

The logo for 'place services' is located in the top left corner. It consists of a solid blue square with the words 'place' and 'services' stacked vertically in a white, lowercase, sans-serif font.

**Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea
Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan**

Schedule of Modifications

**Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental
Assessment Addendum**

November 2016

Contents

1	Introduction and Methodology	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	1
1.3	The Aim and Structure of this Report.....	2
2	Modifications to the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan 2016	3
2.1	SA/SEA Screening Process and Amendments to the SA/SEA Environmental Report.....	3
3	Significant Sustainability Effects and Changes to the SA as a result of Main Modifications	58
3.1	Main Modifications 5 & 23– The Allocation of Dollymans Farm (L(i)16) as a Strategic Site Allocation for Inert Landfill	58
3.2	Main Modification 6 –Supporting Text to Policy 4: Areas of Search	65
3.3	Main Modifications 21 & 22 - Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms & Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area.....	66

List of Tables

Table 1: Main Modifications to the ECC & SBC Replacement Waste Local Plan and impact on accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report	4
--	---

1 Introduction and Methodology

1.1 Background

Following the Examination in Public of the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan, in September-October 2016, a series of modifications were proposed by the Inspector during the hearing sessions in order to make the Replacement Waste Local Plan sound and legally compliant.

These modifications are subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in this report, in so far as they may alter those impacts highlighted in the SA/SEA that accompanied the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission consultation version of Replacement Waste Local Plan 2016.

1.2 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

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

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

The European Directive 2001/42/EC “on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment” (the ‘SEA Directive’) was adopted in June 2001 with a view to increase the level of protection for the environment, integrate environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes and to promote sustainable development.

It requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment to be carried out for all plans and programmes which are:

‘subject to preparation and/or adoption by an authority at national, regional or local level or which are prepared by an authority for adoption, through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government, and required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions’.

The few exceptions are detailed in Article 3 (8, 9) of the SEA Directive. The aim of the SEA is to identify potentially significant environmental effects created as a result of the implementation of the plan or programme on issues such as

‘biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors’

as specified in Annex 1(f) of the Directive. The Directive was transposed into English legislation by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which came into force on 21 July 2004.

Sustainability Appraisals examine the effects of proposed plans and programmes in a wider context, taking into account economic, social and environmental considerations in order to promote sustainable development. They are mandatory for all Development Plan Documents in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended.

Whilst the requirements to produce a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment are distinct, Government guidance considers that it is possible to satisfy the two requirements through a single approach providing that the requirements of the SEA Directive are met.

1.3 The Aim and Structure of this Report

This report forms part of the SA/SEA of the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan 2016. It should be read alongside the SA/SEA Environmental Report of the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan that was published for consultation alongside the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Replacement Waste Local Plan in early 2016. Sustainability impacts identified in this report represent changes to the aforementioned SA/SEA Environmental Report.

Numerous modifications to the Plan are proposed. These modifications are a result of recommendations made by the Inspector during the Examination in Public hearing sessions in order to make the Replacement Waste Local Plan sound and legally compliant. Modifications at this stage in the process could change the direction of the Plan; therefore it is essential that the modifications are also subject to SA/SEA.

This report screens the proposed modifications to the Plan to explore whether they would result in any additional significant impacts to those identified within the SA/SEA Environmental Report of the Pre-Submission Replacement Waste Local Plan 2016. Should any additional significant impacts be apparent as a result of any of the modifications, this document sets out any subsequent changes to the SA/SEA Environmental Report of the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Replacement Waste Local Plan 2016 that are necessary. Any temporal, secondary, cumulative or synergistic impacts resulting from the modifications will also be highlighted should they be apparent.

2 Modifications to the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Replacement Waste Local Plan 2016

2.1 SA/SEA Screening Process and Amendments to the SA/SEA Environmental Report

The Main and Minor Modifications to the Plan have been screened to identify whether or not they will have significant sustainability effects that would be additional to, or alter those, identified in the SA/SEA Environmental Report for the Plan at the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission stage.

It should be noted that many of the modifications are minor. The National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that changes that are not significant will not require further SA/SEA work. The guidance defines significant changes as those that '*substantially alter [...] and [are] likely to give rise to significant effects*'. Nevertheless, minor changes have also been screened for significant impacts in the formulation of this report.

NOTE: It has been assessed, after screening, that none of the Plan's proposed Minor Modifications will give rise to any significant sustainability effects, nor will there be any resultant change to the SA of the Plan at the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission stage.

The following table explores the sustainability effects of those Main Modifications to the Plan chronologically. The final column notes whether there would be any additional significant sustainability effects or changes to the Plan's Regulation 19 Pre-Submission SA/SEA Environmental Report.

Main Modifications are identified in the following ways:

- Deletions: ~~strikethrough~~
- Additions: **Red**

Table 1: Main Modifications to the ECC & SBC Replacement Waste Local Plan and impact on accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
1	Paragraph 4.21 to 4.23	See Appendix 1	<p>See Appendix 1</p> <p>Appendix 1 – The Waste Challenge at a Glance</p> <p>4.21 Non Hazardous Waste</p> <p>There has been and will continue to be cross boundary movements of waste. It has been identified within planning practice guidance that Greater London net imports of non-hazardous waste to the Plan area requires specific consideration. It is estimated that in total the net exports to the plan area from Greater London are estimated to be 1.92mtpa until 2026, with net importation from London having ceased by 2026 according to the adopted London Plan 2015;</p> <p>There has been and will continue to be cross boundary movements of waste. Planning Practice Guidance states that imports of waste from Greater London require specific consideration. The Vision & Strategic Objectives of this Plan therefore recognises the need to continue to make provision for imports from London, albeit at a reducing rate. After 2026, imports of non-hazardous waste to landfill should only be of non-recyclable and non-biodegradable wastes, while some provision may also be made for the management of residues suitable for energy recovery at consented plant.</p> <p>Non-organic, non-hazardous waste arisings within the Plan area are expected to moderately increase during the Plan period. In 2015, it was estimated there was were 1.57mt of</p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>this type of waste arising in the Plan area. By 2031/32, arisings are estimated to be 1.67mtpa. Imports of non-hazardous waste from London has been estimated to be in the region of 375,000 tpa in the early years of the Plan reducing down to around 150,000 tpa at the end of the Plan period.</p> <p>Organic non-hazardous waste arisings within the Plan area are also expected to increase slightly during the Plan period. In 2014 2015, it was estimated that there was 331,000t of organic non-hazardous waste arising in the Plan area. By 2031/32, arisings are estimated to be 349,000tpa.</p> <p>Consented operational capacity will is expected to decline from 221,000tpa to 131,000tpa should no further planning permissions be granted over the Plan period. Consequently there is will be a requirement for 217,000 218,000tpa of new organic treatment capacity by 2031/32;</p> <p>At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering exploring long term management options surrounding the final destination for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, Currently the annual 200,000t output of the from this facility is was exported from the Plan area. A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area. However, in line with In line with the Plan's Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this could accommodate this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term.</p> <p>Assuming the that suitable facilities are delivered on the sites allocated in the this Plan are all successfully delivered, it is forecasted that there will be a surplus capacity of some non-hazardous landfill void space will exist at the end of the Plan period. However, in accordance with the waste hierarchy, this remains the option of last resort and is not considered to be a substitute for developing further identifying additional treatment capacity that will move waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>4.22 Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste</p> <p>It is estimated that local Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste arisings was 3.62mtpa in 2014 (including 0.31mt of waste imported from London's projected needs).</p> <p>It is identified that there is a need for an additional 4.5 1.95mtpa of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste recovery management (recycling or disposal) capacity by 2031/32, partly due to the expiry expiration of existing temporary planning permissions.</p> <p>Locally collected evidence suggests that there is further diversion from landfill through beneficial re-use of inert waste, which equated to approximately 765,000tpa in 2014.</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>It is estimated that there is a current inert landfill void space of approximately 3.4 3.25 million m³, which would equate to approximately 5.1 4.8 million tonnes of CDE disposal capacity. This is, however, not sufficient to accommodate the forecasted need for inert landfill waste management capacity over the Plan period, to accommodate both the Plan Area and the inert waste projected to be imported from London. To address this, sites capable of providing 640,000tpa of inert waste recycling capacity and 9.52million m³ of inert waste disposal capacity landfill sites capable of accommodating 14.08 million tonnes in total are allocated in the Plan. It is, however, recognised that a proportion of the total inert waste recycling capacity is temporary in nature, and without further permissions, the total inert recycling capacity is likely to reduce to 340,000tpa at the end of the Plan period.</p> <p>Nonetheless, even after the allocation of all sites suitable for inert waste recycling and inert waste landfill, Following the above allocations, there is a further need to find management solutions for a total of 2.58mt 7.05mt of inert waste. Since no No other submitted sites proposals have been deemed suitable for the management of inert waste in the Plan area, although locational criteria policies provide the means by which would be used to assess any additional future inert waste management proposals can will be assessed.</p> <p>4.23 Hazardous Waste</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>In 2014, most of the 113,000tpa of hazardous waste requiring management is exported from the Plan area for final management. Of this, around 23,000 tpa was disposed to landfill.</p> <p>The only landfill accepting hazardous waste (Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste -SNRHW) within the Plan area closed in April 2014, so in 2016 waste was is being disposed of at sites beyond the Plan area. This facility, on average, accepted approximately 50,000 tonnes of SNRHW per annum, which included imports from other authority areas as well as waste generated within the Plan area.</p> <p>Hazardous waste is not subject to net self-sufficiency within this Plan due to the specialist nature of the waste facility type and the relatively small quantities generated within the Plan area.</p> <p>A new disposal site for a Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste Landfill with a total capacity for 30,000 tonnes per annum of Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste Landfill is allocated in the Plan. No other proposals for the management of hazardous waste in the Plan area were submitted. Locational criteria policies would be used to assess any future hazardous waste proposals provide the means by which will be assessed, should the market identify a need for further facilities in the Plan area.</p>	
2	Paragraph 5.3	The principle of net self-sufficiency does	The principle of net self-sufficiency does not apply to hazardous waste or radioactive waste as it is not	There will be no significant

