

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

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

**Environmental Report: Annex D - Audit trail of alternatives
explored through the Sustainability Appraisal and plan-making
processes**

February 2016

Contents

1	Introduction.....	6
1.1	The Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission 2016.....	6
1.2	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment.....	6
2	Alternatives Considered Throughout the Plan Making Process	8
3	The Strategy.....	9
3.1	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: The Vision	9
3.2	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Strategic Objectives.....	10
3.3	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: The Spatial Strategy	11
4	Need and Safeguarding.....	17
4.1	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 1 - Need for Waste Management Facilities.....	17
4.2	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 2 - Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure.....	25
5	Areas of Search and Locational Criteria	30
5.1	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 4 - Areas of Search	30
5.2	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 5 - Enclosed Waste Facilities	31
5.3	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 6 - Open Waste Facilities	35
5.4	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 7 – Nuclear Waste Treatment and Storage at Bradwell-on-Sea	38
5.5	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 8 – Non-Nuclear Very Low-Level and Low-Level Radioactive Waste	40
5.6	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 9 – Waste Disposal Facilities.....	42
6	Development Management Policies	47
6.1	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 10 - Development Management Criteria.....	47
6.2	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 11 - Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change.....	51
6.3	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 12 – Transport and Access	53
6.4	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 13 - Landraising	55

6.5	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 14 – Landfill Mining and Reclamation	58
7	Strategic Waste Management Allocations	60
7.1	The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 3 – Strategic Site Allocations	60
7.1.1	Sites excluded having failed the Stage 1 Exclusionary Criteria of the Site Assessment Process	60
7.1.2	Sites included within the Sustainability Appraisal Process	61
7.1.3	The Appraisal of Enclosed Waste Facilities	68
7.1.4	The Appraisal of Enclosed Thermal Facilities	87
7.1.5	The Appraisal of Open Air Facilities	98

List of Tables

Table 1:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Transfer Stations	68
Table 2:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Storage facilities	73
Table 3:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF)	77
Table 4:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Metal Recycling Facilities	80
Table 5:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: In-vessel composting facilities	81
Table 6:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Mechanical Biological Treatment Facilities (MBT)	84
Table 7:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Combined Heat and Power Facilities (CHP)	87
Table 8:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Gasification and Pyrolysis Facilities	90
Table 9:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Anaerobic Digestion / Biogas (AD)	91
Table 10:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Autoclaving Facilities ..	95
Table 11:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&EW) Recycling Facilities (or inert recycling/soil screening and non-inert recycling)	98
Table 12:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities	106
Table 13:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Windrow Composting Facilities ..	107
Table 14:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Inert Landfill Sites	109
Table 15:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Non-hazardous Landfill Sites ..	113
Table 16:	Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Hazardous Landfill Sites	116

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
C&I	Commercial and Industrial wastes
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
EHHER	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

SA/SEA Environmental Report – Annex D: February 2016

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

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.

1.1 The Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission 2016

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

1.2 Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment

The requirement for Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) emanates from a high level national and international commitment to sustainable development. The most commonly used definition of sustainable development is that drawn up by the World Trade Commission on Environment and Development in 1987 which states that sustainable development is:

'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.'

This definition is consistent with the themes of the NPPF, which draws upon The UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future's five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly.

SEA originates from the European Directive 2001/42/EC "on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment" (the 'SEA Directive') which came into force in 2001. It seeks to increase the level of protection for the environment; integrate environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes; and promote sustainable development.

The Directive was transposed into English legislation in 2004 by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (the 'SEA Regulation') which requires an SEA to be carried out for plans or programmes

'subject to preparation and/or adoption by an authority at national, regional or local level or which

are prepared by an authority for adoption, through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government, and required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions’.

This includes Local Plans. The aim of the SEA is to identify potentially significant environmental effects created as a result of the implementation of the plan or programme on issues such as *‘biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors’* as specified in Annex 1(f) of the Directive.

SA examines the effects of proposed plans and programmes in a wider context, taking into account economic, social and environmental considerations in order to promote sustainable development. It is mandatory for Local Plans to undergo a Sustainability Appraisal in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Planning Act 2008, and in accordance with paragraph 165 of the NPPF.

Whilst the requirements to produce a SA and SEA are distinct, Government guidance considers that it is possible to satisfy the two requirements through a single approach providing that the requirements of the SEA Directive are met. This integrated appraisal process will hereafter be referred to as SA.

2 Alternatives Considered Throughout the Plan Making Process

Sustainability Appraisal must appraise all reasonable alternatives. Within the context of Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Planning Practice Guidance states that reasonable alternatives are the different realistic options considered by the plan-maker in developing the policies in its plan. They must be sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made. The alternatives must be realistic and deliverable.

This Annex explores all of the alternatives deemed ‘reasonable’ within the RWLP plan-making process. It also presents the preferred content of each element of the Plan. In each instance within this Annex, the reason for rejection and selection for each alternative or Policy approach has been set out. Please note that the main Environmental Report offers the appraisal of each alternative that is detailed in this Plan.

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 offers the history of the Plan’s preferred content through these iterations and in light of all reasonable alternatives explored for consideration.

This Annex is presented in the following sections, exploring different elements of the Plan:

- Chapter 3 - The Strategy (Vision, Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy)
- Chapter 4 - Need and Safeguarding (Policies 1 - 2)
- Chapter 5 – Areas of Search and Locational Criteria (Policies 4 – 9)
- Chapter 6 – Development Management Policies (Policies 10 – 14)
- Chapter 7 - Strategic Waste Management Allocations (Policy 3)

3 The Strategy

3.1 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: The Vision

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested content	At this stage, suggested aims were consulted upon with consultees asked whether they agree with the content, and whether they could offer any suggested amendments or other recommendations as to the Vision's content. As such, the Vision was developed from this starting point.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Preferred content	The Issues and Options consultation put forward the suggested Vision and requested comments on these, but did not provide distinct alternative options as none could be considered reasonable in response to the WPAs' requirements and remit. The Vision was progressed at this stage.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Preferred content	At this stage the Vision built on the principles of the 2011 Preferred Approach Vision, but was amended to conform to the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. The Vision at this stage is similar and largely indistinct from that of the Pre-Submission.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 1: A variation to plan more strictly for self-sufficiency (this constituted a re-exploration of those previous approaches within the context of current national requirements).	The Preferred Vision's concept of planning for net self-sufficiency 'where practicable' aligned the Vision with current national guidance, which states that 'there are clearly some wastes which are produced in small quantities for which it would be uneconomic to have a facility in each local authority'. The alternative of strict net self-sufficiency, iterating the national stance before the NPPF, was re-explored and rejected for the reason that local circumstances dictate that this is not a practicable approach. The alternative of strict net self-sufficiency would, for example, require facilities for waste streams that are better

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
	managed outside the Plan Area. The plan's evidence base supports a notion that these facilities are not considered practical to be provided within the local context of the Plan Area and as such the alternative of strict self-sufficiency was rejected
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	The Pre-Submission Vision's concept of planning for net self-sufficiency 'where practicable' aligns the Vision with national guidance, which states that 'there are clearly some wastes which are produced in small quantities for which it would be uneconomic to have a facility in each local authority'. As such the Pre-Submission Vision has been selected in order to meet national requirements in a local context.

3.2 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Strategic Objectives

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested content	The overall approach was progressed at the time but has since been rejected in favour of a more streamlined approach that has an added emphasis on flexibility and what is practicable (in the context of what is required of WPAs and the remit of Waste Local Plans).
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Preferred content	This approach was aligned to the Plan's primary focus in terms of what is practicable and tailored to (then) current requirements, conditions and capacity gap analysis. As such elements of this approach were progressed and those omitted were representative of national requirements that have since been superseded in the NPPF.

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - Preferred content	This approach is aligned to the Plan's primary focus in terms of what is practicable and is also more tailored to current requirements, conditions and capacity gap analysis. Changes in national requirements and guidance since 2011 (when the previous Strategic Objectives were developed and appraised) have also dictated the Preferred Strategic Objectives.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - Alternative 1: Re-explored notion of previous iterations of Objectives. These were larger in number and broadly wider ranging to reflect added emphasis on net self-sufficiency	Previous approaches could be considered to be less aligned to the Plan's primary focus in terms of what is practicable and also more tailored to previous requirements pre-NPPF, which was a less flexible approach over the plan period. Changes in national requirements and guidance since 2011 have also dictated the Preferred Strategic Objectives. As such, and in line with the Strategic Objectives reflecting the Vision and being expanded on in more detail through the Local Plan's Preferred Approaches, no additional specific alternative approaches to the Strategic Objectives have needed identification for appraisal. The Strategic Objectives at this stage have been progressed and also represent the content of the Pre-Submission objectives.
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	The Pre-Submission Strategic Objectives follow those of the Revised Preferred Approach. The Objectives have been selected due to their representation of national requirements in the local context and a practicable and flexible approach to waste management over the plan period.

3.3 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: The Spatial Strategy

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Option 1: Expansion and co-location with existing facilities	<p>This option was rejected, although a hybrid option was developed and progressed.</p> <p>This approach would lead to certain areas, such as the north west of the Plan</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
	<p>Area, to continue to be less well served. The approach is similarly inflexible regarding its response to growth across the Plan Area, particularly since the removal of top down regional growth targets and the requirements of the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to objectively assess their needs for growth. For these reasons this alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Option 2: Existing Key Urban Centres of Population and Growth</p>	<p>This option was rejected, although a hybrid option was developed and progressed.</p> <p>This approach would also lead to certain areas, again such as the north west of the Plan Area, to continue to be less well served. The approach, although responding better to expected growth in the Plan Area than Alternative 1, can also be considered inflexible regarding its response to growth across the Plan Area since the removal of top down regional growth targets and the requirements of the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to objectively assess their needs for growth. The alternative is limited in its scope to adapt to changing circumstances in the Plan Area and for these reasons this alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Option 3: De-centralised approach</p>	<p>This option was rejected, although a hybrid option was developed and progressed.</p> <p>The alternative alone does not allow for economies of scale. The local level provision of facilities would require a lot more mitigation of individual impacts and improvements to the rural road network specific to each facility and with negligible secondary benefits. For these reasons the alternative has been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Option 4: Areas with limited existing capacity</p>	<p>This option was rejected, although a hybrid option was developed and progressed.</p> <p>The alternative fails to respond to the proximity principle within the Plan Area and may be seen as too heavily influenced by London imports. Waste data is also not collected at the district-level, so ascertaining where there is local level</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
	need is not possible. For these reasons the option was rejected.
Option 5: A hybrid option (of the above Options 1-4)	N/A - A Hybrid Option was not appraised at this stage due to the uncertainty of which other Options' elements would be included. The specifics of the hybrid option were explored as the Preferred Approach for the overall Spatial Strategy in 2011.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Preferred content (hybrid option developed from the options explored at the Issues and Options stage)	At the Issues and Options stage, a number of alternative options for defining the overall spatial strategy were suggested. A hybrid approach was taken forward as the Preferred Approach as this option was favoured by Consultees and allowed flexibility for the waste industry. The three sites with planning permission for Integrated Waste Management Facilities at Stanway (Colchester), Rivenhall (Braintree) and Courtauld Road (Basildon) were allocated for safeguarding as they had been shown to be suitable sites for waste management through gaining planning permission. Once developed, these sites were anticipated to make a significant contribution to meeting the capacity gap for municipal, commercial and industrial waste recycling and treatment. Two of the facilities are close to the key urban centres and the third is close to one of the smaller centres although centrally located. Therefore, it was identified that that they should be protected from other non-compatible developments by safeguarding these sites for waste management. At the Pre-Submission stage this previously preferred Spatial Strategy can be seen as unviable due to the status of the IWMF at Stanway. As such this approach has since been rejected in favour of a more flexible approach that does not include this IWMF.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Preferred content	The Spatial Strategy at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage responded to a more flexible iteration of the previous hybrid of strategy options explored at both the Issues and Options (2010) and previous Preferred Approach (2011) stages. It's most notable change reflects less focus on the IWMFs. This has allowed the strategy to better reflect notions of distribution throughout the Plan Area and the positive elements of the alternative strategy options explored throughout the plan-making process whilst also becoming more flexible in line with growth in the county over the Plan period. Since 2012, the NPPF has required district level growth targets to be objectively

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
	<p>assessed; a significant change in approach from the top-down figures of the RSS.</p> <p>Local Planning Authorities will have their objectively assessed needs independently examined through the Local Plan making process as district-level Local Plans approach adoption. At present the districts, boroughs and unitaries within the Plan Area are at widely different stages of the Local Plan making process and as such the RWLP can only make assumptions regarding the broad growth needs of the Plan Area. This requires the RWLP to be flexible not only in the allocation of strategic sites, but also in formulating approaches that can sustainably plan for any additionally required and non-strategic sites. Within the Spatial Strategy at the Revised Preferred Approach stage this was reflected through the locational criteria for new sites and the methodology behind identifying areas-of-search; where the principle of development for waste management facilities has been assessed. Regarding the allocation of sites within the Plan, the Spatial Strategy responds to the sustainable, available and viable sites that came forward in response to the Plan's call-for-sites. As such the preferred strategy reflected the most sustainable option in response to previous consultations, security and flexibility. The Spatial Strategy at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage is largely similar to that of the Pre-Submission stage, and as such can be considered to be selected and progressed to that stage, subject to more detail on Areas of Search and locational criteria based policies.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 1: Issues & Options A – Expansion and co-location with existing facilities (this was a re-exploration of the original option explored at the Issues and Options stage, to assess its performance in the context of current national requirements)</p>	<p>This approach would lead to certain areas, such as the north west of the Plan Area, to continue to be less well served. The approach is similarly inflexible regarding its response to growth across the Plan Area, particularly since the removal of top down regional growth targets and the requirements of the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to objectively assess their needs for growth. For these reasons this alternative has been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 2: Issues & Options B – Existing key urban centres of population and growth (this was a re-exploration of the original option explored at the Issues and Options stage, to assess its</p>	<p>This approach would also lead to certain areas, again such as the north west of the Plan Area, to continue to be less well served. The approach, although responding better to expected growth in the Plan Area than Alternative 1, can also be considered inflexible regarding its response to growth across the Plan Area since the removal of top down regional growth targets and the</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
performance in the context of current national requirements)	requirements of the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to objectively assess their needs for growth. The alternative is limited in its scope to adapt to changing circumstances in the Plan Area and for these reasons this alternative has been rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 3: Issues & Options C – De-centralised approach (this was a re-exploration of the original option explored at the Issues and Options stage, to assess its performance in the context of current national requirements)	The alternative alone does not allow for economies of scale. The local level provision of facilities would require a lot more mitigation of individual impacts and improvements to the rural road network specific to each facility and with negligible secondary benefits. For these reasons the alternative has been rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 4: Issues & Options D – Areas with limited existing capacity (this was a re-exploration of the original option explored at the Issues and Options stage, to assess its performance in the context of current national requirements)	The alternative fails to respond to the proximity principle within the Plan Area and may be seen as too heavily influenced by London imports. Waste data is also not collected at the district-level, so ascertaining where there is local level need is not possible. For these reasons the option was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 5: Issues & Options E – A hybrid option (Previous Preferred Approach [WDD]) - The WPAs will address the waste management capacity requirements for the Plan area by safeguarding a network of existing, strategic waste management facilities and the three strategic sites with planning permission for Integrated Waste Management Facilities at Stanway (Colchester), Rivenhall (Braintree) and Courtauld Road (Basildon) to support the additional Preferred Site allocations for strategic recycling and recovery facilities to meet the capacity gap. Should any further sites be required, flexibility is provided through the locational criteria-based Preferred Approaches and development management requirements (this was a re-exploration of the original option explored at the Issues and Options stage, to assess its performance in the context of current national requirements).	The Integrated Waste Management Facility at Stanway is not a Preferred Site allocation as the planning permission previously granted has now expired. This would see the Plan underproviding. As such, this Spatial Strategy option can not be considered viable or a reasonable alternative.
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	The Pre-Submission Spatial Strategy draws on, and is largely similar to, that of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015). The key difference between these two versions of the Spatial Strategy is a heightened degree of flexibility within the Plan Area, emanating from the inclusion of those employment areas

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression
	<p>identified through the Plan's Areas of Search process and locational criteria policies. In order to direct waste management facilities serving a predominantly local need towards appropriate locations, Areas of Search have been designated; the methodology for this having been explored in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) Plan and subject to SA at that stage with a range of positive impacts. These Areas have been designated around employment areas allocated in Local Development Plan documents which are considered to be suitable for waste development in principle. In recognition that not all waste facility types would be appropriate in employment areas, and to afford further flexibility, locational criteria policies are included to guide the location of waste development proposed during the Plan period. For the purposes of ensuring the further flexibility of the Plan, this approach has been selected.</p>

4 Need and Safeguarding

4.1 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 1 - Need for Waste Management Facilities

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested waste arisings, capacity and future requirements	The Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Waste Development Document Capacity Gap Report (May 2010) identified three scenarios that were used to forecast future arisings. At the time, these responded to the The Adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), adopted in 2008, The Submitted Draft of the Revisions to the RSS until 2031 (the 'Submitted RSS'), and a hybrid of Local Waste Strategy MSW Projections and the Submission RSS Scenario for All Other Waste Streams. Where such forecasted arisings were aligned to the Regional Spatial Strategy and in response to the top-down growth targets for the Plan Area's Districts / Boroughs / Unitary, no other alternative approaches were considered reasonable at this stage.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) - Suggested waste arisings, capacity and future requirements	The Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Waste Development Document Capacity Gap Report (May 2010) identified three scenarios that were used to forecast future arisings. At the time, these responded to the The Adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), adopted in 2008, The Submitted Draft of the Revisions to the RSS until 2031 (the 'Submitted RSS'), and a hybrid of Local Waste Strategy MSW Projections and the Submission RSS Scenario for All Other Waste Streams. Where such forecasted arisings were aligned to the Regional Spatial Strategy and in response to the top-down growth targets for the Plan Area's Districts / Boroughs / Unitary, no other alternative approaches were considered reasonable at this stage.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - The Preferred Approach (now Alternative 1) for CD&E arisings is a mid-range scenario of two scenarios reflecting	At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage forecasting for non-hazardous organic waste (for biological treatment [this waste stream is a combination of the Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) stream and the

