

APPENDIX 3

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH WASTE LOCAL PLAN :
ENVIRONMENTAL APPRAISAL**

(SUMMARY).

Appendix 3 – The First Deposit Plan (August 2000)

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

1.1.1 This Appendix provides a summary of the Environmental Appraisal (EA) of the Deposit Waste Local Plan. The full EA of the Plan is set out in the document 'Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (Deposit): Environmental Appraisal'.

1.2. What Is A Strategic Environmental Appraisal?

1.2.1 Local Authorities are required to undertake environmental appraisals of development plans to consider whether all relevant social, economic and environmental concerns have been addressed in the Plan. The appraisal process involves identifying, quantifying (where appropriate), weighing up and reporting the potential impacts of the Plan and ensuring that these are taken into consideration. Environmental Appraisal (encompassing social and economic impacts and is sometimes known as 'Sustainability Appraisal') ensures that a development plan is consistent with European, national, regional and local sustainable development frameworks. It performs a quasi 'health check' on a Plan.

1.2.2 Appraisals are undertaken on all types of development plans, policies and proposals. National planning policies require the appraisal process to be iterative and a continuous element of development plan preparation. The findings are also required to be subject to the same level of public consultation as the Plan itself.

1.3 Summary of Approach

1.3.1 The appraisal embodies the following steps, to:

- review and update environmental stock criteria (as set out in the WLP consultation draft)
- evaluate all of the Plan's policies against European, national, regional and local policies
- evaluate the Deposit Plan's waste management scenarios
- evaluate the Plan's spatial strategy
- evaluate the Plan's policies against sustainability criteria

1.4 Background

1.4.1 The Appraisal of the Deposit Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan builds upon an earlier appraisal undertaken on the Consultation Draft version (1998). The Deposit Plan was formed in the light of representations received on the consultation draft plan and updated to take account of recent changes. This Deposit Plan was then subjected to further appraisal. The approach taken involved:

- identification of environmental stock, against which policies in the Plan were evaluated
- assessment of impacts as either positive, neutral, negative, site specific or not relevant
- evaluation of the Plan's strategy, and policy framework

- identification of mitigation measures (amendments to the Plan) are suggested where policies score poorly against sustainability stock criteria

1.4.2 The Appraisal of the Deposit Waste Local Plan builds upon and develops both the findings of the Consultation Draft Appraisal and the approach taken within it. The recommendations of this latest appraisal have been taken into account in the preparation of the published version of the Deposit Plan.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS.

2.1 The recommendations of the Strategic Environmental Appraisal have been summarised below:

- 1. Social and economic implications of the Waste Local Plan policies and proposals should be included.**
- 2. Local Transport Plan policies and proposals should be integrated into the Plan or facilitated through the Plan.**
- 3. Enhance provisions of the Plan to ensure waste management development is required to be sustainable in form and location.**
- 4. Land stability and contamination require greater consideration.**
- 5. The Plan should demonstrate consideration of project management, including a publicly agreed timetable and facilitation of monitoring and review through Plan content.**
- 6. Scenarios Two and Three are an appropriate basis for sustainable waste management in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, but the Plan should avoid being over-prescriptive.**
- 7. The spatial strategy, which combines aspects of a centralised and dispersed approach to suit the characteristics of the Plan area and the various types of waste management facility, is considered the most sustainable approach for the Plan area.**
- 8. The site selection criteria used to assess sites for identification in the Waste Local Plan are sustainable in nature.**
- 9. Public awareness/perception of waste management issues could be addressed.**
- 10. The role of key stakeholders and the importance of partnerships could be developed.**

11. Further clarification required of 'excessive provision' in Policy WLP 3.
 12. Suggested changes to Policies WLP 3 and WLP 6.
 13. The Plan could include additional supporting text covering waste facilities in new development and new settlements and design of waste management facilities.
 14. [Former] Policy 29 (Secondary Fuels) – should be converted to lower case text.
 15. The Plan should be flexible to facilitate changes in market conditions and the emergence of new technologies.
 16. Over provision of facilities should be avoided.
 17. Policy WLP 18, which safeguards existing major waste management sites needs to ensure that these sites are sustainable and are contributing to social and economic regeneration or improvement.
- 2.2 These recommendations have been addressed through the preparation of the Deposit Draft Waste Local Plan. **Table 1** at the back of this Appendix provides a schedule of the changes made to the Plan in response to this appraisal.

3 REVIEW OF BEST PRACTICE AND SCOPING EXERCISE

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 A review of best practice, in the preparation of Strategic Environmental Appraisals (SEAs) has been undertaken. The review of best practice provides a brief overview of SEAs undertaken nationwide to determine and evaluate approaches taken to appraisal. This is necessary to provide assurance that the approach undertaken in this appraisal is in conformity with best practice. This is summarised in the main document.

3.2 Scoping Exercise

3.2.1 The scoping element of the appraisal reviews European, national, regional and local planning guidance that is of relevance to the Plan. The exercise (provided in detail in the full Environmental Appraisal document) evaluates and identifies key requirements of current legislation and recommends amendments to the Plan's content where deficiencies arise.

3.2.2 The tables produced during the scoping exercise are provided in the full Environmental Appraisal document. The exercise has identified a number of issues that require further consideration by the Authority and within the Plan. A summary of these findings is provided below.

