

**Joint Advisory Committee for Strategic Planning  
Wednesday, 29 September 2010, 10am, County Hall, Preston**

**Minutes**

**Present**

**Members**

Councillor Ian Fowler	Blackpool Council (Chair)
Councillor Tony Humphreys	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
County Councillor Tim Ashton	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Albert Atkinson	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Malcolm Barron	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Michael Green	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Howard Henshaw	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Jennifer Mein	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Miles Parkinson	Lancashire County Council
County Councillor Paul Rigby	Lancashire County Council

**Officers**

Steve Browne	Lancashire County Council
Rea Psillidou	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
Jane Saleh	Blackpool Council
Ian Blinkho	Lancashire County Council
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council
Joanne Mills / Andy Milroy	Lancashire County Council (Minutes)
Louise Nurser	Lancashire County Council
Richard Sharples	Lancashire County Council

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dave Harling (Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council) – Councillor Tony Humphreys substituted.

**Disclosure of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

None Disclosed

**Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 June 2010**

The minutes were agreed as a correct and accurate record.

**Urgent Business**

No additional items of urgent business were notified to the chair.

## **Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Outcomes Report on Addendum to Consultation on Possible Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies**

Marcus Hudson presented the report which set out the main issues that have been raised as part of the consultation that took place between May and June 2010 (extended to 21 June 2010) on the proposals contained in the Appendix to the report (circulated) to the Possible Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

Topics included:

- Managing Road Transport
- Built Waste Facilities

The Outcomes Report outlined common issues raised by those making representations and an accompanying officer response. These issues were previously reported verbally at the Joint Advisory Committee meeting of 22 June 2010, and informed the content of the Submission Version of the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (reported at Item 6A to this meeting)

### ***Managing Road Transport***

In relation to Kellet Quarries Haulage Road and Middleton Junction Marcus explained that officers recommend that both proposals are taken forward as they consider that the proposals are consistent with the objectives of the Core Strategy, and do not raise fundamental issues that cannot be resolved at the planning application stage.

### ***Allocation of Built Waste Facilities***

Marcus Hudson summarised each of the preferred locations for smaller built waste facilities and explained that officers had considered detailed alternatives, including other sites and potential for a site redesign at Flensburg Way but considered that the proposed extension to the Household Waste Recycling Centre to be the best solution and recommended that it be brought forward.

Marcus noted that the more common concerns focused around a perceived increase of HGV's in the area, the uncertainty about suitable uses for the sites, and an inconsistent geographical spread of sites. Other comments related to a perceived detrimental effect on business operating in the area; this was based on the environmental impacts of some existing waste related businesses. It was added that as it was not possible to predict how the waste industry would develop in the future it would be inappropriate to allocate sites for specific uses, beyond the proposals contained in the Submission Version (reported at Item 6A) to distinguish between strategic and local sites, and that planning applications would determine the suitability of a site for specific uses.

**1. Resolved:-** The Joint Advisory Committee for Strategic Planning agreed to the recommendation detailed in the report, and endorsed the officer responses set out in the Outcomes Report as a basis for moving forward with Submission Version of Minerals and Waste Sites Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document.

## **Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Submission Version Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document and Proposals Map**

Marcus Hudson presented the report and explained that this report and its proposals followed lengthy consultation which began at the beginning of the year. Marcus outlined the process involved regarding submission of the Development Plan document and explained that recommendations made by the Joint Advisory Committee would then need to be approved by the Joint Committee for Strategic Planning and in turn by each authority's Full Council. The document will then be published in the new year for inspection and comments invited from the public and other stakeholders over a period of six weeks before the document and a full record of representations is submitted to the Secretary of State, who will appoint an independent planning inspector to consider the Development Plan Document at an Examination in Public.

