

From: Kinderman, Elise

Sent: 12 July 2017 16:53

To: C&E Berkshire Consultation

Subject: Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities - Joint Minerals and Waste Plan: Regulation 18 Issues and Options Consultation

Good afternoon,

Please find attached Oxfordshire's comments on the current Joint Central and Eastern Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan issues and options consultation. Apologies it is not in the Response Form Format – please let me know if you need any additional information because of this.

Kind Regards,
Elise.

Elise Kinderman

Principal Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Officer
Oxfordshire County Council
Environment & Economy
County Hall
New Road
Oxford OX1 1ND

Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities - Joint Minerals and Waste Plan: Regulation 18 Issues and Options Consultation

Waste Background Study

General Comments

Transfer Facilities

Waste transfer facilities appear to have been included in waste arising estimates. Including waste managed by these facilities will mean that double-counting of waste is highly likely, and the total figures are likely to be higher than in reality.

The Role of Slough UA

Slough UA has been included in the waste arising and capacity estimates, although it is not in the Plan area. It is acknowledged that Slough has close functional links with other Berkshire authorities. However, as it is not in the Plan area any capacity availability will need to be identified/secured through the Duty to Cooperate. Additionally, including Slough data in waste arising estimates raises the question of whether the Plan is aiming to make provision for Slough's waste management needs. In general, it would be helpful to clarify the role of Slough in the preparation of the Joint Central and Eastern Berkshire (JCEB) Minerals and Waste Plan.

Waste Management Targets

In developing the approach to meeting future waste management needs, waste management targets will also need to be addressed, including those that are statutory (e.g. the target to recycle 50% of municipal waste and 70% of construction and demolition waste to be recycled or recovered by 2020 outlined in the Waste Framework Directive), and any local aspirational targets.

Net Self-sufficiency

It is noted that an aspiration of the Plan is to be net self-sufficient. However, it is not clarified in what way the Plan aims to be self-sufficient. For example, is it to be net self-sufficient in the principal waste streams (by source, or management type?) or in total waste arising in the Plan area? The parameters of net self-sufficiency will need to be defined going forward.

Specific Comments

Table 1: Waste arisings from the Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities and Slough (tonnes)

This table should note that there will be a further element of waste managed under exemptions, although it is acknowledged that it is hard to estimate the contribution of exempted facilities. This is noted in various other parts of the document (paragraphs 3.19, 5.2).

Paragraph 3.18

This paragraph notes that transfer facilities are included in the estimate of waste arisings for the Plan period which could lead to double counting of waste. Further work could be done to determine whether, and how much to use data from waste

transfer facilities. If the data is included, this will likely inflate the estimate of waste arising in the Plan area.

Paragraph 3.28

As mentioned under general comments, it is noted that an aspiration of the Plan is to be net self-sufficient. However, it is not clarified in what way the Plan aims to be net self-sufficient. For example, is it to be net self-sufficient in the principal waste streams (by source, or management type?) or in total waste arising in the Plan area? The parameters of net self-sufficiency will need to be defined going forward.

In addition, as previously highlighted, the role of Slough will need to be clarified in relation to the Plan area. The first sentence of this paragraph suggests that the Plan will also provide for the waste management needs of Slough, although it is not part of the Plan area. Slough data has also been used in many of the estimated waste arising figures and initial capacity estimates. The final arising and capacity figures used should be consistent as to whether to include or exclude Slough data, in order to determine requirements for net self-sufficiency. Any capacity contributing to provision for the Plan area needs, that is not located in the Plan area will need to be identified/secured through the Duty to Cooperate.

Paragraph 3.34

It is understood that it is an interim position to use the amount of waste received at waste management sites as a proxy for waste management capacity. As acknowledged in paragraph 3.31, this is not likely to accurately reflect the actual capacity at a site, as this may vary greatly depending on market conditions. The further work to update capacity estimates as proposed is necessary and supported. This will be needed in order to provide evidence of the provision of facilities necessary in order to achieve net self-sufficiency, as the Plan aspires to.