3.3 **Key Findings**

- 3.3.1 **Transportation** - Local Transport Plan policies, objectives and context should, where appropriate, be integrated into the Plan. Where an adopted document does not exist, reference should be made to the function and purpose of the Transport Plan, and the importance of the integration of the two policy frameworks. The policy context of the Local Transport Plan should be clearly reflected/facilitated within the Waste Local Plan.
- 3.3.2 In general, emphasis placed upon reducing the need to travel should be clearly and consistently expressed through policies and supporting text.
- 3.3.3 **Environment** - Land stability and contamination require greater consideration within the Plan. This could be done through elaboration in the supporting text to a policy.
- 3.3.4 **Social and economic** - Plan and land use allocations should provide flexibility to ensure that new or emerging technologies can be accommodated as well as existing technologies. Additional text that encourages/facilitates new technology could be introduced into the Plan.
- 3.3.5 Overall the Plan could increase the emphasis placed upon the economic development elements of sustainable waste management and development. Job creation, new market opportunities, regeneration, evolution of new self-sustaining communities and rural regeneration should all be integral elements of the Plan and the land use decisions taken within it.
- 3.3.6 The social elements of waste management facility development should be clearly expressed within the Plan, but also issues of responsibility for production and responsible management, need for co-operation and the establishment of 'ownership' of the waste issue.
- 3.3.7 **Partnership** is an essential element of sustainable development and sustainable waste management and many partnerships are needed to ensure the success of the Plan. Therefore the importance of partnerships should be emphasised in the supporting text to the Plan.
- 3.3.8 **Sustainable development** - An overall goal for sustainable waste management in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough is established in Chapter 6 of the Plan. The policies and land use decisions taken in the Plan should work towards an integrated and co-ordinated approach.
- 3.3.9 **Development** - The Plan could include reference in the supporting text to the following new provisions:
- The provision of waste management facilities in new development
 - Major facilities to be provided/considered within any new settlements
 - Good design in new waste management facilities
- 3.3.10 The land use strategy should ensure flexibility in approach to facilitate changes in market conditions and environmental concerns resulting from the evolution of new technologies.

3.3.11 **Implementation** - PPG 12 requires the development plan process to pursue the requirements of effective project management. This will involve the key elements of:

- a timetable identifying key stages in the WLP preparation. This should be publicly adopted. The Local Authority will be accountable for deviations from this timetable. This timetable will need to be considered and facilitated through the Plan.
- monitoring and review of the effectiveness of the policy context of the Plan is also an important element of project management. Targets and performance indicators should ensure that effective monitoring and review could be achieved. 'Windfall' predictions should also be addressed, considering the effect of this on the release of preferred areas for development indicators and targets are being developed to assist monitoring and review.

3.3.12 Supplementary Planning Guidance can facilitate the effective processing of planning applications, providing guidance to applicants and decision makers. The role of SPG in assisting the waste management development process could be considered within the Plan and facilitated where appropriate.

4 WASTE MANAGEMENT SCENARIOS

4.1 The Waste Management Scenarios

4.1.1 The Plan describes several scenarios for how waste might be managed during the plan period in order to meet EU and national priorities and targets for sustainable waste management. These are:

- the "Do nothing" option which provides a baseline
- Scenario 1 - meet relevant targets
- Scenario 2 - maximise the use of non-energy from waste (EfW) technologies
- Scenario 3 - integrated: recycling, recovery, energy recovery

4.1.2 The choice of scenarios is considered to provide an appropriate range of potential options for realising EC and national recycling and recovery targets. It is important that local choice is not restricted and the Plan's non-prescriptive approach to the mix of solutions is considered to be sound.

4.1.3 Each scenario has been assessed to determine to what extent it represents sustainable development. The assessment consists of two main elements:

- (a) an assessment of the key features of each scenario against the Plan's 'Principal Objectives' (reproduced in **Table 2** at the back of this Appendix)
- (b) an assessment of the key features of each scenario against the full set of sustainability criteria

4.1.4 To facilitate assessment of the scenarios, and to enable a fuller assessment, each scenario has been broken down into key features as follows:

Scenario One	Scenario Two	Scenario Three
Meeting national recovery targets	High reduction and diversion levels based on maximum practicable levels	Meeting national recovery targets
45% diversion of waste	60% diversion of waste	Nearly 90% diversion of waste
Recycling of inert, green and other wastes from household waste recovery centres	Advanced waste treatment technologies, such as 'wet and dry', mixed waste processing and anaerobic digestion	Recycling of inert, green and other wastes from household waste recovery centres
Intensive recycling of collected household waste	Compliance with Landfill Directive	Intensive recycling of collected household waste
High rate of public participation in source-segregation recycling schemes		High rate of public participation in source-segregation recycling schemes
Large-scale organic treatment systems		Large-scale organic treatment systems
Non-compliance with Landfill Directive using current technologies		Utilises energy from waste to treat residual/untreated wastes remaining after recycling and composting
		Compliance with (and exceedance of) Landfill Directive

4.2 **Main Findings**

The main findings of the appraisal of the scenarios can be summarised as follows:

- 4.2.1 **Scenario One and Principal Objectives** - This scenario performed well against the principal objectives in all but one respect. Scenario One is unlikely to comply with the Landfill Directive as it fails to meet the target for diversion of biodegradable municipal waste. This feature of the scenario was therefore judged non-compliant with all those principal objectives that were applicable. On this basis it is doubtful whether Scenario One should be used as a basis for the Plan as it cannot be considered a fully sustainable option. A less serious query arose in relation to potential harm to humans and the environment in relation to large-scale organic treatment systems which are, as yet, untested in this country.
- 4.2.2 **Scenario Two and Principal Objectives** - Scenario Two was judged to be either compliant or highly compliant with all but one of the principal objectives, highlighting this as a sustainable option. The one query arose in relation to the feasibility and environmental and health impacts of advanced waste treatment technologies, due to a likely lack of information on this issue.

