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Summary of Key Points

1. This statement has been produced to assist the Examination process. It explains how and why the DPD was prepared. It contains the Council's response to all the representations made at Submission stage and it demonstrates how the Council believes that the Tests of Soundness have been met. The completed test of soundness toolkit is attached as Annex D. The schedule of responses to the representations is attached as Annex B.

2. The Council believes that the Waste Development Plan Document is sound. It is based on robust and comprehensive evidence, it has been widely consulted upon and it has been subject to Strategic Environmental Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment.

3. Nevertheless, the Council is keen to explore where the Plan can be improved, working with the Inspector and those who commented at Submission stage. A number of suggested changes are proposed and these can be found in Annex B.

A Note on the Planning Process

4. The Waste DPD deals with matters of principle and strategy, ie whether in principle a site is suitable for a particular type of development. This normally means assessing whether there are any “showstoppers” ie those things that might prevent the development from taking place at all. It also gives the opportunity to highlight issues that may need to be explored at later stages.

5. The details of a development and importantly how it might respond to any issues raised at the DPD “in principle” level, are dealt with at planning application stage. This is necessarily a much more detailed stage at which the design and operation of a development will be closely scrutinised in order to ensure that the development is acceptable, and that appropriate mitigation measures, if required, can be put in place. At this stage, for most major waste management development proposals, an Environmental Statement would be required in association with the planning application. Pollution control issues would be dealt with through application to the Environment Agency.

6. However, it is inevitable that in discussing issues of principle, matters of some detail will need to be explored. Particularly since some detailed matters have been raised in the representations. It is for this reason that the Council’s statements go into more detail than would normally be required at this level. This does not imply that the Council agrees that the DPD should make reference to all these issues, or indeed that these matters should in all cases influence the outcome at this level.

7. The purpose of the public examination is to enable the independent Planning Inspector to examine whether the Waste DPD is “sound”. The tests of soundness are set out in PPS12. The following paragraphs demonstrate how the Council believes these tests have been complied with.
Why we need a Waste DPD now

8. This Waste DPD plays a key role in ensuring that Plymouth can effectively and sustainably manage its waste. There are three key imperatives driving the need for this plan:

- The population of Plymouth is likely to grow significantly
- We need to improve the way we deal with our waste
- We have to deliver a sustainable solution to the needs of the city with some urgency

9. The Waste DPD is part of Plymouth’s Local Development Framework which is a comprehensive set of spatial plans for the city based on the vision to turn Plymouth into "one of Europe’s finest, most vibrant waterfront cities where an outstanding quality of life is enjoyed by everyone". Significant improvements will be made to Plymouth’s economy both in terms of job numbers and quality. Alongside this, Plymouth’s population could potentially reach between 300,000 and 350,000. A key element of the growth agenda is ensuring that infrastructure and services keep pace with the numbers of people. This includes the need to manage the waste generated by Plymouth’s existing and future population.

10. There can be no denial of the need to manage our waste more sustainably. It is a clear climate change priority, it is recognised in European legislation and the requirements are laid down in successive UK Government policy documents and strategies. We must move waste treatment up the hierarchy and this means more recycling and more energy recovery. There are strict targets and these are backed up by financial penalties for non compliance.

11. The Waste DPD has to be all about delivery, that is why the plan has been brought forward now. That is why attention has been paid to the need for flexibility. That is why the strategy has identified two sites – to provide flexibility and ensure delivery. This is the right approach for Plymouth and it is right for the sub region. Altering this approach will undermine the strategy and it will undermine the deliverability of a sustainable solution.

12. The consequences of making insufficient provision are immense:

- We may not be able to meet our recycling and recovery targets
- The costs of waste management may increase
- Impacts on the environment, transport and climate change

Background to the preparation of the Waste DPD

13. The Waste DPD provides a long term approach, helping the city to take responsibility for its waste in the most sustainable way. It proposes the locations in the city where waste management facilities should be provided. It also contains a comprehensive policy framework against which all waste management proposals will be considered. A key aim is to ensure that waste
is dealt with in a sustainable way that avoids harm to the environment or to public amenity.

