

## 2.0 CHAPTER 2 – THE CONTEXT FOR THE PLAN

### 2.1 Table 2.1

#### Objections

74/R1	Mr S Eades North Wiltshire Friends of the Earth
224/R7	Mr P Matthews
233/1	Mrs A Cakebread, Godshill Parish Council
351/5	Mr W Laramee, Environmental Services Association
678/R1	Ms V Neal Salisbury Friends of the Earth

#### Summary of Objections

- 2.1.1 (a) The Plan over emphasises municipal waste, which is 28.5% of the total waste stream. Policies should specify industrial and commercial waste producers' responsibilities. Planning permissions should include conditions specifying the route along which waste is transported.
- (b) ‘Private operators’ should be added to table 2.1.
- (c) The Environment Agency regulates all waste to energy proposals. Table 2.1 and paragraph 8.4.10 should not indicate otherwise. The size of ‘small’ waste to energy proposals should be defined.
- (d) The public should not merely be 'asked' to take an active role in recycling and minimisation. Stronger leadership is required - people should be challenged and told what to do.

#### Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.1.2 Godshill Parish Council is concerned that the Plan does not give sufficient weight to dealing with commercial and industrial waste. It argues that policies should set out commercial and industrial waste producers' responsibilities and that planning permissions should include conditions specifying the route along which waste is to be transported.
- 2.1.3 I appreciate, that many of the Government’s targets are directed at municipal and household waste and that a significant proportion of the Plan is devoted to dealing with these wastes. Nevertheless, the aims and objectives of the Plan, and its policies, are directed at the waste stream as a whole, including commercial and industrial waste. Moreover, the Plan recognises the impact that the transport of waste by road can have on the environment and seeks to encourage the best and most efficient use of the defined Strategic and Local Lorry Routes for the County. In particular, Policy 6 seeks to control the impact of waste management facilities including the effects of additional traffic movements. Under the circumstances, I conclude that the objection does not justify a modification to the Plan, or to Table 2.1 in particular, which is intended to list the various parties involved in waste management.
- 2.1.4 However, I am mindful that the FDDP did not include waste contractors in Table 2.1. This was clearly an oversight as they are obviously of utmost importance in delivering waste management solutions. Nevertheless, as they are included in the Table in the RDDP, I see no need to further modify the Plan in response to the original objection raised by the Environmental Services Association regarding the lack of reference to private sector companies.
- 2.1.5 Objections are made to the statement in Table 2.1 that small waste to energy proposals and other waste treatment plant will be regulated by local authorities. It is argued that the regulation of all waste to energy proposals is the responsibility of the Environment Agency. Moreover the North Wiltshire Branch of Friends of the Earth are concerned that the term ‘small’ should be accurately defined.

- 2.1.6 I am mindful that certain activities, such as the burning of waste as a fuel in an appliance having a net rated thermal input of less than 0.4 megawatts, are exempt from waste management licensing. The WPAs point out that facilities qualifying for exemption are relatively small and are normally associated with the heating of buildings, rather than the production of electricity.
- 2.1.7 The licensing regime allows exemptions in cases where it is considered activities are adequately covered by other regulations. It therefore seems to me that the text in Table 2.1 is correct. Moreover, as the Waste Management Licensing Regulations set out the precise details of facilities which are exempt, it would be unnecessarily repetitive for such details to be included in Table 2.1. To do so would extend an already substantial document. I conclude that the Plan should not be modified in response to these objections.
- 2.1.8 Salisbury Friends of the Earth (FOE) submits that the involvement of householders and the public in general will be essential if there is to be a significant change in the amount of municipal waste produced. They argue that Table 2.1 should indicate that the public will be ‘challenged’ rather ‘asked’ to take an active role in recycling and minimisation. The WPAs should provide stronger leadership and tell the public what to do. The FOE points out that a recent survey by the Environment Agency indicated that 90% of those surveyed would be certain or very likely to sort their waste if Councils provided and collected containers for recycling. People are willing to co-operate with recycling provided their local Council gives them support.
- 2.1.9 I agree that it will be necessary to provide incentives and strong leadership if significant progress is to be made in recycling and waste minimisation. The use of the word ‘challenged’ reflects this approach rather more than ‘asked’. I note that the WPAs support such a change and I shall recommend that the Plan be modified accordingly.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1.10 I recommend that Table 2.1 be modified by replacing the words ‘are increasingly being asked’ with ‘will increasingly be challenged’ in the box relating to householders and the public.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 2.2 Section 2. 2 - Policy Overview

### Objections

217/2	Ms A G Stanton
227/7	Mr D Quinn Calne Town Council
235/9	Ms M Willmot Salisbury Friends of the Earth
268/1	Ms S L Layfield
368/32	Mrs J Heselwood

### Summary of Objections

- 2.2.1 (a) The Plan should not seek to identify sites until the Municipal Waste Management Strategy (MWMS) is adopted and the scale and type of required facilities is determined. The WPAs do not appear to support kerbside collection for recycling.
- (b) Zero waste should be the vision for the future.
- (c) There is a lack of transparency on Waste Strategy and insufficient co-ordination between the MWMS and WLP.

### Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions





























