place services

Essex County Council

Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Environmental Report: Annex C – Sustainability Framework and Site Pro Forma

February 2016

Contents

List of Tables

Glossary of Acronyms

ANGSt	Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard
AD	Anaerobic Digestion
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AONB	Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
BARR	Buildings At Risk Register
CD&E	Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste
CH&P	Combined Heat and Power
CPZ	Countryside Protection Zone
CWS	County Wildlife Site
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DPD	Development Plan Document
EA	Environment Agency
EC	European Community
ECC	Essex County Council
EEC	European Economic Community
EHER	Essex Historic Environment Record
ELV	End of Life Vehicle
EU	European Union
FZ	Flood Zone
GIS	Global Information System
GWh	Giga Watt per hour
ha	Hectare
HARR	Heritage at Risk (in Essex) Register
HEC	Historic Environment Characterisation
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
kW	Kilo Watt
LCA	Landscape Character Areas
LDF	Local Development Framework
LNR	Local Nature Reserves

LoWS	Local Wildlife Sites
MGB	Metropolitan Green Belt
MLP	Minerals Local Plan
MRF	Materials Recycling Facility
MW	Mega Watt
NNR	National Nature Reserve
NO2	Nitrogen Dioxide
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PAS	Planning Advisory Service
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PM10	Particle Matter
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PRoW	Public Right of Way
RCHW	Recycling Centres for Household Waste
RWLP	Replacement Waste Local Plan
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SA/SEA	Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the Strategic Environmental Assessment
SAC	Special Areas for Conservation
SARS	Strategic Aggregate Recycling Site
SBC	Southend Borough Council
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessments
SM	Scheduled Monuments
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPZ	Source Protection Zone
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
WCA	Waste Collection Authority
WDA	Waste Disposal Authority
WDD	Waste Development Document
WPA	Waste Planning Authority

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Essex County Council (ECC) and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (SBC) commissioned Place Services to undertake an independent Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission 2016.

1.2 The Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (RPA) 2015

SEA Directive requires: 'An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan or programme, and of its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.' Annex I (a)

As part of its work on the new Waste Local Plan, ECC and SBC as Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) have prepared a Replacement Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission document for public consultation.

The Pre-Submission document builds on the WPAs' previous progress towards a Waste Development Document (WDD), incorporating a Core Strategy, Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, under the previous planning system. The change from a WDD to a WLP brings the document in line with current planning policy terminology, including revisions in approach to reflect new policy requirements, hence the need for a new consultation. The components of the plan are the same, and the WLP contains:

- Site allocations for waste management facilities
- Strategic Objectives and policy direction
- Development management policies

The Plan has been through a number of stages to get to this point. These are:

- WDD Issues and Options (2010)
- WDD Preferred Approach (2011)
- RWLP Revised Preferred Approach (2015)

All of these iterations of the Plan have been made available for consultation and have been accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal.

This annex contains the Sustainability Framework and Site Pro Forma used to assess the Plan's Policy content and Site Allocations.

2 The Sustainability Framework and Site Pro Forma (Stage A4)

The Sustainability Framework is an important tool in the SA/SEA process. It provides the context against which the Plan's emerging content can be assessed and sets out the sustainability objectives with additional criteria and key questions that should be asked to interpret whether the suggested approach adheres to the principles of sustainability; and indicators which can monitor the impact of the documents.

Both the Sustainability Framework and the Site Pro Forma have been subject to consultation with the Statutory Consultees (Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England) through the SA Scoping Report process in February 2015. Comments received by the Statutory Consultees on the Sustainability Framework and Site Pro Forma have been factored into the Sustainability Framework and the Site Pro Forma by way of amendments and additions where necessary. These are documented in the following table:

Table 1: Comments made by Statutory Consultees on SA Scoping Report of February 2015