- 4.2.3 **Scenario Three and Principal Objectives** - Scenario Three generally performed very well against the principal objectives, particularly in respect of the fact that nearly 90% diversion of waste is achieved under this scenario. A few queries did, however, arise. The environmental and health impact of large-scale organic treatment systems is currently unclear, and the public perception of the environmental and health impact of waste-to-energy is likely to be poor. Waste-to-energy was also judged to perform relatively poorly in terms of its place in the waste hierarchy.
- 4.2.4 **Scenario One and Sustainability Criteria** - Again, this scenario performed well against the sustainability criteria in all but one critical respect. The fact that this scenario is unlikely to comply with the Landfill Directive has meant that it was, in this respect, judged to be non-compliant or highly non-compliant with all the sustainability criteria that were applicable. For this reason it is not considered that Scenario One represents a sustainable option for future waste management planning.
- 4.2.5 **Scenario Two and Sustainability Criteria** - Scenario Two performed extremely well in relation to all the sustainability criteria, and was scored as compliant or highly compliant, in all but one instance. This query related to the public perception of advanced waste treatment technologies given that they are essentially an 'unknown quantity' to the public.
- 4.2.6 **Scenario Three and Sustainability Criteria** - Scenario Three generally performed well when judged against the sustainability criteria, particularly with regard to the first five key features which were all judged as either compliant or highly compliant. A number of queries arose in respect of large-scale organic treatment systems and waste to energy, largely because of the untested nature of organic treatment systems and the likely public perception of waste-to-energy. This scenario scored particularly highly as a result of the fact that nearly 90% diversion of waste is achieved and that the requirements of the Landfill Directive are exceeded.

4.3 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- 4.3.1 The following conclusions have been reached as a result of the sustainability appraisal of the scenarios:
- Scenario One does not represent a sustainable option on which to base the provision of the Waste Local Plan, in that it does not meet the requirements of the Landfill Directive
 - Scenario Two offers a highly sustainable option, although it is heavily reliant on advanced waste treatment technologies
 - Scenario Three represents a highly sustainable option, although the public perception of waste-to-energy would need to be addressed
- 4.3.2 It is recommended that Scenarios Two and Three be taken forward as possible sustainable options for planning for waste management in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

5 **SPATIAL STRATEGY**

5.1 **Introduction**

5.1.1 The Waste Local Plan (Chapter 4) provides an indication of the number and type of facilities that would be needed to implement each of the scenarios. It outlines a spatial strategy that says how these facilities might be spread across the county. This strategy combines centralised and dispersed facilities reflecting the different optimum size of particular types of plant. This section looks at the suitability of the scenarios in terms of their respective spatial impacts on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Plan area, and looks briefly at the criteria used in site selection.

5.2 **Assessment of Spatial Strategy**

5.2.1 **Proximity Principle** - All Scenarios attempt to focus significant elements of waste development in major centres of waste arising. It is considered that development under all three scenarios would be consistent with achieving sustainable development and meeting the objectives of the proximity principle.

5.2.2 **Transport Efficiency: Modes and Trips** - The flexible approach adopted for the spatial strategy should ensure that as far as possible the distances over which waste is transported should be quite short. It is considered that the hybrid approach is, bearing in mind practical requirements, the most sustainable approach as facilities are allocated on a localised basis as far as possible. The locations of strategic facilities should however ensure that the frequency of travel is kept to a minimum, in particular through the use of transfer stations that allow waste to be 'bulked up' for onward transport in larger vehicles. The proximity of major facilities to landfill for disposal of residuals will affect transport efficiency. This conclusion applies to all three scenarios.

5.2.3 **Land and Resource Management** - The selected scenarios (2 and 3) require facilities additional to those identified in the Consultation Draft Waste Local Plan. One additional site has been identified in each of the following districts: Fenland, Peterborough, Huntingdon, South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire. The scenarios also require additional landfill void space for putrescible waste. To meet this requirement two additional sites have been identified: one in Peterborough and the other in South Cambridgeshire. Although there is sufficient overall provision for inert landfill to meet scenarios 2 and 3, a local shortfall has been identified in South Cambridgeshire and a site has been identified in this area. The location and intended function of these additional sites should ensure that land and resources are effectively managed.

5.2.4 Resource management can be judged favourably in relation to the quantities of waste that will be diverted from landfill and the levels of recycling and re-use. Scenario 3 scores particularly well in this respect.

5.2.5 **Facilitating Current and Future Needs** - It is considered that the Deposit Draft Plan identifies sufficient sites to provide for current and future needs to the end of the Plan

period. Regular reviews and monitoring of the Plan will ensure that additional provision is made if and when needed. This conclusion is the same for all three scenarios.

