

Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Preferred Options Consultation Report
Appendices

Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework

February 2008



| Table of Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Appendix 1: Links between the Objectives and other Strategies | 2 |
| Appendix 2: Current waste targets | 4 |
| Appendix 3: Calculation of waste requirements to 2026 | 5 |
| Appendix 4: Calculation of minerals requirements to 2026 | 7 |
| Appendix 5: The process used to derive potential sites for Strategic Waste Complexes (SWCs) | 10 |
| Appendix 6: Summary of the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal on the waste and minerals options | 18 |
| Appendix 7: Summary assessment of the waste options | 22 |
| Appendix 8: Potential 'relevant considerations' in the selection of future sites for sand and gravel extraction | 26 |
| Appendix 9: Sites with known potential for future mineral extraction | 28 |
| Appendix 10: Saved policies | 29 |
| Appendix 11: Area Statements | 31 |
| <i>Calvert Landfill Site, Aylesbury Vale District</i> | 32 |
| <i>Wapseys Wood Landfill Site, Gerrards Cross, South Bucks District</i> | 36 |
| <i>Woodham Industrial Area, Aylesbury Vale District</i> | 40 |
| <i>Springfield Farm Landfill Site, Beaconsfield, South Bucks District</i> | 44 |
| <i>College Road North, Aston Clinton, Aylesbury Vale District</i> | 48 |
| <i>London Road, Amersham, Chiltern District</i> | 51 |
| <i>High Heavens, Wycombe District</i> | 54 |
| <i>Richings Park, South Bucks District</i> | 57 |
| <i>Off Osier Way, Buckingham, Aylesbury Vale District</i> | 60 |
| Appendix 12: Principles for sustainable minerals and waste development | 63 |
| Appendix 13: Glossary | 65 |

Appendix 1 Links between the Objectives and other Strategies

| Objective | Related strategies | Related national and regional guidance |
|--|--|---|
| <p>To enable required levels of provision for waste management and for aggregates to be met in ways which satisfy sustainability objectives deriving from national and regional policies and guidance, while minimising any adverse effects on Buckinghamshire’s environment, and on living and working conditions in the county</p> | <p>Sustainable Communities Strategy Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy</p> | <p>UK sustainable development strategy ‘Securing the future’ PPS1 and Annex on Climate Change Waste Strategy 2007 PPS10 MPS1 and Guidelines for aggregates provision in England RPG9 and Draft South East Plan</p> |
| <p>To deliver a strategy to achieve net self-sufficiency in waste treatment within Buckinghamshire, through identifying a range of sites to handle an amount of waste equivalent to that generated in Buckinghamshire</p> | <p>Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy</p> | <p>PPS10 RPG9 and Draft South East Plan</p> |
| <p>To deliver a strategy which results in the provision of suitable and suitably-located facilities for the sustainable management of waste, supporting management techniques further up the waste hierarchy</p> | <p>Sustainable Communities Strategy Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy</p> | <p>PPS10 RPG9 and Draft South East Plan</p> |
| <p>To secure a decrease over the plan period in the number of working non-inert landfill sites, and to husband remaining landfill voidspace</p> | <p>Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy</p> | <p>PPS10 RPG9 and Draft South East Plan</p> |

| Objective | Related strategies | Related national and regional guidance |
|--|---|---|
| To conserve the county's mineral resources through the safeguarding of all viable resources; the managed release of necessary sites for extraction; and an increase in levels of aggregates recycling in the county. | Sustainable Communities Strategy Landscape Plan for Buckinghamshire Chilterns AONB Management Plan | MPS1 and Guidelines for aggregates provision in England |
| To secure the mitigation to acceptable levels of the impacts of necessary minerals and waste development where there might otherwise be harm to the rural, cultural or built environment | Sustainable Communities Strategy Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Local Transport Plan Landscape Plan for Buckinghamshire Chilterns AONB Management Plan | PPS10 MPS1 RPG9 and Draft South East Plan Various PPSs, PPGs and MPSs, notably PPS9, PPS23, PPS25, PPG15, PPS16, PPS24, and MPS2 |
| To minimise the movements of minerals and waste by road, through a combination of a reduction in road mileage travelled and the use of more sustainable methods of transport | Sustainable Communities Strategy Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Local Transport Plan | PPS10 MPS1 PPG13 |
| To ensure the enhancement and restoration to the highest environmental standards of areas affected by minerals and waste development | Sustainable Communities Strategy Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Landscape Plan for Buckinghamshire Chilterns AONB Management Plan | MPS1 MPG7 |

Appendix 2 Current waste targets

| | Waste Strategy 2007 | RPG9 & Draft SE Plan |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Recycling & composting of household waste | 40% by 2010, 45% by 2015, 50% by 2020 | 40% by 2010, rising to 55% by 2020 and 60% by 2025 |
| Recycling & composting of commercial & industrial waste | -- | 50% by 2010, rising to 60% by 2020 and 65% by 2025 |
| Recycling & composting of construction & demolition waste | -- | 50% by 2010, rising to 60% in 2020 and 2025 |
| Recycling & composting of all waste | -- | 50% by 2010, rising to 60% by 2020 and 65% by 2025 |
| Recovery of municipal waste | 53% by 2010, 67% by 2015, 75% by 2020 | |
| Levels of C&I waste landfilled | Reduce by 20% 2004-2010 | |
| Levels of C&D waste landfilled | (Reduce by 50% by 2012)* | |
| Diversion from landfill | -- | <u>MSW</u> : 35% in 2005 rising to 84% in 2025. <u>C&I</u> : 54% in 2005 rising to 84% in 2025; <u>C&D</u> : 81% in 2005 rising to 90% in 2025; <u>All waste</u> : 63% in 2005 rising to 86% in 2025. |
| Waste growth | -- | Reduce to 1%pa by 2010, and 0.5%pa by 2020 |

* Target under consideration

Appendix 3 Calculation of waste requirements to 2026

A3.1 The following provides a breakdown of how the required waste capacity was identified based on the need to manage all of Buckinghamshire’s waste up to 2026.

Buckinghamshire Annual and Total Waste Arisings to be Managed

A3.2 The average annual and total waste arisings (Table A3.1) are based on a combination of Regional Planning Guidance estimates and projected growth in waste arisings (Municipal Solid Waste [MSW] and Commercial and Industrial [C&I] waste) taking an average over 5-year periods up to 2026.

Table A3.1 Buckinghamshire Annual and Total Waste Tonnages to be Managed 2006-2025

| | Municipal Solid Waste¹ | Commercial & Industrial Waste² | Construction & Demolition Waste³ | Imports of waste from London (for landfill)⁴ | TOTAL |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|-------------------|
| 2006 | 377,000 | 946,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,625,000 |
| 2007 | 377,000 | 946,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,625,000 |
| 2008 | 377,000 | 946,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,625,000 |
| 2009 | 377,000 | 946,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,625,000 |
| 2010 | 409,000 | 1,059,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,770,000 |
| 2011 | 409,000 | 1,059,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,770,000 |
| 2012 | 409,000 | 1,059,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,770,000 |
| 2013 | 409,000 | 1,059,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,770,000 |
| 2014 | 409,000 | 1,059,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,770,000 |
| 2015 | 437,000 | 1,158,000 | 1,032,000 | 270,000 | 2,897,000 |
| 2016 | 437,000 | 1,158,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,797,000 |
| 2017 | 437,000 | 1,158,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,797,000 |
| 2018 | 437,000 | 1,158,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,797,000 |
| 2019 | 437,000 | 1,158,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,797,000 |
| 2020 | 462,000 | 1,235,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,899,000 |
| 2021 | 462,000 | 1,235,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,899,000 |
| 2022 | 462,000 | 1,235,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,899,000 |
| 2023 | 462,000 | 1,235,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,899,000 |
| 2024 | 462,000 | 1,235,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,899,000 |
| 2025 | 468,000 | 1,272,000 | 1,032,000 | 170,000 | 2,942,000 |
| 2006 - 2025 TOTAL | 8,516,000 | 22,316,000 | 20,640,000 | 4,400,000 | 55,872,000 |

A3.3 All estimated growth in Buckinghamshire MSW and C&I arisings have been extracted from the ERM Waste Capacity Model for Buckinghamshire. The model was used to inform the emerging South East Plan of estimated waste arisings for the region and

¹ Source: Combination of estimated average total MSW (extracted ERM Waste Capacity Model) and annual allowance of imported waste (102,000 tonnes) extracted from Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals (June 2006), Table 3
² Source: Estimates extracted from Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals (June 2006), Table 3
³ Estimated C&D waste as identified in the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2004-2016
⁴ Imports of waste from London (for landfill), South East Plan Core Document, Submission Draft (March 2006), Policy W3

sub-regions. SEERA encouraged each Waste Planning Authority (WPA) to update, where possible, estimations in waste arisings through using year-on-year baseline arisings with which growth projections are based. The Council has updated the MSW projections using such data for 2006/07⁵.

