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Summary of Key Points

1. The Council believes that it has fully taken into account the plans and policies of other authorities.

2. Firstly in relation to possible alternative sites outside the city that may have been identified in neighbouring authorities Waste Plans, the Council has concluded that there are no sites that offer better opportunities than the two strategic sites now being included in the Plymouth Waste DPD.

3. Secondly in relation to the possible impact that the Waste DPD may have on the plans and policies of neighbouring authorities, these plans and policies have been taken into account and the Council is firmly of the view that there is no detrimental impact.

4. Some minor changes to the DPD are suggested. These are contained within paragraphs 34 and 35 below.

Detailed Points

Cornwall Waste Plans

5. The Cornwall Waste Local Plan was adopted in 2002. A Waste DPD reached Preferred Options stage in March 2006 which included the following elements: Core Strategy & Policies, Waste Development Control Policies and preferred sites for Waste Management facilities. Cornwall however are returning to the Preferred Options stage and have been advised to split the DPD into 2 separate documents. It is anticipated that the Core Strategy and Policies Waste DPD will reach Preferred Options stage in May 2008 with Submission in May 2009 and Adoption in August 2010 (Cornwall Minerals and Waste Development Scheme June 2007). The Preferred Areas for Waste Management Facilities DPD will reach Preferred Options stage in August 2010, Submission stage in August 2011 and Adoption in November 2012 (Cornwall Minerals and Waste Development Scheme June 2007).

6. In relation to the Adopted Waste Plan and the Preferred Options stage of the DPD (March 2006) the County Council has undertaken a search throughout Cornwall for sites considered suitable ‘in principle’ for waste management facilities.

7. The existing Cornwall Waste Local Plan (2002) contains an 'Area of Search', referred to as the 'Central Cornwall Area of Search' in which it is proposed to locate a single thermal treatment facility with sufficient capacity to treat all of the residual municipal solid waste arising in Cornwall.

8. The site search process has identified four potential sites within or close to the Area of Search which are considered to be the most suitable sites for an Energy from Waste facility. While four sites have been identified at this stage it is intended that only one of the sites would need to be developed.

9. Sites in and around Caradon (inc. Saltash) were included in the search but no sites capable of taking a Strategic Waste management facility were
identified. Although the Waste Development Framework is going back to the Preferred Options stage they are not intending to conduct a new search for strategic waste management sites. They will however be returning to the previous sites to update the status.

10. On current knowledge therefore there are no available sites in Cornwall within proximity of Plymouth that could potentially provide waste recovery capacity for the city. However the provision of a sub regional facility in Plymouth does open up the possibility that waste from south east Cornwall (both domestic and commercial/industrial) could use the Plymouth facility if it was deemed to be more sustainable and cost effective than the Cornwall location.

Devon Waste Plans

11. Three potential sites exist outside the Plymouth city boundary, in Devon. Two are identified in the Devon Waste Local Plan. The other is located on an employment allocation in an emerging LDF document. Each site is considered in detail below.

12. The Devon Waste Plan considers that waste management facilities that are likely to cater to a significant degree for waste originating within Plymouth should be located within that settlement. This is consistent with the RSS proximity principles and the Regional Waste Strategy which has a sequential approach giving priority to sites within the boundaries of urban areas. It is within this context that the Devon Waste Plan identifies a Plymouth Area of Search. Two sites are identified.

13. The Wrangaton (near Ivybridge) site is identified for a strategic waste management facility. It is only approx. 20 metres away from the Dartmoor National Park boundary. Access from the A38(T) for traffic traveling to and from Plymouth would entail the use of the South Brent junction to carry out a “u-turn” as the Wrangaton junction has restricted access and the site itself has been identified in an area at risk of flooding.

14. Parts of the New England Quarry (south of Lee Mill) fall within a County Wildlife site, an Ancient Woodland, a County Geological Site, a Mineral Consultation Area and a floodplain. The quarry is owned by Viridor who have stated that the preferred use for the site is landfill. However there are still access difficulties to the site and overcoming them would require a Compulsory Purchase Order because of the ownership difficulties. The site is not located near a rail/road/water interchange and does not have the potential for a recycling centre.

15. Langage Industrial Estate was considered by Devon County Council in their Plymouth area of search for potential strategic waste management facilities. It was however discarded in favour of the sites at New England Quarry and Wrangaton near Ivybridge.

16. PCC made a representation suggesting the Langage Industrial Estate site be considered for provision of a strategic waste management site in association with the Power Station. This was opposed by South Hams District Council on the basis that it would conflict with the Structure Plan as it is an employment site of regional significance.
17. The Inspector attached considerable weight to the opposition from South Hams DC relating to Langage being a Strategic Employment Site and he considered that the case for including the site had not been established. The inspector supported the County Council and District Council’s position that it not be included as a site for a strategic waste management facility as it is an employment site of regional significance and that the case had not been established for its inclusion as a site for a strategic waste management facility.

18. Should the need therefore arise the provision of a major waste facility is not ruled out but would be incumbent upon Devon County Council and South Hams District Council bringing the site forward as an allocation within their LDFs. Equally an application for such a facility could be brought forward and determined by those authorities against the policies already adopted in the DCC Waste Plan and the South Hams Core Strategy. At present though it is their view that Langage is not required or sought after for a waste management facility. PCC in identifying suitable sites within the boundary of Plymouth in the Waste DPD also takes the view that Langage is not required.