- 5.2.6 **Environmental Resource Conservation and Pollution** - The impact of the scenarios upon environmental resource conservation and pollution in spatial terms relates directly to the number of facilities proposed for each scenario and their location. In terms of number of facilities, scenario 2 can be seen to have the least impact and scenario 3 the greatest. All scenarios require location of facilities to limit the impact on the environment and pollution.
- 5.2.7 **Facilitating Social and Economic Development/Regeneration** - Each of the scenarios has social and economic implications. Recycling and recovery initiatives are likely to be more socially acceptable than other waste management facilities and need to be implemented through lifestyle changes. Such lifestyle changes will ensure more sustainable communities.
- 5.2.8 Employment opportunities will be created for up to, in the case of scenario 3, 26 facilities and 3 transfer stations across the plan area. The location, design and operation of facilities will, however, need to ensure social and economic environments are not diminished by waste facility development. Scenarios 1 and 3 scored best under this heading.
- 5.2.9 **Site Selection Criteria** - The criteria used for selecting sites for inclusion in the Plan have been assessed (these are set out at paragraph 8.17.2 of the Plan). These criteria are judged to reflect the criteria set out in PPG10 and to be the most applicable to the circumstances in existence in the Plan area.
- 5.2.10 **Provision for Waste Management Facilities in the Plan** - The Background Paper (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (Deposit): Site Selection) assesses whether there are sufficient preferred sites identified in the Plan to meet the forecast requirement for facilities to implement the selected scenarios (2 and 3). This study identifies a shortfall of putrescible waste landfill as well as a need for other sites for particular waste facilities in particular localities. The Plan makes provision for these additional facilities, in the form of additional sites.
- 5.2.11 The approach adopted by testing the sufficiency of preferred sites in the Plan is considered sound and the inclusion of additional sites is supported. There appears to be a satisfactory geographical distribution of sites to cater for strategic and local facilities in accordance with the spatial strategy.
- 5.2.12 Some sites would need to accommodate several facilities. This provides the benefits of integration but also the potential for environmental capacity and cumulative impacts from operations and traffic. However, the other policies of the Plan should ensure no excessive impacts occur.
- 5.2.13 In addition to identifying **Preferred Sites** the Plan also **safeguards** existing and proposed sites for major waste management facilities and there is also support for proposals for waste management uses on certain types of land in defined circumstances.

5.2.14 These policies are considered to provide additional flexibility in case the preferred areas do not move forward for development as anticipated. Other policies of the Plan should be effective in restricting excessive development. However, the 'take-up' of preferred areas and other potential locations needs to be carefully monitored to prevent over (or under) allocation of sites so that land and resources are carefully managed.

5.3 **OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

5.3.1 The chosen spatial strategy, that is, a hybrid approach containing elements of both a centralised and dispersed strategy, can be judged to represent a sustainable option for locating waste management facilities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The spatial implications of the three scenarios, based upon this hybrid strategy, are not judged to be significantly different.

5.3.2 The site selection criteria used to identify the sites for inclusion in the Plan are judged to be wholly sustainable in nature.

5.3.3 The method of assessing the sufficiency of sites to meet identified need is considered sound and the Plan's response - identifying additional preferred sites to meet any predicted shortfall is considered sustainable.

6 **SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA**

6.1 **Introduction**

6.1.1 The EA develops sustainability stock criteria against which to appraise the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan. These criteria are listed in **Table 3** at the back of this Appendix. These define the assets of the Plan area. They provide a benchmark for testing the impact of the Plan (positive and negative) on the Plan area. These 27 sustainability criteria have been devised from sustainable waste management and sustainable development criteria. They encompass social, economic, and environmental indicators.

6.2 **Assessment**

6.2.1 **Principal Objectives Vs Sustainability Criteria** - Appendix 2 of the full Environmental Appraisal provides the detailed matrix appraisal of the Plan's principal objectives against the sustainability stock criteria. Generally the Principal Objectives of the Plan perform well, posing no incompatibilities with the stock criteria.

6.2.2 **Sustainability Stock Criteria Vs. Waste Local Plan Policies** - The exercise identifies the positive, negative and neutral impact of policies against sustainability criteria. In the EA these 'scores' have been referred to as compatibilities or incompatibilities, and some impacts are not necessarily clearly positive, negative or neutral. The exercise led to a number of recommendations for amending the Plan, which are included in the summary of key findings. Overall recommendations are summarised below.

- 6.2.3 **Socio-Economic Elements of the Plan** - The Plan could provide greater emphasis in its policy context on the social and economic costs and benefits of efficient waste management and the appropriate location of proposed facilities. A reference in the Plan to the provision for facilities in new development to secure sustainable waste management would be an advantage and encourage the public and industry to be more proactive in their approach to waste management. Issues to be addressed include the employment generation implications of different types of waste management facility and the need to regenerate areas through good waste facility design.
- 6.2.4 **Partners** - Reference to the role of partnership within the Plan and the identification of the key stakeholders responsible for ensuring the effective implementation and monitoring of developments would be beneficial.
- 6.2.5 **Reducing the Need to Travel** - The site selection criteria should help to ensure that the resulting network of preferred sites is sustainable in terms of reducing transport impacts.

7 SUMMARY OF POLICY PERFORMANCE

Policies 9-12, 14-37 – do not conflict with other policies in the matrix.

