Please ask if you would like this: Local Development Framework Document, in another language, large print, Braille or audio format, please telephone: 01752 307845
1. **Purpose of this Preferred Options report.**

1.1. This document has been produced by the City Council as a basis for consultation on Plymouth’s emerging Local Development Framework (LDF). It builds on the earlier Issues & Options consultation stage (Spring 2005), developing your ideas as to how to turn Plymouth into - ‘one of Europe’s finest, most vibrant waterfront cities where an outstanding quality of life is enjoyed by everyone’.

1.2. A Local Development Document is being prepared for Waste issues as part of the LDF. Its purpose is to identify a spatial strategy for the provision of waste management in the city.

2. **What is a Local Development Framework?**

2.1. Plymouth’s LDF will replace the existing Local Plan. It will provide a strategic planning framework for the city, guiding change to 2016 and beyond. When adopted, the LDF together with the Regional Spatial Strategy will form the statutory Development Plan for this area.

2.2. The LDF is be made up of a portfolio of documents. This includes a Core Strategy, and Local Development Documents (LDDs), which set out policies and proposals for implementing the Core Strategy. Some of these LDDs will have the legal status of “development plan”. Documents with this status will be afforded very great importance in guiding decisions made on planning applications. They are called Development Planning Documents (DPDs). The Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD) is one of these DPDs.

3. **What is a ‘Preferred Options Report’?**

3.1. Preferred Options Reports must be published for each DPD. They set out for consultation the Council’s proposed policy directions, and highlight alternatives where appropriate.

3.2. Such reports will be material considerations in the planning application process. The Council intends that where there is a conflict between the preferred policy direction set out in this report and the provisions of Plymouth’s First Deposit Local Plan, this report will take precedence.

3.3. Background reports will be published in July 2005 to provide more information on the context for the proposals in this document and the issues that have led to its conclusion. These will be able to be viewed on the Council’s web site www.plymouth.gov.uk.
4. How can you get involved?
4.1. You may already have been involved though earlier consultation processes. The WDPD builds on work done on the First Deposit Local Plan, published in December 2001. Also, an Issues & Options consultation was undertaken in Spring 2005 as part of the LDF process.

4.2. A statutory period of 6 weeks will now given for people to make formal representations on the Preferred Options Report. The period for making representations on this Preferred Options report is from Friday 29th July to Friday 9th September 2005.

4.3. Representations should be made of the official form. This can be found on the Council’s Website (www.plymouth.gov.uk), and is available at the Civic Centre and libraries.

5. What happens next?
5.1. The Council will consider carefully all representations received and, where appropriate, seek to resolve objections. The DPD will then be amended and formally “submitted” to Government.

5.2. The submitted document will be made available for another statutory six-week period during which formal representations can be made. This will be followed by a further six-week consultation period on any alternative sites being put forward by objectors.

5.3. All representations received will be considered at an Independent Examination to be conducted by Planning Inspector. He / she will test the ‘soundness’ of the plan. The Inspector’s report will be binding on the Council.

5.4. For further information, see www.plymouth.gov.uk or contact the Planning Strategy team at: Civic Centre, Plymouth, PL1 2EW (tel. 01752 307845 or 304818).
6. **Context**

6.1. Plymouth’s waste has for the last 4 decades been dealt with, inside the City, by dumping it at Chelson Meadow waste tip. Two significant drivers require the City Council to adopt different ways of and potentially places for dealing with waste. Firstly, Chelson Meadow will close in mid 2007 and there is no other long-term waste treatment or disposal system in place to deal with people’s rubbish. Secondly, waste must by law, now be managed in a more sustainable and environmentally friendly way.

6.2. The City Council is required to be self-sufficient, as far as practicable, in its ability to deal with waste and to manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most acceptable</th>
<th>Least acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce waste</td>
<td>Disposal of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recover material (recycle, compost, energy) from waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. There are a potential range of ways which waste can be managed and treated to achieve sustainable waste management. The basic methods are suggested in the hierarchy above. However, it is not the role of the Waste Development Plan Document to prescribe how waste should be managed. The role of the Waste Development Plan Document is to support sustainable waste management, by ensuring that development takes place in a manner which allows for the sustainable management of waste and importantly that enough sites of the right size, location and type are allocated in the plan where waste management processes can operate.