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>the best and worst case of estimating arisings (including a mid-range scenario between a theoretical uplift of capacity on existing facilities [maximum recycling efficiency] and a reliance on existing facilities at current capacities).</p>	<p>commercial and industrial (C&I) waste stream]) looked at (for C&I wastes) local arising estimations plus Greater London Local Plan arising estimations, and (for LACW) data supplied by local authorities. Regarding the LACW waste stream, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) looked at a scenario of 0% annual growth in waste arisings over the Plan period due to population increases being offset by existing and planned future minimisation measures. This approach was based on the levels of recycling and composting of household waste as set out in Waste Strategy for England 2007 and presented in the adopted 2008 Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS). The new forecasting methodology used for the Pre-Submission Plan instead assumes the growth rates applied in the national Defra central forecast (0.2% per annum) to the Baseline Projection and extrapolates that forward to the end of the Plan period. This is more in line with, and follows the guidance of the PPG, which requires a level of growth to be considered and added flexibility within the Plan. As a result the 0% annual growth scenario has been discounted for LACW and this approach rejected. The approach to C&I forecasting has not changed between the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage Plan and the Pre-Submission Plan.</p> <p>Regarding inert waste, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach to deriving a baseline figure for arisings looked at a mid-range scenario between a theoretical uplift of capacity on existing facilities (maximum recycling efficiency) and a reliance on existing facilities at current capacities. The Pre-Submission Plan relies on a different approach to calculate the baseline figure, the largest difference being the assumptions around how waste has been dealt at intermediate facilities. The key difference between the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) and the Pre-Submission Plan forecasting methodology is that the latter assumes a default growth scenario of zero, as suggested in the waste chapter of Planning Practice Guidance, as 'Waste planning authorities should start from the basis that net arisings of construction and demolition waste will remain constant over time'. This reflects the wide fluctuations in CDEW (inert waste) arisings which occur from year to year as construction projects commence and complete. There is no reason to suggest that the situation in the Plan Area is any different and therefore a zero growth rate, as recommended by PPG, has been applied, and the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach rejected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	<p>Hazardous Waste - At the RPA (2015) stage, the preferred approach to stable non-reactive hazardous waste arisings over the Plan period was to use those data returns published by the Environment Agency within their annual Hazardous Waste Interrogator, which looks at hazardous waste movements when they 'change hands' between producers and disposal / treatment facilities. The quality of this data was, and is, considered good due to the nature of the waste. Despite this, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) did not factor in the figures from the Waste Data Interrogator (which additionally captures all hazardous waste movements) , or the EA Pollution Inventory (which also crucially captures hazardous waste arising from certain waste management facilities such as landfills and Energy from Waste plants). It should also be noted that the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach assumed that hazardous waste management facilities within the Plan Area merely resulted in the transfer of waste elsewhere. For these reasons the approach has been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - USING THE PREFERRED METHODOLOGY - Alternative 2A: CD&E - the best case scenario, reflecting a maximum recycling efficiency estimate.</p>	<p>This alternative would have issues through a reliance on existing facilities to maximise their efficiency. This would also be dependent on significantly reconfiguring existing sites, which is unlikely to be viable across all sites, and it would also potentially have significant cost implications, with site reconfiguration not necessarily being suitable for environmental reasons on individual sites. For these reasons, the alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - USING THE PREFERRED METHODOLOGY - Alternative 2B: CD&E - the worst case scenario reflecting the capacity of existing facilities only.</p>	<p>This alternative does not factor in any planned growth in the Plan Area or London, and is similarly inflexible to any changes in arisings within the Plan period. This would also be dependent on significantly refiguring existing sites, which is unlikely to be viable across all sites, would have significant cost implications, and may not be suitable for environmental reasons on individual sites. For these reasons, the alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - USING THE PREFERRED METHODOLOGY - Alternative 3: (C&I) - a scenario that factors in local arising estimations only</p>	<p>It has been identified within the NPPW that Greater London net imports to the Plan Area requires specific consideration and for this reason it is considered that the Plan's Preferred Approach must align with that forecasted in the adopted London Plan 2015. In addition, Essex County Council had been involved in the Duty to Co-operate process that governed the formation of the</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	London Plan 2015 and it is now considered prudent to plan based on its forecasts. For these reasons, the alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 1: East of England Regional Assembly – National study into commercial and industrial waste arisings 2006/07, 2009, ADAS (Estimates C&I waste arisings on the basis of the number of companies in each standard industrial classification sector for each Region).	The alternative was considered to be stretching grossing methodology too far. The study, and the data used is now old and its uses are for comparison only. As such this alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 2: Detailed Assessment of East of England Waste Arisings, East of England Regional Assembly, 2009 (broad picture of waste arisings in the East of England, using WasteDataFlow, Environment Agency's Regis Appended Tonnage System [RATS] database and Hazardous Waste Interrogator).	This alternative would have limited use due to a lack of capacity data across the range of the exempt sites data supplied. As such it would not be possible to perform a statistically valid survey of exempt sites within the region, and therefore it is not possible to gross this data up to take account of sites which were not surveyed or refused to take part.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 3: Commercial and Industrial Waste in the UK and Republic of Ireland, CIWM, 2013 (this study uses the breakdown of employees by sector from the Business Register Employment Survey 2009, estimating the tonnage of waste generated per employee for each sector grouping).	Although this alternative has some use in checking derived data, it was considered that there are significant gaps. The alternative does not account for C&I waste which may go through exempt sites. The quality and quantity of data on waste leaving sites is also less than that received, due to the fact that not all operators provide detailed information. As a result it is likely that not all waste that passes through one site to another is captured and therefore the overall waste managed figure is likely to be an overestimation. For these reasons this alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 4: New Methodology to Estimate Waste Generation by the Commercial and Industrial Sector in England, Defra, 2014 (the overall approach involves a review of available data sources. The alternative methodologies within this respond to an arisings/survey based approach and a deposit/returns based approach).	This alternative has been considered not robust, with too many un-evidenced assumptions with the revised estimate for 2009 being 21% less than that derived using waste surveys. The significant number of un-evidenced assumptions made to estimate gaps in data, especially regarding waste treated/transferred by operators under exemptions, ensured that this alternative was rejected.

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 5: Northern Ireland Commercial & Industrial (C&I) Waste Estimates, 2011 (the methodology used applies factors [waste per business] derived from the recently-published Defra study covering England: C&I waste survey 2009).</p>	<p>The alternative uses a C&I survey remodelling approach from the data collected in the Defra 2009 C&I study. The methodology would not be able relevant to the waste data collected from English businesses as it does not factor in the differences between Northern Ireland and England's business sectors. Results for waste management routes are not as robust due to differences in management options available in Northern Ireland in comparison with England and for this reason the alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) -FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 6: 2011 Waste Data Quality Report, SEPA/Natural Scotland, 2013 (the method used to estimate Scottish commercial and industrial waste arisings for 2011 is based on the use of SEPA regulatory data. It uses data from licensed/permitted site returns and complex exempt activities to provide estimates of arisings by business sector).</p>	<p>A broader dataset is collected by SEPA in Scotland compared to England; data not directly transferable. It should also be noted that waste produced by a business in Scotland that is exported directly and does not pass through a Scottish waste management site will not be captured in the dataset. The scale of this missing data is not currently known. For these reasons, this alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) -FOR C&I WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 7: Decoupling of Waste and Economic Indicators, WRAP, 2012 (this research investigated trends of household, commercial, industrial, and construction and demolition waste arisings and key economic indicators in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland to see where decoupling has occurred).</p>	<p>The lack of data for C&I and C&D wastes in this methodology means that it would not be possible to derive any reliable conclusions on the relationship between waste and the economic performance of the sectors. There is evidence that waste prevention measures such as economic instruments, co-operation and information are effective in decoupling waste from economic drivers, but the evidence does not allow conclusions to be drawn on which measure or combination of measures is most effective; this will depend on an individual context, waste stream and sector. For this reason, the alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) -FOR CD&E WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 1: East of England Construction and Demolition Waste Arisings – Final report, Aug 2009 (this approach was to develop a set of performance indicators based on waste arisings data from completed construction projects from BRE's SMARTWaste Plan and SMARTStart tools).</p>	<p>Potential double counting in excavation waste as the plan tool did not specify construction waste only, and so some may have included excavation waste. Could provide a specific estimate for each county / unitary authority (within East of England) for 2008 for all waste streams other than excavation. There are significant variations in some figures, including between mean and median – mean has been assumed to be representative of typical projects and the median would be representative of projects operating at good practice. The methodology also does not attempt to quantify waste from exempt activities.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	For these reasons, and due to the data being old, the alternative was rejected.
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) -FOR CD&E WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 2: Study into Waste handled at Exempt Sites, East of England Waste Technical Advisory Body, March 2012 (this report explores the different data sources that exist and analyses the information from a telephone survey of companies operating in the East of England, including those operating mobile crushing equipment. Using this information, together with data from the Environment Agency, other national surveys and site waste management plans, the report attempts to assess the quantities that might be arising in the East of England).</p>	<p>This piecemeal approach is considered insufficiently complete to provide a clear picture. Some level of response was received from a third of waste management and haulage companies. Many of these were unable or reluctant to provide detailed information on the quantity and origin of material that they handled. Most companies do not explicitly operate in the East of England, and therefore had difficulty in identifying the quantity or percentage of their work that was based in the East of England. SWMPs showed great variation in the quantities of waste arising from different projects, even when they are projects of the same type. New build projects were considered to be more consistent in the quantities of waste generated, but the extent of the variation was still too large to provide a meaningful standard level of arisings, either by quantity of built floor space or by the value of the project. For these reasons, in addition to a low participation rate, this alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - FOR CD&E WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 3: Survey of Arisings and Use of Alternatives to Primary Aggregates in England, 2005 Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste, DCLG, 2007 (two surveys were carried out during the spring and early summer of 2006, backed up by a programme of other data analysis, to establish estimates for the arisings and use as aggregate of construction and demolition waste [CDEW] in England in 2005).</p>	<p>This alternative was rejected as the survey response rates were insufficient to presume any regional or sub-regional focus. As such, the data is not considered accurate. The alternative was also rejected as the data is considered old and did not cover non-inert CDEW.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) -FOR CD&E WASTES FORECASTING METHODOLOGIES - Alternative 4: Construction, demolition and excavation waste arisings, use and disposal for England, WRAP, 2008 - Update on the 2007 DCLG survey (this approach was to run a limited survey; draw on information collected from its members by the National Federation of Demolition Contractors to provide a 'second opinion' on the state of the sector; make maximum use of data collected by the Environment Agency; collect targeted information from operators of waste treatment and transfer facilities; and run a formal survey of</p>	<p>This alternative involves the grossing up of the data from 80 respondents into a national picture. This was not considered fully representative of the national population of aggregate recyclers and was perhaps more indicative of those facilities that are in urban areas. As such, re-weighting was required before extrapolation which shows a degree of unreliableness in the data received from surveys. There is also a considerable degree of inter facility movement which was maybe double counted. The alternative also does not provide a regional breakdown and for all the above reasons the alternative was rejected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
selected landfill operators).	
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	<p>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage forecasting for non-hazardous organic waste (for biological treatment [this waste stream is a combination of the Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) stream and the commercial and industrial (C&I) waste stream]) looked at (for C&I wastes) local arising estimations plus Greater London Local Plan arising estimations, and (for LACW) data supplied by local authorities. Regarding the LACW waste stream, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) looked at a scenario of 0% annual growth in waste arisings over the Plan period due to population increases being offset by existing and planned future minimisation measures. This approach was based on the levels of recycling and composting of household waste as set out in Waste Strategy for England 2007 and presented in the adopted 2008 Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS). The new forecasting methodology used for the Pre-Submission Plan instead assumes the growth rates applied in the national Defra central forecast (0.2% per annum) to the Baseline Projection and extrapolates that forward to the end of the Plan period. This is more in line with, and follows the guidance of the PPG, which requires a level of growth to be considered and added flexibility within the Plan. As a result the 0% annual growth scenario has been discounted for LACW. The approach to C&I forecasting has not changed between the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage Plan and the Pre-Submission Plan.</p> <p>Regarding inert waste, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach to deriving a baseline figure for arisings looked at a mid-range scenario between a theoretical uplift of capacity on existing facilities (maximum recycling efficiency) and a reliance on existing facilities at current capacities. The Pre-Submission Plan relies on a different approach to calculate the baseline figure, the largest difference being the assumptions around how waste has been dealt at intermediate facilities. The key difference between the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) and the Pre-Submission Plan forecasting methodology is that the latter assumes a default growth scenario of zero, as suggested in the waste chapter of Planning Practice Guidance, as 'Waste planning authorities should start from the basis that net arisings of construction and demolition waste will remain constant over time'. This reflects</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	<p>the wide fluctuations in CDEW (inert waste) arisings which occur from year to year as construction projects commence and complete. There is no reason to suggest that the situation in the Plan Area is any different and therefore a zero growth rate, as recommended by PPG, has been applied. The most recent arisings data available (2014) indicates that this should be projected at 3.311mtpa throughout the plan period. Comparison between this figure and current consented recycling capacity capable of processing this waste stream (at 2.118mtpa) shows an immediate shortfall of 1.5mtpa. This is reflected in Policy 1 as the shortfall for inert waste.</p> <p>Other Waste Management – At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, there was no figure for this amount and specific provision for it was not made on the basis that the exact destination would be determined through market forces. This has not changed, however the assumption in the RPA (2015) that it could continue to be sent to landfill within the Plan Area does not accord with the Waste Hierarchy and self-sufficiency, therefore specific provision for a waste management facility to deal with this residue has been made within the Pre-Submission document.</p> <p>Hazardous Waste - At the RPA (2015) stage, the preferred approach to stable non-reactive hazardous waste arisings over the Plan period was to use those data returns published by the Environment Agency within their annual Hazardous Waste Interrogator, which looks at hazardous waste movements when they 'change hands' between producers and disposal / treatment facilities. The quality of this data was, and is, considered good due to the nature of the waste. Despite this, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) did not factor in the figures from the Waste Data Interrogator (which additionally captures all hazardous waste movements), or the EA Pollution Inventory (which also crucially captures hazardous waste arising from certain waste management facilities such as landfills and Energy from Waste plants). It should also be noted that the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach assumed that hazardous waste management facilities within the Plan Area merely resulted in the transfer of waste elsewhere. The Pre-Submission Plan also uses the Environment Agency's Hazardous Waste Interrogator, although additionally also the Waste Data Interrogator and the EA Pollution Inventory in order to get a more accurate figure. There has also been a more sophisticated analysis of inputs and outputs from principal Plan Area facilities managing</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	hazardous waste. Regardless of this change in methodology, a similar shortfall in capacity has been highlighted.

4.2 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 2 - Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010). Re-explored in the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) as SAFEGUARDING - Alternative 1.</p> <p>SAFEGUARDING Option 1 - Existing waste management sites will only be safeguarded where they are consistent with policies in the WDD and have a permanent planning permission. If such sites are not consistent with the strategy, alternative uses may be acceptable. This would require alternative sites for waste management to be secured in appropriate locations, to ensure there is no net loss of existing waste management capacity within the Plan Area.</p>	<p>Singularly, this approach was not deemed to adequately meet the capacity needs of the Plan Area because allocated sites may not be able to be delivered due to incompatible uses being established in their proximity in the future. For this reason the alternative was rejected as the sole approach to safeguarding.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010). Re-explored in the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) as SAFEGUARDING - Alternative 2 (size threshold) and Alternative 3 (throughput threshold).</p> <p>SAFEGUARDING Option 2 - Existing waste management facilities and sites allocated in the Plan will only be safeguarded where they are consistent with policies in the WDD and provide for a substantial proportion of existing waste management capacity. This may result in safeguarding sites above a particular size threshold, e.g. 2 hectares or facilities above a certain throughput e.g. 100,000 tonnes per annum, or the strategic facilities as defined in the previous Chapter, to</p>	<p>Singularly, an approach to safeguard sites of a particular size threshold (e.g. 2 hectares) would potentially discount otherwise sustainable sites based on their size only. Also the qualifying threshold for what was considered 'of strategic importance' may not be appropriate across the Plan Area in response to the Spatial Strategy and the need for safeguarding small-scale but important facilities, for example Transfer Stations. For this reason the alternative was rejected as the sole approach to safeguarding. This is also the case for sites above a certain throughput (e.g. 1000,000tpa).</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>recognize their strategic importance. The size threshold may need to vary depending on the type of facility. If such sites do not meet these criteria, alternative uses may be acceptable. This would require alternative sites for waste management facilities to be secured in appropriate locations, to ensure there is no net loss of existing waste management capacity within the Plan Area.</p>	
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010).</p> <p>WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES Option 1 - Waste Consultation Zones should be established around waste facilities that are considered to be central to the delivery of the WDD (i.e. strategic facilities).</p>	<p>This option has been progressed and selected as part of the Pre-Submission approach to safeguarding and Waste Consultation Zones (now Waste Consultation Areas) so as not to prevent or unreasonably restrict the use of the safeguarded site for waste management purposes.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010). Re-explored in the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) as WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES - Alternative 1.</p> <p>WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES Option 2 - To only safeguard those types of waste facilities which have greater potential for adverse effects on people and the environment (Waste Consultation Zones should apply only to certain types of waste facility that have greater potential for adverse effects on people and the environment e.g. landfill, WwTWs, energy from waste and hazardous waste facilities.)</p>	<p>The alternative approach does not conform to the requirements of the WPA or the remit of the Plan. As such this approach was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) Re-explored in the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) as WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES - Alternative 2.</p> <p>WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES Option 3 - The number and extent of Waste Consultation Zones should be established by local planning authorities through</p>	<p>The determination of WCZs by district level LPAs would not have positive impacts for the sustainable management of waste in the Plan Area. The notion is also not compatible with the requirements of the NPPF and is beyond the remit of LPAs. For these reasons the approach was rejected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Local Development Frameworks, to take account of local circumstances.	
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) Re-explored in the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) as WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES - Alternative 3.</p> <p>WASTE CONSULTATION ZONES Option 4 - Waste Consultation Zones should be established around all waste management facilities.</p>	<p>This approach has largely been progressed to the Pre-Submission stage, with the additional possible exemption of non-specialist, small scale waste operations, defined in the Plan as those with an annual capacity of 10,000 tpa or less. As such, this option has been progressed to the Pre-Submission stage and selected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Preferred Approach</p> <p>Safeguarding (summary of approach)</p> <p>The WPAs will seek to safeguard a number of strategic sites essential for delivery of the WDD (including three IWMFs) in accordance with the life of their planning permission which are all licensed, operating waste facilities; or sites that have planning permission extending beyond the plan period, but are not currently operational; or sites with recent permissions or permissions granted subject to legal agreements; or sites allocated in the WDD. Additional sites essential for delivery of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (MWMS) will also be safeguarded.</p> <p>Waste Consultation Zones (summary of approach)</p> <p>Within the two tier area of the plan, where planning applications for uses other than waste management activities (excluding minor householder applications) are proposed within or around a 250m consultation zone of the safeguarded sites, the relevant Local Planning Authority will be required to consult the Waste Planning Authority on the planning application. The application will need to demonstrate that the proposal would not prevent or unreasonably restrict the use of the safeguarded site for waste management purposes.</p>	<p>The 2011 Preferred Approach reflected a hybrid of the options explored at the Issues and Options stage, and specified that the WPAs will seek to safeguard a number of strategic sites, including three IWMFs at Stanway, Rivenhall Airfield and Courtauld Road (Basildon), which are all licensed, operating waste facilities or have planning permission or are allocated in the WDD. No size threshold was determined within which sites will be safeguarded. The 2011 Preferred Approach is generally similar to the Pre-Submission approach to safeguarding and Waste Consultation Zones. As such the 2011 Preferred Approach is not distinctly different to be considered a reasonable alternative approach to be re-explored.</p>
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste	The 2015 Revised Preferred Approach safeguards existing sites hosting