Consultee	Comment	Action
Historic England	Broadly speaking, we consider that the objectives are appropriate and cover all areas of interest without repetition. In terms of the SA objective for the historic environment, we recommend using the overarching wording contained within our SA/SEA guidance document: "To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings" The current wording for SA Objective 5 uses an incorrect term ("historical") and separates cultural heritage and features of archaeological importance, which are part of the historic environment and can be heritage assets in their own right.	Objective changed to reflect suggested wording.
	The key questions for SA Objective 5 in Table 5 are reasonable, although should refer to policies as well as sites. In particular, the second question needs to be amended and would be clearer if it read "Does it ensure that policies and sites will not negatively affect the significance of designated heritage assets (including their setting)?"	Key question changed to reflect suggested wording.
	The site proforma contains a reasonable approach to assessment of sites against SA Objective 5 (although Ancient Woodland	The approach to predicting impacts in the SA has not been changed, in order to

	belongs under a different objective). It helpfully avoids a proximity test in terms of distance between site and heritage asset, and allows for a more nuanced assessment. However, we would argue that positive effects occur not when there are insignificant or no effects on heritage assets, but when a site enhances the significance of a heritage asset. The No Impact "0" score should be used where there is no or little impact (not the Positive and Significant Positive scores, which should be used for genuine positive effects). The same applies to the scoring against SA Objective 6 for landscape and townscape.	reflect a consistent approach to positive predictions across all other objectives. The approach of assessing 'no impacts' positively also allows a larger degree of accuracy, where a scale of positive impacts exists within the Pro Forma.
Natural England	We are satisfied that the scoping report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the SEA Directive, as transposed through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. We believe the report includes consideration of relevant aspects of the environment including objectives for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity, including designated sites, landscape and soils and the need to address climate change. We welcome reference to Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) in the Glossary of Acronyms and would recommend that this is discussed within the text of the scoping report as this is relevant to the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure. The report should also reference and consider the objectives of the local green infrastructure strategy and the Essex Biodiversity Action Plan.	Noted

2.1 The Appraisal of Policies / Preferred Approaches

The SA of the Plan appraises the Plan's policies against the Sustainability Objectives (SOs) outlined in the SA framework. The aim is to assess the sustainability effects of the Plan following implementation. The appraisal will look at the secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary effects in accordance with Annex 1 of the SEA Directive, as well as assess alternatives and provide mitigation measures where appropriate.

The following table sets out the framework for appraising the policy-based elements of the Plan.

Table 2: The Sustainability Framework (Policy Content)

SA Objective	Relevant to Key Sustainability Issue / Problem…	Key Questions	Indicators
1) To protect and enhance biodiversity and geological diversity throughout Essex and Southend.	There are 10 SPA sites in the Plan Area (also Ramsar sites). There are 2 SAC areas in the Plan Area. In the Plan Area there are 81 SSSIs. There are 7 National Nature Reserves (NNRs) located in the Plan Area. There are currently 48 LNRs in the Plan Area. Ancient Woodlands in the Plan Area cover approximately 12,800ha. In the Plan Area there are more than 1,440 LoWS	Does it seek to protect international and national designations through suitable policy criteria? Does it seek to minimise potentially adverse ecological impacts? Does it seek to minimise adverse geomorphological impacts? Does it encourage opportunities for the creation of wildlife habitats? Does it avoid damage to, or fragmentation of, major features of importance for flora and/or fauna? Is the location of new waste facilities likely to adversely impact on indigenous flagship species? Is the location of new waste facilities likely to adversely impact on indigenous BAP priority species? Is the location of new waste facilities likely to adversely impact on known habitats?	Condition of the nearest (to approved applications) sensitive receptors (where information exists). Including condition of SPAs, SACs, SSSIs. Permissions approved / rejected subject to restoration conditions regarding ecologic improvements (LNR, NNR, CWS). Applications approved subject to ecological assessments regarding flagship, BAP species, known habitats.

