Staffordshire County Council

city of stoke on trent

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Core Strategy 2010 - 2026

Sustainability Appraisal: Report on Adoption

February 2011

the knot unites

Contents

1 Introduction

1.0.1. Welcome to this Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report, which has been produced as a final summary of the SA process undertaken to support the development of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document (now generally referred to as the Joint Waste Local Plan). While the process is now complete, and has been assessed by the Planning Inspector to have fully satisfy the legal responsibilities incumbent on the plan-making authorities, this report aims to provide key stakeholders and members of the public with a comprehensive summary of the process and findings of the SA. In particular, it describes the likely significant sustainability implications of the proposed overall vision, the strategic objectives and the policies.

1.0.2. This report has been prepared by Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council, building on earlier work undertaken by Land Use Consultants. A separate document, prepared by Land Use Consultants and published alongside this report, applies the principles of Sustainability Appraisal to the assessment of a wide range of potential sites for the development of new waste treatment or disposal facilities.

1.1. Background to the Joint Waste Core Strategy

1.1.1. As Waste Planning Authorities, Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council are responsible for the planning and control of waste-related development throughout their administrative areas (with the exception of that part of the County that falls inside the Peak District National Park, which has a separate waste planning authority). The policies that guide this process are currently set out in the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Local Plan and the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan

1.1.2. Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council adopted their existing “Waste Local Plan 1998-2011” in February 2003. However, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA) required this to be replaced by a Joint Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document which itself would form part of a Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF). Subsequent changes arising from the National Planning Policy Framework mean that the new document is now referred to as a Waste Local Plan (2010 - 2026).

1.2. Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

1.2.1. The PCPA requires us to undertake Sustainability Appraisals (SA) during the preparation of all of the elements of the MWDF. The purpose of the process is to promote sustainable development through contributing to the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. It should be viewed as an integral part of good plan making, involving ongoing iterations to identify and report on the significant effects of the emerging plan and the extent to which sustainable development is likely to be achieved.

1.2.2. The European Directive 2001/42/EC ‘on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment’ (generally known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment, or SEA Directive) also requires us to carry out

Strategic Environmental Assessments of all of the emerging documents. This aims 'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans….with a view to promoting sustainable development'.

1.2.3. The Government recommends an approach in which the requirements of the SEA Directive are incorporated into the wider SA process, but care must be taken to ensure that the requirements for each piece of legislation are fully met. To this end, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister prepared guidance on a combined SA and SEA process referred to in this document as 'Sustainability Appraisal' (SA). This and subsequent guidance on the Sustainability Appraisal of Local Development Documents[1] has been followed throughout the preparation of this document.

1.3. Aim and structure of this report

1.3.1. This report explores the potential sustainability impacts of the Adopted Joint Waste Local Plan and the options that were considered in its development. It has been produced alongside that document, and progress updates were published at each consultation stage to provide the public and statutory bodies with an opportunity to comment on the emerging Local Plan and the SA together.

1.3.2. The report is structured into the following chapters:

Chapter 1 (this chapter) provides an introduction and background to the SA of the Joint Waste Core Strategy.

Chapter 2 – Staffordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework, sets the context for the MWDF and provides a summary of the main components of the Joint Waste Core Strategy..

Chapter 3 – Appraisal Methodology, describes the SA process in general, the approach used in this case, and the specific SA tasks undertaken, as well as any assumptions made.

Chapter 4 – Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent's sustainability framework, describes the development and refinement of the SA Objectives for assessing the Joint Waste Core Strategy.

Chapter 5 – Sustainability Appraisal of the Joint Waste Core Strategy, sets out the main findings from the appraisals of the Vision, Strategic Objectives and Policies of the Joint Waste Core Strategy. It explains which options were considered and how the chosen options were developed. It then goes on to predict the impacts of those options.

Chapter 6 – Conclusions, summarises the key findings of the SA process and discusses their significance for the plan

[1] Communities and Local Government Plan Making Manual (SA section last updated 23 Sept 2009).

Chapter 7 – Monitoring, discusses the impacts that need to be monitored, and proposes how the monitoring could be integrated into the overall monitoring of the Joint Waste Local Plan.

Appendix A: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of Vision and Strategic Objectives

Appendix B: Full list of Draft Policy Options and their Sustainability Appraisal at the "Emerging Options" stage

Appendix C: Development of 4 Policies from 9 Preferred Options

Appendix D: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of Publication Stage policies

Appendix E: Tables of cumulative and synergistic effects

2 Staffordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework and the Joint Waste Core Strategy

2.0.1. As stated in Chapter 1, Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council are responsible for the planning and control of waste-related development throughout their administrative areas (with the exception of that part of the County that falls within the Peak District National Park). They are also responsible for planning for mineral extraction (quarrying) over the same area.

2.0.2. As the current plan-making process began, relevant policies were set out in the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Local Plan (WLP) and Minerals Local Plan (MLP), adopted in February 2003 and December 1999 respectively, as well as the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan, adopted in 2001. However, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA) require these to be replaced by a Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF), comprising Minerals and Waste Core Strategies, and other specialist documents relating to the selection of new development sites etc as required. Subsequent amendments under the National Planning Policy Framework mean that the Core Strategies will now be called “Local Plans”, though their content will not change. Together, these will guide development for the period up to 2026.

2.0.3. Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council decided to work together to produce a Joint Waste Local Plan as they have previously worked together to prepare the Structure Plan, Minerals Local Plan and, of particular relevance, the existing Waste Local Plan, and Municipal Waste Management Strategy, which sets out a vision for future sustainable municipal waste management within the two Waste Planning Authority areas up to 2020 and beyond.

2.1. The Joint Waste Local Plan

2.1.1. The main aims of the Joint Waste Local Plan are:

- To provide the vision and objectives for sustainable waste management within the plan area;
- To define a spatial strategy for waste development up to 2026, which should ensure that there will be sufficient and suitable land to support the development of a waste management network capable of, as a minimum, an amount of waste, at least equivalent to the amount we generate; and,
- To provide a policy framework for processing planning applications for waste management facilities within the plan area.

2.1.2. The Joint Waste Local Plan is informed by the Municipal Waste Management Strategy (November 2007), and also has regard to aspirations for waste management identified in local Community Strategies. Originally, it was required to be in conformity with the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), but the government have made it clear that this will eventually be withdrawn. However, the evidence base underpinning the RSS Phase 2 Review of Regional Waste Policies is still a relevant consideration as the most up-to-date source of data.

2.1.3. Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent combined produce around 4.2 million tonnes of waste annually. Future quantities of municipal and commercial and industrial waste are forecast in the West Midlands Regional Strategy Phase 2 Review to exceed 3 million tonnes per annum by 2026, with2.3 million tonnes requiring treatment and a maximum of 0.7 million tonnes 'allowed' to be sent to landfill.

2.1.4. Work has been undertaken at a local level to examine the evidence base in relation to the regional waste apportionment for Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent and the gap in treatment capacity. Given the range and capacity of permitted waste management facilities in the plan area at 1 April 2011, analysis concludes that additional recycling capacity of 380,000 tpa is required by 2020/21. If, however, no facilities and subsequent recycling capacity is permitted in the period to 2020, additional capacity of 389,000 tpa would be required by 2026.

2.1.5. Local targets are also set for organic waste treatment (60-80 ktpa) and recycling of construction, demolition and excavation (C,D&E) waste (200 ktpa).

2.1.6. Based on average facility sizes, this suggests that meeting the capacity gap (with Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent pooling existing capacity) would require approximately 6-8 recycling facilities, 2-3 organic waste treatment facilities, and 2-4 C,D&E recycling facilities. This gap needs to be addressed by the Joint Waste Local Plan.

2.2. The process so far

2.2.1. The Joint Waste Local Plan has gone through several stages of development and consultation. The first "Issues and Options" consultation document, published in March 2007, related only to Staffordshire and set out the broad issues to be addressed. These were refined in the light of comments received and improved data that gave a clearer indication of trends. A second consultation document "Issues and Options 2", related to Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent, was published in October 2008 and began to set out key principles for the emerging Joint Waste Local Plan.

2.2.2. The Emerging Joint Waste Local Plan (referred to hereafter as the "Emerging Options" document), produced in August 2010, further defined the challenges of the Joint Waste Local Plan into a Vision, Strategic Objectives and a series of Draft Policy Options. Once again, the strategy was refined in the light of comments received during a public consultation period, and through targeted discussions with respondents who raised particularly significant issues.

2.2.3. Following this "Emerging Options" stage, the draft policies have also been restructured, cutting out un-necessary repetition, and moving from 9 policies to 4 broad policy themes. The resulting "Pre-Publication Version" of the strategy was circulated to previous respondents in an informal extra consultation stage in April 2011, and adjusted in response as appropriate.

2.2.4. The "Publication Document" for the Joint Waste Local Plan was open for formal consultation between 1 October and 11 November 2012, providing an opportunity for representations that related to the legal compliance and soundness of the plan. The plan was then examined by a Planning Inspector, with public hearings taking place between 24 and 27 April, with a round-up session on 19 June 2012. Main

Amendments approved by the Inspector were open for a final period of consultation between 1 October and 11 November 2012 and have now been incorporated into the Inspectors Report.

2.2.5. In line with legislation and guidance discussed in the first chapter, all stages of the document production, including main amendments to address issues raised at the examination, have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal, and the findings of the appraisals have helped to inform subsequent stages.

2.2.6. The Inspector concluded, at the beginning of the examination hearings, that the SA process to date had conformed to the requirements of all of the relevant legislation

2.3. Related assessments

2.3.1. The Joint Waste Local Plan is likely to require the development of additional waste management facilities, though the scale and number of such sites is expected to be small, and delivery is not expected to be dependent on any specific "strategic" sites. To meet with the requirements for Sustainability Appraisal, a separate "Site Assessment Report (incorporating the requirements of SA/SEA)" has been prepared by Land Use Consultants (LUC), on behalf of the two local authorities. It was first published with the "Emerging Options" report and also accompanies this consultation. Its specific aim is to address the sustainability implications of a wide range of potential new waste sites and to demonstrate that a number of combinations of sites could be found that would meet the needs of the plan without creating unacceptable adverse impacts.

2.3.2. The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994,(the Habitats Regulations), reinforced by a European Court of Justice ruling, make it clear that the Joint Waste Local Plan can only be adopted when we can demonstrate that it will not result in any adverse impacts on sites of European importance to nature conservation. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) required to show this has been carried out in parallel with the SA/SEA, and is the subject of a separate report.

3 Appraisal Methodology

3.0. Stages and Tasks in Sustainability Appraisal

3.0.1. The SA guidance introduces the process and explains how to carry out SA as an integral part of the plan-making process.

3.0.2. Figure 1 sets out the main stages of the plan making process and shows how these link to the SA process

Figure 1: Corresponding stages in plan-making and SA.

DPD Step 1: Pre-production - Evidence Gathering
SA stages and tasks
Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives

A2: Collecting baseline information
A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems
A4: Developing the SA Framework
A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA
DPD Step 2: Production
SA stages and tasks
Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects
B1: Testing the DPD objectives against the SA Framework
B2: Developing the DPD options
B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD
B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD
B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPDs
Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report
C1: Preparing the SA Report
Stage D: Consulting on the Preferred Options of the DPD and the Sustainability Appraisal Report
D1: Public participation on the preferred option of the DPD and the SA Report
D2(i): Appraising significant changes
DPD Step 3: Examination
SA stages and tasks
D2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations
DPD Step 4 & 5: Adoption and Monitoring
SA stages and tasks
D3: Making decisions and providing information
Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the DPD
E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring
E2: Responding to adverse effects

3.1. Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope

3.1.1. A Scoping Report was prepared as part of the initial stages of the SEA/SA. It was published in July 2008, to accompany the "Issues and Options" stage of the Joint Waste Core Strategy, for consultation with the three SEA Consultation Bodies (i.e. Natural England, Environment Agency and English Heritage) and other stakeholders. The Scoping Report followed an earlier version produced by Staffordshire County Council in November 2006, prior to the agreement of a joint approach to waste planning with Stoke-on-Trent City Council.

3.1.2. The preparation of the Scoping Report involved the following main tasks:

- Review of plans, programmes, strategies and studies.

- Collection of baseline information and characterisation of Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent.
- Identification of key sustainability issues and problems in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent.
- Development of an SA Framework.
- Description of the SA methodology proposed.

3.1.3. The final SA Scoping Report took into account the incorporation of sustainability issues, policies, plans and programmes and baseline information relevant to Stoke-on-Trent, as well as consultation responses received from statutory stakeholders on the previous Scoping Report.

3.2. Stage B: Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects

3.2.1. The development and appraisal of options is an iterative process. The options proposed at each stage in the Joint Waste Local Plan have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal, and revised to take account of the SA findings and subsequent consultation responses, before moving forward to the next stage.

3.2.2. In the case of this Joint Waste Local Plan, the preferred policy options from the previous consultation stage (Emerging Options) have not only been revised in the light of assessments and consultation comments, but have also been repackaged into a smaller number of broader policies. It is important to note, though, that all of the essential content has been retained and this has not altered their effect.

3.2.3. The final stage of the assessment process has examined the final proposed policies in detail and explored the impacts that might occur as the plan is implemented.

3.3. Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

3.3.1. As we drew towards the end of the plan-making process, this SA Report detailed the appraisal process outlined above, and the findings of the SA to date. It set out the range of options considered, records the reasons for eliminating any options, and presents a detailed appraisal of the final proposed policies, using the SA objectives and criteria in the SA Framework

3.4. Stage D: Consultation on the Preferred Options and the SA Report

3.4.1. The SA Report was open for public consultation for the statutory six-week period prior to formal submission of the Joint Waste Local Plan DPD. All changes proposed following the examination of the plan by the appointed Inspector were also assessed for their potential impacts and additional SA work was carried out to assess where impacts were thought likely to have changed. Updated Sustainability Appraisals were published, as required, alongside the proposed modifications, and these were again published for consultation.

3.5. Stage E: Monitoring Implementation of the DPD

3.5.1. This final SA Report (the Report on Adoption) presents all of the findings to date, identifies where any significant effects are likely to arise, and sets out recommendations for monitoring the social, environmental and economic effects of

implementing the Joint Waste Local Plan. These monitoring proposals are considered within the context of the broader monitoring framework for the MWDF and Staffordshire County Council's and Stoke-on-Trent City Council's Annual Monitoring Reports.

3.5.2. There is also a requirement to produce an Adoption Statement in order to fully comply with the SEA Directive, but this stage can only be completed once the plan has been formally adopted. When produced, it will be made available on the Councils' websites and sent to the statutory consultees as required.

4 Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent's Sustainability Framework

4.0. Introduction

4.0.1. Neither the SEA Directive nor the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act specifically require the use of objectives or indicators in the SEA / SA process, but they are a recognised way in which environmental and sustainability effects can conveniently be described, analysed and compared. SA / SEA objectives state the environmental and sustainability outcomes that we hope to achieve through the Joint Waste Local Plan.

4.1. Development of SA Objectives

4.1.1. The framework of SA Objectives was initially published for consultation in November/December 2006. It has subsequently been revised in the light of comments received, and was the subject of further consultation alongside the Joint Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options in 2008. Again, some minor adjustments have been made in response to comments received. A final adjustment was made to SA Objective 1 in April 2010 to ensure that it was not in conflict with emerging revised Planning Guidance on Climate Change.

4.1.2. Figure 2 lists the SA / SEA Objectives proposed for the Joint Waste Local Plan, and how they promote an integrated approach to sustainability. To demonstrate a balance, ticks in the columns on the right classify the main influences as social, economic or environmental. The nature of the issues, however, is such that influences are unlikely to be limited to the subjects ticked, and almost all objectives will impinge on the social, the environmental and the economic realm.

Figure 2: SEA / SA objectives for the Joint Waste Local Plan and their primary influences

	SA Objective	Econ.	Soc.	Env.
1	Deliver sustainable development, maximising the environmental benefits derived from processing waste.	✓		✓
2	Encourage schemes that contribute to self sufficiency in waste treatment and encourage local communities to take responsibility for the waste that they generate	✓	✓	✓
3	Avoid net losses of "tranquil" areas		✓	✓
4	Reduce the impact of HGV traffic on the local community and environment		✓	✓
5	Provide local facilities to minimise the distance travelled to handle and treat wastes particularly in rural areas	✓	✓	✓
6	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions		✓	✓
7	Protect floodplains and associated watercourses.			✓
8	Protect and enhance designated sites of ecological and geological importance		✓	✓
9	Protect and enhance biodiversity, especially BAP priority species and habitats.			✓

	SA Objective	Econ.	Soc.	Env.
10	Ensure no reduction in quality and supply of ground and surface water resources as a result of waste related developments		✓	✓
11	Conserve soil resources and minimise the irreversible loss of agricultural land at grades 1 and 2.	✓	✓	✓
12	Ensure that National Air Quality Standards are met at all points in the County		✓	✓
13	Preserve, protect and enhance and natural and built historic environment		✓	✓
14	Ensure that there is no downward trend in landscape and townscape quality.		✓	✓
15	Protect the health, amenity and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health		✓	
16	Maximise the use of previously developed land and buildings			✓

4.1.3. Key environmental and sustainability issues that currently relate to waste development in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent have been identified within the Scoping Report. These key sustainability issues have been used to inform the development of the SA objectives. Clearly linking the sustainability issues to the SA objectives has helped to ensure that they were fully taken into account during the development of the Joint Waste Local Plan.

4.1.4. Baseline information, including indicators, trends and targets, has been collected on each SA Objective in the Scoping Report to provide context for the prediction of expected impacts from the Joint Waste Local Plan. This information has been used wherever possible to help inform the appraisal of the Joint Waste Local Plan Issues and Options against the SA objectives.

4.2. Coverage of SEA topics

4.2.1. The SEA Directive requires, in Annex 1 (f), that information is provided on the likely significant effects on a number of environmental topics. Figure 3 sets out these 'SEA topics' and shows that they are all covered by at least one of the SA Objectives for the Joint Waste Local Plan, although many of the SEA topics are cross-cutting issues that will be covered by a number of the headline objectives. Coverage of the SEA topics by the SA objectives ensures that each of the topics should be addressed in the SAs of all Joint Waste Local Plan documents produced as part of the MWDF.

Figure 3: Links between SA / SEA objectives and the SEA Directives issues

SEA Directive issue	SEA / SA Objectives
Material assets	1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16
Climatic factors	4, 5, 6
Biodiversity	8, 9
Fauna	8, 9
Flora	8, 9
Water	7, 10

SEA Directive issue	SEA / SA Objectives
Soil	11, 16
Air	12
Cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage	13
Landscape	14, 16
Population	15
Human health	15

5 Sustainability Appraisal of the Joint Waste Local Plan

5.0.1. The key task of this document is to present the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Joint Waste Local Plan. There are three main elements that require assessment: the Vision, the Strategic Objectives, and the Policies. In each case, we have assessed compatibility with the 16 SA Objectives as set out in Chapter 4.

5.0.2. In the case of the policies, we have set out the options considered at the "Emerging Options" stages, and the reasons for not taking various options forward, before carrying out a detailed assessment of each policy put forward at the Publication stage, and any significant amendments arising from the examination stage.