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
		not apply to reactive hazardous waste or radioactive waste as it is not considered practical to provide for such specialist facilities within the Plan area.	considered practical to provide for such specialist facilities on the basis of net self-sufficiency within the Plan area.	sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.
3	Policy 1	See Appendix 2	<p>See Appendix 2</p> <p>Appendix 2</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Policy 1</p> <p>Need for Waste Management Facilities</p> <p><i>In order to meet the future needs of the Plan area, waste development will be permitted to meet the shortfall in capacity of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>up to 217,000 218,000 tonnes per annum by 2031/32 of biological treatment for non-hazardous organic waste;</i> b. <i>up to 4.5 1.95 million tonnes per annum by 2031/32 for the management of inert waste;</i> c. <i>up to 200,000 tonnes per annum by 2031/32 for the further management of non-hazardous residual</i> </div>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>waste other waste; and</p> <p>d. up to 50,250 tonnes per annum by 2031/32 for the management of hazardous waste.</p>	
4	Policy 2	See Appendix 3	<p>See Appendix 3</p> <p>Waste Consultation Areas</p> <p>6.7 Safeguarding will be implemented through Waste Consultation Areas which are defined around all permitted waste developments (as indicated in the Authority Monitoring Report) and sites allocated in this Plan. Proposed development, including that proposed in Local Plans, within 250m of a safeguarded site (or 400m of a Water Recycling Centre - WRC) will be subject to consultation with the Waste Planning Authority. Waste Consultation Areas will be communicated to the Essex and Southend-on-Sea District/Borough and City Councils. and the unitary authority of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council. Sensitive uses should not be located adjacent to, or within, 250 metres (or 400m of a WRC) of any part of a safeguarded site. However, the actual buffer needed around each site will depend upon the nature of the proposed ‘sensitive’ use and on the specific impacts of the current waste operation.</p> <p>6.8 There will be instances where a proposed non-waste use may not is considered unlikely to compromise the operation of an existing or future waste management facility operating</p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>within that safeguarded site. As such, Table 21 'Development in Waste Consultation Area' sets out those development types which, when coming forward in Waste Consultation Areas, the Waste Planning Authority would not need to be consulted upon.</p> <p>6.9 Existing and allocated waste sites and infrastructure will be protected from inappropriate neighbouring developments that may prejudice their continuing efficient operation. Waste development is not normally a high-value use in comparison with other land uses and as such the existing and allocated sites and facilities are safeguarded as they make an important contribution to the management of waste arising in Essex and Southend-on-Sea. Without a safeguarding policy, sites required to achieve a sustainable distribution of waste management facilities could be lost to other development. Sites covered by this policy that become vacant or where the existing waste use ceases operation, will continue to be subject to safeguarding.</p> <p>6.10 In some cases, the potential adverse impact on loss of a waste site or operation of a waste facility may not be consented by the WPAs. Such instances could include scenarios where be acceptable, for example where it would enable the implementation of a town centre improvement strategy and it can be ascertained that the re are wider social, environmental and/or economic benefits resulting from new development that may such a scheme outweigh the retention of the waste use. In such instances, alternative site provision for the displaced waste use could will be required</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>should such capacity continue to be necessary.</p> <p>6.11 Whilst Waste Consultation Zones apply to all permitted waste facilities in the Plan area, the WPAs are unlikely to object to development in close proximity to a small scale, non-specialist facilities, defined in this Plan as those with an annual capacity of 10,000tpa or less'</p> <p>6.12 The identification of alternative provision could be made by the relevant Local Planning Authority, the applicant for the non-waste development or potentially be considered through a focused review of this Waste Local Plan. This aims to ensure that no shortfall in equivalent waste management capacity occurs in Essex and Southend-on-Sea during the Plan period. Any The loss of waste capacity in the Plan area will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>6.13 The network of Local Authority Collected Waste facilities comprising the Integrated Waste Management Facility at Tovi EcoPark, Basildon and the six supporting transfer stations are integral for the sustainable management of household waste arising in the Plan area. As such, these sites (listed in Existing Waste Management Capacity, Table 3) are to be safeguarded unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required for the delivery of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.</p> <p>6.14 Waste management infrastructure includes facilities such as wharves and railheads, which play an important role in the movement of waste materials. All current and any</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>future facilities that come forward for this purpose during the plan period will be safeguarded under this policy.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Policy 2</p> <p>Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure</p> <p>Waste Consultation Areas <i>Where non-waste development is proposed within 250m of safeguarded sites, or within 400m of a WRC, the relevant Local Planning Authority is required to consult the Waste Planning Authority on the planning application proposed non-waste development (except for those developments defined as 'Excluded' in 'Appendix C - Development Excluded from Safeguarding Provisions').</i></p> <p><i>Proposals which are considered to have the potential to adversely impact on the operation of a safeguarded waste site or infrastructure, including the site allocations within this Plan, are likely to be opposed where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. a temporary permission for a waste use has expired, or the waste management use has otherwise ceased, and the site or infrastructure is considered unsuitable for a subsequent</i> </div>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>waste use; or</i></p> <p><i>b. redevelopment of the waste site or loss of the waste infrastructure would form part of a strategy or scheme that has wider environmental, social and/or economic benefits that clearly outweigh the retention of the site or the infrastructure for the waste use, and alternative provision is made for the displaced waste use; or</i></p> <p><i>c. a suitable replacement site or infrastructure has otherwise been</i></p> <p><i>Where proposed non-waste development gives rise to an objection from the Waste Planning Authority, it is expected that the proposed development would not be permitted</i></p>	
5	Policy 3, Clause 3	See Appendix 4	<p>See Appendix 4</p> <p>Policy 3</p> <p>Strategic Site Allocations</p> <p><i>Waste management development at the following locations (see Strategic Site Allocations Map) will be</i></p>	The allocation of Dollymans Farm in Basildon/Rochford (L(i)16) for inert landfill will have significant environmental effects in addition to a number of changes to

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>permitted as follows and where proposals take into account the requirements identified in the relevant development principles (Allocated Sites: Development Principles):</p> <p>1. For biological waste management at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bellhouse Landfill Site, Colchester (Reg 18 ref: W29); • Basildon Waste Water Treatment Works, Basildon (Reg 18 ref: W3); • Courtauld Road, Basildon (Reg 18 ref: W20); and • Rivenhall, Braintree (Reg 18 ref: IWMF2). <p>2. For inert waste recycling at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crumps Farm, Gt and Lt Canfield, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: W32); • Elsenham, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: W8); • Sandon East, Chelmsford (Reg 18 ref: W7); • Slough Farm Ardleigh, Tendring (Reg 18 ref: L(n)1R); • Blackley Quarry, Gt Leighs, Chelmsford (Reg 18 ref: L(i)10R); • Sunnymead, Elmstead & Heath Farms, Tendring (W36); • Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area; Tendring (Reg 18 ref: W13); • Morses Lane - Brightlingsea, Tendring (Reg 18 ref: W31); and 	<p>the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission SA Environmental Report. These implications are covered in more detail in Section 3 of this report.</p>

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newport Quarry, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: L(i)17R). <p>3. For other residual non-hazardous waste management at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rivenhall, Braintree (Reg 18 ref: IWMF2). <p>4. For inert landfill at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Bullocks Farm, Great and Little Canfield, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: L(n)7R); • Slough Farm, Ardleigh, Tendring (Reg 18 ref: L(n)1R); • Blackley Quarry, Gt Leighs, Chelmsford (Reg 18 ref: L(i)10R); • Sandon, Chelmsford (Reg 18 ref: L(i)6); • Sunnymead, Elmstead & Heath Farms, Tendring (Reg 18 ref: L(i)5); • Newport Quarry, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: L(i)17R); • Bellhouse Landfill Site, Colchester (Reg 18 ref: L(n)5); • Fingringhoe Quarry, Colchester (Reg 18 ref: L(i)15); • Dollymans Farm, Basildon/Rochford (L(i)16); <p>5. For hazardous landfill at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Bullocks Farm, Great and Little Canfield, Uttlesford (L(n)8R). 	
6	Paragraph	Proposals within the	Proposals within the Areas of Search will normally require	This Major

