

# Stewarding the Earth's Resources

An occasional bulletin for the church about waste

No.12

Easter 2007

## Current issues in waste

This edition of **Stewarding the Earth's Resources** summarises a small selection of articles and features from the current edition of 'Waste Planning' journal (no.62: March 2007) that show current issues in waste.

### Contents

	page
Introduction to current issues in waste	1
1. Landfill: planning permission granted at Lidsey, West Sussex	3
2. New Municipal Waste Incinerator granted planning permission at Hull	4
3. Permit for new Municipal Waste Incinerator in London upheld in the High Court	5
4. Planning application for a waste recycling plant at St.Helens	6
5. Planning permission for a materials recycling facility at Mansfield	8
6. Planning permission for a hazardous waste landfill at Skelmersdale	9
7. Berkshire authorities' new 25-year PFI waste management contract	9
Appendix A: Who does what?	12
Appendix B: The different kinds of waste facility	13
Appendix C: Sabbatical Research Project: Opportunities for the Church in the Community Waste Sector in England	15
<b>Stewarding the Earth's Resources</b>	16

### Introduction to current issues in waste

#### There is a continuing need for landfill sites

Two waste disposal methods that are often the object of attack by environmental campaigners are landfill sites and municipal waste incinerators. But both methods are necessary to ensure that waste is adequately disposed of.

The **first article** describes how refusal of planning permission to extend a landfill site was overturned on appeal. The key aim of waste strategy is to reduce the amount of waste that goes to landfill, but this does not mean that landfill will cease as a method of waste disposal. The targets simply aim to significantly reduce the tonnage of waste that is landfilled: they do not aim to completely end landfilling.

## **There is a continuing need for municipal waste incinerators**

Incinerators of municipal solid waste are often opposed because people are fearful about air pollution that they may cause. They are also opposed because it is sometimes argued that the necessary long-term contract for waste to be delivered to an incinerator will inhibit a local council's drive to divert waste to recycling / composting. A third argument against incinerators is that they emit carbon dioxide through the combustion process, and so contribute to global warming.

The **second and third** articles summarise two recent decisions concerning new incinerators at Hull and London. These show that strong counter-arguments are leading to new incinerators being allowed.

The main argument in favour of incinerators is that, other than landfill, there is no other method of disposing of large quantities of residual waste ie. waste that has not been, or cannot be, recycled or composted.

## **New waste recycling facilities**

The most significant contribution that the waste management industry can make to the achievement of higher rates of waste recycling and composting in the UK is to invest in new waste sorting and processing facilities.

It is often difficult to obtain planning permission for these because, despite a widespread popular acceptance of the need for more waste recycling, people do not want new waste facilities to be built close to them.

Waste management companies will often seek to construct a new facility adjacent to an existing facility because:

- this maximises the operational benefits to be gained from operating the two facilities;
- land adjacent to an existing waste site may already have planning permission for a waste-related use and / or be in the waste company's ownership;
- the impact of a new waste facility may be perceived to be less if it is sited at or near an existing waste use or similar use such as a water treatment works or sewage works.

But this approach is often opposed by local people because they perceive it as the perpetuation and extension of an existing nuisance. But standards in the waste management industry are constantly improving, and future waste activities will be different from previous ones.

Two new proposals are summarised in the **fourth and fifth articles**.

## **Landfilling of hazardous waste**

The Government's Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) defines hazardous waste as: 'waste that contains hazardous properties that may render it harmful to human health or the environment'.

The EC Landfill Directive (Council Directive 1999/31/EC) is largely implemented in England and Wales by the Landfill (England and Wales) Regulations 2002. The directive's principal objective is to prevent, or reduce as far as possible, the negative effects of landfilling waste on the environment and health.

Wastes are hazardous if they are, for example: explosive, oxidising, flammable, carcinogenic or corrosive.

To find out more go to:

<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0506BKTR-e-e.pdf>

The directive also requires landfills to be classified as hazardous, non-hazardous or inert, and to accept only waste in the appropriate category. 'Co-disposal' of different waste streams was required to cease by July 2004. Most landfills that previously accepted both hazardous waste and non-hazardous waste now only accept non-hazardous waste. At the same time, the quantity of hazardous waste has increased, partly because Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) is now classified as hazardous waste.

There is therefore currently a shortage of hazardous waste landfill capacity. The existing hazardous waste landfills are subject to increased demand for their tipping capacity, and there is pressure to extend them and open new hazardous waste landfills. Due to the nature of hazardous waste, there are often strong local objections to the approval of new tipping capacity, but this waste must be disposed of somewhere in the UK.

The **sixth article** summarises a planning decision to extend the life of a hazardous waste landfill, despite significant local objections.

### **Local authority waste contracts**

From time to time, Waste Collection and Disposal Authorities must renew their contracts for the management of the municipal solid waste that they have a statutory duty to collect and dispose. New contracts must require the achievement of the statutory waste targets.

The **seventh article** describes a new contract for a consortium of Unitary Authorities in Berkshire and shows the nature of a recently let contract.

