

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING and TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**23 October 2006**

**Report of the Director of Planning & Transportation**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)**

**1 KENT WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

**Summary**

**Response to public consultation on evidence gathering for the Development of Spatial Options**

**1.1 Consultation Period**

1.1.1 Kent County Council (KCC), as Waste Planning Authority for Kent, undertook an evidence gathering consultation on the Kent Waste Development Framework (KWDF) between 26 July and 4 October 2006. The KWDF will ultimately replace the adopted Kent Waste Local Plan (1998) when it is adopted. Officer-level comments were submitted prior to the conclusion of the consultation period subject to Members' endorsement.

1.1.2 Whilst this is a land use planning matter I have of course been in liaison with the Director of Health and Housing concerning the practical waste management implications it may raise.

**1.2 Purpose of Consultation**

1.2.1 The purpose of the consultation was to look at options for the future provision of waste management facilities in Kent. Views were sought on:

- the continuing suitability of sites previously identified in the adopted Waste Local Plan for various waste management uses, and
- the philosophy and implications of using a 'clean sheet' approach through which new treatment and landfill capacity would be located within 'areas of search'.

1.2.2 The 'evidence gathering' stage represents a continuation of the production of issues and alternative options that began in the Autumn of 2005.

### 1.3 Background Information

1.3.1 The consultation was informed by Jacob Babbie's (JBs) Assessment of Need for Waste Management and Disposal Facilities in Kent (September 2004) and the outcome of the consultation on the 'Issues and Options' Report (September 2005).

1.3.2 A number of documents in support of the consultation were published:

- Evidence Gathering for the Development of Spatial Options (Jacobs Babbie, 2006)
- The Development of the Need Assessment Report into Spatial Options (Jacobs Babbie, 2006)
- Assessment of Economies of Scale Associated with the Provision of Waste Treatment Facilities (Jacobs Babbie, 2006)
- Waste Management Sector WDF Engagement (Beyond Waste, 6 February 2006)

### 1.4 Baseline Information

1.4.1 The JB Need Assessment informed the scenarios developed by KCC for meeting the future requirements for waste treatment in Kent.

- 1) **Re-use, Recycling and Composting** - The conclusion, deriving from the JB Need Assessment, is that significant proportions of the waste arising in Kent would not require treatment. 45% of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) would be recycled or composted by 2020 and 60% of Commercial & Industrial (C&I) waste would either be re-used or recycled by 2020.
- 2) **Allington Energy from Waste (EfW) Facility** - This facility is expected to be open by the end of 2006. It will provide additional waste recovery capacity of 500,000 tonnes of waste per annum (tpa). The County Council is reserving 349,000 tpa of this capacity for municipal waste arising in the West Kent districts/boroughs, namely: **Tonbridge & Malling**, Dartford, Gravesham, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Swale and Tunbridge Wells.
- 3) **Waste Treatment Facilities (WTF)** - A WTF is a built facility for treating waste so that its volume is reduced. A WTF may include facilities for separating wastes that can be re-used or re-cycled, and may involve the creation of energy in the form of heat and/or electricity. The County Council considers that there is a need to provide new treatment capacity of up to 200,000 tpa (106,000 tpa MSW, 94, 000 tpa C7I waste). This is in addition to existing capacity and the capacity of the Allington EfW facility. KCC considers it is appropriate to allow for additional new capacity in Kent because:
  - C&I waste movements do not conform to administrative boundaries

- Kent is likely to be required to take some waste from London
- Some of the present 374,000 tpa C&I treatment capacity may no longer be available or used by 2019/20.

1.4.2 **Landfill Facilities** - The JB Need Assessment had identified a need for an additional 773,000 cubic metres of landfill void in the County by 2020.

## 1.5 Proposed Strategy Affecting Tonbridge and Malling

1.5.1 **No New Waste Treatment Facility** - None of the scenarios prepared and modelled by Jacobs Babtie for seeking the location of WTF include the development of a WTF in West Kent. It is assumed by the County Council that the uncontracted capacity at the Allington EfW facility (151,000 tpa) would be used to treat C&I waste arising in West Kent. The exercise to identify sites for new WTFs is therefore concerned with finding sites for the treatment of MSW arisings in East Kent. The scenarios developed and modelled by Jacobs Babtie therefore focus on locating new WTF in East and North-East Kent.

1.5.2 **Landfill Facilities** - The modelling for the landfill sites took place after the modelling for WTFs was complete. This is because it is necessary to know the likely locations of the new WTFs, the residues from which would form a proportion of the material to be landfilled. Other factors taken into consideration in the development of options for additional landfill capacity include: the existing EfW facility at Allington, population centres and existing Waste Transfer Stations - a location to which wastes are delivered from various sources, for onward transmission in bulk to a WTF.

1.5.3 Three options for new landfill facilities will, potentially, affect and impact upon Tonbridge and Malling (see Table below).