2) To maintain and enhance water quality and resources.	Surface water drainage can pollute waters; particularly petrol, oil, grease and metals from vehicles associated with the management of ELV facilities. Adherence to the measures in the Water Framework Directive to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water bodies.	Does the Plan seek to protect rivers and coasts? Will the scale of facilities impact on groundwater within the Plan area? Will it ensure that mitigation measures to combat any negative effects on water quality are incorporated where relevant? Will it ensure no reduction in quality and supply of ground water resources? Will it improve water quality through the improvement of existing facilities? Are proposals in line with the Water Framework Directive? Does it promote the use of SuDS?	Ecological status of rivers. Chemical status of rivers. Resource availability status for units of groundwater in Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy Areas. Condition of water bodies (Water Framework Directive). Developments approved with SuDS
3) To minimise the risk and impact of flooding.	The National Planning Policy Framework seeks to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, but where development is necessary, to ensure that it is safe and does not increase flood risk elsewhere. Surface water flood risk is relatively high in Essex with all main settlements being ranked in the top 1,000 settlements most susceptible to	Does it seek it minimise the risks to people, from fluvial or tidal flooding? Does it seek to minimise the risks to infrastructure from fluvial or tidal flooding? Does it seek to minimise the risks to infrastructure from fluvial or tidal flooding? Does it seek to minimise the risks to development from fluvial or tidal	Permissions approved contrary to EA advice Distance of new facilities to ‘Areas susceptible to surface water flooding’ – EA Maps Developments approved with SuDS

	surface water flooding. Significant levels of flood risk have been identified along the Essex coast and inland along river stretches. Large areas of Southend are susceptible to both fluvial and tidal flooding.	flooding? Does it seek to minimise the risk of residual flood risk? Does it seek to minimise the impact and icidences of ground and surface water flooding? Will new facilities incorporate SuDS and flood resilient design?	
4) To maximise the sustainable use of land and the protection of soils, safeguarding the best and most versatile agricultural land.	In the Plan Area, approximately 75% of the land area is considered agricultural land and over half of this is of high grade soils. There are significant areas of Grade 1 agricultural land within Tendring and Rochford Districts, and smaller areas within Maldon District and Colchester Borough. New and safeguarded waste management facilities should be located in order to adhere to all relevant themes of sustainable development singularly and collectively.	Will it make good use of derelict sites and PDL? Will new facilities/development occur on underused land? Will land be remediated or soil quality adequately protected as appropriate? Will it ensure that waste development does not irreversibly sterilise mineral reserves? Will it conserve soil resources, especially agricultural land grades 1 and 2? Are there practical opportunities for effective restoration, appropriate after-use of sites (applies to temporary sites only)?	Permissions approved on agricultural land grades 1 and 2. Permissions approved on contaminated land. Permissions approved on PDL
5) To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage	There are 13,991 listed buildings in the Plan Area; 272 of which are of exceptional interest (grade I) and 759	Does it ensure that waste facilities meet high quality design principles	Permissions granted / refused subject to archaeological conditions.

assets and their settings.	which are particularly important buildings of more than special interest (grade II*). The known archaeological resource in the Plan Area is very varied and highly significant. Throughout the Plan Area there are 304 Scheduled Monuments, 228 designated Conservation Areas, 38 historic parks and gardens, and 1 of only 46 Registered Battlefield sites in the country.	that respect local character? Does it ensure that policies and sites will not negatively affect the significance of designated heritage assets (including their setting)? Does it ensure that sites will not impact on any local listed assets? Does it ensure that sites will not impact on known important undesignated historic environment assets (including historic buildings, buried and visible archaeological remains and historic landscape features)?	The % of planning applications where archaeological mitigation strategies (were developed and implemented) Applications not granted permission due to impacts on the historic environment (as per policy / policies in the Local Plan). Number of listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, and % at Risk (all grades) due to waste facility allocation (where information available). Number of major development projects that detract from the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character.
6) To minimise the impact on landscape and townscape character.	In the Plan Area there is one AONB. There are 9 local authorities in the Plan Area that have land classified as being within the Metropolitan Green Belt. There are also local authorities in the Countryside Protection Zone. There are many protected lanes in the Plan Area and also over 100 special verges designated in the Plan Area.	Does it seek to ensure that new waste development is not located in areas noted for their landscape character amenity? Does it seek to ensure that new waste development is not located in areas noted as important vistas? Will it seek to avoid the loss of tranquil areas?	Developments permitted contrary to Landscape Character Assessment ‘sensitivities to change’. Number of TPOs affected by new development / applications refused on impacts on TPO grounds.
7) To protect air quality in	Air quality in Essex is generally good.	Are new facilities within 100 metres of	Number of permissions approved