A3.4 The estimation of Construction and Demolition Waste (C&D) is extracted from the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2004-2016, based on a 2000/01 estimate. The Capacity Model assumes no increase in this growth.

Landfill Capacity

A3.5 The County Council has identified that there will be sufficient landfill capacity (both non-hazardous and inert) to 2026 and beyond to handle both Buckinghamshire's own hazardous and inert materials, and imports from London throughout the Plan period.

A3.6 At the end of 2007 it is estimated the Buckinghamshire had 15.7 million m³ (19.6 million tonnes [mt]) of non-hazardous landfill and 10.9 million m³ (7.2 mt) of inert landfill capacity. The capacity (m³) is based on an estimation of existing void space as at 2007. This estimate is converted to tonnages using the following conversion factors adapted from the 'South East Regional Waste Management Statement - 2003' and 'Advice on Planning for Waste Reduction, Treatment and Disposal - 1994':

- 0.8 tonnes (non-inert) = 1 cubic metre
- 1.5 tonnes (inert) = 1 cubic metre (for landfill sites that accept inert waste only)

A3.7 At 2026 the total amount of landfill will have fallen to 5.3 million m³ for non-hazardous landfill and about 6.6 million m₃ for inert. This reduction in landfill is derived from the ERM Waste Capacity Model which assumes imports from London (based on the projections in Table A3.1) and assumes all diversion from landfill targets have been met.

A3.8 Further detail of the waste calculations, projections and estimations used for each of the waste scenarios in the Traffic Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, is available in the '*Waste Summary of Data Sources of Buckinghamshire MWLDF existing waste management capacity, future waste capacity requirements and estimated tonnage movements*' available as part of the supporting evidence base to the Core Strategy.

⁵ Latest waste management projections for growth in MSW arisings up to 2026.

Appendix 4 Calculation of minerals requirements to 2026

A4.1 The following sets out the analysis that has informed the level of provision proposed in Policy 6 of the proposed Core Strategy to meet the aggregate needs of Buckinghamshire to 2026.

Primary Land Won Aggregates

A4.2 The latest national guidance ('Guidelines for aggregates provision in England' 2003) sets a South East regional figure of 13.25 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) for supply of land-won sand and gravel over the period 2001-2016. This figure has subsequently been incorporated in regional planning guidance (RPG9, June 2006, Policy M3), where it is apportioned between mineral planning authorities in the South East England region based largely (though not entirely) on counties' past regional shares of sand and gravel production.

A4.3 The exercise has resulted in Buckinghamshire being allotted a share or 'sub-regional apportionment' of 990,000 tonnes per annum. This is approximately 7.5% of the regional total of 13.25mtpa. The same figures have been carried forward into the Draft South East Plan, which is expected to replace the current version of RPG9 during 2009.

A4.4 The national guidelines for aggregates provision only cover the period to 2016, whereas RPG9 and the Draft South East Plan together cover the period to 2026. For the purposes of preparing the Core Strategy, and in the absence of any better information, it is assumed that the figure of 990,000tpa provision from Buckinghamshire will remain unaltered to 2026.

A4.5 At the start of 2007 Buckinghamshire had a permitted landbank of 6.84 years (6.773mt of permitted reserves ÷ 0.99mt). However, during 2007, planning applications were permitted at all three of the Preferred Areas designated in the BM&WLP. This has provided an additional 8.7mt of permitted reserves which, when added to the existing reserves produces a figure of 15.5mt. Therefore, the actual permitted landbank at the end of 2007 was 15.7 years (15.5mt ÷ 0.99mt), less the amount of production from permitted sites during the year (figure not yet known).

A4.6 Table A4.1 below shows that the ten current active mineral sites and the recently-permitted Preferred Areas would meet the annual apportionment requirement until the end of 2010. Thereafter, the theoretical maximum output of those sites would only be able to achieve a total output of 890,000 tonnes until 2018. After that date, total potential provision from the existing and permitted sites will continue to decline as individual sites are exhausted. By 2026, only one of the ten sites permitted as at 2007 would still have unworked reserves.

A4.7 (It is stressed that the figures in Table A4.1 represent theoretical rather than actual outputs from the individual sites. In practice, market demand may cause sites to be worked quicker or slower than the Table suggests.)

A4.8 Therefore, additional preferred areas capable of achieving an annual production figure of at least 100,000 tonnes need to be identified to meet the shortfall to 2018, and others will be needed if the theoretical apportionment figure is to be attained through to 2026.

A4.9 The last rows of Table A4.1 show the size of the annual 'shortfalls' relative to the target provision level of 990,000tpa, and the cumulative totals at five-yearly intervals. It is these cumulative totals that are repeated in proposed Policy 6 of the Core Strategy document.

Table A4.1 Theoretical Maximum Output of Existing Sand and Gravel sites during the Plan Period 2009 – 2026

| Site * | Est reserves 31.12.08 | Estimated maximum annual outputs in '000 tonnes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | 2009 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| 1 | 1,070,000 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 70 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 2 | 1,170,000 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 70 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 3 | 250,000 | 100 | 100 | 50 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 100,000 | 100 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 5 | 4,000 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 6 | 6,299,000 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 |
| 7 | 158,000 | 150 | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 8 | 73,000 | 73 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 9 | 1,700,000 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 20 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 10 | 3,000,000 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Total | 13,824,000 | 1317 | 998 | 940 | 890 | 890 | 890 | 890 | 890 | 890 | 890 | 560 | 460 | 270 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 | 250 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Shortfall in relation to 990,000tpa | -- | -- | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 430 | 530 | 720 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 | 740 |
| Cumulative shortfall | | | 50 | | | | | 550 | | | | | 2430 | | | | | | 6130 |

* Sites cannot be identified by name because of confidentiality restrictions

Source: SEERAWP Aggregates Monitoring Survey 2005

Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

A4.10 Under the Guidelines for aggregates provision in England issued in 2003, the South East region is required to make provision for 118 million tonnes (in total) of 'alternative aggregates' - chiefly recycled aggregates - over the period 2001-2016. The approved version of RPG9 does not include any 'apportionment' of this figure to county level.

A4.11 The Draft South East Plan proposes such an apportionment, under which Buckinghamshire's required rate of annual provision would be 0.6mtpa by 2016. This would be about 7.6% of the Draft SE Plan's regional total of 7.9mtpa.

A4.12 The Panel that conducted the public examination of the Draft South East Plan has supported this proposed apportionment, although it has recommended that demand aspects should be tested locally at the minerals or waste development framework stage. The outcome of this recommendation is not yet known.

- A4.13 For the purposes of the Core Strategy, the County Council has assumed a requirement to make provision that would allow production of 0.6mtpa of recycled aggregates within Buckinghamshire by 2016. In the absence of any guidance as to the figures to be applied in subsequent years, Policy 5 of the proposed Core Strategy keeps this same figure for the period beyond 2016 - although in practice it is recognised that continuing increases in the amounts of aggregates recycling will assist in holding down the demand for extraction of primary resources.
- A4.14 Currently, most of the known aggregates recycling within Buckinghamshire takes place at temporary facilities, often located at sand and gravel pits. Reliable details of the quantities of recycled aggregates produced in the county are not available. Because of their temporary nature, there is no certainty about the contribution that current facilities might make to future provision. In the absence of a reliable baseline figure, the assumption may be made that an average of around 0.5mt a year of provision may be needed over the period between 2006 and 2016 in order to enable production to reach 0.6mt by 2016.

Appendix 5 The process used to derive potential sites for Strategic Waste Complexes (SWCs)

- A5.1 The MWLDF must make provision in full for the 1.76Mt per annum additional waste management capacity that is expected to be necessary in Buckinghamshire by 2026 (see Box A in Section 4, and Appendix 3). It has to do this in ways which conform to national and regional policy on planning for waste management (PPS10, RPG9), whilst having as few environmental and amenity disbenefits as possible for Buckinghamshire residents.
- A5.2 The Strategy has therefore been to identify a relatively modest number of potentially suitable areas which are either in an existing waste management use, or are brownfield areas, or are employment areas. The Council has then sought ways in which the necessary development could be concentrated and configured between these areas. Sufficient areas have been identified to allow a reasonable distribution in terms of proximity to arisings. There is enough variety in terms of size to allow for flexibility.
- A5.3 Consistent with the requirements of the "plan-led" system, a start was made by identifying areas consistent with the criteria set out in PPS10 through a process of "sieving" a long list of possible areas into a short list of areas potentially suitable for future waste development (the term "area" rather than "site" is used for convenience in this document because some of the identified locations are large and could, therefore, contain a number of possible "sites").
- A5.4 It has appraised these areas for sustainability against the Sustainability Objectives, and for any implications for the most important nature conservation sites. It has then developed and tested packages of possible waste management provision that will allow the required provision to be made upon the short-listed areas. It has sought to reduce the risks of uncertainty by testing the packages against commercial considerations and discussions with the waste management industry to ensure that the plan's proposals are as robust and realistic as possible.
- A5.5 In diagrammatic form, the discrete stages of the plan process have been:



AREA SEARCH AND APPRAISAL SUMMARY

A5.6 The Council commissioned the following consultant studies to inform its area selection process.