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
	8.10	Areas of Search will normally require express planning permission and will be considered against policies in the RWLP, and the wider Development Plan as a whole. The design and operation of waste management facilities proposed within Areas of Search should be consistent with existing uses in the employment area.	express planning permission and will be considered against other relevant policies in the RWLP, including Policy 10 – Development Management , and the wider Development Plan as a whole. The need to consider the wider Development Plan is important as it is the relevant Local Plan which determines whether an Area of Search designation remains relevant. Should a Local Plan seek to re-allocate land pertaining to an Area of Search away from B2/B8 uses, the criteria upon which Areas of Search are based would no longer be fulfilled. In such instances, the location would cease to be an Area of Search and Policy 4 would no longer apply. The design and operation of waste management facilities proposed within Areas of Search should be consistent compatible with existing uses in the employment area.	Modification will not give rise to a significant sustainability effect, however does ensure a change to the SA Environmental Report (and Non-Technical Summary) of the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Plan. This change is highlighted in more detail in Section 3 of this report.
7	Policy 4	<i>See Appendix 5</i>	<p><i>See Appendix 5 – Policy 4</i></p> <p>Areas of Search <i>Proposals for waste management development in the following locations will be permitted.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for waste management development in the following Areas of Search, as defined on the Policies Map, will be supported in principle provided that the design and use of the facility is compatible with existing uses in the employment area.</i></p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment				Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<i>Proposals for waste management will be considered against other relevant policies of this Plan and the wider Development Plan.</i>				
			Area of Search	District	Area of Search	District	
			Burnt Mills Central	Basildon	Westways	Chelmsford	
			Festival Business Park	Basildon	Widford Industrial Estate	Chelmsford	
			Pipps Hill	Basildon	Land of Axial Way, Myland	Colchester	
			Southfields Business Park	Basildon	Severalls Industry Park	Colchester	
			Bluebridge Industrial Estate	Braintree	Tollgate, Stanway	Colchester	
			Earls Colne Airfield	Braintree	Whitehall Road Industrial Estate	Colchester	
			Eastwasy-Crittall Road, Waterside Park	Braintree	Langston Road/Oakland Hill, Loughton	Epping Forest	
			Freebournes Industrial	Braintree	Pinnacles and	Harlow	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment				Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			Estate		Roydenbury Industrial Estate		
			Skyline 120	Braintree	Temple Fields	Harlow	
			Springwood Industrial Estate	Braintree	Rochford Business Park	Rochford	
			Sturmer Industrial Estate Area 1	Braintree	Michelins Farm	Rochford	
			Childerditch Industrial Estate	Brentwood	Stock Road	Southend-on-Sea	
			West Horndon	Brentwood	Temple Farm	Southend-on-Sea	
			Drovers Way	Chelmsford	Martells Farm Industrial Estate	Tendring	
			Dukes Park Industrial Estate	Chelmsford	Oakwood and Crusader Business Park	Tendring	
			Springfield Business Park	Chelmsford	Start Hill, Great Hallingbury	Uttlesford	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal												
8	Policy 5	See Appendix 6 & 7	<p>Appendix 6 – Paragraph 8.15</p> <p>8.15 Waste management development can, depending on its type be delivered in either enclosed or open facilities. separated into two broad categories, those known as 'enclosed facilities' where waste is processed inside a building. Enclosed facilities can be broadly similar in appearance to other industrial processes developments such as factories which take place within warehouses. Some examples are listed in the table below. of enclosed waste facilities include in vessel composting, anaerobic digestion and thermal treatment developments. The other category is 'Open facilities, which although occasionally are can also be partially enclosed, largely deal with waste in the open air. Examples of open waste facilities include inert waste recycling and open windrow composting developments.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="831 967 1644 1423"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="831 967 1133 1023">Broad Waste Facility Type</th> <th data-bbox="1133 967 1644 1023">Example Waste Facility</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 1023 1133 1331" rowspan="6">Enclosed Waste Facilities (housed in buildings)</td> <td data-bbox="1133 1023 1644 1066">Transfer Station</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1133 1066 1644 1109">Storage</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1133 1109 1644 1152">Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1133 1152 1644 1195">Metal Recycling Facility</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1133 1195 1644 1238">End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1133 1238 1644 1331">In-vessel Composting Facility Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility (MBT)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 1331 1133 1423" rowspan="2">Enclosed Thermal Facilities (housed in buildings with flues)</td> <td data-bbox="1133 1331 1644 1374">Combined Heat and Power Facilities (CHP)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1133 1374 1644 1423">Gasification and Pyrolysis Facilities</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Broad Waste Facility Type	Example Waste Facility	Enclosed Waste Facilities (housed in buildings)	Transfer Station	Storage	Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)	Metal Recycling Facility	End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities	In-vessel Composting Facility Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility (MBT)	Enclosed Thermal Facilities (housed in buildings with flues)	Combined Heat and Power Facilities (CHP)	Gasification and Pyrolysis Facilities	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.
Broad Waste Facility Type	Example Waste Facility															
Enclosed Waste Facilities (housed in buildings)	Transfer Station															
	Storage															
	Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)															
	Metal Recycling Facility															
	End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities															
	In-vessel Composting Facility Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility (MBT)															
Enclosed Thermal Facilities (housed in buildings with flues)	Combined Heat and Power Facilities (CHP)															
	Gasification and Pyrolysis Facilities															

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal													
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 309 1137 384">and/or digestate piping)</td> <td data-bbox="1137 309 1644 344">Anaerobic Digestion (AD)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 344 1137 384"></td> <td data-bbox="1137 344 1644 379">Autoclaving Facilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 379 1137 469" rowspan="8">Open Air Facilities</td> <td data-bbox="1137 379 1644 469">Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&EW) Recycling Facilities (or inert recycling)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 469 1644 504">Metal Recycling Facility</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 504 1644 560">End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 560 1644 595">Windrow Composting Facilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 595 1644 630">Water Recycling Facilities (WRCs)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 630 1644 665">Inert Landfill Sites</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 665 1644 700">Non-hazardous Landfill Sites</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 700 1644 735">Hazardous Landfill Sites</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="831 791 1016 826">Appendix 7</p> <div data-bbox="831 855 1644 1437" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p data-bbox="831 895 965 930">Policy 5</p> <p data-bbox="831 970 1599 1038">Enclosed Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or outside Areas of Search</p> <p data-bbox="831 1046 1525 1115"><i>Proposals for new enclosed waste management facilities will be permitted where:</i></p> <ol data-bbox="887 1123 1599 1430" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="887 1123 1599 1278"><i>1. the waste site allocations or and the Areas of Search in this Plan are shown to be unsuitable and/or unavailable for the proposed development;</i> <li data-bbox="887 1318 1599 1430"><i>2. although not exclusively, a need for the capacity of the proposed development has been demonstrated to manage waste arising from</i> </div>	and/or digestate piping)	Anaerobic Digestion (AD)		Autoclaving Facilities	Open Air Facilities	Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&EW) Recycling Facilities (or inert recycling)	Metal Recycling Facility	End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities	Windrow Composting Facilities	Water Recycling Facilities (WRCs)	Inert Landfill Sites	Non-hazardous Landfill Sites	Hazardous Landfill Sites	
and/or digestate piping)	Anaerobic Digestion (AD)																
	Autoclaving Facilities																
Open Air Facilities	Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&EW) Recycling Facilities (or inert recycling)																
	Metal Recycling Facility																
	End of Life Vehicle (ELV) Recycling Facilities																
	Windrow Composting Facilities																
	Water Recycling Facilities (WRCs)																
	Inert Landfill Sites																
	Non-hazardous Landfill Sites																
	Hazardous Landfill Sites																