6.4. A key issue for the WDPD relates to the extent to which the plan area can be self-sufficient in managing its waste. This has been taken as a starting point in the development of the strategy that is designed to achieve the vision of the WDPD, which includes a socially, environmentally and economically responsible approach to waste management. There also has to be a recognition that the plan area is relatively constrained, no more so than in its ability to accommodate landfill capacity. This has to be recognised in option development for the waste plans of adjoining waste planning authorities.
7. The Preferred Vision.
7.1. The City Council’s preferred vision for waste is as follows:
7.2. *In 2016 Plymouth will be a city with a socially, environmentally and economically responsible approach to waste management, where everyone can play a role in delivering long term sustainable waste management, which will show a positive trend in waste minimisation, significant increases in recycling, composting and energy recovery and a dramatic decrease in the amount of waste being sent to landfill. Facilities for waste management will be provided in accordance with the proximity principle, enabling Plymouth to be as self sufficient as possible in terms of managing its waste.*

8. The Preferred Strategy.
8.1. The following sets out three options that could potentially guide the development of the WDPD as a preferred option. The intention is to consider scenarios that could affect site requirements in the Plan area.
8.2. **Option 1: Baseline Option:** This option assumes limited new waste infrastructure development and therefore that a substantial amount of waste will be managed outside the City boundary. Any strategic site would deal with waste transfer. There would therefore be a reliance on the capacity of existing or new sites in other areas to help Plymouth meet its waste management obligations. The option would be the least compliant in terms of the proximity principle and self-sufficiency. It would require significant sub-regional co-operation to ensure that waste is managed as close as possible to Plymouth, consistent with the Regional Waste Management Strategy.

8.3. Spatially, this option would still require civic amenity sites (at least two) and waste transfer facilities to allow the significant export of waste.
8.4. The option also represents the only viable short-term solution for managing the City’s waste that currently goes to Chelson Meadow Landfill, which is due to close in March 2007.
8.5. **Option 2: Enhanced Treatment:** This option assumes that additional strategic recycling/treatment and composting infrastructure will be provided. Strategic facilities would be required to manage municipal waste and industrial and commercial wastes. Facilities would also be required to manage construction and demolition waste. This would be in addition to the need for civic amenity and waste transfer infrastructure. The option recognises the fact that the site search has not identified any significant potential for landfill or landraise facilities within the Plan area.
8.6. There would be a requirement to export residual waste streams for disposal outside the Plan area and a continued need for sub-regional co-operation between authorities to ensure that disposal and/or additional recovery facilities are provided.

8.7. **Option 3: Maximise Treatment:** This option has the most significant requirement for infrastructure provision. It seeks to ensure that the City is as self-sufficient as possible in meeting its waste management obligations. In addition to new recycling and composting infrastructure, there would be a requirement for further waste treatment facilities within the plan area. Treatment infrastructure may include technologies such as energy from waste. There will remain a need to dispose of some residual waste outside the City but the quantities would be substantially reduced.

The City Council's preferred strategy for spatial waste planning is summarised as follows:

1. **First, a short-term option that centres upon the baseline option (Option 1) and recognises the immediate need for new recycling and composting infrastructure, together with the imminent closure of Chelson Meadow landfill;**

2. **Second, the preferred long-term option that will guide the WDPD, which is Option 3 that seeks to maximise opportunities for treatment within the Plan area thus offering maximum flexibility in delivering sustainable waste management.**

9. **The Preferred Policy Options.**

**Preferred Policy Option 1.**

9.1. **A policy which provides for sustainable waste management consistent with the proximity principle, self-sufficiency and the waste hierarchy.**

9.2. The City Council is required by higher levels of guidance and good waste planning practice to adopt underlying principles to support sustainable waste management. These are reflected in this preferred option and they arise from European and National policy.

**Preferred Policy Option 2.**

9.3. **A policy which provides for strategic waste management facilities in sustainable locations.**
9.4. One of the most challenging decisions any responsible Local Authority has to take is to decide where in an area it will be acceptable to locate large scale waste management, treatment and disposal sites. This is because these large waste developments are amongst the most contentious development proposals that there are. A key requirement of planning guidance is to provide clear direction and more certainty about where waste can be dealt with. This is a more open and comprehensive way for residents of the City and potential waste management operators to be involved in decision making on locations for waste treatment facilities. The preferred development option section sets out the potential waste management sites.

