision

4.1 The Vision

4.1.1 Below is the spatial vision for minerals and waste in Lancashire taken from the Core Strategy. A spatial vision is an idealised picture of how a place will function and look in the future. In this case it relates to Lancashire in 2021.

4.1.2 All the policies in the Core Strategy and related planning documents should help to implement this vision.

Over the plan period, Lancashire will continue to contribute an appropriate supply of minerals to provide locally sourced materials and those required to meet regional and national needs, supported by a productive and diverse minerals industry. The use of alternative materials in place of land-won minerals will progressively increase, and will be supported by an expanding mineral recycling industry. New waste facilities will be located to reduce the need to transport wastes unnecessarily and to support self-sufficiency and local ownership in waste management. Minerals will be safeguarded for their economic, environmental or cultural heritage value. All new minerals and waste development will contribute to conserving and enhancing our landscapes, our natural and cultural heritage and our quality of life.

By 2021 we will all, residents, businesses and developers alike, understand our own responsibilities in managing our waste and natural resources sustainably and will view waste as a resource rather than something to be thrown away and forgotten. Our communities and visitors to Lancashire will value our mining and quarrying heritage and appreciate the importance of continuing mineral extraction to our economy and to our quality of life. Residents and industry will work closely together and with local authorities to influence the way future sites for minerals and waste are planned.

Lancashire will benefit from an integrated network of waste facilities using innovative technologies to manage our waste in sustainable ways, and supported by a thriving recycling and reprocessing market. All new developments will embrace waste minimisation and recycling in their design and construction techniques. High quality design and working practices will be an essential feature of all new minerals and waste developments, which will respect the character and distinctiveness of their surroundings. Lancashire's minerals and waste activities will be exemplars of best practice.

4.2 What this Means

4.2.1 This agreed vision, informed by the Joint Authorities' and the districts' community strategies, is the driving force behind both the policies in the Core Strategy and the requirement for specific site allocations and general criteria based policies.
4.2.2 It is important as it demonstrates why certain policy directions have been taken, and brings together the wider spatial and strategic aspects of the Core Strategy which these options will ultimately implement, as well as the need to deliver the priorities of the Local Area Agreements including the important issue of climate change.\(^9\)

4.2.3 It also gives rise to a number of clear policy objectives which the policies need to address. These are set out in detail in the Core Strategy and are replicated in Appendix ii of this document.

4.2.4 Most importantly, it sets out in layman’s language what the policies are meant to achieve.

---

\(^9\) See Appendix 1 for further details.
5 Options for Safeguarding our Mineral Resources

5.1 What the Core Strategy says

Policy CS 1 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals & Waste Core Strategy states:

- Lancashire's mineral resources, including those shown on the Key Diagram and including its former mineral workings will be identified and conserved, where they have an economic, environmental or heritage value.
- Mineral resources with the potential for extraction now or in the future will be identified as mineral safeguarding areas and protected from permanent sterilisation by other developments.
- Mineral consultation areas will be identified and reviewed regularly. District Councils will consult with the minerals planning authority where proposals for development fall within these areas.

5.1.1 The Government expects mineral planning authorities to safeguard important minerals in their development plan documents. This is done by defining mineral safeguarding areas where there will be a presumption against any development that could prejudice the future working of those minerals. The presence of a minerals safeguarding area does not in itself preclude other forms of development, it merely provides an alert to the fact that minerals may be sterilised by proposed development and should be taken account of in the planning process.

5.1.2 It also requires that a mechanism be set up so that districts consult the mineral planning authorities to ensure that any development that is approved does not impact on the ability to extract minerals in the future, or any other objective of safeguarding minerals. These 'mineral consultation areas' must be shown on all districts' proposals maps.

5.2 What you have said

5.2.1 The following key issues/ common themes emerged from the spring 2009 consultation:

**Environmental or Heritage Value**

- Former mineral workings should rely on environmental designations/development management policies for protection.
- Specific safeguarding should be provided where sites can be identified as providing materials for construction or maintenance of historic buildings and/or buildings within conservation areas.

**Existing & Future Mineral Workings**

- Built up areas should be excluded on the basis that no minerals have sufficient value to warrant demolition/relocation of existing built development.
- Only minerals currently being worked economically should be safeguarded.
- National designations should be excluded from mineral safeguarding areas.
Mineral Consultation Areas

- Should match mineral safeguarding areas but have clear exclusions to cover minor development.
- Should only apply to areas where significant development pressures are likely such as housing allocations.

5.3 The Options

We have identified 2 sets of options, the first to consider the extent of mineral safeguarding (1 to 4), and the second to consider the specific aims of safeguarding peat (5-6).

Option MSA 1

Mineral safeguarding areas will be defined around the following mineral deposits identified on the British Geological Survey Mineral Resources Maps:

- Limestone for aggregate supply;
- Limestone for cement manufacture;
- Sand and gravel;
- Gritstone for aggregate/building stone (sandstone);
- Brickshales for brickmaking (brick clay);
- Salt.

Benefits

- Clear indication of where economic minerals exist in the plan area.
- Certainty for local communities and industry.
- In line with national policy.
- Saves land from permanent sterilisation by other development.

Drawbacks

- Large areas of the Plan area will be subject to mineral safeguarding.
- As large areas to be safeguarded it will lead to uncertainty.
- Some large scale developments may be delayed.
- Some minerals currently being worked will not be subjected to safeguarding.
Option MSA 2

Mineral safeguarding areas will be defined around the following mineral deposits identified on the British Geological Survey Mineral Resources Maps:

- Limestone for aggregate supply;
- Limestone for cement manufacture;
- Sand and gravel;
- Gritstone for aggregate/building stone (sandstone);
- Brickshales for brickmaking (brick clay);
- Salt;

but excluding the following environmental designations:

- National nature conservation designations;
- International nature conservation designations;
- Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;

and

- Urban areas.

Benefits

- Clear indication of where economic minerals exist in the Plan area.
- Certainty for local communities and industry.
- Excludes areas of national nature conservation designations, international nature conservation designations, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and urban areas.
- Save land from permanent sterilisation by other development.

Drawbacks

- Large areas of the Plan area will be subject to mineral safeguarding.
- As large areas to be safeguarded it will lead to uncertainty.
- Some large scale developments may be delayed.
- Some minerals currently being worked will not be subject to safeguarding.
OPTION MSA 2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREA
Option MSA 3

Mineral safeguarding areas will be defined around existing and historic consented quarries only.

Benefits

- Indication only of where minerals are being/have been worked not where they could be worked.
- These minerals are economically viable.
- Ensures surrounding areas are not developed on, leaving a buffer around existing site.

Drawbacks

- Would preclude the safeguarding of large unworked areas.
- Potential workable mineral sites would not be safeguarded and could be sterilised by other forms of development.
- May miss out on good quality minerals not on safeguarded land.
- New mineral sites will not be considered.
- Could prolong the life of a site, this may cause upset within the surrounding community.
OPTION MSA 3: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREA
Option MSA 4

Mineral safeguarding areas will be defined around the following mineral deposits, within 3 miles of the strategic road network:

- Limestone for aggregate supply;
- Limestone for cement manufacture;
- Sand and gravel;
- Gritstone for aggregate/building stone (sandstone);
- Brickshales for brickmaking (brick clay);
- Salt.

Benefits

- Ensures future workings are within reasonable distance of road network.
- Minerals safeguarded in the more sustainable and economic locations.
- Good access to road network.
- Close to destination of materials.
- Reduced impact of heavy goods vehicle traffic.
- Ensure surrounding areas are not developed on, leaving a buffer around existing site.

Drawbacks

- Not favoured by national policy and guidance.
- No safeguarding of historic mineral workings.
- Some potential workable minerals would not be be safeguarded.
- New mineral sites will not be considered.
- Could prolong the life of a site, this may cause upset within the surrounding community.
- May miss out on good quality minerals as not on safeguarded land and it subsequently developed.
Option MSA 5

Minerals safeguarding areas will be defined around peat deposits, to protect it as a mineral resource.

Benefits

- Clear indication of where economic minerals exist in the Plan area.
- Certainty for local communities and industry.
- In line with national policy.
- Saves land from permanent sterilisation by other development.

Drawbacks

- National policy is to reduce the amount of peat extracted.
- Little likelihood of peat being extracted in future so little or no need to protect.
- Because the areas are so large it will lead to uncertainty.
- Some large scale developments may be delayed.

Option MSA 6

Mineral safeguarding areas will be defined around peat deposits, to protect as a carbon reserve.

Benefits

- Peat is a major store of carbon, this will ensure that it is not degraded unnecessarily.\(^\text{10}\)
- Will make important contribution to meeting the Government's emission targets reduction.\(^\text{11}\)
- Way to integrate climate change considerations, in particular the protection of carbon sinks, into spatial planning.

Drawbacks

- Will increase the amount of land that is covered by mineral safeguarding.
- As large areas to be safeguarded it will lead to uncertainty.
- Some large scale developments could potentially be delayed.
- Potential conflict with some renewable energy projects.
- Could conflict with future legitimate peat extraction.\(^\text{12}\)

---

10 Further work is being undertaken by the Government in relation to the future use of peat as half of the UK's soil carbon is found within peat habitats.

11 Climate Change Act 2008.

12 Mineral Planning Statement 13 confirms that the extraction of peat should be treated as a mineral and protected for this use.
5.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

5.4.1 The sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy supported the overall aim of minerals safeguarding as fundamental to maintaining the long-term supply of building materials. The options which have been suggested to deliver this, range from a blanket approach providing a high level of protection, through to targeted and specific safeguarding based around known resources or around other sustainability objectives.

5.4.2 Options MSA 1 and MSA 2, which both propose a blanket approach to safeguarding, differ only in respect of whether or not to include key environmental designations and urban areas. The following points have significance in this respect:

- The inclusion or exclusion of these key environmental designations (including nationally- and internationally-important wildlife sites and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) would provide clarity, but in reality would duplicate the protection that these areas are already afforded. In these areas, any future development (minerals or otherwise) would be led by the conservation objectives of these designations themselves.

- Whether or not to exclude urban areas is more complicated, and from a practical point of view, existing development will often prevent any form of future mineral working. However, it is important to recognise that there are a number of mineral workings (past and present) which fall within or lie close to our towns and villages, and whether future working or reworking of these resources is possible will depend purely on local circumstances. This fact need not itself exclude these often important resources from safeguarding.

5.4.3 Options MSA 3 and MSA 4, which focus on existing and known resources, fail to respond to future changes in mineral extraction, particularly the more rapidly change sand & gravel operations, where there is likely to be greatest pressure for development. None of the options (with the possible exception of Option MSA 3) take into account the heritage and environmental value of mineral workings – however, a programme to identify and conserve these is currently being undertaken in partnership with the conservation organisations.

5.4.4 Options MSA 5 and MSA 6 relate to peat, which is an important environmental resource. Peat principally occurs in Lancashire as either upland blanket bog or as lowland raised bog, both of which are priority habitats. In good condition, this resource has an important role in regulating water resources, as well as acting as a sink for carbon dioxide. As a habitat, high quality peat supports a range of important species, and is protected by the CROW Act 2000.

5.4.5 Whilst areas of high quality peat do still exist, in reality, many areas of peat are heavily degraded and in these cases the priority is to restore and enhance this resource. With careful safeguards, planning can help secure these improvements.
5.5 The Favoured Option

**Favoured Option MSA**

The favoured option is Option MSA 1 with the addition of Option MSA 6. Lancashire has been a significant producer of minerals in the past, including the extraction of sandstones, shales, limestone and sand and gravel. Significant reserves of these minerals remain which, whilst activity has recently declined, should be safeguarded for future generations. The specific protection of peat resources in both the upland and lowland areas should be encouraged to ensure that carbon is not unnecessarily released to the atmosphere.

5.5.1 These finite mineral resources should not be sterilised when new building or other forms of development takes place. Defining mineral safeguarding areas on the proposal map will alert prospective applicants for non-mineral development to the existence of valuable mineral resources and peat deposits, although there is no presumption that such resources will be worked.

**Mineral consultation areas**

5.5.2 In areas where existing mineral operations are taking place, where mineral reserves are permitted or long term resources have been safeguarded, we will seek to ensure that future workings will not be compromised by other forms of development. Mineral consultation areas will be defined around all mineral safeguarding areas, together with existing mineral operations outside mineral safeguarding areas\(^{(13)}\) to ensure that existing and future workings will not be prejudiced by other forms of development.

5.5.3 We will identify mineral consultation areas, on an Ordnance Survey base map, on a district by district basis. They will then be included on the district council's proposals map.