the Plan area.	Most industrial processes in Essex are concentrated along the Thames Estuary. There are currently 15 Air Quality Management Areas within the Plan Area. Brentwood has the highest number of designated AQMAs with five of these located along the A12. Levels of air pollution are similar in both rural and urban areas.	AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions? Does it ensure that National Air Quality Standards are met at relevant points in the Plan Area? Will it improve air quality through improvements of existing facilities (where expanded or otherwise applicable)?	within 100m of AQMAs. New AQMAs designated within 100m of facilities (for information – not solely indicative of impact of facility.
8) To maximise energy efficiency, the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and adaptability to climate change.	In the Plan Area the largest proportion of energy consumption in 2010 was within the transport sector which accounted for 39.3% of the total energy consumed. There has been a reduction in fuel consumed on all roads by HGV vehicles in the Plan Area with the exceptions of the M25 at Brentwood and A-roads in Uttlesford. Within the Plan Area there are 18 renewable energy schemes either built or in the planning system. These combine to produce a maximum total of 105.5 MW, with the energy generating capacity for two further biomass facilities and a solar farm yet to be accounted for.	Will facilities seek to deliver renewable energy production where feasible and appropriate? Will waste technologies optimise carbon capture energy to contribute to the electric grid where appropriate? Will the use of technologies increase the energy efficiency of waste facilities and management processes where appropriate? Does it seek to promote the use of residual waste as a source of energy? Will improvements to existing facilities see an improvement in energy efficiency?	Typical energy production (GwH) from Waste facilities. Percentage increases / reductions in waste facilities providing sustainable energy production / products

9) To ensure the sustainable management of waste, minimise the quantity of waste landfilled and to maximise the re-use, recovery and recycling of waste.	In Essex and Southend, 342,882 tonnes which accounts for 49% of the total household waste was sent to landfill in 2012/13. There are few facilities that managed organic waste arisings, especially in rural areas. At present, there are no energy recovery facilities either operational or under construction although there are two with planning permission at Rivenhall and Stanway. There is a significant capacity deficit in biological treatment capacity for the management of organic waste. There is a significant deficit of inert (CD&E) waste recycling capacity when compared with the estimated plan area arisings. The outlook is further worsened when the estimated amount of inert (CD&E) waste imported from London is added to the potential plan area arisings.	Does it increase the proportion of waste (in order of priority) reduced, re-used, recycled, composted and recovered? Does it seek to move towards a zero waste scenario? Does it collectively provide sufficient capacity and waste management facilities to deal with identified future arisings?	Waste sent to landfill as a percentage of total waste. Amount of new energy recovery facilities in the Plan Area. Capacity increases regarding biological treatment. Capacity increases of CD&E waste recycling. Capacity increases in dealing with non-hazardous waste.
10) To promote the sustainable transport of waste and materials within Essex and Southend where viable, and to ensure safe highways	There are persistent network efficiency issues on a number of strategic inter-urban Long distance waste travel occurs where larger or specialist facilities are	Will new facilities be in close proximity to ECC/SBC significant existing or future waste arisings? Will new facilities be in close proximity to the delivery of new	Number of developments where a green travel plan is submitted as a condition of development.