## **1. Landfill: new planning permission granted at Lidsey, West Sussex**

In December 2006 a planning application to extend an existing landfill at Lidsey, near Bognor Regis in West Sussex was approved on appeal after the County Council had previously refused planning permission.

In the appeal (in early 2006) the Inspector appointed by the Government gave a lot of weight to the recently issued Government advice on waste planning known as PPS10. For details of PPS10 refer to **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.10**.

PPS10 emphasises the need for Waste Planning Authorities to plan positively for waste management and to demonstrate in their Waste Development Plan Documents that waste management and disposal capacity equivalent to at least 10 years of the annual rate of waste arisings can be provided in their area.

West Sussex County Council had refused planning permission on the basis of policies in its draft Waste Local Plan that had not been formally adopted by the Council, and that pre-dated PPS10 and the new Waste Development Plan Documents system. But the Inspector agreed with the appellant company's consultants that the appeal should be decided not according to the County Council's out of date policies, but according to the new PPS10.

Key aspects of the proposed extension of the Lidsey Landfill that were also considered were:

1. The need for the landfill site extension: the Inspector found that, assuming waste continuing to be generated at current levels and with no change in the way waste is managed, there was a need, with landfill capacity expecting to be exhausted by 2007/08.
2. The effect of waste being diverted from landfill in the future by more recycling: the Inspector found that even if new alternative treatment and disposal methods come on stream, they will have long lead times, and will have little effect on the amount of waste needing to be landfilled in the short term.
3. The availability of other new landfill sites: the Inspector found that sites identified in the draft Waste Local Plan would be unlikely to come forward early in the plan period and would not provide enough new capacity.

4. The amount of London's waste that West Sussex should assume will be landfilled in its area in the future: the Inspector found that the overriding priority should be for West Sussex to provide for landfilling of its own waste. This approach supports the view of West Sussex County Council. For the background on the export of London's waste to landfill in adjacent counties see **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.6**.

The Inspector concluded that although landfill is the least-preferred method of waste management, it does not mean that waste disposal is unimportant. Landfill performs an essential function, including taking:

- Residues from Energy from Waste (Incineration of Municipal Solid Waste) Plants;
- Residues from Materials Recovery Facilities (MRFs); and
- Ensuring the safe disposal of those elements of non-inert wastes which are not amenable to recycling or further treatment.

(Pages 3-5 of **Waste Planning 62**)

## **2. New Municipal Waste Incinerator granted planning permission at Hull**

A proposal for a new 20MW Energy from Waste (EfW) facility (ie. a municipal solid waste incinerator generating electricity through combustion) at Saltend Lane, Preston lies across the boundary between Hull City Council and the East Riding of Yorkshire Unitary Council. Both councils granted planning permission for the development during the winter of 2006/07.

The EfW facility is for Waste Recycling Group Ltd (WRG), which is contracted by the two councils to deliver recycling and recovery facilities, and to landfill residual wastes.

The site lies 1km south of the main residential fringe of Hull on flat industrial land. The EfW facility would treat 240,000 tonnes of waste per annum. There would also be a facility to bulk up 38,000 tonnes of recyclate materials per annum. The facility would accept municipal solid waste (ie. household waste plus waste arising from councils' own activities eg. street sweepings) from Hull City Council and East Riding of Yorkshire Council, plus material from Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRS) ('Civic Amenity Sites'). Waste would be delivered by road. The capacity of the facility was calculated on the basis that 45% of municipal waste will be recycled by 2012.

54,000 tonnes per annum of furnace bottom ash would be removed from the facility to either be disposed of by landfill or used as a secondary aggregate in recycled products. Some 7,500 tonnes per annum of ferrous metals are expected to be delivered and recovered for recycling. About 12,000 tonnes per annum of flue gas treatment residues would be stored in sealed silos within the facility, and removed from the site via tanker for disposal as hazardous waste unless they could be re-used in industrial processes.

The recyclate bulking facility would take mixed and separated recyclate from the two local authorities together with separately collected kitchen and green waste. These materials would be bulked up and transported off site for recycling and composting.

The EfW would receive waste 7 days per week between 0600 and 2000. Incineration with energy recovery would take place continuously throughout the year except for maintenance shutdowns. The recyclate bulking facility would take waste 7 days per week from 0600 to 2000.

There was extensive public consultation throughout the planning application process. WRG acknowledged that there was opposition: it is committed to setting up a Community Liaison Panel to ensure that environmental monitoring is transparent, with results available. There will be an 'open door' policy so that anyone with an interest or concern can meet site management staff. The facility is intended to have a life of 25 years, and WRG intend to play an active role in the community over that period.

Objections to the planning application were received from: Hedon Town Council; Preston and Paull Parish Councils; the National Farmers Union; Friends of the Earth (Hull); HOTI (Hull and Holderness Opposing the Incinerator); 327 individuals; and a petition with 4822 names.

