

Committee	<b>Cabinet</b>
Date	<b>24 November 2004</b>
Report By	<b>Director of Transport and Environment</b>
Title of Report	<b>West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft 2004</b>
Purpose of Report	<b>To agree a response to the Revised Deposit Draft Plan</b>

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Cabinet is recommended to:**

- 1. object to the overall approach in the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft as this may lead to West Sussex significantly failing to achieve net self sufficiency on waste, and therefore having a consequent impact on East Sussex;**
  - 2. note the deletion of the allocations at Freshfields Lane Brickworks and Keymer Tileworks but reiterate the highway concerns should these sites come forward at a later stage; and**
  - 3. approve the response to the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft 2004 set out in Appendix 1 to the report.**
- 
- 

### **1. Financial Appraisal**

1.1 There are no identified financial implications from the current consultation. The response by the County Council may require it to be represented at any future Public Inquiry into the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (WSWLP). The additional costs of future representation would need to be considered at the time.

### **2. Assessment of West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft 2004**

2.1 The WSWLP Deposit Draft was placed on deposit for six weeks on 15 May 2003. The Cabinet considered this draft on 3 June 2003 and supported the overall approach taken by West Sussex County Council (WSCC), but with objections to a number of site allocations. The response by the Cabinet to WSCC is attached at Appendix 2. WSCC has now published a Revised Deposit Draft Plan and representations are required by 3 December 2004.

2.2 This report considers the WSWLP Revised Deposit Draft and any implications for East Sussex. West Sussex is at present self sufficient in terms of waste management but does export and import waste to and from other areas and is heavily reliant on landfill. West Sussex receives 20% of non-inert waste and 40% of inert waste which is generated in East Sussex and Brighton & Hove. As in the Deposit Draft the WSWLP acknowledges that some cross boundary movement of waste is acceptable in accordance with the proximity principle.

2.3 WSCC has deleted most of the site allocations and identified only 4 major sites for waste management. This raises concerns over the possibility of an adequate number of sites for important waste management facilities coming forward in the plan period. If sites for these facilities are not brought forward there is the risk that West Sussex will significantly fail to achieve net self sufficiency in dealing with waste.

2.4 There has also been the deletion of all data regarding waste arisings and therefore there is no indication as to what the requirements are for capacity of waste facilities for the plan period. It is indicated that in relation to any proposed facility it will be up to the applicant to demonstrate why it is needed. If need information is not set out in the Plan it means there may be a risk of inadequate provision. This may mean having to export waste for recovery or to continue to rely on landfill.

2.5 It should also be noted that the WSWLP does not include a Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO).

2.6 East Sussex County Council objected to two allocated sites in the WSWLP Deposit Draft on highway grounds. These sites are at Freshfield Lane Brickworks (east of Haywards Heath) and Keymer Tileworks. These have now been deleted from the Plan and therefore the objection has been resolved. However, if these sites were to come forward at a later stage, the highway objections to their use would remain.

2.7 The proposed formal response to the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft is enclosed as Appendix 1.

### **3. Environmental Issues**

3.1 The WSWLP provides a land-use framework for encouraging and assessing facilities dealing with more sustainable methods of waste management in the county.

### **4. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendation**

4.1 There have been significant changes in approach since the first round of consultation. The County Council should no longer support the overall approach set out in the WSWLP. It is recommended that Members approve a response that objects to the overall approach and objects to the deletion of certain policies, tables and paragraphs from the Plan.

BOB WILKINS  
Director of Transport and Environment  
16 November 2004  
C24NOV-WSWLP Revised Deposit Draft

Contact Officer: Samantha Walker      Tel. No. 01273 481686  
Local member:      Councillors Reid, Whetstone & Mrs Stroude

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft 2004.

**WEST SUSSEX WASTE LOCAL PLAN REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT – RESPONSE OF EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

1. It is considered that the County Council can no longer support the overall approach taken in the West Sussex Waste Local Plan for the following reasons:
  - (a) Paragraph 127 identifies that to enable West Sussex to maintain its ability to be self-sufficient and to deliver the proposed strategy, major new waste management and disposal capacity needs to be established during the Plan period. The Revised Deposit Draft deletes 23 allocated sites from the Plan. The County Council considers that this will hamper the provision of facilities such that West Sussex could significantly under provide necessary management facilities such that net self sufficiency will not be achieved and that higher levels of waste may be exported to East Sussex's waste facilities with a consequent impact on East Sussex's environment and ability to serve its own County's needs for waste management.
  - (b) The deletion of paragraphs 119-121, Table 1 and paragraphs 128-130 means that the need for any new facilities over the Plan period and any shortfall in capacity is not shown in the Plan. The County Council does recognise that figures for waste arisings, recovery rates and capacity vary over time but it is important that estimates are made of future requirements so that provision can be made. Waste facilities have a substantial lead-in time before they are operational. This may therefore result in West Sussex not being self sufficient.
  - (c) The submitted Alterations to Regional Planning Guidance 9 – the draft Regional Waste Management Strategy (now Regional Spatial Strategy) states in Policy W7 that development plans should identify suitable sites for a range of types and scales of facilities. PPG10 also encourages the identification of sites for waste management and disposal in the development plan. By not specifically allocating sites for these facilities there is the risk that West Sussex will continue to rely heavily on landfill or have to export waste for treatment in surrounding counties.
2. The County Council objects to the revision of Policy A1 as the removal of the allocation of so many sites will not positively facilitate the treatment of waste in West Sussex.
3. The County Council objects to the deletion of Policies A2 and A3 as the removal of specific allocations for open-air composting and energy from waste will not assist the provision of these types of facilities.
4. The County Council welcomes the changes to Policy A4 by the deletion of the allocations for Freshfield Lane Brickworks and Keymer Tileworks but requests that West Sussex County Council be aware that any proposals at these sites at a later stage would have to overcome the concerns that the County Council has on highway safety grounds.

**WEST SUSSEX WASTE LOCAL PLAN (DEPOSIT DRAFT)**

**Cabinet on 3 June 2003 approved the following response to the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Deposit Draft 2003:**

- a. support for the overall approach of the Plan in dealing with waste arising within West Sussex, and the acknowledgement of appropriate exports and imports in line with the proximity principle (paragraphs 110-112);
- b. no objection, in principle, to the allocation of Beeding cement works (Site K) for an energy from waste facility, although recognising the major policy issues that would need to be overcome for the site to be brought into such a use;
- c. objection to the allocation of Freshfield Lane Brickworks (Site BB) as a non-inert disposal site on highway safety grounds unless appropriate measures, which are acceptable in highway and environmental terms, can be undertaken to overcome safety problems;
- d. objection to the allocation of Keymer Tileworks (Site DD) for inert disposal unless a condition were to be attached requiring heavy vehicles to use the access from Burgess Hill.