Stage 1 Initial Long List of Areas

A5.7 As an initial Countywide Area Selection exercise consultants identified a "long list" of 191 areas which could have potential for waste management use (*Site Selection Exercise for Waste Management Facilities in Buckinghamshire*, Jacobs Babbie, June 2005). This was drawn from a variety of sources including Mineral and Waste Local Plans for Buckinghamshire, and District Local Plans from the four districts in Buckinghamshire. PPS10 type sites - waste management, brownfield, employment areas.

Stages 2-4 Preparation of a Shortlist of Potentially Suitable Areas, Assessments, & Appraisals

A5.8 The next stages comprised a more detailed area selection exercise to narrow down the initial "long list" through the application of an appraisal process. This study used a methodology based upon exclusionary criteria to test the principle of waste management development against policy designations, land use or environmental constraints (*Site Selection Exercise for Waste Management Facilities in Buckinghamshire* (TPD02a), RPS, April 2006). This process enabled a clear justification for why one area was rejected for further consideration and why another was taken forward.

A5.9 This work identified 16 areas where more detailed investigations should take place.

Stage 5 Detailed Areas Selection

A5.10 The 16 areas were then evaluated in greater detail (*Detailed Site Assessment for Potential Waste Management Facilities in Buckinghamshire* (TPD08), RPS, September 2006) to assess potential suitability for new waste management development against the following criteria derived from national and local planning policy:

- Land use
- Water environment
- Landscape, amenity and visual impact
- Nature conservation
- Traffic and access
- Historic environment and cultural heritage
- Ecological impact
- Proximity principle

A5.11 Each area was subjected to a detailed planning appraisal and supported by specialist technical assessments of ecology and water environment. For each, the study

provides an assessment of the implications of development for waste management uses and, where possible, suggests appropriate mitigation measures.

- Assessment of all the shortlisted areas identified in Stages 2 - 4 which were considered to be worthy of further investigation as potential locations for waste management activities
- An Assessment of the planning status of each area and its proposed use against local, regional and national planning policy
- Determination of the likely environmental impacts of developing a waste management use on a particular area.
- To provide a preliminary assessment for each area and where appropriate demonstrate consistency and compliance with the relevant policy and guidance and the principles of sustainability.
- Identify the area issues (local ecology, geological, contamination and landscape), which will need to be addressed if the site is to be considered for waste management development.
- Identify any area characteristics that could preclude waste management development.
- Provide a clear assessment of the development issues that will need to be considered in developing the area for a waste management use.
- Identify the reasons/justification as to why any particular area would not be suitable for further consideration.
- Indication of the suitability of the area for waste management development on the basis of a more in depth appraisal and the likely types of facility that could be developed at that location.

A5.12 As a result of the "Stage 1 - 5" appraisal process, nine areas were judged to be suitable to accommodate waste management development. Of these, seven were found to be suitable for a range of waste management technologies, and some were also considered suitable to accommodate large-scale development.

Areas

A5.13 Table A5.1 below summarises the issues which have been identified in the detailed areas appraisal, and provides an indication of the types of waste management technologies that the consultants considered could be acceptable.

Table A5.1 Sites identified through consultants' initial site assessment exercise

| Site/Area and District | Consultant comment | Consultant suggested uses |
|--|--|--|
| Calvert landfill site, AV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large enough to accommodate range of facilities • Traffic and access will be a key consideration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EFW • AD or MBT |
| College Road North, Aston Clinton, AV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well located, limited environmental impact if developed • Visual intrusion is a key consideration • Available land around the area to allow for a range of waste management technologies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EFW • AD or MBT |
| Woodham Industrial Area, AV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well related to areas of waste arisings • Existing industrial use • Risk of visual impacts limits the scale | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small-scale EfW • MBT or AD |
| Long Crendon Industrial Estate (Drakes Farm), AV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable for a range of waste management facilities • Need to ensure scale of buildings is in keeping with existing industrial estate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small-scale EfW • MBT or AD |
| Haddenham Industrial Park, AV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good access • Close to sources of waste arisings • Development should be similar to existing buildings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBT or AD |
| London Road, Amersham, Ch | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential risk of conflict with development plan allocation • EA will object to development of the area for a waste management use • Only suitable for small-scale waste transfer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste transfer |
| Wapseys Wood landfill site, Gerrards Cross, SB | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to co-locate waste management facilities • Good access • Close to waste arisings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EFW • AD or MBT |
| Springfield Farm landfill site, Beaconsfield, SB | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suited to large-scale development • Benefits from co-location of waste management facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EFW • AD or MBT |
| High Heavens, Wy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable for small scale waste treatment • Allocated for a waste transfer station | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste transfer |

- Land at Denham Park Farm (South Bucks)
- Land adjacent to the High Heavens site (Wycombe).

These two sites have been subjected to an initial assessment comparable to that initially carried out on the 191 sites 'longlisted' at Stage 1 of the earlier process.

A5.20 In the light of comments received on the sites suggested in the earlier 'Preferred Options' consultation, and of the initial assessment of the two additional sites, the following table summarises the County Council's current position on the sites that have been suggested, either by consultants or by operators, as potential sites for strategic waste facilities.

Table A5.2 Initial list of potential sites for strategic treatment of municipal waste

| Site* and District AV - Aylesbury Vale SB - South Bucks W - Wycombe | Source | Comment following consultation/further assessment | BCC current position † |
|--|---------------|--|---|
| Calvert landfill site (AV) | Consultants | No overriding reason seen for discounting this site | Maintain site for consideration |
| College Road North, Aston Clinton (AV) | Consultants | Now regarded as unsuitable for thermal treatment because of potential conflicts with operations at RAF Halton | No longer considered suitable for strategic facilities because unsuitable for thermal processes. |
| Woodham Industrial Area (AV) | Consultants | Originally suggested for small-scale thermal processing only, but now considered that the site should not be ruled out for larger-scale facilities because the impacts of such facilities need not necessarily be unacceptable | Maintain site for consideration, with potential for large- or small-scale thermal processes |
| Long Crendon Industrial Estate (AV) | Consultants | Little or no land is available at the Industrial Estate | No longer considered suitable for strategic facilities, for the reason stated |

| Site* and District AV - Aylesbury Vale SB - South Bucks W - Wycombe | Source | Comment following consultation/further assessment | BCC current position † |
|--|---------------|---|---|
| Haddenham Industrial Park (AV) | Consultants | Consultants recognised that site was not suitable for thermal processes. Its peripheral location within Bucks also argues against its selection | Not considered suitable for strategic facilities for handling municipal waste, because unsuitable for thermal processes. Its peripheral location argues against its selection for major C&I recovery. Hence site not considered suitable for inclusion in 'strategic' options |
| Wapseys Wood landfill site, Gerrards Cross (SB) | Consultants | No overriding reason seen for discounting this site # | Maintain site for consideration |
| Springfield Farm landfill site, Beaconsfield (SB) | Consultants | No overriding reason seen for discounting this site # | Maintain site for consideration |
| Denham Park Farm (SB) | Operator | Concerns over access issues, and possible relationship with Denham Airfield. A Green Belt site with no clear advantages over Wapseys Wood or Springfield Farm. Also possible aviation objection relating to RAF Denham. | Not favoured for strategic facilities, for the reasons stated |
| Adjacent to current High Heavens site (W) | Operator | Greenfield site in AONB. Use for strategic facilities would be contrary to regional policies. There is also an aviation objection relating to Wycombe Air Park. | Not suitable for strategic facilities, for the reasons stated |

- * Sites at Amersham (London Road) and High Wycombe (High Heavens), listed in Table A5.1, are not included in this table, because they were identified there as suitable for waste transfer only, and not for major 'strategic' recovery facilities.
- † The fact that a site is "no longer considered suitable for strategic facilities" does not necessarily preclude it being used for more local waste treatment processes. The assessment of sites for these purposes will be considered in preparing the Waste DPD.
- # These sites are around 2-3km of a site designated as of international importance for its biodiversity value (Burnham Beeches). They have therefore been subject to Appropriate Assessment - see paragraph 1.10 - which has concluded that their potential impacts on the biodiversity site is not such as should rule them out from consideration as locations for thermal or anaerobic waste treatment.