5.5.4 It is proposed that the district authority must notify Lancashire County Council of any planning application submitted to them within a mineral consultation area\(^{(14)}\). To enable this consultation requirement to be manageable it is proposed to exclude certain proposals, as detailed below:

- Developments permitted by General Permitted Development Order.
- Details submitted as reserved matters where outline planning permission has already been granted.
- Applications for alterations or expansion within the curtilage of a residential property or within an industrial unit.
- Listed building consent applications unless specifically requested.
- Advertisement applications.

---

\(^{(13)}\) We are working with English Heritage and the British Geological Survey on a Strategic Stone Study to identify the most important building stones used, representative examples of stone buildings or villages, and active/historic stone quarries. The results of this study should be available during this consultation period and may inform the location of further mineral safeguarding areas, which will, if necessary, be subject to a specific consultation prior to finalising the plan.

\(^{(14)}\) This requirement does not apply to Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool Borough Councils as they are not two-tier planning areas.
- Applications for a new or improved access.
- Certificates of Lawful Development.

### 5.6 Implementation and Monitoring

#### 5.6.1

These policies will be implemented by the Joint Authorities in their role as minerals planning authority, and by the district councils as local planning authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA 1 and MSA 6</td>
<td>Identify clearly minerals safeguarding areas on inset maps</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>100% coverage on Proposals maps</td>
<td>Report to AMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA 1 and MSA 6</td>
<td>Identify mineral consultation areas on district Proposals maps by engaging with the MWDF</td>
<td>District Authorities</td>
<td>100% coverage on Proposals maps</td>
<td>Monitor adopted new DPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA 1 and MSA 6</td>
<td>Consult MPA on all appropriate development within MCA</td>
<td>District authorities with support of MPA</td>
<td>100% of relevant applications</td>
<td>Number of consultations received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Options
6 Options for Allocating Inert Waste Recycling Facilities

6.1 What the Core Strategy says

Policy CS 2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy states:

A network of sites for fixed recycling facilities will be identified across the Plan area, with sufficient capacity and conveniently located to maximise the recycling of construction, demolition, industrial and quarry waste.

6.1.1 Lancashire does not have any sources of secondary aggregates such as pulverised fuel ash from coal burning power stations and the majority, if not all, of its colliery waste, produced by the former coal mining industry has been reclaimed or landscaped and is not now available as a source for the manufacture of secondary aggregate.

6.1.2 Therefore, it is reliant on construction, demolition and excavation waste together with road planings to produce recycled aggregates to substitute for virgin material. This is to achieve the target of 25% of construction materials to be from recycled and secondary aggregates by 2021.

6.1.3 The Plan area currently has a number of sites which process and separate construction, demolition and excavation wastes to varying standards. These are identified in the table below.

6.1.4 Whilst the Plan area has a number of aggregate recycling sites, many are small, and the larger sites tend to be linked to restoration of mineral workings and have temporary planning permission only.

6.1.5 There is a need to move towards more permanent facilities to enable the creation of better products. This should increase demand by improving the quality of the recycled products. This will require additional investment. Given the uncertainties of temporary permissions few businesses are able to commit to this.

6.1.6 In order to meet the sub regional targets and to produce the high quality materials needed by the building industry, a network of aggregate recycling sites will be required.
Table 2 Recycled Aggregate Processing Sites

6.2 What you have said

The following key issues/common themes emerged from the spring 2009 consultation:

- Priority should be given to the use of existing quarries where transport can be better utilised and environmental impacts are already being managed.
- Initial crushing should take place on demolition sites, then taken to quarries or industrial estates for further processing if not being used on site.
- Maximise the use of recycled aggregates on site.
- Sites should be remote from centres of population.
• Equal distribution of facilities is less important than good location - less impact.
• A choice and range of sites, including green field will be necessary to provide certainty, capacity and deliverability.

6.3 The Options

We have considered three options for the allocation of inert waste recycling facilities.

Option IWR 1

Sites for fixed aggregate recycling facilities will be allocated within operational quarries or landfills where they can be accommodated without compromising the long term restoration proposals for the site, and residual waste from the facilities is disposed of on site.

Benefits

• Supports co-location of facilities.
• Residues from processing can be disposed of on site.
• Supports existing industry and employment.
• Has a transport network in place.
• Large sites able to accommodate water requirements for high quality aggregate recycling.
• Large sites able to store aggregates to react to fluctuating market.
• Existing market therefore easier to shift from virgin to recycled aggregates.

Drawbacks

• May lead to increase in traffic movements.
• May be too restrictive.
• Could lead to extension of use beyond period originally envisaged.
• Not the source or destination of the material.

Option IWR 2

Provide for new aggregate recycling facilities, based on industrial locations in areas on which economic growth is to be focused.

Benefits

• Near to the market also closer to source of material.
• Reuse of previously developed land.
• Supports existing industry.
Drawbacks

- This is not a long term solution as the areas for economic growth will change.
- Have uneven distribution in the Plan area.
- Scale may not always be appropriate for industrial location.

Option IWR 3

Rely on a development management policy to regulate development, and let the industry take the lead in identifying sites.

Benefits

- Flexible approach to development proposals.
- No strategic constraints on development.
- Market led.

Drawbacks

- Could lead to uneven distribution in the county.
- Uncertainty where development will happen and when - not 'plan led'.
- No certainty for investors or local communities.
- Debate over every proposal; need will have to be proven each application.
- No means of promoting preferred development sites.
- Unable to respond quickly to development proposals.

6.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.1 The sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy identified the importance of recycled aggregates in reducing the rate at which new mineral resources need to be found. Both the sustainability appraisal and Core Strategy recognise the importance of identifying specific permanent facilities to improve the quality and availability of these recycled aggregates. A supplementary planning document has also been published which sets out how to implement policy CS2 in relation to the reduction and recycling of construction and demolition waste.15

6.4.2 The favoured option (detailed below) identifies four possible new sites for aggregate recycling facilities, that would supplement those which already exist. A sustainability assessment has been undertaken for these sites, and can be summarised as follows:

- Leapers Wood benefits from good access to the strategic road network, whilst links with Lancaster and Morecambe will be strengthened with the construction of the Heysham-M6 link road. The site is also well screened by the existing quarry, minimising the extent to which noise and traffic may impact on local communities.

---

Whitworth Quarry is an active quarry. Proposals for aggregate reprocessing could benefit the on-going remediation and restoration of the site. However the area is environmentally important and access to the site is limited.

Scout Moor Quarry is an active quarry, four miles due west of Whitworth Quarry. The constraints are similar to Whitworth Quarry, and although access to the strategic road network is better, this involves passing through Edenfield.

Lydiate Lane Sandpit (which currently has permission for inert landfill) is well located to serve the central Lancashire areas and is close to the M6 and M65. However, impacts on residential communities to the south would need to be addressed. The area has also been promoted in other plans as a strategic investment site.

6.4.3 Further assessment of the proposed new sites has been undertaken and the findings can be found in the sustainability report.
6.5 The Favoured Option

**Favoured Option IWR**

The favoured option is a combination of Option IWR 1 and Option IWR 2. We feel that inert waste recycling facilities can be suitably located at industrial sites, and operational quarries and landfill sites where the residue will be disposed of on site. These types of facilities are generally of a nature and scale similar to quarry operations with similar types and levels of vehicles requiring access, they may be appropriate in the countryside when linked to a landfill or quarry where the residue is used on-site in the restoration. Industrial locations are also close to the source of waste, thus reducing the need to transport waste over long distances or unsuitable roads.

6.5.1 The table below lists the sites which we feel, together with the industrial estates identified in Table 12, should be allocated for inert waste recycling facilities. It is proposed that when determining planning applications for inert waste recycling facilities priority will be given to these sites, unless it can be demonstrated that the alternative is not only suitable on its merits, but also that it is at least as good as these sites. In determining a planning application, detailed proposals for facilities in these areas would need to be considered in the light of their impacts, and other planning considerations, as described in national, regional and local planning policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Leapers Wood Quarry</td>
<td>Map 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosssendale</td>
<td>Scout Moor Quarry</td>
<td>Map 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitworth Quarry</td>
<td>Map 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ribble</td>
<td>Lydiate Lane Sandpit</td>
<td>Map 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 Proposed Sites for Recycled Aggregate Processing Facilities**
Option IWR 1 and Option IWR 2:
Sites for Inert Waste Recycling Facilities and Landfill
Map 2 Scout Moor Quarry
Map 4 Lydiate Lane
## 6.6 Implementation and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWR 1 and IWR 2</td>
<td>Allocation of sites</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>All successfully allocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWR 1 and IWR 2</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions following public engagement</td>
<td>MPA, Industry, Public</td>
<td>Required capacity catered for</td>
<td>AMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Options
7 Options for Allocating Minerals Sites

7.1 What the Core Strategy says

Core Strategy Policy CS 3 states:

Provision will be made for the extraction of the following amounts of mineral for aggregate use between 2001-2021:

- 10.8 million tonnes of sand and gravel;
- 57.8 million tonnes of limestone;
- 38.1 million tonnes of gritstone.

Additional land will be made available for extraction of minerals for cement and brick manufacture, where it can be demonstrated that the landbank supplying the manufacturing plant will fall short of 25 years during the plan period.

Specific sites and/or preferred area will be identified for the extraction of 4.1 million tonnes of sand and gravel by 2021.

No sites or areas will be identified for the extraction of any other minerals in the plan period, unless it can be demonstrated that either the landbank will fall short of its requirement during the plan period, or else that the current landbank contains reserves that are unlikely to be worked during the Plan period or else will not satisfy a commercial need for minerals of a particular specification that cannot be met from elsewhere.

Aggregates - Sand and Gravel

7.1.1 The landbank of sand and gravel at the end of 2005 stood at nine years. The Core Strategy required an additional release of 4.1 million tonnes between the period 2006-2021 to enable apportionment figures for both production and landbank to be maintained. Since 2005 6.42 million tonnes of sand and gravel have been granted planning permission. This gives a landbank based on the average production of sand and gravel within the Plan area of twenty-six years, or eighteen years if the apportionment figure were used instead of annual sales.

Aggregates - Crushed Rock

7.1.2 The landbank of crushed rock at the end of 2005 stood at 114.8 million tonnes (limestone 50.3; gritstone 64.5) against the apportionment requirement of 74.6 million tonnes over the period 2006 to 2021.
7.1.3  By 2007 the landbank of crushed rock had increased to 145.5 million tonnes, (limestone 71.4; gritstone 74.1).\(^{(16)}\) With no new planning permissions being granted during the period between 2005 and 2007 the increase could only have been brought about by reviewed reserve assessment by the mineral operator.

7.1.4  The limestone reserves are limited to four quarries, but with one nearing exhaustion of its planned reserves concern has been expressed over the concentration of reserves in a single quarry and the ability of the remaining quarries to increase production levels over sustained period of time.

7.1.5  There is no doubt that numerically there is a sufficiency of provision for limestone, but that the predominance of the reserve in one site could have limitations on the ability of the industry to maintain production at a level commensurate with the annual requirements.

Brickshale

7.1.6  The Plan area contains three brick works and at least seven quarries that have supplied materials to these brick works in recent times. The recent and rapid downturn in the industry will have had the effect of extending the life of these known reserves and it is unlikely, confirmed by discussion with the industry, that new deposits will be required during the plan period.

Cement

7.1.7  Limestone is used for the manufacture of cement at the Ribblesdale Works, Clitheroe. The substantial quarry complex here has been active for many years. The limestone used in the manufacturing process is a mixture of a high purity limestone and a lesser quality deposit that contains impurities. These materials are quarried from two separate but adjacent quarries, and are both necessary for the cement manufacturing process. The complex has substantial reserves and is unlikely to require any additional reserves in the plan period.

Energy Minerals

7.1.8  No licences presently exist for coal bed methane or abandoned mine methane, supporting the view that the potential for either is not good. Whilst coal is still extracted from one small drift mine in the east of the Plan area, there are no current opencast working and have not been for at least twenty years.

7.1.9  Natural gas has been discovered in the Eastern Irish Sea Basin but with limited implications for the Plan area.

7.1.10  There has been extensive exploration across much of the Plan area for both oil and gas, by way of drilling and seismic surveys. Exploration wells to date show little sign of success other than the Elswick well drilled in 1990 which encountered commercial quantities of gas which is used for power generation on site.