Because of the scale of objections and the general public concern about waste incineration, the councils considered:

- Whether the scheme was the best practicable environmental option (BPEO) for the waste to be dealt with at the facility: it was considered to meet this criterion.
- Whether the scheme was consistent with planning policies for the area; it was found to be consistent.
- Whether the development was visually acceptable: it was found to be acceptable.
- Whether the health implications were acceptable. The East Yorkshire Primary Care Trust advised that the risks to human health afforded by emissions from the proposed facility would be minimal. Advice was also given by the Environment Agency and the councils' Public Protection Services. It was concluded that there were no grounds to refuse the planning applications on health reasons.

Planning permissions were granted.

Environment Agency authorisation is awaited, and construction can then begin in late 2007.

For more on EfW facilities see **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.3.**

For more on BPEO see **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.10.**

(Pages 13-15 of **Waste Planning 62**)

### **3. Permit for new Municipal Waste Incinerator in London upheld in the High Court**

In June 2006 the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry granted consent for a new 72MW Energy from Waste incinerator at Norman Road, Belvedere, South East London, to be operated by Riverside Resource Recovery Ltd.. This decision followed consideration of the recommendations from the Public Inquiry Inspector who oversaw two public inquiries into this proposal in 2003 and 2005.

The Mayor of London – Ken Livingstone, and the London Borough of Bexley Council subsequently took legal action to challenge the decision. They argued that a new waste incinerator in London would undermine the battle against climate change and would not be in the best interests of London as a whole. Over the 30 year life of the EfW incinerator, thousands of tonnes of waste that could otherwise be recycled would instead be burned.

In January 2007 the High Court dismissed the legal challenge: costs were awarded against the Mayor and Bexley Council. The judge, Andrew Gilbert QC, said that the grounds for the challenge were 'totally without merit', following a preliminary hearing. It is understood that the Mayor and the Council will seek a legal judgement that the judge's decision should be reviewed.

For more on EfW facilities see **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.3.**

For more on Ken Livingstone's opposition to the development of further EfW facilities in London see **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.6.**

Decisions concerning EfW incinerators over a certain size are made by the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry under S36 of the Electricity Act. When approval is granted, a direction is given that planning permission should also be deemed to be granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(Page 16 of **Waste Planning 62** )

## 4. Planning application for a waste recycling plant at St.Helens

In January 2007 a planning application was submitted to St.Helens Council by Cory Environmental for a new waste recycling plant at their Vista Road site, near Haydock, St.Helens. The site lies adjacent to an existing landfill site known as Lyme and Wood Landfill which is run by Cory.

The planning application included an Environmental Statement that considered in detail: traffic, noise, ecology, air quality, nuisance and visual impacts. It also addressed comments received from the local community and other stakeholders during the consultation exercise undertaken by Cory during the previous seven months.

The proposal would substantially increase the recycling rate in St.Helens and the wider Merseyside area, and would reduce reliance on landfill. The scheme involves the construction of a Mechanical Biological Treatment plant (MBT) to sort up to 120,000 tonnes per annum of residual household waste that can be re-used. The technology operates in Australia, Canada, the USA and Japan. The plant would initially run for 25 years.

The plant would take green and organic kitchen waste, and other household waste (residual waste) ie. the waste left over after 'dry recyclables' such as paper and tin cans have been removed.

MBT mechanically separates metals, plastics, glass, grit and stones. The remaining material is subjected to an accelerated natural composting process. Dried composted material can then be used on land reclamation projects such as the one taking place next door at Lyme and Wood Landfill.

The planning application will be determined by St.Helens Council in due course.

See **3. Processing of recyclables** and **4. Mixed waste processing** in Appendix B below.

For more details go to <http://www.coryenvironmental.co.uk>

The Parkside Action Group website carries the notice reproduced below about the proposal.

<http://parksideactiongroup.org.uk>

### ***Vista Road Waste Recycling Facility***

*Below you can find a letter from Newton-le-Willows Residents and Friends Association asking for our help in objecting to a planning application for a Waste Recycling Facility adjacent to Vista Road. Towards the end of the article we have also reproduced their template objection letter.*

#### **NEWTON-LE-WILLOWS**

#### **RESIDENTS AND FRIENDS ASSOCIATION**

*March 2007*

*Dear Resident*

#### ***YET MORE HGV'S THROUGH NEWTON?***

*As you may be aware, Cory Environmental have recently submitted a planning application to St Helens Council for a waste recycling plant on Green Belt land adjacent to Vista Road, Haydock. This Association considers such a proposal unsuited to this location in close proximity to large numbers of houses and adjacent to the country park which will be created on the existing landfill site.*

**Of particular concern to the residents of Newton is the access road constructed across the fields at the top of Ashton Road, opposite the Woodlands Office complex, through to Vista Road.** You will probably have seen the dangerous mud covered A49 resulting from vehicles leaving this access road and the litter-strewn hedgerows resulting from improperly covered vehicles accessing the landfill site.

