

# REPORT

## **Boston Alternative Energy Facility**

The Applicant's Response to UKWIN's Oral Submission  
at Issue Specific Hearing on Environmental Matters  
(Part 1)

Client: Alternative Use Boston Projects Ltd

Planning Inspectorate  
Reference: EN010095

Document Reference: 9.55

Pursuant to: APFP Regulation: N/A

Reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-4079

Status: Final/0.0

Date: 13 December 2021



## Note / Memo

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.  
Industry & Buildings

To: National Infrastructure Planning  
From: Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited  
Date: 13 December 2021  
Our reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-4079  
Document reference: 9.55  
Planning Inspectorate: EN010095  
Reference:  
Classification: Project related  
Checked by: Alun McIntyre  
Approved by: Paul Salmon

**Subject: Boston Alternative Energy Facility: Deadline 4 - Applicant's Response to UKWIN's Oral Submission at Issue Specific Hearing on Environmental Matters (Part 1)**

---

## 1 Introduction

1.1.1 This submission sets out the Applicant's response to the UK Without Incineration Network (UKWIN) Deadline 3 Submission (including their Written Summary of their Oral Case from the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH2), held on Wednesday 24 the November 2021) (REP-039). This response covers the waste hierarchy / proximity principle and the Greenhouse Gas / Climate Change aspects of the submission. A response to UKWIN's comments on Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) will be provided at Deadline 5.

## 2 Impact on the Waste Hierarchy and Proximity Principle

2.1.1 UKWIN's oral submission at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 made reference to three points with relation to the waste hierarchy and the proximity principle, as listed below:

- National Policy;
- Critiquing the applicant's need assessments; and
- Isochrone assumptions and associated assumptions.

2.1.2 A response to each of these points is listed in the paragraphs below.

### 2.2 National Policy Statements

2.2.1 The Applicant has considered both the extant National Policy Statement EN-1 and EN-3 and the emerging draft policy documents.

2.2.2 EN-3 (2021) paragraph 2.10.4 is not a relevant consideration relating to site selection for applicants and is also unnecessary given the provisions retained in EN-3 at

paragraph 2.17.7, for waste combustion generating station proposals to have to demonstrate that they accord with the waste hierarchy and national and local waste management targets, or to demonstrate why a conflict with those targets is nonetheless appropriate.

- 2.2.3 Similarly, paragraph 2.10.5 is an isolated and otiose inclusion which is not quantified in any way and which appears to place a limit on Energy from Waste (EfW) projects; something which is not considered appropriate in the context of EfW remaining a technology which will play an important role in the UK meeting its climate change commitments. As with paragraph 2.10.4, paragraph 2.10.5 is not necessary as the test as paragraph 2.17.7 of the draft NPS already gives due consideration to the relevance of the waste hierarchy and national and local waste management targets, and therefore provides the appropriate criteria for assessing applications against the national and local context. In particular paragraph 2.17.7 recognises that there may be occasions where a deviation from the relevant waste strategy or plan is nonetheless appropriate, which is important context which is missing from paragraph 2.10.5.

## 2.3 Critiquing the applicant's need assessments

- 2.3.1 The Applicant has used the most up to date UK EfW capacity data available in the *Addendum to Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment* (document reference 9.5, REP1-018) sourced from the Tolvik EfW Statistics report published in 2021. This data is based those facilities that have reached financial close by the end of the first quarter of 2021, as noted in the Tolvik report.
- 2.3.2 The Applicant has not included a detailed breakdown of the element of Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste being recycled as robust data is not, at this stage in the project's evolution, available to support this. Defra's own publication on UK Statistics on Waste published on the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2021 notes that, '*C&I waste generation remains extremely difficult to estimate owing to data limitations and data gaps. As a result, C&I estimates for England have a much higher level of uncertainty than Waste from Households (or other Local Authority Collected Waste) and users should exercise caution in application of the figures and interpreting trends over time.*'
- 2.3.3 The Applicant will be sourcing Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) from a range of sources throughout the UK, including the non-recyclable element from Materials Waste Facilities (MRFs) indicated in the *Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment* report (document reference 5.8, APP-037), from established RDF suppliers currently exporting the wastes overseas, and from the residual waste streams currently being landfilled. These residual waste streams will include European Waste Catalogue (EWC) codes of 20 03 01 mixed municipal waste, 20 03 01 Bulky waste, and 19 12 12 other wastes as representing the combustible wastes as detailed in the *Addendum to Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment* (document reference 9.5, REP1-018). The residual wastes will come from both household/Local Authority Collected Wastes and commercial and industrial sources diverting them from landfill disposal.

## 2.4 Isochrone assumptions and associated assumptions

- 2.4.1 The Applicant has set out 2-hour waste catchment areas from the ports that were detailed in the Environmental Statement as a means of demonstrating that large quantities of waste are currently being landfilled in these regions and could be routed to the proposed Facility or alternatively exported as RDF outside of the UK. A 2-hour travel time was chosen to represent a practicable limit over which bulk waste transport becomes economically unattractive as part of the overall cost of delivering waste management solutions. The additional response at Deadline 1 (document reference 9.7, REP1-020) *Climate Change - Comparative Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Road and Marine Vessel Transport Options to the Site* recognises that there will be further transport impacts associated with the marine transportation of the RDF to the proposed Facility.

## 2.5 Waste Plans

- 2.5.1 With reference to waste plans considered as part of the Addendum to Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment (document reference 9.5, REP1-018), reference is made (Appendix 3, paragraph 1.3) to the Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment (**Appendix A**). This document is no longer available to view on the Planning Inspectorate website and is therefore submitted to the Examination for reference. Reference was also made to the Examining Authority's Recommendation Report<sup>1</sup>.

## 3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Impacts

- 3.1.1 UKWIN's oral submission at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 made reference to three points with relation to greenhouse gas emissions, as listed below:
- A comparison of emissions from the Facility with landfilled waste;
  - The greenhouse gas benefits should carry little weight in the application; and
  - The greenhouse gas intensity of exported electricity.
- 3.1.2 A response to each of these points is listed in the paragraphs below.
- 3.1.3 Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 21 Climate Change (document reference 6.2.21, APP-059) compared emissions from two 'Do Nothing' scenarios, including landfilled waste, with a 'Do Something' scenario where Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) is processed at the proposed Facility. The implementation of the Facility was not predicted to increase greenhouse gas emissions compared to the other waste management options, considered in the assessment (including landfill), as discussed in paragraphs 21.6.14 – 21.6.19. There is still a significant amount of waste that is treated by the landfill option

---

<sup>1</sup> Examining Authority's Report of Findings and Conclusions and Recommendation to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, The Planning Inspectorate, July 2015

this year, therefore the implementation of the Facility is highly likely result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the national waste sector and carbon budget context.

- 3.1.4 The results of the Greenhouse Gas assessment are presented in ES Chapter 21 Climate Change (document reference 6.2.21, APP-059). The outcome of the assessment is demonstrated in paragraph 21.6.19, which states “*The implementation of the Facility was not predicted to increase GHG emissions compared to the other current indicative waste management options considered in the assessment, and the GHG contribution from the operation of the Facility is not likely to be a significant increase in terms of national emissions.*”
- 3.1.5 In relation to UKWIN’s view that the decision on the Wheelabrator Kemsley Generating Station (K3) and Wheelabrator Kemsley North (WKN) Waste to Energy Facility DCO is analogous, the Applicant’s position is that that the conclusions as to uncertainty of carbon benefits for that project can be distinguished. Additionally, there are a number of additional distinguishing factors from WKN namely, the Facility at Boston is being promoted on a national rather than regional need basis for which it has been demonstrated there is sufficient fuel availability, the draft DCO includes a requirement to ensure compliance with the waste hierarchy which will ensure that the Facility does not divert waste from recycling rather than landfill and export. Additionally, the Facility includes the provision of carbon capture. The Applicant considers that the conclusion by the Secretary of State on the Riverside Energy Park Order 2020 is more analogous, namely that the “*Secretary of State also agrees that as the Order includes provisions to ensure compliance with the waste hierarchy therefore inclusion of the carbon equivalent benefit of diverting waste from landfill is acceptable*”<sup>2</sup>. The Applicant has included a requirement based on that included in the Riverside Energy Park Order 2020.
- 3.1.6 Additionally, with respect to the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Lincolnshire County Council supports the proposed development (as resolved at the Council’s Planning and Regulation Committee meeting on 26 July 2021)<sup>3</sup> and has confirmed that there is a national need for such facilities, with Lincolnshire County Council accepting that the proposal does not compromise the policies of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan in terms of need and location.
- 3.1.7 With respect to the carbon intensity of the exported electricity produced by the Facility, the workings and assumptions that supported the derived UKWIN’s figure of up to 572 grammes of fossil CO<sub>2</sub> per kWh are not available, therefore no further comment can be provided to determine whether these figures are representative. However, the outcomes of the Greenhouse Gas assessment that are presented in ES Chapter 21 Climate Change remain valid, whereby greenhouse gas emissions from treating the RDF at the Facility are lower when compared to the landfill waste treatment pathway. The primary function of this Facility is the treatment of waste and production of

---

<sup>2</sup> At paragraph 4.12 of the Secretary of State’s Decision on the Application for the Riverside Energy Park Order

<sup>3</sup> As set out in The Applicant’s Comments on Lincolnshire County Council’s Local Impact Report (document reference 9.23, REP2-007) paragraph 1.1.2.

aggregates for beneficial re-use, which will also result in a reliable and continuous source of electricity for the national grid.

- 3.1.8 With respect to planning weight to be applied to decision making, the UKWIN position appears to be contradictory in that they state on page 4 of their submission that, '*carbon benefits should carry little weight in the assessment of the application*', but then opine in the following paragraph that, '*the carbon intensity associated with the Facility...should weigh heavily against the proposal in the planning balance*'.

## **Appendix A**

### **Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment**



# Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2)

Document Ref. No: 5.9

PINS Ref: EN010061

## The Proposed Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Order Ferrybridge Power Station Site, Knottingley, West Yorkshire Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure

Regulations 2009

Regulation 5(2)(q)



Applicant: Multifuel Energy Limited

Date: July 2014

---







<b>Document Number</b>	5.9		
<b>Revision</b>	Submission version.		
<b>Author</b>	SLR Consulting Ltd (SLR)		
<b>Signed</b>	SLR	<b>Date</b>	30.07.14
<b>Approved By</b>			
<b>Signed</b>	SLR	<b>Date</b>	30.07.14
<b>Document Owner</b>	SLR		

<b>Revision History</b>			
<b>Revision No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Reason for Revision</b>	<b>Authorised By</b>
Submission version	30.07.14	-	SLR



## Glossary of Abbreviations and Definitions

APFP Regulations	The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. Sets out detailed procedures that must be followed for submitting and publicising applications for Nationally Significant Projects.
Applicant	Multifuel Energy Limited.
Application	The Application for a Development Consent Order made to the Secretary of State under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 in respect of the Proposed Development, required pursuant to Section 31 of the Planning Act 2008 because the Proposed Development is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under Section 14(1)(a) and Section 15 of the Planning Act 2008 by virtue of being an onshore generating station in England or Wales of 50 Megawatts electrical capacity of more.
Application Site	The land corresponding to the Order Limits that is required for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
Associated Development	Defined under S.115 of The Planning Act 2008 as development which is associated with the principal development and that has a direct relationship with it. Associated development should either support the construction or operation of the principal development, or help address its impacts. It should not be an aim in itself but should be subordinate to the principal development.
Book of Reference	A reference document providing details of all landownership interests within the Order Limits and linked to the Land Plan.
Consents and Licences required under Other Legislation	A document setting out the other consents and licences that are required for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development that are not being included within the Development Consent Order.
DCO	A Development Consent Order made by the relevant Secretary of State pursuant to The Planning Act 2008 to authorise a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. A DCO can incorporate or remove the need for a range of consents which would otherwise be required for a development. A DCO can also include rights of compulsory acquisition.
EfW	Energy from waste. A power plant that generates energy in the form of electricity or heat from the incineration or pyrolysis of waste products.
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment. The assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of a development undertaken in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009.
EIA Regulations	The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 setting out how the EIA of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects must be carried out and the procedures that must be followed.
ES	The Environmental Statement documenting the findings of the EIA.
Explanatory Memorandum	A document that explains the intended purpose and affect of a DCO and the authorisations and powers that it seeks.
FM1	Ferrybridge Multifuel 1 Power Station, which is currently under construction to the south of the Application Site.
Ha	Hectares. A metric measurement of area.
Host local authority	The local authority whose area the Application Site lies within. In this case, Wakefield Metropolitan Borough Council.
Land Plan	A plan showing all of the land that is required for the Proposed Development over which rights are to be sought as part of the DCO.
Limits of deviation	The lateral limits shown on the Works Plan(s) and the vertical limits (upwards and downwards) determined by reference to the section plan(s) submitted as part of the Application and within which the Proposed Development may occur.
MEL	Multifuel Energy Limited, a joint venture that has been formed between SSE Generation Limited and Wheelabrator Technologies Inc (the Applicant).
Multifuel power station	The thermal power station that will generate electricity through the combustion of waste derived fuel.
MWe	Megawatts electrical. A measurement of power.

NSIP	A Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project that must be authorised by the grant of a DCO under The Planning Act 2008.
NYCC	North Yorkshire County Council.
Order	The Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Order, being the DCO that would be made by the Secretary of State authorising the Proposed Development, a draft of which has been submitted as part of the Application.
Order Limits	The limits of the land to which the Application for the DCO relates and shown on the Land Plan and Works Plans within which the Proposed Development must be carried out and which is required for its construction and operation.
PA 2008	The Planning Act 2008 setting out legislation in relation to applications for NSIPs, including pre-application consultation and publicity, the examination of applications and decision making by the Secretary of State.
PINS	The Planning Inspectorate. A Government agency responsible for receiving and administering the acceptance and examination of applications for NSIPs on behalf of the Secretary of State.
Power Station site	All of the land comprised within the Ferrybridge Power Station site, including the Ferrybridge 'C' coal fired Power Station, the FM1 site and the majority of the Application Site.
Proposed Development	The development to which the Application relates and which requires a DCO and as listed at Schedule 1 of the draft Order.
Requirements	The 'requirements' at Schedule 2 of the draft Order that, amongst other matters, are intended to control the final details of the Proposed Development as to be constructed and also to control its operation, amongst other matters (e.g. control of noise levels and delivery hours) to ensure that it accords with the EIA and does not result in unacceptable impacts.
Rochdale Envelope	The approach applied to the EIA of a development whereby flexibility needs to be retained in the design of the development at the consenting stage, which involves defining the maximum parameters of the development and assessing these to ensure that the environmental effects of the development in its final built form have been adequately assessed.
Selby DC	Selby District Council
SoS	The Secretary of State. The decision maker for DCO applications and head of Government department. In this case the SoS for the Department of Energy and Climate Change.
SSE	SSE Generation Limited, 50% of the Applicant.
Statement of Reasons	A statement setting out the reasons and justification for the compulsory acquisition of land or rights in land within the Order Limits.
WDF	Waste derived fuel processed from sources of municipal solid waste, commercial and industrial waste and waste wood.
WMDC	Wakefield Metropolitan Borough Council, the host local planning authority.
Works Plan	Plan(s) showing the numbered works referred to at Schedule 1 of the Order and submitted with the Application.
WTI	Wheelabrator Technologies Inc. 50% of the Applicant.