---

\(^{(16)}\) North West regional Aggregates Working Party Annual monitoring Report
7.2 What you have said

7.2.1 The following key issues/common themes emerged from the spring 2009 consultation.

- Any shortfall should be accommodated by extensions to existing sites provided the infrastructure is up to current standards.
- Allowing continual extensions upsets communities who expect end dates to be end dates.
- Dormant sites should not be included in landbanks, they should be removed from calculation, and action taken to rescind planning permissions.
- Reserve sites should be allocated to provide certainty, areas of search should not be used.
- Do not use 'Broad Areas of Search' or reliance on windfall sites.
- Early identification of new sites will allow mitigation measures to be implemented before working commences.
- Operators need to undertake more pre-application surveys on which to base proposals.
- Extraction rates need to be taken into account as well as landbanks.
- Deliverability of landbank is key factor in need for new sites.
- Identifying 'reserve sites' would provide certainty.
- Flexibility needed to allow for situation where long term reserves are shown to be unworkable during the plan period.
7.3 The Options

Given the landbank position described above we have identified 3 options to ensure the long term flexibility of limestone provision.

Option AMS 1

Do not allocate further sites within the plan period but rely on minerals safeguarding to protect workable reserves.

Benefits

- Complies with Core Strategy.
- Safeguards resources that could be worked.
- Provides some certainty.
- Complements minimising use of minerals by restricting supply.

Drawbacks

- Relies on existing sites with permission.
- Inflexible.

Option AMS 2

Allow extensions to existing sites where any adequately demonstrated shortfall in supply could be accommodated, provided no additional impacts arise.

Benefits

- No additional infrastructure required.
- Ensures flexibility in supply without uncertainty involved in promoting new sites.

Drawbacks

- Precludes new locations from being developed.

Option AMS 3

Identify reserve sites and prioritise these for accommodating any adequately demonstrated shortfall in supply, provided no additional impacts arise.
Benefits

- Certainty for developers and public.

Drawbacks

- Relies on geological information being provided by developers/industry.
- Detailed site appraisals would be required.
- Would result in uncertainty for the public and industry.
- Pre-empts review of Core Strategy.

7.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

7.4.1 In relation to sand and gravel resources, the choice of the favoured option to safeguard all sand and gravel resources, instead of identifying reserve sites or possible extensions, is driven by the policies of the Core Strategy. This, taken together with subsequent permissions, predicts sufficient permitted capacity for the remainder of the plan period.

7.4.2 The opening up of new sand and gravel sites can have significant impacts on the landscape as well as causing disruption to local communities. However, being relatively short-lived (at least compared with other types of development) these operations can also provide environmental and recreational benefits after their completion and restoration. So far, no clear way of prioritising different site proposals or preferred areas has been agreed, and therefore a broad approach to safeguarding all resources may help retain a range of locations in order for future decisions to be made. However, this approach has the disadvantage of providing little guidance as to potential future impacts on local areas.

7.4.3 The extent of limestone resources is much more limited, with many areas being designated as nationally or internationally important environments. In the favoured approach, set out below, the Joint Authorities have indicated a preference for releasing resources locked up within Dunald Mill Quarry (should there be a genuine shortfall towards the end of the plan period). The effects of this extraction on local communities and the landscape are likely to be significantly less than those of the alternative proposals considered.
7.5 The Favoured Option

Favoured Option AMS

The favoured option is Option AMS 3; given the potential issue around the supply of limestone later in the plan period, this option should allow us to prioritise Dunald Mill as a reserve site to be brought on stream when it has been demonstrated that the reserve situation is inhibiting production levels. For all other minerals we are proposing to rely on the safeguarding policy, as the requirements within the Core Strategy have already been provided for adequately, and there is sufficient flexibility in the landbank.

7.5.1 There is considered to be little scope for the establishment of a new green field site limestone quarry outside the AONB's or the fringes of the designated areas within the plan area. The existing quarries are constrained by roads, railways or environmental considerations and there is a question mark over the ability of the remaining quarries to produce at a level required to offset the loss of one of the quarries in the long term.

7.5.2 The only quarry considered to have potential for long term development is the Dunald Mill Quarry. Substantial reserves could be released within the footprint of the existing operational area, however the detailed limits will need to be determined by detailed evaluation and environmental impact analysis and considered at the planning application stage.
Managing our Waste and Natural Resources
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Map 5 Dunald Mill Quarry
### 7.6 Implementation and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMS 3</td>
<td>Allocation of Dunald Mill extension on insert map and District Proposals map</td>
<td>MPA District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS 3</td>
<td>Appraise application to ensure acceptability in relation to landbank issue and other considerations</td>
<td>MPA Industry Public Other stakeholders</td>
<td>Delivery of landbank</td>
<td>AMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5 Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Option**
8 Options for Managing Road Transport

8.1 What the Core Strategy Says

Core Strategy Policy CS 5 states:
Alternatives to be bulk transportation of minerals by road will be encouraged. Existing or potential transport, storage, handling or reprocessing facilities will be safeguarded where they offer the potential for the use of rail, water or other means to transport minerals.

Core Strategy Policy CS 5 supporting text states:
As far as possible all traffic will be encouraged to use the primary route network.

Core Strategy Policy CS 9 supporting text states:
Transportation of waste by road should be minimised as far as possible.

8.1.1 Within the Plan area there is only one mineral site capable of an alternative mode of transport to road. Even when minerals are moved by rail or water, they are still reliant on final transport to the end user by road.

8.1.2 The Plan area has port facilities at Heysham, Fleetwood and Glasson, but only Heysham is connected to the rail network. Heysham has until fairly recently imported marine dredged aggregate, which was then moved by road for onward transmission.

8.1.3 The canals within the Plan area are unlikely to have any potential for commercial transportation of minerals or waste as the network is inadequate in both capacity and lacks wharfage.

8.2 What you have said

8.2.1 The following key issues/ common themes emerged from the initial spring 2009 consultation:

- Accept the need to reduce road transport but need to recognise that the economics of rail movements only become viable over long distances.
- The canal system in Lancashire is a leisure system.
- Efforts should be directed to implementing and enforcing routing agreements.
8.3 The Options

We have considered 2 options, one to encourage minerals and waste movements away from roads, and one to improve road conditions for other road users by identifying alternative access or relief road possibilities.

**Option MRT 1**

**Encourage alternative methods of transport by safeguarding sites that could be suitable as minerals or waste rail depots/wharf facilities.**

**Benefits**

- More environmentally friendly sustainable mode of transport than road. Benefits the local landscape and the local community.
- Certainty for local communities and industry/landowners/Investors.
- National policy specifies the need to identify opportunities for alternative transport.
- Clear indication of sites having the potential for specified use.
- Encourages and supports sustainable transport.
- Sites that can provide alternatives for example a site with a railway siding will be more suitable that a site without.

**Drawbacks**

- Rail transport only economical over long distances. The majority of materials are used in the Plan area and only travel short distances.
- Need to look regionally to make the provision of alternative transport economical.

**Option MRT 2**

**Identify improvements to local road network to manage the impacts of minerals or waste developments.**

**Benefits**

- Reduces impacts on local road network.
- Clear indication where improvements are both necessary and achievable.
- Certainty to investors, operators and communities.
- Supports existing industry and employment.
- Could open up increased opportunity.
- Could be implemented through Community Infrastructure Levy.
Drawbacks

- Potential for increased traffic generation.
- Could lead to extension of use both in time and type.
- Concentration of activities.

8.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

8.4.1 The benefits of using alternatives to road transport were supported by the sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy. Whilst there are only limited opportunities available in Plan area, the favoured option (detailed below) identifies nine possible sites for safeguarding.

8.4.2 Several of these sites (including Huncoat former Power Station, Hillhouse Industrial Estate and Riversway Business Park) coincides with other existing or planned development areas and rail freight infrastructure is likely to have wider appeal beyond the minerals sector. A number of other proposed strategic waste sites (Table 12) may also have some potential for rail access. In all these cases, proposals would be best considered as part of a wider planning process, which would make delivering any specific projects more economically feasible.

8.4.3 In reality, much of Lancashire's transport needs will continue to be met by road for the duration of the plan period. Four proposals have been submitted for new access routes to waste and mineral sites, which may help alleviate the impact of existing heavy goods traffic on local communities, as well as helping to overcome existing barriers to the future development of these sites. These include: an alternative access road to Whitworth Quarry, a road diversion around Dunald Mill Quarry to release underlying mineral resources, an additional access route to Hillhouse Industrial Estate, and a link road between Whinney Hill landfill and the new municipal waste facility at Huncoat.

8.4.4 In other cases there may be alternative local measures which can be taken to reduce the impacts of transporting minerals, in particular. Examples include using conveyors to move quarry products across short distances without the local disruption of haulage vehicles. So far, no new proposals have been identified which would achieve these aims.
8.5 The Favoured Option

Favoured Option MRT

The favoured option is a combination of Option MRT 1 and MRT 2. This will mean the allocation of the following sites as set out below, together with the allocation of several access improvements linked to the delivery of long term strategic sites within the plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Possible rail sidings at Riversway and Redscar.</td>
<td>Operational line at Riversway. Potential should be protected. Redscar line long term protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen</td>
<td>Wolstenholme Bronze</td>
<td>On operational line. Should protect potential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Potential rail sidings at Hillhouse</td>
<td>Should protect potential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribble Valley</td>
<td>Rail siding at Ribblesdale Cement Works</td>
<td>Currently in limited use for rail movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
<td>Land adjacent to the former Huncoat Power Station</td>
<td>Previously rail connected site. Should be protected for future rail related uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Land at Heysham Dock</td>
<td>Operational wharfage subject to permitted development rights. Operational siding should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>Land at Salwick</td>
<td>Dependent on long term future of existing operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Sites to be safeguarded for Rail/Wharf Facilities
Option MRT 1 and Option MRT 2:
Possible Sites for Minerals or Waste Rail Depots/Wharf Facilities
and Improvements to Local Road Networks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Map 6  | Rossendale | New Access at Whitworth Quarry | - Poor access via narrow streets.  
- Quarry has benefit of long standing planning permission.  
- Feasible new access solution shown to exist.  
- Safeguarding implies no commitment to increased activity or additional development. |
| Map 7  | Lancaster | Road re-alignment to allow access to reserves at Dunald Mill Quarry | - Substantial reserves under highway between two separate parts of quarry incapable of being worked unless highway diverted.  
- Releases substantial reserves without lateral extension.  
- Lateral extension at other sites has impact on villages, landscape and nature conservation.  
- Alternative route of highway considered not to give rise to significant impacts.  
- Advance screening/planting capable of mitigating visual impact. |
| Map 8  | Hyndburn | New road to relieve congestion at Whinney Hill/Huncoat | - Whinney Hill is a designated strategic landfill site, and will make a major contribution to self sufficiency of the Plan area.  
- Access is currently through residential areas.  
- Substantial industrial sites in the general area together with quarry workings and brick manufacture give rise to significant traffic volumes.  
- Proposals at Huncoat could add to the traffic generation in areas of Huncoat, Clayton-le-Moors, Altham and Church.  
- Without the proposed link road significant additional development would not be appropriate. |
| Map 9  | Wyre | New road to open up the Hillhouse site and allow easier access. | - To allow greater access to the Hillhouse site.  
- To reduce traffic through residential areas. |

Table 7 Sites to be safeguarded for Access/Road Improvements
Map 6 Safeguarded Access Route to Whitworth Quarry
Map 7 Safeguarded Access Route to Dunald Mill
Map 8 Proposed Whinney Hill Link Road
Map 9 Safeguarded Access Route to Hillhouse
8.6 Implementation and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRT 1 and MRT 2</td>
<td>Allocation of sites Include within District proposal maps</td>
<td>MPA District</td>
<td>All successfully allocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRT 1 and MRT 2</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions</td>
<td>MPA Public Transport Authority</td>
<td>Required capacity catered for</td>
<td>AMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Option
9 Options for Allocating Built Waste Facilities

9.1 What the Core Strategy Says

Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy states:

Waste management needs will be met by:

i. identifying a network of major waste management facilities sited at strategic locations;
ii. identifying and prioritising other locations, including industrial sites, which may be suitable for facilities and which would allow waste to be managed close to its source;
iii. developing criteria for considering smaller scale facilities;
iv. identifying generic locations for local community facilities.

Policy CS 9 of the Core Strategy states:

Priority will be given to the location of local waste facilities such as bulking facilities, household waste recycling sites, and bring banks close to residential or community areas.

Priority will be given to the location of larger waste facilities within existing or planned industrial or commercial areas.

The site identification process for waste parks will consider their potential to be accessed by the rail network.

9.1.1 A range of new facilities will be required if the drive to divert waste away from landfill is to succeed. These will be required across the Plan area at a range of scales, from small rural facilities to larger urban facilities where sites can provide the capacity to manage more than one waste stream and co-locate facilities. Opportunities for co-location either with existing facilities or by bringing together several facilities onto a new site will need to be provided, as will both established and new technologies as they are developed, bringing together innovative and effective methods of managing waste.