**Under the present contract to operate the landfill site, this access road must be removed when the landfill contract expires in summer 2009. If permission is granted for the new waste plant, however, this road will remain indefinitely.**

The present landfill contract legally obliges Cory Environmental to ensure that vehicles travelling to their site must only enter this access road from the M6/A580 junction: **vehicles are prohibited from travelling through Newton to the access road** (unless the waste has actually been collected from Newton). This routing agreement has however been regularly abused and again you will most certainly have witnessed HGV's travelling illegally through Newton in Ashton Road, High Street, Winwick Road and Southworth Road, to reach Cory's site. Cory's abject failure to implement adequately this routing agreement renders them unsuitable to manage a further facility at this site and we therefore urge you to **send your objection to St Helens Council** if you have not already done so. Please address your objection before **Friday, 16 March, quoting reference P/2007/0139 to: (please note it is still worth while writing after this date)**

Ms Sally Marsh  
Planning Department  
St Helens Council  
Town Hall  
St Helens WA10 1HP

Alternatively you may wish to complete the enclosed letter, by adding your name and address, but your objection will carry more weight if you rewrite this, with a summary of the points contained, in your own words.

This is a facility we do not want here: please help us to get it stopped.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely

Paul Taylor  
(Chairman)

Name  
Address  
Date

Ms Sally Marsh  
Planning Department  
St Helens Council  
Town Hall  
St Helens WA10 1HP  
Dear Ms Marsh

**Planning Application REF P/2007/0139**

**Proposal for a Waste Recycling Facility, Vista Road. Haydock**

*I object to the above on the following grounds:*

*o Such a development should not take place on Green Belt land, which would be in contravention of the government's Planning Policy Guidelines.*

*o A waste recycling facility should not be located in close proximity to thousands of homes, but in an industrial area, well away from houses.*

*o With the present landfill site destined to become a country park it is unacceptable to have a waste facility directly alongside with all the attendant noise, dust, dirt and unpleasant odors which will blight the quality of life of thousands of nearby residents.*

*o In hot weather unpleasant odors will also emanate from the vehicles carrying waste to the site.*

*o The residents of Newton-le-Willows expect the access road from the A49 to Vista Road to be removed on completion of the landfill and it is not acceptable for this road to become permanent. As a result of vehicles using this access road the A49 is frequently covered in mud, making it a danger to all road users and the hedgerows festooned with litter and debris from improperly covered vehicles accessing the site. This must not be allowed to continue.*

*o Cory Environmental have failed to police adequately their vehicle routing agreement resulting in the residents of Newton-le-Willows suffering thousands of illegal HGV movements since the landfill site opened. They must therefore not be allowed further developments at this location.*

*In view therefore of the environmental damage, blight and health risks to nearby residents and HGV problems I urge the Council to reject this planning application*

*Yours sincerely*

(Page 36 of **Waste Planning 62**)

## **5. Planning permission for a materials recycling facility at Mansfield**

In November 2006 Nottinghamshire County Council resolved to grant planning permission to Veolia Environmental Services for a new materials recycling facility (MRF) at Crown Farm Industrial Park, Forest Town, Mansfield. The key planning concerns were: appropriateness of the development, given the Development Plan designation of the site; the visual and landscape impacts; and traffic and noise.

Veolia was the successful bidder for a 26 year PFI contract with the County Council to provide an Integrated Waste Management Strategy for the sustainable management of municipal solid waste.

The MRF would also have a visitor centre. It would take up to 85,000 tonnes per annum of co-mingled, dry recyclable materials (newspaper and magazines, card, mixed paper, plastics, ferrous cans and aluminium cans) separated by householders for kerbside collections. The MRF would allow manual and mechanical sorting of graded waste streams prior to onward transfer for further processing by specialist recycling companies.

26 letters and emails plus 52 proforma letters of objection were received. A detailed representation was received from Mansfield Against Incineration (MAIN). MAIN's main concern is a proposal for an Energy from Waste incinerator to be constructed in the same area of Mansfield as the recently approved MRF. Go to <http://www.nail.uk.net/Main.htm>.

There was already an outline planning permission that established the principle of using the application site for a MRF, although at a smaller scale. Nevertheless, Nottinghamshire County Council resolved to approve the planning application, notwithstanding that the development would be a 'departure' from the Development Plan and should be referred to the Secretary of State as such.

See **3. Processing of recyclables** in Appendix B below.

(Page 40 of **Waste Planning 62**)

## 6. Planning permission for a hazardous waste landfill at Skelmersdale

In December 2006 Lancashire County Council resolved to grant planning permission for the variation of a condition on an existing planning permission for operations at Whitemoss Landfill Site, Skelmersdale to continue beyond 2007 to June 2013. All other details of site operations such as the final contours, hours of working, landscaping and restoration would remain unchanged and as stated on the original planning permission.

The proposal met with strong opposition. The site originated as a mineral extraction site working peat, clay, shale and coal. Backfilling by filling with imported waste was originally approved in 1977 in order to restore the worked out area. Hazardous wastes were tipped along with non-hazardous wastes. Since 2004, there has been no co-disposal, and only hazardous wastes have been tipped. A void of some 250,000 cu.m. remains to be filled.