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>within the administrative areas of Essex and Southend-on-Sea; and</i></p> <p><i>3. it is demonstrated that the site is at least as suitable for such development as Site Allocations or Areas of Search, with reference to the overall spatial strategy and site assessment methodology associated with this Plan.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, proposals should be located at or in:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. employment areas that are existing or allocated in a Local Plan for general industry (B2) and storage and distribution (B8);or</i> <i>b. existing permitted waste management sites or co-located with other waste management development; or</i> <i>c. the same site or co-located in close proximity to where the waste arises; or</i> <i>d. the curtilages of Waste Water Treatment Works (in the case of biological waste); or,</i> <i>e. areas of Previously Developed Land; or</i> <i>f. redundant agricultural or forestry buildings and their curtilages (in the case of green waste</i> 	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>and/or biological waste).</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for energy recovery facilities with combined heat and power are expected to demonstrate that the heat produced will be supplied to a district heat network or direct to commercial or industrial users.</i></p> <p><i>Any proposals that come forward on land use types not identified above will be assessed on their merits, based on the policies in this Plan the adopted RWLP. Such locations will be considered less favourably than those set out within this Policy.</i></p>	
9	Policy 6	See Appendix 8	<p>See Appendix 8</p> <p>Appendix 8</p> <p>Policy 6</p> <p>Open Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or outside Areas of Search</p> <p><i>Proposals for new open waste management facilities will be permitted where:</i></p> <p>1. <i>the waste site allocations or and the Areas of Search in this Plan are shown to be unsuitable and/or unavailable for the proposed</i></p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>development;</i></p> <p>2. although not exclusively, a need for the capacity of the proposed development has been demonstrated to manage waste arising from within the administrative areas of Essex and Southend-on-Sea;</p> <p>3. <i>it is demonstrated that the site is at least as suitable for such development as Site Allocations or Areas of Search, with reference to the overall spatial strategy and site assessment methodology associated with this Plan.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, proposals should be located at or in:</i></p> <p>a. <i>redundant farm land (in the case of green waste and/or biological waste); or</i></p> <p>b. <i>demolition and construction sites, where the inert waste materials are to be used on the construction project on that site; or</i></p> <p>c. <i>existing permitted waste management sites or co-located with other waste management development; or</i></p> <p>d. <i>the curtilages of Waste Water Treatment Works (in the case of biological waste); or</i></p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>e. mineral and landfill sites where waste material is used in conjunction with restoration, or proposed waste operations are temporary and linked to the completion of the mineral/landfill operation; or</i></p> <p><i>f. areas of Previously Developed Land; or</i></p> <p><i>g. employment areas that are existing or allocated in a Local Plan for general industry (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).</i></p> <p><i>Any proposals that come forward on land use types not identified above will be assessed on their merits, based on the policies in this Plan. the adopted RWLP. Such locations will be considered less favourably than those set out within this Policy.</i></p>	
10	Policy 7	See Appendix 9	<p>See Appendix 9</p> <p>Appendix 9 – Supporting Text and Policy 7</p> <p>Nuclear Radioactive Waste</p> <p>8.21 Bradwell-on-Sea Nuclear Power Station is a licensed Nuclear Site and is the principal source of radioactive waste arisings within the Plan area whilst the Power Station is decommissioned.</p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>8.22 The nuclear waste arisings from this process comprise Very Low Level (VLLW), Low Level (LLW) and Intermediate Level (ILW) Radioactive Wastes. A key element of the decommissioning is to manage the waste arising, to enable the waste to be safely retrieved from the facility, stored and processed whilst having regard to the level of radioactivity and long term options available.</p> <p>8.23 The Bradwell-on-Sea site is the first site operated by Magnox within the Government’s “Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA)” to be decommissioned, and this is within an accelerated programme to deliver the “care and maintenance” stage in 2016/17. At this stage the site would be cleared and secured as appropriate, including the storage of ILW within a dedicated on-site long term ILW Storage facility. The ILW will remain in the store until a national Geological Disposal Facility is available to receive the packages. This process is in accordance with DECC’s UK’s waste management strategy for LLW & ILW (dated 2010).</p> <p>The Bradwell-on-Sea site is one of the first UK nuclear reactor sites to be decommissioned. Within the period covered by this policy document, the site will enter into an extended period of care and maintenance prior to which the site will be secured as appropriate, and packaged ILW placed in storage within the dedicated on-site interim ILW Storage facility. The packaged ILW will remain in the store until a national Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) is available to receive the packages. This process is in accordance with DECC’s UK’s waste management strategy for LLW & ILW (dated 2010).</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>Following the extended period of care and maintenance, the site will be decommissioned and remediation activities undertaken which when completed will allow the site to reach end state and enable the next planned use.</p> <p>8.24 The Government is separately pursuing its strategy (Implementing Geological Disposal: A framework for the long-term management of higher activity radioactive waste, 2014) for a long term national Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) which is scheduled to be operational by 2040. It proposes a range of activities to be taken forward between 2014 and 2016 to set the framework for the GDF site selection process. The GDF is a “Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project” (NSIP) and the future siting is still to be determined. NSIPs are a national consideration and therefore outside of the remit of the RWLP.</p> <p>8.25 It is noted that although the Plan cannot rule out any type of development, it was held in the Waste Local Plan 2001 that the geology of the Plan area does not support the disposal and containment of nuclear waste and that it was therefore likely that any such facility would be located beyond the Plan area. However, evidence contained in the Radioactive Waste Management Ltd consultation on ‘National Geological Screening Guidance – Providing information on Geology’ (September 2015) indicates that there is not a specific type of geology to accommodate a national GDF. This is due to the number of possible design solutions to accommodate different types of geology and the</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>respective safety issues. The location of a GDF will be addressed through a public consultation, managed by Government, to determine an appropriate strategy. Any new GDF will receive the ILW waste that is currently stored at Bradwell-on-Sea.</p> <p>8.26 The NDA was established as a Non-Departmental Public Body under the Energy Act (2004) to ensure that the UK's nuclear legacy sites are decommissioned and cleaned up safely, securely, cost-effectively and in ways that protect people and the environment. The NDA is responsible for developing nuclear decommissioning plans and implementing them through an estate-wide strategy. The Strategies are to develop a clear understanding of what is required to deliver the decommissioning agenda with a strategic focus and coherent approach to decommissioning. The third Strategy "NDA Strategy III" is to be published for consultation in January 2016 and takes into account best practice and new procedures as a result of de-commissioning activities at Bradwell-on-Sea and other licenced sites across the UK. This includes the application of the Waste Hierarchy to reduce the quantity of waste to be disposed. The NDA was established as a Non-Departmental Public Body under the Energy Act (2004) to ensure that the UK's nuclear legacy sites are decommissioned and cleaned up safely, securely, cost-effectively and in ways that protect people and the environment. The NDA is responsible for developing nuclear decommissioning plans and implementing them through an estate-wide strategy. The Strategies are to develop a clear understanding of what is required to</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>deliver the decommissioning agenda with a strategic focus and coherent approach to decommissioning. The third Strategy “NDA Strategy III” was published in April 2016 and takes into account best practice and new procedures as a result of de-commissioning activities at Bradwell-on-Sea and other licenced sites across the UK. Proposals that are consistent with the current strategy (or its subsequent revisions) will be supported in line with Policy 7. This includes the application of the Waste Hierarchy to reduce the quantity of waste to be disposed and the beneficial reuse of material and waste to achieve the site end state and enable the next planned use.</p> <p>8.27 The Government’s National Policy Statement (NPS) for Nuclear Power Generation(8) is considering the Bradwell-on-Sea site, alongside seven other sites nationally, for future nuclear energy development. If the Bradwell-on-Sea site is selected as one of the suitable sites for nuclear energy development, then there would be further arisings of ILW in the Plan area. The fate of these materials ultimately depends upon the progress of the GDF and would need to be considered in the context of future national policy.</p> <p>8.28 Given the formative status of this process any potential waste arisings cannot be planned for at this stage. Such a new nuclear power station would be considered an NSIP and therefore outside of the remit of this Plan.</p> <div data-bbox="831 1342 1644 1415" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>Policy 7</p> </div>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>Radioactive Waste Management Nuclear Waste Treatment and Storage at Bradwell-on-Sea</p> <p><i>Proposals for facilities for the management treatment and/or storage of nuclear radioactive Intermediate Level Waste (ILW), Low Level Waste (LLW) or Very Low Level Waste (VLLW) will be supported only be acceptable within the Nuclear Licensed Areas at Bradwell-on-Sea, where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. the proposals are consistent with the national strategy for managing ILW, LLW and VLLW as well as the decommissioning plans for the Bradwell-on-Sea power station;</i> <i>b. the proposals are informed by the outcome of economic and environmental assessments that support and justify the management of radioactive decommissioned nuclear waste at this location on-site, and;</i> <i>c. the proposals would not cause any unacceptable adverse impacts to the environment, human health or local amenity.</i> 	
11	Policy 9	See Appendix 10	<p>See Appendix 10</p> <p>Appendix 10</p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>Policy 9</p> <p>Waste Disposal Facilities on Unallocated sites</p> <p><i>Proposals for landfill facilities will be permitted where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>the landfill site allocations in this Plan are shown to be unsuitable and/or unavailable for the proposed development;</i> 2. <i>although not exclusively</i>, <i>a need for the capacity of the proposed development has been demonstrated to manage waste arising from within the administrative areas of Essex and Southend-on-Sea;</i> 3. <i>it is demonstrated that the site is at least as suitable for such development as the landfill site allocations, with reference to the site assessment methodology associated with this Plan; and</i> 4. <i>that the proposed landfill has been demonstrated to be the most appropriate and acceptable development in relation to the Waste Hierarchy.</i> <p><i>In addition, preference will be given to proposals:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>for the restoration of a preferred or reserve site</i> 	<p>modification.</p>