---

**CONTENTS**

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
	The Background to the FM2 Project.....	1
	The Applicant.....	1
	The Application Site.....	2
	The Proposed Development.....	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>FUEL AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>5</b>
	Recent Landfill Disposal of Waste Suitable for use as Fuel.....	5
	Export of Residual Waste for Energy Recovery.....	8
	Future Availability of Fuel.....	9
	Fuel Sourcing.....	9
	Conclusions.....	11
<b>3.0</b>	<b>CONFORMANCE WITH WASTE HIERARCHY.....</b>	<b>12</b>
	Origin of the Waste Hierarchy.....	12
	The Legislative Background in England and Wales.....	13
	Application of the Waste Hierarchy.....	13
	Propensity for Compliance with the Waste Hierarchy.....	14
	Compliance with the Waste Hierarchy.....	16
<b>4.0</b>	<b>EFFECT ON WASTE PLANS AND STRATEGIES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
	Introduction.....	17
	National Strategies and Policies.....	17
	National Strategy.....	18
	Draft National Waste Plan.....	20
	Assessment of Compliance with National Strategies and Policies.....	20
	Regional Strategies and Policies.....	21
	Local Strategies and Policies.....	21
	Former Yorkshire and Humber Region.....	21
	Former East Midlands Region.....	21
	Former North East Region.....	22
	Former North West Region.....	22

Conclusions with Regard to Plan Compliance .....	23
<b>5.0 CONTRIBUTION TO RECOVERY TARGETS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Introduction.....	24
National Recovery Targets.....	24
Local Recovery Targets.....	26
Existing Capacity .....	26
Conclusions .....	27
<b>6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>28</b>
Fuel Availability.....	28
Waste Hierarchy.....	28
Waste Policy.....	29
Recovery Targets.....	29
Overall Conclusion .....	30

## **APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1A Review of Relevant Waste Policies- former Yorkshire & Humber Region**

**Appendix 1B Review of Relevant Waste Policies- former East Midlands Region**

**Appendix 1C Review of Relevant Waste Policies- former North East Region**

**Appendix 1D Review of Relevant Waste Policies- former North West Region**

**Appendix 2 Review of Compliance of Local Waste Recovery Targets**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This 'Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment' has been prepared in support of Multifuel Energy Limited's (the Applicant's) application (the Application) for a Development Consent Order (DCO) that has been made to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA 2008).
- 1.2 The Application seeks a DCO for the construction and operation and maintenance of a new build 'multifuel' power station of up to 90 megawatts (MWe) gross output and associated development (the Proposed Development). The Proposed Development is known as Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Power Station (hereafter referred to as FM2) and will be located within the existing Ferrybridge Power Station site, Knottingley, West Yorkshire.
- 1.3 The Proposed Development is a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' (a NSIP), being for an onshore generating station with an average gross electrical output in excess of 50MW (PA 2008 Section 15(2)(c)). Where a NSIP is proposed, an application for Development Consent must be made to PINS and approved by the relevant Secretary of State (SoS) before the development can proceed.
- 1.4 The DCO, if granted, would be known as the 'Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Power Station Order'.

### **The Background to the FM2 Project**

- 1.5 FM2 will be capable of producing low carbon electricity through the use of waste derived fuels from various sources of processed municipal solid waste, commercial and industrial waste and waste wood. It will therefore make a positive contribution toward the UK Government's climate change commitments, in addition to increasing the diversity and security of national electricity supply, while also reducing the amount of waste that is sent to landfill.
- 1.6 A similar multifuel power station is already being constructed on land within the Ferrybridge Power Station site. This project is known as 'Ferrybridge Multifuel 1 Power Station' (FM1) and was consented under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 in October 2011. It is anticipated that FM1 will be fully operational from Q3 2015.
- 1.7 The level of interest received from potential fuel suppliers in relation to FM1 has demonstrated that there is sufficient demand and fuel availability for a second multifuel power station at Ferrybridge. This is one of the reasons that has led to the Applicant's decision to progress FM2.

### **The Applicant**

- 1.8 The Applicant, Multifuel Energy Limited (MEL) is a 50:50 joint venture that has been formed by SSE Generation Ltd (SSE) and WTI/EfW Holdings Ltd, a subsidiary of Wheelabrator Technologies Inc. (WTI) to develop low carbon electricity generating plant.
- 1.9 SSE is one of the UK's leading energy companies and the largest non-nuclear electricity generator, operating a diverse portfolio across the UK and Ireland. A subsidiary of SSE owns and operates the Ferrybridge Power Station site, which includes the operational Ferrybridge 'C' coal-fired Power Station.



- 1.10 WTI is a leading developer, owner and operator of energy from waste (EfW) facilities and has been established for over 37 years. WTI currently owns and/or operates 21 energy facilities in the USA, 17 of which are EfW facilities. It has also recently acquired part of a business in China that has three operational plants and a further six under development.
- 1.11 The Applicant has an option agreement in place to enter into a lease for the land within the Application Site (the proposed DCO 'Order' Limits) that is within the control of SSE, while the draft DCO seeks the necessary powers and authorisations in respect of the land that lies outside SSE's control.
- 1.12 Further information on the Applicant can be found by going to the FM2 project website: [www.multifuelenergy.com/fm2](http://www.multifuelenergy.com/fm2).

### **The Application Site**

- 1.13 The Application Site (the Order Limits) comprises almost entirely of land inside the boundary of the Ferrybridge Power Station site and is entirely within the administrative area of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council (WMDC). The Ferrybridge Power Station site is situated between the River Aire to the north and east and the A1(M) immediately to the west.
- 1.14 The Application Site itself extends to approximately 32 hectares (ha) and consists primarily of land that originally formed part of the Power Station's former golf course, including land that is currently being used in connection with the construction of FM1, in addition to other land (some of which is outside the Power Station site) that may be required for electricity grid and utilities connections.
- 1.15 A detailed description of all the Application Site and its location and surroundings is provided in the 'Application Site Description Document' (Application Document Ref. No. 5.2), which forms part of the Application.

### **The Proposed Development**

- 1.16 The Proposed Development comprises of the multifuel power station (the generating station) and all of the elements that are integral to it, including the fuel reception and storage facilities, combustion system, steam turbine and emissions stack, amongst others, as well as associated and supporting buildings, structures, plant and areas.
- 1.17 In addition, it includes some 'Associated Development' connected with the generating station as defined by Section 115(2) of the PA 2008. This comprises of a new connection to the electricity grid network, improvements to an existing access road and a new foul water connection.
- 1.18 The Proposed Development will also involve temporary works connected with the construction phase such as contractors' compounds and laydown areas.
- 1.19 A detailed description of all the elements of the Proposed Development is provided in the 'Proposed Development Description Document' (Application Document Ref. No. 5.3).
- 1.20 It is currently anticipated that (subject to a DCO being granted and a final investment decision being made) work will commence on the Proposed Development in Q4 of 2015, with construction expected to be completed by Q2/Q3 of 2018. Subject to construction being completed within this timescale, the multifuel power station would enter commercial operation in Q4 2018.

## **The Purpose and Structure of this Document**

- 1.21 This 'Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment' has been prepared to comply with the requirements of paragraphs 2.5.66 and 2.5.67 of NPS EN-3<sup>1</sup> which indicate that the applicant seeking permission for a waste fuelled power station should:
- carry out an assessment of the proposed waste combustion generating station that examines the conformity of the scheme with the waste hierarchy and the effect of the scheme on the relevant waste plan or plans where a proposal is likely to involve more than one local authority; and
  - set out the extent to which the generating station and capacity proposed contributes to the recovery targets set out in relevant strategies and plans, taking into account existing capacity.
- 1.22 Paragraph 2.5.68 of EN-3 notes that it may be appropriate for assessments to refer to the Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) published by relevant waste authorities, which provide an updated figure of existing waste management capacity and future waste management capacity requirements.
- 1.23 Finally, paragraph 2.5.69 of EN-3 indicates that the results of the assessment of the conformity with the waste hierarchy and the effect on relevant waste plans should be presented in a separate document to accompany the application.
- 1.24 This Assessment constitutes the separate document described in paragraph 2.5.69 of EN-3, to fulfil the requirements summarised above.
- 1.25 In order to complete this work, an assessment of current and future demand for waste treatment capacity has been made which constitutes the 'fuel assessment' part of this document.

## **Scope of Work and Structure of this Document**

- 1.26 The scope of work required to comply with the requirements of EN-3 involves three tasks as follows:
- Task 1: Assessment of future waste management capacity requirements, i.e. the fuel assessment;
  - Task 2: Assessment of conformance of proposals with the waste hierarchy;
  - Task 3: Assessment of the effect of the scheme on waste plans and strategies; and
  - Task 4: Assessment of the contribution of the generating station to recovery targets in relevant plans and strategies.
- 1.27 The findings of the assessments are summarised and overall conclusions with regard to compliance with the requirements of EN-3 are set out at the end of this document.
- 1.28 The structure of the remainder of this report is as follows;
- Section 2 Fuel Availability Assessment;
  - Section 3 Conformance with Waste Hierarchy;

---

<sup>1</sup> National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), DECC, July 2011

Section 4	Effect on Waste Plans;
Section 5	Contribution to Recovery Targets in Waste Plans and Strategies;
Section 6	Summary and Conclusions.

## **2. FUEL AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT**

- 2.1 As a precursor to assessing the potential for the Proposed Development to comply with the waste hierarchy, and with relevant planning policies and waste strategies, it is necessary to first determine the availability of suitable residual waste which could be used as fuel in the multi-fuel generating station
- 2.2 This has been done in two ways. Firstly, using the most recent data available for landfilling of waste, the current amount of waste being landfilled, that would be suitable for energy recovery, has been determined. In addition, account has also been taken of the considerable volume of refuse derived fuel which has been exported from the UK for energy recovery at energy from waste facilities on the continent as this activity has reduced demand for landfill disposal of such material.
- 2.3 Secondly, with reference to the most recent government forecasts for the amounts of such wastes that will still be sent to landfill in 2020, the future availability of residual waste which could be suitable for use as fuel in energy from waste facilities has been established.

### **Recent Landfill Disposal of Waste Suitable for use as Fuel**

- 2.4 In 2012, the latest year for which statistics<sup>2</sup> are available, a total of 21.3 million tonnes (Mt) of non-hazardous waste was landfilled at non-hazardous waste landfills in England. While not all of this waste would have been suitable for energy recovery, this simple statistic demonstrates the overall scale of recovery capacity that is required, at national level, in order to move non-hazardous waste up the hierarchy away from landfill which is at the bottom of the hierarchy.
- 2.5 It is also relevant to consider the availability of residual waste feedstock at a more local level in order to define those authorities that have to be considered in the assessment of compliance of the proposals with waste strategies and plans. This 'fuel assessment' is set out in this section and feeds into the assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on waste plans and policies, set out in Section 4, and on the achievement of recovery targets, which is set out in Section 5.
- 2.6 To demonstrate the amount of residual waste which is being landfilled, and which could be moved up the waste hierarchy by being treated in an energy recovery facility such as the Proposed Development, a detailed review of landfill statistics for 2012 has been carried out. This has used data on the types of waste that was deposited at landfills in 2012 to determine the quantity of waste that could be suitable for energy recovery and which could be moved up the waste hierarchy.
- 2.7 In the former Yorkshire and Humber region, within which the Application Site is located, the latest Environment Agency statistics<sup>3</sup> show that a total of almost 2.4 Mt of non-hazardous waste was landfilled at merchant landfills in 2012. This excludes almost 1.4 Mt of non-hazardous waste sent to restricted user landfills, such as those which accept pulverised fuel ash from coal fired power stations.

---

<sup>2</sup> England and Wales: Landfill Inputs 2012, Environment Agency

<sup>3</sup> Yorkshire and the Humber: Waste Deposit Trends - Landfill deposits by site type, waste type and sub-region 2000/1 to 2012 (000s tonnes)

2.8 In Yorkshire and Humber, and in the former regions around it, a total of just less than 10.1 Mt of non-hazardous waste (referred to by the Environment Agency as household industrial and commercial waste) was deposited at landfills in 2012 as shown in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1: Northern England- Non Hazardous Waste Disposal in 2012**

Former Region	Non-Hazardous Waste Inputs to Landfill in 2012/Mt		
	Merchant Landfills	Restricted Landfills	Total Landfilled
Yorkshire & Humber	2.38	1.39	3.77
East Midlands	1.47	0.92	2.39
North East	0.93	0.0	0.93
North West	2.83	0.17	3.0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7.61</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>10.09</b>

2.9 A significant amount of this waste will have been municipal waste (now referred to as local authority collected waste, or LACW) the majority of which, in future, is likely to be sent for energy recovery as local authorities procure waste management contracts. An example of this is the contract to send refuse derived fuel from Manchester to the large scale energy recovery facility being developed by INEOS at Runcorn. At the time of writing, waste from Manchester is still sent by train for landfill disposal at Roxby in North Lincolnshire pending commissioning of the EfW facility at Runcorn.

2.10 However, even if it were assumed, on a conservative basis, that none of the LACW that is currently being sent to landfill in northern England would be available to the Proposed Development, a very large quantity of commercial and industrial waste (C&IW) arising in northern England is currently being landfilled at non-hazardous waste landfills and a significant fraction of this is of a type from which energy could be recovered.

2.11 Data<sup>4</sup> produced by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) show that waste disposal authorities in the former Yorkshire and Humber, East Midlands, North West and North East regions consigned a total of just over 3.9 Mt of LACW to landfill in 2012.

2.12 This implies that around 6.17 Mt of C&IW, arising in the north of England, was consigned to landfills in 2011/12. The split of LACW and C&IW landfilled is summarised in Table 2.2, assuming that the LACW does not move outside its region of origin for disposal.

<sup>4</sup> Local Authority Collected Waste Statistics – Quarterly Statistics Release from 2006 to end 2012, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), 8 August 2013

**Table 2.2: Northern England- LACW and C&IW Landfill Disposal in 2012**

<b>Former Region</b>	<b>Total Non-Hazardous Waste Landfilled in Region in 2012/Mt</b>	<b>LACW Sent to Landfill in 2012/Mt</b>	<b>C&amp;IW Landfilled 2012/Mt</b>
Yorks & Humber	3.77	0.98	2.79
East Midlands	2.39	0.86	1.53
North East	0.93	0.40	0.52
North West	3.0	1.67	1.33
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10.09</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>6.17</b>

- 2.13 Given the heterogeneous nature of C&IW, it would not be realistic to expect that all of the C&IW being disposed of to landfill in northern England would be amenable to energy recovery. However, analysis of the properties of C&IW, as established in a report<sup>5</sup> on C&IW in England, issued by Defra in 2011, indicates<sup>6</sup> that 43% of C&IW that was landfilled in England in 2009 would be described as being 'non-metallic waste' and 'animal and vegetable wastes'.
- 2.14 Based on the descriptions of these wastes, they would be expected to be suitable for treatment by energy recovery, which would have the effect of lifting such wastes up the hierarchy. It is likely that fractions of other C&IW types, which are currently being landfilled in northern England, such as some chemical wastes, healthcare wastes and discarded equipment would also be suitable for energy recovery such that the assumed suitability of just the non-metallic and animal and vegetable waste fractions is considered to be a conservative estimate
- 2.15 Use of this recent compositional information on the C&IW that was landfilled at national level, indicates that over 2.65Mt<sup>7</sup> of non-metallic and animal and vegetable C&IW, from which energy could potentially have been recovered, was consigned to landfills in the north of England in 2012.
- 2.16 In addition to this C&IW, which would be suitable for treatment by energy recovery, the vast majority of the LACW that was landfilled in 2012 would also be amenable to energy recovery suggesting that, in 2012, a total of over 6.5 Mt<sup>8</sup> of waste from which energy could have been recovered was consigned to landfills in northern England.

<sup>5</sup> From Table 30 of Commercial and Industrial Waste Survey 2009, Final Report, Jacobs, on behalf of Defra, May 2011

<sup>6</sup> Table 30 of the C&IW Report (Ref: 11) shows that 3.9Mt (34.6%) and 0.95Mt (8.4%) of non-metallic and animal and vegetable wastes were landfilled out of a total of 11.26Mt of C&IW

<sup>7</sup> 43% (34.6% + 8.4%) of 6.17 Mt of C&IW landfilled at merchant sites (see Table 2.2) = 2.65 Mt

<sup>8</sup> Comprising 3.9 Mt of LACW (see Table 2.2 and Ref 10) plus the 2.65 Mt of non-metallic and animal and vegetable C&IW (see footnote 13)

- 2.17 This finding implies that the Proposed Development would be able to access its full fuel requirements from the equivalent of about 10% of the wastes that are currently being landfilled in northern England, and from which energy could and should be recovered.
- 2.18 It is recognised, however, that there is a 'pipeline' of energy recovery facilities under construction in northern England which will progressively reduce the amount of residual waste which is sent to landfill as facilities are commissioned. However, the current pipeline of permitted facilities in northern England, as published<sup>9</sup> by the Environment Agency, has permitted capacity of just under 4.1 Mt. This pipeline of permitted recovery capacity includes sites that are now unlikely to get developed such as the proposed EfW facility at Salt End in Hull & East Riding and the Ince Marsh resource recovery facility in Cheshire which between them would have been capable of supplying 915,000 tonnes per annum recovery capacity.
- 2.19 The long term contracts to recover value from LACW which the prospective developers of these two facilities were hoping to obtain are now no longer available which calls into serious doubt the prospects of them being developed at least in the foreseeable future.
- 2.20 This implies that the current permitted pipeline of energy recovery facilities in northern England, that are either in construction or which are likely to be developed, would have the capacity to divert around 3.1 Mt of residual waste, from which energy can be recovered, from landfill. This is about half of the quantity of such wastes that were landfilled in northern England in 2012, indicating an ongoing demand, and need for, for energy recovery facilities such as the Proposed Development.