5.0.3. While this Chapter sets out the key findings of the sustainability appraisals, the full appraisal matrices are presented in **Appendix B: Full list of Draft Policy Options and their Sustainability Appraisal at the "Emerging Options" stage**, and in **Appendix D: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of final policies**.

5.1. Identifying the Key Issues

5.1.1. In preparing the Joint Waste Local Plan, Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council have considered evidence relating to the waste produced in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent, and the waste managed by the current network of waste management facilities. They have also taken into account national strategies, policies and guidance including policy objectives to manage waste more sustainably, as well as comments received from previous consultations.

5.1.2. Based on this work, they have identified four Key Issues to be addressed in the Joint Waste Local Plan which are shown in **Figure 4** below. Details of how the issues were identified can be found in Chapter 3 of the Joint Waste Local Plan: "The Spatial Portrait: Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent today'.

Figure 4: Key Issues identified for the Joint Waste Local Plan

Issue 1: We need to take steps to minimise the negative effects of waste management on climate change by:
• Working towards a zero waste society with greater resource efficiency and supporting, insofar as we are able, initiatives that help us to move towards improved recycling rates;
• Encouraging waste operators to treat waste further up the "Waste Hierarchy";
• Continuing to reduce our reliance and use of landfill; and,
• Using our influence in the planning process to encourage, insofar as we are able, resource efficiency during demolition, construction and use of new buildings.
Issue 2: We must continue to take responsibility for managing the waste we generate by ensuring we are net self-sufficient in waste management (managing an amount of waste equivalent to that generated within our areas).
We need to increase the diversion of waste from landfill by:
• Maintaining the existing capacity of our non landfill related waste infrastructure;
• Reducing our reliance on landfill and void capacity; and

• Supporting proposals for new and enhanced waste management facilities to develop our waste infrastructure where it can be shown to be sustainable and presents an opportunity to contribute to our local economy.
We also need to continue to encourage waste operators to increase their capacity to recycle additional construction, demolition and excavation waste to conserve our mineral resources.
Issue 3: Some of our waste infrastructure does not meet modern design standards. We need to encourage waste operators to raise the standard of our waste infrastructure by:
• Ensuring new waste management facilities meet modern design standards; and,
• Supporting proposals to improve the quality of existing waste management facilities, as they are developed, to keep pace with the requirements of legislation and meet modern design standards.
Issue 4: In order to provide sufficient opportunities for our waste infrastructure to develop the right type of facilities, in the right place and at the right time, we need to ensure that proposals:
• Make a positive contribution to people's lives, by helping to deliver jobs, economic growth, and better opportunities for all;
• Protect and/or enhance the natural, historic and water environments and conserve the countryside and open spaces that are vital resources for everyone; and,
• Address the legitimate concerns and interests of local communities and businesses, particularly on human health issues

5.2. Assessing the Vision

5.2.1. The Vision of the Joint Waste Local Plan is set out in **Figure 5** below. It attempts to reflect both the national requirements for waste development plan documents and local priorities identified from the Staffordshire Sustainable Community Strategy, the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, and from the assembled evidence base. Where spatial requirements are set out, they reflect either specific requirements for fulfilling the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, or the principle of locating new waste treatment facilities close to the areas where the waste is known to arise:

Figure 5: Vision for the Joint Waste Local Plan

The Vision
By 2026 the people and businesses of Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent will be actively minimising waste and regarding waste as a resource.
To support this "our waste infrastructure' will comprise a network of existing, enhanced and new sustainable waste management facilities that are in the right place to contribute to the local economy, and to minimise and/or mitigate any impacts on climate change, people, transportation systems, and the built, natural, historic and water environment.
More specifically "our waste infrastructure" will: • Have the capacity to manage an amount of waste at least equivalent to the amount we generate. This capacity will be higher up the "waste hierarchy" so that we can minimise our reliance on and use of landfill In order to maintain this capacity, we will have used our planning powers where necessary to try to protect our waste infrastructure from constraints that may be imposed by non-waste related development in the vicinity;

• Be located close to the main urban areas, as far as practicable, to minimise the impacts of transporting waste and recycled materials; and,
• Meet modern design standards and, wherever practicable and environmentally acceptable, be located within buildings or enclosed structures appropriate to the technology or process, on general industrial or previously developed land.

5.2.2. The Vision was inspired by similar aims to the SA Objectives, so broad compatibility would be expected. We have assessed each of the statements within the Vision separately, in order to gain the most information about its potential impact. The full results of this assessment can be found in **Appendix A: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of Vision and Strategic Objectives**, with a summary set out in **Table 1** below:

Table 1: Summary Assessment of JWCS Vision against SA Objectives

(Full details of the working behind this table can be found in Appendix A)

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
By 2026 the people and businesses of Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent will be actively minimising waste and regarding waste as a resource.	+	+	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?
To support this, 'our waste infrastructure' will comprise a network of existing, enhanced and new sustainable waste management facilities that are in the right place to contribute to the local economy, and to minimise and/or mitigate any impacts on climate change, people, transportation systems, and the built, natural, historic and water environment.	+	0	?+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?+	?
More specifically 'our waste infrastructure' will: • Have the capacity to manage an amount of waste at least equivalent to the amount we generate. This capacity will be higher up the "waste hierarchy" so that we can minimise our reliance on and use of landfill In order to maintain this capacity, we will have used our planning powers where necessary to try to protect our waste infrastructure from constraints that may be imposed by non-waste related development in the vicinity;	?+	+	0	0	?+	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
• Be located close to the main urban areas, as far as practicable, to minimise the impacts of transporting waste and recycled materials; and,	?+	?+	?+	+	?	?+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?
• Meet modern design standards and, wherever practicable and environmentally acceptable, be located within buildings or enclosed structures appropriate to the technology or process, on general industrial or previously developed land.	?+	0	+	?+	?	?	?+	+	?+	?+	+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+

5.2.3. It is clear that all of the SA Objectives are reflected at some point in the Vision, and it is not surprising to find that each sentence seems to concentrate on a particular group of objectives.

5.2.4. Looking in more detail, Objectives 1 to 14 all achieve full and explicit support at some point. Objectives 15 and 16 only achieve more general support, but this may be a reflection of the ways in which they were originally drafted. While it may be appropriate for an SA Objective to aspire to a reduction of health inequalities, it may not be realistic to expect a waste local plan to fully encompass those aspirations within its Vision, even though it might (and does) clearly aim to reduce any adverse impacts on health. Similarly, it is not surprising that while the Vision clearly supports the use of previously developed land, it stops short of preferring over any other type of site.

5.2.5. Overall, we can conclude that the Vision does form a sound basis for developing a Joint Waste Local Plan that addresses all of the SA Objectives.

5.3. Revising the Strategic Objectives

5.3.1. A series of Strategic Objectives for the Joint Waste Local Plan were produced for consultation at the Issues and Options stage in 2008. They were intended to add detail to the Vision, and to set out how it might be delivered.

5.3.2. The original 8 Strategic Objectives were revised in the light of comments received, developments of the Vision, and government guidance, leading to a list of 10 new Strategic Objectives which were again the subject of consultation at the Emerging Options stage

5.3.3. Those 10 were subsequently reformatted and refined to just 4 which are listed in **Figure 6** below.

Figure 6: Strategic Objectives of the Joint Waste Local Plan

Strategic Objectives	
SO1	To support new waste development that helps minimise greenhouse gas emissions and incorporates appropriate measures to mitigate and adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change by permitting facilities/infrastructure that: • Make more use of waste as a resource; • Increase diversion of waste from landfill through restricting new landfill proposals and encouraging new and enhanced waste management facilities involving treatment further up the "waste hierarchy"; • Make a contribution towards secure renewable energy supplies where recycling is not viable. And to influence the development process by encouraging resource efficiency in the demolition, construction and the use of new buildings.
SO2	To encourage the maintenance of the network of new or enhanced sustainable waste management facilities ('our waste infrastructure') so that we can continue to manage an amount of waste, at least equivalent to the amount we generate ('our waste'). In addition, to support the development of new waste treatment facilities so that we can reduce our reliance on and use of landfill, and conserve our mineral resources by: • Permitting waste recycling and recovery facilities in appropriate locations; • Monitoring the capacity of our waste infrastructure and comparing that data with surveys that tell us how much waste we are generating and forecasts that tell us how much waste we are likely to generate in the future; and, • Taking steps where necessary to protect/safeguard our waste infrastructure so that it is not unnecessarily constrained by non-waste related development in the vicinity.
SO3	To encourage appropriate siting and modern design standards and provide opportunities to enhance existing waste management facilities by: • Supporting new waste management facilities that, wherever practicable and environmentally acceptable, treat waste close to the main urban areas, within buildings or enclosed structures appropriate to the technology or process, and are located on general industrial or previously developed land ; and, • Supporting proposals to improve the environmental quality of existing waste management facilities when development opportunities arise.
SO4	To support job creation, economic growth and investment in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent by providing sufficient opportunities to develop new waste management infrastructure of the right type, in the right place and at the right time, and by minimising and mitigating any adverse impacts and avoiding any unacceptable impacts paying particular attention to assessing the suitability of sites in terms of: • The physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and allocated neighbouring land uses; • The cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential; and, • The capacity of the transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and recovered materials, seeking when practicable, environmentally acceptable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.

5.4. Assessing the Strategic Objectives

5.4.1. The revised Strategic Objectives have been assessed against the 16 SA Objectives to determine their compatibility. The full assessment can be found in **Appendix A**, but a summary of the findings is set out in **Table 2** below.

5.4.2. Overall, there is a good degree of compatibility between the Strategic Objectives and the SA Objectives, and no significant conflicts. As with the Vision, it would be unreasonable to expect that each Strategic Objective should fully and explicitly support every SA Objective, so our primary concern is for broad support for each of the SA Objectives by at least one of the Strategic Objectives.

5.4.3. The first two (SO1 and SO2) deal with broad aims and aspirations for the Waste Local Plan. Many impacts on the SA Objectives are scored as "?" or "0" because they can not be predicted with any accuracy at this stage. Much will depend on the ways in which those Strategic Objectives are put into effect. The impacts of SO3 and SO4 are rather easier to envisage, and this is reflected in clearer predictions about their impact. SO3 offers possible support for most of the SA Objectives, while SO4 offers clear support for many, especially those relating to the various aspects of environmental protection.

5.4.4. All but two of the SA Objectives are clearly supported by at least one Strategic Objective. SA Objective 1 (Sustainable Development) is clearly supported by 3 of the Strategic Objectives, and possibly supported by the fourth. This is reassuring as delivering sustainable development is a fundamental aim of the Joint Waste Local Plan.

5.4.5. The two SA Objectives that fail to achieve any unquestioned support are numbers 3 and 5 (Tranquillity and Local Facilities). In the case of SA Objective 3, this may reflect the fact that, whilst tranquillity is broadly recognised as being important, it is not well defined, so its protection is often a by-product of protecting better defined assets, so outcomes are less certain. SA Objective 5, (Local Facilities) is well defined, but may be hard to achieve through a Waste Local Plan that requires very little in the way of additional treatment facilities in order to achieve the desired treatment capacity.

5.4.6. Following their individual assessment, the Strategic Objectives have also been assessed against each other to identify potential synergies or conflicts between objectives. The results of this assessment are set out in **Table 3**

5.4.7. It is unsurprising to find that all of the Strategic Objectives have been assessed to offer possible support for each other. With so few Strategic Objectives it would be unlikely that there would be sufficient overlap anywhere to allow anything more definite. Similarly, we would not expect any conflicts between Strategic Objectives at this stage

5.4.8. As a general conclusion, we can say that the Strategic Objectives, as drafted, present a satisfactory base on which to build a sustainable Joint Waste Local Plan, with no obvious changes to recommend.

Table 2: Assessment of JWCS Strategic Objectives against SA Objectives

(Full details of the working behind this table can be found in Appendix A)

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Strategic Objectives ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
SO1	+	?	?	?+	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
SO2	+	+	?+	?+	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
SO3	?+	?+	?+	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	+
SO4	+	?+	?+	+	?+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?

Table 3: Assessment of compatibility of JWCS Strategic Objectives with each other

Strategic Objectives ➔ **Strategic Objectives ⬇**	**SO1:** To support new waste development that helps minimise greenhouse gas emissions etc…	**SO2:** To encourage maintenance of our waste infrastructure & support the development of new waste treatment etc…	**SO3:** To encourage appropriate siting & modern design, and provide opportunities to enhance existing waste management facilities etc…	**SO4:** To support job creation, economic growth and investment by providing sufficient opportunities to develop new waste management infrastructure etc…
SO1: To support new waste development that helps minimise greenhouse gas emissions etc…		?+	?+	?+
SO2: To encourage maintenance of our waste infrastructure & support the development of new waste treatment etc…	?+		?+	?+
SO3: To encourage appropriate siting & modern design, and provide opportunities to enhance existing waste management facilities etc…	?+	?+		?+
SO4: To support job creation, economic growth and investment by providing sufficient opportunities to develop new waste management infrastructure etc…	?+	?+	?+	

5.5. Developing Policy Options (Emerging Options Stage)

5.5.1. The Vision and Strategic Objectives helped us to identify a list of topics where policies may be needed. We originally identified 9 such topics at the "Emerging Options" stage, which are set out in **Figure 7** below:

Figure 7: Draft policy topics at "Emerging Options" stage

Draft Policies	
Draft Policy 1.	Targets and broad locations of waste management facilities
Draft Policy 2.	Criteria for the locations of new enclosed waste management facilities
Draft Policy 3.	Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities
Draft Policy 4.	Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources
Draft Policy 5	Management of construction, demolition and excavation waste
Draft Policy 6	Waste awareness and waste minimisation
Draft Policy 7	Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities
Draft Policy 8	Enhancement of existing waste management facilities
Draft Policy 9	High Quality Design

5.5.2. For each of these we identified a series of policy options. Whilst the SEA / SA guidance requires us to look at all of the options, the Joint Waste Local Plan must fit within a policy framework laid down by European and National legislation, as well as National planning guidance. This limits the range of policy options that could prove acceptable, and therefore needed to be considered.

5.5.3. In addition to the policy options described above, guidance and best practice also require us to consider the option of not producing a new plan, but simply rolling forward existing policies in each subject area. Such options were added to the list where appropriate.

5.5.4. The full list of Policy Options considered at the ""Emerging Options" stage can be found in **Appendix B**.

5.6. Assessing Policy Options (Emerging Options Stage)

5.6.1. All of the draft policy options for each topic were assessed for their predicted performance against the SA Objectives, and the results are set out in **Appendix B**. For convenience in the tables, and the bulk of the document, the options are listed by short description only. It is important to bear in mind that these summaries may not encapsulate the full details of each option, and that the assessments have been carried out using the full texts.

5.6.2. For each policy topic, the overall performance of the policy options is discussed and conclusions are reached about those options which should go forward for further consideration, and which should be abandoned at this stage.

5.7. Developing and refining the Policy Options

5.7.1. The Draft Policy Options described above, together with their assessment, were subject to public consultation at the "Emerging Options" stage. As a result, they underwent some slight modifications as preferred options were identified

5.7.2. The contents of the Preferred Policy Options have also been examined and re-packaged, with a view to eliminating repetition of certain key elements, and bringing related themes together.

5.7.3. This has led to the replacement of the original nine Preferred Policy Options with just four Policies reflecting broad themes for the Publication Stage of the Joint Waste Local Plan.

5.7.4. **Figure 8** below sets out the topics covered, while **Appendix B** sets out the full texts and illustrates how the key themes of the Preferred Policy Options are taken forward.

Figure 8: Draft policy topics at Publication Stage

New Publication Policies	
Publication Policy 1.	Waste as a Resource
Publication Policy 2.	Targets and Broad Locations for Waste Management Facilities
Publication Policy 3.	Criteria for the Location of New and Enhanced Waste Management Facilities
Publication Policy 4.	Sustainable Design and Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality

5.8. Assessing Policies (Publication Stage)

5.8.1. Whilst the new Publication Policies simply represent a re-packaging of the best performing policy options from earlier stages, it is still important that they should be subjected to SA.

5.8.2. As the policy topics are quite broad, the analysis has been carried out section by section to allow for the full range of impacts to be assessed. Full details of the analysis are set out in **Appendix D**, with a summary of the findings in **Table 4** below:

5.8.3. Following discussions with the Planning Inspector at the Examination hearings, Policies 2.1 and 2.2 were modified. Both revised policies were subjected to SA, but it was only in the case of Policy 2.1 that there was any change from the original scoring. Appendix D and Table 4 reflect the new SA for the revised Policy 2.1.

Table 4: Summary of assessment of Policies

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 1: Waste as a resource																
1.1 General principles	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?+	?
1.2 Making better use of waste associated with non-waste related development	+	+	?+	?+	+	?+	?/0	?/0	?+	?/0	?+	?/0	?/0	?+	?+	?+
1.3 Making better use of construction, demolition and excavation waste	+	?	?	?+	?	?	?/0	?+	?+	?/0	?+	?	?+	+	?+	+
1.4 Waste used in landscaping, engineering and agricultural improvement	+	?	?	?	?	?	+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+
1.5 Energy recovery	+	+	?/0	+	+	+	+	?+	?+	+	+	+	?+	+	?+	?
1.6 Landfill and landraise	+	0	?/0	?/0	?/0	+	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?
Comments on Policy 1 Policy sets out a series of principles about the way that we manage waste of different types. Scoring against SA Objectives varies considerably from one policy element to another, depending largely on how easily impacts on the ground can be anticipated. 1.1 and 1.5 are the easiest to predict with confidence, while 1.6 retains the highest level of uncertainty, though the uncertain impacts are unlikely to be significant.																

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 2: Targets and broad locations for waste management facilities																
Policy 2.1 Landfill diversion targets	+	0	0	?	?+	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 2.2 Targets for new waste management facilities	?+	+	?/0	?	?/0	?	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	0	?
Policy 2.3 Broad locations for different scales of facility	?+	+	?+	+	+	?+	?/0	?/0	?	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	+
Policy 2.4 Strategic waste facilities to be safeguarded (Energy recovery facilities and hazardous landfill)	?+	+	?+	?	0	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0	?+	?+	?+	0
Policy 2.5 Restrictions on development in the vicinity of waste management facilities	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?
Comments on Policy 2 This policy sets out the headline requirements for the Joint Waste Local Plan in terms of landfill diversion and creation of new waste management facilities, then discusses broad locations for new sites and how to protect existing ones. First 3 sections have few clear impacts because of their strategic nature. Impacts here will depend on the details of new proposals, which will be controlled by other policies. The last two sections have more predictable impacts as they aim to protect existing waste sites as a way to minimise the need for more.																

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 3: Criteria for the location of new and enhanced waste management facilities																
Policy 3.1 General requirements for new and enhanced facilities	?+	?/0	?+	0	?/0	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0
Policy 3.2 Exceptions criteria for organic treatment in farm locations close to the urban areas/broad locations	?+	+	?	?	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?	?	?+	?+
Policy 3.3 Exceptions criteria for facilities recycling construction, demolition & excavation waste or comparable industrial wastes	+	?+	?	?	?+	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	0
Policy 3.4 Temporary planning permissions for open air facilities	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?+	0	0	?+	?+
Comments on Policy 3 Policy deals with the details of the form and general location of new waste facilities. While the first section provides enough detail to achieve a fairly positive assessment for many of the SA Objectives, the other three sections tend to offer less certainty. They tend to concentrate on specific situations in which a particular form of development might be permitted, and leave the control of other impacts to other policies. Wordings could be adjusted to overcome this, and to improve the SA scoring, but this is not really necessary when the policy is considered in the context of the rest of the Local Plan.																