Table 5: Waste managed in Central & Eastern Berkshire and Slough, in tonnes based on waste properties

It would be useful to have the source data for this table, and more explanation on the methodology for obtaining the data in it, and the differences to the approach in Table 1 (waste arisings) explained. For example, has the data in table 5 (waste managed) been obtained by taking all waste coded as 'received' in JCEB authorities in the WDI? Whereas the data in table 1 (waste arising) has been obtained by taking all waste described as having JCEB authorities as the *source*.

Paragraph 4.11

It is noted that the future of the Energy from Waste facility at Colnbrook in Slough is uncertain due to the predicted expansion at Heathrow Airport. The contribution of this facility to the waste management needs of the Plan area is significant, with more than a third of the Plan area's non-hazardous waste managed here (Paragraph 4.7). Therefore further work could be done to looking at future capacity scenarios based on when the facility is likely to be in jeopardy, and what the alternatives might be if this were to be the case.

Paragraph 4.14

It is noted that the Municipal waste from the Plan area currently requiring landfilling currently travels to Oxfordshire. It should be noted that non-hazardous landfill

facilities in Oxfordshire have not been safeguarded and no further provision has been made for this resource in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy.

Paragraph 7.2

Footnote 70 to this paragraph indicates that 'land disposal' is excluded from the calculations of figure 5. However, figure 5 does appear to include landfill data. Clarification of this matter would be helpful.

Paragraph 7.14

For forecasting CD&E waste, PPG paragraph 033 Reference ID: 28-033-20141016, is also relevant, which states that *'Waste planning authorities should start from the basis that net arisings of construction and demolition waste will remain constant over time as there is likely to be a reduced evidence base on which forward projections can be based for construction and demolition wastes'*.

Paragraph 8.3

It would appear that the 'Recovery Improvement' scenario, as an option to determine how waste may be managed in future, is contrary to the Waste Management Hierarchy. It may impede the flow of waste to recycling facilities, if recovery capacity is maximised.

In developing the approach to meeting future waste management needs, waste management targets will also need to be addressed, including those that are statutory (e.g. the target to recycle 50% of municipal waste and 70% of construction and demolition waste to be recycled or recovered by 2020 outlined in the Waste Framework Directive), and any local aspirational targets.

Paragraph 8.7

In addition to the outlined issues to be determined regarding the approach to safeguarding facilities, the matter of whether to safeguard temporary facilities will need to be addressed.

Paragraph 9.2

Appendix B to the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) also sets out general locational criteria to be taken into account when testing the suitability of sites and areas in the preparation of Local Plans.

Objective 12 in the Issues and Options Paper also recognises the desire to reduce the distance waste has to travel by providing facilities as close as possible to where it is produced. This will also need to feed into the spatial strategy.

Paragraph 10.15

It is suggested that the Hinksey sidings rail depot in Oxfordshire may be available to service the Plan area. However, this is not the case as this rail siding is solely used by Network Rail for the transport of rail ballast for use on their network, and would not be available for general movements to other areas.

Minerals Background Paper

Paragraph 4.8

The Plan area appears to be vulnerable to changes in the operational rail depots in neighbouring counties, as it does not have any operational depots of its own. This is of particular concern given the uncertainty over Colnbrook due to the Heathrow expansion, and the reliance on the importation of crushed rock by rail (and evidence that demand for crushed rock is increasing). This vulnerability is acknowledged in paragraph 5.44. Therefore, it would seem sensible to, at the least, safeguard the existing identified (unbuilt) rail depot in the Plan area. The suggestion to look at the potential for a rail depot within the Plan area as suggested in paragraph 4.18 would also appear to be sensible. The capacity of the depots believed to be supplying the Plan area will also need to be investigated and any reliance secured through the Duty to Cooperate.

Paragraph 4.16

It is suggested that the Hinksey sidings rail depot in Oxfordshire may be available to service the Plan area. As mentioned in previous comments on the Waste Background Paper, this is not the case, as this rail siding is solely used by Network Rail for the transport of rail ballast for use on their network, and would not be available for general movements to other areas.

Table 5.2: Licensed and operational recycled aggregate sites, in 2015

The recycled aggregate facility 'Fleetwood Grab Services' appears to be missing from Table 5.2, although it appears on Figure 5.