Preferred Policy Option 3.

9.5. A policy which provides for sites suitable for local waste management facilities in sustainable locations

9.6. Small scale waste management sites, (or Civic Amenity and bottle bank types of sites), are an important resource for residents. Not all parts of the city are well catered for in this type of small-scale facility. New sites are particularly needed in the north of Plymouth and at Plympton. The ‘Search for Potential Waste Management Sites’ June 2005, report which is a background report to this preferred options report, has assessed a range of potential sites for small scale local waste facilities. The report identifies a short list of 13 sites, which have potential to accommodate local waste management facilities. This provides the basis of the potential options for local facilities and they will be subject to additional assessment. The location and preliminary assessment of these sites are contained in the part of the WDPD evidence base (‘Search for Potential Waste Management Sites’ June 2005) and are available for public comment.

Preferred Policy Option 4.

9.7. A policy which provides for an interim solution for waste management that recognises the lack of landfill options in the City and the lead times to develop new waste infrastructure.

9.8. Reflecting the preferred strategy for waste, it is recognised that it will not be possible to establish the right long term waste management facilities in time to take over after the closure of Chelson Meadow. Therefore an interim waste management solution is required, and which will allow for the proper consideration of the best long-term waste management solution. The planning strategy therefore needs to be able to identify sites where interim waste management would be appropriate as well as long term.
Preferred Policy Option 5.

9.9. **A policy which sets out the requirement for the City Council to work with neighbouring authorities and the South West Regional Assembly through the Regional Spatial Strategy to ensure that appropriate waste management solutions are found for wastes that need to be managed outside the City.**

9.10. The evidence base, which supports this Waste Development Plan Document, has demonstrated that it is not possible to identify further landfill capacity in the City. It is likely, although not an absolute given, that landfill will still be needed as part of a long-term waste management solution. However, disposal of residual waste to landfill will by the end of the plan period be at significantly reduced volumes. Therefore, landfill capacity outside the City is likely to be needed and this should be reflected in sub-regional planning and adjacent waste planning authorities should take that into account in preparing their plans.

9.11. In addition, whilst the first option should be to deal with waste inside the City, which this plan will seek to achieve, it does not necessarily mean that a large scale integrated waste management facility provided close to the fringe of the City, but outside it, would not also be a sustainable location for dealing with waste. In the event that sites identified in the City do not come forward, there will be a need for waste management/disposal sites in the City’s sub-region. This reflects guidance issued by the Regional Assembly in the Regional Waste Strategy 2004-2020. Therefore, sub-regional plans and those of neighbouring waste planning authorities should make adequate provision for potential waste management sites in their areas, where waste can be sustainably managed.

Preferred Policy Option 6.

9.12. **A policy which sets out development control criteria for new waste management facilities.**

9.13. The Waste Development Document will be required to include policies for the control of waste development. The issues which such policies will address are:

1. Impact of non-waste development on existing or proposed waste management facilities.

2. Compliance with the waste plan.

3. Provision of site waste management plans for construction projects.

4. Local environmental impacts e.g. impact on amenity, noise, odour, pests, dust, hours of working.

5. Impacts on health.
6. The provision of a 'wastes needs statement' with appropriate applications.

7. Design.

Preferred Policy Option 7.

9.14. A policy which sets out environmental objectives with regard to the provision of new waste infrastructure.

9.15. The potential impact of waste related development on the environment is significant. This applies at a local level in relation to the localised impact of a potential development and at a higher level in terms of the environmental performance of the waste management process on issues such as natural resources and climate change. The Waste Development Document will set out objectives for the expected performance of waste development infrastructure.

Preferred Policy Option 8.

9.16. A policy which sets out transport objectives with regard to the provision of new waste infrastructure.

9.17. One of the most significant potential impacts of waste development is the type and frequency of vehicle movements in and out of a waste site. Strategic waste management sites attract regular and frequent lorry movement, it is vital that they are well related not only to waste collection rounds but also the principal road network. Local waste management sites or a civic amenity site can generate a very significant volume of traffic at weekends and in evenings. Fortunately these are outside peak travel times, but the traffic queues can be quite significant, and would need to be accommodated safely. The Waste Development Document needs to set out transport objectives to protect the highway network, allow for efficient waste operation and protect amenity.