Policies 17 and 27 – the Plan demonstrates that relevant sustainability criteria and policy requirements have been considered in determining suitable locations for preferred sites.

[Old] Policy 29 - should be amended or incorporated into another policy.

Additional text could be included regarding:

- the provision for waste management facilities in new development
- major facilities to be provided/considered in new settlements
- good design in new waste management facilities
- consider policy reference or supporting text regarding stability and contamination

Table 1: Changes made to the Deposit Waste Local Plan in response to recommendations in Environmental Appraisal.

Recommendation		Response	Change
1	Ensure social and economic implications of waste development are taken into account	Accept	Revisions to supporting text to Policy WLP 9: paragraphs 7.9.2 to 7.9.6
2	Local Transport Plan policies to be taken into account	Accept	New reference to Local Transport Plans inserted: paragraph 3.6.27)
3	Provisions requiring sustainable waste management development	Qualified acceptance: Plan's policies are aimed at achieving sustainable development	New cross-reference to Structure Plan Keynote Sustainable Development Policy at paragraph 6.1.4
4	Land stability and contamination require greater consideration	Accept	Reference to these issues included at paragraph 7.9.5
5	Project management, agreed timetable and targets against which to monitor and review the Plan should be included	Accept	Timetable added: Executive Summary, Table 1, page iv Performance targets included at section 3.8 and paragraphs 11.3.3-11.3.4 and 11.4.1
6	Scenarios 2 and 3 supported as a basis for the Plan subject to not being prescriptive	Plan includes appropriate explanation of status of scenarios: paragraph 4.7.2 and Executive Summary	No change required
7	Support for Plan's spatial strategy approach		No change required
8	Support for site selection criteria used		No change required
9	Public perception of waste could be addressed	Accept	Reference to this issue added at paragraph 7.9.2 and 7.9.4
10	The role of stakeholders and partnerships could be stressed more	Accept	Amendments to paragraph 3.5.1 and Table 1
11	Further clarification of 'excessive provision' in Policy WLP 3 (the need for waste development and the movement of waste)	Accept	Guidance on excessive provision is provided at paragraph 6.3.4

12	Amendments to Policies WLP 3 and WLP 6	Accept	Policies WLP 3 and WLP 6 amended
13	Plan would include additional supporting text covering waste facilities in new development and new settlements and design of waste facilities	Accept	Text provided at paragraph 6.1.5 ; paragraphs 8.17.6 and 8.17.7 ; paragraph 9.35.5
14	[Former] Policy WLP29 (secondary fuels) to lower case text	Accept	[Former] Policy deleted and incorporated in text at paragraph 8.26.7
15	Plan should be flexible to facilitate market changes and new technologies	Accept	Reference to emerging technologies is provided at paragraph 8.17.5
16	Over provision should be avoided by monitoring	Accept	Interpretation of 'excessive provision' is provided at paragraph 6.3.4
17	Policy WLP 18 (safeguarding waste management sites) should ensure sites are sustainable	Only major established waste management sites have been safeguarded	No change required

Table 2: The Principal Objectives of the Plan

<p>The main objectives, which will be pursued in order to meet the overall goal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• to determine waste planning applications in the light of the Government's principles for sustainable waste management i.e. BPEO, Regional Self-sufficiency, Proximity Principle and the Waste Hierarchy• to contribute towards ensuring regional self-sufficiency in the management of waste, and to seek self-sufficiency within the plan area where practical and in accordance with the proximity principle• to encourage waste management practices which do not incur unacceptable adverse impact on the environment or endanger human health• to ensure suitable provision is made for waste facilities to manage the waste of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough over the plan period• to identify planning policy criteria by which to assess waste development proposals, and ensure effective planning control and the appropriate location and distribution of waste management facilities• to provide clear guidance to operators, members of the public, and any other interested party on planning policy and proposals• to safeguard waste management sites from incompatible development
--

Table 3 : Sustainability Stock Criteria

<u>Waste Local Plan Consultation Draft Environmental Stock Criteria</u>	<u>Waste Local Plan Deposit Environmental Stock Criteria</u>
<u>Global Sustainability</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport emissions • Industrial and other emissions • Energy and fossil fuel emissions • Global biodiversity 	<u>Global Sustainability</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy efficient transport • Air quality • Energy use • Biodiversity
<u>Natural Resources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste • Air • Water quality and quantity • Land and soil 	<u>Natural Resources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste management • Water environment • Mineral resources • Geology and soils • Built environment
<u>Local Environment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape character and countryside • Amenity • Cultural heritage • Human health 	<u>Local Environment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Landscape and countryside</u> • <u>Degradation</u> • <u>Cultural heritage</u> • <u>Public health</u> • Efficient land use • Providing for current needs • Providing for needs in a resource-efficient way
	<u>Socio- Economic</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception • Unemployment • Recreation • Amenity • Access/Exclusion • Public awareness and ownership • Partnerships • Environmentally efficient economy
	<u>Future Requirements</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future reviewed public input • Future impacts • Future choices • Providing for future needs

Supplementary to Appendix 3 - the Revised Deposit Waste Local Plan (October 2001)