access where necessary.	required for that waste type. Essex and Southend accept London's waste for management.	housing as identified in LPA Local Plans? Does it seek to increase the tonnage of waste arisings transported by more sustainable methods (than road)?	
11) To protect health and well-being in the Plan Area.	Health impacts associated with dust, noise and odour are difficult to ascertain where impacts are mitigated through a plan-led system.	Does it seek to ensure that facilities do not have any perceived negative impacts on human health? Does it seek to ensure that waste facilities are not located within 100metres of open space or other sensitive receptors? Will new proposed waste facilities see a loss of open space for recreation?	Loss / gain of public rights of way. Gain of public open / recreation space through restoration proposals / conditions Complaints regarding odour (Environmental Health and ECC). Complaints regarding dust (Environmental Health and ECC).
12) To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal and from access to and from facilities.	There are persistent network efficiency issues on a number of strategic inter-urban routes - the A12 and M25 and M11 have widely recognised issues with poor reliability and delays. Congestion is common on specific sections of the Council-managed network, including sections of the A127, A130 and A414. Ambient or environmental noise is defined as noise which is either unwanted or harmful. Some waste facilities can create noise that could	Does it seek to facilitate the management, recovery and correct disposal of waste controlled by EC directives? Does it seek to minimise the impact of noise and vibration from existing or new waste facilities and related activities? Does it seek to minimise the impact of odour from existing or new waste facilities and related activities on local residents?	Complaints regarding noise (Environmental Health and ECC). Conditions to planning applications (including those breached) regarding hours of operation, emission/release parameters, and transport agreements etc. Permissions granted on employment sites / industrial estates.

	impact on sensitive receptors	Does it seek to minimise the level of nuisance (including dust, vermin, litter, visual impact, light, traffic)? Does it seek to increase measures to minimise waste crime (illegal dumping)?	
13) To support economic development in the Plan Area, including jobs arising from waste related activities.	Economic growth and development in the Plan Area should be supported by appropriate facilities that adhere to the waste hierarchy. The relationship between the location of facilities and key centres for growth.	Does it ensure that the capacity of facilities meet forecasted arirings, particularly associated with planned growth and infrastructure projects? Does it seek to provide employment opportunities in the waste industry? Does it seek to increase the competitiveness and productivity of waste management within Essex and Southend? Does it seek to locate suitable facilities in industrial estates?	The distances of permissions granted / sites allocated in relation to key centres of growth / towns within the Plan Area. Growth in employment from waste sector.

2.2 The Appraisal of Sites

In addition to the above Sustainability Framework formulated for the appraisal of the policy content within the Plan, a separate framework is required for the appraisal of the sustainability of site allocations (and alternatives) within the document.

2.2.1 The Site Pro Forma (Stage A4)

Sites have been subject to appraisal using a pro forma developed taking in the key issues of the area and all relevant available information across a range of sustainability criteria. In addition, the consultation of the Scoping Report has allowed input from the Statutory Consultees. It should be noted that where the SA site pro forma includes information used in ECC Site Assessments to inform certain objectives, a number of changes have been made post-scoping to reflect those made to the ECC Site Assessments themselves. These are shown in **bold**.

It is worthy of note that in line with the pro forma, appraisals have not been intended to be a detailed project-level assessment of each site, such as that provided by an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), but aim to provide a strategic level assessment highlighting those broad impacts of the sites to inform the plan-making process.

The following table shows the site pro forma developed for the appraisal of site allocations in the SA. It is an independent assessment to that undertaken by Land Use Consultants (LUC) on behalf of Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council as Waste Planning Authorities.

Table 3: The Sustainability Appraisal Site Pro Forma

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
1) To protect and enhance biodiversity and geological diversity throughout Essex and Southend	Impact on National and County Wildlife Sites (CWS)	GIS ECC Site Assessment (2I)	S / M	Major impact upon national or international Wildlife Site and associated qualifying species that cannot be adequately mitigated	Moderate impact on a national or international Wildlife Site that could be mitigated; and/or Major impact upon a CWS **or LoWS** that could be mitigated / compensated	Minor impact on a CWS **or LoWS** that could be mitigated; and/or Potential for minor to moderate impact upon an area of undesignated semi-natural vegetation; and/or Potential for minor / moderate impacts / issues associated with European and National protected species and / or Section 41 species	Largely urban sites with very little vegetation and / or There may be some minor impacts / issues associated with European and National protected species that can be mitigated	N/A	Minor impact on a national or international Wildlife Site that could be mitigated (based on HRA) Moderate impact on a CWS **or LoWS** that could be mitigated Major impact upon an area of undesignated semi-natural vegetation
			L	As above	As above	As above	As above (or landfill with restoration to nature	N/A	As above (or restoration unknown)