Option 1a	Option 1b	Option 2
<b>Two landfills, for areas as follows:</b>	<b>Two landfills, for areas as follows (Swale now part of East Kent)</b>	<b>Four landfills, for areas as follows:</b>
West Kent: District/Boroughs of Dartford, Gravesham, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Swale, <b>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</b> and Tunbridge Wells	West Kent: District/Boroughs of Dartford, Gravesham, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, <b>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</b> and Tunbridge Wells	Area A: Maidstone, Swale, <b>Tonbridge &amp; Malling</b> , Tunbridge Wells
East Kent: District/Boroughs of Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Shepway and Thanet	East Kent: District/Boroughs of Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Shepway, Swale and Thanet	Area B Dartford, Gravesham, Sevenoaks

Option 1a	Option 1b	Option 2
Two landfills, for areas as follows:	Two landfills, for areas as follows (Swale now part of East Kent)	Four landfills, for areas as follows:
		Area C Ashford, Shepway
		Area D Canterbury, Dover, Thanet
Note: Modelling for 2 new landfill sites implies each having a capacity of 400,000 cubic metres (approx. half the additional requirement of 773,000 cubic metres). Four sites implies an average site capacity of 200,000 cubic metres.		

- 1.5.4 **Landfill Site-Selection: Clean-Sheet Approach** - This approach involves identifying the most sustainable locations for landfill sites, as opposed to just considering the use or expansion of existing landfill sites or the consideration of sites put forward by individuals, groups or companies. This is considered by the County Council to be a sound approach that accords with Government guidance on the preparation of Development Frameworks.
- 1.5.5 **Landfill Site-Selection: 'Areas of Search'**: The County Council considers that it would not be appropriate to seek to identify specific sites for landfills, and thus the site selection exercise for landfill ends with the identification of 'Areas of Search' (AoS) and the identification of the main planning constraints that apply within them. The reason given for this approach is that there is potentially much greater flexibility in identifying suitable locations than there is for major built facilities.
- 1.5.6 Three AoS for landfill facilities have been identified that impact upon Tonbridge & Malling (see Annex 2 - 'Optimal & Next Best Areas of Search for landfill sites'). One is an optimal AoS (centred on a grid reference south-west of Maidstone). The other two are 'Next Best' AoS - (they perform within 10% of the Optimal AoS). One of these AoS is centred on a point north of Mereworth, the other is centred on a point south of Walderslade. The number within each AoS relates to how it was ranked for the WTF assessment stage. The ranking was based upon the total time required to transport waste from the source points to the centre of the Area of Search.
- 1.5.7 For each of the AoS for landfill facilities a set of planning constraints are identified. However, the AoS are not sieved through the application of the planning constraints to identify the most sustainable locations. This aspect of the methodology was criticised in the officer-level submission made on 4 October 2006 - see Annex A. The planning constraints identified include: Green Belt, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Historic Parks and Gardens, Flood Zones 2 and 3, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation and RAMSAR sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Special Protection Zones 1 & 2 - smaller areas from which water travels to potable abstraction points and Major Aquifers.

## **1.6 Response to Consultation**

- 1.6.1 The consultation was primarily web-based. The on-line consultation focused on a set of questions. Officer-level responses to these questions are set out in Annex A. The set of responses was submitted to the County Council on Wednesday 4 October.

## **1.7 Next Steps**

- 1.7.1 The outcome of this consultation stage will feed into the preparation of the preferred options for the Waste Development Framework for Kent. It is expected that formal consultation on the Preferred Options will take place during the Spring of 2007.

## **1.8 Legal Implications**

- 1.8.1 None directly arising from this report.

## **1.9 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.9.1 None directly arising from this report.

## **1.10 Risk Assessment**

- 1.10.1 The Areas of Search for landfill facilities will, if progressed and adopted, impact upon the Borough Council's Spatial Strategy in the Local Development Framework (LDF). Local Development Documents that form part of the LDF will need to respond and incorporate the adopted Strategy in the Waste Development Framework (WDF).

## **1.11 Recommendations**

- 1.11.1 The officer-level comments (see Annex 1 to this report) made and submitted to Kent County Council are noted and endorsed.

The Director of Planning & Transportation confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

contact: Nigel De Wit

Evidence Gathering for the Development of Spatial Options (Jacobs Bابتie, 2006).

The Development of the Need Assessment Report into Spatial Options (Jacobs Bابتie, 2006).

Assessment of Economies of Scale Associated with the Provision of Waste Treatment Facilities (Jacobs Bابتie, 2006).

Waste Management Sector WDF Engagement (Beyond Waste, 6 February 2006).

Assessment of Need for Waste Management and Disposal Facilities in Kent (Jacobs Bابتie, 2004).

Steve Humphrey

Director of Planning & Transportation