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Preferred Approach (summarised)</p> <p>To safeguard the following sites: A. Strategic Sites Essential for the Delivery of the RWLP; B. Non-Strategic Site Allocations Made in the RWLP; (and) C. Waste Transfer Stations Essential for Delivery of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. The network of Local Authority Collected Waste facilities comprising the Integrated Waste Management Facility at Tovi EcoPark, Basildon and supporting transfer stations are to be safeguarded for the life of the planning permission or unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required for the delivery of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. As part of the annual monitoring process, the safeguarding of these sites will be re-assessed to determine if they are still necessary in terms of meeting the strategy or whether a more suitable site has become available.</p> <p>D. Waste Consultation Zones - Where planning applications for uses other than waste management activities (excluding those defined Appendix D) are proposed within a 250m consultation zone of the safeguarded sites, the relevant Local Planning Authority will be required to consult the Waste Planning Authority on the planning application. The application will need to demonstrate that the proposal would not prevent or unreasonably restrict the use of the safeguarded site for waste management purposes. In consultation with the relevant Local Planning Authority, this distance of 250m may be expanded or reduced depending on the specific nature of the site.</p> <p>E. Monitoring - An indicator will be added to the monitoring framework to ensure that any changes to safeguarding provisions made due to the expiration of planning permission, the delivery of a non-strategic facility or the closure of a strategic facility are reported annually.</p>	<p>facilities deemed strategic and which are already making a significant contribution to current waste management in the Plan Area are safeguarded to ensure their future use for waste management. Safeguarding implemented through Waste Consultation Zones reduces the risk that waste management sites allocated in the Local Plan may be subject to a change of use during the Plan period, which would lead to a loss in the overall waste management capacity planned for the Plan Area. Such a loss would mean that the Local Plan is no longer making sufficient provision for its identified waste need. In addition, the 2015 Revised Preferred Approach included added content regarding the role of monitoring to aid flexibility. Since the Revised Preferred Approach 2015 consultation, the Plan's approach to safeguarding and Waste Consultation Zones has changed in terms of how the policy is presented, although the notion presented in the Revised Preferred Approach has largely been progressed for selection at the Pre-Submission stage.</p>
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)</p>	<p>It should be noted that the safeguarding element of the previous Revised Preferred Approach RWLP 2015 regarding safeguarding and Waste Consultation Zones (now Waste Consultation Areas to reflect appropriate terminology) has now been moved to the supporting text for this corresponding Policy in the Pre-Submission RWLP. This is not considered a significant change in approach and will not lead to any direct subsequent change in sustainability impacts as previously specified in the Sustainability</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	<p>Appraisal of the Revised Preferred Approach RWLP 2015. The Pre-Submission RWLP has used the plan-making process (evidence base and site selection methodology) to allocate sites and then safeguard them through WCAs as a policy vehicle.</p> <p>A noticeable change from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) is the removal of text that specified that regarding consultation with the relevant Local Planning Authority, the distance of 250m may be expanded or reduced depending on the specific nature of the site. Although this appears a significant omission from the Policy, words to a similar effect appear in the supporting text, which specifies that 'the actual buffer needed around each site will depend upon the nature of the proposed 'sensitive' use and on the specific impacts of the current waste operation.' In terms of the sustainability of this approach, there will be no significant change in the impacts presented in this Pre-Submission approach from those identified in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015); the difference is not considered to be distinct or give rise to any change of approach resulting from the implementation of the Policy. In addition, neither can the difference in Policy wording be considered distinct enough to be deemed a reasonably alternative approach for the purposes of the Sustainability Appraisal. For the purposes of a more focused Policy wording, the Pre-Submission approach has been selected in addition to many of the elements of the preceding Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding safeguarding and Waste Consultation Zones.</p>

5 Areas of Search and Locational Criteria

5.1 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 4 - Areas of Search

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Preferred Approach (to designate Areas of Search around suitable B2 [General Industry] and / or B8 [Storage or Distribution] land as defined in the Local Plans of the districts, boroughs and City in the Plan area)	As well as the identification and allocation of Strategic scale facilities, the Plan is also required to provide additional flexibility and to cater for possible non-strategic waste requirements (arising locally) and the preferred approach is to identify Areas of Search alongside criteria that adhere to notions of sustainability in-keeping with similar types of development. The exploration of Areas of Search has only been deemed necessary as a result of national requirements, the NPPF and the need for flexibility to respond to growth in the Plan Area (in response to district / borough OAN requirements). As such, the notion has only been explored at this stage, as the first in the WLP's progression since OAN requirements.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 1: To not identify suitable B2 (General Industry) and / or B8 (Storage or Distribution) land for the consideration of waste management facilities	The alternative would not respond to planning for flexibility within the Plan period. In addition, the approach may see applications for required facilities coming forward on land that does not respond to key centres of growth or in line with the Spatial Strategy. For these reasons this alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 2: To expand the area of search to employment areas beyond B2 and B8 use classes.	Under the Use Class Order, waste management facilities are considered sui generis ('in a class of its own') and therefore do not fit under a specific use class. It is, however, considered that of the Use Classes available, B2 and B8 represent the closest fit, as many waste processing activities are similar to the processes that take place on industrial estates. The alternative would likely see incompatibility between uses and there would likely be less interest from landowners of non-B2 / B8 uses to develop their land for waste management facilities. For this reason the alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste	This alternative could not be considered viable, as the potential of a specific

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 3: To safeguard portions / units of identified suitable areas	proposal coming forward from within any such area has not been demonstrated by interested landowners or developers. As such the alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	The intention is for the Areas of Search to act as a guide for waste operators seeking to develop a site within the Plan area. By virtue of showing a preference for proposals coming forward in employment areas, the Areas of Search act to help move waste up the Waste Hierarchy as it is a land use type which precludes landfill. For this reason the approach to Areas of Search has been selected. Qualifying sites have been selected in line with the assessment methodology, which has been deemed the most sustainable approach in light of all reasonable alternatives explored at the revised Preferred Approach stage (2015).

5.2 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 5 - Enclosed Waste Facilities

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Locational Criteria (for specific facility types)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Industrial sites used for general industry, storage and distribution (MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) - Industrial estates close to waste arisings and used for general industry, storage and distribution. (Waste Transfer Stations only) - Industrial estates close to waste arisings and used for light industry and offices. (Waste Transfer Stations only) 	<p>The SA of the Issues and Options stage (2010) highlighted the various impacts of each specific facility at each location for the purposes of identifying the most sustainable options. As an alternative, the identification of preferred locations for specific facility types has since been rejected in favour of preferred locations for enclosed waste facilities; open air waste facilities; intermediate, low and very low radioactive waste facilities; and landfill.</p> <p>The sustainability impacts of this alternative approach are not significantly different from the Pre-Submission approach. Grouping facility types under the categories of enclosed facilities, open air facilities, radioactive facilities and landfill however can be considered a more flexible approach. Identifying locations for each specific facility type could be considered restrictive, limiting certain facilities to specific types of site without consideration of possible</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brownfield sites in urban areas (MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) - Brownfield sites in rural areas (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) - Redundant farm buildings (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) - Co-located with existing waste facilities (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) - Mineral working and landfill sites (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) - Open countryside (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, IVC, AD, MBT, Autoclaving, energy recovery facilities, Gasification and Pyrolysis) 	<p>mitigation measures (in light of the Plan's policy content) and also possibly affecting the viability of proposals.</p> <p>The Pre-Submission Approach instead seeks to direct facilities to broadly acceptable locations with a larger scope for their consideration on their own merits. For these reasons this alternative has since been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Locational Criteria (for specific facility types)</p> <p>Recycling and Recovery Facilities - within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; within those employment areas (existing or allocated) not categorised by Use Class B2 or B8; within areas of degraded, contaminated or derelict land.</p> <p>Materials Recycling/Recovery Facilities and Waste Transfer Stations - within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; within those employment areas (existing or allocated) not categorised by Use Class B2 or B8; within areas of degraded, contaminated or derelict land; small scale facilities may be accommodated at current landfill sites, provided they</p>	<p>The SA of the Preferred Options stage (2011) highlighted the various impacts of each specific facility at each location in accordance with an approach progressed and developed from the Issues and Options stage consultation. As an alternative, the identification of preferred locations for specific facility types has since been rejected in favour of preferred locations for enclosed waste facilities; open air waste facilities; intermediate, low and very low radioactive waste facilities; and landfill.</p> <p>The sustainability impacts of this alternative approach are not significantly different from the Pre-Submission approach. Grouping facility types under the categories of enclosed facilities, open air facilities, radioactive facilities and landfill however can be considered a more flexible approach. Identifying locations for each specific facility type could be considered restrictive, limiting certain facilities to specific types of site without consideration of possible mitigation measures (in light of the Plan's policy content) and also possibly affecting the viability of proposals. Additionally it was deemed difficult to determine, and also assess, specific locational criteria for those facilities that could be suitable in a number of different types of location. Certain types of</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>do not prejudice the agreed restoration timescale for the site and the new use ceases prior to the permitted completion date of the site.</p> <p>In-vessel Composting Facilities - within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development including Waste Water Treatment Works; on existing areas of hardstanding and/or degraded, contaminated or derelict land and previously developed land in rural areas; within redundant farm land and buildings.</p> <p>Clinical Waste Treatment Facilities - within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; within areas of degraded, contaminated or derelict land; as part of a hospital complex.</p> <p>Mechanical Biological Treatment, Autoclaving and Anaerobic Digestion Facilities - within the IWMF sites which are safeguarded and allocated; within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; within areas of degraded, contaminated or derelict land; as part of district heating schemes (AD, Autoclaving, and MBT with CHP output only); in association with Waste Water Treatment Works (AD only); in agricultural locations and farms (AD only).</p> <p>Energy from Waste, Gasification and Pyrolysis Facilities - within the IWMF sites which are safeguarded and allocated; within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; within areas of degraded, contaminated or derelict land; as part of district heating schemes; co-located with other commercial and industrial users of heat and power.</p>	<p>inert waste recycling facilities for instance could be compatible as an enclosed or open air facility. Similarly inert recycling facilities could be classified as enclosed or open air in theory, and dependant on the specific proposal would have widely differing locational criteria.</p> <p>The Pre-Submission Approach instead seeks to direct facilities to broadly acceptable locations with a larger scope for their consideration on their own merits. For these reasons this alternative has since been rejected.</p>
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste	The Revised Preferred Approach to enclosed waste facilities is a similar

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>Subject to satisfying the other policies included within the Plan, the Preferred Approach is to support proposals for new enclosed waste management facilities at the following locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Firstly, on preferred sites, allocated for that purpose or, where justification that a preferred site is not suitable; 2. Secondly, within the Areas of Search. <p>Where proposals demonstrate that they cannot be delivered as above, they will be supported on the following land use types, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On other existing industrial estates outside of Areas of Search, used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted Local Plan; - On existing permitted waste management sites or co-located in association with other waste management development (including Waste Water Treatment Works in the case of biological treatment facilities); - On existing areas of hardstanding and / or degraded, contaminated or derelict land; - Within redundant farm land and buildings (in the case of in-vessel composting); - As part of a hospital complex in the case of clinical waste treatment facilities. - Where it can be demonstrated that heat can be supplied to a district heat network or direct to commercial or industrial users of heat (for energy recovery facilities with combined heat and power (CHP)) <p>Subject to meeting the locational criteria above, facilities which enable the provision of energy from waste should meet the following additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For energy recovery facilities with combined heat and power: it should be 	<p>approach to that of the Pre-Submission policy. As such, the highlighted sustainability impacts are also similar. The Revised Preferred Approach however reiterates other elements of the Plan regarding the status of allocated sites and the Areas of Search, which can be seen to detract from the purpose of the policy. As such, the numbered parts of the Revised Preferred Approach have been omitted in favour of the Pre-Submission Policy approach of specifying under what circumstances proposals outside allocations and Areas of Search would be favoured; those being predominantly regarding any changes to the availability and suitability status of allocated sites / those in Areas of Search, or where need for additional capacity can be demonstrated. In general this is a more flexible approach, and for that reason these discussed elements of the Revised Preferred Approach have been rejected for the Pre-Submission Policy stance.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>demonstrated that heat can be supplied to a district heat network or direct to commercial or industrial users of heat;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For anaerobic digestion: it should be demonstrated that there will be an ability to inject refined gas produced as part of the process into the gas pipeline network or to be stored for use as a fuel; - For advanced thermal treatment: it should be demonstrated that syngas is to be converted for use as a fuel - For Mechanical Heat Treatment or Mechanical Biological Treatment: it should be demonstrated that the facility can supply the heat produced as part of the process to a district heating scheme. <p>Whilst there will be a policy preference made to those sites which come forward on land uses according with those above, every proposal that comes forward will be assessed on their individual merits, based on the policies in the adopted RWLP and through the wider planning application process.</p>	
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)</p>	<p>The Policy differs slightly from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) to enclosed waste facilities. The Revised Preferred Approach reiterated other elements of the Plan regarding the status of allocated sites and the Areas of Search being supported in the first instance, which can be seen to detract from the purpose of the policy. As such, the Pre-Submission Policy approach specifies under what circumstances proposals outside allocations and Areas of Search would be favoured; those being predominantly regarding any changes to the availability and suitability status of allocated sites / those in Areas of Search, or where need for additional capacity can be demonstrated. In general this is a more flexible approach, and for that reason these discussed elements of the Revised Preferred Approach have been rejected for the Pre-Submission Policy stance.</p>

5.3 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 6 - Open

Waste Facilities

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Locational Criteria (for specific facility types)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Industrial estates close to waste arisings and used for general industry, storage and distribution. (Waste Transfer Stations only) - Industrial estates close to waste arisings and used for light industry and offices. (Waste Transfer Stations only) - Industrial sites used for general industry, storage and distribution (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, OWC, C&D Recycling) - Brownfield sites in urban areas (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, C&D Recycling) - Brownfield sites in rural areas (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, C&D Recycling) - Redundant farm buildings (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF) - Co-located with existing waste facilities (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, C&D Recycling) - Mineral working and landfill sites (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, C&D Recycling) - Open countryside (Waste Transfer Stations, MRF, C&D Recycling) - On development sites on a temporary basis (C&D Recycling only) 	<p>The SA of the Issues and Options stage (2010) highlighted the various impacts of each specific facility at each location for the purposes of identifying the most sustainable options. As an alternative, the identification of preferred locations for specific facility types has since been rejected in favour of preferred locations for enclosed waste facilities; open air waste facilities; intermediate, low and very low radioactive waste facilities; and landfill.</p> <p>The Plan's requirement for flexibility, the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, the need to assess sites on their own merits, and also the need for specific sites in response to the evidence base ensure that a single Preferred Approach for open (air) facilities is appropriate. It should be noted that the broad impacts and requirements of different open air facilities are similar in the context of the Plan. Criteria should be, and has been designed within the Plan's policy content to minimise impacts and eliminate these in the first instance. For this reason different open air facilities share a lot in common and a single Preferred Approach is considered appropriate in regards to the Plan's aims and objectives. For these reasons the alternative approach has been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) - Locational Criteria (for specific facility types)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inert Waste Recycling Facilities - within the IMWF sites safeguarded and allocated; within existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage 	<p>The SA of the Preferred Options stage (2011) highlighted the various impacts of each specific facility at each location in accordance with an approach progressed and developed from the Issues and Options stage consultation. As an alternative, the identification of preferred locations for specific facility types has since been rejected in favour of preferred locations for enclosed waste facilities; open air waste facilities; intermediate, low and very low radioactive</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; within areas of degraded, contaminated or derelict land; at current mineral working and landfill sites, provided they do not prejudice the agreed restoration timescale for the site and the new use ceases prior to the permitted completion date of the site; at demolition and construction sites where the inert waste materials are to be used in the construction project on that site.</p> <p>- Outdoor Composting Facilities - on existing areas of hardstanding and/or degraded, contaminated or derelict land and previously developed land in rural areas; within redundant farm land and buildings; in association with other waste management development, including Waste Water Treatment Works; where the compost is to be used as part of the restoration requirement for a mineral working and/or a reclamation process on adjoining land; at landfill sites where the compost is to be used as part of the restoration and the residual waste can be disposed of, provided the new use ceases prior to the permitted completion date of the site.</p> <p>- Waste Water Treatment Works - within existing Waste Water Treatment Works; within industrial estates used for general industry (B2), storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted local plan or LDF document; within existing waste management sites or in association with other waste management development; on existing areas of hardstanding and/or degraded, contaminated or derelict land and previously developed land in rural areas; within redundant farm land and buildings.</p>	<p>waste facilities; and landfill. Although the alternative is not significantly different from the Preferred Approach, the changes made can be considered a more flexible approach. The Preferred Approach (2011) as an alternative can be considered as more restrictive, limiting certain facilities to specific types of site and the Pre-Submission approach instead seeks to direct them to broadly acceptable locations and on their own merits. For these reasons the 2011 Preferred Approach has since been rejected.</p> <p>The Plan's requirement for flexibility, the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, the need to assess sites on their own merits, and also the need for specific sites in response to the evidence base ensure that a single Preferred Approach for open (air) facilities is appropriate. It should be noted that the broad impacts and requirements of different open air facilities are similar in the context of the Plan. Criteria should be, and has been designed within the Plan's policy content to minimise impacts and eliminate these in the first instance. For this reason different open air facilities share a lot in common and a single Preferred Approach is considered appropriate in regards to the Plan's aims and objectives. For these reasons the alternative approach has been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>Subject to satisfying the other policies included within the Plan, the Preferred Approach is to support proposals for open windrow composting or open waste recycling facilities and associated facilities (not including landfill operations) at the following locations: Firstly, on preferred sites, allocated for inert waste recycling facilities or open windrow composting. Where proposals demonstrate that they cannot be delivered as above, they will be supported on the following land use types, as follows: On existing industrial estates used for general industry (B2),</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Plan Area has enough existing waste water treatment capacity in the Plan period, and that such facilities have not been included within the Plan at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) and Pre-Submission stages.</p> <p>The Revised Preferred Approach to open waste facilities is a similar approach to that of the Pre-Submission policy. As such, the highlighted sustainability impacts are also similar. The Revised Preferred Approach however reiterates other elements of the Plan regarding the status of allocated sites and the Areas of Search, which can be seen to detract from the purpose of the policy.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>storage and distribution (B8) or land allocated as such in an adopted Local Plan or LDF document (in the case of inert waste); On existing areas of hardstanding and/or degraded, contaminated or derelict land; On existing open waste management sites or in association with other waste management development including Waste Water Treatment Works in the case of open windrow; Mineral and landfill sites where material is used in conjunction with restoration, where the additionally proposed waste operations are temporary, linked to the completion of the mineral/landfill operation; Within redundant farm land and buildings, in the case of open windrow; and at demolition and construction sites where the inert waste materials are to be used on the construction project on that site. Any proposals that come forward on landuse types not identified above will be assessed on their merits, based on the policies in the adopted RWLP. Such locations will be considered less favourably than those set out within this Preferred Approach.</p>	<p>As such, the numbered parts of the Revised Preferred Approach have been omitted in favour of the Pre-Submission Policy approach of specifying under what circumstances proposals outside allocations and Areas of Search would be favoured; those being predominantly regarding any changes to the availability and suitability status of allocated sites / those in Areas of Search, or where need for additional capacity can be demonstrated. In general this is a more flexible approach, and for that reason these discussed elements of the Revised Preferred Approach have been rejected for the Pre-Submission Policy stance.</p>
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Plan Area has enough existing waste water treatment capacity in the Plan period, and that such facilities have not been included within the Plan at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) and Pre-Submission stages.</p> <p>The Policy differs slightly from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) to open waste facilities. The Revised Preferred Approach reiterated other elements of the Plan regarding the status of allocated sites and the Areas of Search being supported in the first instance, which can be seen to detract from the purpose of the policy. As such, the Pre-Submission Policy approach specifies under what circumstances proposals outside allocations and Areas of Search would be favoured; those being predominantly regarding any changes to the availability and suitability status of allocated sites / those in Areas of Search, or where need for additional capacity can be demonstrated. In general this is a more flexible approach, and for that reason these discussed elements of the Revised Preferred Approach have been rejected for the Pre-Submission Policy stance.</p>

