

# Wiltshire & Swindon Waste Core Strategy Examination

## Session 4: Identification and Safeguarding

### AGENDA

The issues/ matters for discussion:

- How useful is the WCS Key Diagram? Should it identify Strategic Sites? Does its identification of such sites add to its status and contribution as a spatial plan?
- If the Key Diagram is to identify Strategic Sites, should these be
  - (a) existing Strategic Sites only, including those not to be retained as such (e.g. the site in the far NW of the County); or
  - (b) future Strategic Sites insofar as these are currently known, including those existing sites to be retained as such (and omitting those not to be retained)?
- Should the Key Diagram distinguish between types of Strategic sites (insofar as these are currently known) – in particular, between those on which a range of future waste uses would be acceptable, and those which would be specialised (e.g. inert/CDE landfilling)? How practical would it be at this stage to do so?
- Should the Key Diagram indicate (e.g. by a specific number of circles within the Key box) the scale of the additional provision which it is necessary to make within the Plan area during the CS timespan?
- To what extent have those Strategic Sites so far identified (that is, existing sites) already been assessed for their future performance against the criteria set out in PPS10 paragraph 21(i)? If not, is it helpful to include them on the Key Diagram?
- In what way(s) does the WCS, and particularly Policy WCS4 on safeguarding, provide for the eventual cessation of waste uses on any existing site? Does the WCS pay sufficient regard to PPS10 ¶21, point (-)3 on cumulative effects?
- Does the WCS contain a commitment to the retention/expansion of waste development at Studley Grange and at Brickworth Quarry? Would such a commitment, in respect of either site, be appropriate at this policy level?
- Under what circumstances would waste sites be safeguarded under WCS4? Once planning permission has been granted for waste development, that site appears to be safeguarded even if it was not the landowner who applied. If the permission were not implemented, would an alternative use be allowed under WCS4 (a) within the 3-year permission period (b) at the end of the 3-year period, or (c) not at all, even if the site were surplus to current requirements? Would Policy WCS4 be likely to inhibit flexibility, or not?