Inspector’s opening

Council’s opening statement

Matter 3: Sustainable Waste Management
(Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8)

Issue: Whether the approach to waste management is justified and soundly based?

Policy 1– Need for waste development

41. Having regard to the need identified, how would the policies of the SWLP promote or deliver waste minimisation? How will the policies of the SWLP be effective in promoting the management of waste further up the waste hierarchy?

42. Does the evidence demonstrate that the Policy 1 (ii) requirement is justified, for proposals for ‘other recovery’ capacity not to result in the requirement for such capacity being exceeded, as specified in the latest Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)?

43. Are the identified targets in Table 3 (paragraph 1.4.2.7) for the management of different waste streams justified and deliverable? For
clarity and effectiveness, should reference also be made to waste management through other recovery methods?

44. How are the technological options for managing waste streams addressed by the SWLP? Are circumstances considered to exist where it would be appropriate to prescribe a specific technology for particular sites or facilities? If so, is this clearly justified? (PPG ID: 28-019-20141016)

*Policy 2– Recycling and recovery (other than inert CD&E and soil recycling facilities)*

45. To be effective and for clarity, should the specific wording of Policy 2 reflect the explanatory text at paragraph 5.2.2.5, to clarify that proposed improvements or extensions of existing operations are intended to be considered under Policy 8?

- **Would proposed improvements or extensions of existing operations, proposed to be considered in relation to Policy 8, also be considered in relation to Policy 2? If so, is this clear from the explanatory text at paragraph 5.2.2.5?**

46. How will Policy 2 be effective in addressing the identified need for additional recycling and recovery facilities? Does the specific wording of the policy make it sufficiently clear that all development proposals, including those on allocated and existing waste management sites, will be assessed against other policies in the plan? In this regard, in relation to ‘other recovery’, should Policy 2 include a cross-reference to Policy 1?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

47. Does the wording of Policy 2 make sufficient encouragement for colocation and is the SWLP positively prepared in this regard?

48. To be effective, positively prepared and for clarity, is it necessary for Policy 2 to clearly identify the proposed specific allocation under Policy 11b for a household waste MRF, to process dry mixed recyclable (DMR) wastes?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

*Policy 3 – Recycling of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste*

49. The SWLP, paragraph 5.2.3.7, recognises the tension that may exist between supporting the recycling of inert CD&E waste and encouraging the timely restoration of sites through recovery of this material to land. Is the potential impact of this approach on the restoration of former minerals sites justified, including those within the Green Belt?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification to Policy 8 satisfactorily address this issue?**
50. Policy 3 (A) includes four criteria for assessing whether a proposal is acceptable. Is the Policy, as worded, sufficiently clear that each of the criteria are weighted equally?

- **Would it be necessary to meet only one of the four criteria, to comply with Policy 3 (A)? If so, is this made sufficiently clear?**

51. Amongst other matters, Policy 3 makes provision for temporary CD&E waste recycling facilities within existing minerals sites, rather than permanent facilities at such locations. Given the identified capacity gap for the recycling of inert CD&E waste, is this justified?

- **Would Policy 3 enable the provision of permanent facilities, should they be required in the future?**

**Policy 4 – Sustainable Construction and Waste Management in New Development**

52. The SWLP, paragraph 5.2.4.5, refers to the intention for large scale development, as defined in footnote 50, to be accompanied by a ‘Site Waste Management Plan.’ To be effective, is it necessary for Policy 4 to include a specific reference to this requirement? How is it intended that this requirement will be enforced?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**
- **When will the Consultation Protocol (SWPS-08) and Standing Advice Note – Sustainable Construction (SWPS-07) be reviewed and updated?**

53. Is the specific wording of Policy 4 justified and effective? How will the policy requirements be assessed? Are those requirements clearly identified and unambiguous? Is further guidance in these respects proposed? Is the encouragement in Policy 4 (iii) for on-site operational waste management facilities sufficiently positive? Should this be a requirement?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

**Policy 5 – Recovery of Inert Waste to Land**

54. The explanatory text for Policy 5 refers to the use of inert waste for recovery to land being acceptable where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any potential adverse impacts (in paragraph 5.2.5.4). However, Policy 5 (i) and paragraph 5.2.5.7 refer to significant benefits. How is the inconsistency in the wording used intended to be addressed?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

**Policy 6 – Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land**

55. In relation to Policy 6, does the evidence demonstrate that the SWLP is positively prepared in this regard? Given the scheduled closure of Patteson
Court landfill site in 2030, how is the disposal of non-inert waste to land, including hazardous waste, proposed to be managed in the long-term? How would Policy 6 be effective in addressing the identified needs in this regard?

56. As worded, will the Policy 6 requirement for any new non-inert landfill to take account of existing capacity be effective? Is the policy sufficiently clear in how this requirement will be assessed? For effectiveness, should the policy specify a geographical area or locational proximity?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

**Policy 7 – Safeguarding**

57. In Policy 7, is the phrase ‘in proximity to’ sufficiently precise? How is proximity defined? Is this clearly set out within the SWLP? Is the wording of the second part of the policy sufficiently clear, that it will only be necessary for the proposal to meet one of the specified criteria?