Appendix 6 Summary of the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) on the waste and minerals options

Waste Options

In reviewing the waste options, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- A6.1 All of the options appear broadly acceptable in sustainability terms, subject to the conclusions of more detailed site-specific investigations to be undertaken at application stage, and the inclusion of suitable mitigation measures. None of the options appear to have any significantly negative effects; this is unsurprising since they are formed of combinations of the same small selection of sites which have already passed through previous stages of investigation. Numerous sites which raise potentially significant issues were removed from consideration at a much earlier stage of the site evaluation process.
- A6.2 None of the options appear to have negative effects on the local economy, mainly because the sites have been chosen to avoid using employment land wherever possible. All the options score well against sustainability objectives SA19 (land and premises in employment use) and SA20 (job opportunities).
- A6.3 All the options score well against sustainability objectives SA9 (natural resources and use of alternatives), SA14 (sustainable management), SA15 (energy efficiency and the production of energy from renewable and low carbon sources) and SA17 (community participation and individual responsibility) as all options have been designed to maximise benefits with regard to these issues. The options also all have a neutral effect on SA12 (minerals resources and sterilisation) as they have been selected to ensure that sterilisation is avoided.
- A6.4 There are two main sets of social and environmental impacts – those resulting from the transportation of waste around the County, and those resulting from the proposed sites.
- A6.5 Site-based information, such as regarding biodiversity and archaeology, is currently available for each site under consideration; this information has raised several issues through the SA process that will require more detailed consideration as part of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies for any development proposals that come forward and has highlighted a range of potential mitigation measures that will be required to maximise the sustainability of any development and minimise negative impacts. However, it is not possible to make detailed comparisons of site-specific impacts between the options because:
- (a) the current site-based information is of insufficient detail to draw such conclusions;
 - (b) the actual impacts will also depend upon the exact development proposals for each site, which are currently not known; and
 - (c) many of the potentially negative effects identified in the SA process could be reduced through mitigation and, indeed, many positive effects could be

achieved, but this will depend upon the exact mitigation measures put in place, which cannot be known with any certainty at present.

An EIA and a range of other similarly specific studies would be required to be able to draw more detailed conclusions on site-specific impacts; such studies should be required to accompany any planning application.

- A6.6 As highlighted above, although the SA highlights numerous potentially negative impacts from each option, many, particularly at the site level, may be reduced through mitigation. The SA objectives concerned are, in particular, SA5 (biodiversity), SA6 (archaeology and the historic environment), SA10 (water resources and water quality) and SA11 (flood risk).
- A6.7 It is not certain, however, that the negative impacts on landscapes and townscapes (SA8) can be fully mitigated due to the size of the strategic facilities to be constructed; those options which include sites in, or visible from, area of landscape significance therefore score more negatively than those which do not include sites in, or visible from, such areas. Without mitigation, options 1D, 2H, 3A and 3C have minimal negative scores against SA8, whereas the remainder have moderate negative scores; option 3E has a substantial potential negative impact against SA8.
- A6.8 Differentiation between options can, however, be made regarding transport-related (i.e. mileage) impacts; these particularly concern SA2 (climate change) and SA16 (road journeys). The transport assessment undertaken by Jacobs, and which forms part of the SA evidence, highlights that:
- (a) Sites in the south of the County appear preferable in terms of transport-related impacts, mainly because two-thirds of the population live in the south, and therefore approximately two-thirds of the County's waste is generated there.
 - (b) For the same reason, if municipal waste and commercial waste are to be sent to different sites, it is preferable to send commercial waste to the south and municipal to the north as there is more commercial waste than municipal produced in the County.
 - (c) The inclusion of waste transfer stations appears to increase the total mileage.
- A6.9 The transport assessment highlights that, in terms of mileage, options 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 4A and 4C are preferable, with the least mileage and therefore least negative related impacts. Options 1A, 1C, 2Fii, 2Hi, 2Hii, 2Ji, 2Jii, have the highest associated mileage and therefore the most associated negative impacts.
- A6.10 From a strategic point of view, options scenario 3 appears to be the most sustainable option, with the exception of option 3E. Options 3A to 3D include a small number of sites for each (only two), which means that there are less overall site-based impacts; other options include more sites and therefore increase the potential for impacts. The location of the two sites – one in the north of the County and one in the south – means that transport-related impacts are also minimised in comparison to most other options. Options 3A and 3C appear particularly preferable as they avoid the need for transfer stations located in the AONB and are away from significant landscapes. If it is possible to mitigate most of the negative associated site-based impacts, then option 3A may be slightly more preferable to 3C if a new road is built bypassing Calvert

Green as it may improve quality of life for local residents who live near the existing landfill site, whereas Woodham currently has no waste activities on site.

- A6.11 If Calvert is to be selected for municipal waste, then the inclusion of rail to transport waste from South Bucks district to the site does appear to reduce associated negative impacts, with the reduction in road mileage and so associated carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide emissions being particularly significant (although some road transfer would still be needed). Benefits would be further increased if waste from the southern parts of Chiltern and Wycombe districts was also transported by rail instead of road.
- A6.12 There appears to be no significant benefit or loss from a sustainability perspective in having a transfer station at the site off Osier Way. The most significant differentiator concerns transport, with the transport assessment showing that the total mileage is notably higher with the additional transfer station at Osier Way than without it.
- A6.13 All of the site combinations result in the need for a range of mitigation measures to minimise potential negative effects and maximise the positive, particularly regarding flood risk, biodiversity, archaeology and the historic environment, water resources and water quality, and climate change. Suitable mitigation measures are noted below.
- A6.14 There appears to be significant potential for achieving positive effects from all the options, particularly regarding restoration and after-use (SA13), recreation (SA18) and biodiversity (SA5), if suitable measures are required at application stage.

Minerals Options

In reviewing the minerals options, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- A6.15 All three land-use options (1A, 1B and 1C) include a provision to identify safeguarding areas to secure future extractable minerals reserves. Options 1A and 1B envisage identifying preferred areas for mineral extraction from within the safeguarded areas, whereas Option 1C is less systematic and proactive in its approach to site selection and instead relies upon landowners and operators within the minerals industry to investigate potential sites and submit planning applications thereon. Option 1C tends to compare less favourably against the SA framework on the basis that the selection of sites is reactive rather than proactive, thereby significantly impairing opportunities for selecting sites and ordering their timing for extraction in order to minimise negative social and environmental impacts associated with the minerals extraction process.
- A6.16 Option 1A envisages that preferred areas would be identified in order to meet the annual apportionment set at regional level, whereas Option 1B envisages that preferred areas would be identified to allow for a higher level of provision than the annual apportionment to ensure that that annual apportionment can definitely be met. The predicted effects of Options 1A and 1B are very similar and largely relate to the potential for the operation of minerals extraction sites to generate heavy goods traffic and the potential for both local people and the environment to be disturbed by intrusive development. Option 1A appears to be preferable to Option 1B as the latter increases the potential for more than the annual apportionment of minerals to be extracted and increases the potential for more sites to be opened, thereby increasing the number of potential human and environmental receptors.

- A6.17 In selecting preferred areas, further and more detailed studies should be undertaken into the social, environmental and economic effects of extracting minerals from each site, with the aim of minimising potentially negative impacts and maximising potentially positive benefits. For example, sites should be selected that are situated away from sensitive receptors (human and environmental) and that avoid development in floodplains, as far as practicable; transport assessments should also be undertaken to minimise transport-related impacts associated with new minerals workings.
- A6.18 Options 2A and 2B look at transportation options, with 2A envisaging the use of road transport, whereas Option 2B envisages the use of water and rail transportation to offset some of the use of road transport; both options use Option 1A as the basis for the extraction plans. Option 2B appears preferable as it minimises many of the negative impacts associated with the transportation of minerals, particular regarding climate change (SA2) and road journeys (SA16).
- A6.19 A range of mitigation measures to be required at the application stage should be developed for each site to minimise the predicted negative effects of the development and operation of minerals workings.
- A6.20 The options review process has identified several potential sustainability benefits that could be gained if relevant policies and mitigation measures are included, particularly regarding biodiversity (SA5), restoration and after use (SA13) and recreation (SA18).