Municipal Waste

9.1.2 Lancashire County Council is responsible for the disposal of all municipal waste produced and collected within the twelve districts of Lancashire. Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen are responsible for the waste collected within their own authorities.

9.1.3 Blackpool has joined with Lancashire County Council to procure a long term private finance initiative backed contract to recycle, recover and dispose of all waste collected within these administrative boundaries. Under this contract planning permission has been granted for strategic facilities at Leyland, Thornton and Huncoat.
9.1.4 These facilities will implement the Municipal Waste Management Strategy\(^{(17)}\), and provide sufficient mechanical biological treatment, and composting and materials recovery facility capacity to treat Blackpool and Lancashire's municipal waste during the period up to 2021 and beyond. It is unlikely that any further sites will be required for treatment facilities for this waste stream.

9.1.5 Each of these strategic sites will comprise:

- A mechanical biological treatment plant to treat residual waste, with anaerobic digestion producing electricity.
- An enclosed composting plant to deal with green garden waste, food waste collected from the kerb side, and green garden waste from household waste recycling centres.
- A material recycling facility/transfer station to handle dry recyclates collected at the kerbside. These can be either sorted at source or co-mingled.

9.1.6 As well as these treatment facilities the Municipal Waste Management Strategy envisaged a number of stand alone transfer stations within districts. These would be used to bulk up the waste and then forward it on to the strategic sites. Whilst the majority of sites for these transfer stations have already been granted permission, there is still a requirement identified for a facility in Pendle Borough.

9.1.7 Blackburn with Darwen is not part of this private finance initiative and has yet to contract for the long term disposal of its municipal waste. Sites will need to be found to treat its waste within Blackburn. The latest figures available for municipal waste generated in the Blackburn with Darwen area are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007/2008</th>
<th>Tonnes</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycled</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composted</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Landfilled</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Municipal Waste produced in Blackburn with Darwen
**Commercial & Industrial Waste**

**9.1.8** The majority of commercial and industrial waste that is not currently being recycled or recovered is landfilled in the sites identified in Table 15. Some of these also take municipal waste. The following residual commercial and industrial waste will need to be catered for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Arisings</th>
<th>Recyclable</th>
<th>Compostable</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>1,782,000</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>1,782,000</td>
<td>576,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>1,782,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>481,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10 Commercial and industrial Waste Forecast (tonnes) 2006-2020**

**9.1.9** A range of built facilities, of differing type, size and mix will be required. These will need to be located on a range of sites, to meet this capacity and to provide a sustainable waste management infrastructure within the Plan area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Built Facilities Required (Indicative)</th>
<th>Area Required (Indicative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster/Morecambe</td>
<td>1 Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Composting Plant</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Small Treatment Facility</td>
<td>1.5 ha  Total: 3.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde Coastal Towns</td>
<td>3 Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>3 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Composting Plant</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Small Treatment Facility</td>
<td>1.5 ha  Total: 5.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
<td>3 Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>3 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Composting Plant</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Small Treatment Facilities</td>
<td>4.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or 1 Large Treatment Facility</td>
<td>5 ha  Total: 8.5-9 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>1 Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Composting Plant</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Small Treatment Facility</td>
<td>1.5 ha  Total: 3.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen/Ribble Valley</td>
<td>1 Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Composting Plant</td>
<td>1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Small Treatment Facility</td>
<td>1.5 ha  Total: 3.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lancashire</td>
<td>4 Materials Recycling Facility</td>
<td>4 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Composting Plant</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Small Treatment Facilities</td>
<td>6 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or 1 Large Treatment Facility</td>
<td>5 ha  Total: 11-12 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Indicative Commercial and Industrial Built Waste Facility Requirement Based on 'Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study' (ODPM, 2004)
9.2 What you have said

9.2.1 The following key issues/ common themes emerged from the spring 2009 consultation:

**Municipal Waste**

- Existing and planned facilities should be maximised before new facilities are built.
- The opportunity to use or expand facilities to allow other waste streams should be explored before building new facilities.
- If energy from waste or other thermal treatment is proposed, use of the heat should be a pre-requisite.
- Waste uses are not generic and site selection cannot be confirmed until technology is confirmed.
- Do not locate near residential properties.
**Commercial & Industrial Waste**

- Sites should be allocated in each community.
- Sites in each district would be impractical.
- Sites should be near to areas of production.
- A small number of large facilities would give benefits of scale.
- Industry should decide where to build.
- Built facilities are not coming forward, so more landfill should be provided.
- The two waste streams should not be seen as different.
- Do not locate near residential properties.
9.3 The Options

9.3.1 We have considered two sets of options, the first to do with the choice of locations for new built waste facilities (options 1, 2, and 3), the second to do with the type of facility or technology to be promoted on, or indeed restricted from, identified sites (options 4, 5 and 6).

Type of Location

Option BWF 1
Prioritise all existing or planned industrial locations for new built waste management facilities.

Benefits
- Easily understood policy for developers.
- Allows developers flexibility in locating sites.

Drawbacks
- Adds little to District policy.
- Could lead to wide distribution and increased road miles for movements between facilities.

Option BWF 2
Identify specific existing or planned industrial locations to accommodate built waste facilities.

Benefits
- More certainty.
- Directs operations to appropriate, well located areas.

Drawbacks
- Less flexibility for developers in choice of locations.
- Could lead to concentrations of waste operations.
- Could lead to under supply of land in high demand areas.
Option BWF 3

Promote new large scale built waste management development at other locations, including greenfield locations, where it can be demonstrated that it is not possible to locate them at sites identified in Option BWF 2, or other previously developed sites.

**Benefits**

- Less competition with other potential land users over limited industrial land.
- Enables required facilities to be built in proximity to major waste producing areas.

**Drawbacks**

- May conflict with designations or objectives in other policy documents.
- Could lead to an under utilisation of appropriate industrial areas, at the expense of greenfield land.

**Type of Allocation**

Option BWF 4

Identify sites suitable for specific waste uses only.

**Benefits**

- Provides certainty to communities and industry.
- Clear to community what waste will be taken on this site.

**Drawbacks**

- Lack of co-location this will increase the transportation of waste.
- Not achieving full potential of some facilities.

Option BWF 5

Identify a range of facilities to specific sites i.e. enclosed facilities, open facilities and thermal treatment.
Benefits

- Allows the industry to decide what facility should be developed.

Drawbacks

- Local communities could be left with uncertainty as to what will be developed.

Option BWF 6

Do not allocate any specific technology or type of facility to a site.

Benefits

- It will not stifle new technology.
- Allows the industry to decide what should be developed.

Drawbacks

- May not get an even distribution of facilities throughout the Plan area.
- Local communities left with uncertainty as to what will be developed.

9.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

9.4.1 In terms of modern, built waste facilities, the sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy found no conclusive evidence to support one particular technology over another. Indeed, many of the different impacts of waste facilities relate to matters such as the scale of development or number of vehicle movements, rather than impacts arising from particular technological processes. The sustainability appraisal also recognised the importance of supporting new innovations in waste management, which may require a degree of flexibility in the planning framework.

9.4.2 Of the industrial locations identified, most would satisfactorily accommodate a range of new waste facilities. However, the sites are not without problems. Several of the industrial sites suffer from high flood risks (most notably, Riversway, Lomeshaye, and Hillhouse industrial estates), although waste facilities (like shops, offices, storage and distribution facilities and general industry) are typically less vulnerable to the effects of flooding. Mitigating against these risks, all of the sites proposed include areas of lower flood risk, where the more vulnerable parts of development could be directed towards.

9.4.3 There are also sites which have unique constraints, such as Heasandford, which has a school in the middle of the industrial estate, and Hillhouse, which lies adjacent to an internationally-important wildlife site. However, these are issues which face all forms of new development, and district planning policies (including Area Action Plans, where these exist) will help determine whether particular developments are appropriate.
9.4.4 It is possible that proposals may come forward for thermal treatment facilities, and these may engender particular public concerns. Although the impacts of these technologies are not necessarily very different from those of other waste facilities (scientific evidence suggests that the risks to human health are small), perceived health concerns are likely to affect public opinions about where these facilities are located. This situation could apply with several of the site proposals, where proximity to residential areas may create local concerns.

9.4.5 Greenfield development. Option BWF 3 relates to non-industrial allocations. Although waste facilities are most often suited to industrial locations, there may be other derelict or underused areas (including in some cases neglected greenfield locations) which could be equally suitable for waste management facilities. Strict measures to protect the greenbelt, open countryside and agricultural land, which are at the heart of the planning system, would ensure that this option is not abused.
9.5 The Favoured Option

Favoured Option BWF

The favoured option is a combination of Options BWF 2, BWF 3, and BWF 6. Existing or planned industrial land, in or around established industrial estates, generally offers the most advantageous location for industrial type uses. New build waste facilities will generally be of a nature and scale similar to general industry, attract similar types and volumes of medium to heavy goods vehicles, and share similar potential impacts of noise, dust and smell in their immediate vicinity. Industrial locations are generally within or close to the main waste producing areas which are shown in the Core Strategy. These allocations will not be technology specific. We believe that to do so would have the potential to stifle new and emerging technologies and preempt the detailed determination process for a planning application or indeed a waste management license.

9.5.1 In the context of our main waste producing areas, and the volumes of waste arising in each area, we have identified and prioritised a network of industrial and other locations as suitable to take new built waste facilities. We have divided these into three categories:

- **Strategic locations** capable of accepting single large scale built waste facilities, providing for a wider catchment than the immediate local area. These sites will be expected to accommodate the majority of the built facility requirements presented in Table 11, and particularly the larger treatment facilities.
- **Other preferred locations** that similarly offer advantages over the County's general employment provision but are of a scale and character, or else have limited land currently available, meaning they would not be expected to accommodate larger waste users, and would instead provide for a more modest size of waste user across these catchment areas;
- **Smaller scale or local facilities**, focusing on green waste windrow composting sites and household waste recycling areas.

**Strategic Locations**

9.5.2 We have identified a number of these industrial locations as strategic locations, offering the same advantages over general employment areas as the other preferred locations, but additionally capable of accepting single large scale built waste facilities, or a collection of facilities, and allow the opportunity for built waste facilities to be co-located with reprocessing industries in a ‘waste park’ environment. Most of these sites also have the potential to be rail served. In the case of the land at Whinney Hill/ Huncoat significant additional development other than that which already has permission would not be appropriate, unless the Whinney Hill link road is in place (Table 7).

9.5.3 These locations will be expected to accommodate the majority of built waste facility requirements shown for commercial and industrial waste shown in Table 11, along with any remaining municipal waste management facilities, in particular the larger treatment facilities.
9.5.4 Whilst these locations represent the best opportunities for new built waste facilities, we can envisage situations where the availability of this development land is limited due to high demand for other, higher value employment uses, or because of the poor public perception of some waste uses.

9.5.5 With the concerns that may persist at the local level over the siting of new strategic waste facilities, allied with the pressure to facilitate new built waste facilities from the national level, we believe that to ensure an acceptable, available and deliverable capacity of new build facilities the Plan area should provide for new strategic waste facilities in other vacant or undeveloped, including greenfield, locations. Any such proposal would need to demonstrate the same accessibility benefits as the industrial locations, and provide significant landscape and biodiversity enhancements, and demonstrate that all other options at the identified locations have been considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment</th>
<th>Industrial Locations</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster/Morecambe</td>
<td>Land at Heysham Port</td>
<td>Map 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde Coastal Towns</td>
<td>Land at Hillhouse, Thornton</td>
<td>Map 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
<td>Land at Red Scar</td>
<td>Map 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Riversway</td>
<td>Map 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>Land at Simonswood</td>
<td>Map 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen/Ribble Valley</td>
<td>Land at Whitebirk Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Wolstenholme Bronze/Goosehouse</td>
<td>Map 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lancashire Towns</td>
<td>Land at Huncoat/Whinney Hill</td>
<td>Map 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Strategic Locations for Large New Built Waste facilities
Option BWF 2 and Option BWF 3:
Strategic Locations for Large Built Waste Management Facilities

![Map of strategic locations in Lancashire](image)

- **Strategic Locations**
- **Urban Areas**
- **District and Unitary Authorities**

Sources: Lancashire County Council, BGS, Ordnance Survey
© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Lancashire County Council Licence No. 100023320 2001.
Map 10 Strategic location at Heysham Port (Catchment Lancaster/Morecambe)
Map 11 Strategic location at Hillhouse (Cathcment: Fylde Coastal Towns)
Map 12 Strategic Location at Red Scar Industrial Estate (Catchment: Central Lancashire)
Map 13 Strategic Location at Riversway (Catchment: Central Lancashire)
Map 14 Strategic Location at Simonswood (Catchment: West Lancashire)
Map 15 Strategic Location at Whitebirk Industrial Estate (Catchment: Blackburn/Ribble Valley)
Map 16 Strategic Location at Wolstenholme/Goosehouse (Catchment: Blackburn/Ribble Valley)
Map 17 Strategic location at Huncoat/Whinney Hill (Catchment: East Lancashire Towns)
Other Preferred Locations

9.5.6 We have identified a number of other preferred locations which offer similar advantages to the strategic locations, namely:

- They are readily accessible from the primary route network;
- They benefit from existing infrastructure and services;
- They are of a sufficient size and nature, with the developed land available, to accommodate major new built development, and waste uses specifically;
- Several contain existing waste users already, or else have attracted interest from the waste industry;
- They are suitably and sufficiently located away from residential areas and other sensitive receptors.

