| Committee: | Cabinet | Agenda Item |
|------------|--|-------------------|
| Date: | 23 July 2015 | 9 |
| Title: | Replacement Essex Waste Local Plan – revised preferred approach | • |
| Author: | Cllr Susan Barker, Environmental Services Portfolio Holder | Item for decision |

Summary

- 1. Essex County Council as the waste planning authority is consulting on a revised preferred approach and sustainability appraisal to its replacement waste local plan. The replacement plan will guide the future management of waste in Essex and Southend until 2032.
- 2. The Planning Policy Working Group considered the four proposed preferred site allocations in Uttlesford at its meeting on 13 July:
 - Safeguarding of the local authority collected waste transfer station site which is under construction at Chelmsford Road Great Dunmow;
 - A facility for recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste/ inert waste at Gaunts End Elsenham
 - A site for recycling/ landfill of recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste/ inert waste at Little Bullocks Little Canfield (A22)
 - Another site for landfill of stable non-reactive hazardous waste (i.e asbestos type materials) at Little Bullocks Farm Little Canfield (A23).
- 3. The Working Group also considered a site at Crumps Farm Little Canfield which the consultation document did not recommend for allocation due to its proximity to other proposal sites; and two sites at Armigers Farm Thaxted and Hollow Road Widdington that the consultation document suggested as not suitable for allocation in highways terms, but stated that the suitability would be reviewed if insufficient sites were available. It also considered the recommendations in the consultation document that Ashdon Road Commercial Centre Saffron Walden and Start Hill Great Hallingbury be defined as areas of search for new waste management facilities.

Recommendations

4. The council's response to consultation should be as set out in Appendix 2 to this report.

Financial Implications

5. Further engagement in the waste local plan preparation including consultation on the submission draft plan and it public examination would if necessary be resourced from the planning policy budget provision.

Background Papers

6. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

Consultation documents available at <u>www.essex.gov.uk/WLP</u> :

Replacement Waste Local Plan – Revised Preferred Approach Non-Technical Summary Sites Assessment and Methodology Areas of Search Assessment and Methodology

Impact

| 7 | |
|---|----|
| 1 | |
| | J, |
| | |

| Communication/Consultation | ECC is carrying out consultation | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Community Safety | None | |
| Equalities | None | |
| Health and Safety | None | |
| Human Rights/Legal Implications | None | |
| Sustainability | A sustainability appraisal is included in the site assessments | |
| Ward-specific impacts | Broad Oak and the Hallingburys, Elsenham and Henham, Great Dunmow South, Newport, Saffron Walden Castle, , Takeley, Thaxted and The Eastons, | |
| Workforce/Workplace | None | |

Situation

8. A full explanation of the stage reached in the process of preparing a replacement development plan and its scope is to be found in the attached report to the Planning Policy Working Group. The key elements of its vision are:

- having enough transfer recycling, recovery and disposal capacity to manage the waste generated within the county, with only minor cross border movements where practicable.
- Support for the waste hierarchy
- Managing a reducing proportion of London's waste.
- 9. This vision should, in general, be supported. The principle of self-sufficiency, however, should not extend to hazardous waste if more acceptable sites outside Essex can be identified through Duty to Cooperate processes with other waste planning authorities.
- 10. The report to the working group also considers each of the sites in Uttlesford and the proposed response.
- 11. The working group supported the recommended responses in its papers. In addition the following points were made which should be included in the council's response:
 - That notwithstanding that site L(n)8R Little Bullocks Farm A23 was the only site proposed for SNRHW, the potential to use other proposed sites should be investigated.
 - Access to the sites at Little Bullocks Farm Little Canfield should be clarified to enable a view to be taken on its suitability. Access via narrow county lanes would not be appropriate. ECC is requested to give this site further consideration and consider sites with good access to the strategic road network.

12.

Risk Analysis

13.

| Risk | Likelihood | Impact | Mitigating actions |
|---|--|---|---|
| The most appropriate sites for each waste category are not identified | 1 The plan making process is designed to enable the selection of the most suitable suites but this may be constraine | 3 The most sustainable sites cannot be allocated | Iterations of the plan making process. |

1 = Little or no risk or impact
2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.