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 4: Sustainable design and protection and improvement of environmental quality																
4.1 Sustainable design	+	0	+	+	0	+	?+	+	+	?+	?+	?+	+	+	?+	0
4.2 Protection and improvement of environmental quality	?+	?/0	?	?+	?/0	?	+	?+	?+	+	+	+	?+	+	?+	0
Comments on Policy 4 Policy deals with the details of design and establishes protection against a broad range of adverse impacts. As would be expected, most assessments against SA Criteria are either clearly positive or potentially positive, with only a few areas where impacts are less certain. Where uncertainty arises, it relates either to SA Criteria where impacts depend on the patterns of distribution of sites or the type of land used for development. These are not addressed in this policy but are covered elsewhere.																

5.9. Key findings

5.9.1. Overall, the 4 new policies perform quite well against the SA Objectives. Several policies fully and explicitly aim to deliver one or more of the objectives, and many more have been assessed to have the potential to deliver those objectives.

5.9.2. There is, however, a high degree of uncertainty over some impacts, with scores of "?" recorded against many objectives. This could be seen as indicating a risk of adverse impacts arising in the future, but closer examination of the areas of uncertainty suggest that it tends to arise for one of two reasons. In some cases, the actual impact will be dependent on the details of future developments which we can only guess about at present. In others, the apparent uncertainty may be a product of assessing the various parts of each policy separately. A particular policy element may focus on delivering a specific objective, and not attempt to control its impact in other areas, giving rise to "uncertain" scores. However, in such cases, other policies, or other elements within the same policy will generally serve to ensure that adverse impacts are avoided.

5.9.3. When reading the assessments, it is important to note that impacts overall can be expected to be small as, even after the amendments following the examination, the Joint Waste Local Plan identifies only a limited need for new waste treatment capacity within the plan area. While policies recognise the potential contribution that additional waste development can make to the local economy, the Site Assessment Report shows clearly that there are plenty of sites where new waste facilities could be developed with minimal adverse impacts. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that developing sufficient new waste facilities need not lead to adverse impacts, as long as the sites are chosen carefully.

5.10. Site-related impacts

5.10.1. The discussion above has noted, as have the discussions in previous iterations of the SA, that for many of the topic areas, there will always be some uncertainty over the implications of a particular policy option because the final impact will depend greatly on the choice of any new sites for the development of waste facilities.

5.10.2. The only way round the problem would be for the Joint Waste Local Plan to identify sufficient "Strategic Sites" for development of new waste facilities to meet the requirements of the strategy. But the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Local Plan requires so few new sites that it does not seem appropriate to constrain potential developers to a handful of "strategic sites". We do, however, still need to demonstrate that suitable sites for development are available within the plan area.

5.10.3. To do this, we have, as discussed above, carried out an extensive assessment of potential new waste sites (see below) and demonstrated that there is a plentiful supply of suitable sites that have the potential to be developed with minimal adverse impacts. This work is published in a separate "Site Assessment Report (incorporating the requirements of SA /SEA)".

5.10.4. However, while the Site Assessment Report achieves its objective of demonstrating the availability of suitable sites for new waste management facilities, this still does not allow impacts to be predicted with certainty within this report.

5.11. Further assessments

5.11.1. Whilst the tables above asses the potential impacts of each policy option on the SA Objectives, it is also important to consider how impacts can be expected to change over time (short, medium and long-term impacts), and how the policies would interact with each other (cumulative and synergistic effects).

5.11.2. To assess how the impact of the policies might be expected to change over time, policies were subjected to a more detailed SA process in which their impacts were assessed for three time periods: short term (0-5 years), medium term (6-25 years) and long term (26 years plus).

5.11.3. In the vast majority of cases, there was no reason to predict that the impacts of policies would change over time. There were only four cases where changing impacts were considered to be possible, and these related to policies 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 4.1. In these cases, the policies were clearly aimed at reducing the impact of waste management activities, and it was reasonable to imagine that the policies might begin to have an effect over the course of the plan. It was not, however, possible to predict how great the change would be, or the timescale over which it might occur, because any change will depend on the cumulative effect of changes in waste management practice by independent operators that we can only influence indirectly.

5.11.4. It is also important to assess how policies might interact with each other. In a small number of cases, where two policies are expected to have very similar impacts, the cumulative impact of both policies together was considered likely to be greater than would be expected for either policy alone.

5.11.5. In rather more cases, the assessment identified potential for policies to work together in a less direct, synergistic, way to contribute towards a common outcome. Tables in **Appendix E** identify where the potential for cumulative or synergistic effects might arise.

5.11.6. It is important to note that the cumulative and synergistic effects identified all appear to strengthen the effects that the policies were intended to create. Under such circumstances, the effects are not expected to bring about any adverse effects, or to require any adjustments to the Plan.

6 Conclusions

6.0.1. Sustainability Appraisal is supposed to be an ongoing process that runs in parallel with policy development and is intended to help us to produce a better and more sustainable policy document. This Sustainability Report has been prepared to accompany the Joint Waste Local Plan as it is formally adopted by Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council, in order to allow people to understand the process that we have gone through to produce the strategy, the

options that we have considered and rejected, and the sustainability implications of taking the Strategy forward.

6.0.2. The assessment of the Vision and Strategic Objectives has shown that these show a good level of compatibility with the SA Objectives, and that they form an appropriate foundation for the rest of the Strategy.

6.0.3. The ongoing assessment of the policy options has assisted in the identification of preferred options and in their refinement. It has also highlighted the importance of site selection in determining the actual impacts of many of the policy options, and the contribution that certain policies can make towards reducing the uncertainty.

6.0.4. Whist there are no plans for the Joint Waste Local Plan to identify specific sites for new waste facilities, we have carried out a parallel process to assess the implications of developing such facilities on a wide range of possible sites. This has demonstrated that there are plenty of sites, in suitable locations, that could be developed without unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment. It also gives us some confidence that many of the "site dependant" impacts, currently recorded as uncertain, are likely to turn out to be more positive when actual sites are developed.

6.0.5. This Sustainability Appraisal is not the only analysis of the likely impacts of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Local Plan on the wider environment. Further assessments of potential environmental impacts associated with the Local Plan, including the analysis of sites where new waste facilities could be developed, can be found in the Site Assessment Report (including the requirements of SA / SEA). Meanwhile, the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) address their own specific aspects of the environment. All of these reports are available separately through the councils' websites. They have helped to influence the development and implementation of the Joint Waste Local Plan, and their conclusions have contributed to this Sustainability Report.

7 Monitoring

7.0.1. Finally, this report needs to address the impacts that are expected to arise as a result of the Plan, and how these should be monitored to ensure that they are as predicted. This process helps to identify any corrective action that may need to be undertaken, and can also inform future modelling of impacts.

7.0.2. The Joint Waste Local Plan is largely concerned with the avoidance of adverse impacts that might arise as a result of the development and operation of waste management facilities. As such, we would anticipate that the SA impacts that are likely to arise as a result of the effective implementation of the Plan would largely be positive, or at least to involve the avoidance of negative impacts, despite the a high level of uncertainty in much of the scoring.

7.0.3. One area where concerns might arise is the policies that provide for exceptions to allow certain types of waste management activity to take place in locations, or circumstances, that would not normally be acceptable. Examples include the use of C, D&E waste for landscaping, organic waste treatment in farm locations, or waste treatment in the open air. It will be important to ensure that the application

of such exemptions is carefully monitored to ensure that are not granted more often than was envisaged, and that they do not lead to adverse impacts that had not been predicted.

7.0.4. Performance Indicators 3.2, 3.3, 4.2 and 4.3 from the main Plan should provide sufficient information to allow useful conclusions to be reached, so specific indicators for the SA are not required to address this issue.

7.0.5. There may also be positive impacts arising from the implementation of the plan, and these should also be monitored to record and quantify the benefits. Performance Indicators 3.5 and 4.4 of the main Plan should suffice for this purpose, and specific monitoring can again be avoided.

7.0.6. All of the indicators above will monitored regularly and reported upon each year in the Annual Monitoring Report.

8 Appendix A: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of Vision and Strategic Objectives

Table 5: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of the Vision

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
By 2026 the people and businesses of Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent will be actively minimising waste and regarding waste as a resource.	+	+	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
	Minimising waste and regarding as a resource are broadly supportive of aims of SD	Minimising waste will support self sufficiency	Minimal impact. Vision does not say anything about tranquil areas and it will not have any systematic impact	Impacts hard to predict. Minimising waste should reduce overall quantities to be moved, but use as a resource could impact either way on local traffic.	Uncertain impact as minimising waste and treating it as a resource may or may not involve local facilities to minimise distances travelled	Uncertain impacts as these will depend on treatment technologies used to treat waste as a resource, and the transport impact of location of facilities for treatment or resource recovery	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address floodplains, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address protected sites, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address biodiversity, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address ground and surface waters, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address soils, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address air quality, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address the historic environment, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address landscape, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact expected. Vision does not address health and amenity, few new sites are needed, and site assessment report shows plenty that could be developed without adverse impacts	Uncertain impact as minimising waste and treating it as a resource may require a few new treatment sites and these may or may not be on previously developed land

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
To support this, 'our waste infrastructure' will comprise a network of existing, enhanced and new sustainable waste management facilities that are in the right place to contribute to the local economy, and to minimise and/or mitigate any impacts on climate change, people, transportation systems, and the built, natural, historic and water environment.	+	0	?+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?+	?
	This is the explicit aim of this element of the vision	This element of the vision makes no explicit or implied statements on self sufficiency	Does not specifically refer to tranquil areas, but their distribution is such that achieving the stated aims is likely to also protect tranquil areas.	Aim to minimise impact on people and transportation systems should imply minimising impacts of HGV traffic	Aims to provide the right facilities in the right place which should include local facilities to provide for local needs	Aim specifically refers to minimising and mitigating impacts on climate change	Aim refers to minimising impacts on the water environment, which should include floodplains and associated watercourses	Aim refers to minimising impacts on the natural environment, which should include protected sites	Aim refers to minimising impacts on the natural environment, which should include biodiversity	Aim refers to minimising impacts on the water environment, which should include ground and surface waters	Aim refers to minimising impacts on the natural environment, which should include conservation of soils	Aim refers to sustainable waste management facilities which minimise impacts on people, and the natural environment, so adverse impacts on air quality should be avoided.	Aim specifically refers to minimising impacts on the historic environment	Aim refers to minimising impacts on the built, natural, historic, and water environment, which together should afford good protection for landscape and	Explicitly aims to minimise any impacts on people, but unlikely to do anything to reduce inequalities.	Uncertain impact as this part of the vision may need a few new treatment sites and these may or may not be on previously developed land

Sustainability Objectives →	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
More specifically our waste infrastructure will:	+	+	?	?	?+	?	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?	?
Have the capacity to manage an amount of waste at least equivalent to the amount we generate. This capacity will be higher up the "waste hierarchy" so that we can minimise our reliance on and use of landfill In order to maintain this capacity, we will have used our planning powers where necessary to try to protect our waste infrastructure from constraints that may be imposed by non-waste related development in the vicinity;	Aims to deliver waste management higher up the waste hierarchy, which is fully consistent with aims of sustainable development	Explicitly supports aims to maintain the network which delivers self sufficiency	Impacts uncertain. Vision does not try to control where any new sites should go so impacts could arise but are likely to be small.	Impacts uncertain and will depend on details of location of any new sites and new waste transport	This aim should help to maintain local facilities where they exist, but may not drive greater local provision	Aim is to move treatment up the hierarchy , but overall impacts will depend on treatment technologies and transport impact of location of any new facilities	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Aim is to move treatment up the hierarchy, but overall impacts will also be influenced by location, technology and transport impact of location of any new facilities	Uncertain impact. Main emphasis is on existing sites as any new waste facilities may or may not be on previously developed land

Sustainability Objectives →	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ↓	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**
• Be located close to the main urban areas, as far as practicable, to minimise the impacts of transporting waste and recycled materials; and,	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**+**	**?**	**?+**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?**	**?**
	Aim is broadly compatible with sustainable development, though much will depend on detail of any new developments	A network of waste management facilities should help to deliver self sufficiency, though this is not an explicit aim	Aim favours sites near urban areas so should help to protect tranquil areas, though this is not explicit	Explicitly aims to reduce impacts of waste transport	Explicitly aims to develop sites close to urban areas, but also aims to minimise transport, so impacts in rural areas are unclear	Explicit aim to reduce transport impacts should help with this objective, though there may also be impacts dependent on technology and location of new facilities	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Impacts unpredictable but minimal. There is a wide choice of new sites that could be developed to deliver the Vision without adverse impacts	Aim will help to minimise one factor contributing to well-being, but other impacts are less predictable	Uncertain impacts. Aim is not specific about the type of land to be used for any new waste facilities, though choosing main urban areas could include such land

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Vision ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Meet modern design standards and, wherever practicable and environmentally acceptable, be located within buildings or enclosed structures appropriate to the technology or process, on general industrial or previously developed land..	?+	0	+	?+	?	?	?+	+	?+	?+	+	?+	?	?	?+	?+
	Good design, location choice and favouring enclosure all contribute towards sustainable development, but other factors also have an influence	Aim has no direct impact on self sufficiency	Preference for industrial and previously developed land should help to protect tranquil areas, while enclosure will minimise impacts	Preferred locations and modern design are likely to minimise any adverse impacts of HGV traffic, but local impacts could occur	This could possibly restrict the provision of local facilities, but site assessment report shows that general industrial and previously developed land is widespread in most parts of the plan area	Uncertain impacts as these will depend on treatment technologies and transport impact of any new facilities	Preferred locations for development should help to protect floodplains in most cases	Preferred locations for development should help to protect designated sites	Preferred locations for development are likely to help to protect biodiversity most of the time	Preferred locations for development are likely to help to protect ground and surface waters most of the time	Preferred locations for development are likely to help to conserve soils.	Requirement for enclosure should help to minimise impacts on air quality, though technology, location, and transport implications of new facilities will also have an impact.	Preferred locations should generally avoid adverse impacts though this may not always be the case.	Preferred locations should generally avoid adverse impacts on landscape and townscape, though this may not always be the case	Preferred locations should generally avoid adverse impacts, but much will depend on details	Aim specifically favours the use of this type of land, though not exclusively

Table 6: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Objectives

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Strategic Objectives ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Strategic Objective 1: To support new waste development that helps minimise greenhouse gas emissions and incorporates appropriate measures to mitigate and adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change by permitting facilities/infrastructure that: • Make more use of waste as a resource; • Increase diversion of waste from landfill through restricting new landfill proposals and encouraging new and enhanced waste management facilities involving treatment further up the "waste hierarchy"; • Make a contribution towards secure renewable energy supplies where recycling is not viable. And to influence the development process by encouraging resource efficiency in the demolition, construction and the use of new buildings.	+	0	?/0	?+	0	+	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?	?/0	?/0	?	?
	Increasing diversion from landfill and contributing to renewable energy both contribute towards SD.	Minimal impact. Objective does not really address self sufficiency but should not block it.	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Possible positive impacts as objective aims to minimise / mitigate climate impacts though it does not specifically address transport impacts.	Minimal impact. Objective does not really address provision of local facilities but should not block them.	Objective specifically aims to support measures which minimise greenhouse gas emissions	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Uncertain. Actual impacts will depend on details of facilities, location & transport implications	I Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Well sited modern facilities, should not cause any problems, but minor local impacts could be possible	Uncertain impacts as objective is about details of facilities rather than location

Sustainability Objectives →	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Strategic Objectives ↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Strategic Objective 2: To encourage the maintenance of the network of new or enhanced sustainable waste management facilities ('our waste infrastructure') so that we can continue to manage an amount of waste, at least equivalent to the amount we generate ('our waste'). In addition, to support the development of new waste treatment facilities so that we can reduce our reliance on and use of landfill, and conserve our mineral resources by: • Permitting waste recycling and recovery facilities in appropriate locations; • Monitoring the capacity of our waste infrastructure and comparing that data with surveys that tell us how much waste we are generating and forecasts that tell us how much waste we are likely to generate in the future; and, • Taking steps where necessary to protect/safeguard our waste infrastructure so that it is not unnecessarily constrained by non-waste related development in the vicinity.	**+** This objective explicitly aims to promote sustainable development and maximise benefits derived from processing waste	**+** This objective explicitly aims to maintain self sufficiency	**?+** Objective aims to maintain existing sites or permit additional sites in appropriate locations. Neither are likely to adversely impact on tranquil areas	**?+** Possible positive impact as objective aims to keep things as they are, or to develop new facilities in appropriate locations, which should reduce transport impacts.	**?** Uncertain impact. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, but new facilities diverting waste may impact either way	**?** Uncertain impact. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, but new facilities diverting waste may affect technology and location either way	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?/0** Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, & site assessments show there are plenty of sites that could be developed with minimal impact	**?** Uncertain impact. Maintaining existing facilities causes no change, but new facilities may or may not be on PDL

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Strategic Objectives ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Strategic Objective 3: To encourage appropriate siting and modern design standards and provide opportunities to enhance existing waste management facilities by: • Supporting new waste management facilities that, wherever practicable and environmentally acceptable, treat waste close to the main urban areas, within buildings or enclosed structures appropriate to the technology or process, and are located on general industrial or previously developed land ; and, • Supporting proposals to improve the environmental quality of existing waste management facilities when development opportunities arise.	?+	?+	?+	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	+
	Broadly supportive of the aims of SD though no explicit reference to resource efficiency	Broadly supportive as few new sites are required and objective should not reduce ability to find sufficient suitable locations to achieve self sufficiency	Broadly supportive as well sited, enclosed, modern facilities close to urban areas are less likely to adversely affect tranquillity, though transport to them still might.	Uncertain impacts as objective is concerned with the details of sites rather than their broad location or transport impacts	Mixed impact as preference for urban areas should help minimise distances travelled for most waste, but may not benefit some rural areas	Possible positive impact as urban locations and enclosed facilities should reduce emissions, yet some impacts will depend on technology	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, should avoid adverse impact on floodplains	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, close to urban areas, should avoid adverse impact on designated sites	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, near urban areas, should avoid adverse impact on biodiversity	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land near urban areas, should avoid adverse impact on ground and surface waters	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, near urban areas, should avoid adverse impact on BMV soils	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, near urban areas, should avoid adverse impact on air quality	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, should avoid adverse impact on the historic environment	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, should avoid adverse impact on landscape and townscape	Possible positive impact Appropriate siting and preference for general industrial / previously developed land, should avoid adverse impacts but may not be enough to reduce inequalities.	Clear positive outcome. Objective explicitly favours use of PDL where practicable and environmentally acceptable

Sustainability Objectives ➔	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Strategic Objectives ➔	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Strategic Objective 4: To support job creation, economic growth and investment in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent by providing sufficient opportunities to develop new waste management infrastructure of the right type, in the right place and at the right time, and by minimising and mitigating any adverse impacts and avoiding any unacceptable impacts paying particular attention to assessing the suitability of sites in terms of: • The physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and allocated neighbouring land uses; • The cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential; and • The capacity of the transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and recovered materials, seeking when practicable, environmentally acceptable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.	+	?+	?+	+	?+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?
	Objective clearly addresses key aims of SD	Broadly addressed in aim for right facilities in the right place at the right time	Broadly supportive. Objective refers to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts, but no direct reference to tranquility	Objective makes specific reference to considering impacts on transport infrastructure and also on well being (effects of HGVs on people)	Broadly addressed in aim for right facilities in the right place at the right time	Uncertain impacts, will depend on technology and location of new facilities as objective does not specifically aim to reduce greenhouse gasses.	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering environmental constraints and cumulative impacts	Objective makes specific reference to considering impacts on health and well-being, including cumulative impacts	Uncertain impact as there is no particular preference expressed for previously developed land.