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>in the Minerals Local Plan; or</i></p> <p><i>b. for an extension of time to complete the permitted restoration within the boundary of an existing landfill site.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for non-inert landfill are required to demonstrate the capture of landfill gas for energy generation by the most efficient means.</i></p> <p><i>Any proposals that come forward on land use types not identified above will be assessed on their merits, based on the policies in this Plan the adopted RWLP. Such locations will be considered less favourably than those set out within this Policy.</i></p>	
12	Paragraph 9.33	<p>The Public Rights of Way (PROW) network provides an important means of accessing the countryside. Where necessary, applicants will be required to ensure that PROW remain usable at all times or provide satisfactory</p>	<p>The Public Rights of Way (PROW) network provides an important means of accessing the countryside. Where relevant, applications for waste management will be required to ensure that PROW remain usable at all times or provide satisfactory alternative routes. Alternative paths and any necessary diversions of existing paths will be required to be in place prior to the closure of the existing PROW. Restoration schemes should, in the first instance, be seen as an opportunity to enhance and upgrade PROW where possible, especially with regard to the provision of Bridleways as multi-user paths as part of any permission granted. In all cases, restoration schemes should provide for access which is at least as good as that existing before workings began. and the The</p>	<p>There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p>

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
		<p>alternative routes. Alternative paths and any necessary diversions of existing paths will be required to be in place prior to the closure of the existing PROW. Restoration schemes should provide for access which is at least as good as that existing before workings began and should be seen as an opportunity to create new PROW where this is possible and desirable. The closure of a PROW, where no alternative route is provided, will normally not be acceptable.</p>	<p>closure of a PROW, where no alternative route is provided, will not normally be acceptable.”</p>	
13	Policy 10	<i>See Appendix 11</i>	<i>See Appendix 11</i>	There will be no significant

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>Appendix 11 –</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Policy 10</p> <p>Development Management Criteria</p> <p><i>Proposals for waste management development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the development would not have an unacceptable impact (including cumulative impact in combination with other existing or permitted development) on:</i></p> <p><i>a. local amenity (including noise levels, odour, air quality, dust, litter, light pollution and vibration);</i></p> <p><i>b. the quality and quantity of water within water courses, groundwater and surface water;</i> <i>b. the quality of water within water bodies, with particular regard to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• preventing the deterioration of their existing status; or</i> <i>• failure to achieve the objective of ‘good status’, and</i> <i>• the quantity of water for resource purposes within water bodies’</i> <p><i>c. the capacity of existing drainage systems;</i></p> <p><i>d. the best and most versatile agricultural land;</i></p> </div>	<p>sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p>

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>e. farming, horticulture and forestry;</i></p> <p><i>f. aircraft safety due to the risk of bird strike and/or building height and position;</i></p> <p><i>g. the safety and capacity of the road and other transport networks;</i></p> <p><i>h. the appearance, quality and character of the landscape, countryside and visual environment and any local features that contribute to its local distinctiveness;</i></p> <p><i>i. the openness and purpose of the Metropolitan Green Belt;</i></p> <p><i>j. Public Open Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities;</i></p> <p><i>k. land stability;</i></p> <p><i>l. the natural and geological environment (including internationally, nationally or locally designated sites and irreplaceable habitats);</i></p> <p><i>m. the historic environment including heritage and archaeological assets and their settings; and</i></p> <p><i>n. the character and quality of the area, in which the</i></p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>development is situated, through poor design.</i></p> <p><i>Where appropriate, enhancement of the environment would be sought, including, but not exclusively, the enhancement of the Public Rights of Way network, creation of recreation opportunities and enhancement of the natural, historic and built environment and surrounding landscape.</i></p>	
14	Policy 12	See Appendix 12	<p>See Appendix 12</p> <p>Appendix 12</p> <div data-bbox="831 863 1641 1417" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Policy 12</p> <p>Transport and Access</p> <p><i>Proposals for waste management development will be permitted where it is demonstrated that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the efficiency and effective operation of the road network, including safety and capacity, local amenity and the environment.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals for the transportation of waste by rail and/or water will be encouraged subject to other policies in this Plan. Where transportation by road is proposed,</i></p> </div>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p><i>this will be permitted where the road network is suitable for use by Heavy Goods Vehicles or can be improved to accommodate such vehicles.</i></p> <p><i>The following hierarchy of preference for transportation will be applied:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. the transport of waste by rail or water;</i> <i>b. where it is demonstrated that (a) above is not feasible or practicable, access will be required to a suitable existing junction with the main road network (not including secondary distributor roads, estate roads and other routes that provide local access), via a suitable section of existing road, as short as possible, without causing a detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the network; or</i> <i>c. where it is demonstrated (b) above is not feasible, direct access to the main road network involving the construction of a new access and/or junction where there is no suitable existing access point and/or junction; or</i> <i>d. Where access to the main road network in accordance with (b) and (c) above is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing road prior to gaining access onto the main</i> 	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal								
			<p style="text-align: center;"><i>road network will exceptionally be permitted, having regard to the scale of the development, the proximity of sensitive receptors, the capacity of the road and an assessment of the impact on road safety.</i></p>									
15	Table 8 – Bellhouse Landfill Site	<p>Indicative Facility Scale:</p> <p>75,000tpa - Biological Treatment Facility</p> <p>3,000,000m³ – Inert Landfill</p> <p>Estimated Availability: Between: up to 5-10 years from adoption</p>	<p>Indicative Facility Scale:</p> <p>75,000tpa - Biological Treatment Facility</p> <p>3,000,000m³ 250,000tpa – Inert Landfill</p> <p>Estimated Availability: Upon adoption (2017) Between: up to 5-10 years from adoption</p>	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.								
16	Table 11 – Little Bullocks and Crumps Farm, Great and Little Canfield	See Appendix 14	<p>See Appendix 14</p> <p>Appendix 14 – Table 11 Little Bullocks and Crumps Farm, Great and Little Canfield</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="831 1198 1655 1422"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="831 1198 1032 1235">District</th> <th data-bbox="1032 1198 1655 1235">Uttlesford</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 1235 1032 1278">Area</td> <td data-bbox="1032 1235 1655 1278">7.77ha 6.90ha - Site 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1032 1278 1655 1321">6.15ha - Site 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1032 1321 1655 1422">3.52 ha - Site 3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	District	Uttlesford	Area	7.77ha 6.90ha - Site 1		6.15ha - Site 2		3.52 ha - Site 3	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.
District	Uttlesford											
Area	7.77ha 6.90ha - Site 1											
	6.15ha - Site 2											
	3.52 ha - Site 3											

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment		Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			Indicative Facility Scale	420,000m ³ - Inert Landfill (Site 1) 45,000m ³ - Hazardous Landfill (Site 2) 80,000tpa - Inert Recycling Capacity (Site 3)	
			Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	Site 1 is allocated for extraction within the MLP 2014 as site A22. Site 2 is allocated for extraction within the MLP 2014 as site A23.	
			Site Allocation For	Inert Landfill Capacity (Site 1) Hazardous Landfill Capacity (Site 2) Inert Waste Recycling Capacity (Site 3)	
			Access	Via haul road through existing Crumps Farm site to B1256	
			Estimated Availability	Site 1 - 5 to 10 years Site 2 - Upon adoption of RWLP Site 3 – 5 to 10 years would be brought forward, during the Plan period at an appropriate stage to ensure that it could be operated within the context of the existing Major Waste Management Facility at Crumps Farm.	
			Life	Site 1 - 12 years	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal				
			<table border="1" data-bbox="831 304 1653 416"> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 304 1037 368"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 304 1653 368">Site 2 -15 years 30 years</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 368 1037 416"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 368 1653 416">Site 3 -15 years Permanent</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="801 496 1619 603">These sites would be extensions to the existing mineral/waste site at Crumps Farm. The following issues apply to all three sites:</p> <ul data-bbox="853 644 1659 1011" style="list-style-type: none"> • A vehicle routing routeing agreement is required to ensure the site would be accessed via the existing access for Crumps Farm onto Stortford Road (B1256) to travel via the A120/M11. An internal haul road would be required between the site and the Crumps Farm access. • Dust mitigation measures, limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity. <p data-bbox="801 1050 1599 1118">The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed for Site 1:</p> <ul data-bbox="853 1161 1675 1417" style="list-style-type: none"> • The eastern end of the site lies in a small secluded valley with a small river and nearby woodland. Advanced planting should screen views of the area from this direction, including views from the PRoW Lt Canfield 19. • The river and Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) require protection for example through an appropriate buffer of 		Site 2 - 15 years 30 years		Site 3 - 15 years Permanent	
	Site 2 - 15 years 30 years							
	Site 3 - 15 years Permanent							