5.4 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 7 –

Nuclear Waste Treatment and Storage at Bradwell-on-Sea

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested Policy Criteria</p> <p>The following policy criteria are suggested for the management of low level radioactive waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permission for nuclear or radioactive waste disposal (except low level clinical waste) will not be granted and the Councils will seek to ensure that any nuclear wastes continue to be disposed of and/or reprocessed at appropriate national facilities. - Assess the potential of existing non-hazardous landfill sites within the Plan Area for disposal of certain LLW and VLLW. 	<p>At the Issues and Options stage, it was not necessary to allocate new sites to deal with non-nuclear VLLW and as such policy criteria were explored rather than locational criteria. Since then, the Plan must set out the means by which new facilities would be assessed. This approach is flexible in line with the possibility that Bradwell is selected as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project for future nuclear power generation. For this reason, the alternative has since been rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – General Locational Criteria</p> <p>Proposals for facilities for the treatment, storage or disposal of ILW, LLW or VLLW generated at Bradwell nuclear power station will only be acceptable within the Nuclear Licensed Areas at Bradwell, where: This is consistent with the national strategy for managing ILW, LLW and VLLW and discharges and/or the decommissioning plans for the Bradwell power station, and; The outcome of economic and environmental assessments justify its being dealt with on site, and; Facilities are located and designed in order to minimise adverse impacts on the environment and human health.</p>	<p>The consultation responses from the Issues and Options (2010) stage showed a fairly even split of opinion between agreeing that radioactive wastes should be disposed of at Bradwell Power Station, or within the Plan area, and disagreeing with this approach. However, at the Preferred Approach 2011 stage there was an identified requirement to plan for small quantities of radioactive waste from decommissioning the current nuclear power station and other sources such as hospitals, with a potential requirement for larger quantities of waste generated from the possible development of a new nuclear power facility within the plan period. As such, the Preferred Approach 2011 reflected the policy criteria from the Issues and Options stage that consultees broadly agreed with, as well as this identified need. The approach at this Preferred Approach (2011) stage is broadly similar to that of the corresponding revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage and also the Pre-Submission policy. The differences between the approach at this stage and through its progression to Pre-Submission stage are not distinct enough to be considered reasonable alternative approaches. It can be considered that the content of the approach has been taken forward to selection.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste</p>	<p>The approach at this Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage is broadly</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>Proposals for facilities for the treatment, storage or disposal of ILW, LLW or VLLW will only be acceptable within the limits of the existing Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) Interim Storage Facility (ISF) located within the Nuclear Licensed Areas at Bradwell, where this is consistent with the national strategy for managing ILW, LLW and VLLW and the decommissioning plans for the Bradwell power station, informed by the outcome of economic and environmental assessments that justify the management of decommissioning waste on-site.</p> <p>Proposals for such facilities must ensure, through appropriate siting and design, that adverse impacts on the environment and human health are minimised.</p> <p>Please note that any Preferred Approach / policy arising out of the RWLP would be secondary to any Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.</p>	<p>similar to that of the preceding Preferred Approach (2011) stage and also the corresponding Pre-Submission policy. The differences between the approach at this stage and through its progression to Pre-Submission stage are not distinct enough to be considered reasonable alternative approaches. It can be considered that the content of the approach has been taken forward to selection.</p>
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)</p>	<p>The Policy has been retitled at this stage to offer more clarity on the situation at Bradwell Power Station, although it should be noted that the content of the Policy has progressed throughout the plan-making process in line with the waste treatment requirements regarding the power station's decommissioning. As such the content of the Policy remains similar to that of the previous revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage and also that at the Preferred Approach (2011) stage. For these reasons, the Policy has been selected.</p>

5.5 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 8 – Non-Nuclear Very Low-Level and Low-Level Radioactive Waste

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested Policy Criteria</p> <p>The following policy criteria are suggested for the management of low level</p>	<p>At the Issues and Options stage, it was not necessary to allocate new sites to deal with non-nuclear VLLW and as such policy criteria were explored rather than locational criteria. Since then, the Plan must set out the means by which new facilities would be assessed in order to be flexible. It is considered that</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>radioactive waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permission for nuclear or radioactive waste disposal (except low level clinical waste) will not be granted and the Councils will seek to ensure that any nuclear wastes continue to be disposed of and/or reprocessed at appropriate national facilities. - Assess the potential of existing non-hazardous landfill sites within the Plan Area for disposal of certain LLW and VLLW. 	<p>the exploration of Policy regarding non-nuclear VLLW and LLW was sufficiently explored at this stage, with two options of considering disposal in the Plan Area and not considering disposal in the Plan Area. The alternative to assess the potential of existing non-hazardous landfill sites within the Plan Area for the disposal of certain LLW and VLLW has been rejected as a single method for the management of this waste, with a separate policy having been formulated to deal with locational criteria for landfill proposals. The approach to only consider the potential of existing non-hazardous landfill sites within the Plan Area for disposal of certain LLW and VLLW can be seen as inflexible in regards to the possibility of capacity being needed to manage this waste stream.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – General Locational Criteria</p> <p>Proposals for facilities for the treatment, storage or disposal of ILW, LLW or VLLW generated at Bradwell nuclear power station will only be acceptable within the Nuclear Licensed Areas at Bradwell, where: This is consistent with the national strategy for managing ILW, LLW and VLLW and discharges and/or the decommissioning plans for the Bradwell power station, and; The outcome of economic and environmental assessments justify its being dealt with on site, and; Facilities are located and designed in order to minimise adverse impacts on the environment and human health.</p>	<p>The consultation responses from the Issues and Options (2010) stage showed a fairly even split of opinion between agreeing that radioactive wastes should be disposed of within the Plan area, and disagreeing with this approach. However, there exists a requirement to plan for the possibility of radioactive waste from sources such as hospitals. The Preferred Approach 2011 reflected the policy criteria from the Issues and Options stage that consultees broadly agreed with; however was focussed on nuclear ILW, VLLW and LLW, of which there is an identified need, and this was largely progressed to both the Preferred Approach (2015) stage and Pre-Submission Policy 7. At the Preferred Approach (2011) stage, it was viewed that as the need for non-nuclear VLLW and LLW management facilities does not exist in the Plan Area, that facilities for this waste stream should not be explored.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>Proposals for facilities for the treatment, storage or disposal of ILW, LLW or VLLW will only be acceptable within the limits of the existing Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) Interim Storage Facility (ISF) located within the Nuclear Licensed Areas at Bradwell, where this is consistent with the national strategy for managing ILW, LLW and VLLW and the decommissioning plans for the Bradwell power station, informed by the outcome of economic and environmental assessments that justify the management of decommissioning waste on-site.</p>	<p>The Preferred Approach 2015 reflected the criteria from the previous consultation stages, however again focussed on nuclear VLLW and LLW to reflect the identified need to manage this waste stream in the Plan Area. At the Preferred Approach (2015) stage, it was again viewed that as the need for non-nuclear VLLW and LLW facilities in the Plan Area does not exist, facilities for this waste stream should not be explored.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Proposals for such facilities must ensure, through appropriate siting and design, that adverse impacts on the environment and human health are minimised.</p> <p>Please note that any Preferred Approach / policy arising out of the RWLP would be secondary to any Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.</p>	
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)</p>	<p>A Government commissioned report (Data collection on solid low-level waste from the non-nuclear sector DECC [2008]) stated that this waste stream is likely to reduce over the Plan period, and because there was sufficient capacity nationally to treat the non-nuclear LLW arising in Essex and Southend-on-Sea, there is no requirement to make further provision for non-nuclear radioactive waste facilities. This has previously been the stance taken by the Plan throughout the plan-making process; however, in order for the Waste Local Plan to be able to respond to any changing circumstances, it has been considered that a requirement exists to set out a policy stance on non-nuclear LLW and VLLW. The Policy content has been established from the principles explored in various iterations dealing with nuclear ILW, VLLW and LLW and as such responds to similar themes and content that has been subject to consultation, most notably in the Issues and Options (2010) Plan, which explored the potential of existing non-hazardous landfill sites within the Plan Area for disposal of certain LLW and VLLW. For all of the above reasons the Policy, as it appears in the Plan, has been selected.</p>

5.6 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 9 – Waste Disposal Facilities

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested Locational Criteria</p> <p>Location 1 – Void space within existing C&I landfill sites to accept MSW, subject to</p>	<p>Regarding existing void space, it was considered that this approach would not be viable as a criterion for new non-allocated sites as it would form the basis of, and be a key influence in determining, those allocated sites within the Plan. It could also conflict with the restoration proposals and requirements of minerals sites in the Adopted RMLP and its accompanying Biodiversity SPD.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>environmental considerations (Location 1 and Location 2 explored as a single alternative approach)</p> <p>Location 2 – Void space within mineral and landfill sites. (Location 1 and Location 2 explored as a single alternative approach)</p> <p>Location 3 – Within extensions to existing landfill facilities.</p>	<p>As such the general approach as a single option was rejected for these purposes.</p> <p>Regarding extensions to existing landfill sites it was noted that this alternative would be dependent upon mineral extraction preceding landfilling which as an approach may not be sufficiently flexible. However, in reality most allocated inert landfill sites are extensions either to existing landfill or mineral sites and so this approach is not as dissimilar to the Policy as it may seem. As a sole approach however it was rejected, with elements progressed to the preferred Policy approach and Site Assessment Criteria.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – General Locational Criteria (for non-hazardous, hazardous and new landfill facilities)</p> <p>Locational Criteria for Non-hazardous Landfill Facilities - Proposals for new non-hazardous landfill facilities will only be acceptable if monitoring shows a need for non-hazardous landfill of Essex and Southend-on-Sea's waste, which will not undermine the achievement of statutory recycling and recovery targets, and where there is a clear restoration need identified. The WPAs will require the proposed measures for restoring the land to be feasible and to result in an acceptable and sustainable after-use. The landfilling of waste that could practicably be recycled, composted or recovered will not be acceptable. Proposals for new non-hazardous landfill facilities that meet the criteria above may only be acceptable in the following locations subject to the principle of mineral extraction being approved as a preferred site within the Minerals DD, and provided they are in line with the policies in this WDD: Permitted Landfill sites safeguarded; Void space within existing landfill currently only designated for disposing of C&I, which have the potential to also accept MSW; (and) Proposals for an extension of time to complete the permitted restoration within the boundary of existing landfill facilities. Non-hazardous landfill proposals would not be permitted within 250m of residential dwellings or other sensitive land uses unless special measures are included to control dust, noise and odour. Landfill gas utilisation plants for energy recovery will be required at existing and new non-hazardous landfill sites, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable (e.g. due to inability to make connection to the national grid without unreasonable harm to residential amenity and/or the environment). Adequate</p>	<p>As a result of the Issues and Options (2010) consultation it was considered appropriate to develop separate Preferred Approaches for hazardous and non-hazardous landfill, to reflect the fact that different types of landfill facilities will be appropriate in different locations. Since then, the 2011 Preferred Approach as an alternative option was considered limiting and inflexible in so far as there being separate criteria for non-allocated landfill sites. Proposals for a specific type of landfill may be compatible with extensions for existing landfill for another type. The approach could also be seen to be in conflict with elements of the spatial strategy and the proximity principle; where landfill capacity of a certain type may be required in more specific broad locations than this approach could deliver. For these reasons this approach as an alternative has since been rejected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>arrangements will be made to prevent landfill gas migration to adjoining land. The proposed method of landfill gas collection is environmentally and visually acceptable for as long as facilities have to remain.</p> <p>Locational Criteria for Hazardous Landfill Facilities - Proposals for new hazardous landfill facilities will only be acceptable where they meet the Plan area's identified requirement for hazardous waste disposal for Essex and Southend-on-Sea's waste. The WPAs will require the proposed measures for restoring the land to an acceptable and sustainable after-use to be feasible. The landfilling of waste that could practicably be treated or recovered will not be acceptable. Proposals for new hazardous landfill facilities that meet the criteria above would be suitable in the following locations, provided they are in line with the policies in this WDD: Void space created through mineral workings; within extensions to existing landfill facilities. Hazardous landfill proposals would not be permitted within 250m of residential dwellings or other sensitive land uses unless special measures are included to control emission, dust, noise and odour.</p> <p>Proposals for new landfill facilities which come forward on non-allocated sites should demonstrate: 1. In the case of non-hazardous proposals, they are necessary to deal with non-hazardous waste arising in the Plan area based on the principles of net self-sufficiency, and applicants should also demonstrate how the proposed scheme would: Be in line with an extension of time to complete the permitted restoration within the boundary of existing landfill facilities; Not be permitted within 250m of residential dwellings or other sensitive land uses unless special measures are included to control dust, noise and odour and; Include capture of the landfill gas, for recovery of energy by the most efficient methods, where practicable, and have given consideration to the ability to connect to a district heat network or for converting recovered gas for injection to the gas pipeline network. 2. In the case of inert and Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste, applicants should demonstrate that they are more suitable than the allocated sites (with reference to the same site assessment criteria and method used for selecting the allocated sites. Please see the Site Assessment & Allocations Report, and/or the individual site pro formas for further details), or that they are replacing an existing safeguarded facility and the proposed site is in conformity with the policies in this Plan once adopted. Applicants for new non-allocated inert landfill sites should also demonstrate how the proposed scheme would support on-site restoration and / or meet local derived demand</p>	

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
(particularly in relation to key centres for growth).	
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>Proposals for new landfill facilities which come forward on non-allocated sites should demonstrate:</p> <p>1. In the case of non-hazardous proposals, they are necessary to deal with non-hazardous waste arising in the Plan area based on the principles of net self-sufficiency, and applicants should also demonstrate how the proposed scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be in line with an extension of time to complete the permitted restoration within the boundary of existing landfill facilities. - Not be permitted within 250m of residential dwellings or other sensitive land uses unless special measures are included to control dust, noise and odour and; - Include capture of the landfill gas, for recovery of energy by the most efficient methods, where practicable, and have given consideration to the ability to connect to a district heat network or for converting recovered gas for injection to the gas pipeline network. <p>2. In the case of inert and Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste, applicants should demonstrate that they are more suitable than the allocated sites (with reference to the same site assessment criteria and method used for selecting the allocated sites. Please see the Site Assessment & Allocations Report, and/or the individual site pro formas for further details), or that they are replacing an existing safeguarded facility and the proposed site is in conformity with the policies in this Plan once adopted.</p> <p>Applicants for new non-allocated inert landfill sites should also demonstrate how the proposed scheme would support on-site restoration and / or meet local derived demand (particularly in relation to key centres for growth).</p>	<p>The Revised Preferred Approach (2015) explored an amalgamated approach to landfill, incorporating elements of the 2011 Preferred Approach. Since consultation on the revised Preferred Approach (2015), the Policy has progressed from stating different criteria for landfill proposals of different types of waste. Despite this, the impacts highlighted in the SA of both the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) and Policy 9 are similar, and the implementation of each is not distinctly different. Despite this, the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) can be considered less flexible than that of Policy 9 in the Pre-Submission Plan and for that reason was rejected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	<p>The Pre-Submission policy regarding landfill facilities has been amended from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage in order to offer heightened flexibility. The Policy reflects a single approach to all landfill proposals relevant to the Plan Area, deviating from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach of offering slightly different criteria for landfill proposals of different types of waste. It is not considered within this SA that the difference in approach would have any significantly different sustainability impacts. Policy 9 factors in the possibility that a site allocation for landfill in the Plan could be proved to be unsuitable or unavailable, or comparably less so than any future proposal. This stance has been taken where the vast majority of District level growth targets are unknown at this stage, due to the respective progress of District level Local Plans in the Plan Area, and there being subsequent requirements for waste (of any type) to be managed as close to its source as possible. Aside from the heightened importance of flexibility within the Policy, the content and implications of the approach is and are not distinct enough to be considered an alternative approach to that presented as preferred in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015). For these reasons the Policy has been selected.</p>