9.5.7 These advantages single out these locations for potential future waste uses, albeit a more modest size of facility providing for the needs of the main waste producing areas or more localised needs, on account of their scale and character and likely availability of development land for these purposes.

9.5.8 These locations will not be expected to accommodate the larger waste treatment facilities for commercial and industrial waste or municipal waste. Instead they will be suited to a smaller and more modest facility, such as material recycling facilities or composting plants, in instances where the nearest strategic location is unable to accommodate these users, or where the location can contribute to an overall network of facilities in the waste producing area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment</th>
<th>Industrial Locations</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster/Morecambe</td>
<td>Land at Lancaster West Business Park</td>
<td>Map 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at White Lund Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Heysham Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde Coastal Towns</td>
<td>Land at Whitehills Park</td>
<td>Map 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
<td>Land at Lancashire Business Park</td>
<td>Map 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Walton Summit</td>
<td>Map 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>Land at Pimbo Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Great Altcar</td>
<td>Map 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Burscough Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn with Darwen/Ribble Valley</td>
<td>Land at Roman Road</td>
<td>Map 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Pendle Trading Estate</td>
<td>Map 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lancashire Towns</td>
<td>Land at Lomeshaye Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Heasandford Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land at Whitewalls Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Map 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Other Preferred Locations for Smaller New Build Waste Facilities
Option BFW 2 and Option BWF 3:
Other Preferred Locations for Smaller Built Waste Management Facilities
Map 18 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facility at Lancaster West Business Park (Lancaster/Morecambe catchment)
Map 19 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at White Lund Industrial Estate (Catchment: Lancaster/Morecambe)
Map 20 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Management Facilities at Heysham Industrial Estate (Catchment: Lancaster/Morecambe)
Map 21 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Whitehills Park (Catchment: Fylde Coastal Towns)
Map 22 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Lancashire Business Park (Catchment: Central Lancashire)
Map 23 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Walton Summit (Catchment: Central Lancashire)
Map 24 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste facilities at Pimbo Industrial Estate (Catchment: West Lancashire)
Map 25 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilites at Land at Great Altcar (Catchment: West Lancashire)
Map 26 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Burscough Industrial Estate (Catchment: West Lancashire)
Map 27 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Land at Roman Road (Catchment: Blackburn/Ribble Valley)
Map 28 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Pendle Trading Estate (Catchment: Blackburn/Ribble Valley)
Map 29 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Lomeshaye Industrial Estate (Catchment: East Lancashire Towns)
Map 30 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Heasandford Industrial Estate (Catchment: East Lancashire Towns)
Map 31 Other Preferred Location for Smaller Built Waste Facilities at Whitewalls Industrial Estate (Catchment: East Lancashire Towns)
Locations for Smaller Scale or Local Facilities

9.5.9 In addition to the above locations, some waste management operations, due to their nature and scale, may be suitable in other locations. In particular we are proposing exceptions for green garden waste compost sites and household waste recycling centres.

9.5.10 In addition to being acceptable at the above locations green waste composting may be acceptable in countryside locations, when associated with existing farm complexes. This is because the open windrow composting of plant wastes are rural in nature, particularly when the compost produced is spread on adjoining land. The same could also be said of the anaerobic digestion of farm waste and slurries, when there is an associated reduction in vehicle movements.

9.5.11 The Joint Authorities’ operate a network of twenty-six household waste recycling centres which provide householders easy access by car to deliver their bulky household waste and recyclables. These centres make a significant contribution to diverting municipal waste away from landfill. Together these sites provide nearly every resident with a centre within five miles of home. These sites are long-established, with a number originally co-located alongside earlier Council-operated landfill sites.

9.5.12 These centres generate a mixed traffic of private vehicles bringing in waste and recyclables, and medium and heavy goods vehicles removing waste from the centre. Because of the quantities of waste handled, bulk removals need to be made on every day of the week. They have the potential as well to present issues of noise and smells in their immediate vicinity.

9.5.13 A review is underway, which will report before the Publication stage, to determine whether changes to parts of the household waste recycling centre service are needed. Included in those considerations will be the current problems experienced on, or accessing, some sites.

9.5.14 Whatever outcome this review brings, it is likely that the existing network of sites will continue to provide the basis for these centres, and any additional requirements for recycling facilities will be concentrated at existing sites which will be expanded as necessary.

9.5.15 Additional or replacement centres on new sites are likely to be the exception. At the current time, there is only one such firm proposal, which has arisen out of a necessity to free up the existing site in the centre of Burnley for regeneration purposes. The search for a replacement site has highlighted a general difficulty in finding an acceptable, available and reasonably accessible site capable of handling the scale of traffic generated by these centres on a seven day a week basis. The search has concluded there are no other obvious sites to Burnley, other than land at Heasandford Industrial Estate, in the catchment area where the service could be provided without significant impacts.
Map 32 Site for Household Waste Recycling Centre at Heasandford Industrial Estate
## 9.6 Implementation and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BWF 2</td>
<td>Allocation of sites on inset maps and District Proposals map</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWF 2 and BWF 3</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions</td>
<td>MPA, Industry, Public</td>
<td>Required capacity catered for</td>
<td>AMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14 Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Option
10 Options for Allocating Landfill Capacity

10.1 What the Core Strategy Says

Policy CS 8 of the Core Strategy states:

Provision will be made, as necessary, for the predicted total landfill capacity requirements for non-hazardous waste during the plan period.

Provision will be made for an adequate, available and accessible capacity of sites to handle inert waste.

Non-hazardous waste

10.1.1 The current landfill capacity is estimated to be 20 million tonnes at 2007 at the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Capacity Remaining m³</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
<td>Whinney Hill</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>Deerplay</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>Clayton Hall</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigby</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Jameson Road</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>Westby</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clifton Marsh</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>Planning expires 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Sites with Planning Permission for Disposal of Non-hazardous Waste

10.1.2 The permitted capacity of the current planned landfill sites would satisfy the requirement to dispose of our residual municipal, industrial and commercial waste streams over the plan period, providing the total volumes consented in the original planning applications are available. Should this void space not be available there would be a need to provide additional void space by way of new sites or extensions. Some of the above landfill sites will not be completed to the predicted and approved restoration levels by the time their current planning permissions reach their expiry date.

10.1.3 The trend in recent years has been for a significant reduction in reliance on landfill for the disposal of non-inert waste. The coming into operation of new capacity/facilities in connection with large scale municipal private finance initiative contracts, points to a continuation of this trend and an accelerated reduction in the requirement for future landfill disposal in the Plan area.
10.1.4 However, there are factors which would delay the potential for reducing reliance on landfill disposal, or for the planned void space being turned into actual capacity, such as:

- Treatment facilities not being brought into use on time.
- Slippage in planned recycling rates.
- Minerals not being worked.

Hazardous and Radioactive waste

10.1.5 The Core Strategy requires us to provide criteria relating to the disposal of radioactive and hazardous wastes. However, sites have been brought forward as part of the site suggestion process which may be appropriate.

10.1.6 Hazardous waste is a wide ranging and complex waste stream ranging from liquids, sludges and solid material that can occur in municipal, industrial and commercial and demolition and excavation waste.

10.1.7 Data from the Environment Agency shows that the north west region produced 580,000 tonnes of hazardous waste in 2007 whilst 690,000 tonnes was deposited in the region making the region a net importer of hazardous waste.

10.1.8 The Plan area has hazardous waste treatment and incineration facilities that are expected to continue to operate. It also has merchant landfill site at Whitemoss Landfill in West Lancashire Borough with limited capacity, which provides a final disposal route for wastes that cannot be treated.

10.1.9 Until facilities are available for treating all hazardous waste, it is the role of the planning system to provide for hazardous waste disposal close to where that waste arises. The removal of the landfill tax exemption for contaminated soils, together with the stringent technical requirements that apply to hazardous waste landfill is already driving a reduction in landfilling and an increase in the treatment of such wastes.

10.1.10 Waste generated by the nuclear power stations at Heysham requires specialised treatment and storage and is managed at national facilities outside Lancashire. Other types of very low level wastes are produced at the Springfield Fuels manufacturing site at Salwick. This is predominantly the product of the decommissioning/demolition of former manufacturing buildings.

10.1.11 The intention is that the Springfield manufacturing site will continue in operation until the site closes in 2031. The site plays a unique role in the worldwide, and national, nuclear power industry which provides approximately 20% of UK demand. Although, the site will continue to be operational there will be changes as manufacturing processes evolve and the use of buildings move from production, to post operational clean out, and finally to decommissioning and demolition.
10.1.12  Currently small amounts of waste are deposited at Clifton Marsh Landfill site. This disposal is authorised by the Environment Agency under the Radioactive Substances Act. Clifton Marsh Landfill site currently has planning permission until 2012, which is before the proposed closure date of Springfield Fuels.

Inert waste

10.1.13  Inert waste can be, and is, accepted at different types of sites across the Plan area. These include inert only landfills, non hazardous landfills for use in engineering and for cover, quarries for backfilling to comply with restoration conditions and landscaping, as well as exempt sites. A major proportion of this waste stream is now being recycled into 'recycled aggregates'. The sites shown in the table below currently have planning consent for the disposal of inert waste, predominately for restoration purposes, but some for engineering purposes to enable other development to follow. However some are coming to an end of their useful life and new sites may be required to replace these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Bradleys Sand Pit</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>Fletcher Bank Quarry (part in Bury)</td>
<td>2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tong Farm</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ribble</td>
<td>Lydiate Lane</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lancs</td>
<td>Round O Quarry</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Ellel Quarry</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>Former Royal Ordnance Site</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Windy Harbour</td>
<td>No end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jameson Road</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>Clifton Marsh</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westby Landfill</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
<td>Whinney Hill Landfill</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Sites with Planning Permission for disposal of Inert Waste

10.2 What you have said

10.2.1  The following key issues/ common themes emerged from the spring 2009 consultation:

Landfill Capacity

- No hazardous waste facilities should be provided, it should all be exported
- The view that sufficient landfill capacity exists should be tempered by:
- Single source landfill provision is against proximity principle.
- Need to look beyond the plan period.
- Waste from outside the Plan area can use up capacity.
- Do not allocate any sites, leave that to industry.
- Voids created by minerals extraction should be infilled and brought back to original contours.
- Every district should have its own landfill/facility so that waste is disposed of as close as possible to where it arises.
- More joint working needed between authorities.
- Concern expressed that Lancashire imports more waste than it exports.
- Radioactive waste should be disposed of where it is produced.
10.3 The Options

We have considered a number of options for different landfill types though in a number of cases there is only a limited range of options presented. They cover non-hazardous, inert, radioactive and hazardous landfill separately.

### All types of landfill

**Option ALC 1**

Rely on criteria based policy to allow new landfill where need can be demonstrated and amenity, transport and environmental issues can be overcome.

**Benefits**
- Provides flexibility in system.

**Drawbacks**
- Not in line with objectives of landfill tax.
- Provides uncertainty for developers, industry and public.

**Non hazardous**

**Option ALC 2**

No new landfill capacity will be allocated.

**Benefits**
- Move away from landfill to new cleaner technologies.
- In line with objectives of landfill tax. Will reduce uncertain future costs of landfill tax.

**Drawbacks**
- No flexibility if capacity shortfall occurs.
- If problems occur with other waste treatment facilities it may need to be disposed of at landfill and therefore more capacity may be needed.
Option ALC 3

No new landfill sites will be allocated, but where a site continues to have the capacity to take waste and is required to meet short term needs then time extensions to the permission should be allowed up to 2015. This is to ensure that we maintain an adequate supply in the short term and that the industry has sufficient time to introduce and access alternatives to landfill.

Benefits

- No new landfills will be permitted.
- Ensures sites are properly restored.
- Provides certainty to industry and public alike.
- Maintains a downward pressure on landfilling by demand management.
- Encourages investment in alternatives.