Paragraph 5.24

It is questioned why the sales of recycled aggregate in the Plan area are confidential.

Paragraph 5.42

It is assumed that this paragraph is referring to table 5.6 when describing sales at rail depots, and not table 6.6 (which does not exist in the document).

Paragraph 5.78

This paragraph notes that information on exports is only reported on a Berkshire-wide scale, and not to a Unitary authority level. However, there is further information on Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham Districts in the 2014 data tables that accompany the AM2014 national collation (sand and gravel).

Table 5.13: Comparison of Berkshire's Total Sales of Sand and Gravel and West Berkshire's Output 2006- 2015 (thousand tonnes)

The methodology for calculating The CEB authorities' historical sand and gravel sales relies on up to date information provided by West Berkshire. Going forward, for Plan monitoring purposes, it should be clarified whether an attempt will be made to capture this information separately or whether reliance will continue to be placed on West Berkshire estimates.

Paragraph 5.93

As there is no current working of soft sand in the Plan area, it is assumed that soft sand is imported from other sources. Paragraph 5.105 implies that soft sand

provision is to be identified in the Plan, signalling a shift from relying on imports to providing this resource within the Plan area. Therefore, the future need for soft sand should be investigated further, and quantified, in order for this provision to be made.

How this need is to be met over the Plan period will need to be addressed, including where relevant, any need to address the Duty to Cooperate

Issues and Options Consultation Document

Oxfordshire County Council has specific comments to make on the following points:

Paragraph 7.16

This paragraph states that there is not currently enough waste management capacity available to manage to estimated waste arisings in the Plan area. It is questioned on what basis this statement is made, given that there is no robust assessment of capacity in the Waste Background Paper. Currently, waste managed in the Plan area is being used as a proxy for waste management capacity. The waste background paper acknowledges that this is likely to be inaccurate due to such things as market forces and site factors. It is understood that estimates of capacity are to be gained through undertaking an assessment of facility capacity. Once this has been undertaken, a more accurate reflection of capacity and need requirement will be able to be undertaken.

Paragraph 8.5 – Vision for Central & Eastern Berkshire

The vision includes an aim for the Plan area to be net self-sufficient in waste needs. However, it is not clarified in what way the Plan aims to be self-sufficient. For example, is net self-sufficiency to be applied to the principal waste streams, or total waste produced in the Plan area? The parameters applying to net self-sufficiency will need to be defined going forward.

Paragraph 8.6 – Objective 11

As with the vision, the parameters for net self-sufficiency will need to be defined.

Paragraph 8.12 – Spatial Strategy

The spatial strategy will also need to reflect objective 12, to reduce the distance waste has to travel by providing facilities as close as possible to where waste is produced.

Paragraph 9.5 – Question 9

The sand and gravel data table accompanying the AM2014 national collation has data for Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham District Councils as source AWP.

Paragraph 9.9 – Question 13

The Plan area appears to be vulnerable to changes in the operational rail depots in neighbouring counties, particularly given the uncertainty over Colnbrook due to the Heathrow expansion, and the complete reliance on the importation of crushed rock. Therefore, it would seem sensible to, at the least, safeguard the existing identified (unbuilt) rail depot in the Plan area and the suggestion to look at the potential for a

rail depot within the Plan area as suggested in Minerals Background Paper paragraph 4.18 would appear to be sensible.

Paragraph 9.23 – Question 18

This question relates to imported marine sand and gravel and crushed rock, both of which have increased in consumption in Berkshire. However, the way the question is worded, it could be misunderstood to also include land-won sand and gravel, which appears to be increasingly exported, rather than imported.

Paragraph 9.34

This paragraph refers to an assessment of the movement of construction and demolition waste in the Plan area to determine whether this is being managed within the plan area, or exported outside the Plan area. This assessment does not appear to have been included in the Waste Background Paper.

Paragraph 9.36 – Question 23

This question suggests that the Plan area could be 'more' self-sufficient in the processing of inert construction and demolition waste. Either an area is self-sufficient or not, there would be no in-between state of self-sufficiency. In addition, the vision of the plan is to be net self-sufficient in waste management capacity. It has already been noted that the parameters of this self-sufficiency should be defined. If the Plan is to aspire to be net self-sufficient in waste management, then sufficient facilities should be provided to achieve the capacity required for this.