14. It sits alongside the Plymouth Municipal Waste Management Strategy which establishes how Plymouth’s waste should be managed in the future, ie how much we should recycle and compost, and how we should treat the remaining waste, thus avoiding landfill.

15. Even though sites are identified in the Waste DPD, any proposals for those sites will still need to be subject to planning applications which will enable the details of any proposals to be fully considered. Major applications will also need to be subject to pollution control regulations to ensure that they do not pose a pollution risk.

16. The Waste DPD is part of Plymouth’s Local Development Framework which is a comprehensive set of spatial plans for the city based on the vision to turn Plymouth into “one of Europe’s finest, most vibrant waterfront cities where an outstanding quality of life is enjoyed by everyone”. The Core Strategy sets the overarching planning context for the city. The Waste DPD is in conformity with the Core Strategy which was adopted in April 2007. The Waste DPD also has regard to the existing and emerging plans of neighbouring waste planning authorities.  

(This relates to Test of Soundness 6)

17. The DPD shares the same vision as the Plymouth Sustainable Community Strategy which was adopted in April 2007. Amongst other objectives the Strategy seeks to maintain a clean and sustainable environment, and identifies a key priority as being to effectively manage our city’s waste. The Waste DPD contributes to the delivery of that priority.  

(This relates to Test of Soundness 5)

18. This submission version of the Waste DPD is based on a robust and comprehensive evidence base, has been subject to public consultation during its preparation and has taken account of the results of sustainability appraisal. This will be demonstrated in the following paragraphs.

19. The starting point for the preparation of any DPD is the Local Development Scheme. This is the timetable for the Local Development Framework where the Council sets out the timescales for preparation and the scope of the documents to be published. Plymouth’s LDS was originally submitted in January 2005 although the current version was revised in March 2007. It identifies the description, content, evidence base, key milestones and the area to be covered by the Waste DPD. The Waste DPD complies with all these requirements and is on target with the key milestones.  

(This relates to Test of Soundness 1)

20. There are a range of national, regional and local plans, policies and guidance that the DPD is required to have regard to. Nationally, the DPD has taken into account the Waste Strategy for England 2007, and Planning Policy Statement 10 (in particular the key planning objectives for waste). Regionally the DPD has regard to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and the Regional Waste Strategy. (Further discussion of the DPDs compliance with the Regional Spatial Strategy is contained in Annex C). At a local level the DPD complies with and seeks to assist the delivery of the Plymouth

(This relates to Test of Soundness 4)

21. The **Sustainability Appraisal** looks at the economic, environmental and social effects of a plan to ensure that it creates a sustainable Plymouth. The Sustainability Appraisal of the Waste DPD has been undertaken by independent consultants at each key stage of the DPD’s development. The conclusions and recommendations have been taken into account in refining the content of the DPD. The process has informed the strategic direction of the DPD, the choice of options, and the content of the policies and proposals. The Municipal Waste Management Strategy has also been subject to sustainability appraisal. As a result the Council believes that this DPD delivers the most sustainable option.

(This relates to Test of Soundness 3)

22. Plymouth’s **Statement of Community Involvement**, adopted in July 2006, sets out how the Council must consult on the preparation of DPDs. The Council believes that it has given adequate opportunity for people to comment on the DPD during its development over the last 3 years, in particular at the **Issues and Options** and **Preferred Options** stages. Further opportunities have been afforded during preparation of the waste chapter of the now adopted Core Strategy, and during preparation of the Council’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

23. A schedule detailing the consultation undertaken at Submission stage (and previous stages) is attached as Annex A.

(This relates to Test of Soundness 2)

24. The following list identifies key dates in the evolution of the DPD:

- Publication of the Issues and Options document – March 2005
- Publication of Preferred Options document – July 2005
- Consultation on and Adoption of the Municipal Waste Management Strategy – April 2007
- Adoption of the LDF Core Strategy – April 2007
- Publication of Submission Document Waste DPD – August 2007

25. The purpose of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment** is to assess the impacts of a land use plan against the conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 sites – Special areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas. The HRA Screening Report for the Plymouth Waste DPD was published in June 2007. Sites within 15km of the city were assessed: Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC, Tamar Estuaries Complex SPA, Dartmoor SAC, South Dartmoor Woods SAC, and Blackstone Point SAC.