9 Appendix B: Full list of Draft Policy Options and their Sustainability Appraisal at the "Emerging Options" stage

Draft Policy 1: Targets and Broad Locations of waste management facilities

To address the targets and broad locations for waste management facilities, the following options have been considered:

- Seek new waste management sites only in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 (Major Urban Areas - Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme; Settlements of Significant Development - Stafford and Burton-upon-Trent; and Other Large Settlements - Cannock, Lichfield, Rugeley and Tamworth). [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]
- Make specific allocations for new waste management sites only in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3.
- Seek new waste management sites in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 and in the vicinity of Other Significant Settlements (Burntwood, Kidsgrove, Cheslyn Hay & Great Wyrley, Biddulph, Leek, Stone, Uttoxeter, Wombourne, Cheadle, Codsall & Bilbrook, Perton, Penkridge, Kinver).
- Make specific allocations for new waste management sites in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 and in the vicinity of other significant settlements.

Draft Policy 2: Criteria for the locations of new enclosed waste management facilities

To minimise potential adverse impacts on people, transportation systems and the environment by encouraging enclosed waste management facilities, the following options have been considered:

- Rely on PPS10, draft RS Policy 5, and other national/regional guidance to determine appropriateness of location. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]
- Adopt broad locational criteria for identifying sites suitable for new enclosed waste facilities
- Provide a prescriptive list of waste technologies together with appropriate types of location.

Draft Policy 3: Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities

To address the need for open air waste facilities, the following options have been considered:

- No need for the Policy and rely on national and regional policy and guidance to control development of open air facilities.
- Policy restricting development of new open air waste management sites to a small range of specific uses where alternatives are not readily available.
- Policy to consider existing landfill sites as opportunities for other open air waste processes.
- Additional restriction that open air composting facilities should be subject to a specified stand off from sensitive receptors.

Draft Policy 4: Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources

To address the issue of maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources, the following options have been considered:

- "Do Nothing" option, in this case relying on current policy at national and regional level.
- Deliver new waste management facilities through moving waste up the "waste hierarchy". Also promote decentralised heat and energy networks. Restrict new sites for landfill and landraise by supporting proposals for waste recycling, organic treatment, energy recovery.
- Proposals for new waste management facilities will be permitted where waste is viewed as a fuel resource rather than a recycling resource.
- Proposals only for small scale waste incineration will be permitted where the proposed development includes energy recovery

Draft Policy 5: Management of construction, demolition and excavation waste

To address the need to sustainably manage construction, demolition & excavation wastes, the following options have been considered:

- No need to plan for additional sites as there are a number of permitted recycling sites and construction & demolition wastes are often managed through the use of mobile plant and equipment in close proximity to the source of waste generation;
- Prioritise the development of new facilities for recycling construction, demolition & excavation waste close to areas of large development (North Staffordshire conurbation and large settlements, see draft policy 1) where they can obtain a reliable supply of feedstock and good access to the market without adversely affecting the community and environment.
- Prioritise recycling of CD&E waste on-site and the diversion of inert fill to quarries with existing restoration schemes, rather than new landfill.

Draft Policy 6: Waste awareness and waste minimisation

In consideration of national and regional policy together with the aims of the vision the following options were considered:

- No plan option, i.e. rely on national guidance and legislation and District Local Development Framework policies on waste awareness and waste minimisation which we have had an input to during consultation
- All new and enhanced waste management facilities and major developments (as defined by the General Permitted Development Order) should address waste as a resource; minimise waste as far as possible; be designed to a high standard (no need for compliance with requirements of West Midlands sustainability checklist - refer to www.checklistwestmidlands.co.uk).
- As for option 2, but with added reinforcement of checklists and design requirements for new waste management facilities.

Draft Policy 7: Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities

To address the need to safeguard existing sites, the following options have been considered:

- Do not have a policy as the existing waste sites are already protected by PPS10 and draft Regional Policy W4.
- Enhance protection for existing sites using broad criteria.
- Safeguard all existing waste facilities from non-waste related developments.
- Safeguard only Four Ashes and Hanford sites and all landfill sites.

Draft Policy 8: Enhancement of existing waste management facilities

To address the expansion and improvement of environmental quality of existing waste management facilities, the following options have been considered:

- Rely on national/regional legislation and guidance.
- Actively encourage enhancement of existing waste facilities by setting criteria for improvement of existing facilities.
- Where improvements or expansion of existing facilities are sought, the whole site must be brought up to the standards required for new waste facilities.

Draft Policy 9: High Quality Design

To address the issues included in the proposed policy the following options have been considered:

- Not to include a policy relating to the issues of design including the mitigation of climate change but to refer to these issues where appropriate to the consideration of locating enclosed and open air facilities (refer to draft policies 2 & 3)
- To include a locally distinctive policy to assist in managing new waste development and to encourage greater focus on the delivery of high quality design that also principally addresses the need to mitigate impacts associated with climate change.

Table 7: Summary of Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Policy Options

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy Options ↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 1: Targets and broad locations of waste management facilities																
Option 1: Seek new waste management sites only in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 (Major Urban Areas - Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme; Settlements of Significant Development - Stafford and Burton-upon-Trent; and Other Large Settlements - Cannock, Lichfield, Rugeley and Tamworth). [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	0	?	?	?	?-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Option 2: Make specific allocations for new waste management sites only in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3.	0	?	?+	?+	?-	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy Options ↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 3: Seek new waste management sites in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 and in the vicinity of Other Significant Settlements (Burntwood, Kidsgrove, Cheslyn Hay & Great Wyrley, Biddulph, Leek, Stone, Uttoxeter, Wombourne, Cheadle, Codsall & Bilbrook, Perton, Penkridge, Kinver). **Possible Preferred Option when considered with other policies**	0	+	?	?+	+	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Option 4: Make specific allocations for new waste management sites in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 and in the vicinity of other significant settlements. **Preferred Option**	0	+	?+	?+	+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?

Comments

Options 1 and 2, which restrict development to areas identified in the RSS, may make it difficult to provide local facilities for all, and for some communities to be self sufficient in waste management. This, in turn, may lead to increased transport related impacts. As a result, the options perform less well against SA Objective 5, and possibly 2 and 6.

Options 1 and 3 lead to a high degree of uncertainty over potential impacts as they only define locations for development in general terms. By contrast, Options 2 and 4 anticipate specific sites, which can be assumed to be selected through a SA process in order to minimise adverse impacts.

On the basis of the assessment alone**,** Option 4 would appear to be the most sustainable option, but Option 3 could yield as good an outcome if backed by other policies on site selection**,** such as those put forward in Draft Policies 2 and 3. This combined approach may also provide greater flexibility should planning applications be received to waste facilities in good locations which were not identified at the time of making this plan.

Overall, Options 3 and 4 could each be considered to represent the most sustainable option.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 2: Criteria for the locations of new enclosed waste management facilities																
Option 1: Rely on PPS10, draft RS Policy 5, and other national/regional guidance to determine appropriateness of location. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	+	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
Option 2: Adopt broad locational criteria for identifying sites suitable for new enclosed waste facilities **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
Option 3: Provide a prescriptive list of waste technologies together with appropriate types of location.	+	?	?+	?-	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
Comments All options are broadly supportive of most of the SA Objectives, with the key differences occurring in the first six. The performance of Option 1 against objectives 2 to 5 is more uncertain than the other two options, but this is partly because it is the "Do Nothing" option that relies on a wide range of existing guidance rather than specific statements on the topics. Option 2 is able to offer more confidence of a positive outcome because the broad locational criteria add detail and weight to the existing guidance on suitability of sites. Option 3 risks uncertain or even negative impacts for SA Objectives 2, 4 and 5, largely as a result of being very prescriptive, and therefore likely to compromise the ability to deliver local facilities. **On balance, Option 2 represents the most sustainable option.**																

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 3: Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities																
Option 1: No need for the Policy and rely on national and regional policy and guidance to control development of open air facilities. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	+	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
Option 2: Policy restricting development of new open air waste management sites to a small range of specific uses where alternatives are not readily available. **Preferred Option**	+	?	?	?+	?	?-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?
Option 3: Policy to consider existing landfill sites as opportunities for other open air waste processes.	+	?+	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	+
Option 4: Additional restriction that open air composting facilities should be subject to a specified stand off from sensitive receptors.	+	?	?-	?-	?	?-	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?	?	+	?

Comments

Relying on national and other pre-existing guidance, as in Policy Options 1, gives a reasonable outcome, with the main area for improvement being the uncertainty of the performance against SA Objectives 2 to 6. Option 3 favours co-location on landfill sites which will already have demonstrated acceptably small impacts, so it should give an additional level of protection in some areas, and it performs well against SA Objective 16 as landfill sites can be seen as previously developed. Option 2, however, performs substantially better against 9 of the SA Objectives due to its explicit aims of avoiding adverse environmental impacts, and should deliver positive outcomes in those areas. Option 4 contains an additional restriction that could be added to options 2 or 3. Whilst it performs well against SA Objective 15, it performs poorly against many other criteria because the challenge of locating open-air composting sites at least 500m from sensitive receptors is likely to force compromises over the impact on other assets.

Option 2 clearly represents the most sustainable option, and the addition of Option 4 appears to have no extra benefits to offer.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 4: Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources																
Option 1 "Do Nothing " option, in this case relying on current policy at national and regional level.	+	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
Option 2 Deliver new waste management facilities through moving waste up the "waste hierarchy". Also promote decentralised heat and energy networks. Restrict new sites for landfill and landraise by supporting proposals for waste recycling, organic treatment, energy recovery. **Preferred Option**	+	?	?	?+	?+	?+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?
Option 3 Proposals for new waste management facilities will be permitted where waste is viewed as a fuel resource rather than a recycling resource.	+	?	?	?	?	?-	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Option 4 Proposals only for small scale waste incineration will be permitted where the proposed development includes energy recovery	?+	?	?	?	?	?-	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?

Comments

There is not much to separate Options 1 (Do Nothing), 3 and 4. This is hardly surprising as the policy options do not attempt to address the subjects of the SA Objectives, so any protection offered to them springs from notional legislation/guidance. The one obvious difference is that Options 3 and 4 were judged to have the potential to have a negative impact on SA Objective 5. This stems from their strong support for the use of waste as a fuel resource for energy generation, which brings the potential for increased greenhouse gas emissions. These, however, must be set against the emissions that would have occurred if other waste disposal routes were used, and any emissions displaced by power generated.

Option 2 manages to achieve a good performance against SA Objectives 7-15 as a result of the inclusion of specific phrases to ensure that no adverse impacts on these SA Objectives

Option 2 represents the most sustainable policy option. Option 4 or even Option 3 could perform as well in practice, but this would depend on the details of the specific projects involved.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 5: Management of construction, demolition and excavation waste																
Option 1 No need to plan for additional sites as there are a number of permitted recycling sites and construction & demolition wastes are often managed through the use of mobile plant and equipment in close proximity to the source of waste generation; [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	?+	?	?+	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	+
Option 2 Prioritise the development of new facilities for recycling construction, demolition & excavation waste close to areas of large development (North Staffordshire conurbation and large settlements, see draft policy 1) where they can obtain a reliable supply of feedstock and good access to the market without adversely affecting the community and environment. **Preferred Option**	+	+	?+	?	+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
Option 3 Prioritise recycling of CD&E waste on-site and the diversion of inert fill to quarries with existing restoration schemes, rather than new landfill.	+	?+	?+	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?-	?+	?+	?-	+

Comments

Option 11, depending on rolling forward the current pattern of recycling for C, D & E waste, may have a reasonably positive impact on 11 of the SA Objectives as national legislation / guidance offers some protection and the existing recycling sites and future demolition sites are not very likely to be in particularly sensitive areas. Option 3 gives a stronger push to recycling, so performs better against SA Objective 1, but raises the concern that recycling inert materials on site may have a negative impact on air quality and general amenity within the immediate vicinity, although this could be avoided by applying appropriate conditions to any such operation. Option 2 performs better against SA Objectives 2 and 5 because it offers more certainty of providing new facilities in the areas where they are needed. The option does not explicitly favour the use of previously developed land, but it does perform acceptably well against the other SA Objectives.

Option 2 represents the most sustainable option.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 6: Waste awareness and waste minimisation																
Option 1 No plan option, i.e. rely on national guidance and legislation and District Local Development Framework policies on waste awareness and waste minimisation which we have had an input to during consultation	?+	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
Option 2 All new and enhanced waste management facilities and major developments (as defined by the General Permitted Development Order) should address waste as a resource; minimise waste as far as possible; be designed to a high standard (no need for compliance with requirements of West Midlands sustainability checklist - refer to www.checklistwestmidlands.co.uk). **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
Option 3 As for option 2, but with added reinforcement of checklists and design requirements for new waste management facilities. **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?+	+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?

Comment

There is very little to separate these options, with all having the potential to have positive impacts on SA Objectives 6-15, though this reflects the impacts of national legislation and guidance rather than anything specific to the options themselves. There is some uncertainty over the impacts of Option 1 on SA Objectives 2-5, largely because it relies on guidance and policy at other levels. Options 2 and 3 contain more specific commitment, so they impacts can be expected to be more predictable, and in this case, positive. Option 3 achieves one more clear positive outcomes than Option 2, as a result of the use of checklists. As a result, Option 3 may offer greater certainty of outcome in the short term, yet Option 2 may prove preferable in the longer term as it allows for flexibility for interpretation of the policy to evolve over time to meet current needs.

Options 2 and 3 could each be considered to represent the most sustainable option. There is little to separate any of the options, and each could be adjusted to perform just as well.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 7: Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities																
Option 1 Do not have a policy as the existing waste sites are already protected by PPS10 & draft Regional Policy W4. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	?	?+	?	0	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0
Option 2 Enhance protection for existing sites using broad criteria. **Preferred Option**	?	?+	?+	0	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0
Option 3 Safeguard all existing waste facilities from non-waste related developments.	?	?+	?	0	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0
Option 4 Safeguard only Four Ashes and Hanford sites and all landfill sites. **Preferred Option**	?	+	?+	0	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0

Comments

All of these policy options address the issue of protecting existing waste management sites from the potential impacts of other development nearby. The overall effects of the selected policy will fall into two distinct areas – the impact on the range of sites that continue to operate, and the impact of any new sites that will have to be developed if existing ones are lost. The second area is too complex to predict in a meaningful way at this stage, so we have concentrated the assessment on the first area.

The 4 options fall into 2 distinct pairs. Options 1 and 3 attempt to protect all existing waste facilities from the impact of other development either by the use of existing legislation (Option 1), or by specific new policies (Option 3). Both are predicted to have uncertain impacts on many of the SA Objectives, largely because they protect all waste sites without an attempt to assess their performance or suitability. Most should be perfectly acceptable by modern standards, but some may not be.

Options 2 and 4 are more selective in the protection they offer, limiting it to site that meet selection criteria (Option 2), or to those deemed to be most important to the aims of the overall plan (Option 4). These restrictions lead to amore positive assessment against the majority of the SA Objectives. Option 4 performs slightly better than Option 2 because it has been designed to maintain self sufficiency, but Option 2 may perform just as well in practice

Options 2 and 4 can both be considered to represent more sustainable policies, but it would be hard to distinguish between them.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 8: Enhancement of existing waste management facilities																
Option 1 Rely on national/regional legislation and guidance. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	?	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0
Option 2 Actively encourage enhancement of existing waste facilities by setting criteria for improvement of existing facilities. **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0
Option 3 Where improvements or expansion of existing facilities are sought, the whole site must be brought up to the standards required for new waste facilities.	?+	?+	?	?	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0

Comments

Option 1 has a high level of uncertainty over its impacts as general guidance will tend to favour improvements in technology etc, but these might be accompanied by increases in capacity which might, in turn, lead to an overall rise in impacts. Options 2 and 3 include wording that would avoid this occurring, so they score more positively against SA Objectives 7-15. They also both explicitly support SA Objective 1. The only concern is that Option 3, by requiring whole sites to be brought up to current standards if any part is upgraded, could sometimes act as a barrier to improvement.

Option 2 represents the most sustainable option, but Option 3 could also perform very well.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Draft Policy 9: High Quality Design																
Option 1 Not to include a policy relating to the issues of design including the mitigation of climate change but to refer to these issues where appropriate to the consideration of locating enclosed and open air facilities (refer to draft policies 2 & 3)	0	0	?	?	0	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	0
Option 2 To include a locally distinctive policy to assist in managing new waste development and to encourage greater focus on the delivery of high quality design that also principally addresses the need to mitigate impacts associated with climate change.	0	0	?+	?+	0	+	?+	+	+	+	?+	+	+	+	+	0

Comments

The Draft Policy deals with details of the design of facilities, rather than their function or location, so it has been judged to be unlikely to have any significant impact on SA Objectives 1, 2, 5 & 15. Option 1, relying on other policies in this strategy, as well as national legislation / guidance, leads to uncertain impacts against SA Objectives 3, 4, and 6, and possible positive impacts on the other SA Objectives. The adoption of locally distinctive policies on the design of new waste facilities, as in Option 2, however, increases the likelihood of positive impacts across almost all of the SA Objectives.
Option 2 is the preferred option, though it is acknowledged that, under certain circumstances, Option 1 might actually perform just as well.