- **Does the SWLP clearly identify that the Consultation Protocol (SWPS-08) defines the meaning of ‘in proximity to’?**
- **Does the definition accord with the wording of Policy 7?**
- **For clarity and to be effective, should the Policy specify the relevant distance?**
- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address the second part of the question?**
- **How has the potential impact of proposed allocations in other emerging plans on the deliverability of proposed allocations in the SWLP been assessed? What implications, if any, may arise?**

58. Given the spatial strategy, Policies 1 and 2, and the hierarchy of preference for the location of new waste management proposals, is the safeguarding of existing, permitted and allocated sites justified?

- **Would the safeguarding, if justified, be effective?**
- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

59. Does the evidence demonstrate that the Surrey Minerals & Waste Consultation Protocol will be effective in safeguarding existing, allocated and permitted waste facilities? What other collaborative measures and communication methods will be used to ensure effective working between the county council and district and borough councils in this regard? (SWLP, paragraph 5.2.7.7)

60. In relation to proposed allocation 5.1 (Land to the north east of Slyfield Industrial Estate, Guildford), how will the SWLP ensure that replacements are in place for the existing waste management sites before redevelopment occurs?
Policy 8 – Improvement or Extension of Existing Facilities

61. Paragraph 5.2.8.4 includes reference to taking account of the original reasons for time limited permissions, in the consideration of proposals for the improvement or extension of facilities with temporary permission. For clarity, to be effective and justified, should this be included within the wording of Policy 8?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

62. To be justified, should the wording of Policy 8 refer to the type or quality of waste to be managed? Will the requirement for environment and local amenity improvements be readily achievable?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**
- **Would the requirement for benefits to the environment and local amenity be consistent with the requirements of Policy 14, where it seeks to avoid significant adverse impacts on the environment and communities?**

Matter 4: Spatial Strategy (Policies 9, 10, 11a, 11b and 12)

**Issue: Whether the spatial strategy and distribution of waste management provisions are soundly based?**

63. Is the proposed spatial strategy for the planned provision for new capacity justified and consistent with national planning policy and guidance, including in relation to the focus on towns and urban areas, the use of previously developed land, and impacts on the environment and amenity? Is the identified spatial hierarchy for the location of future waste management provision justified, clear and readily understandable? Do the policies of the plan, including Policies 2, 9 and 10, clearly support the delivery of the spatial strategy and the locational hierarchy?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**
- **Would the absence of primacy for the proposed site allocations represent an effective and positive plan-led approach to the delivery of waste management facilities?**
- **Do the proposed site allocations appropriately reflect the key building blocks of the spatial strategy identified in paragraph 4.1.1.1 and the locational hierarchy in Figure 5 of the SWLP?**

64. Does the proposed distribution reflect a robust analysis of waste management needs, including for specific waste streams? What sources of data have been used for this analysis? How reliable and up-to-date are
these sources? Does the evidence demonstrate that options for strategic approaches to locating facilities have been considered?

- **Does the Site Identification and Evaluation Report (SWLP 9) clearly identify how the sites proposed for allocation were identified?**

65. How does the spatial strategy and the proposed distribution of waste management facilities address the proximity principle and are strategic movements of waste justified? How have the transport implications for the proposed distribution of proposed allocated sites and ILAS been assessed? Is the distribution justified in this regard?

- **Has appropriate consideration been given to the routing to the Strategic Road Network from the proposed site allocations?**

66. Does the SWLP include sufficient information on the location criteria for site identification? Does it meet European reporting requirements for waste management plans to show existing and proposed waste management sites on a geographical map, and/or include sufficiently precise locational criteria for identifying such sites? (PPG ID: 28-039-20141016)

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

*Policy 9 - Green Belt*

67. Is the spatial strategy consistent with national planning policy in respect of development within the Green Belt? To be effective, should the spatial strategy clearly indicate that allocated sites within the Green Belt would not be preferred to other suitable sites outside the Green Belt that may come forward in the future. For effectiveness, should the interrelationship between the Spatial Strategy, Policy 2, Policy 9 and Policy 10 be clearly explained within the Plan?

- **Would this strategy enable a plan-led approach?**
- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

68. Is Policy 9 consistent with other adopted and emerging development plans within the area covered by the SWLP? Is the location of proposed allocations within the Green Belt justified? Does the evidence demonstrate an inability to identify sufficient, suitable, opportunities for waste management facilities on land outside the Green Belt?

- **Is there clear and robust evidence to support the allocation of each of the proposed sites in this regard?**
- **Do the proposed allocations within the Green Belt take account of the extent to which the sites serve the purposes**
of a Green Belt and how this may alter in relation to proposed allocations within emerging plans?

69. Does the wording of Policy 9 make it sufficiently clear that, even for proposed allocations, to be considered acceptable, waste development in the Green Belt would need to demonstrate very special circumstances exist? To be consistent with national planning policy, should the policy refer to the factors identified as those that may contribute to ‘other considerations’? To be justified, should the policy clarify that those factors are indicative, with each proposal considered on its merits?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification satisfactorily address this issue?**

70. The evidence indicates that sites within the Green Belt allocated in the current Waste Local Plan, such as former Weylands STW, have faced issues with their proposed development, due in part to their location within the Green Belt. Given this, what confidence does the Council have that the proposed allocations are likely to be effective in delivering waste development?

- **Given the spatial strategy, the locational hierarchy and absence of primacy of the proposed allocated sites, how effective would the proposed site allocations within the Green Belt likely to be in delivering the development of waste facilities during the plan period?**