6 Development Management Policies

6.1 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 10 - Development Management Criteria

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested Policy Criteria</p> <p>Issue 23 outlined general considerations that will be taken into consideration in relation to all waste management development. These included: Potential impact on residential amenity; Potential flood risk; Potential impact upon the local water environment; Potential impact upon landscape; Potential impact upon archaeological or cultural heritage; Potential impact upon agricultural land; Potential impact from noise, dust and vibration; Potential impact upon air quality, including odour; Potential visual impact, including light disturbance; Potential impact upon public open space and Public Rights of Way; Requirements of PPG13, including proposed vehicle movements and access; Land instability and contamination; Site management issues including litter, vermin, birds and hours of operation; Potential impact upon local aerodrome operators; (and) Site restoration, including the potential for nature conservation and increase public accessibility.</p>	<p>At the Issues and Options stage, the different development management issues were considered separately. For each issue, a range of policy criteria were proposed and consultees were asked to comment on them, rather than setting out distinct options to be chosen or rejected. The range of criteria is not distinctly different enough from the Pre-Submission approach to be considered a reasonable alternative. As such, the criteria have been largely selected and progressed through to the Pre-Submission stage.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011)</p> <p>Waste management development proposals will be acceptable, subject to meeting the other policies of this WDD and provided satisfactory provision is made to avoid unacceptable impacts and maximise opportunities in respect of the following: The potential for economic and social benefits through provision of the facility, including employment generation; The potential effect on general amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in particular as a result of noise, odour, visual impacts (including light pollution) dust or vibration from both the facility operation and HGV transportation of waste to and from the facility. Hours of operation may be restricted in order to mitigate these potential effects on residential amenity; The potential to enhance and/or protect geodiversity and biodiversity within the Plan area (including</p>	<p>The range of criteria is not distinctly different enough from the Pre-Submission approach to be considered a reasonable alternative. As such, the criteria have been largely selected and progressed through to the Pre-Submission stage.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>internationally, nationally and locally designated sites and species or features identified in UK, Essex and Southend-on-Sea Biodiversity Action Plans, and the green infrastructure network of the Plan area). In particular, proposals should avoid loss or fragmentation of geological assets or habitat, disturbance or harm to species, as a result of noise, visual impacts (including light pollution) dust or vibration from both the facility operation and transportation of waste to and from the facility. Periods of facility construction and hours of operation may be restricted seasonally to mitigate potential effects on protected species; The potential effect on countryside, including landscape and visual impacts and light pollution of tranquil areas. Proposals should be well designed and seek opportunities to enhance or be integrated with the surrounding environment and relevant landscape/townscape character area in accordance with the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Landscape Character Assessments and the relevant district/borough level landscape assessments; The potential effect on historic, archaeological or cultural sites/assets and their setting; The potential effect on agricultural land, in particular loss of Grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land; The potential effect on public open space and Public Rights of Way, to safeguard and protect amenity of the users of these recreational assets and where practicable improve access and connections to the PROW network; The potential effect on local aerodromes and airports, in particular the risk of bird strike within safeguarding areas; (and) The potential effect on the purposes of the Green Belt in locations within the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p>	
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>To permit proposals for waste development where it can be suitably demonstrated that the development would not have an unacceptable impact, including cumulative impacts with other developments, on the following: The wider potential for economic and social benefits through provision of the facility; The potential effect on local amenity of neighbouring occupiers; The potential to protect and / or enhance geodiversity and biodiversity (including internationally, nationally and locally designated sites, and species or features identified in UK, Essex and Southend-on-Sea Biodiversity Action Plans, and the green infrastructure network of the Plan area); In particular, proposals should avoid loss or fragmentation of geological assets or habitat, disturbance or harm to species, because of noise, visual impacts (including light pollution) dust or vibration from both the facility</p>	<p>The range of criteria stated in the Policy is similar to the Previous Revised Preferred Approach (2016) approach to development management criteria. Despite this, the Pre-Submission Policy elaborates on certain issues and criteria, predominantly in the supporting text, offering a stronger and more sustainable stance on issues such as transport networks, air quality and water quality. Notably the Policy also has an increased focus on protecting internationally, nationally and locally designated wildlife sites, with an notable inclusion that proposals may be required to be accompanied with a project-level HRA in certain instances and within specific distances, which was lacking and a criticism of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach. As such, the Policy approach has been selected in favour of the approach espoused in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015), which has since been rejected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>operation and transportation of waste to and from the facility; The potential effect on countryside, including landscape and visual impacts, light pollution and tranquillity. Proposals should be well designed and seek opportunities to enhance or be integrated with the surrounding environment and relevant landscape / townscape character area in accordance with the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Landscape Character Assessments and the relevant district / borough level landscape assessments; The potential effect on historic, archaeological or cultural sites/assets and their setting; The potential effect on agricultural land, in particular loss of Grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land; The potential effect on public open space, outdoor recreation facilities and the definitive Public Rights of Way network, to safeguard and protect amenity of the users of these recreational assets and where practicable improve access and connections to the PROW network; The potential effect on local aerodromes and airports, in particular the risk of bird strike within safeguarded areas; The potential effect on locations within the Metropolitan Green Belt; The quality and quantity of water within watercourses, groundwater and surface water and the capacity of sustainable drainage systems. Proposals should demonstrate they maximise flood resilience and reduces the flood risk on the site and its surroundings. For the purposes of data collection and monitoring within the annual monitoring reports, where additional waste capacity is permitted, operators will be required to notify the Waste Planning Authority of commencement of construction and commencement of operations. In addition, details of annual throughput of the facility once commenced must be provided on the request of the Waste Planning Authority for the purposes of annual capacity monitoring, if required.</p>	
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - Alternative 1: To have separate policies on the following development management issues – Health Impact Assessments, landscape and townscape, and biodiversity.</p>	<p>At the Issues and Options stage, these different development management issues were considered separately. For each issue, a range of policy criteria were proposed and consultees were asked to comment on them, rather than setting out distinct options to be chosen or rejected. Notably, for Health Impact Assessments four options were explored (Option 1: Where development of a particular size is proposed [e.g. above a particular land area, or managing over a particular tonnage of waste]; Option 2: Where waste management of a particular type is proposed [e.g. anaerobic digestion]; Option 3: Where waste management is proposed within 250m of sensitive receptors [housing, schools and hospitals], and within 400m in the case of WwTWs; Option 4: On a case by case basis, where there is potential for significant effects on health). The</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
	<p>2011 Preferred Approach document stated that, in rejecting the need for Health Impact Assessments, <i>‘the need for Health Impact Assessments was considered in the WDD: Issues and Options report. However, government research has concluded that modern waste management practices have at most a minor effect on human health. In addition, PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management states in paragraph 30 that: “Modern, appropriately located, well-run and well-regulated, waste management facilities operated in line with current pollution control techniques and standards should pose little risk to human health.” It also states that the detailed consideration of a waste management process and the implications, if any, for human health is the responsibility of the pollution control authorities. Where concerns about health are raised, waste planning authorities should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessment of epidemiological and other health studies. The Environment Agency is responsible for issuing environmental permits for waste facilities, and these include conditions relating to odour.’</i></p> <p>In rejecting the approach of separate policies on the listed development management issues, the WPAs’ analysis of the consultation responses and the Annual Monitoring Report, as well as Waste Local Plan policies and input from Development Management officers indicated that rationalising policy into a single preferred approach dealing with DM issues would be most appropriate. The criteria put forward were selected with the aim of addressing all of the key issues without unnecessary repetition. As such this alternative approach was rejected.</p>
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	<p>The range of criteria is similar to the Previous Revised Preferred Approach (2016) approach to development management criteria. Despite this, the Pre-Submission Policy elaborates on certain issues and criteria, predominantly in the supporting text, offering a stronger and more sustainable stance on issues such as transport networks, air quality and water quality. Notably the Policy also has an increased focus on protecting internationally, nationally and locally designated wildlife sites, with an notable inclusion that proposals may be required to be accompanied with a project-level HRA in certain instances and within specific distances. As such, the Policy approach has been selected.</p>

6.2 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 11 - Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested Policy Criteria</p> <p>Proposals for new waste management facilities should: Demonstrate the need for the type of waste management process, relating this to the waste management capacity gap for the Plan Area, and to opportunities for managing waste further up the Waste Hierarchy; Demonstrate how the proposed facility will make efficient use of energy, recover and utilise energy from waste where appropriate and feasible; Be consistent with transport policies of this WDD by connecting to the main highway network (key routes (motorways and trunks roads) and county routes), reducing total transport distances and seeking the most sustainable modes of transport possible; Avoid areas at risk of flooding; Avoid increasing pressure on natural resources such as water, which may result from over-abstraction and pollution; (and) Incorporate measures for sustainable design and construction.</p>	<p>National Planning Policy requires that measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change are incorporated into new development proposals, including waste. ECC corporate policies and strategies aspire to develop deliver a Zero-Waste economy, to value waste arisings as a resource, and managing waste in a cost effective way, minimising the impact on the environment.</p> <p>The ECC and SBC (2015) Non-Technical Capacity Summary supports waste management in line with the waste hierarchy. It identifies a need for future capacity requirements based on the principles of national planning policy and local ambitions/evidence.</p> <p>The SA of the previous Preferred Approach WDD (2011) stated that, 'At the Issues and Options stage, suggested policy criteria were proposed in relation to mitigating and adapting to climate change, rather than distinct alternatives being suggested. Suggestions for alternative approaches were requested where respondents did not agree fully with the suggested policy approach. Of the 29 respondents who selected either 'yes' or 'no', 23 broadly agreed with the suggested policy approach, and this is reflected in the Preferred Approach.' The SA/SEA of the Issues and Options WDD stated that there would be 'major positive impacts on climate change (SEA Objective 8) through efficient use of energy and the recovery and utilisation of energy from waste where appropriate and feasible.' There would also be 'major positive impacts on sustainable management of waste (SEA Objective 9) where proposals demonstrate the need for the type of waste management process in relation to the waste hierarchy and the waste management capacity gap in the Plan Area. In addition there would be 'indirect positive impacts on SEA Objectives 1 (biodiversity) and 2 (water quality) through avoiding increased pressure on natural resources' and 'positive impacts on SEA Objective 3 (flood risk) through avoiding areas at risk of flooding.' There would also be 'positive</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Suggested Policy Criteria</p> <p>Proposals for new waste management facilities should through their construction and operation, minimise their potential contribution to climate change by reducing carbon emissions, incorporating energy and water efficient design measures and being adaptable to future climatic conditions.</p> <p>A: Proposals for new waste facilities should set out how this will be achieved, which may include: Demonstrating how the location, design including associated buildings and transportation related to the development will limit carbon emissions; Supporting opportunities for decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy supply, subject to compliance with other policies in the development framework; Use of sustainable drainage systems, water harvesting from impermeable surfaces</p>	

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>and layouts that accommodate waste water recycling; Incorporating proposals for sustainable travel including travel plans where appropriate.</p> <p>B: Proposals for new waste management facilities will only be permitted where: There would not be an unacceptable risk of flooding on site or elsewhere as a result of impediment to the flow of storage or surface water; Existing and proposed flood defences are protected and there is no interference with the ability of responsible bodies to carry out flood defence works and maintenance where applicable; There would not be an unacceptable risk to the quantity and quality of surface and groundwaters, or impediment to groundwater flow.</p>	<p>impacts on SEA Objectives 7 (air quality) and 10 (transport) where facilities are consistent with transport policies of the WDD by reducing total transport distances and seeking the most sustainable modes of transport possible.'</p> <p>The findings of the two previous Sustainability Appraisals at the Issues and Options (2010) and Preferred Approach WDD (2011) stages have contributed to the Preferred Approach.</p> <p>For all the above reasons, there have been no distinctively alternative approaches developed for mitigating and adapting to climate change. It is considered, and has been decided, that no possible alternative approaches could be deemed reasonable for the purposes of the SA. Any alternative approaches would not reflect national policy requirements of WPAs in formulating a Waste Local Plan or the evidence base of the Plan itself.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>To require proposals for new waste management facilities through their construction and operation, to minimise their potential contribution to climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, incorporating energy and water efficient design measures and being adaptable to future climatic conditions.</p> <p>1. Proposals for new waste facilities should set out how this will be achieved, which may include: Demonstrating how the location, design (including associated buildings) and transportation related to the development will limit greenhouse gas emissions; Supporting opportunities for decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy supply, subject to compliance with other policies in the Development Framework; Use of sustainable drainage systems, water harvesting from impermeable surfaces and layouts that accommodate waste water recycling; Incorporating proposals for sustainable travel including travel plans where appropriate.</p> <p>2. Proposals for new waste management facilities will only be permitted where: There would not be an unacceptable risk of flooding on site or elsewhere as a result of impediment to the flow of storage or surface water; Existing and proposed flood defences are protected and there is no interference with the ability of responsible bodies to carry out flood defence works and maintenance where applicable; There would not be an unacceptable risk to the quantity and quality of surface and ground</p>	

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
waters, or impediment to groundwater flow.	
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	The content of the preceding approach in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) is largely similar to that of the Pre-Submission Policy. The Pre-Submission Policy has however progressed to include further detail on the requirements of proposals which are capable of directly producing energy or a fuel from waste in section 3. Section 3 of the policy is a new inclusion at this stage of the Plan and is viewed as clearly setting out the requirements of proposals for the purpose of maximising energy production from waste activities and exploring it in all relevant proposals. This is viewed as a more sustainable approach than previous iterations of this Policy and has therefore been selected.

6.3 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 12 – Transport and Access

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested Policy Criteria</p> <p>Proposals for new waste management facilities should: Apply the proximity principle by seeking to reduce transport distances by taking account of where the majority of waste arises and the destination of recycled, treated and recovered outputs and residual waste for disposal; Focus on regional interchange centres and inter-urban/intra-urban routes with existing capacity as defined by the main highway network; Avoid increased traffic in rural areas, unless a rural location can be justified in accordance with relevant locational criteria; Wherever practicable, seek opportunities to transport waste by rail or water; Identify and put in place measures to mitigate any adverse impact on people and the environment, such as emissions and noise.</p>	The most distinct difference between the Issues and Options (2010) policy criteria and those of the Pre-Submission Approach was that the Issues and Options approach sought to 'reduce transport distances by taking account of where the majority of waste arises and the destination of recycled, treated and recovered outputs and residual waste for disposal (with an additional focus on regional interchange centres and inter-urban/intra-urban routes with existing capacity as defined by the main highway network).' This approach was rejected as it was considered too broadly focused on the location of facilities in line with the proximity principle. This approach would result in very few facilities being appropriate or available in line with the spatial strategy and the capacity gap requirements of the Plan. For these reasons, the alternative was rejected.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste	Appendix A of the Preferred Approach (2011) WDD stated that, 'at the Issues

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011)</p> <p>The order of preference for transportation of waste to and from proposed new waste management facilities would be: 1. Wherever practicable, seek opportunities to transport waste by rail or water (where this does not undermine the WDD aim of net self-sufficiency); 2. Road access via a short length of suitable existing road to a suitable existing junction with the main road network (trunk road, strategic route or main distributor) as defined within Highways Development Management Policies February 2011, Route Hierarchy Plan; 3. Road access directly on to the main road network where there is no existing access point or junction. This would involve development of a new access point, which would need to be constructed in accordance with the County Council's Highway Standards; 4. Where access to the main road network is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing secondary road should be used before gaining access on to the main road network, subject to scale of development, capacity of the road is adequate and there will be no undue impact on road safety or the environment.</p>	<p>and Options stage, suggested policy criteria were proposed in relation to highways and transportation, rather than distinct alternatives being suggested. Suggestions for alternative approaches were requested where respondents did not agree fully with the suggested policy approach. Of the 29 respondents that selected either 'yes' or 'no', 27 broadly agreed with the suggested policy approach, and this is reflected in the Preferred Approach.'</p> <p>The content of the Preferred Approach (2011) was progressed to all subsequent iterations of the Plan. As such the content at this stage has been predominantly selected at the Pre-Submission stage, with any differences considered sufficiently indistinct to be considered as a reasonable alternative (for the requirement of identifying such as specified in the SEA Directive).</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>To provide an order of preference for transportation of waste to and from proposed new waste management facilities, as follows: 1. Wherever practicable, seek opportunities to transport waste by rail or water; 2. Access to a suitable existing junction with the main road network (not including secondary distributor roads, estate roads and other routes that provide local access), via a suitable section of existing road, as short as possible, without causing a detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the network; 3. Where (2) above is not feasible, direct access to the main road network involving the construction of a new access / junction where there is no suitable existing access point or junction; 4. Where access to the main road network in accordance with (ii) and (iii) above is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing road prior to gaining access onto the main road network will exceptionally be permitted, having regard to the scale of the development, the proximity of sensitive receptors, the capacity of the road and an assessment of the impact on road safety.</p>	<p>The content of the Revised Preferred Approach 2015, following on from the 2011 Preferred Approach, has been largely progressed as the Pre-Submission approach to the transportation of waste in the Plan. As such the content at this stage has been progressed and predominantly selected at the Pre-Submission stage, with any differences considered sufficiently indistinct to be considered as a reasonable alternative (for the requirement of identifying such in accordance with the SEA Directive).</p>
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste</p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Policy has been selected where it seeks opportunities to</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	transport waste by more sustainable modes. It transposes national policy requirements in a local context and acknowledges that a lack of suitable rail or water infrastructure means that waste will continue to be primarily transported by road. The Policy then identifies a suitable hierarchy including those related to the main road network, commensurate with access criteria used in the Plan's Site Assessment Methodology. For these reasons the Policy has been selected. The content of the Revised Preferred Approach 2015, following on from the 2011 Preferred Approach, has been largely progressed as the Pre-Submission approach to the transportation of waste in the Plan. As such the content at this stage has been predominantly selected at the Pre-Submission stage, with any differences considered sufficiently indistinct to be considered as a reasonable alternative (for the requirement of identifying such in accordance with the SEA Directive).