Table 8: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Policy Options

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 1: Targets and broad locations of waste management facilities																
Option 1: Seek new waste management sites only in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 (Major Urban Areas - Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme; Settlements of Significant Development - Stafford and Burton-upon-Trent; and Other Large Settlements - Cannock, Lichfield, Rugeley and Tamworth). **[Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]**	**0** Option is concerned with location of sites not what they do, so it is unlikely to impact on this objective (see full text in Figure 2)	**?** Mixed impact. Locations constrained to a few specific sites, so self sufficiency may only be achieved at the county scale	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on tranquil areas, but proposed locations tend to avoid these	**?** Uncertain impact. Policy option may go some way to reducing transport distances overall, and details aim to minimise adverse impacts, but choice of sites is limited.	**?-** Locations constrained to a few specific sites so may not be possible to establish local facilities for all	**?** Policy option may go some way to reducing transport emissions but constrained locations may act against this	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on flood plains	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on ecology and geology, beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on biodiversity beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on ground and surface waters beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on soils beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on air quality beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on the historic environment beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on landscape and townscape beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted only addresses impact on health and amenity in general intention to minimise adverse impacts	**?** Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 1: Targets and broad locations of waste management facilities																
Option 2: Make specific allocations for new waste management sites only in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3.	**0** Option is concerned with location of sites not what they do, so it is unlikely to impact on this objective (see full text in Figure 2)	**?** Mixed impact. Locations constrained to a few specific sites, so self sufficiency may only be achieved at the county scale	**?+** Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on tranquil areas, but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option option and details aim to minimise adverse impacts, and potential sites will have been through SA so positive outcomes may arise	**?-** Locations constrained to a few specific sites so may not be possible to establish local facilities for all	**?+** Policy option may go some way to reducing transport emissions but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option does not attempt to address impact on flood plains but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on ecology and geology but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on biodiversity, but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on ground and surface waters but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on soils but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on air quality but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on the historic environment but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on landscape and townscape but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not addresses impact on health and amenity but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?** Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 1: Targets and broad locations of waste management facilities																
Option 3: Seek new waste management sites in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 and in the vicinity of Other Significant Settlements (Burntwood, Kidsgrove, Cheslyn Hay & Great Wyrley, Biddulph, Leek, Stone, Uttoxeter, Wombourne, Cheadle, Codsall & Bilbrook, Perton, Penkridge, Kinver). **Possible Preferred Option when considered with other policies**	**0** Option is concerned with location of sites not what they do, so it is unlikely to impact on this objective (see full text in Figure 2)	**+** Location criteria should be flexible enough to allow facilities to be developed to enable a wide range of communities to achieve self sufficiency	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on tranquil areas, but proposed locations tend to avoid these	**?+** Wider choice of sites in this policy option, & aim to minimise adverse impacts should help to reduce transport distances overall.	**+** Location criteria flexible enough to allow facilities to be developed to serve wide range of communities	**?+** Wider choice of sites in this policy option, & aim to minimise adverse impacts should help to reduce transport related emissions	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on flood plains	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on ecology and geology, beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on biodiversity beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on ground and surface waters beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on soils beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on air quality beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on the historic environment beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on landscape and townscape beyond general intention to minimise impacts on environment	**?** Uncertain impact. Option as drafted only addresses impact on health and amenity in general intention to minimise adverse impacts	**?** Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 1: Targets and broad locations of waste management facilities																
Option 4: Make specific allocations for new waste management sites in or close to areas identified in draft Regional Strategy Policy W3 and in the vicinity of other significant settlements. **Preferred Option**	**0** Option is concerned with location of sites not what they do, so it is unlikely to impact on this objective (see full text in Figure 2)	**+** Location criteria should be flexible enough to allow facilities to be developed to enable a wide range of communities to achieve self sufficiency	**?+** Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on tranquil areas, but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Wider choice of sites in this policy option, & aim to minimise adverse impacts should help to reduce transport distances overall. Potential sites will have been through SA with this as a factor in their choice	**+** Location criteria flexible enough to allow facilities to be developed to serve wide range of communities	**?+** Wider choice of sites in this policy option, & aim to minimise adverse impacts should help to reduce transport related emission. Potential sites will have been through SA with this as a factor in their choice	**?+** Option does not attempt to address impact on flood plains but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not attempt to address impact on ecology and geology but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on biodiversity, but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on ground and surface waters but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on soils but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on air quality but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on the historic environment but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not specifically address impact on landscape and townscape but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?+** Option as drafted does not addresses impact on health and amenity but potential sites will have been through SA and this will have been a factor in their choice	**?** Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 2: Criteria for the locations of new enclosed waste management facilities																
Option 1: Rely on PPS10, draft RS Policy 5, and other national/regional guidance to determine appropriateness of location. **[Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]**	+	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
	PPS10 states achievement of SD in the terms of this SA Objective as a key planning objective	Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but this may not alone be enough to bring sites forward where needed to achieve it.	Uncertain impact as PPS10 provides protection for several related factors such as Green Belt, but this is not total and does not address tranquillity	Policy option relies on broad consideration of suitability of the road network, so impacts are hard to predict	Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but this may not alone be enough to bring sites forward where needed to achieve it.	Uncertain Impact. Policies aims to minimise emissions but individual sites may still lead to an increase	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for designated sites"	Legislation and guidance should afford due consideration to biodiversity issues beyond designated sites	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for water resources	Specific guidance in Planning Policy Statements should afford consideration for soils, especially the best and most versatile.	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for air quality	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for the historic environment and built heritage	Specific guidance in PPS10 addresses visual intrusion, which should affords some protection against impacts on landscape and townscape	Uncertain impact. PPS10 aims to avoid endangering health, but amenity and well-being rely on more general protection	Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 2: Criteria for the locations of new enclosed waste management facilities																
Option 2: Adopt broad locational criteria for identifying sites suitable for new enclosed waste facilities **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
	Option as drafted is concerned with location of sites not what they do, so it will have minimal impact. PPS 10, however, will still apply as in Option 1 above	Option adds to provisions of PPS10 with flexibility to allow local facilities to develop at a range of suitable local sites, so should give some support to this objective.	Uncertain impact. Policy option does not attempt to address impact on tranquil areas beyond general aim to be compatible with nearby uses	Policy should ensure that sites are not harmful to transportation systems or the environment, so this should reduce impact of HGV traffic	Policy adds to provisions of PPS10 with flexibility to allow local facilities to develop at a range of suitable local sites, so should give some support to this objective	Uncertain Impact. Policies aims to minimise emissions but individual sites may still lead to an increase	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option favours general industrial or previously developed land so should help to conserve soils	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option relies on broad aim not to harm the environment. National guidance should afford protection	Option requires development to be compatible with nearby uses. Together with legislation above this should minimise adverse impacts	Uncertain outcome. Option specifically refers to PDL as being a desired location, but also favours general industrial land and existing waste management sites

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 2: Criteria for the locations of new enclosed waste management facilities																
Option 3: Provide a prescriptive list of waste technologies together with appropriate types of location.	**+** Impact of policy as drafted is unclear as details of technologies and sites are not complete at this stage, **however**, PPS 10 will still apply as in Option 1 above	**?** Uncertain impact, dependent on detail. Option is very prescriptive so may constrain attempts to achieve self sufficiency	**?+** Prescriptive list of locations should be based on site assessment using SA criteria, so should exclude options that may be more tranquil	**?-** Option is very prescriptive in locations so may not be able to minimise transport implications of a full strategy.	**?** Uncertain impact, dependent on detail. Option is very prescriptive so may constrain attempts to achieve self sufficiency	**?** Option will tend to favour development further up the hierarchy, but very prescriptive in locations so not be able to minimise transport emissions	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, option will general industrial or previously developed land so should help to conserve soils, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** At minimum, national guidance and broad aim not to harm the environment. should afford protection, but detailed Option may go further	**?+** Broad aim for development to be compatible with nearby uses should achieve some benefits, but detailed Option may go further	**?** Uncertain outcome, Option specifically refers to PDL as being a desired location, but also favours general industrial land and existing waste management sites

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 3: Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities																
Option 1: No need for the Policy and rely on national and regional policy and guidance to control development of open air facilities. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	+	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
	PPS10 states achievement of SD in the terms of this SA Objective as a key planning objective	Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but this alone may not be enough to bring sites forward where needed to achieve it.	Uncertain impact as PPS10 provides protection for several related factors, but this is not total and does not directly address tranquillity	Policy option relies on broad consideration of suitability of the road network, so impacts are hard to predict	Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but this may not alone be enough to provide local sites for all.	Uncertain Impact. Policies aims to minimise emissions but individual sites may still lead to an increase	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for designated sites"	Legislation and guidance should afford due consideration to biodiversity issues beyond designated sites	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for water resources	Specific guidance in Planning Policy Statements should afford consideration for soils, especially the best and most versatile.	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for air quality	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for the historic environment and built heritage	Specific guidance in PPS10 addresses visual intrusion, which should affords some protection against impacts on landscape and townscape	Uncertain impact. PPS10 aims to avoid endangering health, but amenity and well-being rely on more general protection	Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 3: Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities																
Option 2: Policy restricting development of new open air waste management sites to a small range of specific uses where alternatives are not readily available. **Preferred Option**	+	?	?	?+	?	?-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?
	Option as drafted is concerned with whether sites are enclosed not what they do, so it will have minimal impact. PPS 10, however, will still apply as in Option 1 above	Uncertain impact. Option will affect whether a type of site in a specific location may be open-air, so it will have minimal impact on self sufficiency. PPS10 supports the aim, but may not be able to drive it.	Uncertain impacts. Option & national guidance offer protection for related factors, yet suitable locations may well be in tranquil areas, though careful development should mitigate these.	Option specifically guards against unacceptable impacts on transportation systems or people, so adverse impacts should be avoided	Uncertain impact. Option will only affect whether a site may be open-air, so it will have minimal impact on the availability of local sites. PPS10 supports the aim, but may not be able to drive it.	Potential adverse impacts from open air composting and transport out to suitable locations Option specifically guards against unacceptable transportation impacts systems or people, so adverse impacts should be avoided	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on people or the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Uncertain impacts as, despite general guidance, other locational considerations are likely to take precidence

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 3: Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities																
Option 3: Policy to consider existing landfill sites as opportunities for other open air waste processes.	+	?+	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	+
	Co-located waste facilities should serve to divert waste towards more sustainable options, and PPS 10 will still apply as in Option 1 above	Option has the potential to make extra sites available, so this may sometimes help with self sufficiency.	Uncertain impacts. Existing landfills are unlikely to be in areas considered to be tranquil	Uncertain impact, dependent on the location of landfill sites that are developed.	Uncertain impact. Option has the potential to make extra sites available, so these may not be in the right place to provide local facilities	Uncertain impacts as co-located facilities may well produce less greenhouse gasses than landfill, but transport emissions are harder to predict.	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts, and specific guidance in PPS10 should afford further protection	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts, and specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for designated sites"	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts, and legislation and guidance should afford due consideration to biodiversity issues beyond designated sites	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts, and legislation and specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for water resources	Existing landfill sites should already be located where adverse impacts will not arise	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts and additional legislation should further protect air quality	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts and specific guidance gives further protection to the historic environment	Existing landfill sites should already have minimal adverse impacts and additional guidance gives further protection to landscape and townscape	Existing landfill sites should already be located where adverse impacts will not arise and additional guidance strengthens the protection against adverse impacts	Policy favours use of landfill sites which are previously developed

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 3: Criteria for the location of open-air waste management facilities																
Option 4: Additional restriction that open air composting facilities should be subject to a specified stand off from sensitive receptors.	+	?	?-	?-	?	?-	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?	?	+	?
	Option as drafted is concerned with location restrictions not what sites do, so it will have minimal impact. PPS 10, however, will still apply as in Option 1 above	Option severely restricts location of certain new sites and so, depending on need, may constrain ability to achieve self sufficiency	Pressure to maintain 500m buffer round new sites may move development further into more tranquil areas	Pressure to maintain 500m buffer may increase transport distances and risks increasing impacts of HGV traffic	Option severely restricts location of certain new sites and so, depending on need, may constrain ability to provide local sites	Pressure to maintain 500m buffer round sites may increase transport distances and risks increasing greenhouse gas emissions	Specific guidance should afford good protection for flood plain, despite pressures to compromise to maintain 500m buffers.	Specific guidance should afford good protection for designated sites despite pressure to compromise for 500m buffer"	Uncertain impact. Legislation and guidance offer consideration for biodiversity issues beyond designated sites but pressure for 500m buffer could force compromises.	Specific guidance should afford consideration for water resources despite pressures to compromise to maintain 500m buffers	Specific guidance should afford good protection for designated sites despite pressure to compromise for 500m buffer"	Possible positive impact as 500m buffer is designed to ensure that any potentially harmful emissions are dispersed before they reach sensitive receptors	Uncertain impact. National guidance should afford some protection but pressure for 500m buffer could force compromises on historic environment	Uncertain impact. National guidance should afford some protection but pressure to find sites 500m from housing could force compromises on landscape	Option has been drafted to give greater consideration to this SA Objective than is required by National guidance	Uncertain impacts as, despite general guidance favouring use of PDL, it will be harder to find sites more than 500m from sensitive receptors

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 4: Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources																
Option 1 "Do Nothing " option, in this case relying on current policy at national and regional level.	+	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
	PPS10 states achievement of SD in the terms of this SA Objective as a key planning objective	Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but this may not alone be enough to bring sites forward where needed to achieve it.	Uncertain impact as PPS10 provides protection for several related factors such as Green Belt, but this is not total and does not address tranquillity	Policy option relies on broad consideration of suitability of the road network, so impacts are hard to predict	Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but this may not alone be enough to bring sites forward where needed to achieve it.	Uncertain Impact. Policies aims to minimise emissions but individual sites may still lead to an increase	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for designated sites"	Legislation and guidance should afford due consideration to biodiversity issues beyond designated sites	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for water resources	Specific guidance in Planning Policy Statements should afford consideration for soils, especially the best and most versatile.	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for air quality	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for the historic environment and built heritage	Specific guidance in PPS10 addresses visual intrusion, which should affords some protection against impacts on landscape and townscape	Uncertain impact. PPS10 aims to avoid endangering health, but amenity and well-being rely on more general protection	Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 4: Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources																
Option 2 Deliver new waste management facilities through moving waste up the "waste hierarchy". Also promote decentralised heat and energy networks. Restrict new sites for landfill and landraise by supporting proposals for waste recycling, organic treatment, energy recovery. **Preferred Option**	+	?	?	?+	?+	?+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?
	Option has been prepared with specific intention of meeting this SA objective	Option focuses on the treatment of the waste rather than the location of the treatment, so outcomes are uncertain	Uncertain impacts, dependant on sites selected, though general protection of related issues should minimise risk of adverse impacts.	Possible positive impact. Option am to minimise transport emissions and impacts on community though no specific reference to traffic	Possible positive impact. Option aims to minimise transport emissions, though not to specifically to create local facilities.	Possible positive impact. Hierarchy may minimise process emissions, and transport impacts should be reduced.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Option does not allow any adverse impacts on people or the environment so positive outcomes should be assured.	Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 4: Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources																
Option 3 Proposals for new waste management facilities will be permitted where waste is viewed as a fuel resource rather than a recycling resource.	+	?	?	?	?	?-	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?
	This option has also been prepared to meet this SA objective	Option focuses on the treatment of the waste rather than the location of the treatment, so outcomes are uncertain	Uncertain impacts, dependant on sites selected, though general protection of related issues should minimise risk of adverse impacts.	Uncertain impact. Dependant on sites selected and scale of plant built	Option focuses on the treatment of the waste rather than the location of the treatment, so outcomes are uncertain	Boost for incineration is likely to lead to a rise in greenhouse gas emissions, though this can be offset against energy recovered	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for designated sites"	Legislation and guidance should afford due consideration to biodiversity issues beyond designated sites	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for water resources	Specific guidance in Planning Policy Statements should afford consideration for soils, especially the best and most versatile.	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for air quality	Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for the historic environment and built heritage	Specific guidance in PPS10 addresses visual intrusion, which should affords some protection against impacts on landscape and townscape	Uncertain impact. PPS10 aims to avoid endangering health, but amenity and well-being rely on more general protection	Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 4: Maximising waste reuse, recycling and recovery of resources																
Option 4 Proposals only for small scale waste incineration will be permitted where the proposed development includes energy recovery	?+ Option supports objective for small scale plant. Unclear about intentions at larger scale.	? Option focuses on the treatment of the waste rather than the location of the treatment, so outcomes are uncertain	? Uncertain impacts, dependant on sites selected, though general protection of related issues should minimise risk of adverse impacts.	? Uncertain impact as we do not know scale or location of sites, or of other treatment services needed	? Uncertain impact. Small scale facilities could be ideal as local services, but option may not deliver full coverage	?- Boost for incineration is likely to lead to a rise in greenhouse gas emissions, though this can be offset against energy recovered	?+ Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration	?+ Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for designated sites"	?+ Legislation and guidance should afford due consideration to biodiversity issues beyond designated sites	?+ Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for water resources	?+ Specific guidance in Planning Policy Statements should afford consideration for soils, especially the best and most versatile.	?+ Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for air quality	?+ Specific guidance in PPS10 should afford consideration for the historic environment and built heritage	?+ Specific guidance in PPS10 addresses visual intrusion, which should affords some protection against impacts on landscape and townscape	? Uncertain impact. PPS10 aims to avoid endangering health, but amenity and well-being rely on more general protection	? Uncertain outcome. General policy background states clear preference for general industrial land as well as PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 5: Management of construction, demolition and excavation waste																
Option 1 No need to plan for additional sites as there are a number of permitted recycling sites and construction & demolition wastes are often managed through the use of mobile plant and equipment in close proximity to the source of waste generation; [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	**?+** Broadly consistent with this objective, but this option may not do enough to ensure clear positive impact.	**?** Uncertain impact. Option assumes that we are already almost self sufficient. If we are not, it will do little to direct us that way.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within areas defined as being more tranquil	**?** Uncertain impact. On-site recycling should reduce traffic where it is possible, but waste that must be taken off site may travel further if no new sites are provided	**?** Uncertain impact. On-site recycling effectively brings local facilities some of the time, but option does nothing to provide local facilities for waste moved off site	**?** Uncertain impact. On-site recycling should reduce transport emissions, but they may increase where this is not always be possible.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**?+** Possible positive impacts as existing treatment sites and demolition sites are unlikely to be within sensitive areas.	**+** Clear support. Both existing sites and redevelopment sites are effectively previously developed

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 5: Management of construction, demolition and excavation waste																
Option 2 Prioritise the development of new facilities for recycling construction, demolition & excavation waste close to areas of large development (North Staffordshire conurbation and large settlements, see draft policy 1) where they can obtain a reliable supply of feedstock and good access to the market without adversely affecting the community and environment. **Preferred Option**	**+** Option offers more proactive approach to the issue so should give clear support for this objective	**+** Option actively steers development to areas of greatest need, so should lead to greater self sufficiency	**?+** Option favours proximity to built-up areas, and aims to minimise impact on the environment	**?** Uncertain impact as option should reduce transport distances but may increase impacts in immediate vicinity of sites	**+** Option specifically attempt to locate facilities close to areas of greatest need	**?+** Option should reduce transport emissions in most cases, as well as process emissions compared to extracting new materials.	**?+** Option aims to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Broad aim to minimise any impact on people or the environment should offer some protection National guidance will apply and avoid adverse impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Explicit statement favours either previously developed or general industrial land