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
							conservation or part)		
2) To maintain and enhance water quality and resources.	Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study Groundwater Source Protection Zones (EA, 1998)	ECC Site Assessment (2E) GIS	S / M	Landfill sites in SPZ2 and / or containing or adjacent to water bodies	Landfill sites in SPZ3 **Non-landfill sites containing or adjacent to water bodies**	N/A	Landfill and non-landfill sites outside both SPZ2 and 3 and not containing or adjacent to water bodies	N/A	Non-landfill sites in SPZ1
			L	As above (where landfill sites can be assumed to contaminate)	As above (where landfill sites can be assumed to contaminate)	N/A	As above	N/A	As above
3) To minimise the risk and impact of flooding.	Susceptibility to River Flooding – within flood zones	GIS ECC SITE Assessment	S / M	Sites in FZ3b or FZ3a.	N/A	N/A	Any potential site within FZ1	N/A	Sites in FZ2
			L	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	N/A	As above
4) To maximise the sustainable use of land and the protection of soils, safeguarding the best and most versatile agricultural land.	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) PDL or Greenfield Temporary or Permanent facility Long term impacts dependant on landfill restoration	ECC Site Assessment GIS Agricultural Land Classification map Eastern Region	S / M	The site is on greenfield land (Grade 1 ALC)	Site is on greenfield land (Grade 2 ALC)	Site is on greenfield land (Grade 4 or 5 ALC) adjacent to existing facility / represents co-location possibilities	The site represents Previously Developed Land	N/A	General uncertainties (for information only); or Site is on greenfield land (Grade 3 ALC)
			L	Permanent facility on Greenfield	Permanent facility on Greenfield	Permanent site on Greenfield (Grade 4 or 5	**As above; or** Restoration to	Restoration to use other than agriculture	General uncertainties (for information

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
				(Grade 1 ALC)	(Grade 2 ALC)	ALC)	agriculture		only); or Permanent facility on Grade 3 ALC); or Restoration unknown
5) To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	World Heritage Sites, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, HERs, Archaeological deposits, Ancient Woodland	GIS Historic environment specialist assessment as part of ECC Site Assessment	S / M	The impact / issue is so severe it could not be adequately mitigated	There is a major impact / issue, which may be capable (in most cases with substantial mitigation)	**Minor impact / issue, which may be acceptable (but may require mitigation)**	There are no impacts / issues; or **Impacts considered insignificant**	N/A	There is a moderate impact / issue, which may be acceptable (but in most cases will require mitigation
			L	As above (for permanent sites)	As above (for permanent sites)	As above (for permanent sites)	As above (for permanent sites)	Temporary sites	As above (for permanent sites)
6) To minimise the impact on landscape and townscape character.	No short – medium term impacts for landfill for this objective. Landscape impacts – ECC Specialist Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB)	Landscape Sensitivity, Visual Sensitivity ECC Landscape Specialist / ECC Site Assessment	S / M	Major landscape and/or visual impact(s) which could not be made acceptable with mitigation Or Land is in the MGB	Major landscape and/or visual impact(s) which may be capable of mitigation to make acceptable	Minor landscape and/or visual impact(s) which may be capable of mitigation to make acceptable	No or insignificant landscape and/or visual impact(s) AND Land is not within the MGB	N/A	Moderate landscape and/or visual impact(s) which may be capable of mitigation to make acceptable
			L	**As above** (for	As above (for	As above (for	As above (for	As above (for	As above (for

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
				permanent sites)	permanent sites)	permanent sites)	permanent sites) All landfill sites, through restoration.	permanent sites)	permanent sites) Landfill sites where restoration details presently unknown.
7) To protect air quality in the Plan area.	Impacts on Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) Distance to strategic highway network	GIS ECC Site Assessment	S / M	Sites that are within 1km of an AQMA and /or far from the strategic highway network	N/A	N/A	Site is in close proximity to the strategic highway network; and not within 1km of an AQMA	N/A	Site is not in close proximity to the strategic highway network and/or within 1km of an AQMA
			L	As above	N/A	N/A	As above	**All temporary proposals**	As above
8) To maximise energy efficiency, the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and adaptability to climate change.	Does the proposal include Energy from Waste? From information submitted by the applicant. Prevalence of infrastructure	Site Proposal information	S / M	N/A	N/A	Site will generate energy as part of proposal however has an issue with necessary infrastructure.	Site will generate energy as part of proposal and has necessary infrastructure.	**All other uses**	Proposal states AD / Autoclaving / Pyrolysis and Gasification / CH&P but no other info submitted.
			L	N/A	N/A	As above	As above	**As above**	As above