### **Export of Residual Waste for Energy Recovery**

- 2.21 One of the implications of the rapid increase in the cost of landfill disposal of residual waste that has been caused by the escalation of landfill tax, is that considerable volumes of residual waste, which have been subject to some limited pre-treatment, are now being exported from the UK into the continent for energy recovery at energy from waste facilities and cement works.
- 2.22 A recent study<sup>10</sup>, carried out for the Chartered Institute of Waste Management has determined that, in 2012, a total of 739,500 tonnes of refuse derived fuel (RDF) was exported from England and Wales to the continent for energy recovery and that permits to allow the export of 4.65Mt of RDF were granted. The trend for the export of RDF to the continent showed a small increase on 2011 after a significant increase between 2010 and 2011. A further increase in exports is expected in 2013.
- 2.23 The growth in the export market for RDF has been stimulated by the surplus capacity at some energy from waste facilities on the continent, and lack of similar capacity in the UK, which has led to costs of export of RDF being lower than landfill gate prices seen in the UK (as shown in Table 3.1 below). This has meant that export of residual waste, as RDF,

---

<sup>9</sup> Incineration facilities that were pre-operational in England and Wales during 2012: Permitted capacity, Environment Agency. This indicates 4.09Mt of non or per-operational recovery capacity in northern England. Information accessed at [REDACTED] on 7 February 2012

<sup>10</sup> Research into SRF and RDF Exports to Other EU Countries, Amec on behalf of The Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (CIWM), July 2013

for energy recovery, may in some instances be more cost effective than local landfill disposal, once landfill tax is factored in. It is estimated<sup>11</sup> that the total costs of preparation of RDF and then export for energy recovery on the continent is in the order of €80-100/tonne, which is already lower than gate fees at UK landfills before landfill tax rises to £80/tonne in April 2014.

### **Future Availability of Fuel**

- 2.24 The government, in its 'Waste 2020' forecast document<sup>12</sup>, has investigated whether the 2020 landfill diversion target<sup>13</sup>, set in the EU Landfill Directive, is likely to be met.
- 2.25 It has determined that there is a 95% prospect that the Landfill Directive target will be met. In the 'Waste 2020' analysis of the prospects of achieving this target, the government estimates this to require that no more than 10.2 Mt of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) should be sent to landfill by 2020.
- 2.26 However, the government estimates, in Appendix A of 'Waste 2020', that, even if it withdrew financial support to three particular municipal waste management projects being pursued by local authorities, there would be a 95% likelihood of there being surplus recovery capacity for 2.4 Mt of BMW.
- 2.27 This implies that the government's modelling shows that some 7.8 Mt of BMW would have to be landfilled in 2020<sup>14</sup>. However, the study acknowledges that "since this biodegradable waste is generally mixed with residual waste (and is treated in this way) the surplus of capacity will be greater" than that predicted by the modelling carried out. The same applies to the amount of BMW that the government forecasts will be landfilled in 2020.
- 2.28 In the modelling work undertaken, the biodegradable content of municipal solid waste (MSW) is deemed to be 66% which implies that the actual recovery capacity shortfall forecast by the government would be in the order of 11.8 Mt<sup>15</sup> in order to raise the management of the remaining residual MSW up the hierarchy from landfill to energy recovery.
- 2.29 The Proposed Development could, at a maximum input rate of 675,000 tonnes per annum, utilise just over 5% of this remaining residual waste, that the government is predicting will still be landfilled in 2020, as fuel.

### **Fuel Sourcing**

- 2.30 As the Proposed Development would operate, predominantly, in a merchant capacity, the obtaining of contracts to secure adequate fuel supplies would be a matter for commercial consideration. This accords with the findings of planning inspectors and secretaries of state in relation to examination of other large scale energy recovery similar proposals, in relation to the source of fuel derived from waste in that contracts can,

---

<sup>11</sup> Section 5.5 of reference 10.

<sup>12</sup> Forecasting waste arisings and 2020 treatment capacity, Defra, October 2013

<sup>13</sup> Which is that the amount of BMW that is landfilled is 35% or less than that landfilled in 1995

<sup>14</sup> See Table A1 in Appendix A to the 'Waste 2020' Report- Ref 12

<sup>15</sup> 7.8 Mt of BMW at 66.2% biodegradable content = 11.78 Mt of residual waste



realistically, only be concluded once the date on which the facility would be commissioned was certain.

- 2.31 The decision of the Secretary of State<sup>16</sup> regarding the 60 MW Lostock energy from waste generating station, confirmed that, for merchant facilities, where no contracts of waste have been obtained at the date of the application, the sourcing of fuel for the facility should be, as it is for existing fossil fuelled electricity generating stations, a matter of commercial judgment for the operator.
- 2.32 The Inspector's report<sup>17</sup> on the Lostock project concluded, in paragraph 18.4 that "the letting of contracts and hence the source of the waste, would be largely a commercial matter for the operators. This has been the view taken in recent decisions, which have not sought to constrain such processes." The Inspector also noted that "the waste to be used as a fuel arises everywhere".
- 2.33 It is considered, therefore, that it would be both unrealistic and potentially misleading to attempt, at this stage, to provide definitive information with regard to the origin of the waste fuel for the Proposed Development such that this fuel assessment does not do this. However, there are commercial, environmental and policy considerations which would eventually influence the origins of the fuel for the Proposed Development and the transport routes and modes which would be used to import fuel to the site. These considerations have been used to assist in parameterisation of the lifecycle (or WRATE) assessment<sup>18</sup>, which is contained at Appendix 17B of the Environmental Statement (Application Document Ref. No. 6.4.24).
- 2.34 The Proposed Development is well located with regard to potential supplies of residual waste which could be used as fuel in that it has a central location in the northern part of England and benefits from multi-modal transport links, with good access by road and rail.
- 2.35 Some of the fuel supplies may come from a wider national area in circumstances where a supply to the Proposed Development is the best option for that fuel. It is considered, therefore, that the Proposed Development would also be capable of meeting part of the wider need for waste recovery, as well as some of the national need for additional energy generation capacity, the urgent need for which is set out in the Overarching National Policy Statement EN-1 at paragraph 3.1.3.
- 2.36 On a conservative basis, and in order to model the life cycle impacts of the energy recovery proposals, it has been assumed, therefore, in the WRATE assessment that all of the residual waste that would be required to fully fuel the Proposed Development would be imported by road and across an average distance of 160km. In reality, most of the larger conurbations in the four former regions (of Yorkshire and Humber, East

---

<sup>16</sup> Application for consent to construct and operate an energy from waste-fuelled generating station at land formerly occupied by the Lostock Power Station, Lostock, Northwich, Cheshire, Letter from the Secretary of State at DECC to RPS, 2 October 2012

<sup>17</sup> Report to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change by Elizabeth Hill BSc(Hons), BPhil, MRTPI, 5 March 2012 on an application by Tata Chemicals Europe Ltd and E.on Energy from Waste UK Ltd under s36 of the Electricity Act 1989 for a 60MW generating station at Lostock, Northwich, Cheshire

<sup>18</sup> Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2), Ferrybridge Power Station Site, Knottingley, West Yorkshire, Appendix 17B WRATE Assessment Report, URS July 2014

Midlands, North-east and North-west) around the Proposed Development lie within this transport radial such that this average distance is considered to be a realistic maximum.

- 2.37 Table 17B.13 of the WRATE assessment demonstrates that the overall life cycle emissions associated with transportation of the residual waste to the Proposed Development are relatively insensitive to the distance across waste is transported provided that the effect of the transportation effort is to divert the waste from being landfilled.

### **Conclusions**

- 2.38 The high level fuel availability assessment set out above demonstrates that, at the time of writing, large quantities of residual waste, from which energy could be recovered, are being landfilled at both national level, and more locally in northern England. Significant volumes of RDF are also being exported to the continent for energy recovery.
- 2.39 At the national level, Defra is forecasting that over 11.8Mt of municipal waste will still be sent to landfill in 2020, after taking account of the current 'pipeline' of waste recovery capacity. This residual waste would be suitable for use as fuel in the Proposed Development.
- 2.40 The carbon emissions associated with transportation of waste to the Proposed Development would be much lower than the emissions that would be avoided by diverting this waste from being landfilled as demonstrated in the Applicant's lifecycle assessment<sup>19</sup>.
- 2.41 These analyses demonstrate the current and future availability of fuel for the Proposed Development and that this fuel could be sourced by diverting waste from landfill or from the export of RDF.

---

<sup>19</sup> See reference 18

### 3. CONFORMANCE WITH WASTE HIERARCHY

#### Origin of the Waste Hierarchy

- 3.1 The revised Waste Framework Directive<sup>20</sup>, which came into force on 12 December 2008, established the overarching framework for the management of waste across the EU. It required Member States to “bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive”, within two years of its entry into force, i.e. by December 2010. The Directive brought together existing elements of waste legislation and introduced a new approach to waste management which focuses more strongly on the prevention of waste.
- 3.2 In summary, the revised Waste Framework Directive (rWFD) repealed the original Waste Framework Directive (2006/12/EC), the Directive on Hazardous Waste (91/689/EEC) and part of the Directive on Waste Oils (75/439/EEC). Of particular relevance to the Proposed Development, the rWFD requires in Article 16(3) that MSW is recovered at “one of the nearest appropriate installations” and, in Article 4(1), introduced a new five point waste hierarchy, based on the priority order of:
- Prevention (preferred option);
  - Preparing for re-use;
  - Recycling;
  - Other recovery (e.g. energy recovery); and
  - Disposal (i.e. landfilling or incineration without energy recovery).
- 3.3 The changes in emphasis in the revised hierarchy were the preference for waste prevention and the confirmation that waste treatment involving energy generation is a recovery operation (subject to it achieving energy recovery efficiency expressed as R1<sup>21</sup> of 0.65 or more).
- 3.4 Member states of the EU are required by Article 4(1) of the rWFD to apply the hierarchy as a priority order “in waste prevention and management legislation and policy”.
- 3.5 However, the need to observe the principles of the hierarchy is devolved further in that guidance<sup>22</sup> on the interpretation of the rWFD confirms that EU case law has established that the “waste hierarchy is to be observed and applied by all the relevant administrative levels within a given Member State that are concerned with waste policies and legislation”.
- 3.6 The rWFD sets out, in Article 11 (2), a minimum target for recycling in that it requires, inter alia, that:

---

<sup>20</sup> Directive 2008/98/EC on waste

<sup>21</sup> The way in which the R1 criterion is calculated is set out in the rWFD. The Proposed Development is designed to achieve an R1 of >0.65 such that it would be regarded as a waste recovery activity

<sup>22</sup> Guidance on the interpretation of key provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC on waste, European Commission, June 2012

*“Member States shall take the necessary measures designed to achieve the following targets:*

*(a) by 2020, the preparing for re-use and the recycling of waste materials such as at least paper, metal, plastic and glass from households and possibly from other origins as far as these waste streams are similar to waste from households, shall be increased to a minimum of overall 50 % by weight.”*

- 3.7 There are no recovery targets in the rWFD other than a general requirement in Article 10 that “Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that waste undergoes recovery operations, in accordance with Articles 4 and 13”, which require compliance with the waste hierarchy and with general principles of environmental and amenity protection respectively.

### **The Legislative Background in England and Wales**

- 3.8 The rWFD was incorporated into national legislation, in England and Wales, by the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011.

- 3.9 These regulations require, in Schedule 1, at paragraph 2(1), that the waste hierarchy, as set out in the rWFD, is applied by the appropriate authority as a “priority order” in waste prevention and management policy.

- 3.10 Schedule 1, at paragraph 2(2) requires that when applying the waste hierarchy, the appropriate authority must ensure that it:

*“(a) encourages the options that deliver the best overall environmental outcome, which may require specific waste streams to depart from the hierarchy where this is justified by life-cycle thinking on the overall impacts of the generation and management of such waste;*

*(b) takes into account—*

- (i) the general environmental protection principles of precaution and sustainability,*
- (ii) technical feasibility and economic viability,*
- (iii) protection of resources, and*
- (iv) the overall environmental, human health, economic and social impacts.”*

- 3.11 The ‘appropriate authority’ is defined in Regulation 3 as, in England, the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and in relation to Wales, the Welsh Ministers.

### **Application of the Waste Hierarchy**

- 3.12 The hierarchy of waste management methods, and the requirements as to how it should be applied, dictates that the waste feedstock for the energy recovery projects can only be drawn from residual waste which would otherwise be landfilled and which is not capable, either technically or from the standpoint of economic feasibility (see paragraph 2(2)(b)(ii) of Schedule 2 to the Waste Regulations 2011), of being recycled.

3.13 With regard to the fuel being received, the responsibility for compliance with the Waste Hierarchy lies with each of the processors of waste producing fuel for the Proposed Development and that their compliance with the hierarchy will be regulated and monitored by the EA (or other permitting authority if located elsewhere in the UK) through their respective Environmental Permits at source.

3.14 MEL will:

- only accept fuel from licenced waste treatment facilities operating under an Environmental Permit granted by the EA (or other permit granted by the relevant permitting authority if elsewhere in the UK); and
- cease to take fuel from a waste treatment facility for which the Environmental Permit is withdrawn by the EA (or other permit granted by the relevant permitting authority if elsewhere in the UK), or for which the permit is removed for that part of the treatment facility's operations which are used to produce fuel supplied to the Proposed Development.

3.15 The above measures will be implemented and controlled through the Environmental Permit and Environmental Management System to be prepared for the operation of the Proposed Development.

### **Propensity for Compliance with the Waste Hierarchy**

3.16 The propensity of a waste recovery scheme to comply with the waste hierarchy, based on market forces and practical factors alone, will be affected by a combination of:

- The availability of waste which is being treated by methods which are lower in the hierarchy than the recovery proposal; and
- The financial disincentive to use waste which is already being managed higher in the hierarchy, as feedstock in the recovery facility

These inter-related issues are explored below.

### **Availability of Waste Below Recovery in the Hierarchy**

3.17 The availability of wastes that are below recovery in the hierarchy at present and in 2020 has been assessed in Section 2, using landfill utilisation statistics which are published by the Environment Agency and a Defra forecast of landfill utilisation by biodegradable MSW in 2020.

3.18 The use of this residual waste would be in accordance with the requirements of the waste hierarchy providing that such recovery activity did not prevent those wastes that are currently being landfilled from being recycled.

3.19 The potential for this to happen, in the context of a hierarchy which has to take account of, inter alia, "technical feasibility and economic viability", can be explored having regard to the respective costs of recycling, landfilling and treatment by energy recovery, as described below in Section 3.20 et seq.

### **Financial Incentive for Recycling**

3.20 The potential for there to be a financial incentive to effectively deviate from the waste hierarchy, to divert waste from landfill to recovery rather than to recycling, in order to provide fuel for an energy from waste facility, such as the Proposed Development, is the

reason that has been cited as necessitating planning conditions such as those in the FM1 consent, as described above.

- 3.21 However, recent data<sup>23</sup> on the respective costs of landfilling (at the bottom of the hierarchy), energy recovery and recycling, show clearly that gate fees at materials recycling facilities and organic waste treatment facilities (such as anaerobic digestion and composting plants) are significantly lower than gate fees at landfills if the landfill tax element of disposal costs are taken into consideration. The most recent gate fee data are summarised in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Waste Management- Gate Fees 2013 (from WRAP Report: Ref 13)**

<b>Waste Management Technology</b>	<b>Median Gate Fee- £/t</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Landfill disposal	93	Inclusive of Landfill Tax of £72/t- will rise to £80/t in April 2014
Energy recovery	82	
Mechanical and biological treatment	76	
Organic waste energy recovery- AD	41	
Organic waste recycling- composting	24-46	Range for open windrow to in-vessel composting systems
Materials Recycling Facility	9	

- 3.22 Given that there is clearly a strong financial, as well as environmental, incentive to divert wastes from landfill to these recycling and organic waste recovery facilities, it can be concluded that there must be technical impediments in being able to do so in that the cost of landfilling far exceeds the cost of using these alternative treatment methods which are higher up in the waste hierarchy.
- 3.23 This suggests that provision of an additional facility, which could recover energy from about 10% of the suitable LACW and C&IW that were recently being consigned to landfill in the north of England, would be unlikely to contravene the waste hierarchy in this area and indeed would be in compliance with the hierarchy.
- 3.24 The design of the Proposed Development is flexible in that it can accept a wide range of fuel on a NCV basis. The Proposed Development will therefore be able to accommodate changing fuel type as the residual fuel arising after application of the Waste Hierarchy changes with time. The Proposed Development does not require a specific fuel produced to a narrow specification, and therefore complements the Waste Hierarchy.

<sup>23</sup> Gate Fees Report, 2013. Comparing the cost of alternative waste treatment options, WRAP

### Compliance with the Waste Hierarchy

- 3.25 It is concluded that the Proposed Development would have the propensity to comply with the waste hierarchy.
- 3.26 It has been demonstrated that large quantities of suitable waste, from which energy could be recovered, are still being consigned to landfill, which is at the bottom of the hierarchy, at both national level and also in the North of England. Other wastes are being exported to the continent as refuse derived fuel. Given the current combination of landfill gate fees and landfill tax, or the lower but still appreciable costs of exporting RDF for energy recovery, there is a clear financial imperative already for such waste to be recycled if this were technically possible.
- 3.27 In that this is not taking place, and given that recycling facilities are more easily developed than recovery facilities, it is considered reasonable to assume that these wastes are not readily amenable to being recycled. If large scale energy recovery facilities were available and accessible these residual wastes could be managed higher up the hierarchy.
- 3.28 The flexibility of the design of the Proposed Development in that it can accept a wide range of fuel on a NCV basis, naturally complements the Waste Hierarchy.