There are houses within 20 metres of the site, with larger groupings of houses some 200 metres away. Objections were raised by West Lancashire District Council and the Council for the Protection of Rural England. 133 letters of objection were received, plus a petition of 29 signatures from local residents, objecting to continuation of landfill beyond 2007. A local action group 'Action to Reduce and Recycle Our Waste' (ARROW) objected on the grounds of: odour; health implications; groundwater contamination; and lack of proper monitoring facilities.

The Environment Agency (EA) raised no objection. Lancashire County Council noted that the landfilling of the site could not be completed within the timescale conditioned by the existing planning permission, and that the operator was therefore seeking to extend the site's life. The continued availability of a specialised facility had to be balanced against the impacts that the extended site life would cause to the local amenities. It was recognised that the site had caused unacceptable levels of odour in the past. The view of the EA was that due to changed management at the site, the impact on amenities should be not as great as the impact previously experienced. It was considered that the extended site life could be found to be acceptable. Some of the conditions on the existing planning permission were revised to reflect modern standards.

(Page 43 of **Waste Planning 62**)

## 7. Berkshire authorities' new 25-year waste management contract

From time to time, Waste Collection and Disposal Authorities must renew their contracts for the management of the municipal solid waste that they have a statutory duty to collect and dispose of. New contracts that are let must require the achievement of the statutory waste targets.

In October 2006 a new 25-year contract for a consortium of Unitary Authorities in Berkshire was awarded to the waste contractor Waste Recycling Group. The consortium comprises Reading, Bracknell Forest and Wokingham Councils – known as the RE3 Waste Partnership.

The Press Release is reproduced below from <http://www.reading.gov.uk/news/pressreleases/>

*A new £600 million waste contract aimed at further reducing reliance on landfill while boosting recycling rates has been signed by three local authorities and their private sector waste management partner.*

*The 25-year joint Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) between Reading Borough Council, Bracknell Forest Borough Council and Wokingham District Council - known as the RE3 Waste Partnership - aims to deliver a long-term sustainable solution to dealing with waste produced by households in three council areas.*

*Waste Recycling Group (WRG), the UK's leading waste management services and energy recovery company, have been chosen by the RE3 Waste Partnership to deliver the new waste strategy.*

*The contract will see new waste management facilities constructed at the Smallmead site in Island Road, Reading, and the site in Longshot Lane, Bracknell.*

*The Smallmead site will feature a redeveloped indoor Civic Amenity Site, a recycling plant and a waste transfer station. Longshot Lane in Bracknell will also be redeveloped to include an improved Civic Amenity Site and waste transfer facility. The contract will include greater capacity for recycling and composting of green waste and energy from waste.*

*The contract would also see the creation of a Joint Waste Disposal Board between the three local authorities, with membership of two councillors per authority.*

*Cllr Rob Stanton, Executive Member for Corporate Services at Wokingham District Council and Chairman of the Joint RE3 Waste Disposal Board, said: "Following a very long and detailed procurement and technical process we have arrived at an exciting moment in this innovative commitment to the future of waste management.*

*"It secures the Wokingham District a long term cost effective waste processing facility designed to achieve and exceed future Government waste targets for the future. This complex process is a mix of state of the art technical ability in waste management, combined with high levels of recycling and green waste compost facilities. Clearly, with the Environment now at the top of the National agenda, we are in a very strong position and together with Bracknell and Reading are taking a lead in a very important environmental issue.*

*"Speaking as the chairman of the Joint Waste Board, which is the managing body of the RE3 project, it is an excellent example of how all three councils have worked very hard together, both at officer and member level."*

*Steve Waite, Lead Councillor at Reading for Environment, said: "The traditional wasteful practice of hiding the bulk of our rubbish in the ground will thankfully come to an end. It was important for all three Authorities to set in place a sustainable and responsible strategy for the foreseeable future. I would like to pay tribute to the Council officers who have worked tirelessly on this project and come up with a solution that is not only good value for money, but also good news for the environment. It is another piece in Reading's environmental jigsaw that will give a sound basis for future generations to build on."*

*Cllr Mrs Mary Ballin, Bracknell Forest Borough Council's Executive Member for Planning and the Environment, added: "The RE3 project has been designed to provide better recycling facilities for our residents and improved waste disposal arrangements in all three authorities. The three councils have joined up in partnership to realise the economies of scale which can be achieved by working together. As well as offering good value for money for council tax payers, RE3 promises to make a substantial difference to the impact our waste has on the environment."*

*Ben Bradshaw, Defra's Local Environment Minister and Parliamentary Under Secretary, said: "It is heartening to see this PFI project reach contract close so soon after Cornwall CC. This is an inspiring example of how local authorities can work together towards a common goal, securing greater value for money for their residents in the process.*

