

Nottinghamshire and Nottingham  
**Waste Core Strategy**

**Sustainability Appraisal  
Adoption Statement**



**December 2013**

## **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council adopted the Waste Core Strategy on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

1.2 This statement has been produced in line with paragraph (16) (3) and (4) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 which incorporates the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (2001/42/EC) into UK legislation. This requires the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment which includes waste core strategies because of the likely significant effects they might have on the environment. Upon adoption of a plan or programme a statement is required to provide the following details:

- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme;
- How the environmental report has been taken into account;
- How opinions expressed through public consultation on the SA process have been taken into account;
- The reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and
- The measures that are taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme.

1.3 This adoption statement addresses the above points.

## **2.0 Context**

2.1 All local development frameworks (now referred to as local plans under current legislation), including those for waste, are required to complete a sustainability appraisal (SA) under S19 (5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The purpose of the SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans. SA helps local planning authorities to ensure that their plans are compatible with the aims of sustainable development.

2.2 Although the requirements to complete SA and SEA are distinct, the government has issued guidance<sup>1</sup> that states that SA fully incorporates the requirements of the European Directive on SEA and therefore providing the SA follows published guidelines<sup>2</sup>, there is no need to

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning, Communities and Local Government 2008

<sup>2</sup> A Practical Guide to the SEA Directive Office of the Deputy Prime Minister September 2005 and the Plan-Making Manual Department for Communities and Local Government and Planning Advisory Service live, online guidance

carry out a separate SEA. This statement therefore refers to both processes as SA for simplicity.

### 3.0 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the Plan

- 3.1 The first stage in the SA process involved the scoping of the sustainability issues for the Plan area in order to establish an appropriate appraisal framework. This resulted in the publication of the Sustainability Scoping Report in September 2005. The Scoping Report was subsequently reviewed and updated to ensure it was appropriate for both waste and minerals development plan documents, with a final version being published in January 2012.
- 3.2 The Scoping Report established the principles of the sustainability appraisal framework and set out the 14 sustainability appraisal objectives which were used to assess the Waste Core Strategy, together with decision making criteria relating to each objective. These are shown in the table below.

**Table 3.1: SA objectives and decision making criteria**

Objective	Decision making criteria
1. Ensure that adequate provision is made to provide a network of suitable waste management sites for the safe treatment and disposal of waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal provide waste treatment/disposal sites close to where the waste is produced?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the distance waste is transported?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the cost of waste treatment/disposal?</li> <li>• Will it help to reduce fly-tipping?</li> <li>• Will the plan identify adequate resources to meet local and national requirements over the plan period?</li> </ul>
2. Protect and enhance biodiversity at all levels and safeguard features of geological interest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal have an adverse effect on internationally, nationally or locally important sites or legally protected species?</li> <li>• Will it affect habitats or species identified within the Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP)?</li> <li>• Will it restore or create new habitat in line with LBAP priorities?</li> <li>• Will it support the retention/enhancement of the county's green infrastructure?</li> </ul>

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Decision making criteria</b>
3. Promote sustainable patterns of movement and the use of more sustainable modes of transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal reduce overall transport distances for waste?</li> <li>• Will it reduce road haulage of waste?</li> <li>• Will it promote alternative forms of transport?</li> <li>• Will it reduce/increase road congestion?</li> <li>• Will it result in sites that are well related to the main highway network?</li> <li>• Will it require new transport infrastructure to be developed?</li> </ul>
4. Protect the quality of the historic environment above and below ground.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal have an adverse impact upon heritage assets and/or their setting, including archaeological remains and historic buildings?</li> <li>• Will it enhance or increase our understanding of the historic environment?</li> </ul>
5. Protect and enhance the quality and character of our townscape and landscape.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal have an adverse impact on local landscape character or areas of important townscape?</li> <li>• Will it have an adverse effect on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt?</li> <li>• Will it affect areas of public open space?</li> <li>• Will it lead to landscape/townscape improvements?</li> <li>• Will it result in development that is sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of design, layout and scale?</li> <li>• Will it contribute to the availability of local building materials to enable local distinctiveness to be retained in conservation projects and reflected in new development?</li> </ul>
6. Minimise impact and risk of flooding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal increase the risk of flooding?</li> <li>• Will it help to alleviate flood risk or the impact of flooding?</li> </ul>
7. Minimise any possible impacts on and increase adaptability to climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan/proposal increase emissions of greenhouse gases from waste activities?</li> <li>• Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?</li> <li>• Will it encourage the use of renewable energy sources?</li> <li>• Will it help to reduce our vulnerability to the impacts of climate change?</li> </ul>