Appendix 7 Summary assessment of the waste options

Table A7.1 Summary of the waste options between Sustainability Assessment, Transport Assessment and Deliverability

| | Sustainability Appraisal | | Deliverability |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Overall | Transport Assessment (mileage) | |
| Scenario 1 | | | |
| Option 1A* | Yellow | Red | Orange |
| Option 1B | Yellow | Yellow | Orange |
| Option 1C | Yellow | Red | Orange |
| Option 1D i | Yellow | Yellow | Orange |
| Option 1D ii | Yellow | Yellow | Orange |
| Option 1E i | Yellow | Yellow | Orange |
| Option 1E ii | Yellow | Yellow | Orange |
| Scenario 2 | | | |
| Option 2A | Yellow | Yellow | Light Green |
| Option 2B | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2C i | Yellow | Yellow | Light Green |
| Option 2C ii | Yellow | Yellow | Light Green |
| Option 2D | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2E | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2F i | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2F ii | Yellow | Red | Yellow |
| Option 2G | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2H i | Yellow | Red | Yellow |
| Option 2H ii | Yellow | Red | Yellow |
| Option 2I | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2J i | Yellow | Red | Yellow |
| Option 2J ii | Yellow | Red | Yellow |
| Option 2K i | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2K ii | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2L i | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Option 2L ii | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Scenario 3 | | | |
| Option 3A | Light Green | Light Green | Yellow |
| Option 3B | Light Green | Light Green | Yellow |
| Option 3C | Light Green | Light Green | Yellow |
| Option 3D | Light Green | Light Green | Yellow |
| Option 3E | Yellow | Yellow | Red |
| Scenario 4 | | | |
| Option 4A | Yellow | Light Green | Red |
| Option 4B | Yellow | Yellow | Red |
| Option 4C | Yellow | Light Green | Red |
| Option 4D | Yellow | Yellow | Red |
| Overall Sustainability Impact | Mileage Impact Assessment | | Degree of Deliverability |
| | Overall | Mileage | |
| Unacceptable | High | 1,000,000+ miles | Undeliverable |
| N/A | N/A | | Unlikely to be deliverable |
| Acceptable | Moderate | 600,000 – 999,999 miles | Possibly deliverable |
| N/A | N/A | | Deliverable |
| Preferable | Low | Under 600,000 miles | Highly deliverable |

* Options set out below for convenience

- A7.1 This Appendix is intended to show the considerations which have led the Council to select its Preferred Option for waste as set out in paragraphs 5.14 to 5.21 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (MWCS) consultation report. It illustrates these factors figuratively, for convenience, and is not intended to replace examination of the relevant underpinning detailed studies contained within the Evidence Base for the MWCS. These studies are, principally, the supporting Sustainability Appraisal and the Transport Assessment of the Preferred Options sites. In addition, the Council has been able to add information on deliverability resulting from earlier consultation responses made by the waste industry.
- A7.2 The principal factors that have been applied to each of the waste Options are:
- Overall Sustainability Impact
 - Transport Assessment (mileage waste would be carried)
 - Deliverability
- A7.3 It can be seen that **Alternative 1** (MWCS paragraph 5.21), equating to Option 3A (see overleaf) scores very well ("preferable") on both the Overall Sustainability Impact and Transport Assessment factors. It is also potentially deliverable.
- A7.4 It can also be seen that **Alternative 2** (MWCS paragraph 5.21), equating to Options 2A and 2C (see overleaf) are seen as "acceptable" in terms of sustainability and the aggregated distance that waste would need to be conveyed. However, these Options score well by being "highly deliverable".

Scenario 1: Providing all the county's required capacity for recovering both MSW and C&I waste at a single site

- Option 1A All recovery capacity at Calvert landfill site, using road transfer only
- Option 1B All recovery capacity at Calvert landfill site, with a mix of road and rail transfer of waste to the site
- Option 1C All recovery capacity at Woodham
- Option 1D i-ii All recovery capacity at Wapsey's Wood.
- Option 1E i-ii All recovery capacity at Springfield Farm

Scenario 2: Providing all the county's required capacity for recovering MSW at a single location, and the required capacity for treating C&I waste at a single, but different, location

- Option 2A All MSW recovery capacity at Calvert; all C&I waste capacity at Wapseys Wood
- Option 2B All MSW recovery capacity at Calvert, with a mix of road and rail transfer of waste to the site; all C&I waste capacity at Wapseys Wood
- Option 2C i-ii All MSW recovery capacity at Wapseys Wood; all C&I waste capacity at Calvert
- Option 2D All MSW recovery capacity at Calvert; all C&I waste capacity at Springfield Farm
- Option 2E All MSW recovery capacity at Calvert, with a mix of road and rail transfer of waste to the site; all C&I waste capacity at Springfield Farm
- Option 2F i-ii All MSW recovery capacity at Springfield Farm; all C&I waste capacity at Calvert
- Option 2G All MSW recovery capacity at Woodham; all C&I waste capacity at Wapseys Wood
- Option 2H i-ii All MSW recovery capacity at Wapseys Wood; all C&I waste capacity at Woodham
- Option 2I All MSW recovery capacity at Woodham; all C&I waste capacity at Springfield Farm
- Option 2J i-ii All MSW recovery capacity at Springfield Farm; all C&I waste capacity at Woodham
- Option 2K i-ii All MSW recovery capacity at Wapseys Wood; all C&I waste capacity at Springfield Farm
- Option 2L i-ii All MSW recovery capacity at Springfield Farm; all C&I waste capacity at Wapseys Wood

Scenario 3: Providing all the county's required capacity for recovering both MSW and C&I waste at two sites, with recovery capacity shared at each site

- Option 3A All recovery capacity at Calvert and Wapseys Wood
- Option 3B All recovery capacity at Calvert and Springfield Farm
- Option 3C All recovery capacity at Woodham and Wapseys Wood
- Option 3D All recovery capacity at Woodham and Springfield Farm
- Option 3E All recovery capacity at Wapseys Wood and Springfield Farm

Scenario 4: Providing all the county's required MSW recovery capacity split between two sites, with C&I waste recovery all at a single, different site

- Option 4A MSW recovered at Calvert and Wapseys Wood; C&I recovered at Springfield Farm
- Option 4B MSW recovered at Calvert and Springfield Farm; C&I recovered at Wapseys Wood
- Option 4C MSW recovered at Woodham and Wapseys Wood; C&I recovered at Springfield Farm
- Option 4D MSW recovered at Woodham and Springfield Farm; C&I recovered at Wapseys Wood

Appendix 8 Potential ‘relevant considerations’ in the selection of future sites for sand and gravel extraction

| Considerations |
|--|
| Number of dwellings within indicative buffer zone area |
| Number of dwellings on haul route to strategic highway network |
| Impact of possible road improvements |
| Duration of activities |
| Impact on utilities |
| Proximity of other/recent workings |
| Birdstrike issues |
| Health generally |
| Biodiversity quality and impacts |
| Agricultural land classification |
| Landscape quality and impacts |
| Townscape quality and impacts |
| Yield/ha (as indicative of wider disturbance) |
| Overburden thickness |
| Impact on water quality and resources |
| Flood risk impact |
| Potential for the sterilisation of resources |
| Potential for effective restoration |
| Intrinsic acceptability of access and haul route |
| Impact on air quality and dust |
| Impact on climate change |
| Impacts on archaeology and historic landscapes |
| Impacts on conservation areas and listed buildings etc |
| Impact on wider waste management objectives |
| Potential for use of water or rail |
| Relationship to Rights of Way network |
| Impact on Colne Valley Park |
| Relationship to other recreation uses |
| Impact on geodiversity |
| Impact on energy use |
| Potential for renewable energy |
| Impacts on employment uses |
| Impact on growth and investment in minerals industry |

| |
|--|
| Issues relating to the generation of mineral waste |
| Impact on conservation of mineral resources |
| Issues relating to management of mineral waste |
| Meeting needs for minerals |
| Community participation and responsibility |
| Responsible use of sound science |

Source: Jacobs for BCC: Minerals Development Framework - Assessment of potential mineral sites - Comparative Assessment, December 2006, Table 2.2

Further consultation on the 'relevant considerations' will take place in due course as part of continuing work on the Minerals DPD.

Appendix 9 Sites with known potential for future mineral extraction

| | |
|----|---|
| 1 | Barge Farm, Taplow |
| 2 | Berry Hill Farm, Taplow |
| 3 | Lake End West |
| 4 | Lake End East |
| 5 | Slade Farm, Hedgerley |
| 6 | George Green |
| 7 | Trenches Farm, Middle Green |
| 8 | Shreding Green |
| 9 | Park Lodge extension |
| 10 | New Denham |
| 11 | The Lea South, Denham |
| 12 | West Town Farm, Taplow |
| 13 | Langley Airfield, Richings Park |
| 14 | Springfield Farm, Beaconsfield (residual area from Preferred Area in the adopted Minerals & Waste Local Plan) |

Sources:

The first 11 sites listed have been promoted by the minerals industry for inclusion in Buckinghamshire's Minerals Local Plans (or equivalent document) over a period of many years. They were included in the initial assessment of sites reported in the document referred to in the note to Appendix 8. They are listed here in a generally west-to-east order.

The sites at West Town Farm and Langley Airfield have since been put forward by a prospective mineral operator for consideration alongside the initial 11 sites.

The site at Springfield Farm is the part of BMWLP Preferred Area 1 that was not included in the application for mineral extraction at Springfield Farm on which planning permission was granted during 2007.

Further consultation on potential mineral extraction sites will take place in due course as part of continuing work on the Minerals DPD.

Appendix 10 Saved policies

1. Structure Plan Policies

The Buckinghamshire County Structure Plan 1991 -2011 was formally adopted on 23 March 1996. However the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has resulted in the abolition of Structure Plans. With regard to "saved" policies, the Government Office for the South East has (September 2007) indicated that a number of its policies will be "saved" until the adoption of the new Regional Spatial Strategy (the South East Plan) in Autumn 2008. The saved policies are as follows: BS2, H1, H2, E7, TR1A, TR3, TR7, TR8B, TR11, TR14, TR15, TR21, TR22, TC3, UF2, OC3, GB2, LS3, HE1, SR4, EN1, W1, W2, W3, W4, P3 and IN1. None of the minerals and waste policies from the adopted structure plan have been saved beyond September 2007.

2. Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

The Council intends that all of the existing minerals and waste local plan policies will have been replaced by April 2011 when the last of the new Development Plan Documents (the Waste DPD) is adopted.

In the meantime, the policies of the adopted Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2004 - 2016 (the BM&WLP) have been automatically "saved" under transitional arrangements until April 2009. Beyond that, the Council will have to decide (by September 2008) how it wishes to extend its saved adopted local plan policies for development control purposes. It will then make the appropriate application to the Government.

The table below shows the Council's present expectations as to how and when the adopted minerals and waste local plan policies will be replaced.

| BM& WLP Policy No. | Subject | Replaced by (Document)* | Replaced at |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Overarching Minerals Extraction Principles | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 2 | Aggregates Landbank | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 3 | Preferred Areas for Sand and Gravel Extraction | MDPD | January 2011 |
| 4 | Area of Search | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 5 | Borrow Pits and other Windfall Sites | MDPD | January 2011 |
| 6 | Alternative Aggregates Production | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 7 | Importation of Aggregate | MDPD | January 2011 |
| 8 | Other Minerals | MDPD | January 2011 |
| 9 | Oil Exploration | MDPD | January 2011 |
| 10 | Overarching Waste Management Principles | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 11 | Imported Wastes | WDPD | April 2011 |

| | | | |
|----|--|-----------|--------------|
| 12 | Integrated Waste Management | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 13 | Recycling Composting Facilities | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 14 | Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 15 | Waste Transfer Facilities | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 16 | Anaerobic and Mechanical – Biological Treatment plant | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 17 | Energy from Waste Plant | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 18 | Landfill and Landraising | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 19 | Calvert Landfill Site | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 20 | Landfill Gas Collection and Energy Recovery | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 21 | Hazardous Wastes | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 22 | Inert Wastes & Inert Waste Recycling | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 23 | Sewage Treatment Works & Management of Sewage Sludge | WDPD | April 2011 |
| 24 | Protection of Key environmental Assets | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 25 | Protection of Other Environmentally Important Sites & Features | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 26 | Protection of Agricultural Land | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 27 | Protection of Green Belt | MWCS | January 2010 |
| 28 | Amenity | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 29 | Buffer Zones | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 30 | Proximity Principle and Sustainable Transport | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 31 | Restoration and Aftercare | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 32 | Restoration of Old Sites | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 33 | Groundwater and Floodplain Protection | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 34 | Aviation Safeguards | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 35 | Best Practicable Environmental Option | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 36 | Planning Application Issues | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 37 | Environmental Assessment | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 38 | Planning Obligations | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |
| 39 | Site Monitoring and Enforcement | MDPD/WDPD | April 2011 |

* MWCS Minerals and Waste Core Strategy
 MDPD Minerals Development Plan Document
 WDPD Waste Development Plan Document

Appendix 11 Area Statements

Appendix 12 Principles for sustainable minerals and waste development

In furtherance of the objective of securing the sustainable use of Buckinghamshire's natural and material resources, the following principles will underlie the approach and operation of this Core Strategy and the other Development Plan Documents within the MWDF:

- A Minimising the contribution of minerals and waste development to climate change - in particular by
- Minimising the generation of greenhouse gases from minerals and waste facilities
 - Minimising CO₂ emissions associated with the transport of minerals and waste
 - Maximising the recovery of energy and hence reducing demands for fossil fuels
 - Requiring the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in new minerals and waste developments
- B Conserving natural resources, while providing appropriate quantities of minerals and of waste treatment capacity to meet society's needs - in particular by
- Providing for continuity of supply of primary and recycled aggregates in accordance with national and regional policies
 - Providing for levels of waste treatment and disposal in accordance with national and regional policies
 - Safeguarding mineral resources that might be required for the longer term, while encouraging the prior extraction of minerals that might otherwise be sterilised by new development
 - Promoting the use of recycled materials
 - Husbanding available landfill voidspace, in order to prevent its use by materials of inappropriate type or from inappropriate sources.
- C Adopting a sustainable approach to the transportation of minerals and waste - in particular by
- Seeking to achieve net self sufficiency in provision for waste management, subject to making provision in addition for the disposal of a declining amount of waste from London
 - Supporting the retention of existing appropriately-sited rail depots used for the transport of minerals or waste, and supporting proposals for new facilities of these types
 - Giving priority to sites for minerals or waste development that can be accessed by rail or water, and encouraging access to them by these modes
 - Supporting the use of modes other than road for the transport of minerals and waste, including for short-distance movements where practicable
 - Wherever possible, locating new facilities for minerals and waste where they will minimise total road transport mileage
- D Minimising the disturbance resulting from necessary mineral and waste development - in particular by

- Respecting national and regional policies for protecting sites or areas of particular value (e.g. AONB, Green Belt, national and international biodiversity sites, etc)
 - Protecting important environmental and quality-of-life interests when identifying potential sites for new mineral or waste development, and in the development control process
 - Encouraging the co-location of waste facilities where possible, and the safeguarding of existing appropriately-located waste management sites
 - Requiring the highest standards of restoration of sites disturbed for minerals and/or waste development
- E Promoting energy recovery and the use of energy from renewable sources - in particular by
- Requiring the recovery of energy from suitable waste processes, including the recovery of landfill gas from waste disposal sites
 - Requiring the use of recovered energy within the minerals or waste development site wherever possible
 - Requiring the supply of recovered energy either to local homes or businesses, or to the national grid
- F Maximising waste reduction and the treatment of waste by means higher up the waste hierarchy - in particular by
- Promoting action and encouraging measures to assist in reducing rates of waste growth
 - Supporting the removal of material from the waste stream for re-use or recycling
 - Requiring a sustainable approach to be adopted in the design, construction and demolition of all new development.