*"This is a sector which has been perceived as difficult in the past, but Defra has been working hard with the market to understand private sector concerns and putting initiatives in place to address those concerns wherever possible. That work is beginning to bear fruit and I look forward to seeing many more of these projects close in the coming months. The waste sector is fast becoming a major sector for PFI and it is good to see an increase in the interest being shown by the banking and business community. The success of this sector will be key in delivering the country's EU landfill directive targets in the coming years."*

*In order to help achieve local authority targets on landfill, two short listed contractors were invited to submit their proposals as part of the project which would enable the council's to minimise the amount of waste produced, significantly increase levels of recycling and composting and to divert waste from landfill.*

Waste Recycling Group (WRG) were chosen as the preferred bidder. The contractor's bid is to focus investment in the creation of a new Waste Management Park at the Smallmead site in Reading, and at Longshot Lane, Bracknell.

Jim Meredith, Chief Executive of Waste Recycling Group, said: "We were delighted when we were selected to help deliver a robust and sustainable waste management strategy through this inspirational partnership of the three local authorities. Now we are looking forward to getting to work in order to meet and exceed the ambitious recycling and landfill diversion targets that the people of Reading, Bracknell Forest and Wokingham have set themselves."

The Smallmead site would come complete with a new state of the art materials recycling facility at its heart. The new site would also include a new waste transfer station and re-provision of the civic amenity site. WRG propose to support the waste minimisation objectives of the partnership through education and awareness initiatives delivered through dedicated staff and provision of a visitor and education centre at both waste management parks.

It is anticipated that the new site will allow all three local authorities to achieve high levels of recycling and composting performance over a 25 year period while achieving lower landfill diversion targets set by Central Government.

The Waste Management Partnership was established following an earlier period of consultation with local people and communities in all three local authority areas entitled 'What shall we do with our rubbish'. All three councils also took into account the views of a user group which had been working on the project since the start of procurement. The user group was made up of community representatives who had considered key aspects of the proposals received, to ensure they would meet the needs of local people.

The project has been named RE3, representing the partnership between the local councils, the private sector and the public, and reinforcing the three key messages: reduce, reuse, recycle.

Ian Higham of technical advisers Jacobs said: "One of the largest and most diverse providers of professional technical services, Jacobs acted as technical advisers to the Councils throughout the PFI project. Given the current urgency to address global climate change, Jacobs are pleased to have been associated with this project which will make a significant contribution to reducing the environmental impact associated with the management of waste generated within the three council areas."

Stephen Smith of Ernst & Young, who acted as the financial advisor to the councils throughout the procurement, said: "We have achieved an innovative, financially efficient solution utilising a combination of existing regional facilities and new build infrastructure funded by bank debt, representing value for money for the Council's and local taxpayers."

ENDS

**Notes for Editors:**

**NOTES TO EDITORS:**

\* Waste Recycling Group (WRG) is one of the UK's leading waste management and energy recovery companies and handles some 13 million tonnes of household, commercial and industrial waste each year. The company operates facilities for the reception, recycling and disposal of waste, including a network of waste transfer and recycling centres and a regional network of operating landfill sites and manages nearly 70 civic amenity sites on behalf of local authorities for use by the general public.

Oscar Mortali

**Tel: 0118 939 0301**

(Page 50 of **Waste Planning 62**)

# Appendix A

## Who does what?

It is the responsibility of local authorities (District and Borough Councils in 'shire county' areas, London Borough Councils, Unitary Authorities and Metropolitan District/Borough Councils) as **Waste Collection Authorities**; and County Councils, London Borough Councils, Unitary Authorities and Metropolitan District/Borough Councils as **Waste Disposal Authorities** to achieve the targets for reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill and increasing the amount of waste that is recycled/composted that are set by the Government. See Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.11 for more details on the waste targets.

It is the responsibility of County Councils, London Borough Councils, Unitary Authorities and Metropolitan District/Borough Councils as **Waste Planning Authorities** to determine planning applications for waste development. See **Stewarding the Earth's Resources no.7 & no.10** for more details on the statutory Town and Country Planning process as applied to waste planning.

And Parish and Town Councils also have their own role in promoting sustainable waste management in local communities.

The Environment Agency is responsible for all aspects of pollution control concerning waste management. The Environment Agency and the Waste Planning Authority must work closely together because their roles often overlap.

# Appendix B

## The different kinds of waste facility

The main types of facility, other than landfill, are listed below, each with a brief description:

### 1. Composting

A biological process in which micro-organisms convert biodegradable organic matter into a stabilised residue known as compost to be used for example as soil conditioner, mulch, land restoration material or daily landfill cover.

Existing sites can be categorised as: (a) centralised; (b) on-farm; and (c) community. May be either open air in 'windrows' or 'in vessel'.

### 2. Anaerobic Digestion

The biological treatment of biodegradable organic waste in the absence of oxygen, utilising microbial activity to break down the waste in a controlled environment, resulting in the generation of (a) biogas (rich in methane that can be used to generate heat/electricity); (b) fibre (or digestate) which is nutrient rich and can potentially be used as a soil conditioner; (c) liquor which can potentially be used as a liquid fertiliser.