6.4 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 13 - Landraising

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010) – Suggested approach / criteria</p> <p>The Waste Planning Authority should be consulted when a development application is considered by a local planning authority to constitute a 'waste disposal activity'. Areas of landfill/raise for the deposit of waste will only be permitted where: there is an identified need for inert waste to be disposed of in this manner; there is no acceptable alternative waste management option, taking into account the capacity of existing and permitted recycling and treatment facilities and landfill sites; the proposal is restoration-led; the proposal would not result in harm to human health and the natural environment; the proposals would not result in an unacceptable landscape impact; and the principal of the overall development is accepted.</p>	<p>At this stage suggested policy criteria were consulted upon with a request that alternative or additional content be suggested. Of the responses, only 2 disagreed with the suggested criteria and where they sought an amendment to the criteria these were incorporated in the Preferred Approach (2011). As such no distinct alternative approaches were developed, and the content was progressed at the time.</p>
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste	Of the 23 consultees that responded at the Issues and Options stage, a significant majority (21) agreed with the suggested policy criteria and only 2

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011) – Preferred Approach</p> <p>The landfilling or landraising of inert waste that could practicably be re-used, recycled, or reprocessed will not be acceptable. Landfill and landraising for own sake with no restoration or engineering need will not be accepted. Where landraising is proposed as part of an engineering project to achieve the primary development, the principle of the land use proposed as the primary development must be in compliance with the district LDF, and must demonstrate the minimum amount of material required to meet the development. Proposals for inert landraising that constitutes a waste disposal activity (rather than a valid engineering and/or construction project), will only be acceptable where there is an identified need for restoration and for inert waste to be disposed of in this manner. This will only be acceptable where this does not undermine the provision of waste development on strategic inert landfill sites safeguarded in Preferred Approach 4, or delivered through Preferred Approach 16, and/or where no acceptable alternative form of waste management can be made available to meet the need. All proposals must demonstrate that they would not divert inert waste material away from existing mineral workings / landfill sites which require the material for restoration purposes. All inert landfill and landraise proposals would need to meet the policies in this WDD. The WPAs will require the proposed development and use of the inert waste to be an acceptable and sustainable use.</p>	<p>disagreed. Where they sought an amendment to the criteria these were incorporated in the Preferred Approach (2011) where appropriate. As such the content was progressed at the time. The Pre-Submission Approach is not distinctively different from the 2011 Preferred Approach to be considered a reasonable alternative.</p>
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Preferred Approach</p> <p>Landraising for its own sake, with no demonstrable restoration or engineering need will not be permitted. Landraising may be considered as part of an essential engineering project to achieve the primary development (for example coastal defence works or engineering works for highways provision), and where the principle of the land use proposed as the primary development is in compliance with the district Local Development Framework. In these instances, the proposal must demonstrate the minimum amount of material necessary to meet the requirements of the development. Landraising might be acceptable in instances where there is a proven benefit that outweighs any harm caused by a proposal. Again, the proposal must demonstrate the minimum amount of material necessary to meet the requirements of the development, and articulate this benefit. Proposals</p>	<p>The results of previous consultations formed the content of the Plan's approach to landraising. Up until this stage, no other distinctly different alternative approaches had emerged through the plan-making process and the various consultation stages of the Plan. The approach was considered suitable in mind of the characteristics of the Plan Area and in addition to the Plan's evidence base. The Preferred Approach (2015) approach to landraising is not distinctly different to that of the Pre-Submission policy and as such can be considered to have been selected.</p>

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
<p>for inert landraising that are considered to constitute a waste disposal activity, rather than a valid engineering and / or construction project, will only be acceptable where there is an identified need for restoration and for inert waste to be disposed of in this manner. Landraising will only be acceptable where: It can be suitably demonstrated no acceptable alternative form of development can be made available to meet the need and where it does not undermine: The provision of waste development on strategic inert landfill sites safeguarded in Preferred Approach 3; Delivery by Preferred Approach 8, Preferred Approach 9, or Preferred Approach 16; and/or It must be demonstrated that the amount of material imported and deposited would be the minimum necessary to bring about any alleged improvements. All inert landfill and landraise proposals would also need to meet the policies in the RWLP once adopted.</p>	
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) – Alternative 1: To adopt a less restrictive 'locational criteria' based approach to landraising</p>	<p>In light of no previous iterations of the Plan exploring a contrary approach to landraising it was considered appropriate to explore, for robustness, a 'more flexible' alternative approach at the 2015 Revised Preferred Approach stage. This alternative approach was highlighted as having negative impacts on relevant sustainability objectives / criteria. The alternative was rejected as it would not reflect the recycling of inert material as defined within the Waste Hierarchy. In addition, there would be less material available that would be required for restoration purposes. As such the alternative was rejected.</p>
<p>Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)</p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Policy can be seen to be largely similar to that of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) and all other consultation versions of the Plan. The Policy has been selected where it reflects the recycling of inert material as defined within the Waste Hierarchy and ensures that appropriate waste is available for required restoration purposes; of great benefit and importance within the Plan Area in respect of existing mineral voids and the Plan's approach to Waste Disposal (Policy 9).</p>

6.5 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 14 – Landfill Mining and Reclamation

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Issues and Options (2010)	The requirement and viability of exploring landfill mining and reclamation was not established at this stage. As such the issue was not explored and no alternative approaches were developed.
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Waste Development Document: Preferred Approach (2011)	The requirement and viability of exploring landfill mining and reclamation was not established at this stage. As such the issue was not explored and no alternative approaches were developed.
<p>Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015)</p> <p>To only permit the mining of waste where: The site is demonstrated to be endangering or has the potential to endanger, human health or harm the environment; and / or removal of the waste is required to facilitate major infrastructure projects. In this case it must be demonstrated that there are no other locations which are suitable for the infrastructure. Proposals will be required to assess the potential for capturing any fuel/energy produced as part of the mining operation.</p>	<p>The Plan area has the environmental legacy associated with the historic use of landfill. There are almost 400 historic landfills located across Essex ranging across different landfill types. In parallel, as resources have become scarcer (including contaminated land which could otherwise be used for development), the value in previously disposed wastes is increasingly recognised. With the notion of the circular economy gaining momentum, attention is turning towards what potential value could be recovered through landfill mining. Landfill Mining and Reclamation (LFMR) can recover the materials and / or energy contained within previously disposed of waste and this could be seen as an unusual twist on the waste hierarchy, which has primarily been brought about due to the realisation that resources are becoming scarcer. At present actual landfill mining schemes are little more than trials as it is not yet seen to be entirely viable and / or cost effective at a significant scale. Despite this, at present LFMR could be an appropriate option in specific locations or circumstances. Examples of this situation would include if the site suffers from poor engineering, or if it is currently the cause of significant pollution, which outweighs that which could be created by its opening. In such cases, landfill mining may be justified and the eventuality should be included within the Plan. The Revised Preferred Approach (2015) approach to landfill mining and reclamation has been selected and progressed to largely reflect the content of the Pre-Submission Policy.</p>
Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach (2015) - Alternative 1: To not have a policy	The requirement and viability of exploring landfill mining and reclamation was not established at the Issues and Options (2010) or Preferred Approach

Option	Reason for Rejection or Progression / Selection
on the mining of waste.	(2011) stages. As such the issue was not explored and no alternative approaches were developed. Despite this, the absence of a policy on landfill mining and reclamation offers an alternative approach in itself. Although in the shorter term it is difficult to see how the reworking of general landfills, notably those containing municipal solid waste, could yield worthwhile revenue to offset the costs (including environmental assessments, securing planning and other consents and any necessary mitigation), the RWLP must remain flexible. As such, this alternative was rejected in favour of including a policy on the mining of waste.
Essex County Council & Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre-Submission (2016)	The Pre-Submission Policy approach to landfill mining and reclamation has been selected and progressed from the content of the preceding iteration in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015). The Plan Area has a legacy associated with historic landfilling operations, with almost 400 historic landfills of various types located across Essex. As resources become scarcer, the value in previously disposed wastes is being increasingly recognised. With the notion of the circular economy gaining momentum, attention is turning towards the potential resource and energy value that could be recovered through extracting material from historic landfills. In order for the Waste Local Plan to be able to respond to any technological advancement in landfill mining, there is a requirement to set out a policy stance and for this reason the Policy has been selected.

7 Strategic Waste Management Allocations

7.1 The reasons for choosing the Waste Local Plan in light of other reasonable alternatives: Policy 3 – Strategic Site Allocations

7.1.1 Sites excluded having failed the Stage 1 Exclusionary Criteria of the Site Assessment Process

Site Reference	Site Name	Reasons for Exclusion
L(n)2R	Martell's	The site is not allocated in the Minerals Local Plan and therefore there is no available void suitable for landfill. Furthermore, the site borders a SSSI and Scheduled Monument.
L(n)3	Crumps Farm, Lt Canfield	While parts of the site are located within Flood Zone 3, these are relatively small when compared to the size of the site. The planning permission of the current operation on the site ensures that there will be no impacts resulting from the allocated use. The site is not allocated in the Minerals Local Plan, and therefore there is no available void suitable for landfill. However, the site promoter confirmed that they are not proposing landfill on this site, so the same site has been coded as W32 and considered for the other waste facility types proposed.
L(n)4	Barling Landfill, off Mucking Hall Road	The site is partly within a Ramsar site, SPA, SAC and SSSI and most of the site sits within Flood Zone 3.
L(i)3R	Tile Kiln, Valley farm, Sible Hedingham	The site is not allocated in the Minerals Local Plan and therefore there is no void space suitable for landfill.
L(i)8	Armigers Farm, Uttlesford	The site is not allocated in the Minerals Local Plan, and therefore there is no available void suitable for landfill.

Site Reference	Site Name	Reasons for Exclusion
W2	Units 5-7 Hallsford Bridge Industrial Estate	The site is likely to be too small (0.337ha) to accommodate a waste management facility.
W28	Barling Landfill, off Mucking Hall Road	The site is partly within a Ramsar, SPA, SAC and SSSI and most of the site sits within Flood Zone 3.
IWMF1	IWMF Stanway, Colchester	Site owner unable to offer confirmation that the site would be available for a suitable waste use during the plan period (2014 to 2031).

7.1.2 Sites included within the Sustainability Appraisal Process

A number of sites have been assessed in this Environmental Report. These respond to sites that have been identified as allocated in the Plan and those that are non-preferred and as such unallocated in the Plan. Site appraisals have also been undertaken for facilities for which there is no identified requirement in the Local Plan. The appraisal of sites in this document corresponds to all those that have come forward from the Plan's call-for-sites, and also for the various different waste facilities or uses that were identified for each site by the site owner / developer. This thorough appraisal responds to the requirement for the Sustainability Appraisal to appraise all reasonable alternatives.

The following table outlines those sites appraised within the Sustainability Appraisal process and for the range of facilities that were proposed for each site by the site owner / developer. Those sites in grey represent those that have changed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage of the Plan. Commentary alongside each change offers further explanation in each instance.

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
IWMF2	Rivenhall Site, Braintree	Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Energy from waste – Combined Heat & Power; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas
IWMF3	Tovi EcoPark, Courtauld Road, Basildon	Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
L(i)3R	Tile Kiln, Valley Farm, Sible Hedingham, Braintree	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Landfill – Inert
L(i)4R	Shellow Cross Farm, Willingale, Chelmsford / Epping	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Landfill – Inert
L(i)5	Sunnymead, Elmstead & Heath Farms, Alresford, Tendring	Landfill – Inert
L(i)6	Sandon, Chelmsford	Landfill – Inert
L(i)7	Fiveways Fruit Farm, Colchester	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert
L(i)10R	Blackley Quarry, Gate Farm Site 1, Chelmsford	Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert
L(i)13R	Wellwick, Martins Farm, St Oysth, Tendring	Landfill – Inert
L(i)15	Fingringhoe Quarry 1, Colchester	Landfill – Inert
L(i)16	Dollymans Farm, Doublegate Lane, Basildon / Rochford	Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(i)17R	Newport Quarry, Uttlesford	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert <i>This is a new site that has been promoted as a result of the Revised Preferred Approach 2015 consultation</i>

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
L(n)1R	Slough Farm, Ardleigh – Area 1, Tendring	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)2R	Martell's, Tendring	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)3	Crumps Farm, Lt Canfield, Uttlesford	Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert, Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)4	Barling landfill – Off Mucking Hall Road, SS3 0NR, Rochford	Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)5	Bellhouse Landfill Site, Warren Lane, Colchester	Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)6R	Pitsea Landfill, Pitsea Hall Lane, Basildon	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)7R	Little Bullocks Farm Site A22, Uttlesford	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert
L(n)8R	Little Bullocks Farm Site A23, Uttlesford	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Landfill – Inert; Landfill – Non-hazardous; Landfill - Non-inert; Landfill – Hazardous
W1	Green Acres, Old Packards Lane, Wormingford, Colchester	Transfer – Transfer station; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Recycling

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
		– CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert
W2	Units 5-7, Hallsford Bridge Industrial Estate, Ongar, Brentwood	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage
W3	Basildon WWTW 1, Courtauld Road, Basildon	Transfer – Transfer station; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Composting – In-vessel; Energy from waste – Combined Heat & Power; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert
W7	Sandon East, Chelmsford	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Energy from waste – Combined Heat & Power; Energy from waste – Gasification & Pyrolysis; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Composting – Windrow
W8	Elsenham, Uttlesford	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Energy from waste – Combined Heat & Power; Energy from waste – Gasification & Pyrolysis; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Composting – Windrow
W9	Great Dunmow, Uttlesford	Transfer – Transfer station
W10	Harlow, Harlow	Transfer – Transfer station
W12	Ballast Quay, Fingringhoe, Colchester	Transfer – Waste Transfer Station <i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation the site owner / developer has specified that the site should not be considered for waste storage, but for a waste</i>

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
		<i>transshipment facility.</i>
W13	Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area, Colchester	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening <i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site owner / developer has specified that Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas is no longer promoted for consideration on the site.</i>
W14	Alresford, Tendring	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert
W15	Wellwick, Martins Farm, St Osyth, Tendring	Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening
W16	Eastern Avenue, Southend	Transfer – Transfer station; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility
W17	Allens Farm, Wivenhoe Road, Colchester, CO7 7BN	Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas
W18	Batemans Farm, Lynderswood Lane, Braintree / Chelmsford	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert
W19	Hastingwood, London Road, Harlow	Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert
W20	Courtauld Road, Burnt Mills, Basildon	Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas
W21	Dollymans Farm, Doublegate Lane, Basildon / Rochford	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Recycling – Metal recycling Site; Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Recycling – End of Life Vehicle Facility; Composting – Windrow;

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
W22	Michelins Farm, Arterial Road, Rayleigh, Rochford	<p>Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage</p> <p><i>The site is an Area of Search in the Plan and it could be developed as a transfer station if required in the Plan period. At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site was a preferred 'Opportunity Site' due to scoring highly in the Site Assessment Report; however the concept of Opportunity Sites has been dropped in the Plan following consultation. Under Policy NEL1 in the adopted Rochford District Council Allocations Plan 2014, the site has been allocated to accommodate future displaced heavier industrial uses from the Rawreth Industrial Estate (being redeveloped under policy BFR4), whilst land is also set aside for a new 1.2ha Waste Recycling Centre. That it is considered that the site could house waste facilities in the future is in accordance with the concept of Areas of Search and therefore this designation remains in the emerging Waste Local Plan.</i></p>
W23	Station Yard, Bentley Road, Tendring	Recycling – Metal recycling Site; Recycling – End of Life Vehicle Facility
W24	Widdington, Hollow Road, Uttlesford	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Composting – Windrow
W25	Fairfield Road, Fordham Road, Colchester	<p>Composting – Windrow</p> <p><i>This site has since been withdrawn by the site owner / developer.</i></p>
W26	Winsford Way, Chelmsford	Transfer – Transfer station
W27	Friern Manor, Land South of the A127, Basildon / Brentwood	Energy from waste – Combined Heat & Power
W28	Barling Landfill, Off Mucking Hall Road, SS3 0NR, Rochford	Composting – Windrow

Site Reference	Site Name	Potential Facility Types (as per site owner / developer)
W29	Bellhouse Landfill Site, Warren lane, Colchester	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Composting – Windrow
W30	Pitsea Landfill, Pitsea Hall Lane, Basildon	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Composting – In-vessel; Composting – Windrow
W31	Morses Lane, Brightlingsea, Tendring	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Energy from waste – Combined Heat & Power; Energy from waste – Gasification & Pyrolysis; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility
W32	Crumps Farm, Lt Canfield, Uttlesford	Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility
W33	Ardleigh off the A120, Tendring	Transfer – Transfer Station
W34	Cordons Farm, Braintree	Transfer – Transfer Station
W35	Armigers Farm, Uttlesford	Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Recycling – C&D inert/soil screening; Recycling – C&D non-inert
SIE5	The Basketworks, Grange Road, Tiptree, Colchester	Transfer – Transfer station; Transfer – Waste storage; Recycling – Materials Recovery Facility; Recycling – Metal recycling Site; Composting – In-vessel; Treatment – Mechanical Biological Treatment; Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas; Treatment – Autoclaving; Recycling – CD&EW inert/soil screening; Recycling – CD&EW non-inert; Recycling – End of Life Vehicle Facility

7.1.3 The Appraisal of Enclosed Waste Facilities

Enclosed waste facilities are those housed in buildings. The broad category of waste facility types described as enclosed for the purposes of this section, are listed below. The facility types are:

- Transfer Stations
- Waste Storage (Stations)
- Materials Recovery Facilities
- Metal Recycling Facilities
- In-Vessel Composting Facilities
- Mechanical Biological treatment Facilities

It should be noted that the status of Transfer Stations has changed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015). Transfer Stations were previously allocated within the Revised Preferred Approach RWLP (2015) however are now 'safeguarded' in the Pre-Submission Plan. The previous position regarding their specific allocation in the Plan, was to support their permission in principle and ensure that any future re-configuration of the existing facilities were supported by policy and this, in conjunction with the Plan's stance on Waste Consultation Areas has now been deemed unnecessary. All of the transfer stations safeguarded below are now operational.