19. The timescales for the Devon WDF place it beyond the timescales required to fulfil the City’s waste strategy. South Hams would be unlikely to accept an energy from waste plant as fulfilling the employment objectives. Consequently, on the information to hand currently Langage may not be available for the required uses and within the required timescale.

20. It is the Council’s view that none of the potential sites in Devon are suitable replacements for the two sites identified in the Waste DPD. Guidance is clear and says we must identify suitable and deliverable sites within the DPD to meet the needs of the city. In addition there is an imperative on the City Council to have a planning framework in place to deliver its waste strategy obligations and we need to deal with this with some urgency.

21. We have fully considered what is available outside our boundary, and concluded that there are no sites able to meet the city’s requirements for strategic waste sites. Therefore the right approach has to be to ensure that we are able to deliver within our boundaries, even though there may be other albeit less certain possibilities outside the city in the longer term.

Saltash Regeneration Plans

22. Two documents set out the intentions for regenerating the Saltash area: the Saltash Regeneration Study and the Gateway MCTi Action Plan. The objectives of the Saltash Regeneration Study are:

- To bring vitality and spending to the town centre and waterfront
- To enhance Saltash’s economic position
- To improve the external image of Saltash
- To support key or ‘flagship’ projects
23. The key issue identified within the representations on the Waste DPD is to what extent the proposed allocation at Ernesettle will impact upon these plans.

24. It is accepted that the facility would be seen from parts of Saltash and in particular from the developments on the waterfront but it has not been demonstrated within those representations exactly how this will have a negative impact on Saltash. Furthermore there is no evidence to suggest that this development will have a negative impact on the regeneration objectives of Saltash.

25. The City Council’s view is that the site is located within, and must be seen against the backdrop that is, the city. Looking across the water from Saltash you are looking towards the city and elements of the city’s built environment are clearly visible: industry, housing, transport infrastructure, sewage treatment works, armaments depot, and the Dockyard are all clearly visible from Saltash. This is what you would expect when looking across the river towards a city whose boundary comes right up to the water’s edge. The development of a further facility, albeit a highly visible one is just another element of the development a city needs to accommodate to ensure that it remains sustainable and able to meet the needs of modern city life.

26. In this respect, it is important to point out that until 2013 the city's waste is being transported by road to Liskeard for landfill. Failure to deliver adequate sites in Plymouth would actually increase the risk of Plymouth waste needing to be transferred to Cornwall in the longer term. This would arguably have a much more significant impact on Saltash than the current Ernesettle proposal, which is primarily a visual impact (a distant view set within the urban context of Plymouth).

27. The likely impacts were assessed at site selection stage and the key considerations are documented in the Evidence Base. Further work has been undertaken since Submission, partly to inform the requirements of the site assembly and procurement stages of the waste strategy, in relation to both Ernesettle and Coypool sites. This is identifying the key design considerations of the site, which will assist in ensuring that visually any potential impacts of the development can be better understood and dealt with.

28. Taking the Saltash regeneration objectives in turn:

29. PCC disagrees that the Ernesettle site has a detrimental impact on the gateway to Cornwall/Saltash (objective 3 of the Saltash Regeneration Strategy) particularly when leaving Plymouth and entering Cornwall. It merely suggests to visitors on exiting Plymouth that they are leaving behind the City and subsequently on leaving Cornwall that they are entering the City. High standards of design will be applied to any development such that the facility may have the potential to become a visitor attraction in its own right.

30. The facility has the potential to improve and enhance the surrounding structures in its immediate vicinity (the industrial estate, water treatment works and industrial buildings and structure within the MOD Land) Furthermore the structure could become an iconic building that compliments the landmark developments of Tamar Bridge and Royal Albert Bridge.
31. In PCC’s view the identification of sites within its boundary to deal with its waste has the potential to deal with waste from the Saltash area and this should be seen as a crucial strategic opportunity for the residents and businesses of Saltash. This could enhance Saltash’s economic position (objective 2 above) in that business costs could be reduced by having a waste management facility close by.

32. The Council also fails to see how the facility would have a detrimental visual impact on the sport and leisure uses on the estuary and as stated above the facility has the potential to be a positive landmark in its own right. (Design and architecture will be of paramount importance)

South Hams

33. Two issues have arisen as a result of representations submitted by South Hams. The first relates to the potential conflict between the Moorcroft Quarry allocation and the route of the High Quality Public Transport system serving Sherford, and the second relates to the potential location of a Household waste recycling centre at Langage.

34. In relation to Moorcroft Quarry, the preferred route for the proposed HQPT link does not cross the area potentially required for the recycling activities, but does intersect with the access to the current quarry workings and the potential recycling site. This conflict of access has not yet been considered in detail, but should be resolvable by an appropriate engineering solution. It is suggested in the interests of clarity that a further requirement should be added to Proposal W3: “d. the need to safeguard the HQPT route and its associated infrastructure.”

35. The DPD makes reference to the possible provision of a recycling centre within the Langage Business Park. Whilst this may be a viable alternative, this is clearly a matter for either the Devon Waste Development Framework or the South Hams LDF process. In the circumstances it is suggested that the reference (in paragraph 6.7), to Langage as an alternative option for a recycling centre, is removed.