### 3. Processing of recyclables

Includes all operations that are designed to accept source separated recyclate for processing and bulking up prior to transport to downstream specialist reprocessors. The recyclate is likely to originate from kerbside collection of materials that have been separated by individual householders and businesses, and also material from centralised recycling facilities (bottle banks, civic amenity sites etc).

A distinction is made between:

1. facilities that take mixed unsorted household wastes (a 'dirty Materials Recovery facility [MRF]) (see Mixed waste processing below); and
2. facilities designed to process dry, separated recyclables (a 'clean MRF');
3. hybrid facilities will also be needed.

A combination of techniques are used including: bag splitter; hand picking; mechanical sorting/screening/sieving; magnetic separation; light and density separators; and air separators for paper. The operations are generally housed in a large warehouse type building.

### 4. Mixed waste processing

A general term used to describe those operations, primarily of a mechanical and/or biological nature which are designed to process (a) unsorted 'black bag' wastes; (b) residual household waste following doorstep separation of recyclables/green waste; (c) residual waste following centralised separation of recyclables/organics. The processing of mixed household waste is sometimes described as a 'dirty MRF' (see above).

The term Mechanical and Biological Treatment (MBT) is commonly used to describe a hybrid process which combines mechanical and biological techniques used to sort and separate mixed household waste. There are a number of patented MBT processes. Through biological treatment a dry, odourless product is created, making the waste more manageable. This product can be further processed either as a fuel or for further recovery. The partially stabilised waste residue is, however, currently classified as being biodegradable for the purposes of the Landfill Directive diversion targets.

### 5. Pyrolysis and gasification

'Pyrolysis and gasification technologies form part of a group of processes and techniques collectively known as advanced or novel thermal treatment. In reality most of the processes are neither advanced nor novel. Pyrolysis and gasification, like normal combustion, involve chemical reaction which takes place at high temperature. This generally generates energy from organic or hydrocarbon containing materials.

Pyrolysis takes place either in the complete absence of oxygen or with limited oxygen. Gasification, like pyrolysis, is a process that has had previous applications using feedstocks other than waste. For example, so called 'town gas' produced from coal using gasification was a very common process prior to the widespread availability of natural gas.

Gasification is a thermal upgrading process, in which carbon is converted to a syngas leaving a solid residue. This takes place in the presence of air, or air enriched with oxygen. Temperatures employed are generally higher than pyrolysis at 900 to 1100 degrees C when in air and 1000 to 1400 degrees C using oxygen'.

## **6. Small scale thermal treatment**

'In the recent past there have been comparatively few examples of such plants that have been designed to accept relatively small quantities of waste (of say less than 90,000 tonnes per annum) from a relatively small catchment area. In the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century such facilities, often called 'Destructors' were more commonplace and could be found in most towns and cities across the country. Such facilities had very rudimentary environmental controls and no air emission controls. Most of the existing operational examples today have been designed to treat specific industrial waste streams as part of combined heat and power (CHP) arrangements. Small thermal treatment plants (furnaces or kilns) are also used to treat clinical wastes at hospital sites. Small scale plants are typically used to generate either steam for process use or electricity for export to the national grid. Sometimes plants are designed to have a dual steam and electricity generating capacity.

## **7. Large scale thermal treatment**

'Large scale thermal treatment plants are typically characterised by large building designs, which are often located in or near urban areas, receiving between 90,000 and 600,000 + tonnes of waste per year.

In land use planning terms a distinction can be drawn between plants that are designed to handle large volumes of mixed waste following the 'mass burn' approach and smaller scale facilities often designed to receive a specific component of the waste stream using different process technologies. 'Large scale thermal treatment plants are designed to burn waste as efficiently as possible, usually recovering energy. Waste is burnt under controlled conditions and at high temperatures. Heat released from the combustion of this waste is recovered and used to generate electricity and/or to provide steam or hot water. The volume of waste needing disposal following large scale thermal treatment is reduced by approximately 90%, reducing the need for landfill. The resultant output of a thermal treatment plant is ash, which is far more stable than the municipal solid waste (MSW) input, mainly due to the oxidation of the organic component of the waste stream'.

## **8. Waste transfer**

Waste transfer is the process by which waste is taken from waste producers, including industry, commerce and the general public, and taken for treatment, recycling and/or disposal. To minimise the cost of transport and to reduce environmental impacts, transfer stations are commonly used to transfer waste from smaller vehicles to larger vehicles, or from road vehicles to trains or barges for onward transport. MSW transfer stations usually consist of a large building where vehicles deliver waste either onto the floor, into bays, or into compaction units. Inert wastes may be transferred in the open. The waste is usually only present for a matter of hours before being transferred into larger vehicles for onward transport. Waste is not usually stored within the waste transfer station overnight. Waste transfer stations are often located in association with other waste management activities such as MRFs, and Civic Amenity Sites.