26. The HRA identifies a number of potential indirect and/or in combination impacts arising from the policies and proposals of the DPD. In screening these impacts against the qualifying features of the sites, the Report concludes that “there will be no significant adverse impact on the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites as a result of Plymouth’s Waste DPD”.

Page 5 of 22
Evidence Base

27. The Council is required to prepare a DPD that is the most appropriate having considered the reasonable alternatives. The DPD is the culmination of an extensive assessment of potential waste management sites, both those generated by the Council and those suggested during consultation. This independent assessment of alternatives has been augmented by consultation responses as well as by the sustainability appraisal process.

28. The DPD needs to be based on a robust and credible evidence base. The documents upon which this DPD is based cover waste requirements, waste management options, site assessments and impact assessments, as well as relevant national, regional and local policy. A full list is included in the DPD and on the website. This Statement helps to demonstrate that the contents of the DPD are justified by this extensive body of up to date evidence.

29. The Waste DPD is but one part of the process of ensuring that the city’s waste can be effectively and sustainably managed into the future. There are a number of other processes going on in parallel, including site assembly, contract preparation and tendering etc. Evidence is also being prepared to support these processes and where appropriate this evidence is being made available through the planning process. In particular, two further reports support the planning process: Preliminary Air Quality Assessment for Ernesettle (published by ENTEC), and a design statement which is currently in preparation.

Monitoring and Delivery of the DPD

30. The DPD sets out how each proposal and policy is to be delivered. There is also a clear monitoring regime with targets and indicators and this is integrated with the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report.

31. The DPD has avoided the risks associated with a close fit approach and it therefore contains sufficient flexibility to embrace the requirements of the Municipal Waste Management Strategy, to accommodate future waste management contracts, and to react to changes in technology, targets or other circumstances. Whilst giving certainty as to the locations for future major development it enables choices to be made between different technologies, allows flexibility to cater for waste growth, and avoids the risks associated with land ownership. Policies are included to enable consideration of other sites that may come forward but which are not identified in the DPD.

The principle of energy from waste

32. It has not been disputed that the technologies referred to in the DPD are acceptable in principle. There is sufficient evidence from elsewhere in the UK and abroad, and in statements issued by the Government and the
Environment Agency that the technologies are both proven and acceptable in health/pollution terms. Given that in the UK we have a robust regulatory regime covering both detailed planning and pollution control there should be no reason to suggest that the use of these technologies would cause problems in practice.

33. Neither can it be asserted that these technologies are inappropriate in an urban or edge of urban location. Again, there are many locations in the UK and abroad where these waste management processes are operating successfully and their impacts are being managed effectively.

34. No-one during the consultation on this DPD, has questioned the overall waste management approach being adopted. The Municipal Waste Management Strategy on which much of the DPD is based achieved a broad consensus amongst the community and key stakeholders. The principle of locating and operating technologies such as energy from waste within Plymouth is not therefore in question.

**Sites within the City**

35. Given the imperative to achieve a major step change in the way the city’s waste is managed, the key task for the waste DPD has been to identify sites where strategic facilities can be located. These include composting, energy from waste and other waste treatment processes. It is of great importance that the DPD allocates two sites for these facilities for the following important reasons. Otherwise we would be unable to deliver a solution that is adequate and timely:

- We need sufficient capacity to meet the identified needs of the city and potentially the sub region
- We need flexibility to cater for competition and choice of technologies
- We need to minimise the risks associated with achieving delivery
- We need to be honest about where development is likely to take place

36. Statement 4 covers the detail of the site selection process and the reasons behind the Council’s decision to include Ernesettle as an allocated site for strategic facilities. Statement 4 also responds to the issues concerning the Ernesettle site, raised in the Submission stage representations. The following paragraphs, by way of context, explain the reasoning for the decisions taken in relation to the other sites.