Preferred Policy Option 9.

9.18. A policy which provides a framework to raise public awareness of waste issues, promote the view of waste as a resource opportunity and to work with the local business community and other public bodies and neighbouring authorities in seeking waste minimisation.
9.19. The focus of the Waste Development Plan Document is on the provision and control of waste development to meet waste management needs. However, the WDPD can also have a role in changing our perspective on waste so that we move from a ‘throw away’ society to one that views waste as an economic resource opportunity. In this way the WDPD can be more than just a land use plan and one that seeks the active co-operation and participation of stakeholders within the City to help change attitudes to waste and also to promote waste minimisation initiatives. This may include the use of planning obligations for appropriate types of development to ensure that the occupiers are provided with guidance and information on waste minimisation, as well as local facilities for recycling and composting.

Preferred Policy Option 10.

9.20. A policy which provides a framework to ensure that new developments consider waste minimisation and incorporate waste recovery facilities as appropriate.

9.21. It is essential that new development provides the space, which will be necessary for the implementation of successful waste collections schemes that will be a basic requirement of sustainable waste management. For example the City Council currently provides a ‘twin bin’ and green waste collection service and new housing developments will need to provide the space and the bins for each property for this service. In relation to commercial and business developments, they also should provide space within them for the sorting and storage of different waste streams and reusable products to promote re-use and recycling.
10. The Preferred Development Options.


10.1. The City Council’s preferred option is to allocate the China Clay works site at Coypool for the development of a range of waste management facilities. Not all the site is required and it would be appropriate to include other development on this site, but which is compatible and would not conflict with waste management uses.

10.2. This site is likely to become available for re-development, as the current occupier is to relocate the facility to the place of production of the clay at Lee Moor. The site has a history of ‘heavy industrial’ use, which involves the movement of large lorries on a regular and frequent basis. The site has a rail access and the benefit of a good access onto the principal road network. The site currently has a small power station with a tall chimney stack, which is significant if incineration with energy recovery formed part of the waste treatment and disposal process. The site is relatively well screened already and is well separated from residential development. This site has significant potential to accommodate a range of sustainable waste management facilities. The site is large, with a developable area of approximately 35 ha and not all of it would be needed for waste uses. The site could accommodate other uses, which would be compatible with the waste use. Despite the site’s size, its shape is awkward and this may affect development format and uses. Alternative uses on the remainder of the site will be considered in the Policies and Proposals Documents of the LDF, which are to be prepared in coming phases.

10.3. Delivery of the preferred option: This option could be delivered through public sector or private sector investment, separately or potentially in partnership. The site’s potential to accommodate strategic waste uses will be sought to be safeguarded through the planning process.
Preferred Option 11 - China Clay Works, Coypool

10.4. The City Council’s preferred option is to safeguard the use of and existing facilities in the southwestern corner of Chelson Meadow as an existing waste management centre and to provide for additional new waste management development.

10.5. This section of Chelson Meadow has been the centre for the management of the City’s waste for the last 4 decades. The site includes a mix of waste management facilities, notably; a material reclamation facility, civic amenity site, composting, green waste, glass transfer, wood chipping and waste management offices. The site is well known and accepted as a centre for waste management and the current facilities should be retained unless they are provided for elsewhere or they become obsolete as a result of a new long term waste management use elsewhere. There is also potential for the site to accommodate new waste management uses, particularly waste transfer, although space is limited and beyond waste transfer there would be a need for significant redesign of the whole site to accommodate any additional significant waste management uses. New waste development on this site would need to be sensitive to the fact that the adjacent site at Plymstock Quarry has been allocated for re-development. Whilst the quarry re-development must respond to the fact that it’s next to an existing waste management site, waste development on the this site should also be sensitive to the need to provide a successful development within the quarry, in relation to design and siting and impact of the proposed new waste use.

10.6. Delivery of the preferred option: This option could be delivered through public sector or private sector investment, separately or potentially in partnership. The sites potential to accommodate strategic waste uses will be sought to be safeguarded through the planning process.
Preferred Option 12 - Chelson Meadow
Preferred Option 13. Prince Rock depot, Cattedown.