Appendix 13 Glossary

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|---|--|
| AA | Appropriate Assessment | Appropriate Assessment considers the impact on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites of a project or plan, either alone or in combination with other projects or plans, with respect to the sites' structure and function and its conservation objectives. Additionally, where there are adverse impacts, AA assesses the potential mitigation of those impacts. |
| AD | Anaerobic digestion | A process where biodegradable material is encouraged to break down in the absence of oxygen. Material is placed into an enclosed vessel and in controlled conditions the waste breaks down into digestate and biogas. |
| | Aggregates | Sand, gravel and crushed rock (known as primary aggregates) and other mineral waste such as colliery spoil, industry wastes and recycled materials (known as secondary aggregates). Aggregates are used in the construction industry to produce concrete, mortar, asphalt, etc. |
| | Alternatives | Different ways of achieving the Plan objectives. Sometimes referred to as Options. |
| AMR | Annual Monitoring Report | A report that presents an analysis of existing ('saved') policies, progress on the Local Development Scheme (see below) and note if any adjustments to the scheme are needed. |
| AONB | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty | Areas of land designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, where the primary purpose is the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty, which includes protecting flora, fauna, geology and landscape features. The Countryside Agency is responsible for formally designated AONBs and advising on policies for their protection. Much of southern Buckinghamshire is within the Chilterns AONB. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|------------------|--|--|
| AQMA | Air Quality Management Area | Area designated (under the Environment Act) by local authorities following local assessment of air quality where individual pollutants are forecast to exceed standards defined in the National Air Quality Strategy. |
| | Best Value | Places a duty on local authorities to deliver services (including waste collection and waste disposal management) to clear standards – covering both cost and quality – by the most effective, economic and efficient means available. |
| | Biodegradable | Waste that is capable of undergoing anaerobic or aerobic decomposition, such as food and garden waste, and paper and paperboard |
| BMW | Biodegradable Municipal Waste | Waste from households, that is capable of undergoing anaerobic or aerobic decomposition, such as food and garden waste, and paper and paperboard |
| | Borrow Pit | Mineral working to provide materials for a specific and major construction project and normally close to the works. |
| | Buckinghamshire Waste Authorities | Buckinghamshire County Council is the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) for the county. It is legally responsible for the safe disposal of household waste and to provide Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs). The four District Councils (Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe District Councils) are the Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs) within Buckinghamshire. They have a statutory responsibility to provide a waste collection service to householders and, on request, to local businesses. WCAs also collect bulky household waste and cleanse the streets. |
| | Buffer zone | Safeguarding area around dwellings and other sensitive developments and areas to protect them from the most immediate damaging effects of mineral working and waste disposal. |
| C & D | Construction and Demolition Waste | Waste arising from construction and demolition activity and often referred to as inert. It forms a sub-group of Industrial Waste. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|------------------|--|---|
| | | Although often described as inert, that can be misleading as C & D waste may include material such as timber, paper and paint, which need to be separated out if the waste is to be re-used, e.g. as inert fill, or if disposed of at a site licensed only for inert waste. |
| C & I | Commercial and Industrial Waste | Waste arising from premises used for industry, trade or business, and hence may include a wide range of waste material – Commercial waste does not include sewage. |
| CAS | Civic Amenity Site | Supervised facilities where members of the public can bring and discard of a variety of household waste. Civic Amenity Sites typically cater for paper, plastic, metal, glass and bulky waste such as tyres, refrigerators, electronic products, waste from DIY activities and garden waste. In Buckinghamshire these sites are known as "Household Waste Recycling Centres" (HWRCs). |
| | Centralised composting | Large-scale schemes which handle kitchen and garden waste from households and which may also accept suitable waste from parks and gardens. Schemes may rely on aerobic methods or use anaerobic digesters. |
| | Civic Amenity Waste | A sub-group of household waste, normally delivered by the public direct to sites provided by the local authority. Consists generally of bulky items such as beds, cookers and garden waste as well as recyclables. |
| | Clinical Waste | Waste arising from medical, nursing, dental, veterinary, pharmaceutical or similar practices, which may present risks of infection. |
| CHP | Combined Heat and Power | A highly fuel-efficient technology which produces electricity and heat from a single facility. |
| C & I | Commercial and Industrial Waste | Waste arising from premises used for industry, trade or business, and hence may include a wide range of waste material. – Commercial waste does not include sewage. |
| | Commercial Waste | Waste arising from premises which are used wholly or mainly for trade, business, sport, recreation or entertainment, excluding municipal and industrial waste. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|-------------|--|---|
| | Composting | An aerobic, biological process in which organic wastes, such as garden and kitchen waste are converted into a stable granular material which can be applied to land to improve soil structure and enrich the nutrient content of the soil. |
| | Composting (Enclosed Reactor) | Shredded waste is placed inside a container or chamber through which air is forced. This method allows good control of temperature, moisture and aeration leading to rapid composting (sometimes as little as two weeks) although it will then need a period of outdoor maturation. |
| | Composting (Windrowing) | Shredded waste is placed in elongated heaps, called windrows, normally outdoors. The windrows are turned mechanically to periodically aerate the composting waste. The process takes at least 16 weeks, at the end of which the compost represents half the weight of the input material. |
| | Conservation Area | Area of special architectural or historical interest |
| | Controlled Waste | Comprised of household, industrial, commercial and clinical waste which requires a waste management licence for treatment, transfer or disposal. The main exempted categories comprise mine, quarry and farm wastes. Radioactive and explosive wastes are controlled by other legislation and procedures. |
| | Cumulative Effects | Effects that result from changes caused by a project, plan, programme or policy in association with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future plans and actions. |
| CWI | Clinical Waste Incinerator | A facility that can burn medical waste from hospitals and similar institutions. |
| DCLG | Department for Communities & Local Government | The job of this Department is to help create sustainable communities, working with other Government departments, local councils, businesses, the voluntary sector, and communities themselves. |
| | Development Plans | Statutory Documents that set out local planning authorities' policies and proposals for the development and use of land in their area. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|--|--|
| DPD | Development Plan Document | A Local Development Document which forms part of the statutory development plan, including the Core Strategy, Proposals Map and Area Action Plans. |
| EA | Environment Agency | Public body for protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales. |
| EfW | Energy from Waste | The combustion of waste under controlled conditions in which the heat released is recovered to provide hot water and steam (usually) for electricity generation. |
| | EU Landfill Directive | Adopted by the Member States during 1999, is intended to reduce the environmental effect of the landfilling of waste by introducing uniform standards throughout the European Union. The main objectives are to stimulate recycling and recovery of waste, and to reduce emissions of methane (a powerful greenhouse gas). The Directive requires the UK to reduce the proportion of biodegradable municipal solid waste going to landfill to 35% (by weight) of the 1995 level by 2020. It also introduces the mandatory "pre-treatment" of putrescible waste and a ban on the co-disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. |
| GIS | Geographical Information System | Technology that manages, analyses, and disseminates geographic information. |
| GOSE | Government Office South East | The Government Office for South East England is the regional arm of Central Government in the South East, particularly the Departments for Communities & Local Government, Education and Skills, Trade and Industry, Transport; Culture, Media and Sport, Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the Home Office. GOSE works to influence contracts and develop government programmes and initiatives at a regional and local level, by working in partnership with relevant organisations to meet local needs. |
| | Green Belt | An area of land, designated in Development Plans, whose primary purpose is to curb the outward expansion of a large urban area and within which development is strictly controlled. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|-------------|---|---|
| | Hazardous Waste | Legislation concerning the treatment and disposal of waste classified as “hazardous” came into effect in July 2004. |
| | Home Composting | Compost can be made at home using a traditional compost heap, a purpose-designed container, or a wormery. |
| | Household Waste | Includes waste from household collection rounds (waste within Schedule 1 of the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992), waste from services such as street sweeping, bulky waste collection, hazardous household waste collection, litter collections, household clinical waste collection and separate garden waste collection (waste within Schedule 2 of the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992), waste from civic amenity sites and wastes separately collected for recycling or composting through bring/drop off schemes, kerbside schemes and at civic amenity sites (Source: Municipal Waste Management 1995/96, DETR, June 1997). |
| HWRC | Household Waste Recycling Centre | Supervised facilities where members of the public can bring and discard of a variety of household waste. HWRCs typically cater for paper, plastic, metal, glass and bulky waste such as tyres, refrigerators, electronic products, waste from DIY activities and garden waste. |
| | Incineration | The controlled burning of waste, either to reduce its volume, or its toxicity. Energy recovery from incineration can be made by utilising the calorific value of paper, plastic, etc to produce heat or power. Current fluegas emission standards are very high. Ash residues still tend to be disposed of to landfill. |
| | Indicator | Measurement of change to a system or objective |
| | Industrial Waste | Waste from any factory and from any premises occupied by an industry (excluding mines and quarries). |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|--------------|--|---|
| | Inert landfill | Waste which does not give rise to significant quantities of toxic leachate or landfill gas and which does not easily decompose. This generally consists of clean excavated materials from civil engineering projects, construction and demolition wastes etc |
| | Inert Waste | Waste which does not give rise to significant quantities of toxic leachate or landfill gas and which does not easily decompose. This generally consists of clean excavated materials from civil engineering projects, construction and demolition wastes etc |
| | Integrated Waste Management | Involves a number of key elements, including: recognising each step in the waste management process as part of a whole; involving all key players in the decision-making process; and utilising a mixture of waste management options within the locally determined sustainable waste management system. |
| IWR | Inert Waste Recovery Facility | Facility to recycle inert waste into reusable materials eg alternative aggregates |
| JMWMS | Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy | The Buckinghamshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) sets out proposals for the management of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) produced in Buckinghamshire to 2025. The JMWMS has been produced by the authorities responsible for waste collection and disposal within the county combined into a body known as the <i>Waste Partnership for Buckinghamshire</i> ("the Partnership"). The JMWMS is programmed for agreement by the Partnership for submission to Government in early 2007. |
| | Kerbside Collection | Any regular collection of recyclables from premises, including collections from commercial or industrial premises as well as from households. Excludes collection services delivered on demand. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|--|---|