Drawbacks

- Will lead to an extension of use beyond period originally envisaged.
- Relies on the industry supplying accurate data.
- Limited availability of accurate, up to date information.

Option ALC 4

Identify and safeguard specific sites or extensions that will come on stream when shown by our annual monitoring that new capacity is needed.

Benefits

- This provides additional capacity only if it is needed.
- A certain number of strategic sites will be picked.

Drawbacks

- Could be many years before these sites are needed this means communities have these sites in their areas with unknown time limit of when they will be restored.
Hazardous

Option ALC 5

Allow extension to the existing hazardous waste landfill only if there is a demonstrated regional or national need for the capacity.

Benefits

- Ensures that no new sites are developed.
- Ensures that sites are only developed according to need.
- Utilises existing infrastructure.
- Provides certainty to industry and public.

Drawbacks

- This is a continuation of the importation of hazardous waste from outside the Plan area.
- Physical extension of development.

Radioactive

Option ALC 6

Allow on-site landfilling of low level radioactive waste, within the curtilage of the existing facility from which it is produced.

Benefits

- Reduces the need to transport wastes.
- Reduces the need for landfills outside existing facilities to become registered for accepting low level radioactive wastes.

Drawbacks

- May increase the number of separate landfills which contain low level radioactive wastes.
- May lead to landfill sites accepting low level radioactive wastes from outside the Plan area to fill existing void space.
Inert

Option ALC 7

Inert waste disposal should only be allowed to restore mineral workings or in restoring landfill sites.

Benefits

- The capacity for inert landfill in the Plan area is low so we should use what quarries and landfills are available.
- A move away from using municipal waste to restore sites. Quarries will not become municipal landfills.

Drawbacks

- If we do not have enough inert waste to restore quarries and landfill they will spoil the local landscape.
- Reduces the capacity available for municipal waste.

Option ALC 8

Allow inert waste disposal on other sites for agricultural improvements or large scale landscaping works where it can be demonstrated that there is a local need or environmental benefit.

Benefits

- More flexible to local circumstances and needs.
- May reduce distances travelled on roads.

Drawbacks

- Could compromise local recycling operations or restoration schemes.
- Could lead to an inefficient use of inert waste materials.
Option ALC 3, Option ALC 5, Option ALC 6 and Option ALC 7: Options for Landfill

Legend:
- Existing Non-Hazardous
- Existing Hazardous
- Existing Radioactive
- Existing Inert
- Proposed Hazardous
- Proposed Radioactive
- Proposed Inert
- Urban Areas
- District and Unitary Authorities

Source: Lancashire County Council, BGS, Ordnance Survey
© Crown Copyright, All rights reserved. Lancashire County Council Licence No. 100023320 2005.
10.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

10.4.1 The proposal to allow time extensions for existing landfills (Option ALC 3) may increase the duration of any existing impacts at these sites, but the effects are likely to be less significant than identifying new sites. The identification of new sites would also detract from the need to complete and restore existing landfill capacity in Lancashire.

10.4.2 In relation to hazardous and radioactive wastes, the range of suitable sites is much more limited and the proposals inherent in Options ALC 5 and ALC 6 (to extend Whitemoss Landfill and to allow on-site treatment/disposal of low-level radioactive wastes at BNFL Springfields) are unlikely to infringe upon any high-level environmental constraints, subject to necessary controls and regulations being in place.

10.4.3 The options regarding inert wastes are more flexible and the capacity requirements during the plan-period take account of the increase in construction and demolition waste recycling, set out in the Core Strategy. The ability for residual inert wastes to be safely used in a wide range of situations (most typically in landfill and quarry restoration, but also in landscaping works and in land stabilisation) makes both Options ALC 7 and ALC 8 appropriate. The benefit of limiting most inert wastes to quarry sites and landfills are that these sites often include sorting and recycling facilities to recover any remaining usable material prior to disposal.

10.4.4 The two inert landfill proposals set out in the favoured approach below are intended to meet the likely shortfall in capacity requirements during the plan-period. However, both sites also include environmental issues that would need to be addressed in the subsequent working up of proposals. These issues are most significant at the former ICI site, where there could be impacts on the adjacent internationally-important Wyre estuary wildlife site.
10.5 The Favoured Option

10.5.1 Our favoured options are set out below:

**Favoured Option ALC**

*Non-hazardous waste.*

_We are proposing that no new landfill will be allocated, as per Option ALC 3, as the available capacity currently exceeds the likely need over the plan period._

10.5.2 As the rate of waste going to landfill is declining the full utilisation of the identified and planned capacity could require flexibility to extend planning timescales and will also be subject to operators submitting further planning applications which demonstrated need. Agreeing to extend time periods on existing planning permissions for a fixed period up to 2015 would avoid the possibility of poor or incomplete restoration schemes. It would also avoid increased volumes being imported over a short timescale to use up the remaining void space. This would prevent the possibility of consequential temporary closure of other existing facilities or increased impacts on local communities due to increased lorry movements.

10.5.3 By providing a clear cut off date at 2015 this will give the industry time to access alternatives to landfill.

10.5.4 It is therefore proposed that in addressing long term landfill provision, _extensions to the timescale over which the original capacity can be filled should be taken with a cut off date of 2015._ This would be subject to environmental and wider planning considerations, including the maintenance of capacity and pattern of provision.
Favoured Option ALC

Hazardous Waste

Our favoured option is to allocate a westward extension, as per Option ALC 5, which will allow this facility to continue to play a role in the region's hazardous waste management.

10.5.5 Landfill is the last resort for hazardous waste management, and stringent technical requirements apply to both the site engineering and the operational aspects of waste acceptance and emplacement.

10.5.6 The Whitemoss Landfill site in Skelmesdale is one of only two dedicated hazardous waste landfills in the north west and whilst the amounts of waste accepted are small in landfill terms it nonetheless provides a regional facility of strategic significance.
Managing our Waste and Natural Resources

Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies

Development Plan Document

Map 33 Whitemoss Landfill
Favoured Option ALC

Radioactive Waste

We are proposing to promote an on-site solution to low level radioactive waste arising from Springfield Fuels, as per Option ALC 6. An area of land will be allocated at Springfield Fuels as shown below.

10.5.7 The change to the Government's stance on new nuclear facilities may have had an effect on the planned de-commissioning of facilities at Springfield and could give the site an extended operational life beyond the current assumed site closure of 2031.
Managing our Waste and Natural Resources

Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies

Development Plan Document

Map 34 Springfield Fuels
Favoured Option ALC

Inert Waste

We are proposing that any inert waste that cannot be recycled should be used to restore former mineral workings and landfill sites, as per Option ALC 7. The sites below will be allocated, and a development management policy will be produced to express this approach for future applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Number</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map 35</td>
<td>Rossendale</td>
<td>Scout Moor Quarry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 36</td>
<td>Wyre</td>
<td>Land to south of Jameson Road Landfill</td>
<td>Site occupied by lagoons formerly used to deposit liquid waste, but remains unrestored from this previous use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Sites Suitable for Inert Waste Landfill
Map 35 Scout Moor Quarry
Map 36 Proposed Extension at Jameson Road
## 10.6 Implementation and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favoured Option</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALC 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Allocation of sites on insert maps and District Proposals map</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>All sites allocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC 3, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions following public engagement.</td>
<td>MPA, Industry, Public</td>
<td>Required capacity catered for</td>
<td>AMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18  Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Option
11 Options for Other Development Management Policies

11.1 What the Core Strategy Says

Policy CS 5 and CS 9 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy state that criteria will be developed for considering proposals brought forward outside of the plan-making process: they identify the objectives of the core strategy, as it refers to the policies to be prepared in support of it in this development plan document. Policy CS 8 refers to the development of criteria specific to the consideration of hazardous and radioactive waste. Though there is some variation around the specific wording of the policy considerations between CS 5 and CS 9, the policy objectives can be summarised as:

- Protecting from harm, conserving and enhancing the character and quality of Lancashire’s landscape
- Retaining local distinctiveness and character
- Protecting from harm and enhancing features and landscapes of historic and cultural importance
- Protecting the amenity, health, economic wellbeing and safety of the population
- Protecting essential infrastructure and services to the public
- Protecting from harm and contamination, and enhancing natural resources, including water, air, soil and biodiversity
- Not adversely contributing to fluvial flood risks or surface water flooding
- Ensuring sensitive environmental restoration takes place

11.2 What you have said

11.2.1 There were only a limited number of responses relevant to this chapter from the spring 2009 consultation, but of those that were there was a general leaning amongst consultees towards development management criteria to enable decisions to be made based on matters such as:

- determining the significance of potential impacts.
- whether those impacts are permanent or temporary.
- the potential for minimising or compensating for the proposal’s impacts.
- the vulnerability of the environment or individuals to the various impacts.
- criteria need to reflect local interests and the values of local residents rather than simply protecting nationally important assets.
- on restoration, emphasis should be placed on value to the local community, and a variety of favoured end uses including agriculture, biodiversity, and recreation. Deciding on the preferred approach in any given situation should be dictated by the nature and location of the site and surrounding area, the priorities of the land owner and the needs of the community.
11.3 The Options

Option DM 1

Treat the minerals and waste development framework as a stand alone document, and in preparing it fulfil all of the requirements on local planning authorities laid out in national and regional policy. This would mean the development management policies chapter would contain separate policies on greenbelt, landscape, open countryside, archaeology, flooding, contaminated land etc.

Benefits

- Comprehensive, self-contained land use planning document
- Easy reference for developers and planners
- All policies developed 'in house'

Drawbacks

- Likely to duplicate or conflict with a number of district planning policies
- Large document
- Policies likely to add little to national policy
- Conflicts with guidance and Planning Inspectorate advice
- Difficult to be locally specific, given the size of the Plan area

Option DM 2

Only produce policies with a specific relevance to determining minerals and waste applications, within the wider context of the policies of the districts’ development plan documents and the regional spatial strategy.

Benefits

- Concise document
- No duplication of national or district policies
- Fits well in the Local Development Framework and 'development plan' format
- Increased autonomy for districts, with the development plan being more locally specific

Drawbacks

- Reliant on districts ensuring adequate policy coverage in their development plan documents
- Reliant on district policies being suitably detailed
- May be an inconsistent approach in district policies across the county
- Different approach compared to past local plans
Generic policies open to misinterpretation by applicants
Lots of development plan documents for planners and applicants to refer to

Option DM 3

Produce a series of topic based policies to address specific types of activity, with criteria based policies for the land uses relevant to Lancashire. This would be similar to the old style plan, with policies on green waste composting, recycling, incineration, anaerobic digestion etc.

Benefits

- Explicit policies on typical land uses
- Our stance on particular types of developments is more visible

Drawbacks

- Unlikely to be comprehensive
- Difficult to predict relevant technologies so could become dated
- Produces a larger document
- Duplication between policies
- Possible conflict between policies

11.3.1 In assessing these options, and in future work required to develop the required policies, our central aim is to ensure there will be an adequate policy base to underpin planning decision making and thus ensure transparency of decision making and confidence in the Joint Authorities.

11.4 The Sustainability Appraisal

11.4.1 The role that other plans and strategies have in setting local priorities and preventing harm to local communities and the environment was recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy. The timing of the Minerals & Waste Development Framework and the preparation of District plans has hindered greater collaboration, but it is appropriate that - according with Option DM 2 - District plans play a central role in setting the policies and criteria locally.

11.4.2 Not all generic development issues sit at a local level, and examples include the priorities identified in the Landscape Strategy for Lancashire and the way in which the County’s Biological Heritage Sites are protected. Many of these issues were encompassed in the Landscape & Heritage Supplementary Planning Guidance, and options are being explored to transfer that document into the new District plans or to adopt it as part of regional planning documents. In the interim, it may be beneficial to make similar arrangements with the Minerals & Waste Development Framework.
11.4.3 Other matters have significant cross-boundary issues, including flood risk and transport planning (particularly in relation to railway infrastructure). In these cases, the policies and investment programmes of other administrations (in the these examples, the Environment Agency and the Department for Transport) will also be important to the delivery of new developments.

11.4.4 There are, of course, specific matters relating to minerals and waste developments, and some of these are reflected in the suggested policies below - e.g. in relation to Combined Heat & Power schemes and site restoration plans. The favoured approach set out below suggests policies which could address these sorts of planning issues.

11.5 The Favoured Option

Favoured Option DM

The favoured approach is Option DM 2, to produce a concise set of minerals and waste specific policies that will sit alongside the other policies of the development plan for the area to help deliver the spatial vision. Consequently we will be relying on the regional spatial strategy and district local plan/local development documents to address the non minerals and waste specific issues, and relying on national policy where it is explicit and robust enough for our needs.