## **4. EFFECT ON WASTE PLANS AND STRATEGIES**

### **Introduction**

- 4.1 The scope of the assessment of the effect of the a waste fuelled generating station at the scale of a nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP) on waste plans and strategies was considered by the former Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) in its determination of an application by Covanta Rookery South Limited for a resource recovery centre at the Rookery South pit in Bedfordshire. The facility was of comparable generating capacity to the Proposed Development.
- 4.2 The IPC, in its decision document<sup>24</sup>, noted in paragraph 4.14, that “Paragraph 2.5.70 of NPS EN-3 (which was at that stage still in draft) advises that the assessment of an EfW plant should take into account relevant waste strategies and plans. This is in order to satisfy the requirement that the proposal should be in accordance with the waste hierarchy and of an appropriate type and scale so as not to prejudice the achievement of local or national waste management targets”.
- 4.3 In paragraph 4.15 of its statement of reasons, the IPC noted that “we therefore need to consider what constitutes the development plan relevant to the application”. It concluded that the development plan and strategies to be considered would include national, regional and local documents.
- 4.4 At national level, the IPC identified the following waste policy and strategy documents as being relevant considerations:
- The [then] emerging National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
  - The March 2011 update of PPS10- Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, which incorporated the new waste hierarchy from the rWFD;
  - The Waste Strategy for England 2007; and
  - The Government Review of Waste Policy in England, July 2011
- 4.5 The IPC also identified the former regional spatial strategy (RSS) for the East of England as a material consideration in relation to the Rookery South project, as well as the local plans for the unitary authorities which previously lay within the jurisdiction of Bedfordshire County Council.

### **National Strategies and Policies**

#### **Legislative Origin of National Strategies and Policies**

- 4.6 In that the national strategy has to be, at a minimum, compliant with the requirement that the rWFD places on EU member states, it is relevant to consider how the relevant rWFD requirements have been implemented. In England and Wales, the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 require, at Regulation 18, that planning authorities must have regard to the provisions of Article 13 (regarding general environmental protection) and to the majority of Article 16 of the rWFD. Those parts of paragraph 1 of Article 16 which are

---

<sup>24</sup> The Planning Act 2008 Rookery South Resource Recovery Facility Order Panel’s Decision and Statement of Reasons, Infrastructure Planning Commission, October 2011



given effect by the Regulation, and which are relevant to the Proposed Development, require that:

*“Member States shall take appropriate measures to establish an integrated and adequate network of waste disposal installations and of installations for the recovery of mixed municipal waste collected from private households, including where such collection also covers such waste from other producers”.*

- 4.7 Paragraph 2 of Article 16 of the rWFD also requires that the network of disposal and recovery installations referred to in paragraph 1 shall be designed to enable the Community as a whole to become self-sufficient in waste disposal as well as in the recovery of the types of waste referred to in paragraph 1 (i.e. municipal wastes and waste collected alongside municipal waste). Paragraph 2 indicates that the network of facilities to be established should “enable Member States to move towards that aim (i.e. self sufficiency) individually, taking into account geographical circumstances or the need for specialised installations for certain types of waste.”
- 4.8 Paragraph 3 of Article 16 requires that member states ensure that the network of facilities shall enable waste to be disposed of or waste referred to in paragraph 1 to be “recovered in one of the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies, in order to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health.”
- 4.9 In responding to the need, therefore, to consider the effect of the Proposed Development on the “relevant waste plan or plans”, as required by NPS EN-3, this review of high level legislative background is considered relevant in that it identifies that the national objectives, as set out in the Waste Regulations of 2011, are to:
- obtain self-sufficiency at the national level; and
  - establish a network of facilities from which value can be recovered from municipal waste or waste collected together with municipal waste

### **National Strategy**

- 4.10 The national strategy considered relevant to the Proposed Development from the context of compliance with the requirements of paragraph 2.5.67 of NPS EN-3, is considered to be the national waste strategy and the review of the waste policy carried out by the incoming coalition government in 2011.
- 4.11 Following an extensive consultation period, revisions to the Waste Strategy for England were published as Waste Strategy 2007<sup>25</sup>, in May 2007, replacing the Waste Strategy 2000. A review of progress<sup>26</sup> was issued in October 2009.
- 4.12 The salient details of the strategy that are relevant to the consideration of the compliance of the Proposed Development with the strategy are the:
- targets for recycling and composting of MSW arisings of at least 40% of MSW arisings by 2010, 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020;

---

<sup>25</sup> Waste Strategy for England 2007, Defra, May 2007

<sup>26</sup> Waste Strategy Annual Progress Report 2008/09, Defra, October 2009

- targets for recovery of municipal wastes of 67% and 75% in 2015 and 2020 respectively;
  - recognition that “recovering energy from waste which cannot sensibly be reused or recycled is an essential component of a well-balanced energy policy”;
  - objective to achieve and exceed the Landfill Directive targets for MSW diversion from landfill;
  - use of the fiscal stimulus of further escalation in the rate of Landfill Tax to encourage diversion of waste from landfill;
  - identification of the need to increase the diversion of non-municipal waste from landfill;
  - identification that, for energy recovery facilities there are “significant benefits” in recovering heat as well as electricity; and the
  - recognition that changes to patterns of waste management have a significant role to play in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- 4.13 The strategy also noted that experience from European countries shows that very high rates of recycling often co-exist with high rates of recovery of energy from waste, which demonstrates that a policy of recovering energy from waste is not incompatible with high recycling rates.
- 4.14 The strategy provided very little information or guidance on C&IW other than forecasting a reduction in the amount of C&IW that is landfilled. It does indicate that new national targets will be set for reducing the amount of C&IW landfilled.
- 4.15 The October 2009 progress review indicated that a national survey of C&IW arisings and management would be completed in late 2010. This survey was carried out for Defra by Jacobs and was published in December 2010 and as a revised version<sup>27</sup>, following one minor change, in May 2011.
- 4.16 Following the general election in 2010, Defra announced<sup>28</sup> that it would review its waste policies in order to, inter alia, ensure the right contribution from energy from waste and anaerobic digestion technologies, having noted that the Government would consider how to move to a position of “zero waste to landfill”.
- 4.17 In July 2010, Defra and the Welsh Assembly Government issued a consultation document<sup>29</sup> about the transposition of the revised Waste Framework Directive into legislation. This indicated, in paragraph 2.18, that the government’s response to the emphasis on the waste hierarchy would be to encourage “*the right waste management facilities, in the right places, operating in the right way to deliver sustainable development outcomes*”.

---

<sup>27</sup> Commercial and Industrial Waste Survey 2009, Final Report, Jacobs, on behalf of Defra, May 2011

<sup>28</sup> Terms of Reference for a Review of Waste Policies, Defra, 29 July 2010

<sup>29</sup> Stage Two: Consultation on the transposition of the Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/93/EC), Defra and WAG, July 2010

- 4.18 The consultation document emphasised, in paragraph 2.22, that, in balancing competing objectives and interests, it is critical that the waste hierarchy is applied appropriately to bring forward the timely delivery of robust and credible waste infrastructure.
- 4.19 In June 2011, the coalition government published its Review of Waste Policy in England. This confirmed, in paragraph 23, the government's view that *"landfill should be the last resort for most waste"*. In paragraph 212, the Review sets out the government's "overarching goals" with respect to the recovery of energy from waste which include the need to ensure that *"recovery of energy from waste makes an important contribution to the UK's renewable energy targets"* and, in this context, paragraph 214 notes that *"energy recovery is an excellent use of many wastes that cannot be recycled and which would otherwise go to landfill"*.
- 4.20 Although the review did not set an explicit target for the development of energy from waste capacity, it indicated, in paragraph 215, that the government expected the amount of renewable electricity that is generated from thermal treatment of waste to treble from the 1.2 TWh/annum to between 3.1 and 3.6 TWh by 2020.
- 4.21 The government's fundamental position on landfill was emphasised in paragraph 240 of the review in which it states that *"it is **clearly wrong** that we still send so much material to landfill in England that is a resource"*. The emphasis is in the strategy document.

#### **Draft National Waste Plan**

- 4.22 In July 2013, the government produced a consultation draft<sup>30</sup> of a national waste plan which has been prepared in response to one of the requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive.
- 4.23 The draft plan confirms that the government is "working towards moving beyond our current throwaway society to a 'zero waste economy' in which material resources are reused, recycled or recovered wherever possible and only disposed of as the option of last resort".
- 4.24 It also confirms the need for self-sufficiency in recovery and disposal infrastructure.

#### **Assessment of Compliance with National Strategies and Policies**

- 4.25 As demonstrated in Section 2, significant amounts of waste from which energy could be recovered are still being sent to landfill in the north of England. The provision of the Proposed Development, which could raise up the hierarchy, the way in which these wastes are managed, is considered to be compliant with the national policies and aims described above in that it would:
- contribute to self-sufficiency (in terms of energy recovery from waste) at the national level; and
  - become part of a network of facilities from which value could be recovered from municipal waste or waste collected together with municipal waste.

---

<sup>30</sup> Waste Management Plan for England. Draft for Consultation, Defra, July 2013

### **Regional Strategies and Policies**

- 4.26 Although the IPC considered that regional policy was a material consideration in relation to the Rookery South energy recovery project, the subsequent revocation of the regional strategies for the north of England, from where it is anticipated that the Proposed Development would source the majority of its fuel, indicates that compliance with these strategies is no longer of relevance.

### **Local Strategies and Policies**

- 4.27 A review of the local waste strategies and policies in the area in which the majority of the fuel for the Proposed Development is expected to originate, i.e. northern England, has been carried out and is provided in Appendix 1, which is presented in several sections.
- 4.28 In the majority of cases, the strategies and waste plans focus on municipal waste (now local authority collected waste or LACW), which is understandable as the waste planning authorities were, in most cases, the same authorities which had the responsibility of managing these wastes and, as a result of which, had good statistics with which to develop their plans and strategies.
- 4.29 Given that a total of 47 waste planning authorities lie within the northern England area (as defined by the former regions of Yorkshire and Humber, east Midlands, North West and North East), the review of the policies and strategies is summarised on a regional basis below which is considered logical as many of these policies will have derived from policies and targets set out in the regional spatial strategies which have now been revoked.

### **Former Yorkshire and Humber Region**

- 4.30 The summary of the review of the potential effect of the Proposed Development on waste plans in the former Yorkshire and Humber region is set out in Appendix 1A.
- 4.31 This shows that none of the 15 waste planning authorities (WPAs) in the former Yorkshire and Humber Region have policies in their adopted waste plans or emerging DPDs that seek to restrict the movement of waste outside the plan areas. Several plans explicitly acknowledge the possibility that such movement to a facility outside the plan area as being the most sustainable option and way of lifting the management of some residual wastes up the hierarchy. For instance, The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Plan, which was adopted in March 2012, allows “waste to be imported or exported where this represents the most sustainable option”.
- 4.32 Some WPAs have expressed a preference for local or regional self-sufficiency. For North East Lincolnshire Council, this means “each authority in the Yorkshire and Humber region playing a commensurate part in the provision of facilities”.

### **Former East Midlands Region**

- 4.33 The summary of the review of the potential effect of the Proposed Development on waste plans in the former East Midlands region is set out in Appendix 1B.
- 4.34 In the former East Midlands region, none of the nine waste planning authorities had adopted or emerging policies that seek to constrain the movement of residual waste outside the plan area. Some plans, such as the Derby City Council and Derbyshire County Council Joint Waste Local Plan suggest that development of waste facilities

should take account of the proximity principle and self-sufficiency whereas others, such as Leicestershire County Council and Leicester City Councils forecast a significant shortfall in waste treatment capacity of around 900,000 tonnes per annum commenting that this could require the construction of four 250,000 tonnes per annum energy from waste facilities.

### **Former North East Region**

- 4.35 The summary of the review of the potential effect of the Proposed Development on waste plans in the former North East region is set out in Appendix 1C.
- 4.36 There are 12 waste planning authorities in the former North East region, although in the Teesside area, five authorities have worked together to produce a Joint Minerals and Waste DPD.
- 4.37 None of the waste planning authorities in the former region have policies that seek to prevent residual waste being moved outside plan areas although several point to the desirability of what Durham County Council, in its emerging County Durham Plan, refer to as “net self-sufficiency”.
- 4.38 However, Durham County Council comments, in its Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that “waste does not respect local authority administrative boundaries” which is consistent with the council’s acknowledgement, in the emerging County Durham plan that “in the medium term it may be necessary to export waste where this is shown to be the most sustainable option”.
- 4.39 Similarly, South Tyneside Council, in its adopted Development Management Policies Document, notes that some wastes will be managed at a regional level “due to efficiency and economies of scale”.
- 4.40 Sunderland City Council acknowledges, in its Core Strategy preferred options document that it exports LACW to an EfW facility in Teesside and that there is still a shortfall in capacity to recover value from C&IW.

### **Former North West Region**

- 4.41 The summary of the review of the potential effect of the Proposed Development on waste plans in the former North West region is set out in Appendix 1D.
- 4.42 There are 11 waste planning authorities in the former region several of which comment on the potential use of regional or national scale facilities for the recovery of energy from waste. None of the authorities have adopted or emerging plan policies that seek to prevent the movement of residual waste outside the respective plan areas.
- 4.43 The Joint Lancashire Minerals and waste Core strategy DPD (which was produced with Blackburn and Blackpool Borough Councils) notes that it might be reasonable to consider cross boundary movements of waste where “economies of scale point to larger sub-regional or nationally important facilities”. The Cheshire Waste Local Plan suggests that a strategic view of the need for such facilities should be taken with regard to high level guidance. Now that the North West RSS has been revoked such guidance could be considered to be NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3.
- 4.44 The largest producer of waste in the former North West region, Greater Manchester, notes that the proximity principle can be met if waste is managed in the “most appropriate location” and that “wastes may then be sent outside Greater Manchester for

secondary or tertiary treatment depending on market demand". This is consistent with the export of residual waste from Manchester to a landfill in North Lincolnshire, for many years, and the intention to export RDF from Manchester for energy recovery at an EfW facility in Runcorn.

- 4.45 The Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside, adopted in July 2013, recognises that it has sites within the plan area with planning permissions for thermal treatment with a total capacity of 1.5 Mtpa which is describes as being of "regional significance".

### **Conclusions with Regard to Plan Compliance**

- 4.46 Having completed a review of high level and local level plans that are relevant to the Proposed Development development it is concluded that, at the national level, the development of additional energy recovery capacity would contribute to national self-sufficiency (in terms of energy recovery from waste), and that it would become part of a network of facilities in which value could be recovered from local authority collected waste. Both of these aims are requirements of the EU Waste Framework Directive. At present, the export of significant volumes of refuse derived fuel from England to the continent, as described in paragraphs 2.21 et seq above, suggests that self-sufficiency has not yet been achieved.
- 4.47 At the local level, a review of the relevant adopted and emerging policies in plans prepared by the 47 waste planning authorities in northern England has confirmed that none of these authorities have policies which would seek to prevent residual waste being moved outside the plan area for energy recovery.
- 4.48 It is concluded, therefore, that the Proposed Development would be in conformity with the relevant waste plans of the jurisdictions from which it is likely to obtain its feedstock.

## 5. CONTRIBUTION TO RECOVERY TARGETS

### Introduction

- 5.1 As required by paragraph 2.5.67 of NPS EN-3, the applicant seeking permission for a residual waste fuelled power station should set out the extent to which the generating station and capacity proposed contributes to the recovery targets set out in relevant strategies and plans, taking into account existing capacity.

### National Recovery Targets

- 5.2 As described in paragraph 4.12, the national recovery targets are set out in Waste Strategy 2007 and require the recovery of value from at least 75% of municipal waste by 2020. There are no comparable targets for recovery of value from C&IW but the government's stated position is that "landfill should be the last resort for most waste", i.e. that these recovery targets should be exceeded if possible.
- 5.3 The government's fundamental position on landfill is emphasised in paragraph 240 of the review in which it states that "*it is **clearly wrong** that we still send so much material to landfill in England that is a resource*".
- 5.4 In this context, the 2011 Waste Policy Review noted that the government expects the amount of renewable electricity that is generated from thermal treatment of waste to treble from by 2020, implying a need for the trebling of thermal treatment recovery capacity compared to the situation in 2010 when this capacity forecast<sup>31</sup> was made.
- 5.5 In 2010, operational energy recovery facilities recovered energy from just over 4 Mt of mostly<sup>32</sup> municipal and small amounts of commercial and industrial waste. This implies that, by 2020 an additional 8Mt of similar wastes should be sent to energy recovery facilities.
- 5.6 Environment Agency statistics<sup>33</sup> show that, in 2012, throughput at operational energy recovery facilities treating municipal and commercial and industrial wastes was 5.145 Mt and these facilities had total permitted capacity of 6.0 Mt.
- 5.7 This capacity available in 2012 implies that the government expects the waste management sector to commission an additional 6.0Mt of energy recovery capacity in the period to 2020 just to achieve landfill diversion targets, which apply only to biodegradable municipal waste (BMW), let alone to reduce the amount of waste (including commercial and industrial waste) that is landfilled to "near zero" which is the vision set out in the 2011 waste policy review.