| | Landbank | The quantity of mineral remaining to be worked at sites with planning permission for mineral working – usually expressed as the number of years that permitted reserves will last at the indicated level of supply and given rate of extraction. |
| | Land-Use Planning | The Town and Country Planning system regulates the development and use of land in the public interest, and has an important role to play in achieving sustainable waste management. |
| | Landfill | The disposal of waste material by tipping into voids in the ground. |
| | Landfill Sites | Are areas of land in which waste is deposited. Landfill sites are often located in disused quarries or mines. In areas where there are limited, or no ready-made voids, the practice of land raising is sometimes carried out, where some or all of the waste is deposited above ground, and the landscape is contoured. |
| LATS | Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme | A scheme whereby waste disposal authorities are allocated allowances for the amount of biodegradable municipal waste that can be disposed of to landfill. |
| LDD | Local Development Documents | The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states, Local Development Documents will comprise both statutory Development Plan Documents and non-statutory Supplementary Planning Documents. LDDs are likely to include core policies, area action plans, proposal map, site-specific policies and a Statement of Community Involvement. |
| LDF | Local Development Framework | A folder containing a number of documents including LDDs setting out a local authority's policies for meeting the economic, environmental and social aims of its area. |
| LDS | Local Development Scheme | A timetable and project plan for the production of all the LDDs relating to a LDF. |
| LNR | Local Nature Reserve | A statutory term denoting an area of land designated as being of importance for nature conservation and where public understanding and enjoyment of nature conservation is actively promoted. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|---|--|
| | Leachate | Contaminated liquid which can seep from a landfill site. |
| | Licensed Site | A waste disposal or treatment facility which is licensed under the Environmental Protection Act for that function. |
| | Listed Building | Building included on a list of buildings of architectural or historic interest |
| | Minimisation | See Reduction |
| MBT | Mechanical - Biological Treatment | MBT is a generic term used to describe a combination of waste management technologies that utilise biological and mechanical processes to treat waste. These technologies can use aerobic or anaerobic processes as part of the biological element of the treatment process, with a mechanical element designed to separate out materials not suitable for biological treatment. |
| MCA | Mineral Consultation Area | An area where proven mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development |
| MDPD | Minerals Development Plan Document | A document dealing with mineral planning issues which forms part of the Local Development Framework |
| | Mitigation | Measures to avoid, reduce or offset the adverse effects of the plan on sustainability |
| | Monitoring | Check of effectiveness of policies |
| MPG | Minerals Policy Guidance | Guidance issued by DCLG, setting out the Government's policy on minerals planning issues |
| MPS | Minerals Policy Statements | New guidance issued by DCLG, setting out the Government's policy on minerals planning issues. These will replace MPGs. |
| MRF | Materials Recycling Facility | A special sorting 'factory' where mixed recyclables are separated into individual materials prior to despatch to reprocessors who wash and prepare the materials for manufacturing into new recycled products. |
| MSA | Mineral Safeguarding Area | An area based on a MSA where a district authority should consult with the county on any non-mineral planning applications |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|---|---|
| MSW | Municipal Solid Waste | More commonly known as rubbish, trash or garbage — consists of everyday items such as product packaging, grass clippings, furniture, clothing, bottles, food scraps, newspapers, appliances, paint, and batteries. |
| | mt | Million Tonnes |
| MWLDF | Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework | A collection of LDDs (see above) relating to mineral and waste issues. |
| MWLDS | Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme | A timetable and project plan for the production of all the LDDs (see above) relating to mineral and waste issues. |
| MWMS | Municipal Waste Management Strategies | A strategy produced by local authorities to deliver more sustainable waste management and break the link between economic growth and the amount of waste produced so that the disposal of waste is the last option for dealing with it. |
| | Objective | Statement of what is intended, specifying the desired direction of change |
| PDL | | Previously Developed Land |
| PPG | Planning Policy Guidance | Guidance issued by DCLG, setting out the Governments policy on planning issues. |
| PPS | Planning Policy Statements | New guidance issued by DCLG, setting out the Governments policy on planning issues. These will replace PPGs. |
| | Preferred Area | Area where there will be a general presumption in favour of mineral extraction being granted planning permission – subject to specific planning considerations |
| | Proximity principle | The proximity principle (as applied to wastes) is that they should be treated or disposed of as near to their place of origin as possible so as to minimise the distance that they are moved. |
| | Recycling | Involves the reprocessing of wastes, either into the same product or a different one. Many nonhazardous industrial wastes such as paper, glass, cardboard, plastics and scrap metals can be recycled. Special wastes such as solvents can also be recycled by specialist companies, or by in-house equipment. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | Recycled Materials | Aggregate materials that are recovered from construction and demolition processes and from excavation on construction sites. |
| | Reduction | Achieving as much waste reduction as possible is a priority action. Reduction can be accomplished within a manufacturing process involving the review of production processes to optimize utilisation of raw (and secondary) materials and recirculation processes. It can be cost-effective, both in terms of lower disposal costs, reduced demand for raw materials and energy costs. It can be carried out by householders through actions such as home composting, reusing products and buying goods with reduced packaging. |
| | Re-Use | |
| RPG | Regional Planning Guidance | Strategic Planning Guidance for the South East (see below) produced by GOSE. The Waste and Minerals part of the plan cover the period from 2001 to 2026. |
| RSS | Regional Spatial Strategies | Strategy setting out the Government's planning and transport policy for each region for a 15-20 year period |
| RWS | Regional Waste Strategy | Strategic Strategy that sets regional targets for the diversion from landfill to recycling and composting. |
| SA | Sustainability Appraisal | A single appraisal tool which provides for the systematic identification and evaluation of the economic, social and environmental impacts of a proposal |
| | Sustainable Development | Put simply, this is the concept of making provision for the needs of the existing population without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. |
| SAC | Special Area of Conservation | An SSSI (see below) additionally designated a Special Area of Conservation. |
| SAM | Scheduled Ancient Monument | Nationally important archaeological site included in the Schedule of Ancient Monuments |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------------|---|---|
| SCI | Statement of Community Involvement | Document setting out how the community will be consulted on major planning applications and in the preparation of the Local Development Framework |
| | Scoping | Process of deciding the scope and level of detail of the SEA |
| | Screening | Process of deciding if a plan or programme requires an SEA or other assessment |
| SE Plan (SEP) | The South East Plan | The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for South East England |
| SEA | Strategic Environmental Assessment | A process to ensure that significant environmental effects arising from policies, plans and programmes are identified, assessed, mitigated, communicated to decision-makers, monitored and that opportunities for public involvement are provided |
| SEERA | South East England Regional Assembly | The representative body of local authorities, plus social, economic and environmental partner organisations in South East England. Created under Regional Development Agencies Act 1999, Regional Assemblies have various functions, one of which is the preparation of Regional Spatial Strategies – the one for this part of the country being better known as The South East Plan. |
| SEERAWP | South East England Regional Aggregates Working Party | A group established to advise SEERA on options and strategies for dealing with mineral planning. |
| | Self-sufficiency | Dealing with wastes within the region or country where they arise. |
| SEP | The South East Plan | The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for South East England |
| | Separate collection | Kerbside schemes where materials for recycling are collected either by a different vehicle or at a different time to the ordinary household waste collection. |
| SERTAB | South East Regional Technical Advisory Body | A group established to advise SEERA on options and strategies for dealing with Waste Management. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|-------------|--|---|
| | South East | The area covered by both GOSE and SEERA (refer above) this includes the geographical counties of Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, East Sussex, Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Kent, Oxfordshire, Surrey and West Sussex. |
| SPA | Special Protection Area | An area designated for the protection of wild birds. |
| SWMA | Strategic Waste Management Assessment | Report from SERTAB to SEERA setting out policy drivers, targets and obligations for changing waste management in the future. |
| SWCs | Strategic Waste Complexes | <p>Term used in this plan for co-located facilities comprising complementary waste management activities (sometimes called resource recovery parks or waste resource parks). They can provide major centralised recycling and composting facilities combined with recovery capacity for materials which cannot be recycled. Where the location includes an existing landfill, the process residues can then be disposed of.</p> <p>The recyclable materials can be further processed "on-site" (for example, metals, paper, wood, aluminium can and electrical goods recycling services) in ways which can add value. A further advantage can be a reduction in the distance that waste materials are carried (since the outputs of one management process can become the inputs of a complementary treatment). In the case of the major landfills waste residues can be subsequently landfilled without the need for any further movement by road.</p> |
| SSSI | Site of Specific Scientific Interest | Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Areas of national nature conservation or wildlife importance protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. SSSIs are identified by English Nature. |
| | Sustainable Development | Development which is sustainable is that which can meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|--|--|
| | Treatment | Involves the chemical or biological processing of certain types of waste for the purposes of rendering them harmless, reducing volumes before landfilling, or recycling certain wastes. |
| | Unitary Authority | A local authority which has the responsibilities of both Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Authorities. |
| | Waste | Is the wide-ranging term encompassing most unwanted materials and is defined by the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Waste includes any scrap material, effluent or unwanted surplus substance or article which requires to be disposed of because it is broken, worn out, contaminated or otherwise spoiled. Explosives and radioactive wastes are excluded. |
| | Waste Arisings | The amount of waste generated in a given locality over a given period of time. |
| | Waste Hierarchy | A hierarchy of approaches to waste management, with 'reduction' the most preferred approach, followed by 're-use'; 'recycling, composting or energy recovery from waste'; and finally 'disposal'. |
| WCA | Waste Collection Authority | |
| WDA | Waste Disposal Authority | Local authority responsible for the collection of waste in their administrative boundary and its disposal |
| WDPD | Waste Development Plan Document | A document dealing with waste planning issues which forms part of the Local Development Framework. |
| | Waste Management Industry | Businesses (and not-for-profit organisations) involved in the collection, management and disposal of waste. |
| | Waste Management Licensing | Licences are required by anyone who proposes to deposit, recover or dispose of waste. The licensing system is separate from, but complementary to, the land use planning system. The purpose of a licence and the conditions attached to it is to ensure that the waste operation which it authorizes is carried out in a way which protects the environment and human health. |

| Acronym | Term | Definition |
|----------------|--|--|
| WEEE | Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive | Aims to prevent the disposal of electrical and electronic goods and ensure greater levels of recovery and disassembly. |
| WTS | Waste Transfer Station | A facility where waste is unloaded in order to permit its preparation for further transport for recovery, treatment or disposal elsewhere. |