11.5.1 As a result we are proposing to address the following policy areas.

Planning Criteria

11.5.2 A policy will be developed to ensure that proposals are acceptable in terms of their environmental, social and economic impacts, and ensure that if the impacts of the development (either direct, indirect or cumulative) would cause significant harm, planning permission would be refused. The aim is to provide a test upon which a judgement about the suitability of a planning application can be based. It would seek to ensure that any decision made would protect the environment and amenity of the area, and that any development would be compatible with its surroundings, provide for safe and satisfactory access, make efficient use of land, and adequately control any on and off site impacts.

Planning Obligations

11.5.3 We are proposing to produce a policy to identify the matters to be covered by planning obligations and the factors to be taken into account when considering the scale and form of contributions; the tests as to whether a planning obligation may legally be applied are outlined in national policy. It is proposed that where planning obligations are required in order to achieve the necessary control of development, provision for the following may be included:

- Access or road improvements
- Long-term aftercare or management

19 Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations
• Provision of new or diverted footpaths
• Public access to restored sites
• Complementary provision elsewhere to offset the loss of any significant amenity or environmental resource

11.5.4 The Joint Authorities are not defined as charging authorities under the current consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy; we may need to include reference to a contribution to any infrastructure requirements identified in district local development plan documents, or more detailed provision should this position change.

Energy Recovery

11.5.5 We are proposing to encourage or require suitable developments to include measures to produce electricity or use the heat produced as a by-product of the treatment or disposal process. This policy could be used to require landfills to generate electricity from landfill gas if sufficient levels are produced, or require large scale energy from waste facilities to connect to a district heating network. It could also require such facilities to be located close to major heat or electricity consumers. Conversely, it could require facilities producing a biogas to connect directly to the gas mains as the preferred option.

Restoration and Aftercare

11.5.6 Legislation\(^\text{20}\) defines aftercare and restoration conditions, and gives planning authorities the power to request submission of an aftercare scheme in these conditions. Within this context we will seek to identify an approach for determining the most appropriate form of restoration for any given proposal. It could provide guidance on preferred afteruses and reclamation standards, though any considerations will also need to take into account the policies in the rest of the development plan (particularly the district development plan documents). It will influence soil management strategies for the site, and consequently have an impact on the design of any mitigation bunds etc during the life of the site. Proposals for the restoration and afteruse of the site would be required to take into account the pre-worked character of the site, its surroundings and landscape setting. Where possible proposals should provide for enhancement of the general quality of the landscape and local environment.

11.6 Implementation and Monitoring

11.6.1 These policies will be implemented through the Joint Authorities in their role as planning authority for determining minerals and waste planning applications. The table below illustrates this mechanism in more detail.
### Table 19 Implementing and Monitoring the Favoured Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favoured Option</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Considerations</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions following public engagement</td>
<td>MPA Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AMR Applicants survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary planning document on Standards of Operation</td>
<td>MPA Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Obligations</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions following public engagement.</td>
<td>MPA Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AMR Agreed heads of terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPA Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Recovery</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions following public engagement.</td>
<td>MPA Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AMR Applicants survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPA Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration and Aftercare</td>
<td>Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions following public engagement.</td>
<td>MPA Industry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AMR Submitted/agreed restoration schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary planning document on Standards of Operation</td>
<td>MPA Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.6.2 Given the changes in the plan making process, with the resultant increase in planning policy documents that developers and planners will be required to refer to, we will be producing a guidance document bookmarking the relevant national policies, and explaining the documents that make up the area's development plan. This will help to address some of the criticisms of the favoured approach identified earlier.
Appendix i Policy Context

i.1 The Plan Led System

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states "if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning acts the determination must be in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise".

The development plan consists of the North West of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy, and the development plan documents (taken as a whole) which have been adopted or approved in relation to that area (i.e. The Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework's Development Plan Documents and the relevant District's Local Development Framework's Development Plan Documents).

This is the reason the planning system in England and Wales is known as the 'plan led system'; the certainty and predictability it aims to provide are central to planning and integrating sustainable development objectives. National planning policies, and the policies of the development plan, provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for that development to be managed effectively.

National planning policy, as contained in Planning Policy Statements and Minerals Policy Statements, contains policy statements that can be directly applied by local planning authorities when determining planning applications, and a number of requirements on local planning authorities to include certain policies within the development plan.

The North West of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 contains the regional planning policy for the Plan area. It places a number of requirements on local planning authorities to consider certain issues when preparing their development plan documents, to include certain policies in their development plan documents, and to apply certain regional policies, where relevant, when determining planning applications.

PPS 12 states: "if it is the intention of the local planning authority simply to apply national and regional policy in its decision making it does not need to reiterate it in development plan documents in order to do so, nor reformulate it by devising a similar kind of wording which achieves the same result" PPS 12 para 4.32

The Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy - Managing our Waste and Natural Resources development plan document is the first development plan document to be adopted in the minerals and waste development framework. It provides the spatial vision and objectives for minerals and waste development in the Plan area, and includes strategic planning policies. Further as defined by s38(3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
information on the implementation of these policies, and the requirements it places on this document can be found in Appendix 1 of the Core Strategy, which identifies further development plan documents as a mechanism for implementing a number of its policies.

The Core Strategy has already implemented a number of the requirements placed on local planning authorities by national and regional planning policy, and this is demonstrated in the ‘Reference Guide to Policy Context and Development’ prepared as part of the earlier consultation on this document.

i.2 Relationship with Local Area Agreement

A Local Area Agreement outlines how priorities identified in a sustainable community strategy will be measured and how much improvement will be made over the period 2008-2011. The table below identifies the national indicators contained in the Joint Authorities local area agreements that are relevant to this consultation document.

Not all of these indicators are relevant to all the options set out. However, the reduction in carbon emissions and adapting developments to climate change is relevant to all the options as climate change is accepted as one of the greatest challenges facing mankind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options to:</th>
<th>NI:186- Per capita CO₂ emissions in the Local Authority area</th>
<th>NI:188- Adapting to climate change</th>
<th>NI:192- Household waste recycled and composted</th>
<th>NI: 197- Improved local biodiversity-active management of local sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard our mineral resources</td>
<td>By keeping reserves able in future to supply local source of minerals</td>
<td>Able to protect peat supplies and consequent carbon sinks</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>By protecting sites for their biological and heritage value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate inert waste recycling facilities</td>
<td>Reduces carbon emissions from primary aggregates</td>
<td>Reduce land use change</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduces number of new quarries and disturbance to fauna and flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate mineral sites</td>
<td>No additional allocations encourages market in recycled aggregates</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>By not providing additional landfill capacity ensures must find alternative</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to:</td>
<td>NI:186- Per capita CO₂ emissions in the Local Authority area</td>
<td>NI:188- Adapting to climate change</td>
<td>NI:192- Household waste recycled and composted</td>
<td>NI: 197- Improved local biodiversity-active management of local sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage road transport</td>
<td>Possible to reduce carbon emissions</td>
<td>Design to ensure transport changes able to withstand climate changes.</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
<td>No direct impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate built waste facilities</td>
<td>Reduces carbon emissions by recycling primary materials. Reduces distance travelled. Reduces carbon dioxide from landfill</td>
<td>Any waste facilities able to withstand climate changes</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure and facilities will benefit recycling sector, and add value to encourage expansion of market for recyclables</td>
<td>Reduce need for landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate landfill capacity</td>
<td>Restricted capacity allowed diverts waste stream to recycling</td>
<td>Little new landfill capacity. Consider possible climate change scenarios if extensions proposed</td>
<td>No new landfill to be proposed. Requires high recycling and composting rates</td>
<td>Require restoration of sites to produce some wildlife habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management policies</td>
<td>Policy options ensure reduction in carbon emissions as insist on sustainable locations.</td>
<td>Policy to be implemented in the context of PPS1 and changing climate scenarios.</td>
<td>No direct impact.</td>
<td>Restoration policies will have direct impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20 Relevant National Indicators**

**i.3 Evidence base.**

**The Evidence Base**

Baseline data has been drawn from the following published documents:
Rubbish to Resources - Waste Management Strategy for Lancashire 2008-2020
Assessment of Waste Management Needs
Strategic Waste Issues
Strategic Minerals Issues
North West Regional Aggregates Working Party Annual Report
North West Regional Technical Advisory Body 4th Waste Management Monitoring Report
Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy DPD
North West of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021
Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework - Sand and Gravel Study - Entec UK Limited
Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework - Sand and Gravel Study Stage 2 - Geoplan Limited
Appendix ii Objectives Derived from Core Strategy

- Safeguarding Lancashire’s mineral resources
  
  **Objective 1** To identify and safeguard mineral resources for specific purposes which meet a proven and sustainable need, recognising their environmental, cultural and landscape value and their potential for future working.

- Minimising the need for minerals extraction
  
  **Objective 2** To encourage the availability and use of recycled and secondary minerals, supported by resource-efficient construction techniques.

- Meeting the demand for new minerals in a sustainable manner
  
  **Objective 3** To provide a sustainable supply of locally sourced minerals, sufficient to meet our contribution to local, regional and national needs.

- Identifying sites and areas for minerals extraction
  
  **Objective 4** To provide certainty for businesses, operators and the public by identifying sites and areas for new minerals extraction, whilst seeking to conserve and enhance Lancashire’s environmental assets and ensure a high quality of life for all.

- Achieving sustainable minerals production
  
  **Objective 5** To support high standards of working practices and environmental protection, and take an integrated and innovative approach to enhancing the quality of land and our landscapes during extraction and in restoration for beneficial after-use, including potential benefits to biodiversity, amenity and access to the countryside.

- Our vision calls for greater community involvement and partnership working
  
  **Objective 6** To encourage and enable local communities, businesses and local authorities to work together in coming to decisions and delivering solutions for sustainable resource management.

- Promoting waste minimisation and increasing waste awareness
  
  **Objective 7** To encourage greater understanding and responsibility among residents, businesses and developers to reducing and recovering value from waste.

- Managing our waste as a resource
  
  **Objective 8** To contribute to breaking the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste by minimising waste requiring final disposal and promoting the development of environmental technologies for sustainable waste management.

- Identifying capacity for managing our waste
Objective 9 To provide a sufficient capacity of waste management facilities, including landfill needed for final disposal, that prioritises waste reduction, then reuse, recycling and recovery so that the plan will be net self-sufficient in waste management capacity by 2021.

- Identifying appropriate sites for waste management

Objective 10 To identify and safeguard sites to deliver sustainable waste management to allow waste to be dealt with a close to its source as possible, whilst conserving and enhancing Lancashire’s environmental assets.

Objective 11 To promote high quality design and working practices in waste management facilities, to minimise harm caused to local communities, the landscape and local environment and encourage the satisfactory restoration of landfill sites for beneficial after-uses.
## Appendix iii Sites Excluded Through Assessment

### WASTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blackburn with Darwen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWD6</td>
<td>Council Depot Davyfield Road</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWD9</td>
<td>Sappi Mill</td>
<td>EfW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blackpool</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>Layton Depot</td>
<td>Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Burnley</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU1</td>
<td>Metro Metals</td>
<td>MRF (Metals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU3/4</td>
<td>Deerplay</td>
<td>Landfill Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chorley</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Clayton Hall</td>
<td>Landfill Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Stanworth (Withnell) Quarry</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Land at Highfield Farm</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fylde</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Weeton Land</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Mythop Lodge Farm</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Tarnbrick Farm</td>
<td>Composting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Shepherd Farm</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Carr Farm</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Clifton Marsh</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hyndburn</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Holme Road</td>
<td>Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Preston</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR4</td>
<td>Bradley Sand Quarry</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rossendale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO5</td>
<td>Whitworth Quarry</td>
<td>MRF EfW Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO8</td>
<td>Tong Quarry</td>
<td>Inert Landfill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South Ribble

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR3</td>
<td>Lancashire Business Park</td>
<td>MBT, IVC, MRF Anaerobic Digestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West Lancashire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WL4</td>
<td>Landfill adjacent to Whitemoss Landfill (2)</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste Landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL5</td>
<td>Pimbo</td>
<td>IVC, Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL6</td>
<td>Stanley Way</td>
<td>Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MINERALS