1.0 Summary of Findings:

- **the broad waste management strategy set out in the Plan remains largely unchanged and there are few significant policy changes proposed. Consequently strategic environmental appraisal (SEA) of the Plan shows that no new significant barriers to achieving sustainable development are presented by the changes proposed**
- **best practice on environmental appraisal (EA) has evolved since appraisal of the deposit plan**
- **new Government targets for recycling and recovery of waste could be linked more clearly to the Plan's strategy**
- **there is insufficient confidence in newly available additional baseline waste management data to warrant a re-assessment of the Plan's proposed strategy**
- **changes to policies bring both improved and reduced compatibility with sustainability criteria. Wording of certain policies could be reassessed**

2.0 Introduction

- 2.1 The first Deposit Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan was placed in deposit in August 2000. A number of representations were received and the WPA has produced a number of Proposed Changes to the Plan in the light of those representations and to update the Plan. These are incorporated in the Revised Deposit Plan.
- 2.2 The first Deposit Plan was subject to an Environmental Appraisal. This document is intended to update the earlier version taking account of the proposed changes to the Plan, new guidance affecting local plans and developments in best practice in environmental appraisal that have occurred since the previous EA was undertaken.
- 2.3 Strategic environmental appraisal (SEA) of the revised deposit focuses largely on the proposed changes to the Plan. The revised deposit Plan retains the waste management scenarios developed in the deposit version and proposes the same spatial strategy. Consequently, the EA of these sections of the deposit Plan remains valid for the proposed changes and these elements of the Plan have not been subjected to a revised SEA at this stage.
- 2.4 The appraisal identifies key proposed changes, reviews EA best practice and the scoping exercise and appraises proposed policy changes against sustainability criteria, before drawing conclusions on the environmental implications of the proposed changes.

3.0 Key proposed changes

3.1 Relatively few significant changes are proposed to the deposit Plan. A number of policies have been amended in order to reflect altered Government planning policy guidance or waste management targets, or to meet valid objections to the first deposit version. In places the waste planning authority (WPA) has sought to strengthen and/or clarify the degree of protection afforded interests of acknowledged importance and a number of additional sites have been added and some deleted from the deposit Plan (WLP17).

4.0 Review of best practice and scoping exercise

Best Practice

4.1 EA is continuing to evolve. PPG12¹ requires 'full environmental appraisal' of development plans and notes that sustainable development is not limited to environmental concerns, but encompasses economic and social issues. Development plan best practice is moving towards 'sustainability appraisals' or 'strategic environmental appraisals' (SEA), which take in a wider range of sustainability indicators, embracing the comprehensive aim of sustainable development, rather than focusing more simply on the potential environmental impacts of a development plan.

Scoping

4.2 EA of the deposit draft Plan was carried out using a series of scoping and sustainability criteria developed in the period leading up to the appraisal. Over the intervening period, planning policy against which the Plan was scoped has evolved and it is important to take account of the most up to date policy when carrying out SEA of the proposed changes.

Key Findings of Scoping Exercise

- 4.3 **Targets.** A clearer correlation between arisings, targets and number of different types of facility required could be considered.
- 4.4 **Economic Development.** The Plan does not fully exploit opportunities to support economic development or employment creation.
- 4.6 **Environmental Protection.** Changes to WLP9 should be considered against the objectives in PPG10 and other relevant policy guidance.
- 4.7 **Nature Conservation.** Careful consideration should be given to the degree of protection offered by re-worded policy WLP10 and new policy WLP10a [*now WLP11*], particularly in the light of advice in Government policy advice.
- 4.8 **Environmental Health.** Consideration could be given to provision of additional information on the potential air quality impacts of the spatial strategy where available, in terms of emissions from traffic and waste facilities.

¹ Planning Policy Guidance Note 12: Development Plans (Dec 1999)

5.0 Waste management scenarios (including impact of new data on proposed scenarios)

5.1 Since the publication of the Deposit Plan, the publication of the Environment Agency's Strategic Waste Management Assessment (SWMA) for the East of England (October 2000) has made available new data that could influence the statistical basis of the Plan. Uncertainties over future waste management practices and concerns over the level of confidence of the data in the SWMA, which has a high margin for error, are sufficient to conclude that a re-modelling of the WLP data is unnecessary.

6.0 Spatial Strategy

6.1 The spatial strategy proposed in the deposit Waste Local Plan takes into consideration the proximity principle and sustainable transport principles, as well as the environmental effects of locating waste facilities in certain areas. These principles and considerations continue to be embodied in existing and new policy guidance and the revised deposit Plan does not propose any changes to the overall spatial strategy, although a number of changes to proposed sites are incorporated.

7.0 Sustainability Criteria

7.1 Changes to EA best practice also impact upon sustainability criteria used to appraise the Plan. More recent SEAs have used a set of criteria slightly expanded from those used to appraise the deposit draft Plan, taking into account the Government produced indicators for sustainable development in the UK². Proposed changes to policies were appraised to determine compatibility with revised criteria. Key results of policy appraisal are reproduced below.

Assessment

Policy	Impact of Changes
WLP9	Greater degree of protection to the identified interests of importance, bringing improved compatibility with certain relevant sustainability criteria.
WLP10	Apparently reduced level of protection for areas of local importance. Compatibility with the biodiversity indicator is therefore reduced.
WLP10a [now WLP11]	Protection of protected species is potentially weakened and therefore scores less well against biodiversity criteria.
WLP17[now WLP18]	Proposed changes may have implications in terms of air quality and landscape impacts in locations previously unaffected by EfW development and choice and flexibility in the Cambridge area. Increased flexibility for locating EfW should be balanced against greater public uncertainty.