**Coypool**

37. Coypool has also been allocated for strategic waste management facilities. Whilst it firmly believes that both Coypool and Ernesettle can accommodate strategic waste management facilities, there are fewer constraining planning factors at Coypool. No representations were received on the issue of the acceptability of the Coypool site and the Council therefore maintains therefore that this site in planning terms is an appropriate location for such facilities.
38. Consequently, despite the delivery difficulties associated with a site not in the Council’s ownership the City Council has been in negotiation with the various owners of the land at Coypool for some time. Negotiations have been complicated by the fact that there are a number of landowners, there are potential other uses for other parts of the site, and the site is still in use by a primary industry and therefore unlikely to be delivered in the immediate future.

39. In addition the Council has undertaken a number of more detailed investigations at the site in support of its aspiration to purchase the land, such as the Preliminary Air Quality Assessment and the Key Constraints and Opportunities reports. The Council is nevertheless pursuing the purchase of this site with vigour, and negotiations, as well as other site investigation studies are still ongoing.

Chelson Meadow

40. This site is considered unsuitable for strategic facilities because the need to secure restoration of the landfill site limits the amount of land available for further development. Siting further strategic facilities on this site would require the removal of other uses (itself problematic), with the knock on effect that they would need to be located elsewhere.

41. In the adopted North Plymstock Area Action Plan, provision is made to safeguard a site for a potential waste to energy or landfill gas combined heat plant within the Chelson Meadow waste management centre. However detailed investigation since the preparation of the NPAAP has determined that whilst a facility utilising the landfill gas is still possible, there is insufficient space for a waste to energy plant.

Moorcroft Quarry

42. Moorcroft Quarry is also considered unsuitable for strategic facilities. It is still an operational quarry where the current related inert recycling operations could be expanded. The site operators have indicated that they will not support any other form of waste management facility on this site.

Prince Rock

43. Prince Rock has been excluded from the Plan as a location suitable for strategic waste management facilities. There were four key reasons for this decision and these are summarised in the Waste DPD:

- Uncertainty about the amount of land available, which would limit the role the site could play as a strategic location, and possible problems with ground conditions
- The housing which is in close proximity to the site is a Renewal Area and the Council’s objectives are to avoid any further degradation in environmental conditions in the area, by avoiding industrial uses and reducing traffic
- The proximity of residential development, which virtually abuts the site, would limit the type of waste management processes that would be suitable
- The city’s needs can be accommodated on other sites
Responses to Representations made at Submission stage

44. Annex B contains a schedule of the Council’s responses to all the representations made at Submission stage of the Waste DPD. In total there were 80 individual representations. Fuller responses to those issues being discussed at the Examination are contained within the following Council Statements:

Statement 002: Site capacities and waste arisings
Statement 003: Plans and policies of other authorities
Statement 004: Ernesettle
Statement 005: Response to climate change
Annex A: Consultation and Communication

The Council takes consultation and communication on this matter extremely seriously. As well as the statutory requirements to consult on the Waste DPD, there has been extensive consultation on the Waste Management Strategy. In addition the Council is developing an ongoing communication strategy supporting elements of the waste strategy. This will take on board comments made in the SEA, and will enable local residents to get involved in further stages, utilising the database of interested residents put together as part of the submission stage consultation. The following paragraphs outline the details of the consultation stages.

Issues and Options stage

During the six-week consultation period (7th March – 18th April 2005) copies of the Waste DPD, the Sustainability Appraisal, response forms, the statement of availability and proposal matters were available on the Council web page [www.plymouth.gov.uk](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk), from the Civic Centre and Windsor House Offices, local libraries and council housing offices. In addition letters were sent to all consultees. A press advertisement was published on 4th March 2005.