### Chorley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Stanworth (Withnell) Quarry</td>
<td>Extraction of Brickshales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Land at Runshaw</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Highfield Farm</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hyndburn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Whinney Hill</td>
<td>Extraction of Shales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Whinney Hill</td>
<td>Extraction of Shales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lancaster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Leapers Wood Quarry</td>
<td>Limestone Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Back Lane Quarry</td>
<td>Limestone Extraction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR1</td>
<td>Bradley Sand Quarry</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR2</td>
<td>Elston Estate</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV1</td>
<td>Cuttock Clough</td>
<td>Gritstone Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO1</td>
<td>Jameson Quarry</td>
<td>Gritstone Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO2</td>
<td>Scout Moor Quarry</td>
<td>Gritstone Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>Land near Lower Hall Farm</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2</td>
<td>Brockholes Bridge</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3</td>
<td>Lydiate Lane</td>
<td>S&amp;G Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL8</td>
<td>Land at White Moss (2)</td>
<td>Mineral Extraction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix iv Replaced Local Plan Policies

The table below details the replacement of the old saved local plan policies with the new emerging site specific allocations and policies and generic development management policies. Policies that were not saved in 2007, or were subsequently replaced by Core Strategy policies, are not listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saved Local Plan Policies</th>
<th>Emerging Replacement Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1 (Balancing the Policies of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2 (Quality of Life)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3 (Buffer Zones)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4 (Cumulative Impacts)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5 (Environmental and Other Benefits)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6 (Planning Gain)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7 (Open Countryside and Landscape)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8 (Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Minerals Development)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Waste Development)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12 (Developments in the AONB Fringe)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 13 (Green Belts and Minerals Developments)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14 (Green Belts and Waste Developments)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 16 (Nationally Important Nature Conservation Sites - Minerals Developments)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17 (Nationally Important Nature Conservation Sites - Waste)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 18 (Locally Important Nature Conservation Sites)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 19 (Mitigating Adverse Impacts)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 21 (Wildlife Corridors)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 22 (Water Resource Availability)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved Local Plan Policies</td>
<td>Emerging Replacement Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 23 (Water Resource Protection)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 24 (Flood Risk)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 25 (Coastal Protection/Open Coastline)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 26 (Nationally Important Archaeological Sites)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 27 (Other Archaeological Sites)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 28 (Archaeological Assessments)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 29 (Archaeological Investigations)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 30 (Heritage)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 31 (Public Rights of Way)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 32 (Recreational Facilities)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 33 (Hazards)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 37 (Strategic Road Network)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 41 (Safeguarding Land for Alternative Access to Whitworth Quarries)</td>
<td>Ch 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 47 (Secondary Material)</td>
<td>Ch 7 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 51 (Foreshore Extraction)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 55 (Provision at Dunald Mill Quarry)</td>
<td>Ch 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 56 (Deepening Existing Limestone Aggregate Quarries)</td>
<td>Ch 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 59 (Borrow Pits)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 61 (Cement Manufacturing Plant)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 71 (Protection of the Surface of the Former Saltfield from Development)</td>
<td>Ch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 74 (Mineral Exploration)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 75 (Plant and Ancillary Development - on-site)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 79 (Safeguarding Land for Future Disposal of Waste)</td>
<td>Ch 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 80 (Maintenance of a Network of Landfill Facilities)</td>
<td>Ch 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved Local Plan Policies</td>
<td>Emerging Replacement Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 84 (Extraction of Landfill Gas)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 85 (Special Considerations for Landraising)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 88 (Recycling, Sorting and Transfer of Waste)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 94 (Provision of New Household Waste Disposal Centres)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 96 (Incineration of Municipal Waste)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 97 (Incineration, Treatment and Transfer of Animal, Clinical, Industrial and Special Waste)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 98 (Digestion Plants and Mixed Waste Composting)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 99 (Green Waste Composting)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 100 (Scrapyards)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 101 (Wastewater and Sewage Sludge)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 102 (Extensions)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 103 (Ancillary Development)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 104 (Treatment of Sludge by Incineration)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 105 (Anaerobic Digestion at Wastewater Treatment Works)</td>
<td>Ch 9 and Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 106 (Reclamation of Minerals and Waste Sites)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 107 (Proposed Reclamation Schemes)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 108 (Restoration of Agricultural Land)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 112 (Standards of Operation)</td>
<td>Ch 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix v Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Proposals Map</td>
<td>This map illustrates all the policies contained in Development Plan Documents, together with any saved policies. It is revised as each new Development Plan Document is adopted, and will always reflect the up to date minerals and waste planning strategy for the area. Relevant minerals and waste policy will be represented by inset maps, to be included in the districts’ proposals map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregates</td>
<td>Sand, gravel, crushed rock and other bulk materials used by the construction industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Standard</td>
<td>In 2002 new European standards were published for aggregates and came into force as new British Standards in 2004, abbreviated to BS EN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Waste</td>
<td>Controlled waste arising from premises used wholly or mainly for trade, sport, recreation or entertainment, as defined by the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Demolition Waste</td>
<td>Controlled waste arising from the construction, repair, maintenance and demolition of buildings and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Sets out the long-term spatial vision for the local planning authority area, the spatial objectives, and outlines the strategic policies required to delivery that vision in respect of minerals and waste. District and unitary authorities also produce a core strategy as part of their local development framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed Rock</td>
<td>Hard types of rock, which have been quarried, fragmented and graded for use as aggregate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development plan</td>
<td>Consists of the regional spatial strategy and the development plan documents that have been adopted in that area. Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development plan document</td>
<td>Planning policy document, produced under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and subject to examination in public, that forms part of the local development framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormant Site</td>
<td>A historic quarry with planning permission that was not been worked between 1982 and 1995; as defined by the Environment Act 1995. These sites would require the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Markets</td>
<td>submission and approval of updated planning conditions prior to the restarting of quarrying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy from Waste</td>
<td>The conversion of waste into a usable form of energy, often heat or electricity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification &amp; Pyrolysis (Advanced Thermal Treatment)</td>
<td>A means of recovering energy from waste, known as advanced thermal treatment. Waste is heated at high temperatures and a usable gas is produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Development Management Policies</td>
<td>These are a series of criteria-based policies which ensure that all development within the area will meet the spatial vision and spatial objectives set out in the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gritstone</td>
<td>The use of the term gritstone in the Development Framework includes sandstones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Rock</td>
<td>Consolidated rock such as limestone, gritstone and granite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>Wastes that have the potential to cause harm to human health or the environment, for example contaminated soil; as defined by the Hazardous Waste Regulations 2005 and the European waste classifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Waste</td>
<td>Refuse from household collection rounds, waste from street sweepings, public litter bins, bulky items collected from households and wastes which householders themselves take to household waste recovery centres and &quot;bring sites&quot;; as defined by the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)</td>
<td>A facility provided by the Waste Disposal Authority that is available to the public to deposit waste which cannot be collected by the normal household waste collection round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incineration</td>
<td>The controlled burning of waste. Energy may also be recovered in the form of heat (see Energy from Waste).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Examination</td>
<td>Prior to adoption the local planning authority must submit the development plan document to the Secretary of State for examination, under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The examination is carried out by a planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State, in order to test the soundness and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Conformity of the development plan document and the consultation processes undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Commercial Waste</td>
<td>Controlled waste arising from the business sector. Industrial waste is waste generated by factories and industrial plants. Commercial waste is waste arising from the activities of wholesalers, catering establishments, shops and offices; as defined by the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inert Waste</td>
<td>Waste which does not contain any components which exhibit chemical or biological activity (i.e. wastes that do not contain any organic matter or &quot;chemicals&quot;); as defined by the Landfill Directive. Examples of inert wastes include sand, clay, crushed rock, demolition rubble and hardcore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The physical features (for example roads, rails, and stations) that make up the transport network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues, Options and Preferred Options</td>
<td>The &quot;pre-submission&quot; consultation stages on development plan documents with the objective of gaining public consensus over proposals ahead of submission to Government for independent examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Authorities</td>
<td>Refers to the Joint Working of Lancashire County Council, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council and Blackpool Council in preparing the joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside Collection</td>
<td>The collection by local authorities of recyclable goods directly from households, or occasionally industrial and commercial premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan</td>
<td>Contains planning policies on minerals and waste for Lancashire prepared under the old style plan making process. Adopted in 2001, half of its policies have been replaced by the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landbank</td>
<td>A stock of planning permissions sufficient to provide for continued mineral extraction over a given period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill (including land raising)</td>
<td>The permanent disposal of waste into the ground, by the filling of man-made voids or similar features, or the construction of land forms above ground level (landraising).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
<td>A suite of documents prepared by a local planning authority, containing the planning policy for the area. Prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Act 2004 it contains development plan documents that are subject to examination in public prior to adoption and form part of the development plan, and local development documents that have less stringent requirements for preparation and adoption but do not form part of the development plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine Dredged Aggregate</th>
<th>Sand and gravel dredged from deposits on the seabed and landed at shipping wharves for use as aggregate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)</td>
<td>The treatment of residual waste using a combination of mechanical separation and biological treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td>Rock or other material that has a commercial value when extracted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Development</td>
<td>Any activity related to the exploration for or winning and working of minerals, including tipping of soil and ancillary operations such as the use of processing plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resource</td>
<td>A potential mineral deposit where there quality and quantity of material present has not been tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents (DPDs)</td>
<td>Documents within the MWDF which form the statutory plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals and Waste Development Scheme</td>
<td>Document setting out documents the Joint Authorities intend to include within its MWDF, and the programme for production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Apportionment</td>
<td>The splitting of regional supply guidelines for minerals demand between planning authorities or sub regions, based on national estimates of the country’s future needs for minerals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Consultation Area</td>
<td>An area identified in order to ensure consultation between the relevant Minerals Planning Authority and district planning authority before certain non-mineral planning applications made within the area are determined, using powers under schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerals Reserves</strong></td>
<td>Mineral deposits which have been tested to establish the quality and quantity of material present and which could be economically and technically exploited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Solid Waste (or MSW); Also referred to as Municipal Waste</strong></td>
<td>Household waste and any other waste collected by a Waste Collection Authority such as municipal parks and gardens waste, beach cleansing waste and waste resulting from the clearance of fly-tipped materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted Reserves</strong></td>
<td>Mineral reserves with the benefit of planning permission for extraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act 2004</strong></td>
<td>The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduces a statutory system for regional planning; a new system for local planning; reforms to the development control and compulsory purchase and compensation systems; and removes crown immunity from planning controls. It also updates elements of the 1990 Town &amp; Country Planning Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Aggregates</strong></td>
<td>Naturally occurring sand, gravel and crushed rock used for construction purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity Principle</strong></td>
<td>Waste should be managed as near as possible to its place of production, reducing travel impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery</strong></td>
<td>Value can be recovered from waste by recovering materials through recycling, reducing travel impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycled Aggregates</strong></td>
<td>Aggregates produced from recycled construction waste such as crushed concrete and planings from tarmac roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling</strong></td>
<td>The reprocessing of waste either into the same products or a different one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF)</strong></td>
<td>A fuel product produced from the combustible fraction of waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Self Sufficiency</strong></td>
<td>Requires that most waste should be managed within the region in which it is produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB)</strong></td>
<td>Provides specialist advice on waste to the Regional Planning Body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Aggregates</strong></td>
<td>Aggregates other than crushed rock and sand and gravel (primary aggregates) produced as by-products of other processes such as foundry sand and furnace bottom ash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Specific Policies and Allocations</strong></td>
<td>This refers to allocation of sites for specific minerals and waste developments. Policies will identify any specific requirements for individual proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Planning</strong></td>
<td>Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. This will include policies which can impact on land use, for example by influencing the demands on, or needs for, development, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission and which may be implemented by other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Vision</strong></td>
<td>A brief description of how the area will be changed at the end of the plan period (often 10-15 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sterilisation</strong></td>
<td>When development or land use changes prevent possible mineral exploitation in the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Development</strong></td>
<td>Sustainable development is focused on providing a better quality of life for everyone now and for generations to come. This is achieved through considering the long-term effects of social, economic and environmental impacts in an integrated and balanced manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste</strong></td>
<td>Waste in any material or object that is no longer wanted and which requires disposal. If a material or object is reusable, it is still classed as waste if it has first been discarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Hierarchy</strong></td>
<td>A framework for securing a sustainable approach to waste management as defined by the national waste strategy. Wherever possible, waste should be minimised. If waste cannot be avoided, then it should be reused; after this value recovered by recycling or composting; or waste to energy; and finally landfill disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Minimisation/Reduction</strong></td>
<td>Found at the top of the waste hierarchy, the most desirable way of managing waste - avoiding the production of waste in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Stream</strong></td>
<td>Waste stream is the flow or movement of wastes from the point of generation (i.e. household or commercial premises) to final disposal. A waste stream may reduce significantly over time as valuable items are separated for recycling and are recovered through resource recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>