---

<sup>31</sup> It was carried out in support of the 2010 Spending Review with regard to the level of PFI support for municipal waste projects in order to meet the EU Landfill Directive targets for biodegradable MSW diversion from landfill

<sup>32</sup> Defra records show that 3.868Mt of MSW from England was incinerated in 2010

<sup>33</sup> Incineration facilities that accepted waste in England and Wales during 2012: Permitted capacity and tonnage incinerated, Environment Agency, October 2013

- 5.8 However, the government in its 'Waste 2020' forecast document<sup>34</sup> states that there is a 95% prospect that the Landfill Directive target<sup>35</sup> will be met. In the 'Waste 2020' analysis of the prospects of achieving this target, the government estimates that the target requires that no more than 10.2 Mt of BMW should be sent to landfill by 2020. The government estimates, in Appendix A of 'Waste 2020', that, even if it withdrew financial support to three particular municipal waste management projects being pursued by local authorities, there would be a 95% likelihood of there being surplus recovery capacity for 2.4 Mt of BMW after meeting the target.
- 5.9 This implies that the government's modelling shows that some 7.8 Mt of BMW would have to be landfilled in 2020<sup>36</sup>. However, the study acknowledges that "*since this biodegradable waste is generally mixed with residual waste (and is treated in this way) the surplus of capacity will be greater*" than that predicted by the modelling carried out. The same applies to the amount of BMW that the government forecasts will be landfilled in 2020.
- 5.10 In the modelling work undertaken, the biodegradable content of MSW is deemed to be 66% which implies that the actual recovery capacity shortfall forecast by the government would be in the order of 11.8 Mt<sup>37</sup> which would translate to waste that would be landfilled in order to raise the management of the remaining residual MSW up the hierarchy from landfill to energy recovery.
- 5.11 The Proposed Development could, at a maximum input rate of 675,000 tonnes per annum, move just over 5% of this remaining residual waste up the hierarchy thus contributing to achievement of the national policy. National policy has yet to be fully reformulated following the implementation of the revised Waste Framework Directive into national legislation but the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 require, in Schedule 1, at paragraph 2(1), that the waste hierarchy is applied by the appropriate authority as a "priority order" in waste prevention and management policy. This implies that it is national policy to seek to implement the waste hierarchy as far as it is technically and economically feasible to do so. The Secretary of State, as the appropriate authority, is obliged therefore to seek to go beyond the Landfill Directive targets for BMW diversion from landfill. Indeed, the government has recognised, in its 2011 waste policy review<sup>38</sup>, that the "*challenge for the Government is how to move beyond the existing trajectory to deliver the vision that landfill is only used for wastes for which there is no better use*".
- 5.12 It is concluded, therefore, that the Proposed Development could play a significant part in the achievement of this overall policy and the implicit recovery target, for 2020, to divert an additional 11.8 Mt of residual waste from landfill from which energy could be recovered.

---

<sup>34</sup> Forecasting waste arisings and 2020 treatment capacity, Defra, October 2013

<sup>35</sup> Which is that the amount of BMW that is landfilled is 35% or less than that landfilled in 1995

<sup>36</sup> See Table A1 in Appendix A to the 'Waste 2020' Report, Ref: 27

<sup>37</sup> 7.8 Mt of BMW at 66.2% biodegradable content = 11.78 Mt of residual waste

<sup>38</sup> Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011, Defra, May 2011 at paragraph 243



### Local Recovery Targets

- 5.13 A review of the recovery targets set by waste planning authorities in northern England is included at Appendix 2. It should be noted that the vast majority of recovery targets relate to the national target of recovering value from at least 75% of municipal waste by 2020 that comes from the national waste strategy<sup>39</sup> of 2007. In that this has been reviewed<sup>40</sup> in 2011 by the incoming coalition government, which confirmed that it would be guided by the requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive, which are discussed above in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.7, it is considered that many of the local waste recovery targets identified in Appendix 2 will have been overtaken by the need to apply the waste hierarchy as required by The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations.
- 5.14 The systematic review of waste recovery targets shows that most of the plans and strategies prepared by waste planning and waste disposal authorities in northern England have focussed on recovery targets for MSW.
- 5.15 None of the plans and strategies has an upper cap on the amount of recovery capacity that is required such that a purposeful interpretation of the requirements of these strategies, in the light of the requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive and of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, would be that councils should be supportive of proposals that would help to deliver the implied national recovery targets as described in paragraph 4.12 above.

### Existing Capacity

- 5.16 The availability of existing capacity to achieve the recovery targets can be carried out with reference to the surplus permitted capacity at active energy from waste recovery facilities. As described in paragraph 5.6 above, operational energy recovery facilities had about 0.85 Mt spare capacity in 2012. In addition, there is a significant number of prospective energy from waste projects<sup>41</sup> which have a valid permit but which have yet to be developed and which are non-operational. However, some of these facilities, including FM1, are in the course of construction so it is reasonable to regard these as being operational for the purposes of this compliance review.
- 5.17 These energy recovery facilities, throughout England, which are in the course of construction and/or commissioning have a permitted capacity of just over 4.1 Mtpa. In total, it appears that there may be almost 5 Mtpa of operational or near operational capacity available. However, the development of some of these facilities will have been factored into the calculation of the surplus capacity available at 2020, in the 'Waste 2020' report such that some of this capacity will have been taken account of in the 11.8Mt shortfall in recovery capacity described in paragraph 5.10 above.
- 5.18 This implies that after taking account of operational (and near-operational) capacity to meet the implicit recovery target, additional capacity will be required in order to "deliver the vision that landfill is only used for wastes for which there is no better use".

---

<sup>39</sup> Waste Strategy for England 2007, Defra, May 2007

<sup>40</sup> Ref 38

<sup>41</sup> Incineration facilities that were pre-operational in England and Wales during 2012: Permitted capacity, Environment Agency, October 2013

## Conclusions

- 5.19 It is concluded that local recovery targets, as set out in adopted plans and strategies, the majority of which have been based on targets in the Waste Strategy 2007 document have been generally superseded by the implementation of the revised Waste Framework Directive via The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 which emphasise the requirement for all waste to be managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy, if it is technically and economically feasible to do so.
- 5.20 The government's analysis of prospects of compliance with the EU Landfill Directive targets, for diversion of biodegradable municipal waste from landfill, set out in its 'Waste 2020' document, indicate that even if this target is met a significant shortfall in recovery capacity would remain. Analysis of the capacity of operational and near operational energy recovery facilities shows that these facilities will not meet that shortfall.

## **6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **Fuel Availability**

- 6.1 A high level, fuel availability assessment has been carried out with reference to the availability of fuel in the form of residual waste that is, or will be, disposed of to landfill, i.e. managed lower than energy recovery in the waste hierarchy. This demonstrates that, at present, large quantities of residual waste, from which energy could be recovered, are being landfilled in northern England. The Proposed Development could utilise about 10% of these residual wastes as fuel and would divert them from landfill, in accordance with the waste hierarchy.
- 6.2 At the national level, Defra is forecasting that over 11.8Mt of municipal waste will still be sent to landfill in 2020, after taking account of the current 'pipeline' of waste recovery capacity. This residual waste would be suitable for use as fuel in the Proposed Development.
- 6.3 A review of other recent statistics, information and forecasts has shown that:
- in the northern part of England, analysis of recent Defra and Environment Agency statistics show that over 10Mt of non-hazardous waste was disposed of by landfilling in 2010 of which over 3.9Mt was waste collected by local authorities;
  - data on compositional analysis of commercial and industrial waste suggest that around 2.65Mt of the remainder of the wastes that were landfilled in northern England in 2010 would have been suitable for treatment by energy recovery, suggesting that in northern England a total of over 6.5Mt of waste was landfilled in 2012 from which energy could have been recovered;
  - in 2012, almost 0.75 Mt of refuse derived fuel was exported from England to the continent, for energy recovery;
- 6.4 It is concluded that there is adequate availability of fuel for the Proposed Development and that this fuel could be sourced by diverting waste from landfill or by reducing the significant amount of RDF which is currently being exported to the continent for energy recovery and which represents a lost opportunity to the UK economy.

### **Waste Hierarchy**

- 6.5 A waste hierarchy compliance review has been carried out in relation to the Proposed Development. Its findings can be summarised as follows:
- the waste hierarchy, in which landfill disposal is at the bottom, has been incorporated into national legislation by the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and requires that the Secretary of State, who considers the Proposed Development, should seek to move the management of waste up the waste hierarchy;
  - the recovery of energy from residual waste is in accordance with the hierarchy where waste that would otherwise be landfilled and which cannot, for technical and economic reasons be recycled, be treated;
  - information on the relative costs to waste producers of recycling waste versus landfill disposal or energy recovery (either domestically or on the continent) suggests that the residual waste now being deposited in landfills may not be technically or economically capable of further recycling; and

- it is concluded that the operation of the Proposed Development would be in accordance with the waste hierarchy in that it would move the management of residual wastes, predominantly arising in the north of England, away from landfill and up to recovery in the hierarchy.

### **Waste Policy**

6.6 A waste policy compliance review has been carried out in relation to the Proposed Development and its findings can be summarised as follows:

- a review of national plans and policies that are relevant to the Proposed Development has concluded that the development of additional energy recovery capacity would contribute to national self-sufficiency (in terms of energy recovery from waste), and that Proposed Development would become part of a network of facilities in which value could be recovered from local authority collected waste;
- at the local level, a review of the relevant adopted and emerging policies in plan prepared by the 47 waste planning authorities in northern England has confirmed that none of these authorities have policies which would seek to prevent residual waste being moved outside the plan area for energy recovery; and
- it is concluded, therefore, that the scheme would be in compliance with the relevant waste plans of the waste planning authorities from which the Proposed Development is likely to obtain its feedstock.

### **Recovery Targets**

6.7 A review of the effect of the Proposed Development on waste recovery targets has been carried out and its findings can be summarised as follows:

- national recovery targets were set in 2007 to recover value from at least 75% of MSW arisings but there are no explicit targets for recovery of C&IW;
- these targets have been overtaken by the implementation of the revised Waste Framework Directive and its requirement to comply with the waste hierarchy;
- a recent government review of the prospects of compliance with the Landfill Directive target for diverting biodegradable municipal waste from landfill by 2020 confirms that the most likely scenario is that this target will be met but that, even after allowing for improved recycling, potential reductions in waste arisings and the development of a pipeline of energy recovery facilities, about 11.9 Mt of waste from which energy could be recovered would still be sent to landfill in 2020;
- a review of operational and near-operational energy recovery capacity (some of which will have been factored into the government forecasts for 2020) estimated that these energy recovery facilities would be able to recover energy from up to 5 Mtpa of residual waste;
- it is concluded that the Proposed Development could make a significant contribution (of up to 5%) to meeting the 11.9 Mt shortfall in national energy recovery capacity that the government expects to remain by 2020.

## **Overall Conclusion**

- 6.8 Having conducted an assessment of the availability of fuel which would be suitable for use at the Proposed Development, it is concluded that large quantities of residual waste from which energy could be recovered are either being landfilled in the UK or are being exported to the continent. A thorough review of compliance with the waste hierarchy, with waste policy at national and local levels has concluded that the Proposed Development could be operated in accordance with the requirements of the waste hierarchy and waste policies. A review of the contribution of the Proposed Development to national self-sufficiency in energy recovery capacity, and the achievement of targets to reduce the landfilling of waste from which energy could be recovered, concludes that the facility would be of significant benefit.



**APPENDIX 1A      REVIEW OF RELEVANT WASTE POLICIES- FORMER  
YORKSHIRE & HUMBER REGION**

Waste Planning Authority	Adopted Waste Local Plan	Emerging Waste DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
<b>YORKSHIRE &amp; HUMBER</b> The RSS for Yorkshire and Humber was partially revoked in February 2013. Only Green Belt Policy for York remains.			
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Joint Waste Local Plan adopted November 2004.	Hull City Council is leading on the production of a joint waste development plan document (DPD) which will cover Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire.	<p>The Joint Waste Local Plan, adopted in November 2004, does not contain policies restricting movement of residual waste outside of the plan area for energy recovery.</p> <p>The Joint Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire Waste Development Plan will replace the Joint Waste Local Plan, which was adopted in November 2004. At the time of review, it is at issues and options stage such that no adopted or draft policies to review at this time.</p> <p>It is considered that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on these plans.</p>
Kingston-upon-Hull City Council		Hull City Council is leading on the production of a new Waste Local Plan. The latest stage in the preparation of the new WLP was Issues and Options Consultation during 2012. Adoption is expected during summer 2014	
North East Lincolnshire Council	The North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (adopted 2003 and updated 2007) includes waste policies for the area.	Preparation of new Local Plan commenced in January 2013 with evidence gathering and informal consultation. No policies to review at this time.	<p>Local Plan Policy MW8: Development of Waste Facilities states that <i>"the Council will support proposals for the use of land and the erection of plant and buildings for the recycling, transfer, storage and other treatment or handling of waste provided that: the proposed site is located so as to minimise transport of the waste; and or recycled materials;</i></p> <p>The supporting text for this policy states:  <i>11.62 The overall goal is regional self-sufficiency. In accordance with the "proximity principle" waste should be treated and disposed of as close as possible to the point at which it is generated.</i></p> <p><i>11.63 The "proximity principle" suggests that local solutions should be sought wherever possible, with each authority in the Yorkshire and Humber region playing a commensurate part in the overall provision of facilities. Whilst there will continue to be some cross boundary movement of waste ... sites will need to be provided for the development of necessary facilities. These should normally be sited close to the source of waste arisings.</i></p> <p>It is considered that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on this plan in that it would contribute to regional self sufficiency.</p>
North Lincolnshire Council	North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2007 saved policies version) includes waste policies.	Core Strategy was adopted during 2011.  <u>Waste DPD:</u> work on preparation of Waste DPD to commence in near future.	<p>Local Plan Policy_W9 - Handling of Waste requires that proposals for the use of land and the erection of plant and buildings for the recycling, transfer, storage and other treatment or handling of waste will be permitted provided that:</p> <p><i>i) the proposed site is located near to the likely source(s) of waste and/or the market(s) for the recycled or recovered materials; and</i></p> <p><i>ii) the proposed site is located within an existing industrial site or on land which is permitted or allocated for industrial or similarly related development.</i></p> <p>Chapter 12 of the Core Strategy (2011)_deals with Sustainable Waste Management. Only one policy relating to sustainable waste management. Chapter refers to sites in plan area for EfW and recovery facilities and states that recovery of municipal waste should increase to 75% by 2020.</p> <p>Neither plan has policies restricting movement of residual waste outside of the plan area for energy recovery. It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in either plan.</p>
York City Council	Local Plan adopted 1998 and updated in 2005.	LDF Core Strategy Publication version (2011)	<p>The Local Plan does not contain any policies considered to be of relevance.</p> <p>Chapter 20 of the Core Strategy concerns waste but it contains no policies that seek to restrict movement of residual waste outside the plan area for energy recovery.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Adopted Waste Local Plan	Emerging Waste DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
			It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in either plan.
North Yorkshire County Council	Waste Local Plan (saved policies version post 2009). Contain no relevant policies.	North Yorkshire County Council, the City of York Council and North York Moors National Park Authority are producing a minerals and waste joint plan. This has undergone the first stage of consultation and adoption is expected during 2015.	<p>The Waste Local Plan (saved policies version post 2009) does not contain any relevant policies.</p> <p>The Joint Minerals and Waste DPD is in early stage of preparation (first issues and options consultation has taken place).</p> <p>It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in this saved plan.</p>
Sheffield City Council	Unitary Development Plan (1998).	Core Strategy Adopted 2009. No relevant policies.	<p>Chapter 13 of the UDP concerns waste matters in addition to Minerals and Reclamation but it does not contain any relevant policies.</p> <p>The Core Strategy does not contain any relevant policies.</p> <p>It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in either plan.</p>
Rotherham MBC Doncaster MBC Barnsley MBC	Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999).	Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Plan (March 2012).	<p>The UDP and its Supplementary Planning Guidance (1999) do not contain any relevant policies.</p> <p>The Joint Waste Plan's Policy WCS1 (part D3) states that: <i>Proposals will be supported which enable Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham's waste to be managed locally, whilst allowing waste to be imported or exported where this represents the most sustainable option.</i></p> <p>Policy WCS 1 (Part A1) states that: <i>existing strategic waste management facilities are safeguarded to maximise their efficiency;</i></p> <p>Policy WCS1 (Part E2): <i>ensure that they [meaning all types of development] do not prevent or prejudice either the delivery or continued operation of waste facilities on safeguarded or allocated sites.</i></p> <p>It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in either plan. The Joint Waste Plan acknowledges that transport of residual waste outside the plan area may be the most sustainable option.</p>
Leeds City Council MBC	UDP review 2006.	The Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan was adopted by Leeds City Council during January 2013.	<p>The UDP Volume 2 includes saved waste policies. Policy WM1 states that proposals for waste management facilities will be assessed with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii) <i>The proximity principle relating to the source, treatment and disposal of waste which results in as local a network as possible.</i></li> <li>iv) <i>self sufficiency at district level before regional level, environmental factors and use of conditions to mitigate where appropriate.</i></li> </ul> <p>Waste Local Plan Policy Waste 1 states that:</p> <p><i>Proposals which meet the future capacity requirements of waste arisings to achieve self sufficiency and demonstrate they support the waste hierarchy will be supported at safeguarded waste management sites shown on the Policies Map and locations for new waste management facilities set out in WASTE 3.</i></p> <p>The UDP and the Waste Local Plan Policy Waste 1 have a preference for self sufficiency. However, supporting text in the Local Plan acknowledges that some waste will continue to be exported outside Leeds. Proposals for two energy from waste facilities have already been granted permission in Leeds such that the grant of permission for the Proposed Development could have no material effect on the assessment of the applications for these facilities or on compliance with other policies in the Plan.</p>
Kirklees MBC	UDP (1999)	The LDF Core	The UDP saved policies document includes Chapter 7 on Waste Management. However it does not contain any relevant policies.