Preferred Options

During the six-week consultation period (29th July – 9th September 2005) the following was undertaken:

- The Waste DPD, Sustainability Appraisal, response form, proposal matters, and statement of availability were made available on the Council’s webpage [www.plymouth.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/ldf), as well as at the Civic Centre and Windsor House Offices, all Libraries within Plymouth, and Council Housing Offices during the consultation period.
- An advertisement was placed in the Evening Herald newspaper, which was carried 26th July 2006.
- Copies of the document, the response form the DPD matters and statement of availability, were sent to all statutory consultees, with a covering letter. Letters of notification were sent to all other consultees.
- Presentations to Area Committee meetings were given throughout the city, and copies of the Waste DPD and response forms were disseminated to all Councillors and further copies were available to the public.
- Four consultation events were staged throughout the city with display boards, a DVD, and Officers available for discussion. These events were advertised locally and in local press.
- Copies of the Waste DPD were sent to all Plymouth City Council Heads of Departments for dissemination through their teams.
- During the consultation stage a series of articles were run on the “Staff Room” which is a Plymouth City Council staff daily information web page, notifying staff of the Draft Preferred Options Documents including the Waste DPD’s availability and of two internal consultation events for staff.
- An article about the Draft Preferred Options Documents including the Waste DPD was run in “Mail Out”, Plymouth Community Partnerships.
monthly newsletter, circulated to all their members who are made up of community and voluntary groups in Plymouth.

- It was arranged for Plymouth Guild of Voluntary Services to include information on the LDF, and where the consultation documents can be obtained, in the Guild’s “Bulletin Update” newsletter sent to 175 voluntary and community groups within its membership.

Submission stage consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press Release issued with Q and A sheets</td>
<td>16th July</td>
<td>“Possible locations outlined for waste management facilities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full page article, Plymouth Herald</td>
<td>30th July</td>
<td>“What to do with a load of our rubbish”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF Newsletter edition 1 to all consultees</td>
<td>Mid August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice, Plymouth Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted to PINS and GOSW</td>
<td>28th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to RA to confirm conformity with draft RSS</td>
<td>28th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview, ITV Westcountry</td>
<td>28th August</td>
<td>Waste Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Week Consultation period starts</td>
<td>29th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter and cd to all statutory consultees (List A)</td>
<td>29th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to all other consultees (Lists B and C)</td>
<td>29th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Surgery, Chelson Meadow</td>
<td>30th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site goes live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to all on List A, B and C who have email address</td>
<td>30th August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public surgery, Coypool</td>
<td>10th Sept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview, Plymouth Sound</td>
<td>18th Sept</td>
<td>Mark Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article, Western Morning News</td>
<td>27th Sept</td>
<td>PFI bid and where waste will come from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Surgery, Ernesettle</td>
<td>1st October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article, Plymouth Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Waste plant fears”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article, Cornish Guardian</td>
<td>6th October</td>
<td>Saltash angry about incinerator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview, Radio Cornwall</td>
<td>6th October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview, ITV Westcountry</td>
<td>10th October</td>
<td>Mark Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Week Consultation period ends</strong></td>
<td><strong>10th October</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article, Plymouth Herald</td>
<td>12th October</td>
<td>“Anger over waste site proposal”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B Response to Submission stage representations

This Annex details the Council’s response to all the representations made at Submission stage. Each submission is dealt with in turn and there is either a full response made or reference to one of the Council’s Examination statements.

38443/1
Currently there is no evidence on this issue. The Council is preparing a Coastal Planning SPD and this will be explored during the preparation of that document.

38457/18

38474/21
Support welcomed

38475/22
See Council Statement 005 Climate Change

38475/23
Suggest that W9 be amended with the addition of an additional criteria: “The development proposal would not suffer unacceptable adverse impacts as a result of the operation of the waste facility;”

38477/24
See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38477/25
Government Guidance expects local authorities to find sites where alternatives to road transport are a possibility. This option exists at both Coypool and Ernesettle in the form of a possible rail link, although this is only likely to be viable for waste that may come from neighbouring authorities, for example from a waste transfer station at Torbay, or for the residues that need to be taken to final disposal or recycling elsewhere. Local waste is still likely to be brought in by road.