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>at least 15m and through the assessment of potential hydrological impacts with appropriate protection. Existing vegetation to the south of the site should be protected and retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those areas of archaeological deposits preserved in-situ from the extraction phase shall be included as part of any restoration scheme. • The impacts from the proposal need to be addressed on the designated buildings located in the vicinity - especially on the setting of the Church of All Saints. • The site layout should ensure a sequential approach is adopted whereby areas of greater vulnerability, such as buildings and stockpiles are located in Flood Zone 1. • Careful consideration must be given to the final restoration contours to ensure the final landform blends with the surrounding topography and the restoration would be predominantly back to agricultural use given the presence of Grade 2 agricultural soil. <p>The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed for Site 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste shall be restricted to stable non-reactive hazardous waste. No liquids, slurries, sludges, clinical wastes or oils shall be deposited on site. • Residential property off Canfield Drive with views of the site should be protected by appropriate bunding/screening. Gaps in hedging on the boundary should be addressed to screen views. 	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site (UFD 172 – Runnels Hey), and area of Ancient Woodland. This site must be protected for example, through an appropriate buffer. • To demonstrate that there would not be an adverse effect on a European site through HRA. Any development would need to ensure that there would not be an adverse impact on water quality. Most likely potential impacts to consider would be caused by water pollution. • A hydrological assessment should be undertaken. • Those areas of archaeological deposits preserved in-situ from the extraction phase shall be included as part of any restoration scheme. • The impacts from the proposal need to be addressed on the designated buildings located in the vicinity - especially on the setting of Church of All Saints. • PRoW footpaths Great Canfield 2 and Little Canfield 8 cross the site and would require temporary diversion during operations. • Careful consideration must be given to the final restoration contours to ensure the final landform blends with the surrounding topography and the restoration would be predominantly back to agricultural use given the presence of Grade 2 agricultural. <p>The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed for Site 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An archaeological evaluation should be undertaken to 	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal																
			<p>assess the area for surviving archaeological deposits. This should comprise a programme of trial trenching covering the total area of development. If deposits are identified then an appropriate mitigation strategy for preservation in situ or preservation by excavation should be submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any proposal shall include planting to screen development on south and east boundaries of the site. 																	
17	Table 14 – Morses Lane, Brightlingsea	<p>See Appendix 15</p> <p>Morses Lane Site Assessment Scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “3D – Proximity to Sensitive Receptors” – Amber 3 “3K – Recreation Facilities” – Green 	<p>See Appendix 15</p> <p>Appendix 15 – Table 14 Morses Lane, Brightlingsea</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="831 788 1655 1390"> <tr> <td>District</td> <td>Tendring</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Area</td> <td>1.82ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indicative Facility Scale</td> <td>75,000tpa</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Link to Waste and Mineral Activities</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site Allocation For</td> <td>Inert Waste Recycling Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Access</td> <td>Morses Lane</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Availability</td> <td>Immediately</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Life</td> <td>Permanent</td> </tr> </table>	District	Tendring	Area	1.82ha	Indicative Facility Scale	75,000tpa	Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	N/A	Site Allocation For	Inert Waste Recycling Capacity	Access	Morses Lane	Estimated Availability	Immediately	Life	Permanent	<p>There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p>
District	Tendring																			
Area	1.82ha																			
Indicative Facility Scale	75,000tpa																			
Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	N/A																			
Site Allocation For	Inert Waste Recycling Capacity																			
Access	Morses Lane																			
Estimated Availability	Immediately																			
Life	Permanent																			

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>This undeveloped site on the edge of an urban area adjoins an existing waste operation. The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To demonstrate that it could not have an adverse effect on European sites through HRA. Most likely potential impacts would be by exhaust emissions (from the road into Brightlingsea) and disturbance to birds. • Site should be screened by planting on the north, south and west sides of the site to mitigate visual and landscape effects. • A trial trenching evaluation should be undertaken to assess the area for surviving archaeological deposits. If deposits are identified then an appropriate mitigation strategy should be submitted. • It is expected that operations would be enclosed within an appropriate building. Dust mitigation measures, limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity. • The configuration and operation of the proposed facility shall have regard to impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use. 	
18	Table 15 –	See Appendix 16	See Appendix 16	There will be no

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal																
	Newport Quarry		<p>Appendix 16 – Table 15 Newport Quarry</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="831 416 1655 1094"> <tr> <td>District</td> <td>Uttlesford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Area</td> <td>8.4ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indicative Facility Scale</td> <td>15,000tpa - Inert Waste Recycling Capacity 300,000m3 - Inert Landfill Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Link to Waste and Mineral Activities</td> <td>ESS/17/12/UTT granted planning permission for chalk extraction</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site Allocation For</td> <td>Inert Landfill Capacity Inert Waste Recycling Capacity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Access</td> <td>Via Unnamed Road to B1383 London Road</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Availability</td> <td>Up to 5 years</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Life</td> <td>Until 2042</td> </tr> </table> <p>This site is within an existing quarry. The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should continue to be restored to lowland calcareous grassland, with areas also retained to demonstrate its geological importance. • Areas already restored should not undergo any further development except to ensure that the chalk grassland 	District	Uttlesford	Area	8.4ha	Indicative Facility Scale	15,000tpa - Inert Waste Recycling Capacity 300,000m3 - Inert Landfill Capacity	Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	ESS/17/12/UTT granted planning permission for chalk extraction	Site Allocation For	Inert Landfill Capacity Inert Waste Recycling Capacity	Access	Via Unnamed Road to B1383 London Road	Estimated Availability	Up to 5 years	Life	Until 2042	significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.
District	Uttlesford																			
Area	8.4ha																			
Indicative Facility Scale	15,000tpa - Inert Waste Recycling Capacity 300,000m3 - Inert Landfill Capacity																			
Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	ESS/17/12/UTT granted planning permission for chalk extraction																			
Site Allocation For	Inert Landfill Capacity Inert Waste Recycling Capacity																			
Access	Via Unnamed Road to B1383 London Road																			
Estimated Availability	Up to 5 years																			
Life	Until 2042																			

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>develops into Priority Habitat Lowland Calcareous Grassland and/or Open Mosaic Habitat, improve any other existing biodiversity and to retain the sand piles.</p> <p>Careful consideration of the environmental and visual impacts of the waste development will be necessary as part of a planning application, particularly if a proposal relates to already restored areas. Specifically, ecological enhancement of the site would be sought, with the final restoration and long-term aftercare expected to result in the creation of lowland calcareous grassland priority habitat. It will be necessary to consider phased working to avoid the loss of existing species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain existing trees and hedges to screen views of site. Consider new planting to screen views into site. • No development should occur outside the quarried areas as this will have the potential to impact important archaeological deposits. • Dust mitigation measures, limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity. • A vehicle routing routeing agreement is required to ensure the site would be accessed via the existing access to Newport Quarry and via the Main Road Network (B1383). The number of heavy vehicle movements to and from the east shall be limited to those serving Widdington only. • Consideration would need to be given at the planning 	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal										
			application stage to the safe operation of the road bridge over the railway line west of the site access and the requirement for any additional traffic management.											
19	Table 16 – Rivenhall	Indicative Facility Scale: AD 85,000tpa CHP 360,000tpa	Indicative Facility Scale: AD 85,000tpa 30,000tpa CHP 360,000tpa 595,000tpa	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.										
20	Table 17 – Sandon	Indicative Facility Scale: 40,000 tpa – Inert Waste Recycling Capacity	Indicative Facility Scale: 40,000 tpa 300,000 tpa – Inert Waste Recycling Capacity	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.										
21	Table 19 – Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms	See Appendix 17	<p>Appendix 17 – Table 19 Sunnymead</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="842 965 1615 1415"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 965 1055 1007">District</td> <td data-bbox="1055 965 1615 1007">Tendring</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 1007 1055 1082">Area</td> <td data-bbox="1055 1007 1615 1082">Site 1: 63.74ha Site 2: 7ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 1082 1055 1193">Indicative Facility Scale</td> <td data-bbox="1055 1082 1615 1193">Site 1: 1,800,000m³ Site 2: 40,000tpa</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 1193 1055 1342">Link to Waste and Mineral Activities</td> <td data-bbox="1055 1193 1615 1342">Site is allocated for extraction within the MLP 2014 (site A20)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 1342 1055 1415">Site Allocation</td> <td data-bbox="1055 1342 1615 1415">Site 1: Inert Landfill Site 2: Inert Waste Recycling</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	District	Tendring	Area	Site 1: 63.74ha Site 2: 7ha	Indicative Facility Scale	Site 1: 1,800,000m ³ Site 2: 40,000tpa	Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	Site is allocated for extraction within the MLP 2014 (site A20)	Site Allocation	Site 1: Inert Landfill Site 2: Inert Waste Recycling	The allocation of Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms in Tendring (W36) for inert waste recycling will have environmental effects, however none that are significant. There will be a number of changes to the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission SA Environmental
District	Tendring													
Area	Site 1: 63.74ha Site 2: 7ha													
Indicative Facility Scale	Site 1: 1,800,000m ³ Site 2: 40,000tpa													
Link to Waste and Mineral Activities	Site is allocated for extraction within the MLP 2014 (site A20)													
Site Allocation	Site 1: Inert Landfill Site 2: Inert Waste Recycling													