Paragraph 9.50 – Question 30

It appears that soft sand in Berkshire is currently being supplied from outside of the Plan area. As mentioned previously, an attempt should be made to quantify this need, and identify where the supply is coming from, in order to secure the steady and adequate provision of this aggregate for the Plan period. West Berkshire has included alternative methods of calculating need for soft sand due to confidentiality constraints in their recent preferred options consultation.

Paragraph 9.58 – Question 36

As mentioned previously, the role of Slough in the Plan needs to be clarified. It is not part of the Plan area, and so any account of the mineral resources available will need to be identified and secured through the Duty to Cooperate.

Paragraph 9.62 – Question 39

It is queried where the assumption of a 'decline in exports' has come from. Table 2 appears to show that there has been an increase in exports of sand and gravel in Berkshire from 2009 – 2014, as consumption of sand and gravel has decreased, but sales have increased. This is supported by the AM 2014 data, which shows that 39% of aggregates were exported in 2009, and 72% in 2014.

Paragraph 9.70 – Question 44

As mentioned previously, an attempt should be made to quantify the amount of provision that should be made for soft sand over the Plan period. West Berkshire have included alternative methods of calculating need for soft sand due to confidentiality constraints in their recent preferred options consultation.

Paragraph 9.70 – Question 45

If imports of soft sand are solely to be relied upon for the Plan area over the Plan period, then this will need to be identified and secured through the Duty to Cooperate. However, Minerals Background Paper paragraph 5.105 implies that provision will be made for soft sand in the Plan.

Paragraph 9.81 – Question 51

It is understood that a call for sites will be undertaken to support the preparation of the Plan. The current preferred areas in the Plan area have yet to come forward. Without industry support, it is unlikely that they will come forward. Further work should be done to identify whether they are still likely to contribute to the required provision over the Plan period if they are to be included.

Paragraph 10.5 – Question 74

As mentioned previously, and acknowledged in the Waste Background Paper, using the amount of waste received at a facility is not likely to be an accurate representation of the capacity of that facility for waste management purposes. It is understood that an assessment of the capacity of facilities in the Plan area will be undertaken to support the preparation of this Plan. As such, the use of waste received as a proxy for waste management capacity should only be an interim position until more accurate data is obtained.

Paragraph 10.5 – Question 74

Planning practice guidance Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 28-013-20141016 states that:

Waste planning authorities should plan for the sustainable management of waste including:

- *Municipal/household*
- *Commercial/industrial*
- *Construction/demolition*
- *Low Level Radioactive*
- *Agricultural*
- *Hazardous*
- *Waste water*

Therefore, a general policy approach to low level radioactive, agricultural, hazardous wastes and waste water should also be included.

Paragraph 10.12

This paragraph highlights the importance and reliance of the Plan area on the Colnbrook incineration facility in Slough. The contribution of this facility to the waste management needs of the Plan area is significant, with more than a third of the Plan area's waste managed here (Paragraph 4.7). Therefore, its contribution to capacity in the Plan area will need to be carefully addressed, including any concerns raised through the Duty to Cooperate. Further work could be done to looking at future capacity scenarios based on when the facility is likely to be in jeopardy, and what the alternatives might be if this were to be the case.

Paragraph 10.14 – Questions 83 – 85

If it is not possible to cater for the disposal needs of the Plan area over the Plan period, then provision from other areas should be secured through the duty to cooperate. The Plan could also include general landfill policy, should there be potential to meet disposal needs within the Plan area at some stage.

Paragraph 10.22 – Question 92

Many of the identified wastes will be covered by inert, non-hazardous, or hazardous waste streams already identified. Agricultural waste should be considered, as identified in planning practice guidance.

Paragraph 10.26 – Question 104

It would appear that scenario 3 – ‘Recovery Improvement’ is contrary to the waste hierarchy. It may impede the flow of waste to recycling facilities if recovery capacity is maximised.