Source: The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's research study report of 2004 [Planning for Waste Management Facilities](#).

# Appendix C

## Sabbatical Research Project: Opportunities for the Church in the Community Waste Sector in England

During a sabbatical in September, October and November 2007, Jon Hale will undertake a research project on opportunities for local churches to get more involved in the Community Waste Sector (CWS).

£2000 sponsorship for the research project has been promised or received from the following: Biffa plc; The Anglican Diocese of Chichester; The Cox Group; Ekonoprint (Waterprint Ltd); Entec UK Ltd; Environmental Services Association; Oilfield Production Consultants (OPC) Ltd; SITA UK; West Sussex County Council.

The referees for the research project are:

- Ms Claire Foster - Church of England National Policy Advisor on Environmental Issues
- Professor Sam Berry – Chair of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland Environmental Issues Network
- Mr Brian Hamilton - Associate Director with waste planning consultancy Entec UK Ltd

The outcomes of the research project will be:

- a project report;
- a fact-sheet to encourage local churches to get more involved in waste recycling; and
- a website that will be linked to the Church of England's Shrinking the Footprint website.

The main areas of research are:

1. The Christian theology of waste recycling.
2. Liaising with local churches in England that undertake waste recycling / composting.
3. Liaising with the CWS infrastructure organisations.
4. Liaising with church-based and non-church based CWS schemes.
5. Exploring opportunities for the church to extend its involvement in the CWS in England
6. Exploring opportunities for a scheme to promote local churches in West Sussex as partners in sustainable waste management with West Sussex County Council and the West Sussex District and Borough Councils.
7. Potential business opportunities for churches in waste recycling / composting.

If you know of a church near you that promotes or carries out any kind of recycling or composting – however large or small the project may be - please let Jon Hale know. Jon would also like to hear of such projects that have taken place and have now ceased.

Please contact Jon to discuss the research project on 01342 714922 or [aj@jkcahale.co.uk](mailto:aj@jkcahale.co.uk)

# Stewarding the Earth's Resources

The Church of England's report of 2005 **Sharing God's Planet** sets out the scale of humankind's responsibility for altering the planet over the last 100 years. It also provides Biblical and theological reflection and suggests a practical Christian response.

But nowhere does it acknowledge that difficult environmental decisions are being made every day by waste management businesses, and by local authorities as they decide planning applications, and that everyone may have a role in influencing planning decisions. Some of the most contentious planning decisions are those that concern development proposals for waste management and waste disposal.

One of the main obstacles to increasing the diversion of waste from landfill is the difficulty in obtaining planning permission for new waste facilities. **Stewarding the Earth's Resources** currently takes the form of an occasional review of recent development control decisions by Waste Planning Authorities and the Secretary of State on waste development proposals. The November 2006 edition of **Stewarding the Earth's Resources** provides the foundation for these reviews. Increasingly the emerging Waste Development Frameworks will be the basis for development control decisions.

**Stewarding the Earth's Resources** is compiled by the Revd Jon Hale BA who is an ordained Church of England priest with a background in waste planning. It is distributed by email to: 22 waste management and planning professionals; 33 church organisations, and individuals via church organisations; 18 Church of England Diocesan Environment Officers and similar; and 24 other recipients connected with the Sabbatical Research Project:

**Previous editions of Stewarding the Earth's Resources may be obtained on request:**

1.	July 2005	What's happening to waste, and what can Christians conclude from this?
2.	October 2005	Sustainable Development: noble vision or national self-interest?
3.	November 2005	Incineration of municipal solid waste: a contentious issue
4.	January 2006	Rubbish tips dumped in £8bn waste revolution: UK faces 'rude shock' over cost of refuse disposal. (Reproduced from The Guardian 05.01.06)
5.	February 2006	Current issues in waste management from the standpoint of a skip hire / waste recycling company
6.	Easter 2006	Can London kick its waste export habit?
7.	Ascension Day 2006	Restoring the goodness of creation: waste as 'materials' and 'resources'
8.	June 2006	The Town & Country Planning system: delivering essential new waste facilities. (Interview with Hilary Herbert [president of the Planning Officers Society] reproduced from Planning 23.06.06).
9.	July 2006	Behavioural change and the social context of household waste management
10.	November 2006	The 'Waste Development Framework' and 'Sustainability Appraisal': the new basis for local council decisions on planning applications for waste facilities
11.	January 2007	The key role of local councils: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting the waste targets</li> <li>• Deciding planning applications for waste facilities</li> </ul>

**Waste Planning** is the main professional journal in the field of waste planning. It is published by DCS Ltd, Suite 1, Fuller's Court, 40 Lower Quay Street, Gloucester, GL1 2LW. Tel: 01452 835820. fax: 01452 835822. dcs@haymarket.com www.planningresource.co.uk/dcs

There are also other waste management journals.

**Revd Jon Hale, The Vicarage, Vicarage Road, Crawley Down, West Sussex. RH10 4JJ.  
Tel: 01342 714922. aj@jkcahale.co.uk**