

7.0 CHAPTER 7 – WASTE ELIMINATION, REDUCTION AND RE-USE

7.1 Paragraph 7.1.2

Objections

281/16	Mrs A Lock Corsham Civic Society
368/23,38,39	Mrs J Heselwood
368/39	Mrs J Heselwood
604/R2	Ms R Popplestone
659/R2	Ms S Thursby Gloucestershire County Council

Summary of Objections

7.1.1

- (a) The Plan should be more ambitious in aiming for zero waste, rather than merely seeking to implement the Government’s guidelines.
- (b) The WLP selects only some aspects of the zero waste approach and omits others.
- (c) The current arrangements in place between WCC, the District Councils and Hills Minerals and Waste contribute to the high volume of landfill. They do not provide an incentive to recycle in excess of a mutually agreed target.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

7.1.2 With regard to objections arguing that the Plan is not sufficiently ambitious in aiming towards “Zero Waste”, I accept that a major change will be required in society’s attitude and approach to waste in general, if a sustainable system of waste management is to be achieved. The vision of ‘Zero Waste’ is a radical and commendable aim and I can see benefits in directing policies towards such an aim. However, the WLP must also be a practical document that sets out realistic objectives on which reasonable and balanced policies can be based. It must provide a framework that enables adequate provision to be made for waste management facilities to meet the needs of the area during the Plan period.

7.1.3 The Government acknowledges that its recycling targets will not be easily achieved. This is confirmed in the ‘Review of the Requirements for Waste Management Facilities’ undertaken by consultants on behalf of the WPAs, which concluded that the short-term recycling/composting targets for municipal and household wastes are particularly challenging. In my opinion, it would be unrealistic for the Plan to set more ambitious targets aimed at zero waste and I conclude that it should not be modified in response to these objections.

7.1.4 I deal with an objection to the current waste management contract with Hills Minerals and Waste Ltd at paragraph 3.13.8 of this report. Although I understand objectors concerns and agree that incentives to maximise recycling should be encouraged, the details and operation of the waste management contract with Hills Minerals and Waste Ltd is a matter for the parties involved and the relevant MWMSs, not the WLP.

RECOMMENDATION

7.1.5 I recommend that no modification be made to the Plan in response to these objections.

7.2 Policy 9

Objections

21/4	Ms J Hindley
46/13,14	Ms S Ziessen
165/1,2	Sherston Parish Council

Objection Coding

XXX/XX A N Other = Respondent No./Objection No. Name
RX = objection to Revised Deposit Draft **W** = Withdrawn

CW = Conditional Withdrawal

Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Local Plan 2011 – Inspector’s Report Section 7
– Objections to Chapter 7 of the Plan

215/40	Mrs C G Carver Devizes and Marlborough Friends of the Earth
230/8	Ms S Singleton
251/1	Dr S Page
340/12	Mr B Smith Environment Agency
349/6	Mr M Oliver Viridor Waste Management
375/7	Ms D Kulburn

Summary of Objections

7.2.1

- (a) The policy should indicate that all new development will be required to incorporate waste minimisation and re-use measures.
- (b) Policies related to minimisation and re-use of waste are inappropriate in a land use planning document.
- (c) District Councils should undertake kerbside collections for recycling and composting to reduce landfill.
- (d) No charges should be applied for the collection of garden waste and bulky items.
- (e) Reference should be made to the Schedules of Preferred areas, particularly for development involving the re-use of waste that requires specialist locations.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

7.2.2

Some objectors argue that all new development should incorporate waste minimisation and re-use measures. I note that although a requirement that consideration be given to the reduction, re-use and recycling of waste in development proposals is set out in Policy 10, Policy 9 is intended to give encouragement to all development which incorporates waste minimisation and re-use measures. However, I do not consider that it would be practical or reasonable to expect all new development, however small or whatever it may be, to include waste reduction measures.