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative --	Negative -	Positive +	Significant Positive ++	No impact 0	Neutral / Uncertain /
9) To ensure the sustainable management of waste, minimise the quantity of waste landfilled, to maximise the re-use, recovery and recycling of waste and to promote the minimisation of waste produced at source.	Planning background	ECC Site Assessment	S / M	Similar or identical planning refusal on site Incompatible (unimplemented) permissions of strategic scale on-site or adjacent	Recent potentially incompatible (unimplemented) permissions on site	No relevant history / policy	Positive waste use policy / permission history	N/A	Previous refusal of some relevance on site (e.g. industrial use or similar structure in size and scale to a waste facility).
			L	As above (where relevant)	As above (where relevant)	As above (where relevant)	As above (where relevant)	Where use is not relevant in long term	As above (where relevant); or Where uncertainty exists
10) To promote the sustainable transport of waste and materials within Essex and Southend where viable, and to ensure safe highways access where necessary.	Method of transportation ECC Highway Authority traffic and transportation assessment (inc. suitability of existing access, capacity of local transport infrastructure and safety of the access route). Compliance with transport policy in Policy W4C of Essex and Southend Waste Local Plan (Adopted September 2001).	ECC Highways and Transportation specialist ECC Site Assessment Consistency with waste transportation policies in the Plan.	S / M	Not suitable in Highway Terms. Does not comply with Transport Policy.	Major issues that require further information / investigation. Major works required, feasibility yet to be demonstrated in opinion of Highway Authority.	Suitable in Highway Terms, nothing further required; and/or Complies with Transport Policy (Policy W4C in Essex and Southend Waste Local Plan Adopted September	Appropriate connection to a rail depot / transhipment site; and / or appropriate connection to a wharf.	N/A	Minor issues require further information / investigation. Minor works required but feasible in opinion of Highway Authority; or Moderate issues that require further information / investigation.

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
						2001.			Works required, feasibility yet to be demonstrated in opinion of Highway Authority.
			L	As above where relevant	As above where relevant	As above where relevant	As above where relevant	Landfill / temporary sites post restoration	As above where relevant

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
11) To protect health and well-being in the Plan Area.	On or adjoining site: PRoWs, open space designations Restoration proposals for temporary sites. Long term impacts are only possible for temporary sites, based on the fact that long term impacts for permanent sites can not be comparable to restoration proposals. For consistency and fairness across sites/proposals, all long term impacts for permanent sites are scored as uncertain (for information only).	GIS Site visits ECC Site Assessment	S / M	For landfill sites: sensitive receptors within 250m; or Site contains a PRoW and / or formal open space, outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens, children's equipped playspace and school grounds / playing fields	**Sensitive receptors within 250m of the site**	N/A	No sensitive receptors within 250m (100m for MRFs); and No other existing waste sites within 1km of the site, limiting the risk of cumulative effects on the amenity of the local community; AND Site does not contain any PRoW or within 100m of formal open space, outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens, children's equipped playspace and school grounds / playing fields	N/A	No sensitive receptors within 250m, however the site is within 1km of a settlement and other existing waste sites, increasing the risk of cumulative effects on the amenity of the local community; or Site is directly adjacent to a PRoW and / or formal open space, outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens, children's equipped playspace and school grounds / playing fields