Marcus Hudson updated the Committee following a meeting between several County Councillors and officers and representatives of ARROW Northwest, on 24 September 2010, and summarised the points made by ARROW. Following that meeting, officers had been asked by the County Council's Cabinet Member for Environment & Planning to explore the opportunity for introducing greater safeguards into the policy, to support the Core Strategy's objectives for minimising waste requiring final disposal, promoting the development of environmental technologies, providing a sufficient capacity of facilities to meet net self-sufficiency, allowing waste to be dealt with as close to its source as possible, and minimising harm to local communities, which would meet concerns expressed by ARROW Northwest and others.

An amendment to the Submission Version of the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (Item 6A – Appendix 'A') was tabled at the meeting, to amend section 4.3 Hazardous Landfill (page 25) by replacing the wording in the document presented at Appendix 'A' with the following wording:

### **4.3 Hazardous Landfill Policy LF 3 - Site for Hazardous Landfill**

Development will be supported for the disposal of residues from the treatment of hazardous waste that cannot be recycled or recovered on land adjacent to and as an extension to Whitemoss Landfill [ALC2 ], only when the applicant can demonstrate:

- there is a continuing national or regional need for that disposal to take place at Whitemoss landfill; and
- that all possible alternatives to landfilling residues are exhausted, and the only residues that are counted towards need are those that cannot be recycled or recovered or otherwise treated at another facility nationally, or else deposited at a suitable licenced landfill nearer to where residues will originate; and
- that the permitted capacity is below the equivalent of five years predicted need and that this capacity taken together with a new extension will not exceed five years predicted need; and

- the application is accompanied by a planning obligation to give effect to full restoration of the existing and extended site by 2018.

## **Justification**

**4.3.1** Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy requires the maintenance of adequate capacity to meet the predicted demand for hazardous waste. Policy LF3 identifies a site which could provide capacity during the plan period for those anticipated waste arising without encouraging excessive landfilling. The Defra Strategy for Hazardous Waste Management promotes the waste hierarchy, with emphasis put on reducing the amounts of hazardous wastes, and recycling and recovering what is produced, with disposal being a last resort. This policy provides for exhausting all alternatives to depositing the residues of hazardous wastes at Whitemoss landfill, and limits the residues that can be counted towards demonstrating a continuing national or regional need to those that cannot be recycled or recovered, or otherwise treated to reduce their quantity and/or environmental impact, at a facility elsewhere nationally.

**4.3.2** Year on year the amounts of hazardous waste sent to landfill are reducing, due to the implementation of further strict controls over the type of wastes that can be landfilled and better performance on recycling and recovering value from hazardous wastes. As an indication of the success of the UK in driving waste up the waste hierarchy, the amount of hazardous waste disposed of to landfill fell from approximately 2 million tonnes in 2000, to just over 1 million tonnes in 2008 (representing 16% of hazardous wastes managed in 2008). However, there remains a diminishing but continuing need for disposal of hazardous residues.

**4.3.3** Whitemoss landfill site is one of a limited number of hazardous waste landfills and provides a national and regional significant waste management facility. The site contributes to the Plan area's ability to work towards a net-self sufficient position for hazardous waste management, in which broadly equivalent volumes of hazardous waste enter and leave the area, expressed in Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy. In 2008, some 100,000 tonnes of hazardous waste from other areas was imported into the Plan area, with around 125,000 tonnes of hazardous waste produced in the Plan area exported outside to other areas.

## **Implementation**

**4.3.4** Approval of applications subject to appropriate conditions, or refusal of applications if proposals are unsatisfactory; to be monitored and reported in the Annual Monitoring Report - the remaining landfill void space is reported in the annual monitoring report. Allocations that are not taken up will be reviewed and updated at least every 5 years.

**4.3.5** Applications will need to be accompanied by a full and detailed analysis of the types of residues predicted to be deposited, to include:

25ission Version

- the pre-treatment method, under the requirements of the Landfill regulations, expected to be applied to the type of waste;
- what potential each waste type has, in full or in part, to be fully recovered and turned into one or more alternative, quality products;

- what has to be done to produce a fully-recovered, non-waste product; and
- what facilities or markets there are on a national scale to undertake this, either existing at the time of the application or through emerging technologies.