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 5: Management of construction, demolition and excavation waste																
Option 3 Prioritise recycling of CD&E waste on-site and the diversion of inert fill to quarries with existing restoration schemes, rather than new landfill.	+	?+	?+	?	?	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?-	?+	?+	?-	+
	Again, this option offers more proactive approach to moving waste up the treatment hierarchy. It also attempts to maximise benefit of any material that can not be recycled.	Option favours on-site recycling as first choice, which should ensure high level of self sufficiency. There is also likely to be enough demand for quarry restoration to use any other inert fill within the county	Option avoids new sites, and neither construction sites nor quarries for restoration are likely to be in otherwise tranquil areas	Uncertain impact as option should reduce transport distances but may increase impacts in immediate vicinity of sites, and material taken to quarries as fill may need to travel some distance.	Uncertain impact. Option favours on-site recycling as first choice, but where this is not possible, quarry restoration projects requiring fill may not be local.	Uncertain impact as on-site recycling should reduce transport, but pattern of existing sites may not meet demand where materials must be moved off site.	Option should not give rise to adverse impacts unless site being demolished, or quarry being in filled is in a flood sensitive area. Other legislation and guidance makes this unlikely.	Option should not give rise to adverse impacts unless site being demolished, or quarry being in filled is in a flood sensitive area. Other legislation and guidance makes this unlikely	Option should not give rise to adverse impacts unless site being demolished, or quarry being in filled is in a flood sensitive area. Other legislation and guidance makes this unlikely	Option should not give rise to adverse impacts unless site being demolished, or quarry being in filled is in a flood sensitive area. Other legislation and guidance makes this unlikely	Option has potential to help to conserve soils by encouraging recycling where possible, and supporting quarry restoration to enable stripped soils to be put back to good use.	Recycling of CD&E waste on site has potential to have some short term adverse impacts on very local air quality, but this can be addressed through good practice on site and the careful use of conditions	Option should not give rise to adverse impacts unless site being demolished, or quarry being in filled is in a flood sensitive area. Other legislation and guidance makes this unlikely	Option should not give rise to adverse impacts unless site being demolished, or quarry being in filled is in a flood sensitive area. Other legislation and guidance makes this unlikely	Recycling of CD&E waste on site has potential to have some short term adverse impacts on amenity for local people, but this can be addressed through good practice on site and the careful use of conditions	Clear support as on-site recycling utilises previously developed site as does alternative disposal route.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 6: Waste awareness and waste minimisation																
Option 1 No plan option, i.e. rely on national guidance and legislation and District Local Development Framework policies on waste awareness and waste minimisation which we have had an input to during consultation	**?+** Guidance and LDF policies should be broadly supportive of SA Objective	**?** Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but policy is not location specific	**?** Outcomes are unclear as option is not location specific, but developments are unlikely to be in otherwise tranquil areas	**?** Uncertain impact, though major development are unlikely to be located where they may adversely affect the highway network.	**?** Uncertain impact. PPS10 supports self sufficiency, but policy is not location specific	**?+** Policy encourages process savings, but impacts of location are unclear	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?+** In the absence of a specific policy, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	**?** Outcome unclear. Option is not specific about location, but new development may often favour PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 6: Waste awareness and waste minimisation																
Option 2 All new and enhanced waste management facilities and major developments (as defined by the General Permitted Development Order) should address waste as a resource; minimise waste as far as possible; be designed to a high standard (no need for compliance with requirements of West Midlands sustainability checklist - refer to www.checklistwestmidlands.co.uk). **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
	Option explicitly aims to achieve this objective	Policy is should support self sufficiency by ensuring that all new developments are managed to contribute to that aim	Outcomes are unclear as option is not location specific, but developments are unlikely to be in otherwise tranquil areas	Possible positive outcome. Sustainable construction, resource efficiency and on-site recycling should reduce HGV movements	Possible positive outcome as option should help to provide on- site waste management facilities	Policy encourages process savings, and transport savings by encouraging on-site waste management facilities	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	In the absence of a specific provision within the option, national guidance should avoid adverse impacts	Outcome unclear. Option is not specific about location, but new development may often favour PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 6: Waste awareness and waste minimisation																
Option 3 As for option 2, but with added reinforcement of checklists and design requirements for new waste management facilities. **Preferred Option**	+	?+	?	?+	+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?
	Option explicitly aims to achieve this objective, and checklist should reinforce that aim.	Likely positive outcome as checklist should help this option to ensure that all new developments are managed to contribute to self-sufficiency	Outcomes are unclear as option is not location specific, but developments are unlikely to be in otherwise tranquil areas	Possible positive outcome. Sustainable construction, resource efficiency and on-site recycling should reduce HGV movements	Likely positive outcome as checklist should help this option to ensure provision of on-site waste management facilities	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Checklists and design requirements should add to National guidance to prevent adverse impacts	Outcome unclear. Option is not specific about location, but new development may often favour PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 7: Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities																
Option 1 Do not have a policy as the existing waste sites are already protected by PPS10 and draft Regional Policy W4. **[Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]**	**?** Uncertain impact, Protection applies to all sites, without regard to waste treatment used on site	**?+** Protection should help to maintain current levels of self sufficienc y	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they are unlikely to be in otherwise tranquil areas.	**0** Policy is about protection of existing sites, so should make little change to current situation	**?+** Protected sites will maintain local facilities where they already exist	**?** Uncertain impact. Policy will protect existing sites, but technolog ies, and process emissions may change.	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**0** Policy is concerne d with existing sites only.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 7: Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities																
Option 2 Enhance protection for existing sites using broad criteria. **Preferred Option**	**?** Uncertain impact, Protection applies to sites, without regard to treatment technology used	**?+** Option will only protect sites that meet broad locational criteria, but should still help to maintain self-sufficiency.	**?+** Existing sites are unlikely to be in otherwise tranquil areas, and option will only protect sites that meet broad locational criteria, so outcomes should be positive.	**0** Policy is about protection of existing sites, so should make little change to current situation	**?+** Protected sites will maintain local facilities where they already exist	**?** Uncertain impact. Policy will protect existing sites, but technologies, and process emissions may change.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**?+** Policy will only protect sites that meet broad locational aims.	**0** Policy is concerned with existing sites only

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 7: Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities																
Option 3 Safeguard all existing waste facilities from non-waste related developments.	**?** Uncertain impact, Protection applies to all sites, without regard to waste treatment used on site	**?+** Protection should help to maintain current levels of self sufficienc y	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they are unlikely to be in otherwise tranquil areas.	**0** Policy is about protection of existing sites, so should make little change to current situation	**?+** Protected sites will maintain local facilities where they already exist	**?** Uncertain impact. Policy will protect existing sites, but technolog ies, and process emissions may change.	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection applies to existing waste sites, regardles s of suitability, but they should all have been assessed before they were first permitted	**0** Policy is concerne d with existing sites only

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 7: Safeguarding strategic waste facilities and the location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities																
Option 4 Safeguard only Four Ashes and Hanford sites and all landfill sites. **Preferred Option**	**?** Uncertain impact. Protection would apply to landfill sites as well as those designed to use waste as an energy resource	**+** Aim is to protect sites most required to achieve self sufficiency, including landfill for residues from other processes	**?+** Sites to be protected are few and generally not located in more tranquil areas	**0** Option is about protection of existing sites, so should make little change to current situation	**?+** Protected sites will maintain local facilities where they already exist	**?+** Option protects existing sites, and a waste to energy plant that is permitted but yet to be built. Existing sites should make little change to current situation, and new plant should displace more emissions than it generates	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, without regard to suitability of location, but few are likely to affect flood plains	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**?+** Protection applies to categories of site, regardless of location, but they should all have been fully assessed before they were first permitted	**0** Policy is concerned with existing sites only

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 8: Enhancement of existing waste management facilities																
Option 1 Rely on national/regional legislation and guidance. [Equivalent to "Do Nothing" option]	**?** Uncertain impacts. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, but is unlikely to drive them	**?+** Action to improve existing facilities may serve to support viability of existing sites and maintain current levels of self sufficiency, though it is unlikely to improve them	**?** Uncertain impacts. Depends on location of existing sites, but these are unlikely to be in areas previously considered tranquil	**?** Uncertain impact. Increased capacity could generate more traffic but good design could offset this	**?** Uncertain impacts, Option can support local facilities where appropriate sites exist, but will not create new sites where they may be needed	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**?** Uncertain impact. Guidance would support improvements to reduce impacts, where location is OK, but greater capacity may increase impacts	**0** Policy only refers to existing sites

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 8: Enhancement of existing waste management facilities																
Option 2 Actively encourage enhancement of existing waste facilities by setting criteria for improvement of existing facilities. **Preferred Option**	**+** Option specifically supports moves towards more efficient use of waste.	**?+** Option can support self sufficiency where appropriate sites exist, but will not create new sites where they may be needed	**?** Uncertain impacts. Depends on location of existing sites, but these are unlikely to be in areas previously considered tranquil.	**?** Uncertain impact. Increased capacity could generate more traffic but good design could offset this and option has conditions to avoid adverse impacts	**?+** Option can support local facilities where appropriate sites exist, but will not create new sites where they may be needed	**?** Uncertain impacts as greater efficiency may reduce impacts but greater capacity may increase them	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on people or the environment as a result of the location of expanded or improved sites	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option specifically aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on local communities and the environment	**0** Policy only refers to existing sites

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 8: Enhancement of existing waste management facilities																
Option 3 Where improvements or expansion of existing facilities are sought, the whole site must be brought up to the standards required for new waste facilities.	**?+** Option clearly supports the aims of this objective, but there is a concern that its effectiveness may be reduced as it imposes a high threshold for any improvement work	**?+** Option can support self sufficiency where appropriate sites exist, but will not create new sites where they may be needed	**?** Uncertain impacts. Depends on location of existing sites, but these are unlikely to be in areas previously considered tranquil.	**?** Uncertain impact. Increased capacity could generate more traffic but good design could offset this	**?+** Option can support local facilities where appropriate sites exist, but will not create new sites where they may be needed	**?** Uncertain impacts as greater efficiency may reduce impacts but greater capacity may increase them	**?+** Option aims to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts of expanded or improved sites	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**?+** Option aims to upgrade whole sites and avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	**0** Policy only refers to existing sites

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Draft Policy 9: High Quality Design																
Option 1 Not to include a policy relating to the issues of design including the mitigation of climate change but to refer to these issues where appropriate to the consideration of locating enclosed and open air facilities (refer to draft policies 2 & 3)	**0** National policy and guidance has little to say on design that would influence SD in the context of this objective	**0** National policy and guidance has little to say on design that would influence self sufficiency, though PPS10 would support it.	**?** Uncertain impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers protection for many related factors, but not for tranquil areas as such	**?** Uncertain impacts. With no design policy, national guidance will favour minimising adverse impacts on the highways network but this may not reduce HGV traffic.	**0** National policy and guidance has little to say on design that would influence the availability of local facilities, though PPS10 would support this aim.	**?** Uncertain impact. With no design policy, national policy will aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but there may be other factors causing them to rise	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection for flood plains	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection for designated sites.	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection for biodiversity	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection for ground and surface waters	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers protection for best and most versatile soils	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection against adverse impacts on air quality	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection against adverse impacts on the historic environment	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers effective protection against adverse impacts on the quality of the landscape or townscape	**?+** Potential positive impacts. With no design policy, national policy offers wide-ranging protection against adverse impacts on many aspects of heath, amenity and well-being	**0** National policy and guidance has little to say on design that would influence the use of PDL.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 2 To include a locally distinctive policy to assist in managing new waste development and to encourage greater focus on the delivery of high quality design that also principally addresses the need to mitigate impacts associated with climate change.	**0** Policy considers design of facilities rather than their location or function, so will not influence how they contribute to SD.	**0** Policy considers design of facilities rather than their location or capacity, so will not influence self sufficiency.	**?+** Requires proposals to fit with adjoining land uses and mitigate any environmental impacts, so should encourage positive outcomes	**?+** Policy option requires high standard of design and mitigation of environmental impacts, so should encourage positive outcome	**0** Policy considers design of facilities rather than their location or capacity, so will not influence the supply of local facilities.	**+** Criteria contain specific aim to minimise greenhouse gas emissions, also to adapt to climate change	**?+** Requires proposals to fit with adjoining land uses, and achieve good mitigation of any environmental impacts, so should encourage positive outcome	**+** Requires proposals to fit with adjoining land uses, achieve good mitigation of any environmental impacts, and to plan for biodiversity and climate change, so should ensure positive outcome	**+** Option aims to support BAP, GAP and other schemes, as well as adaptation for climate change	**+** Requires proposals to be compatible with adjoining land uses, and for SUDS, so should encourage positive outcome	**?+** Requires proposals to fit with adjoining land uses, and to achieve high standards of mitigation of any environmental impacts, so should encourage positive outcome	**+** As well as general environmental aims, option contain specific aim to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to climate change should encourage positive outcome.	**+** Requires proposals to fit with adjoining land uses and to comply with local policies for design, as well as achieving high level of mitigation, so should ensure positive outcome	**+** Requires proposals to fit with adjoining land uses and to comply with local policies for design and landscape, so should ensure a positive outcome	**+** Option requires high standards of design and mitigation of environmental impacts, as well as climate change adaptation which should contribute to well-being and amenity.	**0** Policy considers design of facilities rather than their location, and does not mention PDL, so will not influence its use.

10 Appendix C: Development of 4 Policies from 9 Preferred Options

Table 9: Transfer of Policies from "Emerging Options" to "Publication" Stage

"Emerging Options" Policy Number	"Publication Stage" Policy Number
1.1 Targets for New facilities required by 2026 to manage Municipal, Commercial & Industrial and Construction, Demolition & Excavation waste streams.	2.2 Targets for new waste management facilities required by 2026 to manage municipal, commercial & industrial, and construction, demolition & excavation waste streams
1.2 Broad Locations	2.3 Broad locations
2.1 General Requirements for Enclosed Facilities	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
2.2 Criteria for Organic Treatment Facilities in Urban Locations	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
2.3 Criteria for Organic Treatment Facilities in Rural Locations	3.2 Exceptions for processes that must be away from people, restrictions on open-windrow composting and notes on re-use of existing buildings
2.4 Criteria for the Re-use of Redundant Farm or Forestry Buildings	3.2 Exceptions for processes that must be away from people, restrictions on open-windrow composting and notes on re-use of existing buildings
3.1 General Requirements	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
3.2 Criteria for Facilities Recycling Construction, Demolition & Excavation Waste	3.3 Exceptions for facilities recycling construction, demolition & excavation waste or comparable industrial wastes.
3.3 Criteria for Open Windrow Composting Facilities	3.2 Exceptions for processes that must be away from people, restrictions on open-windrow composting and notes on re-use of existing buildings
3.4 Temporary Planning Permissions	3.4 Conditions for temporary planning permissions where impacts are uncertain
4.1 Waste Hierarchy	1.1 Minimising waste, treating it as a resource, upholding the hierarchy, and avoiding unacceptable impacts.
4.2 Waste Incineration	1.5 Proposals for energy recovery.
4.3 Landfill or Landraise	1.6 Restrictions on landfill or landraise
5.1 General Requirements	1.3 Favouring recycling of CDE waste, or use in quarry restoration
5.2 Broad Location	2.3 Broad locations for different scales of facility
5.3 Contaminated Soils	2.2 Targets for new waste management facilities
5.4 Criteria for Urban Sites	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc. 4.2 Protection and improvement of environmental quality
5.5 Criteria for Facilities within Landfill Sites or Quarries	3.3 Conditions for CDE recycling on mineral and landfill sites
5.6 Criteria for Use of Waste for Landscaping, Screening or Engineering Purposes	1.4 Conditions for waste used in landscaping, engineering and agricultural improvement

6: Waste Minimisation and Major Development Proposals	1.2 Minimising waste from new development
7.1 Strategic Waste Facilities to be Safeguarded	2.4 Strategic waste facilities to be safeguarded (Energy from waste and hazardous landfill)
7.2 New Facilities on Landfill Sites	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
7.3 The Location of Development in the vicinity of Waste Management Facilities	2.5 Restrictions on development in the vicinity of waste management facilities
8.1 General Requirements	1.1 Minimising waste, treating it as a resource, upholding the hierarchy, and avoiding unacceptable impacts.
	2.3 Broad locations
	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
	4.1 High quality and energy efficient design
8.2 Broad Locations	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
8.3 Consolidation of Existing Planning Consents	3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
9: High Quality Design	4.1 High quality and energy efficient design
	4.2 Protection and improvement of environmental quality

Table 10: Full text of policies at Publication Stage

Note: Bullet points in these tables have been numbered with Roman numerals to assist in discussion. The text is the same as appears in the Publication Document

Full wording of policy	Summary for analysis table
New Policy 1: Waste as a resource	
Policy 1.1 General principles Planning permission for the development of new sustainable waste management facilities will be granted where the applicant can demonstrate that the proposal accords with the principles listed below: i. Waste is minimised; ii. Waste is used as a resource, including the formation of waste synergies, for example through the creation of resource recovery parks; iii. The proposals represent the most sustainable option for management of waste at the top end of the "waste hierarchy" (Refer to Appendix 4: The Waste Hierarchy); iv. Protection of human health and the environment. v. Unacceptable adverse impacts, including cumulative effects, should be avoided and adverse impacts minimised and mitigated as part of the proposals; vi. The overall (economic, social and environmental) benefits outweigh any material planning objections.	**1.1 General principles**

Policy 1.2 Make better use of waste associated with non-waste related development All major development proposals(as defined by the Town and Country Planning (England) Development Management Procedure Order 2010 (the DMPO) or any subsequent changes/revisions) should: i. Use /Address waste as a resource; ii. Minimise waste as far as possible; iii. Demonstrate the use of sustainable design and construction techniques, i.e: resource-efficiency in terms of sourcing of materials, construction methods, and demolition; iv. Enable the building to be easily decommissioned or reused for a new purpose; and enable the future recycling of the building fabric to be used for its constituent material; v. Maximise on-site management of construction, demolition and excavation waste arising during construction; vi. Make provision for waste collection to facilitate, where practicable, source separated waste collection systems; and, vii. Be supported by a site waste management plan.	**1.2 Making better use of waste associated with non-waste related development**
Policy 1.3 Construction, demolition and excavation waste Recycling of construction, demolition & excavation waste and the diversion of inert waste to quarries requiring backfill for restoration purposes will be favoured over new inert landfill / landraising proposals.	**1.3 Making better use of construction, demolition and excavation waste**

Policy 1.4 Use of waste for landscaping, screening, engineering purposes or for the improvement of agricultural or forestry land A) Where **inert** waste is to be used for the improvement of agricultural or forestry land, or for landscaping, screening or engineering purposes to enable non waste development to proceed, the applicant should demonstrate that the proposal addresses the following: i. It can demonstrate that the nature and extent of landscaping and screening is reasonable and necessary; ii. The amount of waste proposed to be deposited is the minimum necessary for the intended / agreed purpose; iii. It will not undermine the provision of waste management facilities operating further up the waste hierarchy. The waste to be deposited therefore must not practically be suitable for recycling; iv. It will not undermine the restoration of quarries that require the inert materials for restoration purposes; v. It can demonstrate that flood risk will not be increased, and surface run-off will be managed safely; vi. It would not raise the level of the land to an unacceptable degree such that it would create an adverse visual impact on the landscape and/or reduce openness of the Green Belt; vii. The proposals are comprehensive, detailed, practicable and achievable within the proposed timescales. B) Where **non-inert** (organic) waste is to be spread for the purpose of land treatment resulting in agricultural improvement, the proposed development should address the following: viii. The amount of waste proposed is necessary and appropriate to the scale of the farm holding and for carrying out the proposed agricultural activities/operations; ix. It will not undermine the provision of waste management facilities operating further up the waste hierarchy. The waste to be spread therefore must not practically be suitable for reuse, recycling or processing to recover materials; x. It is necessary and of benefit for agriculture or nature conservation; and xi. In the case of spreading compost, the material spread must meet the recognised quality standards to no longer be regarded as waste	**1.4 Waste used in landscaping, engineering and agricultural improvement**