² Quality of life counts. Indicators for a strategy for sustainable development in the United Kingdom: a baseline assessment. (DETR Dec 1999)

WLP19 [now WLP20]	Potentially negative impact on a number of sustainability criteria, such as built environment, landscape and amenity indicators, all of which could be affected by new HWRC facilities, even if only to an 'acceptable' degree. Conversely, the change has a positive impact upon the unemployment indicator, as new facilities will require new staff.
WLP26 [now WLP27]	May have wider adverse impacts on built environment and degradation/regeneration criteria and may also widen impacts on amenity to areas outside those considered for EfW development in the deposit Plan.

8. Summary of policy performance

- 8.1 Revised policies were tested for compatibility with all other Plan policies using a grading system to identify degrees of compatibility and conflict. Overall, the majority of policies scored well in terms of internal compatibility.

Supplementary to Appendix 3 - the Proposed Modifications (May 2003)

1 Summary of Findings

- There are few significant policy changes in the proposed modifications to the Plan and the findings of the strategic environmental appraisal (SEA) show no major incompatibilities with appraisal criteria.
- The majority of policy changes result in improved performance when policies are appraised against SEA criteria. Many of the changes seek to enhance policy clarity in relation to national guidance and local circumstances.
- The proposed changes to Policy WLP8 are worded in such a way as to offer adequate protection to Green Belt interests, whilst introducing flexibility to allow certain appropriate types of development in the Green Belt in special circumstances. There were no changes to the appraisal findings.
- The proposed changes to Policy WLP17 [*now WLP18*] are perhaps the most significant, and involve the introduction of a new allocated site and area of search, and the removal of a requirement to demonstrate that proposals in non-allocated areas must demonstrate that allocated sites are not available. The SEA process reveals that the proposed modifications have no significant negative impact on policy performance against sustainability criteria.
- Overall, the SEA of the policies shows that no new significant barriers to achieving sustainable development are presented by the proposed modifications.

2 Purpose of Document

- 2.1 The first Deposit Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (WLP) was placed on deposit in August 2000. A number of representations were received and the Waste Planning Authority (WPA) incorporated its response to these into the Revised Deposit Plan. Outstanding objections to the First Deposit Plan, along with objections to changes made in the Revised Deposit Plan were considered at a Public Local Inquiry between 23rd July and 18th November 2002. The Inspector's Report was published in December 2002 and the WPA has considered the Inspector's comments and made proposed modifications to the Plan.
- 2.2 The first Deposit Plan and the revised Deposit Plan were each subject to environmental appraisal. This document is intended to update the previous strategic environmental appraisal SEA, taking account of the proposed modifications to the Plan.

- 2.3 The findings of this strategic environmental appraisal (SEA) will be considered and incorporated into the proposed modifications, which will be placed on deposit for six weeks. The WLP is due to be adopted in Summer 2003.
- 2.4 This SEA focuses on the proposed modifications to the Plan and is intended as a supplementary appraisal to the environmental appraisals produced for the deposit and revised deposit draft Plans.
- 2.5 The proposed modifications retain the waste management scenarios developed in the deposit and revised versions and proposes the same spatial strategy. Consequently, the appraisal of these sections of the previous versions remains valid for the proposed changes and these elements of the Plan have not been subjected to a revised SEA at this stage.
- 2.6 The previous EA and SEA for the first and revised deposit drafts respectively examined SEA best practice and involved a scoping exercise. The review of best practice sought to ensure that the SEA methodology reflected the most up to date guidance. SEA criteria were reviewed in the scoping exercise against new relevant planning policy and guidance.
- 2.7 This report identifies key proposed policy modifications, appraises these against sustainability criteria and sets out brief conclusions.

3 Review of best practice and scoping exercise

- 3.1 The proposed modifications to the Plan have been made in response to the Inspector's Report into the Public Local Inquiry. At the Inquiry, the Plan and its policies were subject to close scrutiny against national and regional policy that was in place at the time. The proposed modifications are necessarily therefore made in response to the consideration of issues affecting the plan at a particular point in time, in the context of policies and guidance extant at that time. It is therefore not appropriate to carry out a further review of best practice or an additional scoping exercise to assess the proposed modifications.
- 3.2 Should any significant changes to policy and guidance have occurred in the intervening period, the Plan, when adopted, should be subject to an early review. Further, although the WPA is not obliged to accept the Inspector's recommendations, it must provide clear reasons for not doing so. Consequently the SEA process must be mindful of the detailed consideration of issues at the inquiry and the Inspector's findings. The policy appraisal findings in Section 5 include reference to the reasons for the proposed modifications, and generally these were to changes accord with the Inspector's recommendations.

4 Key proposed changes

- 4.1 The proposed policy modifications of the Plan have resulted in few significant policy changes. A number of policies have been amended in order to reflect the Public Local Inquiry and the Inspectors Report. In places the WPA has sought to strengthen and/or clarify the degree of protection afforded interests of acknowledged importance, for

example amendments to WLP7 affords greater flexibility to development in the countryside and Policy WLP10 seeks to give specific protection to locally significant nature conservation sites.