Objective	Decision making criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will it help to increase the resilience of flora and fauna to climate change?</li> </ul>
<p>8. Protection of high quality agricultural land and soil.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the plan/proposal have an adverse impact on soil quality?</li> <li>•Will it lead to the irreversible loss of best and most versatile agricultural land?</li> </ul>
<p>9. Promote more efficient use of land and resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will it promote sustainable waste management and encourage movement of waste up the waste hierarchy?</li> <li>•Will it reduce waste/provide for re-use of waste materials?</li> <li>•Will it make use of previous developed land or buildings?</li> </ul>
<p>10. Promote energy efficiency and maximise renewable energy opportunities from new or existing development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the plan/proposal minimise energy needs?</li> <li>•Will it contribute to renewable/low carbon energy targets?</li> <li>•Will it offset the use of fossil fuels?</li> </ul>
<p>11. Protect and improve local air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the plan/have an adverse impact on local air quality?</li> <li>•Will it adversely affect a designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)?</li> </ul>
<p>12. Protect and improve water quality and promote efficient use of water.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the plan/proposal have an adverse impact upon water quality?</li> <li>•Will it increase demand for water?</li> <li>•Will it help to improve existing water quality?</li> <li>•Will the proposal incorporate sustainable water management and/or drainage?</li> </ul>
<p>13. Support wider economic development and promote local job opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the plan/proposal help to increase training and employment opportunities in Nottinghamshire?</li> <li>•Will it help to enable wider economic development?</li> </ul>
<p>14. Protect and improve human health and quality of life.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the plan/proposal minimise adverse impacts of waste activity on human health and levels of nuisance including dust, particulate emissions, noise (including traffic noise), vibration, visual amenity and light pollution.</li> </ul>

Objective	Decision making criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will it promote best practice in the operation and restoration of sites?</li>   <li>•Will it help to enhance health and wellbeing through the provision of new or improved public open space and access?</li>   <li>•Will it lead to a loss of public open space/reduction in public access?</li> </ul>

3.3 The process of sustainability appraisal has played a key role in the preparation of the Waste Core Strategy. It has been an iterative process with each successive stage of the document being informed by the SA results. Accordingly, SA played an important role in assessing the initial issues and options, the results of which can be found in the initial Sustainability Appraisal Report (June 2007); in assessing further issues and options and the preferred approach (Sustainability Appraisal & Strategic Environmental Assessment Report, May 2011); and in assessing the proposed policies (Sustainability Appraisal Report on Proposed Submission Document, February 2012 and updated September 2012). In addition, through the Examination of the Waste Core Strategy some modifications were proposed to policies and these were reviewed in terms of their implications for the sustainability appraisal objectives.

#### **4.0 How the environmental report has been taken into account**

##### **Consultation/ Representation**

4.1 Each stage of the Sustainability Appraisal was made available for comments or representations alongside the corresponding version of the Waste Core Strategy, with input sought from statutory environmental bodies, other stakeholders and the general public. The feedback received has informed the preparation of the Waste Core Strategy. The Councils' Consultation Statement (Regulation 22 Statement), published in December 2012, sets out the participants and methods of consultation/representation on a stage by stage basis. It also provides a summary of responses and how these were taken into account in the production of the Submission Document.

4.2 The stages of the SA which were made available for consultation/representation are shown in the table below:

**Table 4.1: Stages of SA consultation**

<b>Document</b>	<b>Consultation Dates</b>
Scoping Report 2005	27 Oct – 8 Dec 2006
Revised Scoping Report 2011	1 Apr – 6 May 2011
Final Scoping Report 2012	5 Mar – 30 Apr 2012
Sustainability Appraisal Report (Issues & Options) 2007	3 Sep – 29 Oct 2010
Sustainability Appraisal & Strategic Environmental Assessment Report (Preferred Approach) 2011	22 Jul – 16 Sep 2011
Sustainability Appraisal Report (Proposed Submission Document) Feb 2012 ( <i>Updated Sept 2012</i> )	5 Mar – 30 Apr 2012
Sustainability Appraisal Report on Proposed Changes September 2012	1 Oct – 12 Nov 2012

### **SA of Issues and Options and Preferred Approach**

- 4.3 Firstly, the SA assessed the proposed vision for the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) and found it to be in general accordance with sustainability principles. Secondly, the strategic objectives required to deliver the vision were appraised and found to be compatible with the SA objectives.
- 4.4 The main issues which the WCS needed to address had been identified as follows:
- Planning for future waste management needs
  - Meeting future needs for municipal, commercial and industrial waste
  - Disposal of non-hazardous waste
  - Managing inert waste
  - Location of new sites
  - Recycling and energy recovery
  - Combined sites (resource recovery)
  - Small/medium sites (recycling/energy recovery)
  - Small scale sites (rural and Green Belt areas)
  - Hazardous waste
  - Site search sequence
  - Site criteria
  - Safeguarding
  - Extension of existing sites

- 4.5 For each of these issues the SA examined the options and alternatives and recommended the options which were considered to be most sustainable for the preferred approach. Full details of how the SA has been taken into account in the preparation of the WCS are provided in the SA reports corresponding to each stage of the WCS.