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
			L	N/A	N/A	Temporary proposals restoration is nature conservation	Temporary proposals restoration is to amenity	Temporary proposals restoration to agriculture	All permanent sites / proposals Temporary proposals - no restoration given, or uncertain whether publicly accessible
12) To minimise public nuisance from waste treatment and disposal and from access to and from facilities.	Proximity to sensitive receptors: Residential areas (including single properties / dwellings), Schools, Hospitals. Distances are to the built form of the dwelling, and not surrounding land in curtilage. ECC Highway Authority traffic and transportation assessment (inc. suitability of existing access, capacity of local transport infrastructure and safety of the access route).	PPS10 Appendix B Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study ECC Site Assessment GIS	S / M	Site is within an Airport Safeguarding or Bird Strike Hazard Area; or For all sites: Not suitable in Highways Terms.	Major issues that require further information / investigation. Major works required, feasibility yet to be demonstrated in opinion of Highway Authority.	Minor issues that require further information / investigation. Minor works required but feasible in opinion of Highway Authority	For landfill sites: site is not within an Airport Safeguarding or Bird Strike Hazard Area Suitable in Highways terms, nothing further required; and Complies with relevant transport policy	N/A	Moderate issues that require further information / investigation. Works required, feasibility yet to be demonstrated in opinion of Highway Authority; and/or General uncertainty surrounding mix of impacts

Sustainability Objective	Key Criteria	Source	Time	Significant Negative	Negative	Positive	Significant Positive	No impact	Neutral / Uncertain
				--	-	+	++	0	/
			L	N/A for landfill sites As above for permanent sites	N/A for landfill sites As above for permanent sites	N/A for landfill sites As above for permanent sites	N/A for landfill sites As above for permanent sites	All landfill / temporary proposals where long term effects relate to restoration	N/A for landfill sites As above for permanent sites
13) To support economic development in the Plan Area, including jobs arising from waste related activities.	Location in proximity to key centre for growth – Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester, Harlow, Southend and towns as defined in district borough Local Plan settlement hierarchies Temporary or permanent facility	Desktop mapping assessment	S / M	Site is 25.1km or over of a key centre for growth or recognised town in the plan area	Site is 15.1km – 25km from a key centre for growth or recognised town in the plan area	Site is within 10km of a recognised town within the plan area	Site is within 10km of a key centre for growth in the plan area	N/A	Site is 10.1km – 15km of a key centre for growth or recognised town in the plan area
			L	Permanent site which is 25.1km or over of a key centre for growth or recognised town in the plan area	Permanent site which is 15.1km – 25km from a key centre for growth or recognised town in the plan area	Permanent site within 10km of a recognised town within the plan area	Permanent site within 10km of a key centre for growth in the plan area.	All temporary sites post operation	Permanent site which is 10.1km – 15km of a key centre for growth or recognised town in the plan area

3 Monitoring

The significant sustainability effects of implementing a Local Plan must be monitored in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action. The Sustainability Framework and Site Pro Forma of this Environmental Report contain suggested indicators in order to monitor each of the Sustainability Objectives. For the purposes of addressing the approach to monitoring, it should be taken that all of the indicators highlighted in the Sustainability Framework and Site Pro Forma would be relevant for monitoring the impacts of the Plan; however it should be noted that these may not all be collected due to limited resources and difficulty in data availability or collection.

Guidance stipulates that it is not necessary to monitor everything included within the Sustainability Framework, but that monitoring should focus on significant sustainability effects, e.g. those that indicate a likely breach of international, national or local legislation, that may give rise to irreversible damage or where there is uncertainty and monitoring would enable preventative or mitigation measures to be taken. The monitoring indicators contained within this Annex are indicative only, and information, including that used to monitor the impacts of this SA, is likely to be more appropriately collected through the WPAs annual monitoring requirements and in line with best practice.

Upon adoption the Plan will be accompanied by an Adoption Statement which will outline those monitoring indicators most appropriate for future monitoring of the Plan in line with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

place services

This information is issued by
Place Services Team at Essex County Council

You can contact us in the following ways:

Visit our website: **www.placeservices.co.uk**

By telephone: **03330136840**

Be email: **enquiries@placeservices.co.uk**

By post:
Place Services, Essex County Council
County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH

Read our online magazine at **essex.gov.uk/ew**

Follow us on Essex_CC

Find us on facebook.com/essexcountycouncil

The information in this document can be translated, and/ or made available in alternative formats, on request.

Published February 2016