10.7. The City Council’s preferred option is to allocate the Prince Rock depot for waste recycling and other recovery facilities compatible with nearby residential areas.

10.8. Prince Rock depot is in an area of existing industrial character, and it has direct links to the principal road network. The site also includes existing, but limited waste managements uses. It has the potential to accommodate more significant waste facilities, if existing uses in the depot could be relocated. Not all the site would necessarily be required for waste management development and existing uses of the site could be retained. Whilst the area in general has an industrial character, there are residential properties adjoining the site’s northern boundary, at higher level. The type, scale and impact of potential waste uses would need to be sensitive to this relationship. Nevertheless it is considered that modern, well-controlled waste management facilities would be viable in this location.

10.9. Delivery of the preferred option: This option could be delivered through public sector or private sector investment, separately or potentially in partnership. The sites potential to accommodate strategic waste uses will be sought to be safeguarded through the planning process.
Preferred Option 13 - Prince Rock Depot, Cattedown
Preferred Option 14. Moorcroft Quarry.

10.10. The City Council’s preferred option is to allocate Moorcroft Quarry for waste development, which could include recycling and other recovery facilities, including potentially management of inert construction and demolition wastes. Not all of the site is required and it would be appropriate to include other development appropriate to this site, which could include employment development.

10.11. Moorcroft Quarry has been a limestone extraction and processing quarry for many years. The quarrying element of the operation within Moorcroft Quarry has ceased, as quarrying has now started in Hazeldene Quarry to the east. However, this site retains the limestone processing plant and other associated works. Some waste management already occurs in the site, where inert construction and demolition waste is recycled. Part of the site to the west, amounting to approximately 4.5 ha will become available for redevelopment during the plan period. Given the site’s current use, its relationship to the surrounding area, the fact that it is relatively well hidden and has direct access onto the principal road network, it makes a suitable location for a potential range of waste management facilities. The site is large enough to accommodate employment uses, which would also provide more local employment opportunities. There maybe potential to relocate existing employment uses from other re-development areas in Plymstock to assist their regeneration. The other uses, which might be acceptable on this site, are considered in the North Plymstock Action Area Plan Preferred Options Report.

10.12. Delivery of the preferred option: This option could be delivered through public sector or private sector investment, separately or potentially in partnership. The site’s potential to accommodate strategic waste uses will be sought to be safeguarded through the planning process.
Preferred Option 14 - Moorcroft Quarry
Preferred Option 15. Land at Ernesettle Lane.

10.13. The City Council’s preferred option is to safeguard this as a reserve site for waste management uses.

10.14. This site is a green field site and should only be brought forward for development if the other sites identified cannot be brought forward for waste development. Despite this fact, the site has the advantage of being well related to the principal road network and being relatively remote and well screened from existing residential areas. The military use of land adjacent to this site and factories to the north also provide a setting, which a sensitive waste development would not be out of step with. Part of the site has planning consent for employment development, which could still be implemented. This would reduce the amount of land available for waste uses. The site is nevertheless of some amenity value and it is visible from long distance views from the Cornish side of the River Tamar. Therefore, the need for high quality design and sensitive siting would be a particular concern here.

10.15. Delivery of the preferred option: This option could be delivered through public sector or private sector investment, separately or potentially in partnership. Delivery of this site will be based on a sequential approach, which considers first the availability of previously developed and less sensitive sites in the City and sub-region.
Preferred Option 15 - Land at Ernesettle Lane
Alternative options

10.16. Alternative options for waste management sites were examined in the context of the ‘Search for Potential Waste Management Sites’ report June 2005, which is a background document to this Waste Development Document Preferred Options. The outcome of that site search has revealed the above as the preferred options.
We need to know what you think

The statutory consultation period to respond is 29th July 2005 - 9th September 2005.

All comments must be received within this period and can be sent to:

Planning Policy Manager
Planning and Regeneration Service
Plymouth City Council
Civic Centre
Plymouth
PL1 2EW

or

by fax: 01752 304294
by e-mail: ldf@plymouth.gov.uk

Further copies of the leaflet and response forms are available from:

www.plymouth.gov.uk
The Civic Centre (Planning Section)
Local Libraries

The document is also available in Large Print, Braille, or on Audio Tape.