7.2.3

Although I am mindful that a major change is necessary in society’s approach and attitude to waste, and that vigorous and radical methods will need to be adopted if waste recycling and reduction targets are to be met, the measures adopted must be both practical and reasonable. It seems to me that to require waste minimisation measures as part of a proposal for a house extension, for example, would be unduly zealous and impractical. Moreover, as Policy 10 is intended to deal with this matter, I conclude that Policy 9 should not be modified as suggested.

7.2.4

In contrast, Viridor Waste Management Ltds submits that policies related to the minimisation and re-use of waste are inappropriate in a land use planning document. I disagree. Waste elimination and re-use are at the top of the waste hierarchy and the need to tackle the growth in waste is at the heart of the Government’s waste strategy. These matters should be borne in mind when considering proposals for new development and the use of land. In my opinion, it is therefore appropriate that favourable consideration be given to development that helps to meet this aim. Moreover, consideration should be given to the amount of waste that will be generated by new development and any measures that may be taken to minimise the production of waste and the use of raw materials, and to maximise waste recovery. These are legitimate material considerations when considering land use proposals.

7.2.5

I deal with the issue of encouraging kerbside collection in various sections of this report, including sections 2.2, 4.1 and 4.3. I have no doubt that kerbside collection will prove to be an essential measure to achieve substantial increases in waste recycling and should form part of the strategy for dealing with municipal waste. For this reason, I recommend at paragraph 14.2.22 of the report that the Plan should encourage appropriate initiatives to increase recovery, such as kerbside recycling measures. However, kerbside recycling is not in itself a land use matter and, in my opinion, is only one of the methods and measures that will be necessary to achieve the recycling targets that have been set by the Government. I consider that decisions on the precise use of kerbside collections as a means of increasing recycling

should be dealt with by the MWMSs and conclude that no further modifications should be made to the Plan on this matter.

- 7.2.6 With regard to collection charges, it is arguable that the free collection of garden waste could create recycling problems and that it may be preferable to introduce measures to encourage householders to compost such waste at home. However, the issue of charging for the collection of garden waste and bulky items is a matter for the various Waste Collection Authorities and not the WLP.
- 7.2.7 In response to the FDDP, the EA argued that reference should be made to the Schedules of Preferred Areas, pointing out that some re-use initiatives require specialist locations. I consider that adequate references to this point have been included in the RDDP and conclude that no further modification is necessary despite the fact that the objection has not been withdrawn.

RECOMMENDATION

- 7.2.8 **I recommend that no modification be made to Policy 9.**

7.3 Paragraph 7.2.2

Objections

215/41,42 Mrs C G Carver Devizes and Marlborough Friends of the Earth
368/34 Mrs J Heselwood

Summary of Objections

- 7.3.1
- (a) There should be a policy detailing mechanisms for joint working of all authorities involved in waste management.
 - (b) The Plan should indicate that all those carrying out processes entitling them to payment of recycling credits will be paid such credits.
 - (c) The Paragraph should also encourage recycling.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.3.2 I agree with the WPAs that a policy setting out mechanisms for joint working of all authorities involved in waste management would not relate directly to the use of land and therefore it is doubtful that such a Policy would be appropriate in a WLP. Although the waste management responsibilities and broad relationships between the various authorities are given in Chapter 2 of the Plan, the joint strategy between the Waste Disposal Authorities and Waste Collection Authorities is set in the relevant MWMS. An MWMS should demonstrate how the collection and disposal authorities will work together to deliver Government targets and I note that the Wiltshire MWMS indicates that it is intended to provide leadership and direction to stakeholders with an interest in waste management. Although I agree that close working relationships will contribute to effective land use planning, it is for the MWMS to set out how such co-ordination is to be carried out. For these reasons, I conclude that it would be inappropriate to attempt to include a Policy in the WLP setting out a mechanism for joint working.
- 7.3.3 Similarly, it is not the function of the WLP to set out a Policy on the payment of recycling credits. It is not strictly a land use planning matter and in my opinion should not be included in the WLP. Government guidance indicates that MWMSs should set out authorities’ policies on the payment of recycling credits to third parties.