Policy 1.5 Energy recovery Proposals for energy recovery should demonstrate that they: xii. Are consistent and comply with the requirements of Policy 4; xiii. Will not undermine the provision of waste management facilities operating further up the waste hierarchy. The waste to be treated therefore cannot practically be suitable for reuse, recycling or processing to recover materials; xiv. Are in close proximity to the source of waste in order to obtain reliable and regular supply of feedstock and minimise transport emissions; xv. Include maximum energy recovery, either by combined heat and power (CHP) or electricity generation, or be CHP ready, with a realistic prospect of a market for the energy in the area; and xvi. Meet the locational approach of the Strategy set out in Policy 2.	**1.5 Energy recovery**
Policy 1.6 Landfill or landraise Proposals for new sites for landfill or landraise will generally not be permitted and waste disposal should be considered as the last resort. Proposals for new landfill or landraise will be only considered where they are supported by: i. Robust evidence that there is an overriding need for the landfill capacity; ii. Proposals, where relevant, to capture the landfill gas, and recover energy, where practicable; iii. A detailed restoration and aftercare scheme providing for an acceptable afteruse; iv. Evidence that there are sufficient materials available to complete the infilling in a reasonable timescale and to agreed levels.	**1.6 Landfill and landraise**

New Policy 2: Targets and broad locations for waste management facilities					Summary for analysis table
2.1 Landfill diversion targets Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent will aim to achieve the following landfill diversion targets as a minimum, and will aspire to achieve higher targets, moving towards zero waste to landfill. **Table 1: Minimum diversion from landfill targets.**					**2.1 Landfill diversion targets**
Waste Stream	**2010/11**	**2015/16**	**2020/21**	**2025/26**	
Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)	75%	90%	90%	90%	
Commercial and Industrial Waste (C&I)	75%	75%	75%	75%	
2.2 Targets for new waste management facilities required by 2026 to manage municipal, commercial & industrial, and construction, demolition & excavation waste streams. To meet the landfill diversion targets and achieve " equivalent/net self-sufficiency", new waste management facilities/capacity will be required by 2026 across Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent in accordance with the number of facilities/future treatment tonnages set out below: **New waste capacity requirements** for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and Commercial and Industrial Waste (C&I) Treatment					**2.2 Targets for new waste management facilities**
Waste Management Types	**Total Additional Capacity Required By 2026 (tonnes per Annum)**	**Equivalent No. of Facilities Required**	**Typical Average Land Take (ha) and throughput (tonnes per annum) per Facility**	**Total Land Take Required (ha)**	

Recycling /Material Recovery (Mechanical Sorting)	Minimum of 106,000 tonnes per annum required by 2020/21 or 116,000 tonnes per annum by 2025/26	2-3 facilities.	0.9 hectares. 55,000 tonnes per annum.	Equivalent to 1.8 - 2.7 hectares in total land area	
Organic Waste Treatment	60,000 - 80,000 tonnes per annum required by 2020 capable of treating co-collected municipal green and kitchen waste. (In-vessel composting or new technology e.g. Advanced anaerobic digestion ('wet; process)).	2 - 3 facilities. 1 facility is specifically required to serve the North Staffordshire Conurbation and Staffordshire Moorlands.	Dependent on facility type. An In-Vessel Composting facility (IVC) is approximately 1.3 hectares in size and throughput is 32,500 tonnes per annum An Anaerobic Digestion (AD) facility is approximately 0.9 hectares in size and throughput is 30,000 tonnes per annum.	Equivalent to 1.8 - 3.9 hectares in total land area.	
Construction , Demolition and Excavation Waste (C,D&E) / Hazardous Waste Treatment					
Recycling / Material Recovery	200,000 tonnes per annum.	2 - 4 facilities. Facilities are required in or close to large areas of development/construction	Land take and throughput difficult to quantify. An average facility is between 2 – 4 hectares in size with a throughput of between 50,000 and 100,000 tonnes per annum.	Equivalent to 4 – 16 hectares in total land area.	

Contaminated Soils (Storage, Treatment and Remediation)	Not possible to quantify	Not possible to quantify what is required to serve the regeneration of the North Staffordshire conurbation.	Not possible to quantify land take and throughput.	Temporary 'hub' sites to serve regeneration corridors as required.	
The specific new waste capacity requirements set out above assume that existing capacity will be maintained in line with Policy 2.5. Proposals consistent with the locational approach; the requirements of Policies 1, 3 and 4; and which meet the following requirements will also be given favourable consideration: • Proposals that will deliver local economic growth and exceed the minimum landfill diversion targets in Policy 2.1; and, • Proposals that help to reduce our reliance on landfill by diverting more residual waste away from landfill than the minimum diversion target and/or help to reduce permitted landfill capacity.					

2.3 Broad locations In order to minimise the impact of our waste infrastructure, and provide a network of sustainable waste management facilities which enable the movement of waste to be minimised, ensure that waste is being dealt with as close as possible to where it arises, and reduce the need to transport waste great distances, preference will be given to such developments on general industrial land (including urban and rural general industrial estates (alongside B2& B8 uses)), previously developed land and existing waste management sites, within or close to the hierarchy of urban areas defined below and shown on the Key Diagram. a) Proposals of a local or sub-regional scale will be supported provided that they are located in or close to the **North Staffordshire Conurbation** (City of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle - under-Lyme), or the **Large Settlements** of: Stafford; Burton upon Trent; Cannock; Lichfield; Rugeley; or Tamworth. b) Proposals of a local scale only will be supported if they are located in or close to the **Other Significant Settlements** of: Burntwood; Kidsgrove; Cheslyn Hay & Great Wyrley; Biddulph; Leek; Stone; Uttoxeter; Wombourne; Cheadle; Codsall & Bilbrook; Perton; Penkridge; Kinver; or Brewood. c) Proposals for the storage, treatment, and recycling of soils; construction, demolition and excavation waste; and, comparable industrial wastes will be supported in or close to areas of large development in the **North Staffordshire Conurbation** (City of Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle - under-Lyme), and the **Large Settlements** of: Stafford; Burton upon Trent; Cannock; Lichfield; Rugeley; or Tamworth, where they can demonstrate the availability of a reliable supply of waste material and have good access to the market for the resultant recycled product. d) Proposals of a regional and national scale must demonstrate/meet the following siting/locational criteria: i. Be sustainably located within the waste supply area to minimise transport impacts (seeking where practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport) both in and outside the county; ii. The site selection process has considered viable sustainable alternatives and sites inside and outside of the county and demonstrates a sequential approach; iii. Be of a scale and size which is proportionate and appropriate to the area; iv. Avoid causing unacceptable adverse impacts; v. The overall (economic, social and environmental) benefits outweigh any material planning objections.	**2.3 Broad locations for different scales of facility**

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">2.4 Strategic waste facilities to be safeguarded
The existing strategic residual treatment Energy Recovery Facilities for municipal waste; and hazardous waste landfill, as listed below and shown on the Key Diagram, (and new permitted or allocated waste facilities identified in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)) will be safeguarded.</td>
<td rowspan="8">2.4 Strategic waste facilities to be safeguarded (Energy Recovery Facilities and hazardous landfill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Recovery Facility</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Energy Recovery Facility</td>
<td>Campbell Road, Hanford, Stoke-on-Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Ashes Energy Recovery Facility</td>
<td>The Dell off Enterprise Drive, Four Ashes South Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Landfill</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meece Landfill</td>
<td>Swynnerton, Cold Meece, Nr Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2"></td>
</tr>
</table>

2.5 The location of development in the vicinity of waste management facilities a) In order to implement our Waste Local Plan and ensure that waste is being treated as high up as possible in the waste hierarchy the Waste Planning Authority requires a network of different types of waste management facilities each playing their separate role. To minimise any risk of waste moving down the waste hierarchy due to impacts on this network, and in order to maintain capacity and net-self sufficiency the Waste Planning Authority will not support proposals for non-waste related development on or in the vicinity of all permitted [or allocated] waste management facilities, as listed in the Schedule in Appendix 5: Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Infrastructure at April 2011(and updated in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)), which would: i. Unduly restrict or constrain the activities permitted or allocated to be carried out at any waste management facility; or ii. Restrict the future expansion and environmental improvement of existing operational waste management facilities. b) The Waste Planning Authority will only support proposals for non-waste related developments on sites allocated for waste management once the waste management capacity targets for Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent have been met, unless there are overriding planning reasons why the non-waste related development should be permitted. c) The Waste Planning Authority requests that development proposals which would prejudice the implementation of the Waste Local Plan and result in the loss of a waste management site to a non-waste management use must be accompanied by supporting information setting out how much waste management capacity would be lost as a result of the proposal, the impact on the waste management capacity, and justification for any loss of capacity. This information should be supplied to the Waste Planning Authority. This policy also applies to sites which may be subsequently permitted [or allocated] for waste management identified in Annual Monitoring Reports or adopted Development Plan Documents.	**2.5 Restrictions on development in the vicinity of waste management facilities**

New Policy 3: Criteria for the location of new and enhanced waste management facilities	
Policy 3.1 General requirements for new and enhanced facilities Within the broad locations set out in Policy 2.2, proposals for new and the expansion of existing waste management facilities should: i. Be fully contained within well designed purpose built or appropriately modified existing buildings or enclosed structures appropriate to the technology or process. Where this is not practicable or environmentally acceptable, the applicant must clearly demonstrate that any environmental impacts can be effectively mitigated by alternative means; ii. Include a programme of phased improvements to bring the whole site up to modern standards, if the proposal relates to an existing facility which is to be extended or enhanced. iii. Be compatible with nearby uses, and appropriate in scale and character to their surroundings giving careful consideration to any cumulative effects that may arise (Refer to Policy 4: Sustainable design and protection and improvement of environmental quality) iv. Complement existing or planned activities or form part of an integrated waste management facility and demonstrate an overall enhancement of the site; and, v. All proposals should be submitted together with details on the annual throughput and waste stream that the site would handle.	**3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.**

Policy 3.2 Exceptions criteria for organic treatment in farm locations close to the urban areas/broad locations a) Proposals for enclosed organic treatment facilities on farm locations will be supported provided that they meet the following: i. It is demonstrated that the proposed operation could not be carried out on general industrial or previously developed land within or close to the hierarchy of urban areas defined in Policy 2; ii. More than half of the material would derive from farm activities taking place on the site itself and surrounding farms or more than half of the material produced would be used on the farm land or surrounding farms without having an unacceptable adverse impact upon the highway network; and iii. The proposed facility would be integrated as part of the farm business and would not represent a stand-alone waste management facility. b) Proposals for open windrow composting on agricultural land in farm locations should satisfy the following: i. The proposals are supported by a robust evidence of need arising from a shortage of local capacity that exists in the plan period; and ii. The proposed location is capable of meeting the EA permitting requirements in relation to bio-aerosols c) The re-use of redundant farm or forestry buildings will be supported provided that the external character and appearance of the building is either substantially unchanged, or improved.	**3.2 Exceptions for processes that must be away from people, restrictions on open-windrow composting and notes on re-use of existing buildings**
Policy 3.3 Exceptions criteria for facilities recycling construction, demolition & excavation waste or comparable industrial wastes Where the proposal is on existing landfill or mineral sites it should demonstrate that: i. It is related to the lawful/permitted use of the land; ii. Timely and appropriate restoration of the site is not undermined by the facility in terms of duration of the operations Temporary facilities will be permitted at mineral extraction sites with existing processing plants, particularly where this allows for secondary and recycled materials to be processed or blended to achieve a higher quality end use.	**3.3 Conditions for CDE recycling on mineral and landfill sites**

Policy 3.4 Temporary planning permissions for open air facilities	**3.4 Conditions for temporary planning permissions where impacts are uncertain**
Where there are doubts remaining about the character or effect of the proposed open air waste management facility, a temporary planning permission may be issued. The duration of the temporary period will have regard to the location, nature or scale of the proposed development and the level of investment required to put in place systems to control the operations and minimise the impacts.	

New Policy 4: Sustainable design and protection and improvement of environmental quality	
4.1 Sustainable design All proposals for waste management facilities should be designed and operated to high environmental standards. They should avoid unacceptable adverse impacts and minimise adverse impacts, taking particular account of climate change implications. Where practicable they should positively contribute to the character and quality of the local natural, historic and built environment and amenity, and provide safe and convenient access for all potential users. In particular the proposal should: i. Be compatible with adjoining land uses and the locality, taking into account national and local policies for building design, landscape character, ecology, historic environment and sport and recreation; ii. Provide measures to minimise greenhouse gases associated with the construction, and operation of the facility, and where relevant, the decommissioning and reinstatement of the site. iii. Provide measures to adapt to climate change; iv. Consider design and environmental performance of the facility from the design stage and as a minimum standard should aim to achieve a BREEAM 2011 rating for industrial buildings of "very good" or higher; v. Be supported by a site waste management plan; vi. Provide a sustainable drainage system, unless it would be impractical to do so, to manage clean uncontaminated roof and surface run-off, with a focus on filtration techniques to improve the quality of the water environment; vii. Consider rainwater harvesting from impermeable surfaces and encouragement of layouts which accommodate wastewater recycling, where practicable; viii. Make a positive contribution, where appropriate, towards decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy supply; ix. Assess the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, minimising transport emissions and seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport; x. Contribute where appropriate to green infrastructure initiatives as supported by local policies; xi. Consider any impact upon mineral resources through potential sterilisation and address any land instability issues and/or contamination arising from former land uses; and xii. Where restoration and aftercare is applicable, provide comprehensive, detailed, practical and achievable restoration and aftercare proposals for the site, that would achieve at the earliest opportunity, an acceptable after-use.	**Promoting high quality and energy efficient design**

4.2 Protection and improvement of environmental quality The development of waste management facilities will be supported provided that the proposals would not give rise to materially harmful impacts, except where the material planning benefits of the proposals outweigh the material planning objections. In determining the impact of the proposed development, consideration will be given to the effect of the proposals on the following: i. People and local communities, including the potential health effects; ii. The highway network and other public rights of way; iii. Historic environment; iv. Natural environment; v. Biodiversity and geodiversity and wider environment; vi. The Landscape; vii. Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the setting of the Peak District National Park; viii. The Green Belt; ix. The Countryside; x. Trees, hedgerows and woodland; xi. Agricultural land; xii. Open space (including recreational and sporting facilities) xiii. Protection of air, soil and water and reduction of flood risk; xiv. Any other interests or acknowledged importance	**Protecting and improving environmental quality**

11 Appendix D: Details of Sustainability Appraisal of final policies

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 1: Waste as a resource																
1.1 General principles	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?+	?
	Policy is fully consistent with the principles of SD	Policy does not address self sufficiency and should not affect it in a systematic way	Existing tranquil areas should be protected from waste developments	Policy clearly aims to minimise any adverse impacts of new developments,	Policy does not address location, and should not have any systematic influence	Policy clearly aims to avoid or manage any waste treatment and transport emission.	Policy should offer protection through final 2 bullet points	Policy clearly aims to protect ecology and geology	Biodiversity value will be protected by this policy but may not be enhanced	Policy should ensure no loss of quality or supply	Policy offers good protection though general aims, though	Policy should ensure that this objective is met	Policy should ensure that the historic environment is protected	Policy should ensure that landscape and townscape quality are maintained.	Policy explicitly aims to protect health, but it may not be able to address inequalities	Policy makes no reference to previously developed land. As this is a main guiding policy, impacts are uncertain

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies⬇	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.2 Making better use of waste associated with non-waste related development	**+**	**+**	**?+**	**?+**	**+**	**?+**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?+**	**?/0**	**?+**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**
	Policy is fully consistent with the principles of SD	Policy encourages self sufficiency, waste minimisation and resource efficiency at a project level, thus making a clear contribution to this objective.	Possible positive impact as more waste reduction and treatment at source should reduce potential transport or disposal impacts in potentially tranquil areas	Possible positive impact as more waste reduction and treatment at source should reduce potential transport impacts of major developments	By maximising on-site management of waste, this policy aims to encourage very local facilities for major developments	Key elements of policy could all contribute to the aim of reducing greenhouse gas emissions	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Potential positive impact if policies lead to reduced need to extract new raw materials for construction and disposing of waste	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Policy should help to conserve soils though those affected by construction will often be lower grade	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Possible benefits from reduction in need for other waste management facilities and for extraction of raw materials	Possible positive impacts. Waste reduction and treatment at source should reduce potential transport impacts	Policy supports the use of previously developed land but is not drafted to steer development towards it

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.3 Making better use of construction, demolition and excavation waste	+	?	?	?+	?	?	?/0	?+	?+	?/0	?+	?	?+	+	?+	+
	Policy promotes treatment further up the waste hierarchy and to more beneficial ends, which should be in line with SD	Uncertain impact as policy focuses on the type of treatment rather than the location	Uncertain impacts. Recycling should reduce pressure to extract new mineral – possibly from tranquil areas – but location of treatment sites is hard to predict	Recycling construction and demolition waste should reduce pressure to extract and transport new minerals, but treatment or use for backfill will also have transport impacts	Uncertain impacts as policy focuses on the type of treatment rather than the location	Uncertain impacts. Recycling CDE waste should reduce emissions from extracting and transport, but treatment or use for backfill will also have transport implacts based on location	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Should reduce demand for new mineral and associated transport, while speeding appropriate restoration	Should reduce demand for new mineral and associated transport, while speeding appropriate restoration	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy does not attempt to address this topic.	Should encourage re-use of excavated soils and allow high quality soils to be relayed and agricultural land to be re-used	Uncertain impacts dependent on location of treatment or disposal sites, transport implications and management of sites	Possible benefits from reduction in demand for new mineral extraction and associated transport	Policy should reduce demand for new mineral extraction and avoid delays in required restoration due to waste being diverted into landscaping schemes	Policy should increase amenity by assisting required restoration, but transport implications are much harder to predict and may bring disbenefits for some	Policy is intended to help to bring former quarry sites back into beneficial use

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.4 Waste used in landscaping, engineering and agricultural improvement	+	?	?	?	?	?	+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+
	Policy promotes SD by keeping treatment high up hierarchy	Uncertain impact as policy focuses on the way in which waste is treated rather than the location	Uncertain impacts as they will depend on location of the land improvement or alternative treatment . Often, it will not be in tranquil areas, but it may be.	Uncertain impacts. Policy may reduce local HGV impacts from landscaping schemes, but overall impact will depend on other disposal options	Uncertain impacts as policy focuses on the details of treatment rather than the location	Uncertain impacts. Will depend largely on impacts of transporting waste to disposal site, not how it is treated once it gets there.	Policy explicitly aims to avoid adverse impacts in certain types of waste management that might otherwise pose a threat.	Policy specifically aims to avoid adverse impacts where possible, but can not deliver improvements	Policy specifically aims to avoid adverse impacts where possible, but can not deliver improvements	Policy should offer protection through general avoidance of environmental impacts where possible	Policy does not mention protection of soils though it should offer general protection for the environment	Policy does not mention protection air quality though it should offer general protection for the environment	Policy specifically aims to avoid adverse impacts where possible, but can not deliver improvements	Policy specifically aims to avoid adverse impacts where possible,	Policy aims to avoid adverse impacts on people or health, but would not tackle inequalities	Policy has no specific reference to PDL, but provides ways to encourage restoration of such land for development.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.5 Energy Recovery	+	+	?/0	+	+	+	+	?+	?+	+	+	+	?+	+	?+	?
	Policy actively promotes many aspects of SD	Policy encourages facilities that are in close proximity to sources of waste, so should contribute to self sufficiency.	Uncertain impact, but likely to be minimal. No reference to tranquillity, though sites which comply with locational criteria are unlikely to be considered tranquil	Policy specifically aims to minimise transport emission	Policy encourages facilities that are in close proximity to sources of waste to minimise transport emissions	Policy specifically aims to minimise transport emissions, and maximise energy recovery	Policy makes no reference to floodplains, but refers to Policy 4 which does	Policy makes no reference to designated sites, but refers to Policy 4 which does, though it can not deliver enhancement	Policy makes no reference to biodiversity, but refers to Policy 4 which does, though it can not deliver enhancement	Policy makes no reference to water resources, but refers to Policy 4 which does	Policy makes no reference to soils, but refers to Policy 4 which does	Policy makes no reference to air quality, but refers to Policy 4 which does	Policy makes no reference to the historic environment, but refers to Policy 4 which does, though it can not deliver enhancement	Policy makes no reference to landscape and townscape, but refers to Policy 4 which does	Policy makes specific reference to impacts on communities but does not address inequalities	Policy does not make any reference to previously developed land so chosen sites may or may not fall into this category