See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38477/26
See Council Statement 003 Relationship with Other Plans

38453/27
It is accepted that the Safeguarding Lines have caused some confusion. Therefore suggest that Proposal Map W2 is amended to make the allocation clearer. An alternative map for W2 is attached.
Correct version of Technical Note has now been added to evidence base.
See Council Background Paper 001

38453/28
See Council Background Paper 001

38453/29
A public right of way runs along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to the Sewage Treatment Works. It is suggested that this should be mentioned in the text although its protection would be covered by other legislation.
see Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38453/30
see Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38453/32
See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38453/33
See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38476/34
See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38453/35
See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle

38483/36
See Council Statement 004 Proposal W2 Ernesettle
Given that Chelson Meadow is already a waste management site with activity currently taking place, it is more appropriate that this should be covered by a policy than a new allocation/proposal.
Plans for expansion of the recycling site at Weston Mill are not sufficiently advanced for it to be included in the DPD as an allocation. In particular it is not yet clear which piece of land the site may extend into. Therefore it is appropriate that this remains a Policy and not a Proposal.

38480/49
This has been included to ensure consistency and to clearly set out the Council’s strategy for the provision/expansion of this and the Weston Mill site.

38480/50
It is important to retain the distinction between the two policies. W7 outlines the criteria to be employed when considering whether a previously unidentified piece of land might be suitable for locating waste management facilities. It therefore gives the Plan a degree of flexibility and enables it to deal with unforeseen circumstances. Policy W8 applies to all waste management development and identifies the criteria to be taken into account when considering the merits of a particular development.

38480/51
See response to 38480/50 above

38480/52
Support welcomed

38480/53
Support welcomed

38485/54
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38488/55
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38490/56
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle
No indicators have been included in the Waste DPD to enable the monitoring of emissions from waste management facilities. This would normally be the domain of the Environment Agency and it is therefore inappropriate for this information to be included in a planning document. The Environment Agency put in place strict controls over the emissions and by products resulting from waste management facilities.
The objection appears to concern the area nearest to the railway line, which is not available for the construction of buildings in any event. The area in question is likely to be retained in open use for the foreseeable future - and even if a rail realignment were to be approved at a later date, it would only affect the sports pitch nearest the river and would have no bearing on the viability or operation of the waste facility.
38497/77
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 003 Relationship with Other Plans
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38498/78
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38501/79
See Council Background Paper 001

38499/80
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 003 Relationship with Other Plans
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38502/81
Support welcomed

38503/82
See Council Background Paper 001

38504/83
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38505/84
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38505/85
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38505/86
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle
38505/87
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38505/88
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38506/89
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38507/90
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38508/92
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

40743/93
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

38502/94
See Statement 003 Relationship with other plans

38502/95
See Statement 003 Relationship with other plans

41266/96
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

44229/97
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

45099/98
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

46047/99
See Council Background Paper 001
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle

46064/100
See Council Statement 004 W2 Ernesettle
Annex C: Compliance with RSS

The Waste DPD sets out how the DPD sits within the context of the Regional Waste Strategy and the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. The Regional Assembly has stated that the submitted Waste DPD is in general conformity with the draft RSS.

In terms of detailed compliance, the relevant policy of the draft RSS is W2 (Waste Facilities and the Waste Hierarchy). It states that waste that cannot be managed at its point of arising should be managed according to the proximity principle. The Waste DPD is founded on this premise, since the overall objective has been for the city to take responsibility for managing its own waste wherever possible.

The policy states that the identification of sites should take into account established and proposed industrial sites and previously developed land. The policy does not state this as a requirement. Nevertheless, the DPD demonstrates that this has been taken into account and 3 of the 4 sites are located on previously developed land. The fourth site is adjacent to industrial land.

W2 does not give detailed locational criteria but does say about SSCTs, of which Plymouth is one, that new waste management facilities should follow a sequential approach. They should be (1) within, (2) on the edge of, and/or (3) in close proximity to (ie within 16 kilometres) of the urban area primarily served by the facility. All proposed sites in the DPD, including the Ernesettle site are within the city and therefore this complies fully with draft RSS policy W2.