Sites highlighted in grey represent those sites for which the status has changed or an amendment in the highlighted impacts has been made following re-assessment since the revised Preferred Approach (2015).

Table 1: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Transfer Stations

Sites for: TRANSFER STATIONS														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W1	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++

Reason for rejection:		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.													
W3	S / M	+	-	/	++	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	++	
	L	+	-	/	++	+	++	++	0	++	+	/	++	++	
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a Transfer Station. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use. <i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive.</i>													
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
	L	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a Transfer Station. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.													
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/	
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/	
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a Transfer Station. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use. <i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i>													
W9	S / M	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	0	++	+	-	++	/	
	L	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	0	++	+	/	++	/	

Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable due to having planning permission in accordance with the Joint Waste Management Strategy and is currently operational. It also conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.													
W10	S / M	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	+	
	L	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	0	++	+	/	++	+	
Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable due to having planning permission in accordance with the Joint Waste Management Strategy and is currently operational. It also conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.													
W12	S / M	/	-	--	++	++	/	/	0	++	++	-	++	++	
	L	/	-	--	++	++	/	/	0	++	++	/	++	++	
Reason for rejection:		Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation the site owner / developer has requested the site be considered for a waste transhipment facility. Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation, an amendment has been made to historic environment impacts previously highlighted in the SA. The previous positive impact is now considered a significant positive impact in line with a re-assessment of the site.													
W16	S / M	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	0	++	/	-	/	++	
	L	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	0	++	/	/	/	++	
Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable due to having planning permission in accordance with the Joint Waste Management Strategy and is currently operational. It also conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.													
W18	S / M	+	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	++	
	L	+	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++	

Reason for rejection:		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.													
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++	
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++	
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Green Belt.													
W22	S / M	+	-	++	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	-	+	++	
	L	+	-	++	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not specifically needed for use as a Transfer Station.</p> <p><i>The site is an Area of Search in the Plan and it could be developed as a transfer station if required in the Plan period. At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site was a preferred 'Opportunity Site' due to scoring highly in the Site Assessment Report; however the concept of Opportunity Sites has been dropped in the Plan following consultation. Under Policy NEL1 in the adopted Rochford District Council Allocations Plan 2014, the site has been allocated to accommodate future displaced heavier industrial uses from the Rawreth Industrial Estate (being redeveloped under policy BFR4), whilst land is also set aside for a new 1.2ha Waste Recycling Centre. That it is considered that the site could house waste facilities in the future is in accordance with the concept of Areas of Search and therefore this designation remains in the emerging Waste Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) have been amended from positive in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA, to significantly positive.</i></p>													
W24	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-	
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-	
Reason for rejection:		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.													
W26	S / M	+	++	++	++	+	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++	
	L	+	++	++	++	+	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++	

Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable due to having planning permission in accordance with the Joint Waste Management Strategy and is currently operational. It also conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>An amendment to the impact highlighted for the historic environment (SO5) in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage has been necessary to factor in the site's proximity to a Grade II listed building whose setting will need to be considered as part of a heritage impact assessment. As such previously stated significant positive impacts are now minor positive.</i></p>												
W29	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a Transfer Station. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.												
W30	S / M	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W31	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not needed for use as a Transfer Station. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>												
W33	S / M	+	++	++	++	/	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	/	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
Safeguarded Site – Reason		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered												

for safeguarding:		<p>suitable due to having planning permission in accordance with the Joint Waste Management Strategy and is currently operational. It also conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>An erroneous significantly negative impact for the sustainable use of land (SO4) was highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage. This has since been amended to significantly positive to reflect the fact that a municipal waste transfer station and associated infrastructure has been constructed and is operational on the site.</i></p>												
W34	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	+
	L	+	++	++	++	++	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	+
Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable due to having planning permission in accordance with the Joint Waste Management Strategy and is currently operational. It also conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p>												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p><i>The site has also been re-assessed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage as not being suitable in Highway Terms and/or not complying with Transport Policy.</i></p>												

Table 2: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Storage facilities

Sites for: STORAGE FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++

Reason for rejection:		No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.												
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i></p>												
W12	S / M	/	-	--	++	++	/	/	0	++	++	-	++	++
	L	/	-	--	++	++	/	/	0	++	++	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation the site owner / developer has specified that the site should not be considered for waste storage, but for a waste transshipment facility.</i></p> <p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation, an amendment has been made to historic environment impacts previously highlighted in the SA. The previous positive impact is now considered a significant positive impact in line with a re-assessment of the site.</i></p>												
W18	S / M	+	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	++
	L	+	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.												
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++

Reason for rejection:		No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.													
W22	S / M	+	-	++	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	-	+	++	
	L	+	-	++	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not specifically needed for use as a storage facility.</p> <p><i>The site is an Area of Search in the Plan and it could be developed as a transfer station if required in the Plan period. At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site was a preferred 'Opportunity Site' due to scoring highly in the Site Assessment Report; however the concept of Opportunity Sites has been dropped in the Plan following consultation. Under Policy NEL1 in the adopted Rochford District Council Allocations Plan 2014, the site has been allocated to accommodate future displaced heavier industrial uses from the Rawreth Industrial Estate (being redeveloped under policy BFR4), whilst land is also set aside for a new 1.2ha Waste Recycling Centre. That it is considered that the site could house waste facilities in the future is in accordance with the concept of Areas of Search and therefore this designation remains in the emerging Waste Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) have been amended from positive in the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA, to significantly positive.</i></p>													
W24	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-	
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-	
Reason for rejection		No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. Also, the site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.													
W29	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	+	+	--	++	++	
	L	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	+	+	/	++	++	
Reason for rejection:		No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.													
W30	S / M	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	-	++	++	
	L	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	/	++	++	

Reason for rejection:		No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.												
W31	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>												
W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.</i></p>												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new storage facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>The site has also been re-assessed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage as not being suitable in Highway Terms and/or not complying with Transport Policy.</i></p>												

Table 3: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF)

Sites for: MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITIES (MRF)														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
IWMF2	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	++	++	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	++	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not specifically needed for use as MRF for waste generated within the Plan Area. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p>It should be noted that a change in a positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for IWMF2 – Rivenhall has been necessary at this stage regarding SO2 (water quality). This is due to a number of water bodies being within the existing adjacent operational quarry and the presence of a lake located north of the IWMF as part of the mineral restoration. The site will now have a negative impact on water quality as identified. In addition, a significant negative impact was highlighted for flooding due to the site being partly within FZ2 and FZ3; however it has been re-assessed that the vast majority of the site sits within FZ1 - a very small portion of the access track to the site goes over a waterway (River Blackwater) designated as both FZ2 and FZ3 however, a bridge over the waterway significantly reduces the risk of the access road flooding. The site has also re-assessed as having significant positive impacts on the historic environment (SO5) where the listed and ancillary buildings at Woodhouse Farm are to be archaeologically recorded and renovated under the present approved application.</p>												
IWMF3	S / M	+	++	--	++	++	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	--	++	++	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. The site is operational as a MBT plant which incorporates MRF and is safeguarded due to providing sufficient capacity to recover materials from the residual waste fraction of LACW in the Plan Area.</p>												

L(i)10R	S / M	+	-	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as MRF. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.												
W1	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W3	S / M	+	-	/	++	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	-	/	++	+	++	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not needed for use as a MRF. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive.</i></p>												
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a MRF. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.												
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a MRF. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.												

		An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.												
W15	S / M	/	-	++	/	++	-	/	0	-	/	-	+	/
	L	/	-	++	/	++	-	/	0	-	/	/	+	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. In addition, there is an application for another incompatible use (housing) on the site which is pending.</p> <p>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the impact highlighted in the SA for the sustainable management of waste (SO9) has needed amendment from significantly positive to negative. This is due to a current application for 190 dwellings on the site. In addition, previously highlighted uncertain impacts for landscape (SO6) have been amended to negative to reflect moderate to high adverse effects on St Osyth's park, the users of the B1027 and the caravan park.</p>												
W16	S / M	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	0	++	/	-	/	++
	L	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	0	++	/	/	/	++
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a MRF. The site is, and has been safeguarded within the Plan as, a Waste Transfer Station.												
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W31	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a MRF. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.												

		An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.												
W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
Reason for rejection:		Not needed for use as a MRF. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use. W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.												
W35	S / M	+	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	+
	L	+	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	+
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site has also been re-assessed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage as not being suitable in Highway Terms and/or not complying with Transport Policy.												

Table 4: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Metal Recycling Facilities

Sites for: METAL RECYCLING FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++

	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		No new Metal Recycling Facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is also within the Greenbelt.												
W23	S / M	+	++	++	/	+	-	/	0	+	--	-	--	++
	L	+	++	++	/	+	-	/	0	+	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		No new Metal Recycling Facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. Also, the site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new Metal Recycling Facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>The site has also been re-assessed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage as not being suitable in Highway Terms and/or not complying with Transport Policy.</i></p>												

Table 5: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: In-vessel composting facilities

Sites for: IN-VESSEL COMPOSTING FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W3	S / M	+	-	/	++	+	++	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	-	/	++	+	++	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
Preferred Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and its conformity to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site is preferred for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment, although the specific facility type												

		has not been determined at this point.													
		<i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive.</i>													
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
	L	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
Preferred Site – Reason for allocation:		Not allocated for use as biological treatment. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.													
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/	
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/	
Reason for rejection:		Not allocated for use as biological treatment. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.													
		<i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i>													
W20	S / M	+	-	++	/	++	+	++	0	++	+	-	+	++	
	L	+	-	++	/	++	+	++	0	++	+	/	+	++	
Preferred Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report in consideration also of its suitability to meet the capacity gap requirements and its conformity to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site is preferred for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment, although the specific facility type has not been determined at this point.													

		An amendment has also been necessary for the impact on water quality (SO2) previously stated on site W20 Courtauld Road. The alteration to the route of the Nevendon Brook now sees it run along the eastern boundary of the proposed site. As such previously significantly positive impacts are now negative due to the proximity of this water body.												
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W30	S / M	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not allocated for use as biological treatment. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p>W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.</p>												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site was deemed to have scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report in consideration also of its suitability to meet the capacity gap requirements and its conformity to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site was, as a result, a preferred allocation for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment. Since then, the site has been considered to not be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with</p>												

Transport Policy. This is due to Grange Road being of an insufficient width to allow two HGVs to pass satisfactorily.

Table 6: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Waste Facilities: Mechanical Biological Treatment Facilities (MBT)

Sites for: MECHANICAL BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES (MBT)														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
IWMF2	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	++	++	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	++	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>Given the IWMF at Tovi Eco Park (Basildon) is safeguarded, it has not been deemed necessary to allocate any new MBT within the Plan Area. The site is however allocated for other uses.</p> <p><i>It should be noted that a change in a positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for IWMF2 – Rivenhall has been necessary at this stage regarding SO2 (water quality). This is due to a number of water bodies being within the existing adjacent operational quarry and the presence of a lake located north of the IWMF as part of the mineral restoration. The site will now have a negative impact on water quality as identified. In addition, a significant negative impact was highlighted for flooding due to the site being partly within FZ2 and FZ3; however it has been re-assessed that the vast majority of the site sits within FZ1 - a very small portion of the access track to the site goes over a waterway (River Blackwater) designated as both FZ2 and FZ3 however, a bridge over the waterway significantly reduces the risk of the access road flooding. The site has also re-assessed as having significant positive impacts on the historic environment (SO5) where the listed and ancillary buildings at Woodhouse Farm are to be archaeologically recorded and renovated under the present approved application.</i></p>												
IWMF3	S / M	+	++	--	++	++	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	--	++	++	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
Safeguarded Site – Reason for safeguarding:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity												

		principle. There is no identified capacity requirement for MBT beyond the operation of this site. This facility, coupled with its associated network of supporting waste transfer sites, provides sufficient capacity to recover materials from the residual waste fraction of LACW in the Plan Area. As a result of this, the site is safeguarded.												
W1	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	/	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		Given the IWMF at Tovi Eco Park (Basildon) is safeguarded, it has not been deemed necessary to allocate any new MBT within the Plan Area. The site is however allocated for another use.												
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not allocated for use as MBT. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i></p>												
W29	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		Given the IWMF at Tovi Eco Park (Basildon) is safeguarded, it has not been deemed necessary to allocate any new MBT within the Plan Area. The site is however allocated for another use.												

W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not allocated for use as MBT. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use</p> <p><i>W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.</i></p>												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p><i>The site has also been re-assessed since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage as not being suitable in Highway Terms and/or not complying with Transport Policy.</i></p>												

7.1.4 The Appraisal of Enclosed Thermal Facilities

Enclosed Thermal waste facilities are generally those housed in buildings with flues and digestate piping, although this is not always the case for some facilities that although include some level of heating in the treatment of waste, transport the products of this off site. The broad category of waste facility types described as enclosed thermal for the purposes of this section, are listed below. The facility types are:

- Combined Heat & Power facilities
- Gasification and Pyrolysis facilities
- Anaerobic Digesters / Biogas facilities
- Autoclaving facilities

Please note that numerous sites were put forward for multiple facility types, and these have been appraised on a facility type basis. As such, it may appear that preferred sites for one facility type are not preferred (i.e. rejected) for other facility types proposed by the site owner / developer.

Sites highlighted in grey represent those sites for which the status has changed or an amendment in the highlighted impacts has been made following re-assessment since the revised Preferred Approach (2015).

Table 7: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Combined Heat and Power Facilities (CHP)

Sites for: COMBINED HEAT AND POWER FACILITIES (CHP)														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
IWMF2	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	- -	++	/
	L	+	-	++	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	/	++	/
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is exploring long term options surrounding the final destination for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. Currently the 200,000t output of the facility is exported from the Plan Area. A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which includes continued exportation from the Plan Area. However, in line with net self-sufficiency, the Plan includes IWMF2 as a site allocation for												

		<p>'other waste management' which could accommodate this waste.</p> <p><i>It should be noted that a change in a positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for IWMF2 – Rivenhall has been necessary at this stage regarding SO2 (water quality). This is due to a number of water bodies being within the existing adjacent operational quarry and the presence of a lake located north of the IWMF as part of the mineral restoration. The site will now have a negative impact on water quality as identified. In addition, a significant negative impact was highlighted for flooding due to the site being partly within FZ2 and FZ3; however it has been re-assessed that the vast majority of the site sits within FZ1 - a very small portion of the access track to the site goes over a waterway (River Blackwater) designated as both FZ2 and FZ3 however, a bridge over the waterway significantly reduces the risk of the access road flooding. The site has also re-assessed as having significant positive impacts on the historic environment (SO5) where the listed and ancillary buildings at Woodhouse Farm are to be archaeologically recorded and renovated under the present approved application.</i></p>												
W3	S / M	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	/	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	/	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>While close to the source of waste W3 Basildon is considered to be too small a site to accommodate a facility of the nature needed to meet this specific need. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive. There will also now be uncertain impacts on landscape (SO6) for enclosed-thermal and open-air facilities as well as uncertain impacts on biodiversity due to the site being within 10km of internationally designated sites.</i></p>												
W7	S / M	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	-	+	++
	L	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for CHP. The site is however allocated												

		for another use.												
W8	S / M	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	-	++	/
	L	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for AD. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i></p>												
W27	S / M	/	++	++	/	/	--	++	/	+	+	-	++	++
	L	/	++	++	/	/	--	++	/	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for AD.												
W31	S / M	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>It is noted in the commentary for W31 in the Site Assessment Report that should an Energy from Waste facility include flues it would have significant negative impacts (requiring an amendment to a red score using the methodology of that assessment) given the high number of residential neighbours within 250m of the site. For this reason, the site was rejected for use as CHP. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>												

Table 8: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Gasification and Pyrolysis Facilities

Sites for: GASIFICATION AND PYROLYSIS FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W7	S / M	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	-	+	++
	L	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		No new gasification and pyrolysis facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however allocated for another use.												
W8	S / M	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	-	++	/
	L	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new gasification and pyrolysis facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i></p>												
W31	S / M	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new gasification and pyrolysis facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts</i></p>												

associated with its positive waste use / permission history.