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal								
			<table border="1" data-bbox="842 308 1615 536"> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 308 1055 344">For</td> <td data-bbox="1055 308 1615 344"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 344 1055 419">Access</td> <td data-bbox="1055 344 1615 419">Current haul road associated with the mineral workings</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 419 1055 494">Estimated Availability</td> <td data-bbox="1055 419 1615 494">2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="842 494 1055 536">Life</td> <td data-bbox="1055 494 1615 536">17 years</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="819 576 1615 643">The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed:</p> <ul data-bbox="869 651 1615 1431" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="869 651 1615 794">• The site would be an extension to the existing Wivenhoe Quarry, linked by a haul route to the existing processing plant and utilising the existing highway access onto the B1027. <li data-bbox="869 802 1615 869">• Improvements required to visibility at the junction of the private access and Keelers Tye. <li data-bbox="869 877 1615 1093">• Restoration provides the opportunity for significant biodiversity enhancement and habitat creation on site. In-filling and restoration should be in line with habitat creation and outcomes sought in the Minerals Local Plan and any associated documents. <li data-bbox="869 1101 1615 1209">• To demonstrate that it could not have an adverse effect on European sites through HRA. Most likely potential impacts would be caused by disturbance. <li data-bbox="869 1217 1615 1321">• Those areas of archaeological deposits preserved in-situ from the extraction phase shall be included as part of any restoration scheme. <li data-bbox="869 1329 1615 1431">• An archaeological desk based assessment would be required to investigate the gravels to establish their potential for Palaeolithic 	For		Access	Current haul road associated with the mineral workings	Estimated Availability	2018	Life	17 years	<p data-bbox="1688 308 2029 746">Report. Site 2 within Sunnymead (W36) is a new allocation that was previously not appraised within the SA for inert waste recycling. The implications of this allocation are covered in more detail in Section 3 of this report.</p>
For												
Access	Current haul road associated with the mineral workings											
Estimated Availability	2018											
Life	17 years											

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<p>remains and trial trench evaluation will be required, along with a mitigation strategy, to form part of the Environmental Statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infilling must return the site to original ground levels and to agricultural use. Woodland planting of an appropriate species/character, scale etc must be considered to ensure compatibility with adjacent Ancient Woodland. • PRow footpath Elmstead 24 crosses the site 1 and is adjacent to site 2, and requires sufficient stand-off distance and protection during operations (e.g., satisfactory crossing point(s) provided for quarry vehicles). • Dust mitigation measures, limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity. • Careful consideration must be given to the final restoration contours used to ensure the final landform blends with the surrounding topography and to ensure Grade 2 agricultural soils are retained on site. <p>The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed for Site 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum of 100m standoff should be provided for all residential properties and effective screening provided to screen views of the site. 	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cockaynes Wood Local Wildlife Site adjoins the southern boundary and would require protection during operations. • Footpaths Elmstead 19 and Alresford 2 also run along the southern boundary and through Cockaynes Wood and need protection during operations. The ability to reinstate these fully needs to be investigated as part of the suggested restoration scheme. <p>The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed for Site 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bunding is required on north, east and south sides to screen the site. • To demonstrate that it could not have an adverse effect on European sites through HRA. Most likely potential impacts would be caused by disturbance. 	
22	Table 20 – Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area	N/A	Removal of the site allocation to reflect that the facility is now included as part of Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms.	The removal of site W13 Wivenhoe Quarry for inert waste recycling as an allocation within the Plan will not have any significant environmental effects. The facility is now allocated as part of Sunnymead,

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal								
				<p>Elmstead and Heath Farms in Tendring (W36). This leads to a number of changes to the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission SA Environmental Report. The implications of this allocation are covered in more detail in Section 3 of this report in response to Main Modification 21.</p>								
23	Table xx ¹ – Dollymans Farm	Site not allocated at Pre-Submission stage.	<p>Appendix 18 – Table xx – Dollymans Farm</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="842 898 1615 1126"> <tr> <td>District</td> <td>Basildon/Rochford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Area</td> <td>16.09ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indicative Facility Scale</td> <td>500,000 tonnes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Link to</td> <td>The site constitutes a former</td> </tr> </table>	District	Basildon/Rochford	Area	16.09ha	Indicative Facility Scale	500,000 tonnes	Link to	The site constitutes a former	<p>The allocation of Dollymans Farm in Basildon/Rochford (L(i)16) for inert landfill will have significant environmental effects in addition to a number of changes to</p>
District	Basildon/Rochford											
Area	16.09ha											
Indicative Facility Scale	500,000 tonnes											
Link to	The site constitutes a former											

¹ Table numbering to be confirmed prior to Adoption

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment		Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal	
			Waste and Mineral Activities	mineral borrow pit.	the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission SA Environmental Report. These implications are covered in more detail in Section 3 of this report.	
Site Allocation For	Inert Landfill Capacity	Access	Via private road adjoining A130	Estimated Availability		2017
Life	Up to 5 years	<p>This site would culminate in the restoration of a former mineral void. The following specific issues and opportunities are to be addressed:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All access should be via the A129. A Transport Assessment would be required at the planning application stage to review access arrangements and examine safety and capacity of the local road network. This may result in the diversion of bridleway to segregate users from vehicles or other mitigation works. 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restoration of the site through this allocation provides the opportunity for biodiversity, landscape and visual enhancement. Careful consideration of the environmental impacts of the waste development will be necessary as part of a planning application with proportionate levels of mitigation to be established. Specifically, the WPA 						

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal				
			<p>would seek the overall landscape improvement of the site, with the final restoration and long-term aftercare to be beneficial to the Green Belt and biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain trees and shrubs to screen plant and materials from the road. Consider new planting and bunding to screen views into the site. • Dust mitigation measures, limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity. • An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment should be carried out to identify the extent of preservation within the northern part of the site and preservation requirements around war memorials. • Areas of archaeological deposits preserved in situ will require excavation if working is likely to cause ground disturbance in the north western part of the site • A management proposal for the survival and maintenance of the memorial for the burial sites should be submitted with any application. 					
24	Table 21 – Development in Waste Consultation Areas	<p>See Appendix 19</p> <p>The original safeguarding table (Table 21) highlighted that all ‘change of use’</p>	<p>See Appendix 19</p> <p>Appendix 19 – Table 21 Development in Waste Consultation Area</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="831 1345 1659 1417"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="831 1345 1395 1417">Nature of Development</th> <th data-bbox="1395 1345 1659 1417">Included or Excluded from</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="height: 20px;"></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Nature of Development	Included or Excluded from			<p>There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p>
Nature of Development	Included or Excluded from							

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment		Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
		<p>applications were to be included within the scope of Policy 2 – Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure</p> <p>Removal from Table 21 of the row stating that ‘Applications for temporary buildings, structures or uses (for up to five years)’ were to be ‘Included’ within the scope of Policy 2.</p>		<p>consultation with the Waste Planning Authority</p>	
			<p>Applications for development on land, which is already allocated in adopted local development plan documents.</p>	<p>Included</p>	
			<p>Proposals for minor infilling of development within the defined settlement limits for towns, villages and hamlets identified in adopted local development plan documents.</p>	<p>Included</p>	
			<p>Applications for householder development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a replacement dwelling where the new dwelling occupies the same or similar footprint to the building being replaced; • Minor extensions to existing dwellings or properties where they lie within the immediate curtilage and would not bring the building within 250m of the boundary of an existing strategic facility or preferred site allocation; • Proposals for the provision of incidental and non-habitable structures lying within the 	<p>Excluded</p>	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment		Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
			curtilage of an existing dwelling (such as driveways, garages, car parks and hard standing).		
			Proposals for the erection of agricultural buildings immediately adjacent to an existing working farmstead.	Excluded	
			Applications: for change of use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From B2/B8 to any other use • To Class A and C, from any other use 	Included	
			Other applications for change of use.	Excluded	
			Applications for temporary buildings, structures or uses (for up to five years).	Included	
			Applications related to existing permissions such as for reserved matters, or for minor amendments to current permissions.	Excluded	
			Applications for other kinds of consent – advertisements; listed building consent; Conservation Area consent and proposals for work to trees or removal of hedgerows.	Excluded	
			Proposals for the demolition of a residential or other building.	Excluded	
			Proposals for minor works such as	Excluded	

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal						
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 304 1395 341">fencing or bus shelters.</td> <td data-bbox="1395 304 1659 341"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 341 1395 416">Proposal for any extension of and/or change to the curtilage of property.</td> <td data-bbox="1395 341 1659 416">Included</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="831 416 1395 531">Proposals for B2 and B8 development on land allocated for such uses.</td> <td data-bbox="1395 416 1659 531">Excluded</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="801 571 1599 643">(The inclusion of temporary development to be included within the scope of Policy 2 is addressed in MAIN 26)</p>	fencing or bus shelters.		Proposal for any extension of and/or change to the curtilage of property.	Included	Proposals for B2 and B8 development on land allocated for such uses.	Excluded	
fencing or bus shelters.										
Proposal for any extension of and/or change to the curtilage of property.	Included									
Proposals for B2 and B8 development on land allocated for such uses.	Excluded									
25	C2	However, it is neither practicable nor necessary for consultation to occur on all developments proposed through planning applications. The table below sets the developments proposed to be subject to consultation with the Waste Planning Authorities:	However, it is neither practicable nor necessary for consultation to occur on all developments proposed through planning applications. The table below sets the developments proposed to be subject to consultation with the Waste Planning Authorities: The development types below include those relating to temporary structures and uses:	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.						
26	Map 51 – Oakwood and Crusader Business Parks	N/A	Removal of Map as the site is no longer being considered as an Area of Search.	There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this						

Mod. No.	Paragraph / Policy Reference	Original Text	Amendment	Significant Impact(s) / Impact on Sustainability Appraisal
				modification.