- 4.2 It is understood that no significant changes have been made to waste management scenarios or the general spatial strategy and Babbie was not instructed to include these matters in the appraisal process. Policies WLP8 and WLP11 [now WLP12] are identified by the WPA as being potentially significant. Particular importance was attached to the appraisal of these policies.

5. Sustainability Appraisal of Policies

Criteria

- 5.1 As described above, a best practice review and scoping exercise are not appropriate at this stage in Plan preparation. Nevertheless, Babbie continually reviews changes to waste management policy and there have been no major changes to government Policy that would significantly affect the SEA criteria applicable to the Waste Local Plan.

Policy Appraisal

- 5.2 Proposed modifications to policies 3, 5, 12, 28 and 30 were subject to appraisal and no significant issues or changes to performance against environmental criteria were identified.

WLP7

- 5.3 Introduction of the word “significantly”, to accord with the Inspector’s recommendation, allows a greater degree of flexibility of waste development in the countryside. This reduces the policies compatibility with certain relevant criteria. However, the policy should still ensure positive protection of landscape character in accordance with national guidance.

WLP8

- 5.4 The proposed modification implements the Inspector’s recommendation, and reflects the potential acceptability of certain types of waste development within the Green Belt, and is worded in such a way as to afford appropriate protection to Green Belt principles. There are no changes to the compatibility of the policy against sustainability criteria. However, for purposes of clarity specific references could be made to the “Green Belt” in the first part of the second paragraph, as below:

“.....construction of new buildings for waste management purposes in the Green Belt will not be permitted;”

WLP10

- 5.5 The policy, in accordance with the Inspector’s recommendation, now gives greater certainty to the protection of locally significant nature conservation sites and consequently improves the compatibility with criteria for future impacts, choices available and the needs of future generations.

- WLP11** [now WLP12]
- 5.6 The policy modifications implement the Inspector's recommendations. The changes proposed give improved compatibility with the built environment and cultural heritage criteria. The grammatical structure of Clause A should be reviewed for the benefit of clarity, in particular the last line.
- WLP17** [now WLP18]
- 5.7 The main substantive changes to Policy WLP17 involve the addition of one new site and one new area of search to the list of sites identified for favourable consideration for major waste management facilities, to accord with the Inspector's recommendations.
- 5.8 The new site is The Carrops, Red Lodge, which was previously identified in the revised deposit Plan as a safeguarded site and is an existing waste transfer site. Additional waste management facilities at this site may result in an increase in local impacts. However, the information provided on the location of the site and in the Inspector's Report³ suggests that these increases would be insignificant in the overall consideration of the performance of Policy WLP17 against SEA criteria.
- 5.9 The new area of search is the 'Cambridge Area'. This is a new area allocated in order to meet an identified need for new non-landfill waste management capacity in the Cambridge area, in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation. The information provided in the Inspector's Report suggests that an area of search approach was chosen, rather than identifying specific sites, in order to build a degree of flexibility into the Plan, that will allow the development of waste management facilities in appropriate locations to deal with the expected and planned future growth of Cambridge. Whilst areas of search lack the certainty of identifying specific sites, it would seem to be the appropriate course of action in this specific case, and selection of sites for development within the area of search would need to be in accordance with the other Plan policies, which seek to afford an adequate degree of protection to interests of environmental importance.
- 5.10 Additionally, the last paragraph of the revised deposit Plan policy, referring to the consideration of non-allocated sites for major waste management uses, is proposed to be deleted. This deletion removes an element of inflexibility in the policy, and would have the effect of allowing planning permission for major facilities at non-allocated sites, subject to compatibility with other Plan policies. The Plan contains policies against which proposals for all types of waste development would be judged and each proposal would have to demonstrate that it was environmentally acceptable. Further, alternative planning permissions for new major facilities would be likely to be in replacement of, rather than in addition to, permissions for schemes at allocated sites, in the context of Plan policies requiring consideration of BPEO. Such permissions at non-allocated

³ *Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough waste local plan - Inspector's Report (December 2002)*

sites should not therefore result in increased environmental and other impacts. It is therefore not considered that the deletion of this paragraph would have a significant negative impact on policy performance against sustainability criteria.

5.11 A number of changes are also proposed to site and area of search boundaries, including:

- **WLP17(c)** Reduced allocated area
The proposed change is in accordance with Inspector's recommendation, does not appear to have adverse implications for the waste management potential of the site and may have some nature conservation benefits.
- **WLP17(d)** Removal of part of area of search
The proposed change does not appear to have adverse implications for the waste management potential of the site.
- **WLP17(e)** Identification of a specific site, instead of a larger area of search.
The proposed change improves the certainty of the waste local plan proposals and improves compatibility with the development of the new Hampton township. The allocation does not appear to have adverse implications for the waste management potential of the site.
- **WLP17(f)** Small extension to site boundary
The change is proposed to reflect the up to date planning situation at the site. There appear to be no significant implications for assessment against sustainability criteria.

WLP21 [*now WLP22*]

5.12 The policy modifications accord with the Inspector's recommendation and provide greater flexibility for the development of waste transfer stations, at sites where they form an integral part of a major waste management facility. The proposed change has a resultant potentially positive impact on a number of sustainability criteria, such as energy efficient transport, air quality, efficient land use, current needs and resource efficiency.