Table 9: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Anaerobic Digestion / Biogas (AD)

Sites for: ANAEROBIC DIGESTION (AD) / BIOGAS														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
IWMF2	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	--	++	/
	L	+	-	++	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	/	++	/
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and its conformity to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy. The site has been allocated for Biological Treatment and it could be developed as AD if required in the Plan period.</p> <p><i>It should be noted that a change in a positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for IWMF2 – Rivenhall has been necessary at this stage regarding SO2 (water quality). This is due to a number of water bodies being within the existing adjacent operational quarry and the presence of a lake located north of the IWMF as part of the mineral restoration. The site will now have a negative impact on water quality as identified. In addition, a significant negative impact was highlighted for flooding due to the site being partly within FZ2 and FZ3; however it has been re-assessed that the vast majority of the site sits within FZ1 - a very small portion of the access track to the site goes over a waterway (River Blackwater) designated as both FZ2 and FZ3 however, a bridge over the waterway significantly reduces the risk of the access road flooding. The site has also re-assessed as having significant positive impacts on the historic environment (SO5) where the listed and ancillary buildings at Woodhouse Farm are to be archaeologically recorded and renovated under the present approved application.</i></p>												
W1	S / M	+	-	++	-	+	--	/	/	++	--	/	--	++
	L	+	-	++	-	+	--	/	/	++	--	/	--	++

Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.													
W3	S / M	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	/	++	+	-	++	++	
	L	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	/	++	+	/	++	++	
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site is preferred for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment, although the specific facility type has not been determined at this point.</p> <p><i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive. There will also now be uncertain impacts on landscape (SO6) for enclosed-thermal and open-air facilities as well as uncertain impacts on biodiversity due to the site being within 10km of internationally designated sites.</i></p>													
W7	S / M	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	-	+	++	
	L	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	/	+	++	
Reason for rejection:		Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for AD. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.													
W8	S / M	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	-	++	/	
	L	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	/	
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for AD. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic</i></p>													

		environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.												
W13	S / M	/	-	++	-	++	/	/	/	++	/	--	+	++
	L	/	-	++	-	++	/	/	/	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>The site scored relatively well against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It was considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. As such, this site was a preferred site at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</p> <p>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site owner / developer has specified that Treatment – Anaerobic Digestion/Biogass is no longer promoted for consideration on the site.</p>												
W17	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	+	++	/	++	--	--	--	++
	L	/	-	++	++	+	+	++	/	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W20	S / M	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	/	++	+	-	+	++
	L	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	/	++	+	/	+	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site is preferred for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment, although the specific facility type has not been determined at this point.</p> <p>An amendment has also been necessary for the impact on water quality (SO2) previously stated on site W20 Courtauld Road. The alteration to the route of the Nevendon Brook now sees it run along the eastern boundary of the proposed site. As such previously significantly positive impacts are now negative due to the proximity of this water body. There will also now be an uncertain impact on landscape (SO6), and amendment to the previously stated positive impact, due to a re-assessment of the site for enclosed thermal facilities. This is also the case for</p>												

		<i>biodiversity (SO1) due to a re-assessment of the site for enclosed thermal facilities due to the proximity of internationally designated sites.</i>												
W21	S / M	/	-	--	/	+	--	++	/	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	--	/	+	--	++	/	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W29	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	-	/	/	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	/	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site is preferred for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment, although the specific facility type has not been determined at this point.												
W31	S / M	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for AD. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>												
W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	+
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation for AD. Has been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to</i></p>												

		<i>impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.</i>												
SIE5	S / M	/	++	++	++	++	+	/	/	++	--	++	++	++
	L	/	++	++	++	++	+	/	/	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site was deemed to have scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It was also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conformed to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site was, as a result, a preferred allocation for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment.</p> <p>Since then, the site has been considered to not be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy. This is due to Grange Road being of an insufficient width to allow two HGVs to pass satisfactorily.</p>												

Table 10: Appraisal of sites put forward for Enclosed Thermal Facilities: Autoclaving Facilities

Sites for: AUTOCLAVING FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W1	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	--	/	/	++	--	/	--	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	--	/	/	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		No new autoclaving facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. Also, the site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W7	S / M	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	-	+	++
	L	/	-	--	/	/	-	++	/	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		No new autoclaving facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however												

		allocated for another use.												
W8	S / M	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	-	++	/
	L	/	++	++	/	-	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new autoclaving facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i></p>												
W29	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	-	/	/	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	/	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new autoclaving facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however allocated for another use.</p>												
W31	S / M	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	++	++	/	/	-	/	/	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new autoclaving facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. The site is however allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>												
SIE5	S / M	/	++	++	++	++	+	/	/	++	--	++	++	++
	L	/	++	++	++	++	+	/	/	++	--	/	++	++

Reason for rejection:

No new autoclaving facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.

Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site has been considered to not be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy. This is due to Grange Road being of an insufficient width to allow two HGVs to pass satisfactorily.

7.1.5 The Appraisal of Open Air Facilities

Open air waste facilities are those that are not housed in buildings. The broad category of waste facility types described as open air for the purposes of this section, are listed below. The facility types are:

- Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste Recycling facilities (or inert recycling)
- End of Life Vehicle Recycling facilities
- (Open) Windrow Composting facilities
- Waste Water Treatment Works
- Inert Landfill Sites
- Non-inert Landfill Sites
- Non-Hazardous Landfill Sites
- Hazardous Landfill Sites

Sites highlighted in grey represent those sites for which the status has changed or an amendment in the highlighted impacts has been made following re-assessment since the revised Preferred Approach (2015).

Table 11: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&EW) Recycling Facilities (or inert recycling/soil screening and non-inert recycling)

Sites for: CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION AND EXCAVATION (CD&EW) RECYCLING FACILITIES (OR INERT AND NON-INERT RECYCLING)														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(i)4R	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	--	/	0	++	/	--	/	++
	L	/	-	++	++	/	--	/	0	++	/	/	/	++

Reason for rejection		The site is within the Green Belt.													
L(i)7	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	++	/	0	++	+	--	++	++	
	L	/	-	++	++	/	++	/	0	++	+	/	++	++	
Safeguarded site – Reason for safeguarding:		The granting of planning permission for this activity means that this site must now be considered to contribute towards the total waste capacity in the Plan Area. Allocation of the site to support this activity is therefore unnecessary.													
L(i)10R	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++	
	L	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	/	++	++	
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.													
L(i)17R	S / M	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	-	+	+	
	L	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	-	+	+	
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation		Site L(i)17R Newport Quarry was put forward during the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation. The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report and was identified as being able to meet inert landfill and recycling needs particularly in the west of the County. For these reasons the site has been allocated for both inert recycling and inert landfill.													
L(n)1R	S / M	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++	
	L	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++	
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.													
L(n)6R	S / M	-	-	--	++	+	--	/	0	++	+	-	++	++	

	L	-	-	--	++	+	--	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection		The site is within the Green Belt.												
L(n)7R	S / M	/	-	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
Reason for rejection:		<p>The WPAs do not consider that this site would be capable of operating independently for this specific use with other sites at Crumps Farm / Little Bullocks Farm having been allocated. The site however has been allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm Site A22. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. In addition, the site was also previously erroneously judged to have significant positive impacts on flooding (SO3) for certain uses / facilities, however a small amount of the site is within FZ3. As such the site will now have significantly negative impacts on this objective. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate impacts on landscape which will give rise to an uncertain impact on SO6; an amendment of a significantly positive score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												
L(n)8R	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/
	L	/	-	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>The WPAs do not consider that this site would be capable of operating independently for this specific use with other sites at Crumps Farm / Little Bullocks Farm having been allocated. The site has however been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)8R. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate to major effects on landscape which will give rise to an negative impact on SO6; an amendment of an uncertain score highlighted in the SA at</i></p>												

		<i>the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i>												
W1	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W3	S / M	+	-	/	++	+	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	-	/	++	+	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>The WPAs have decided to prioritise meeting the forecasted biological recovery capacity need over the recycling of inert waste. This approach will reduce the amount of biological waste going to landfill. Sending biological waste to landfill, rather than inert waste, is considered to have greater environmental impacts, given the potential for such waste to generate bio-aerosols and greenhouse gases. As a result, this site has not been allocated for inert recycling and has been allocated in the Plan for biological treatment.</p> <p><i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive.</i></p>												
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored relatively highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>The WPAs have decided to prioritise meeting the forecasted biological recovery capacity need over the recycling of inert waste. This approach will reduce the amount of biological waste going to landfill. Sending biological waste to landfill, rather than inert waste, is considered to have greater environmental impacts, given the potential</i></p>												

		<p>for such waste to generate bio-aerosols and greenhouse gases. As a result, this site was a preferred site for biological treatment at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage. It scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report, was also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conformed to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, it has been determined that the previous five preferred sites for biological treatment can deliver a total of 259,000tpa which is over and above the 217,000tpa needed. As the site W7 Sandon East scored significantly lower than the other four sites and those four sites on their own would provide sufficient capacity it has been discounted for biological waste treatment. The site has instead been allocated for inert recycling.</p>												
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</p>												
W13	S / M	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	/	--	+	++
	L	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	/	/	+	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, this site was not allocated for inert recycling as its preferred use was for biological treatment. This was due to the WPAs having decided to prioritise meeting the forecasted biological recovery capacity need over the recycling of inert waste in order to reduce the amount of biological waste going to landfill.</p> <p>It should be noted that since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site owner / developer of site</p>												

		<i>W13 (Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area, Colchester) has specified that Anaerobic Digestion/Biogas is no longer to be promoted on the site. As the site also scored highly against other sites considered for inert recycling allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report and due to its suitability in meeting the capacity gap requirements and conformity to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle, the site has now been selected for inert recycling.</i>												
W14	S / M	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	--	-	--	++
	L	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W15	S / M	-	-	++	/	+	-	/	0	++	/	-	+	/
	L	-	-	++	/	+	-	/	0	++	/	/	+	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. In addition, there is an application for another incompatible use (housing) on the site which is pending.</p> <p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the impact highlighted in the SA for landscape (SO6) has needed amendment from significantly negative to minor negative. This is due to a re-assessment of the site.</i></p>												
W18	S / M	/	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	++
	L	/	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W19	S / M	+	++	++	-	++	--	++	0	+	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	-	++	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection		<i>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage the Council initially allocated this site, despite it failing the Stage 2 sieving criterion of being located within the Green Belt. Despite being located in the Green Belt, W19 was at that stage deemed to have fewer other negative impacts than the sites for inert recycling that passed Stage 2. At this Pre-Submission stage however, the decision to allocate has been reversed which is consistent with other</i>												

		sites that also failed at Stage 2 due to being located within the Green Belt.													
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	- -	++	++	
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++	
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.													
W24	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	- -	/	- -	-	
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	- -	/	- -	-	
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.													
W31	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++	
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++	
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report in consideration also of its suitability to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>													
W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+	
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+	
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p><i>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, this site was not selected. The site promoter put forward three proposals for inert recycling in this location: L(n)7R (55,000tpa), L(n)8R (30,000tpa) and W32 (80,000tpa) and previously L(n)7R was selected for inert recycling. The WPAs do not consider that three separate inert waste facilities at each of these three sites within the Little Bullocks / Crumps Farm operation would be capable of operating independently of each other and simultaneously from a practical standpoint. For this reason only one of the proposed sites has been included as a site allocation for inert waste recycling.</i></p>													

		<p><i>W32 Crumps Farm has been selected because it provides for the most efficient use of the total waste site in conjunction with other existing and permitted operations. It has the largest potential capacity of the three proposals (80,000tpa), is located closer to the highway and would not displace any part of landfill operation on L(n)7R. L(n)8R is a less appropriate location for an inert recycling operation and has been selected for taking hazardous waste.</i></p> <p><i>W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.</i></p>												
W35	S / M	/	-	++	-	/	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	+
	L	/	-	++	-	/	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	+
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site has been considered to not be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy. This is due to Grange Road being of an insufficient width to allow two HGVs to pass satisfactorily.</i></p>												

Table 12: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities

Sites for: END OF LIVE (ELV) RECYCLING FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		No new ELV Recycling facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.												
W23	S / M	+	++	++	/	+	-	/	0	+	--	-	--	++
	L	+	++	++	/	+	-	/	0	+	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		No new ELV Recycling facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan. Also, the site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>No new ELV Recycling facilities have been deemed necessary to specifically allocate within the Plan.</p> <p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site has been considered to not be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy. This is due to Grange Road being of an insufficient width to allow two HGVs to pass satisfactorily.</i></p>												

Table 13: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Windrow Composting Facilities

Sites for: WINDROW COMPOSTING FACILITIES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		<p><i>The WPAs have decided to prioritise meeting the forecasted biological recovery capacity need over the recycling of inert waste. This approach will reduce the amount of biological waste going to landfill. Sending biological waste to landfill, rather than inert waste, is considered to have greater environmental impacts, given the potential for such waste to generate bio-aerosols and greenhouse gases. As a result, this site was a preferred site for biological treatment at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage. It scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report, was also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conformed to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</i></p> <p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, it has been determined that the previous five preferred sites for biological treatment can deliver a total of 259,000tpa which is over and above the 217,000tpa needed. As the site W7 Sandon East scored significantly lower than the other four sites and those four sites on their own would provide sufficient capacity it has been discounted for biological waste treatment. The site has instead been allocated for inert recycling.</i></p>												
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
Reason for rejection:		<p>This site has not been allocated for use for open windrow composting as it is also proposed for inert waste recycling, which has a greater capacity gap. Therefore, it is recommended as suitable for allocation for inert waste recycling instead and has been allocated for this use instead.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a</i></p>												

		<i>major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i>												
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W24	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W25	S / M	+	-	++	-	+	/	/	0	--	--	--	--	++
	L	+	-	++	-	+	/	/	0	--	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		<p>The site was not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or did not comply with Transport Policy.</p> <p><i>This site has since been withdrawn by the site owner / developer.</i></p>												
W29	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. This site is preferred for its suitability for allocation for biological treatment, although the specific facility type has not been determined at this point.												
W30	S / M	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	-	-	--	/	+	--	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												

Table 14: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Inert Landfill Sites

Sites for: INERT LANDFILL SITES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(i)4R	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	--	/	0	++	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection		The site is within the Green Belt.												
L(i)5	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms</p>												
L(i)6	S / M	-	--	--	++	+	/	++	0	++	/	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p>												

		The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymeade, Elmstead and Heath Farms												
L(i)7R	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Safeguarded site – Reason for safeguarding:		The grant of planning permission for this activity means that this site must now be considered to contribute towards the total waste capacity in the Plan Area. Allocation of the site to support this activity is therefore unnecessary.												
L(i)10R	S / M	+	--	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymeade, Elmstead and Heath Farms</p>												
L(i)13	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	/	/	0	++	/	--	+	+
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		There is an application for another incompatible use (housing) on the site which is pending.												
L(i)15	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	++	++	0	++	++	--	++	++

	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p><i>Fingringhoe Quarry (Li15) was submitted as a site suitable for inert waste landfill by the landowner as part of the call for sites. Despite scoring well in the Waste Site Assessment Report, and being considered suitable for inert waste disposal, at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage the WPAs chose not to include Fingringhoe Quarry as a preferred site allocation where it was considered that the inert fill material to be used at this site would be entirely sourced from London and imported to the site by barge via Ballast Quay Wharf. Waste arising in Essex or Southend-on-Sea would not be used to fill the void space (currently being created by the extraction of sand and gravel) and thus the site was not taken forward.</i></p> <p><i>Since then the site promoter, through their representation (through the Revised Preferred Approach [2015] consultation) and subsequent correspondence, has been able to satisfy the Waste Planning Authorities that a reasonable portion of inert fill material to be used at this site can be sourced from within the Plan Area. For this reason, and the fact that an existing mineral void exists at the quarry, the site has now been allocated to contribute in meeting void space requirements..</i></p>												
L(i)16	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection :		The site is within the Green Belt.												
L(i)17R	S / M	/	--	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	--	+	+
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p><i>Site L(i)17R Newport Quarry was put forward during the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation. The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report and was identified as being able to meet inert landfill and recycling needs particularly in the west of the County. For these reasons the site has been allocated for both inert recycling and inert landfill.</i></p>												
L(n)1R	S / M	+	--	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity												

allocation:		<p>principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymeade, Elmstead and Heath Farms</p>												
L(n)5	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p><i>Despite scoring well as part of the site selection process the large L(n)5 Bellhouse site (which currently takes non-hazardous wastes and has an agreed restoration plan) was not taken forward as part of the Revised Preferred Approach. This was due to reservations that it was close to other sites in this area near Colchester (such as L(i)7 Stanway). However, given re-assessment it is prudent to now include it as an inert landfill site.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that a change in a significant positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for L(n)5 – Bellhouse has been necessary at this stage regarding SO6 (landscape). This is due to a re-assessment which has established that there would be a minor adverse effect regarding views from receptors (properties and a PROW).</i></p>												
L(n)7R	S / M	/	--	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymeade, Elmstead and Heath Farms</p>												

		<p><i>There is also an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm Site A22. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. In addition, the site was also previously erroneously judged to have significant positive impacts on flooding (SO3) for certain uses / facilities, however a small amount of the site is within FZ3. As such the site will now have significantly negative impacts on this objective. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate impacts on landscape which will give rise to an uncertain impact on SO6; an amendment of a significantly positive score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												
L(n)8R	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		<p>This is the only landfill site that has been proposed as suitable for taking hazardous waste, which may be required during the plan period. The site has been allocated for the landfill of hazardous waste and as such rejected for allocation for inert landfill in the Plan.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)8R. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate to major effects on landscape which will give rise to an negative impact on SO6; an amendment of an uncertain score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												

Table 15: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Non-hazardous Landfill Sites

Sites for: NON-HAZARDOUS LANDFILL SITES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13

L(i)16	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Green Belt. It is assessed within Topic Paper 1: Waste Capacity Gap Update (2015) that there is adequate capacity for non-hazardous waste disposal throughout the Plan period. There is no requirement for additional non-hazardous landfill void space capacity.												
L(n)1R	S / M	+	--	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		It is assessed within Topic Paper 1: Waste Capacity Gap Update (2015) that there is adequate capacity for non-hazardous waste disposal throughout the Plan period. There is no requirement for additional non-hazardous landfill void space capacity.												
L(n)5	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		<p>It is assessed within Topic Paper 1: Waste Capacity Gap Update (2015) that there is adequate capacity for non-hazardous waste disposal throughout the Plan period. There is no requirement for additional non-hazardous landfill void space capacity..</p> <p><i>It should be noted that a change in a significant positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for L(n)5 – Bellhouse has been necessary at this stage regarding SO6 (landscape). This is due to a re-assessment which has established that there would be a minor adverse effect regarding views from receptors (properties and a PROW).</i></p>												
L(n)6R	S / M	-	--	--	++	+	--	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Green Belt. It is assessed within Topic Paper 1: Waste Capacity Gap Update (2015) that there is adequate capacity for non-hazardous waste disposal throughout the Plan period. There is no requirement for additional non-hazardous landfill void space capacity.												

L(n)7R	S / M	/	--	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		<p>It is assessed within Topic Paper 1: Waste Capacity Gap Update (2015) that there is adequate capacity for non-hazardous waste disposal throughout the Plan period. There is no requirement for additional non-hazardous landfill void space capacity.. The site is however allocated for another landfilling use.</p> <p><i>There is also an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm Site A22. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. In addition, the site was also previously erroneously judged to have significant positive impacts on flooding (SO3) for certain uses / facilities, however a small amount of the site is within FZ3. As such the site will now have significantly negative impacts on this objective. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate impacts on landscape which will give rise to an uncertain impact on SO6; an amendment of a significantly positive score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												
L(n)8R	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		<p>It is assessed within Topic Paper 1: Waste Capacity Gap Update (2015) that there is adequate capacity for non-hazardous waste disposal throughout the Plan period. There is no requirement for additional non-hazardous landfill void space capacity.. The site is however allocated for another landfilling use.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)8R. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate to major effects on landscape which will give rise to an negative impact on SO6; an amendment of an uncertain score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												

Table 16: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Hazardous Landfill Sites

Sites for: HAZARDOUS LANDFILL SITES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(n)8R	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Preferred Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>This is the only landfill site that has been proposed as suitable for taking hazardous waste. It has not been allocated for alternative uses as preferred use was for a stable non-reactive hazardous landfill and allocated accordingly in the Plan.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)8R. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate to major effects on landscape which will give rise to an negative impact on SO6; an amendment of an uncertain score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												

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](https://twitter.com/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