Waste Planning Authority	Adopted Waste Local Plan	Emerging Waste DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
	policies saved beyond 2007.	Strategy was submitted to the SoS for inspection during April 2013	<p>The LDF Core Strategy does not contain any relevant policies.</p> <p>It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in either plan.</p>
<b>Wakefield City MDC</b>	No saved waste policies in the UDP	<p>Core Strategy (2009)</p> <p>Core Strategy (2009) &amp; the Development Policies Document (2009).</p> <p>Waste Development Plan Document. Adopted December (2009).</p>	<p><u>The Core Strategy</u> sets out details of waste arisings and recovery capacity required for 2010, 2015 and 2021 but does not have any policies relevant to use of waste as fuel outside the plan area.</p> <p>Table on page 30 of the Waste DPD identifies requirement for 136,000tpa thermal treatment or disposal capacity. This is backed up in Policy W1 which also states that capacity for 130,000 tpa of residual waste disposal capacity is required.</p> <p>It is concluded that the Proposed Development would be in compliance with policies in the strategy and DPD.</p>
<b>Bradford City MDC (MBC)</b>	The saved policies in the Replacement UDP (2005).	<p>Draft publication version of the Core Strategy is yet to be published.</p> <p>Work on DPDs is yet to commence.</p>	<p>None of the saved policies in the replacement UDP are considered relevant to this review.</p> <p>It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with policies in either plan.</p>
<b>Calderdale MBC</b>	Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP), adopted 25 August 2006.	<p>Local Plan Core Strategy –at an early stage with preferred options consultation taking place at the end of 2012. Adoption is anticipated during late 2015.</p> <p>Waste Policy Options document was produced for consultation during Feb 2012 with feedback from consultees has been published.</p> <p>Local Plan Land Allocations and Designations document – at very early stage in preparation.</p>	<p>The Replacement UDP does not contain any policies considered relevant to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Local Plan Core Strategy is at an early stage of preparation and, as drafted, does not contain any relevant policies.</p> <p>The Waste Policy Options document recognises that some waste will continue to be exported out of the district but proposes support for proposals that maximise self-sufficiency.</p> <p>It is concluded that the intention to maximise opportunities for managing waste in a self sufficient manner does not seek to prevent some movement of waste outside the district such that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on compliance with emerging policies in either plan.</p>



**APPENDIX 1B      REVIEW OF RELEVANT WASTE POLICIES- FORMER EAST  
MIDLANDS REGION**

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework and DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
<b>EAST MIDLANDS</b> The RSS for the East Midlands was revoked in April 2013			
Derby City Council	Derby City and Derbyshire County Councils adopted a Joint Waste Local Plan in 2005.	Derby City and Derbyshire County Councils are producing a Joint Waste Core Strategy DPD. However, at the time of the review, it is in the early stages of preparation.	<p>Policy W1a, in the joint waste local plan, states that proposals for waste development will be assessed against sustainability considerations and will take account of the key considerations, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the waste hierarchy;</li> <li>the proximity principle;</li> <li>self-sufficiency</li> </ul> <p>However, the plan does not contain any policies which seek to prevent waste being moved from the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on these plans.</p>
Derbyshire County Council			
Rutland County Council	The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Waste Local Plan was adopted September 2002.	Rutland Core Strategy Adopted in 2011. The Leicestershire & Leicester Waste Core Strategy (2009).	<p>The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Waste Local Plan (2002) does not contain any waste policies considered relevant to the review of the effect that the Proposed Development may have on waste policies although it did forecast an anticipated shortfall in capacity of c. 1million tonnes per annum of industrial/commercial, household and civic amenity wastes.</p> <p>The Rutland Core Strategy noted that the majority of Rutland's waste is exported to surrounding counties where it is recycled, composted, or disposed of to landfill and that regional self-sufficiency will be promoted through sustainable patterns of waste movements in relation to urban areas in neighbouring counties, particularly for advanced treatment, non-inert disposal, and hazardous waste management.</p> <p>The Leicestershire &amp; Leicester Waste Core Strategy noted that the amount of residual municipal and C&amp;I waste requiring treatment or disposal after recycling at the end of the WDF Period is estimated at around 900,000 tonnes per annum (938,095tpa). To prevent this amount all having to go to landfill the Waste CS noted that between four at 250,000tpa or 19 at 50,000tpa energy/value recovery facilities would be required. The Strategy did not seek to control residual waste being moved from the plan area for recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on these plans.</p>
Leicester City Council			
Leicestershire County Council			
Lincolnshire County Council	Waste Local Plan (2006)	<p>Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan to replace the Waste Local Plan is in preparation.</p> <p>In June 2010, a Preferred Strategy consultation was undertaken.</p> <p>Draft Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document to be consulted on in Autumn 2013.</p>	<p>The Waste Local Plan does not contain any policies that could be affected by the Proposed Development. However the Plan indicated that more than half of the waste arising in the County was exported.</p> <p>It is considered that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on this plan.</p>
Nottingham City Council Nottinghamshire County Council	Nottinghamshire Waste Local Plan 2002 (produced jointly by Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council and covering the whole of the former county of Nottinghamshire)	The Waste Core Strategy document was submitted to Government on 14 January 2013. Being prepared by Nottingham and Nottinghamshire.	<p>The Waste Local Plan does not contain any policies considered relevant to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The submission Waste Core Strategy policy WCS 11 states that: <i>Additional waste management capacity, sufficient to manage at least the equivalent amount of waste produced within Nottinghamshire and Nottingham, will be permitted. Waste management proposals which are likely to treat or dispose of waste from areas outside Nottinghamshire and Nottingham will need to demonstrate that:</i></p> <p><i>a) they will make significant contribution to meeting the waste management needs of Nottinghamshire and Nottingham; or</i></p> <p><i>b) there are wider social, economic or environmental sustainability benefits that clearly support the proposal.</i></p> <p>Although the WCS plans to deliver self sufficiency it does not require it nor to seek to prevent waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework and DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
			It is considered, therefore, that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on these plans.
<b>Northamptonshire County Council</b>	Waste Local Plan now superseded and replaced by the Core Strategy.	The Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) Core Strategy 2010	<p>The MWDF Core Strategy 2010 recognises in Policy CS1 on Waste Management Capacity that 420,000 tonnes per annum of residual waste capacity would be required in 2015, rising to 432,000 tonnes per annum in 2025. There are no policies seeking to restrict the removal of residual waste from the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on this plan.</p>





**APPENDIX 1C      REVIEW OF RELEVANT WASTE POLICIES- FORMER  
NORTH EAST REGION**

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework & DPD	Review of Effect of Proposed Development on the Plan
<b>NORTH EAST</b> The North East Regional Spatial Strategy has been revoked			
Stockton on Tees Borough Council (Unitary)  Redcar & Cleveland Council (Unitary)  Middlesbrough Borough Council (Unitary)  Hartlepool Borough Council (Unitary)  Darlington Borough Council (Unitary)		Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents (MWDPDs) adopted on 15 September 2011 covers the five unitary authorities listed in the column to the left.  The two DPDs are:  Core Strategy DPD & Policies and Sites DPD	<p>The Core Strategy DPD in relation to Waste Management: Local and National Importance - Pages 11 and 12 note in Para 3.1.4 that: <i>Waste produced within the sub-region is largely managed within the sub-region and although there are already good recycling and recovery rates, there is opportunity to further improve these. Due to the presence of existing hazardous waste treatment facilities some hazardous waste streams are brought in to the area for management. Whilst recognising the advantages of managing waste close to where it arises, it is accepted that this cannot always be achieved, particularly when dealing with specialised waste streams...</i></p> <p>3.3 Strategic Objectives include, at Para 3.3.1 the intention "to promote the management of waste close to its point of production whilst recognising the existing role and future potential of the Tees Valley in specialist waste management;"</p> <p>At Para 5.2.7, it is noted that "there will be a shortfall in recovery facilities ...climbing to 76,000 tonnes in 2021 as waste arisings increase and landfill limitations increase" and that "Provision will therefore need to be made to meet these requirements."</p> <p>Policy MWC7: Waste Management Requirements states that "Land will be provided for the development of waste management facilities to meet the identified requirements of the Tees Valley"</p> <p>The Policies and Sites DPD identifies sites for recovery facilities to meet the identified need.</p> <p>Although the CS DPD plans to maintain near self sufficiency it does not require it, does it seek to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy.</p>
South Tyneside Council		South Tyneside LDF, Core Strategy, adopted June 2007  South Tyneside Development Management Policies, adopted December 2011	<p>The adopted Core Strategy notes, at Policy EA6, regarding waste management in the Core Strategy that "South Tyneside generated over 93,000 tonnes of household waste in 2005-2006. Most of the Borough's waste in this and other categories is currently managed or disposed of outside South Tyneside."</p> <p>The Development Management Policies document recognises that here are a number of waste streams produced in the borough that need to be managed, such as construction and demolition, commercial and industrial, municipal (including household), agricultural, and hazardous wastes. Some of these wastes will be managed within the borough, and some outside on a sub-regional and/or regional basis due to efficiency and economies of scale.</p> <p>Neither the Core Strategy nor the Development Management Policies document seek to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere and indeed the latter document recognises that efficiencies and economies of scale may dictate some wastes being managed outside the plan area.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy or Development Management Policies.</p>
Durham County Council	Durham County Council Waste Local Plan Adopted April 2005  Durham County Council Waste Local Plan Saved Policies	County Durham Plan 2030 Preferred Options Consultation  County Durham Infrastructure Delivery Plan	<p>The saved Waste Local Plan refers to the need for regard to be had to the ability to satisfy the BPEO, the requirements of regional self-sufficiency, the proximity principle and the waste hierarchy when determining applications in the plan area.</p> <p>Policy W2 states that "Proposals for new waste development will be required to demonstrate that there is an established need for the facility... and ... whether the facility would move the management of waste material up the waste hierarchy, contribute to regional self-sufficiency and meet the proximity principle".</p> <p>The Emerging County Durham Plan, Preferred Options Consultation refers to a Capacity Gap shown in Table 14 as follows "provision for future waste management in County Durham is based upon providing facilities to deal with the County's own waste arisings (net self-sufficiency)... The Strategy is therefore based on the approach of making provision for all of County Durham's own waste which will allow management close to source. However, whereas the Tyne and Wear and Tees Valley authorities now have MSW contracts in place, the procurement of facilities to manage County Durham's MSW has yet to be completed. Therefore in the medium term it may be necessary to export waste where this is shown to be the most sustainable solution."</p> <p>The County Durham Infrastructure Delivery Plan also refers to the Waste Capacity Gap and notes that "despite the significant improvements achieved to date in waste reduction, recycling and composting, a residual waste fraction will always remain" and notes that in "the past residual waste was primarily disposed at landfill. This cannot continue and the Council is developing waste management solutions that maximise beneficial recovery from residual waste. This may be, for example, in the form</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework & DPD	Review of Effect of Proposed Development on the Plan
			<p><i>of the recovery of raw materials or the generation of energy".</i></p> <p>With regard to cross boundary issues, at paragraph 3.107 the Plan notes that "Waste does not respect local authority administrative boundaries and it is important to be aware of cross boundary movements of waste" and that "historically County Durham has been a net importer of waste, largely on the basis of available landfill capacity, but a move away from landfill, together with an increased focus on self-sufficiency has changed the position."</p> <p>Neither the saved Waste Local Plan and the emerging County Durham Plan do not seek to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere and the County Durham Plan recognises that this may be the most sustainable solution.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy or Development Management Policies.</p>
<p><b>Northumberland County Council</b></p>	<p>Waste Local Plan December 2001</p> <p>The Northumberland Joint Municipal Waste Strategy covers the period up to 2020</p>	<p>Core Strategy Preferred Options Document – Feb 2013</p>	<p>The adopted Waste Local Plan noted that a "small proportion of household waste is exported out of the County" although this was for disposal at that stage.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Issues and Options Document assesses projected residual municipal and commercial &amp; industrial waste arisings and identifies the amounts of recovery and disposal capacity required.</p> <p>Neither document seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy or Development Management Policies.</p>
<p><b>Newcastle City Council</b></p>		<p>Planning for the Future - Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne Proposed Submission Draft, Sept 2013</p>	<p>Gateshead and Newcastle, along with other waste planning authorities in the region, commissioned a study on waste to inform the preparation of local plans (Model of Waste Arisings and Management Capacity Report, 2012). This includes a forecast of waste arisings to 2030, and an assessment of the capacity of existing and planned waste facilities, from which any resulting shortfall in provision during the plan period can be identified and planned for.</p> <p>The study confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to 2030 across both the region and Gateshead and Newcastle, to manage and treat the forecast residual waste arisings.</p> <p>There is no reference in the Core Strategy policy on waste that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere. Indeed the document notes that some RDF from MSW treatment is to be exported to Teesside for energy recovery.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy policies.</p>
<p><b>Gateshead MBC</b></p>	<p>Saved Policies within the 2007 UDP.</p>	<p>Gateshead and Newcastle Councils have been working together and with local communities and partners to prepare the Core Strategy. See text above under Newcastle Council.</p> <p>Preparation of the Waste DPD is yet to commence.</p>	<p>The Gateshead UDP noted that Gateshead is a net importer of non-hazardous waste, including material from outside Tyne and Wear.</p> <p>See above for policy compliance.</p>



Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework & DPD	Review of Effect of Proposed Development on the Plan
<b>Sunderland City Council</b>	<p>Sunderland City Council UDP September 1998</p> <p>Majority of policies were saved in March 2007</p> <p>Sunderland City Council Alteration to the UDP (Alteration No. 2) Adopted September 2007</p>	<p>Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Draft Revised Preferred Options August 2013</p>	<p>Para 12.83 of the adopted UDP noted that "The Government subscribes to the 'proximity principle' (see PPG23 para. 2.3), under which waste should be disposed of (or otherwise managed) close to the point at which it is generated. This strategy implies that Sunderland should consider options for disposal of its waste within its own boundaries (which also has the environmental benefit of minimising heavy vehicle movements). The ability to do this is constrained by the availability and economic viability of landfill sites"</p> <p>The Core Strategy and DMP – draft preferred options notes that with "<i>considerable local landfill capacity and access to the new energy from waste plant at Haverton Hill in Tees Valley, residual waste capacity exceed arisings until 2029, although there is still energy recovery shortfall attributed to commercial &amp; industrial generated waste.</i>"</p> <p>The documents acknowledge, implicitly, movement of waste to an EfW facility at Tees Valley and recovery shortfall for residual C&amp;IW.</p> <p>There is no reference in the Core Strategy and DMP documents that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere. Indeed the document notes that some MSW is to be exported to Teesside for energy recovery.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy policies.</p>
<b>North Tyneside Council</b>	<p>The North Tyneside Unitary Development Plan is the statutory development plan for the borough and was adopted in March 2002</p>	<p>The Local Plan will replace the Unitary Development Plan 2002.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is currently at <i>Preferred Options: Further Consultation on Growth</i> stage.</p>	<p>The saved 2002 UDP does not contain any text or policies relating to export of waste or recovery targets.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan is still at an early stage in its preparation (preferred options). Preparation of the Waste DPD is yet to commence.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the UDP policies.</p>