**4.3.6** Only those residues which are not recyclable or recoverable through this analysis, and for which there is no nearer suitable alternative licenced landfill, can be counted towards the assessment of need. In turn, this assessment of need will also inform a maximum position for five years capacity that will not be exceeded.

**2. Resolved:-** The Joint Advisory Committee resolved to recommend to the Joint Committee for Strategic Planning that:

- (a) The Revised Submission Version of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document as updated with the approved revisions made in connection with section 4.3/Policy LF3, and attached at Appendices 'A' and 'B', subject to any decision on the Queensway and Whitehill sites, together with Proposals Map (Appendix 'C'), Habitat Regulations Screening Report (Appendix 'D') and an accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Report (Appendix 'E'), be referred to the Full Councils of the three constituent Waste and Mineral Planning Authorities for approval and authorisation for publication and the submission thereafter to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
- (b) The Chief Planning Officers of Lancashire County, Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen Councils be given delegated authority to propose minor amendments to improve the clarity of the document, or Proposals Map, and which do not alter the substance of the document when submitting the document to the Secretary of State. These amendments are to be collated in a list form.

### **Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Report on proposed allocations for local built waste facilities – Fylde Coastal Towns**

Marcus Hudson presented the report and explained that following the Committee meeting held on 22 June 2010 the Joint Advisory Committee had requested officers to consider an alternative to both the Whitehills and Queensway sites for smaller built waste facilities. Officers have investigated a further site at Westby and have concluded that it would not be appropriate to be taken forward as an alternative to be consulted on, for reasons of availability, acceptability and deliverability, specifically that there is no current interest from the owner and the site has significant access issues constraining any further opening up of the site.

Marcus outlined the relative planning merits of the Whitehills and Queensway sites, setting out some more background information on the scale and type of local built waste management facility that could be accommodated under the proposed policy wording.

In conclusion, it was noted that the Whitehills site has benefits over the Queensway site and can appropriately be taken forward into the Submission Version of the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. An alternative to this course of action detailed in the report would be to rely on the Hillhouse site as the preferred location to manage commercial waste produced across the Fylde catchment.

**3. Resolved:-** The Joint Advisory Committee agreed to a revised recommendation as follows:

That, subject to the recommendations relating to the Submission Version of the document which are found in a separate report to this Committee, the Joint Advisory Committee recommends an appropriate network of site(s) to accommodate built waste management facilities in the Fylde catchment, namely that:

1. The Queensway proposal is not taken forward into the Submission Version of the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, as this does not provide a satisfactory arrangement.
2. The Whitehills site is proposed as the preferred location for local built waste management facilities.

**Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework:  
Regulation 27 Consultation for Site Allocations and Development Management  
Development Plan documents**

Louise Nurser presented the report which described the consultation and publicity that will take place relating to the Submission Version of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

**4. Resolved:-** The Joint Advisory Committee notes the contents of the report and recommends to the Joint Committee for Strategic Planning and the Full Councils of the three plan authorities that the pre-submission consultation goes ahead in January 2011.

**Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework:  
Local Development Scheme 2010-2014**

Louise Nurser presented the report which outlined that the County Council is required to produce and maintain a Local Development Scheme setting out the timetable and procedures for producing documents in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

Progress towards producing these documents is measured against the Development Scheme and reported to the Secretary of State on an annual basis. The milestones set by the Development Scheme are also included in the Authority's business plans.

Louise explained that work on the Development Framework has progressed significantly since the last development scheme, and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD is now at an advanced stage. Meanwhile, changes in the legislation (particularly regarding the process around consultations) and significant public interest generated by the site allocations process have created considerable challenges.

With these challenges in mind, it is now anticipated that the final parts to the Development Framework containing detailed development management and site specific policies will be adopted by March 2012.

**5. Resolved:-** The Joint Advisory Committee endorses the revised Development Scheme and recommend its approval by the Joint Committee and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State.

**Date of Next Meeting**

To be confirmed. Marcus Hudson proposed that a meeting be held in early March 2011 to allow the Committee to receive a report on the consultation on the Submission Version to be published in the new year, and the nature of representations received during that process.