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.6 Restrictions on landfill or landraise	+	0	?/0	?/0	?/0	+	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?/0	?
	Clear positive impact as policy aims to promote more sustainable treatment choices	Policy should not impact on self sufficiency as it would permit new landfill if it were needed	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved	Clear positive impact as policy attempts to restrict landfill and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from landfill gas	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts but likely to be minimal as very few sites will be involved and there are plenty of potential sites without adverse impacts	Uncertain impact. Few sites will be needed but they may or may not be on PDL.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 2: Targets and broad locations for waste management facilities																
2.1 Landfill diversion targets Assessment based on move towards revised policy, raising Landfill Diversion targets to 100%	**+**	**0**	**0**	**?**	**?+**	**?**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	The choice of a higher target clearly supports principles of sustainable development. The higher the target, the better	As above, the choice of a higher landfill diversion target should not significantly impact on self sufficiency as past applications suggest that easily enough facilities should come forward	As above, the choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on tranquil areas as there is a plentiful supply of less sensitive sites and policies will favour these	As above, the choice of a higher target for landfill diversion may have local impacts on HGV traffic but these will be hard to predict. Will depend on location of facilities, not what they do	The choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is likely to lead to a slightly more recycling facilities being built, and may improve the provision of local facilities, though this is not certain.	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion could have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions, but this will depend on transport impacts and treatment technologies, and is hard to predict.	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on floodplains as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on protected sites as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on biodiversity as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts`	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on ground and surface waters as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on BMV soils as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on air quality as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on the historic environment as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on landscape and townscape as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on health and amenity as all waste facilities should avoid adverse impacts	As above, choice of a higher target for landfill diversion is unlikely to have a significant impact on the choice to use previously developed land

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2.2 Targets for new waste management facilities	**?+**	**+**	**?/0**	**?**	**?/0**	**?**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**0**	**?**
	Targets broadly support the principle of SD and help to maximise beneficial use of waste	Targets are specifically planned to deliver self sufficiency	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts are uncertain as they will depend on source and treatment locations	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts are uncertain as they will depend on transport distances and treatment routes	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. New sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Minimal impact. Sufficient sites are available for new waste facilities to avoid adverse impacts	Uncertain impact. Polcy says nothing about what kind of land any new facilities may be on.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2.3 Broad locations for different scales of facility	**?+**	**+**	**?+**	**+**	**+**	**?+**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**?/0**	**+**
	Policy aims to ensure that new waste developments are well located to minimise transport and other impacts, thus supporting some of aims of this objective	Policy aims to provide a range of locations appropriate for different scales of development, and is fully consistent with self sufficiency.	Policy makes no specific reference to tranquil areas, but is likely to steer development away from such areas	Policy specifically aims to reduce impacts of transporting both waste and any secondary products	Policy specifically aims to minimise transport of waste	Policy aims to minimise transport demands so this should reduce greenhouse gas emissions, impact will also depend on treatment technology.	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts. Policy makes no reference to biodiversity. Most favoured locations should avoid adverse impacts, but some PDL may have biodiversity value.	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Impacts uncertain but likely to be minimal. Policy is not specific but new sites could be developed without adverse impacts	Policy specifically encourages the use of previously developed land.

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies⬇	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2.4 Strategic waste facilities to be safeguarded (Energy Recovery Facilities and hazardous landfill)	**?+**	**+**	**?+**	**?**	**0**	**?**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**0**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**0**
	Safeguarding the current facilities which would be most challenging to replace should help to maintain waste treatment at current levels of sustainability whilst still allowing for improvement	Clear positive impact. Safeguarding key current facilities will help to maintain current self sufficiency	Likely positive impact. Safeguarded facilities are all away from tranquil areas, so safeguarding avoids the need to replace them	Policy will have an uncertain impact on HGV traffic. It serves to maintain current or predicted impacts at a few key sites. We can not predict impacts of the alternative approaches	Policy is concerned with safeguarding a few key facilities and will have minimal impact on provision of local facilities elsewhere	Uncertain impact. Policy is concerned with safeguarding a few key facilities, and this should minimise change for these sites, but new sites and changes in technology at existing sites may have other impacts	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them .	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them ..	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them .	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them . .	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them .	Policy protects key waste sites which do not affect air quality but alternatives should also avoid adverse impacts	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them .	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them .	Potential positive impact. Policy protects key waste sites which do not have adverse impacts and avoids need to replace them .	Policy will have minimal impact on previously developed land as it serves to protect a few existing sites but does not attempt to influence new sites

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies⬇	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2.5 Restrictions on development in the vicinity of waste management facilities	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?+	?+	?	?+	?+	?+	?
	Potential positive impact as it aims to reduce the need to find new waste sites and minimise risk of adverse impacts on the community where new development is proposed close to existing waste facilities	Policy aims to protect existing infrastructure which will help to maintain current self sufficiency	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Policy should avoid any increase in HGV traffic by keeping facilities much the same, and should prevent neighbouring development that might be affected	Policy should help to maintain local facilities by preventing development that might compromise their continued operation.	Uncertain impacts. Policy will help to avoid increased transport distances if waste sites have to move further away from settlements, but may also move other development further away.	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Uncertain impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate but impact will depend also on treatment technologies	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Potential positive impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate to sites that might have greater impacts	Policy is designed in part to avoid risk of adverse impacts where new development might take place close to existing waste facilities. It can not, however, reduce inequalities	Uncertain impact as. Policy should avoid need for waste facilities to relocate but existing sites and potential replacements may or may not be on PDL

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 3: Criteria for the location of new and enhanced waste management facilities																
3.1 General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.	**?+**	**?/0**	**?+**	**0**	**?/0**	**?**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**0**
	Policy gives some support to SD by encouraging well designed and located facilities that	Uncertain impact but likely to be minimal. Site assessment shows there are suitable sites for waste facilities which would meet the policy but delivery will depend on applications coming in.	Potential positive impact as requirement for compatibility with surroundings and for enclosure should avoid adverse impacts.	Minimal impacts as policy is only concerned with details a site rather than location (which is controlled by other policies)	Uncertain impact but likely to be minimal Policy is concerned with the details of waste facilities, not locations, but is unlikely to limit the availability of local facilities.	Uncertain impacts. The policy aims to reduce adverse impacts through enclosure and improving processes. It is not clear whether this will always reduce GHG emissions	Potential positive impact. Requirement for compatibility with nearby uses should avoid adverse impacts on floodplains.	Potential positive impact. Requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses should avoid adverse impacts	Potential positive impact. Requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses should avoid adverse impacts	Potential positive impact. Requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses should avoid adverse impacts	Potential positive impact. Requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses should avoid adverse impacts	Policy makes no specific reference to air quality, though enclosure and improving standards should effectively minimise impacts	Potential positive impact through requirement for compatibility in scale and character	Potential positive impact through requirement for compatibility in scale and character	Potential positive impact. Requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses should avoid adverse impacts It can not, however, address inequalities	Policy is concerned with the details of new waste management facilities rather than the nature of the land they are built on. It is unlikely to have a significant impact on this objective

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
3.2 Exceptions for processes that must be away from people, restrictions on open-windrow composting and notes on re-use of existing buildings	?+	+	?	?	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?+	?	?	?+	?+
	Policy supports SD by limiting waste developments outside urban areas unless there are good reasons, and by ensuring that rural locations do not cause other problems	Policy supports self sufficiency by recognising strict criteria (including local arisings) that may justify waste development outside urban areas.	Uncertain impacts. Policy limits development in areas more likely to be tranquil, but does make exceptions which could still have adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts. Policy attempts to reduce vehicle movements by keeping development in urban areas, but allows for a few exceptions	Potential positive impacts as policy provides criteria, including local need, to justify facilities in areas where they would not otherwise be permitted	Uncertain impacts as they will be affected by location of sites, nature of treatment and alternative that might otherwise be used.	Uncertain impacts. Policy does not address floodplains so impacts will depend on details of each specific proposal. Very few would be expected to have adverse impacts.	Uncertain impacts. Policy does not address protected sites so impacts will depend on details of each specific proposal. Very few would be expected to have adverse impacts.	Uncertain impacts. Policy does not address biodiversity so impacts will depend on details of each specific proposal. Very few would be expected to have adverse impacts.	Uncertain impacts. Policy does not address ground and water so impacts will depend on details of each specific proposal. Very few would be expected to have adverse impacts.	Uncertain impacts. Policy does not address soils so impacts will depend on details of each specific proposal. Very few would be expected to have adverse impact	Possible positive impact. Affected sites affected likely to meet Air Quality Standards, and policy does attempt to control impact of bio-aerosols	Uncertain impact. Policy tries to retain the character of rural buildings, but other impacts on the historic environment are possible, if unlikely	Uncertain impacts. Policy does not address landscape so impacts will depend on details of each specific proposal. Very few would be expected to have adverse impact	Policy does identify and attempt to control potential health and amenity impacts, but it does not address inequalities	Policy support s the re-use of redundant rural buildings, and farm locations may include previously developed land so positive outcomes are possible

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
3.3 Conditions for CDE recycling on mineral and landfill sites	**+**	**?+**	**?**	**?**	**?+**	**?**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**?**	**0**	**0**	**?**	**0**
	Policy will support the principles of SD by encouraging recycling whilst taking care not to undermine restoration of mineral workings	Policy may have beneficial impacts on self sufficiency by providing more locations for recycling CDE waste with minimal adverse impacts	Uncertain impacts. Will depend on precise location of relevant sites and associated transport routes, though mineral workings would not normally be regarded as tranquil.	Uncertain impact depending on details of transport of materials in and out of the proposed site	Policy may boost the provision of local facilities by considering more locations for recycling CDE waste	Uncertain impacts as recycling operations are likely to increase vehicle movements, but recycled CDE waste may displace newly-won minerals and the emissions associated with their extraction and transport.	Minimal impacts Quarries are flood compatible, and any restoration infill would be planned not to have adverse impacts. Only impacts of recycling are likely to derive from stockpiles and plant.	Policy will have minimal impact on designated sites as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration	Policy should have minimal impact as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration	Policy should have minimal impact as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration	Policy should have minimal impact as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration	Uncertain impacts. Recycling may have a slight impact, but theisneed to be balanced against savings through reducing need to extract new materials	Policy should have minimal impact as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration	Policy should have minimal impact as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration	Uncertain impacts CDE recycling may have adverse local impacts through extra transport movements but reduced demand for newly-won minerals avoids impacts associated with their extraction and transport	Policy should have minimal impact as it only affects the detailed implementation of agreed infill for restoration

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
3.4 Conditions for temporary planning permissions where impacts are uncertain	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**?+**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**?+**	**0**	**0**	**?+**	**?+**
	Policy may have a positive impact as it gives a chance to test whether adverse impacts can be avoided and to bring operations to a close if they cannot	Policy may have a positive impact on self sufficiency as it gives a chance for waste operations to show that adverse impacts can be avoided where doubts may remain.	Though policies do not specifically refer to protection of tranquil areas, this one may have a positive impact as provides a chance to end a waste operation if trials show that adverse impacts can not be avoided	Policy may have a positive impact as it gives a chance to test whether adverse impacts can be avoided and to bring operations to a close if they cannot	Policy may have a positive impact on local facilities as it gives a chance for waste operations to show that adverse impacts can be avoided where doubts may remain.	The policy is likely to have minimal impacts on greenhouse gas emissions as their control is unlikely to be a key factor in determining whether a temporary permission should be made permanent.	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on floodplains were suspected	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on designated sites were suspected	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on biodiversity were suspected	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on ground and surface waters were suspected	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on soils were suspected	Policy may have a positive impact as it gives a chance to test whether adverse impacts can be avoided and to bring operations to a close if they cannot	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on the historic environment were suspected	Minimal impact. Lack of easy reversibility means it would probably not be appropriate to grant temporary permission if adverse impacts on landscape or townscape were suspected	Policy may have a positive impact as it gives a chance to test whether adverse impacts can be avoided and to bring operations to a close if they cannot	Policy could have a positive impact on the reuse of previousl developed land if it gives a chance for waste operations on such land to show that adverse impacts can be avoided where doubts may remain

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies⬇	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Policy 4: Sustainable design and protection and improvement of environmental quality																
4.1 Promoting high quality and energy efficient design	+	0	+	+	0	+	?+	+	+	?+	?+	?+	+	+	?+	0
	Policy explicitly supports many aspects of sustainable development	Policy is concerned with the details of a waste facility rather than its location. It should have minimal impact on self sufficiency	Policy requires compatibility with the locality which should offer protection for otherwise tranquil areas	Policy requires safe and convenient access and a positive contribution to amenity, so the aims of this objective should be met	Policy is concerned with the details of a waste facility rather than its location. It should have minimal impact on provision of local facilities	Policy specifically aims to minimise emissions both directly and indirectly, as well as adapting to any unavoidable impacts	Possible positive impact. Policy calls for compatibility with adjoining land uses which should ensure protection of flood plans etc.	Policy requires positive contribution to character and quality of the natural environment which should meet this objective	Policy requires positive contribution to character and quality of the natural environment, and contribution to green infrastructure where appropriate, which should meet this objective	References to water harvesting as well as sustainable drainage are likely to support this objective	Policy makes no specific reference to conservation of soils but compatibility with adjoining land uses and the locality should offer good protection	Policy does not explicitly refer to air quality, but call for positive contribution to character and quality of the natural environment etc should support this objective	Policy calls for positive contribution to the historic environment	Policy calls for compatibility with the landscape and the locality	Policy makes no specific reference to health, but contains several requirements to maintain amenity and minimise adverse impacts. This should support most of the objective, but may not address inequalities.	Policy is concerned with the details of a waste facility rather than the type of land it is on. It should have minimal impact on whether previously developed land is chosen

	Sustainable development	Self sufficiency	"Tranquil" areas	HGV traffic	Local facilities	Greenhouse gases	Floodplains.	Ecology and geology	Biodiversity	Ground and surface waters	Conserve soils	Air Quality	Historic environment	Landscape and townscape	Health, amenity and well-being	Previously developed land
Policies↓	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
4.2 Protecting and improving environmental quality	**?+**	**?/0**	**?**	**?+**	**?/0**	**?**	**+**	**?+**	**?+**	**+**	**+**	**+**	**?+**	**+**	**?+**	**0**
	Policy is designed to avoid adverse environmental impacts, so may only partially deliver sustainable development.	Uncertain impact but likely to be minimal. Site assessment shows there are suitable sites for waste facilities which would meet the policy but delivery will depend on applications coming in.	Policy does not refer to tranquil areas. Protecting a wide range of areas, some of which could also be tranquil, could put pressure on sites not covered. Given the scale of development expected and other criteria, impact on tranquil areas should be minimal.	No specific mention but policies to avoid adverse impacts on people and communities, the highway network etc should all serve to support the aims of this objective.	Uncertain impact but likely to be minimal. Site assessment shows there are suitable sites for waste facilities which would meet the policy but delivery will depend on applications coming in.	Uncertain impact. Policy says nothing specific about greenhouse gas emissions, and other aspects could either increase or reduce emissions	Policy offers specific protection	Policy offers specific protection, but does not commit to enhancement	Policy offers specific protection, but does not commit to enhancement	Policy offers specific protection	Policy offers specific protection	Policy offers specific protection	Policy offers specific protection, but does not commit to enhancement	Policy offers specific protection	Policy offers specific protection to a range of factors that contribute to this objective, but does not address inequalities	Policy says nothing about favouring previously developed land, and other aspects of the policy are unlikely to have any significant impact either way

12 Appendix E – Tables of cumulative and synergistic effects

	Policy Summaries
1.1	General principles
1.2	Making better use of waste associated with non-waste related development
1.3	Making better use of construction, demolition and excavation waste
1.4	Waste used in landscaping, engineering and agricultural improvement
1.5	Energy recovery
1.6	Landfill and landraise
2.1	Landfill diversion targets
2.2	Targets for new waste management facilities
2.3	Broad locations for different scales of facility
2.4	Strategic waste facilities to be safeguarded (Energy Recovery Facilities and hazardous landfill)
2.5	Restrictions on development in the vicinity of waste management facilities
3.1	General requirement for enclosure and compatibility with nearby uses etc.
3.2	Exceptions for processes that must be away from people, restrictions on open-windrow composting and notes on re-use of existing buildings
3.3	Conditions for CDE recycling on mineral and landfill sites
3.4	Conditions for temporary planning permissions where impacts are uncertain
4.1	Promoting high quality and energy efficient design
4.2	Protecting and improving environmental quality

Potential cumulative effects

(Would the impact of two policies together be greater than either policy alone?)

	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.2
1.1		✓															
1.2			✓														
1.3				✓		✓											
1.4																	
1.5																	
1.6							✓										
2.1																	
2.2																	
2.3																	
2.4											✓						
2.5																	
3.1																	
3.2																	
3.3															✓		
3.4																	
4.1																	
4.2																	

Potential synergistic effects

Would the policies tend to work together to reinforce an impact?

	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.2
1.1		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.2			✓	✓												✓	
1.3				✓		✓	✓							✓			
1.4						✓											
1.5																	
1.6							✓			✓	✓						
2.1								✓		✓	✓						
2.2										✓	✓						
2.3																	
2.4											✓						
2.5																	
3.1																✓	✓
3.2																	
3.3																	
3.4																✓	✓
4.1																	✓
4.2																	

For more information please contact:
Staffordshire County Council
Planning, Policy & Development Control
Office address:No 1 Staffordshire Place
Stafford ST16 2LP
Postal Address: Wedgewood Building
Block A, Tipping Street, Stafford ST16 2DH
Tel: 01785 (27) 7293
E-mail: planning@staffordshire.gov.uk

Mathieu Evans
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Civic Centre
Glebe Street
Stoke-on-Trent ST4 1RN
Tel: 01782 232353
E-mail: mathieu.evans@stoke.gov.uk

"If you would like this publication in another language or format please contact us on 01785 (27) 7278 or by emailing tim.billings@staffordshire.gov.uk"