**APPENDIX 1D      REVIEW OF RELEVANT WASTE POLICIES- FORMER  
NORTH WEST REGION**

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework & DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
<b>NORTH WEST</b> The RSS for the North West was revoked during April 2013			
Lancashire County Council  Blackburn and Darwen Borough Council  Blackpool Borough Council		Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework February 2009 Core Strategy DPD  Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan	<p>The Joint Lancashire MWDF Core Strategy DPD noted that the plan area was a significant net importer of waste going to landfill, and ... a net exporter of waste being put through other treatment processes. In some cases, it might be reasonable to expect these cross-boundary movements to continue, for example where, [inter alia] :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) economies of scale point to larger sub-regional or nationally important facilities;</li> <li>2) locational constraints or opportunities favour certain locations for particular types of waste facilities.”</li> </ol> <p>The site allocations plan suggests that, by 2020, a total of 7410,000 tonnes per annum of residual MSW and C&amp;IW could require landfill disposal.</p> <p>There is no reference in either document that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere. Indeed the Core Strategy document notes it may be appropriate where benefits of scale can be obtained.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Core Strategy policies.</p>
Cheshire East  Cheshire West and Chester	The Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan 12 <sup>th</sup> July 2007		<p>The aims and objectives of the Replacement Waste Plan are to “make the best use of the waste generated in Cheshire by promoting (in order of priority) increased re-use, recycling and composting, and energy recovery to reduce the quantity of waste being disposed to landfill”.</p> <p>The plan considered the potential for built waste management facilities on a national/regional scale or a sub-regional strategic basis in the plan area and suggested that for any such proposals the level of need and spatial advice set out in the RSS [now revoked] will be considered, together with the degree to which the proposal accords with the strategies and plans of other Waste Planning Authorities within the North West Region.</p> <p>This suggests that a strategic view of the need for such facilities would be taken with regard to high level guidance. Now that the RSS has been revoked this would be NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3.</p> <p>There is no reference in the Plan that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Plan’s policies.</p>
Greater Manchester WDA	The Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan document was adopted by each of the ten Greater Manchester authorities and came into force on 1st April 2012.  GMWDA Baseline Report 2011		<p>The Joint Waste Development Plan identifies the need for additional recovery and landfill disposal capacity. It contains site specific allocations of land for waste treatment facilities some of which have direct access to rail.</p> <p>The GMWDA Baseline Report notes that “<i>self sufficiency and proximity principles are often misunderstood. Many people misinterpret them as meaning waste has to be treated as near as possible to where it is produced. Under the self sufficiency principle the member states must have sufficient capacity for the disposal and recovery of waste. However, the proximity principle can be met as long as waste is treated in the most appropriate location. This can mean sending the waste abroad where it is technically and economically viable to do so. In Greater Manchester there is sufficient capacity for the primary treatment of waste, however, wastes may then be sent outside Greater Manchester for secondary or tertiary treatment depending on market demand.</i>”</p> <p>There is no reference in the Joint Waste DPD that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere and indeed the baseline Report recognises that this may be appropriate.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the development of Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the Joint Waste DPD’s policies.</p>
Warrington Borough Council	The UDP (adopted 2006) contains policies saved up to 2016.	Core Strategy (Local Plan Core Strategy Submission Version Sept 2012).  No progress made with Waste DPD to date.	<p>The UDP does not contain any policies or supporting text relevant to the movement of waste outside the plan area for energy recovery.</p> <p>The submission Core Strategy notes that <i>The borough has sufficient facilities to meet its own waste management needs.</i></p> <p><i>Quantities of municipal, commercial and industrial wastes imported into the borough have been significantly reduced whilst still having regard to regional and sub-regional needs for waste management facilities. The only wastes sent to landfill constitute waste with no further potential for recycling or re-use, or from which no value can be recovered.</i></p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Local Plan	Emerging / Adopted Waste Development Framework & DPD	Review of Effect of the Proposed Development on the Plan
			<i>Reduce the amount of wastes imported into the borough having regard to regional and sub-regional needs for waste management facilities.</i>
<b>Halton Borough Council</b>	The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted by Halton Borough Council on 7th April 2005	Halton Core Strategy Local Plan adopted April 2013.	<p>Paragraph 21 (Chapter 5) of the UDP states that <i>The Government believes that waste should not be exported from the UK for disposal. Planning Authorities should aim, wherever practicable, for regional self sufficiency in managing waste.</i></p> <p>The Core Strategy Local Plan states that the <i>“Council’s aim for sustainable waste management is that an adequate range of waste management facilities will be provided to ensure that waste generated in Halton is treated and disposed of in a sustainable and environmentally acceptable way”.</i></p> <p>There is no reference in the UDP or Local Plan that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on either plan’s policies.</p>
<b>Cumbria County Council</b>		Cumbria County Council formally adopted the MWDF Core Strategy and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Documents during April 2009	<p>The Core Strategy, at Policy 8, states that <i>“Provision will be made for the management of all of Cumbria’s wastes within the county, with the acceptance of limited cross boundary movements (net self sufficiency). Any proposals to manage significant volumes of wastes from outside the county would have to demonstrate that the local, social and economic benefits outweigh other sustainability criteria. These other criteria include the impacts of the additional “waste miles” and the principles of managing waste as close as possible to its source, with each community taking responsibility for its own wastes and taking account of the nearest appropriate facility”.</i></p> <p>There is no reference in the Core Strategy that seeks to prevent residual waste being transported out of the plan area for energy recovery elsewhere and the strategy recognises that sustainability criteria are relevant to consideration of such proposals.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the Proposed Development would not have a material effect on the core strategy’s policies providing that it met the sustainability criteria.</p>
<b>Wigan Borough Council</b>	UDP (2006) saved policies. Only a small number of policies remain following the adoption of the Core Strategy.	Core Strategy adopted September 2013.	<p>All waste related policies in the UDP have been replaced by the recently adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Wigan is included as one on the authorities in the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan. Please see text above. Under Greater Manchester.</p> <p>Its Core Strategy does not contain any policies which would be affected by the Proposed Development.</p>
<b>Merseyside MBC</b>		The six Councils for Halton, Liverpool, Knowsley, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral have each resolved to formally adopt the Joint Waste Local Plan (WLP) for Merseyside and Halton with effect from <b>18th July 2013</b> .	<p>The Joint Waste Local Plan notes, in paragraph 2.109 that <i>“Despite the approval for the time extension at Lyme and Wood Pit Landfill, the Waste Local Plan has to adopt a policy position that non-inert, non-municipal residual waste will have to be exported throughout the plan period (ie. to 2027) and possibly beyond.”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 2.122 notes that <i>“Significant quantities of waste are exported from the sub-region to non-inert landfill in neighbouring authorities and regions, and there will be a lessening but continuing requirement for this throughout the lifetime of the plan. Conversely, however, Merseyside and Halton have planning consents for several large scale thermal treatment facilities with a combined capacity of greater than 1,500,000 tonnes. These are likely to be of regional significance and provide potential capacity to offset the non-inert waste sent to landfills in other waste planning authorities.</i></p> <p>The JWLP does not contain any policies which would be affected by the Proposed Development and indeed recognises that movements of waste to large scale facilities may be appropriate.</p>



## **APPENDIX 2 REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE OF LOCAL WASTE RECOVERY TARGETS**

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b>YORKSHIRE &amp; HUMBER</b>			
<b>Hull City Council</b> <b>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</b>	<p>The Waste Local Plan includes the following targets to recover value from 40% of municipal waste by 2005, rising to 45% by 2010 and 67% by 2015. The WLP states that <i>This is to be achieved through recycling, composting, other forms of material recovery (e.g. anaerobic digestion) and energy recovery;</i></p> <p>Specifically, the WLP states that the City of Hull intend to recycle or compost at least 14% by 2003 - 2004, rising to 21% by 2005 - 2006, 30% by 2010 and 33% by 2015; and</p> <p>The East Riding of Yorkshire intend to recycle or compost at least 18% by 2003 - 4, rising to 27% by 2005 - 2006, 30% by 2010 and 33% by 2015.</p> <p>The Hull City Council and East Riding Joint Waste Management Strategy includes:</p> <p>Target of 45% for recycling and composting of household waste by 2015 which has been achieved by Hull City Council but not East Riding.</p> <p>To increase recycling and composting rates, the following targets are proposed in the strategy for household waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55% recycling and composting in Hull by 2015 and 60% by 2020</li> <li>• 62% recycling and composting in East Riding by 2015 and 65% by 2020.</li> </ul> <p>These targets are significantly higher than those in the national Waste Strategy 2007.</p>	<p>Kingston upon Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire Joint Waste Local Plan (2004) (Saved Policies Version)</p> <p>Joint Waste DPD is at an early stage in its preparation and does not provide information for analysis at this stage.</p> <p>The Hull City Council and East Riding Joint Waste Management Strategy (2012)</p>	<p>The Joint Waste Local Plan's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>
<b>North East Lincolnshire Council</b>	<p>The adopted Local Plan (2003) includes minerals and waste policies but no references to waste recovery targets.</p>	<p>Local Plan (2003)</p> <p>New Local Plan at Issues and options stage</p>	<p>Lack of recycling and recovery targets means that there is no local compliance issue</p>
<b>North Lincolnshire Council</b>	<p>The Local Plan Includes the target to recover 40% of municipal waste by 2005. No other targets included in local plan</p> <p>The Core Strategy includes targets for recovery of municipal waste: Increase the level of municipal waste recovered to 53% by 2010; 67% by 2015; and 75% by 2020.</p>	<p>Local Plan (2007)</p> <p>Core Strategy (2011)</p> <p>The North Lincolnshire Municipal Waste Management Strategy (2012)</p>	<p>The municipal waste management strategy recognises the benefits of recovering energy from waste and diverting waste from final disposal in landfill. However, the document does not include targets or bench marks for the recovery of municipal, household or other types of waste.</p>
<b>York City Council</b>	<p>Includes target to recover 40% of municipal solid waste (MSW) by 2005. No other targets stipulated.</p> <p>Core Strategy submission version has been produced but does not include specific targets but states that:</p> <p><i>The amount of waste reused, recycled, composted and recovered in line with the targets set out in the City of York Council Waste Management Strategy and the Waste Strategy for England 2007</i></p>	<p>Local Plan (2005)</p>	<p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan and the strategy's recycling &amp; recovery aspirations.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b>North Yorkshire County Council</b>	<p>The WLP refers to national targets set out by the government in the National Waste Strategy to recover value from 40% of municipal waste by 2005, from 45% by 2010 and 67% by 2015.</p> <p>The WLP also refers to the targets set out in the national Waste Strategy for the recycling and composting of household waste to recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005, 30% by 2010 and 33% by 2015.</p> <p>The WLP does not expressly adopt the targets set out in the National Waste Strategy and does not include any local targets for waste recovery.</p> <p>The Municipal Waste Strategy (2006) produced for the City of York and North Yorkshire includes the following, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recycle or compost 40% of household waste by 2010</li> <li>Recycle or compost 45% of household waste by 2013</li> <li>Recycle or compost 50% of household waste by 2020</li> </ul>	<p>North Yorkshire County Council Waste Local Plan (2006).</p> <p>The NYCC Waste DPD is at an early stage in its preparation.</p> <p>Municipal Waste Management Strategy for the City of York and North Yorkshire 2006-2026.</p>	<p>The Waste Local Plan's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 33%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>
<b>Sheffield City Council</b>	<p>The Sheffield UDP does not include references to recovery targets.</p> <p>The Core Strategy includes the target: <i>At least 80% of municipal waste managed through recycling/composting or energy recovery per year by 2015</i></p>	<p>Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998)</p> <p>Sheffield Core Strategy (2009)</p>	<p>The Core Strategy's recycling, composting &amp; recovery target implies that additional (up to 20%) residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan's target.</p>
<b>Rotherham MBC Doncaster MBC Barnsley MBC</b>	<p>The Joint Waste Local Plan refers to the European Waste Framework Directive which sets a target that, by 2020, the UK must recycle 50% of its household waste and re-use, recycle and recover 70% of its non-hazardous construction and demolition waste.</p> <p>The government has set challenging targets to recycle and compost at least 50% and recover value from at least 75% of our household waste by 2020.</p> <p>The strategy adopted by Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham aims to achieve high levels of recycling and recovery, equal to or greater than regional or national targets.</p> <p>Table 8 of the WLP sets targets to monitoring and implementation of the Development Framework as follows; Proportion of municipal waste recycled, composted and treated within Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham: 50% (up to 2015) &amp; 90% (by 2016).</p> <p>Proportion of household waste recycled and composted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham (50% by 2020)</li> <li>Barnsley (45% by 2015/2016)</li> <li>Doncaster (60% by 2015/2016)</li> <li>Rotherham (45% by 2015/2016)</li> </ul> <p>The WLP acknowledges that C&amp;IW must be diverted from landfill and that additional recycling, treatment and recovery facilities will be required to facilitate this. However the WLP does not include targets for the recycling and recovery of C&amp;IW.</p>	<p>Barnsley, Doncaster &amp; Rotherham Joint Waste Local Plan (2012)</p> <p>Barnsley MBC Municipal Waste Management Strategy, 'An opportunity not to be wasted' Doncaster MBC's MSW management strategy (2009)</p> <p>Rotherham MBC Municipal Waste Management Strategy, (2005)</p>	<p>The Joint Waste Local Plan's recycling and recovery targets, and the targets in the individual MSW strategies, imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Joint Waste Local Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>



Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
	<p><b>Barnsley's</b> municipal waste management strategy (2007) sets a target to recycle or compost 45% of its household waste by 2015/16.</p> <p><b>Doncaster's</b> MSW management strategy sets out how the authority will deal with its MSW up to 2026. This strategy sets targets to achieve a 60% recycling and composting rate by 2020/21.</p> <p><b>Rotherham's</b> municipal waste management strategy sets a target to recover the value from 67% of municipal waste and achieve a recycling rate of 45% by 2015/16.</p>		
<p><b>Leeds City Council MBC</b></p>	<p>The Waste DPD does not include any targets for waste recovery. However the DPD acknowledges that new recovering facilities/capacity will be required during the plan period.</p> <p>Only municipal waste is collected by Leeds City Council. Waste either recycled (current rate 31%) or sent to landfill. Target to recycle 50% by 2020 to reflect target in the National Waste Strategy 2007.</p> <p>The Waste DPD sets re-use, recycling and composting targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% for MSW;</li> <li>• 70% for C&amp;I; and</li> <li>• 70 - 85% for CD&amp;E.</li> </ul> <p>Leeds has no significant residual treatment capacity, except for Hazardous Waste, and new provision is planned for in the DPD. Up to 730,000 tonnes of additional residual waste treatment capacity to support all waste streams may be required to meet the needs of the City.</p> <p>The DPD refers to the Leeds Waste Topic Paper which states: <i>The Council Waste Solution Programme will deliver a new Energy Recovery facility with a capacity for processing between 135,000 and 175,000 tonnes of residual waste generated in Leeds from 2015.</i></p> <p>The topic paper also states that: <i>The anticipated recovery amount for MSW is the same as the proposed residual waste treatment PFI which is due to be operational from 2015. This will recover up to <b>90%</b> of residual waste in Leeds. This is higher than the National Waste Strategy 2007 target of 70% recovery by 2020/21</i></p>	<p>Leeds City Council Waste DPD (2013)</p>	<p>The Waste DPD's re-use, recycling and composting targets imply that significant amounts of residual waste will either require recovery treatment or landfill disposal (i.e up to 50% of MSW arisings and up to 30% of C&amp;IW arisings).</p> <p>This is consistent with the need for up to 730,000 tonnes of additional treatment capacity.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this capacity for non-MSW waste streams, and is considered compliant with the re-use, recycling and composting targets.</p>
<p><b>Kirklees MBC</b></p>	<p>The Kirklees Core Strategy does not contain any recovery targets.</p> <p>The UDP refers to 1995 national waste strategy targets to recover 40% of municipal waste by 2005.</p>	<p>Kirklees Core Strategy (submission version) 2012</p> <p>Saved policies within the Kirklees UPD (2007)</p>	<p>Considered to be compliant in that current targets are lower than national targets, which acknowledge need for more energy recovery capacity (NPS EN-3).</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b>Wakefield City MDC</b>	<p>The Wakefield Waste DPD refers to recovery target (2009) includes a monitoring table on page 48 which sets out targets for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the recycling of 52% of municipal waste and;</li> <li>achieving the national recovery target of 67% for commercial and industrial waste as set out in the National Waste Strategy 2007.</li> </ul> <p>The Wakefield Municipal Waste Strategy includes targets for recycling, composting and recovery. Targets include achieving recycling 33% of MSW by 2015. However the Strategy was formed during 2004 and so refers to targets that are in line with the National Waste Strategy 2000 which have been superseded.</p>	<p>The Wakefield Waste DPD (2009).</p> <p>A Strategy for the Management of Municipal Waste in Wakefield. (2004)</p>	<p>The Waste DPD's recycling and recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual waste would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the re-use, recycling and composting targets.</p>
<b>Bradford City MDC (MBC)</b>	<p>The UDP contains recovery targets for MSW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40% by 2005</li> <li>45% by 2010</li> <li>67% by 2015</li> </ul>	<p>Bradford Replacement UDP (2005)</p> <p>Core Strategy at Issues and options and further consultation stage</p>	<p>The UDP's MSW recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 33%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal. The lack of C&amp;IW recycling targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the UDP's recovery targets.</p>
<b>Calderdale MBC</b>	<p>The Calderdale Council 'Waste Data Evidence report (2012) Calderdales overall target for 2020 is in line with the National Waste Strategy (2007) being to recover 75% value from MSW and 50% recycling / composting of household waste arisings by 2020.</p> <p>Calderdale have adopted different targets for for recycling and composting of MSW during the intervening years leading to 2020, the targets being; 45% by 2012, 46% by 2015 and 50% by 2020.</p> <p>The UDP refers to but does not specifically adopt the targets within Waste Strategy 2000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40% recovery of MSW by 2005</li> <li>45% recovery of MSW by 2010</li> <li>67% recovery of MSW by 2015</li> </ul> <p>The UDP states that Calderdales recycling performance has previously been below 5% and so to achieve the targets set by central government, Calderdales recycling target for 2003/4 will be 10% and 20% by 2005/6. Longer term targets for recycling, composting and recovery are not provided in the UDP.</p>	<p>Replacement Calderdale UDP (2006)</p> <p>The Calderdale Council 'Waste Data Evidence Report' Update September 2012.</p>	<p>The UDP's MSW recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 33%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal. The lack of C&amp;IW recycling targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the UDP's recovery targets.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b>EAST MIDLANDS</b>			
<b>Derby City Council</b> <b>Derbyshire County Council</b>	<p>Defines recovery as a means of obtaining value from waste through recycling, composting, other forms of material recovery or energy recovery.</p> <p>National</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2010 to recover value from at least 45% of municipal waste</li> <li>By 2015 to recover value from at least 67% of municipal waste</li> </ul> <p>And, district and national</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2010 to recycle or compost 30% of household waste</li> <li>By 2015 to recycle or compost 33% of household waste.</li> </ul> <p>The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Derby and Derbyshire adopts the recycling and recovery targets set out in the National Waste Strategy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recover 40% of MSW (including 25% recycling/composting of household waste) by 2005,</li> <li>Recover 45% of MSW (including 30% recycling/composting of household waste) by 2010</li> <li>Recover 67% of MSW (including 33% recycling/composting of household waste) by 2015</li> </ul>	<p>Derby City &amp; Derbyshire County Council Joint Waste Local Plan (2005).</p> <p><i>Derbyshire Waste Strategy Document (2006) 'Looking after Derbyshires Waste'</i></p>	<p>The Waste Local Plan's recycling and recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>
<b>Leicestershire County &amp; Leicester City Council</b>	<p>The Joint Waste Core Strategy (JWCS) refers to the recovery targets for recovery of municipal waste and recycling of household waste set out in the National Waste Strategy.</p> <p>Leicester City Council and Leicestershire City Council have adopted a different set of targets for the recycling and composting of municipal waste.</p> <p>Municipal waste targets in Leicester City set out in the JWCS are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to recycle or compost at least 30% of municipal waste by 2009/10;</li> <li>to recycle or compost at least 50% of municipal waste by 2014/15;</li> <li>to recycle or compost at least 50% of municipal waste by 2019/20. (paragraph 2.17 and 2.18 JWCS 2009)</li> </ul> <p>Leicestershire County Council has adopted targets beyond those set by the National Waste Strategy for municipal waste in Leicestershire County only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to recycle or compost at least 40% of municipal waste by 2007 (achieved);</li> <li>to recycle or compost at least 50% of municipal waste by 2010;</li> <li>to recycle or compost at least 58% of municipal waste by 2017.</li> </ul> <p>This equates to 50% by 2009/10, 53% by 2014/15 and 58% by 2019/20. (paragraph 2.18 JWCS 2009)</p> <p>The Leicestershire Waste Strategy adopts the following targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieve statutory recycling/composting targets for 2003/04 and;</li> <li>Aim to recycle/compost 50% of household waste by 2005/06</li> <li>Recover 40% of municipal waste by 2005</li> <li>Recover 45% of municipal waste by 2010 and 67% by 2015</li> </ul>	<p>Joint Waste Core Strategy (2009)</p> <p>The Leicestershire Waste Strategy</p>	<p>The JWCS's recycling and recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b>Rutland County Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 1.15 &amp; 2.24 provides targets for recovery;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To recover value from 45% of municipal waste by 2010</li> <li>To recover value from 67% of municipal waste by 2015</li> </ul> <p>The Rutland Waste Management Strategy (2008) was published more recently than the Joint Local Plan (2002) and includes the following targets which have been adopted for recovery:</p> <p>To achieve a household waste recycling rate of 30% (or greater) by the end of 2008/09 financial year and to achieve at least a 45% recycling rate by 2012, which is more stringent than those included in the national waste strategy 2007. The Rutland Waste Management Strategy does not include specific targets for waste recovery.</p>	<p>Saved policies within the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Waste Local Plan (2002) still apply within Rutland.</p> <p>Rutland Council Waste Management Strategy 2008-2020</p>	<p>The saved Plan's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>The local plan refers to recovery, recycling and composting targets for municipal and household waste set out in the National Waste Strategy</p> <p>The WLP (2006) states that the recycling target in Lincolnshire is 20% in 2003/4 and 30% in 2005/6.</p> <p>The more recent Joint Waste Municipal Waste Management Strategy (2008) adopts the target for Lincolnshire to achieve 55% recycling and composting by 2015 (23% composting, 32% recycling) which exceeds targets in the National Waste Strategy 2007, and the Regional target for 2015.</p>	<p>Waste Local Plan (2006)</p> <p>Joint Waste Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Lincolnshire (2008). Prepared for the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership</p>	<p>The Local Plan's recovery, recycling &amp; composting targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Local Plan's recycling or composting &amp; recovery targets.</p>
<b>Northamptonshire County Council</b>	<p>The DPD refers to recovery targets in the updated National Waste Strategy (2007) for the recovery of municipal waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>53% by 2010</li> <li>67% by 2015</li> <li>75% by 2020</li> </ul> <p>The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Northamptonshire (JMWMS) was approved in 2008. The JMWMS sets the following targets for recycling and composting of household waste in Northamptonshire (which exceed national targets):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>44% by 2009/10,</li> <li>48% by 2012/13,</li> <li>52% by 2015/16,</li> <li>56% by 2019/20.</li> </ul>	<p>Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (2010)</p> <p>The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Northamptonshire 2008</p>	<p>The DPD's recovery targets imply that significant amounts (up to 25%) of residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Local Plan's recycling or composting &amp; recovery targets.</p>
<b>Nottingham City Council Nottinghamshire County Council</b>	<p>Saved policies version of the Joint Nottingham and Nottinghamshire WLP (2002) does not contain references to recovery targets.</p> <p>The Proposed Submission version (2012) of the Joint Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Waste Core Strategy refers to the targets within the national Waste Strategy 2007:</p> <p><i>Recover 67% of municipal waste by 2015, rising to 75% by 2020. Within this</i></p>	<p>Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Local Plan (2002)</p> <p>Joint Nottingham and</p>	<p>The submission WCS's recovery targets imply that significant amounts (up to 25%) of residual MSW would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity to move C&amp;IW up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the WCS's recycling &amp; recovery targets.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
	<p><i>broad recovery target at least 45% of household waste should be recycled or composted by 2015, rising to 50% by 2020.</i></p> <p>The Joint Waste Core Strategy adopts the following targets for municipal, commercial and industrial waste for 2025:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70% minimum recycling (includes AD),</li> <li>• 20% max energy recovery,</li> <li>• 10% max waste disposal.</li> </ul>	<p>Nottinghamshire Waste Core Strategy - Proposed Submission version (2012)</p>	

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b><u>NORTH EAST</u></b>			
<b>Stockton on Tees BC</b>  <b>Redcar and Cleveland Council</b>  <b>Middlesbrough BC</b>  <b>Hartlepool BC</b>  <b>Darlington BC</b>	<p>The DPD has a recovery target of 53% of MSW from Tees Valley from 2010 rising to 72% from 2016.</p> <p>The DPD also has a target to increase the recovery of value from commercial and industrial waste from the Tees Valley to 73% from 2016.</p>	<p>Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste DPD (2011)</p>	<p>The Minerals and Waste DPD's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual waste will either require recovery treatment or landfill disposal (i.e up to 28% of MSW arisings and up to 27% of C&amp;IW arisings).</p> <p>The development of Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered, therefore, to be compliant with the DPD's recovery targets.</p>
<b>South Tyneside Council</b>	<p>No refs to recovery targets</p> <p>No Waste DPD</p>	<p>South Tyneside Core Strategy 2007.</p>	<p>Lack of recycling and recovery targets means that there is no local compliance issue</p>
<b>Durham County Council</b>	<p>The Waste Local Plan does not provide targets for recovery. It refers to national waste strategy 2000 and quotes its national recycling / targets for household waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005;</li> <li>• to recycle or compost at least 30% of household waste by 2010; and</li> <li>• to recycle or compost at least 33% of household waste by 2015.</li> </ul> <p>The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for County Durham was updated in 2010 and includes the following targets for the recovery of MSW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2010 – 53%</li> <li>• 2015 – 67%</li> <li>• 2020 – 75%</li> </ul>	<p>County Durham Waste Local Plan (2005)</p> <p>Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for County Durham, 2010</p>	<p>The MSW Strategy's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling targets implies the need for additional recovery capacity.</p> <p>The development of Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Strategy and Local Plan's recovery targets.</p>
<b>Newcastle City Council &amp; Gateshead MBC</b>	<p>Gateshead, as part of the South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership, is aiming to increase recycling and composting of household waste to 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020, and to achieve a minimum 75% recovery rate for residual waste by 2020</p> <p>Newcastle City Council has set out targets for the recycling and composting 55% of household waste by 2020, and for at least 75% recovery of municipal waste by 2020.</p>	<p>Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne Core Strategy (Submission Document 2013)</p> <p>South Tyne &amp; Wear Waste Management Partnership Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, 2007</p>	<p>The Joint MSW Strategy's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling targets in the Core Strategy implies the need for additional recovery capacity.</p> <p>The development of Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Core Strategy's recovery targets.</p>
<b>Northumberland County Council</b>	<p>The Waste Local Plan references targets in Waste Strategy 2000: recover value from at least 40% of municipal waste and recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005, and by 2005 to reduce the amount of industrial and commercial waste sent to landfill to 85% of that landfilled by 1998.</p>	<p>Northumberland Waste Local Plan (2001)</p> <p>Joint Municipal</p>	<p>The development of Proposed Development could provide some of additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Waste Local Plan's objectives.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
	<p>The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Northumberland (2003) refers to the recovery and recycling targets set out in the National Waste Strategy 2000.</p> <p>The Strategy adopts targets for recycling 10% of household waste in Northumberland County Council by 2003/4 and 18% by 2005/6.</p> <p>The Strategy also adopts the following targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recover value from at least 80% of municipal waste by 2020</li> </ul> <p>Recycle and compost at least 50% of household waste by 2020.</p>	<p>Waste Management Strategy for Northumberland (2003)</p>	
<b>Sunderland City Council</b>	<p>The UDP had a target to recover value from 40% of municipal waste by 2005.</p> <p>The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy has been prepared by the following partners: Sunderland City Council, South Tyneside Council, Gateshead Council,</p> <p>The Joint MSW Strategy includes , a target to increase recycling and composting of household waste to 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020. The Strategy states that the Councils in the partnership also aim to meet or exceed the national recovery targets of 67% by 2015 and 75% by 2020.</p>	<p>The Sunderland City Council UDP (1998)</p> <p>South Tyne &amp; Wear Waste Management Partnership Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, (2007)</p>	<p>The proposed Core Strategy's recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling targets in the UDP implies the need for additional recovery capacity.</p> <p>The development of Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Core Strategy's recovery targets.</p>
<b>North Tyneside Council</b>	<p>Target to recover 40% of municipal waste by 2005 in accordance with the national Waste Strategy.</p>	<p>North Tyneside Council UDP (2002).</p>	<p>The UDP's relatively low recovery target imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling targets in the UDP implies the need for additional recovery capacity.</p> <p>The development of Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Core Strategy's recovery targets.</p>

Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b><u>NORTH WEST</u></b>			
<b>Lancashire County Council</b>  <b>Blackburn and Darwen Borough Council</b>  <b>Blackpool Borough Council</b>	<p>The following recycling, composting and recovery targets are planned for in the Plan period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) recycle and compost 46% of MSW by 2010, to reach 56% by 2015 and 61% by 2020</li> <li>(ii) additionally recover value from 18% of MSW by 2015</li> <li>(iii) recycle 35% of I&amp;C waste by 2010, 40% by 2015 and 45% by 2020</li> <li>(iv) additionally recover value from 30% of I&amp;C waste by 2010, falling to 25% by 2020</li> <li>(v) recycle 50% of C&amp;D waste by 2010, 55% by 2015 and 60% by 2020</li> <li>(vi) additionally recover value from 42 % of C&amp;D waste by 2010, falling to 35% by 2020</li> </ul>	Joint Minerals and Waste DPD (2009)	<p>The DPD's recycling &amp; recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 21%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets in the DPD implies the need for additional recovery capacity to bring waste up the hierarchy equivalent to 25% of arisings.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Core Strategy's recovery targets.</p>
<b>Cheshire East &amp; Cheshire West and Chester</b>	<p>The Waste Local Plan refers to the national recycling / composting and recovery targets of the National Waste Strategy which include are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recycle or compost 25% of municipal solid waste by 2005; 30% by 2010 and 33% by 2015;</li> <li>• Recover value from at least 40% of municipal waste by 2005; 45% by 2010 and 67% by 2015.</li> <li>• These targets have been adopted in the WLP as monitoring indicators and targets.(page 55 of the WLP).</li> </ul>	The Cheshire Waste Replacement Waste Local Plan (2007)	<p>The Waste Local Plan's recycling &amp; recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 33%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets in the Plan implies the need for additional recovery capacity to bring waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Waste Local Plan's recovery targets.</p>
<b>Greater Manchester WDA</b>	<p>The GMWS has targets to achieve levels of recycling and composting of household waste of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33% by 2010</li> <li>• a minimum of 50% by 2020 and through to 2030</li> </ul>	Greater Manchester Waste Strategy, Review 2006/7	<p>The GMWDA MSW Strategy recycling &amp; composting targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 33%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets in the Strategy implies the need for additional recovery capacity to bring waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Strategy's recycling targets.</p>
<b>Cumbria County Council</b>	<p>MSW recovery target matches National Waste Strategy 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 53% by 2010</li> <li>• 67% by 2015</li> <li>• 75% by 2020</li> </ul> <p>No recovery targets for C&amp;I waste.</p>	Cumbria Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2009)	<p>The Core Strategy's recycling &amp; recovery targets imply that significant amounts of residual MSW (up to 25%) would either require additional recovery capacity or landfill disposal.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;IW recycling and recovery targets in the Core Strategy implies the need for additional recovery capacity to bring waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development could provide some of this additional recovery capacity, and is considered compliant with the Core Strategy's recovery targets.</p>
<b>Warrington Borough Council</b>	<p>No targets within the Core Strategy</p> <p>No targets with the UDP</p>	Submission version of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2012)  UDP 2006	<p>Lack of recycling and recovery targets means that there is no local compliance issue</p>



Waste Planning Authority	Waste Recovery Targets	Relevant Plan/Strategy	Assessment of Proposed Development Compliance
<b>Wigan Borough Council</b>	The Core Strategy sets a recovery target for household waste of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 67% by 2015</li> <li>• 75% by 2020</li> </ul> Two-thirds of which should be achieved through recycling and composting.	Wigan Local Plan Strategy (2013). Local Core Strategy (2013).	
<b>Merseyside MBC &amp; Halton Borough Council</b>	The six councils of Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral have prepared the Joint Waste Local Plan for the sub-region.  The Joint WLP includes adopted targets for recycling and recovery from commercial and industrial wastes for monitoring purposes which are in line with regional and national targets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 65% recycled by 2020;</li> <li>• Recover value from 90% by 2020 (includes recycling).</li> <li>• The Joint WLP includes a target for waste sent for recycling, composting, re-use. The target of 50% by 2020 is inline with National Waste Strategy target for recycling household waste</li> </ul>	Joint Local Plan (2013). Waste Plan	