

Main Matter 6 Statement: Non Hazardous Waste Disposal (Policies 2 and 7)

Key Issue: Whether the future need for non hazardous residual waste disposal is based in a sound and robust evidence base.

1. Matter 2 Statement sets out and provides a justification the evidence used to identify the capacity requirements for Greater Manchester throughout the Plan period.
2. In relation to non hazardous waste disposal, the capacity requirement is set out under paragraph 2.2, p 27 'Headline waste capacity requirements' of the Submitted Waste Plan and in more detail between pages 39 - 43.
3. Whilst Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment (**TD010**) sets ambitious targets for diversion of waste from landfill there is still a requirement to provide capacity for the residual waste following recycling and recovery.

Key Issue: Whether the identified locations for disposal are the most appropriate taking account of site constraints and deliverability.

4. The criteria used to select sites/areas (including locations for residual waste disposal) for allocation within the Waste Plan is set out within Site Search Methodology (**TD017**). This document sets out how the methodology was used at each stage of Plan preparation.
5. Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal Report March 2009 (**CDC012**) set the context for future residual waste disposal opportunities across Greater Manchester including the specific locational requirements and constraints for such development in Greater Manchester. Pages 36-46 of the Residual Waste Disposal Report summarises that whilst it would be desirable to guide the location of future landfill sites using the spatial considerations used to guide the location of built waste facilities, the constraints (see Maps 3 and 4 after pg 38) in Greater Manchester meant this may not possible. This conclusion was supported by the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (**CDC013**, pg 15, paragraph 4.4.4).

6. All landfill sites included at this stage were removed from further consideration following consultation (as set out within **CDC014**); however several extensions to existing landfill facilities were brought forward for allocation by operator Viridor Waste Management Ltd. These extensions were subject to the normal assessments described in the Waste Plan Site Search Methodology (**TD017**) and Sustainability Appraisal. Notwithstanding the difficulty in identifying sites for residual waste disposal and their stringent locational requirements, the three extensions allocated for residual waste disposal perform well in relation to the Waste Plan's spatial considerations and it is clear from this process that these sites are the least constrained when compared to the initial list of sites that were considered. An additional consultation on the three extensions to existing landfill sites was undertaken in July 2009 (**CDC016**) and they were included as allocations at Publication stage in November 2010 (**CDC025**).
7. In terms of deliverability, the sites allocated within the Waste Plan are supported by the site operator Viridor Waste Management Ltd, who has made it clear that effective mitigation is possible to overcome the site constraints as set out within the Site Profile included in the Submitted Waste Plan.

Specific Location: W21 Whitehead Landfill

(i) Access

8. The assessment of the site through the Sustainability Appraisal (**SD004**) recognises that the site has an excellent access to the primary road network and the motorway. Traffic from the site currently uses the link road to the A580 thereby avoiding Astley Green.
9. Residents at Astley Green are concerned that the access road junction to the A580 is inadequate and do not want heavy traffic to use the A572 Leigh Road, Boothstown/Worsely Route. However, no existing issues relating to the existing access or the junction with the A580 were revealed during preparation of the Waste Plan. It should be noted that the district Highways Department would be consulted on any application to extend the landfill and this issue would be considered at that stage.

(ii) Other local impacts

10. W21 (Whitehead Landfill) was awarded a Band C through the Sustainability Appraisal (**SD004**), although the development of a landfill site would not have a significant impact on the social cohesion or the economic potential of the

area, it could potentially have an adverse impact on a number of environmental designations surrounding the site as follows:-

- The site is on a major aquifer;
- Flood Zone 3 borders the site to the south-east ;
- Whitehead Brook runs along the east and south-east of the site;
- Grade C SBI Marsh at Lower Green is adjacent to Area B (as shown on the Whitehead Landfill site profile included within the Submitted Waste Plan)
- The Mossland Heartland is located near to the south of the site boundary
- Botany Bay Wood Grade A SBI is located 1k south east of the site boundary.

11. Other local impacts include:-

- Green Belt
- Ecology
- Impact of Odour, vermin, birds, noise vibration and litter
- Adverse impact due to the raised landform

12. The Sustainability Appraisal concludes that the full impact on protected species and the environmental designations needs to be assessed as early as possible in the planning process (submission of a planning application) in order to be in a position to know the full effect of impacts before any application is determined. Any approval would need to make full provision for mitigation.

Issue (iii) Would removal of the site from Policy 7 make the DPD unsound?

13. PPS10 paragraph 3, page 5 states that WPAs should “provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities”. This is a key statement, as although it is known that waste developments are never popular they are needed and if Greater Manchester is producing waste it needs to be able to manage this.

14. The response to Matter 4 highlights the need for the inclusion of the residual waste disposal sites as identified through the site search process which include Whitehead. Whitehead is a key site and if this site was to be removed it would question the ability of the Waste Plan to manage waste arisings over the Plan period in line with the requirements of PPs10 (paragraph 18 bullet

point 1) which states Waste Plan should “be able to demonstrate how capacity equivalent to at least ten years of the annual rates set out in the RSS could be provided”. As such this could result in the Plan being found unsound.

15. The Waste Plan clearly sets out the disposal capacity required over the Plan period through Policy 2, page 40 of the Submitted Waste Plan. Tables 6a and 6b specifically identify when there is a capacity gap, what capacity is required and when and where this capacity can be met i.e. through extensions to Pilsworth North, Bury and Whitehead, Wigan.
16. If Whitehead was to be removed from the Plan this would result in a loss of capacity of 4 million tonnes which would mean Greater Manchester no longer had sufficient capacity to manage its waste arisings and would need to export this waste outside the area.
17. The site search work detailed under matter 4 clearly sets out the process undertaken to find new disposal capacity and the only options available are those identified in the Plan,