#### **SA of the Waste Core Strategy Policies (Proposed Submission Document)**

- 4.6 The policies of the WCS were developed taking into consideration the SA findings at the Issues and Options and Preferred Approach stages. The emerging and fully developed proposed policies were then assessed through the SA process.
- 4.7 Overall, the SA found that the policies offered the potential for significant positive effects on the SA objectives. Whilst potential for some negative impacts was identified it was considered that these could be avoided or minimised through mitigation, largely by the effective implementation of other policies, in particular the development management policies (which will be the subject of a further DPD).
- 4.8 There was some uncertainty about the effects of some policies on some objectives, particularly those related to the impact on environmental receptors, such as biodiversity and landscape. However, this was considered inevitable given the strategic, rather than site specific, nature of the Waste Core Strategy. In the case of sites, such uncertainty will be resolved in appraisal of the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.
- 4.9 In many cases the cumulative effects of policies on each SA objective were found to be significantly positive. Where there was potential for adverse effects it was considered that these could be avoided or reduced through mitigation. In some cases the cumulative effects were uncertain due to the strategic nature of the policies and the fact that impacts would be dependent on the specific location and nature of the waste management facility.

#### **SA of Proposed Changes**

- 4.10 Following the response to consultation on the Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission document a new policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development was introduced and a number of proposed changes were made to the proposed policies. Accordingly, further SA was undertaken to assess the new policy and the changes to other policies.
- 4.11 The inclusion of the new policy, 'The presumption in favour of sustainable development', was found to offer the potential for significant positive effects on the SA objectives.

- 4.12 It was considered that the proposed changes to the other policies would not alter the overall conclusions drawn in the previous SA Report (February 2012).

### **SA Screening of the Proposed Modifications**

- 4.13 Following the Examination of the Waste Core Strategy, in May 2013, three main modifications to the Submission document were proposed. These included modifications to two of the policies:
- WCS4 (WCS3 in Submission document) 'Broad locations for waste treatment facilities', and
  - WCS5 (WCS4 in Submission document) 'Disposal sites for non-hazardous and inert waste'.
- 4.14 In both cases the modifications, which were suggested by the Inspector and Gedling Borough Council, were to provide clarity on the policy stance on proposals in the Green Belt in relation to the matters addressed by these policies.
- 4.15 The implications of the modifications to these policies in terms of the SA were considered through a screening review. The review concluded that these modifications would not result in any changes in the effects of those policies on the SA objectives and did not raise any issues which warranted further assessment.

## **5.0 How opinions expressed through public consultation (on the SA process) have been taken into account**

- 5.0 As detailed earlier in this Statement, the Statement of Consultation (Regulation 22 Statement), published December 2012, sets out the participants and methods of consultation/representation on a stage by stage basis. It also provides a summary of responses and how these were taken into account in the production of the Submission Document.
- 5.1 These comments were considered and addressed as necessary as part of the Waste Core Strategy's production, including factual updates to the contextual information (baseline data and relevant plans policies and programmes) for the SA and amendments to/expansion of the sustainability issues identified. This ongoing and iterative process informed the spatial portrait, issues and challenges, vision and detailed objectives of the Waste Core Strategy which fed into the resulting policies.

## **6.0 The reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with**

- 6.1 Sustainability appraisal has played a key role in the formulation of the Waste Core Strategy, informing each successive stage of the document. All of the options on the issues to be addressed by the WCS were tested through the SA, ensuring that all reasonable alternatives were considered. Each proposed policy was tested through the SA and the cumulative effects of policies were also tested to ensure that all the potential significant effects (both positive and negative) of the Plan as a whole were identified. Where adverse effects were identified the potential measures for avoidance or mitigation were set out.
- 6.2 The SA has been based on a sound process of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment in Accordance with EU Directive 2001/42/EC and Section 39(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

## **7.0 The measures that are taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme**

- 7.1 The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will be the vehicle for monitoring the significant environmental effects of implementing the Waste Core strategy and the progress being made towards meeting the sustainability objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal. The AMR will monitor implementation using the indicators set out in the comprehensive monitoring and implementation framework shown in Table 7 of the Waste Core Strategy. This should enable any unforeseen adverse effects to be identified and facilitate an appropriate response to address them.

## **8.0 Further Information**

- 8.1 Further information on the Waste Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal can be found on the County Council's website:

[www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/wastehaveyoursay](http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/wastehaveyoursay)