3 Significant Sustainability Effects and Changes to the SA as a result of Main Modifications

The following sections set out the detailed implications of the Main Modifications to the Plan regarding significant sustainability impacts and changes to the SA of the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission plan.

3.1 Main Modifications 5 & 23– The Allocation of Dollymans Farm (L(i)16) as a Strategic Site Allocation for Inert Landfill

The inclusion of Dollymans Farm (L(i)16) as an inert landfill allocation will have implications regarding the SA. This modification will affect elements of the SA and these are addressed in the following sub-section of this report.

Element of the SA - 4.1.14 Significant Effects of Inert Landfill Allocations

Sites for: INERT LANDFILL														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(n)7R Little Bullocks A22	S / M	/	--	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	--	++	+
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(n)1R Slough Farm	S / M	+	--	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)10 Blackley (Site 1)	S / M	+	--	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)6 Sandon	S / M	-	--	--	++	+	/	++	0	++	/	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)5 Sunnym- ead	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)17R Newport Quarry	S / M	/	--	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	--	+	+
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(n)5 Bellhou- se	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)15 Fingring- hoe	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	++	++	0	++	++	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)16 Dollym- ans	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	++	0	0	0	0	/	0	0

Additional / Amended Text

Recycling processes involve the removal of materials such as wood, plastic and metal, a process that can be carried out at both enclosed and open-air facilities. Locally collected evidence suggests that there is further diversion from landfill through beneficial re-use of inert waste, which equated to approximately 765,000tpa in 2014. It is estimated that there is a current inert landfill void space of approximately 3.4 million m³, which would equate to approximately 5.1 million tonnes of CDE disposal capacity. This is, however, not sufficient to accommodate the forecasted need for inert landfill over the Plan period. To address this previous shortfall, 500,000tpa of inert waste landfill capacity has been allocated at Dollymans Farm, Basildon / Rochford post-Examination and as a result of the Inspector's recommendation.

There will be significant negative impacts associated with the location of Dollymans (L(i)16) within the Metropolitan Green Belt and associated landscape impacts. Despite this, the site would correspond to the restoration of a minerals void, and as such can be expected to have significant positive impacts in the long term. This has led to a change in the long term impacts highlighted for landscape (SO6), particularly in recognition of the development principle regarding such restoration. While parts of the site are located within Flood Zone 3, these are relatively small when compared to the size of the site. With this in mind, impacts regarding flood risk (SO3) can be expected to be mitigated through Policy 10 Development Management Criteria and the policy's supporting text. It should also be noted that further justification would be through Sequential and Exceptions Testing.

Element of the SA - Table 10: Cumulative Impacts of sites W3, W20 and L(i)16

Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W3 Basildon WWTW	S / M	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
W20 Courtauld Road	S / M	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	0	++	+	-	+	++
	L	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	0	++	+	/	+	++
L(i)16 Dollymans	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	++	0	0	0	0	/	0	0

Additional / Amended Text

- As can be seen from the above comparative assessments of the sites W3, W20 and L(i)16 in Basildon, there are a number of significant positive impacts associated with minimising environmental effects, and in the sustainable management of waste (SO9).
- The cumulative impact of these sites on the localised transport network (SO10) would have to be explored in further detail for sites W3 and W20, due to the sites being located in very close proximity to another however this would not apply to site L(i)16 in response to the development principle that access should be via the A129. This was an issue raised in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding sites W3 and W20. Since then, development principles for the sites have been included within the Plan to address specific issues and / or opportunities. With regard to site W3 Basildon WWTW, confirmation will be needed as to how internal access arrangements in relation to Courtauld Road in order to adequately alleviate any cumulative impacts.

Element of the SA - Table 29: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Inert Landfill Sites

Sites for: INERT LANDFILL SITES														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(i)4R	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	--	/	0	++	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection		<p>The site is within the Green Belt. Although the site is allocated for minerals extraction in the Minerals Local plan (2014), no planning application has come forward. This extraction site has a 14 year estimated life (as indicated within the Minerals Local Plan) and as such the site is not available for allocation in the Waste Local Plan within the Plan period. In addition, the Minerals Local Plan indicates that the site would be restored to low levels only.</p>												
L(i)5	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity.</p>												
L(i)6	S / M	-	--	--	++	+	/	++	0	++	/	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity.</p>												
L(i)7R	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Safeguarded site – Reason for		<p>The grant of planning permission for this activity means that this site must now be considered to contribute towards the total waste capacity in the Plan Area.</p>												

safeguarding:		Allocation of the site to support this activity is therefore unnecessary.												
L(i)10R	S / M	+	--	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity.</p>												
L(i)13	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	/	/	0	++	/	--	+	+
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		There is an application for another incompatible use (housing) on the site which is pending.												
L(i)15	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	++	++	0	++	++	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p><i>Fingringhoe Quarry (Li15) was submitted as a site suitable for inert waste landfill by the landowner as part of the call for sites. Despite scoring well in the Waste Site Assessment Report, and being considered suitable for inert waste disposal, at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage the WPAs chose not to include Fingringhoe Quarry as a preferred site allocation where it was considered that the inert fill material to be used at this site would be entirely sourced from London and imported to the site by barge via Ballast Quay Wharf. Waste arising in Essex or Southend-on-Sea would not be used to fill the void space (currently being created by the extraction of sand and gravel) and thus the site was not taken forward.</i></p> <p><i>Since then the site promoter, through their representation (through the Revised Preferred Approach [2015] consultation) and subsequent correspondence, has been able to satisfy the Waste Planning Authorities that a reasonable portion of inert fill material to be used at this site can be sourced from within the Plan Area. For this reason, and the fact that an existing mineral void exists at the quarry, the site has now been allocated to contribute in meeting void space requirements.</i></p>												
L(i)16	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	++	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.												

		<p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity.</p>												
L(i)17R	S / M	/	--	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	--	+	+
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>Site L(i)17R Newport Quarry was put forward during the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation. The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report and was identified as being able to meet inert landfill and recycling needs particularly in the west of the County. For these reasons the site has been allocated for both inert recycling and inert landfill.</p>												
L(n)1R	S / M	+	--	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity.</p>												
L(n)5	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>Despite scoring well as part of the site selection process the large L(n)5 Bellhouse site (which currently takes non-hazardous wastes and has an agreed restoration plan) was not taken forward as part of the Revised Preferred Approach. This was due to reservations that it was close to other sites in this area near Colchester (such as L(i)7 Stanway). However, given re-assessment it is prudent to now include it as an inert landfill site.</p> <p>It should be noted that a change in a significant positive impact identified in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage for L(n)5 – Bellhouse has been necessary at this stage regarding SO6 (landscape). This is due to a re-assessment which has established that there would be a minor adverse effect regarding views from receptors (properties and a PROW).</p>												
L(n)7R	S / M	/	--	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	/

	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p>The decision to prioritise sites for the treatment of biological waste over inert waste recycling and also not to take sites forward where located in the greenbelt has resulted in fewer sites being available for inert waste treatment. As a consequence, the need for sites suitable for inert waste landfill has increased. There is therefore a continued need for the same preferred sites previously identified in the Revised Preferred Approach as L(i)10R Blackley Quarry, L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm site, L(n)1R Slough Farm, L(i)6 Sandon and L(i)5 Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms, with the addition of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm to meet the shortfall in inert landfill capacity.</p> <p><i>There is also an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm Site A22. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. In addition, the site was also previously erroneously judged to have significant positive impacts on flooding (SO3) for certain uses / facilities, however a small amount of the site is within FZ3. As such the site will now have significantly negative impacts on this objective. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate impacts on landscape which will give rise to an uncertain impact on SO6; an amendment of a significantly positive score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												
L(n)8R	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Reason for rejection:		<p>This is the only landfill site that has been proposed as suitable for taking hazardous waste, which may be required during the plan period. The site has been allocated for the landfill of hazardous waste and as such rejected for allocation for inert landfill in the Plan.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)8R. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate to major effects on landscape which will give rise to a negative impact on SO6; an amendment of an uncertain score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>												

Additional / Amended Text

To reflect the allocation of site L(i)16 Dollymans Farm for inert landfill at this stage as per the Inspector's recommendation, it can be seen from the above that only two reasonable options existed; L(i)16 and L(i)4R. The table above indicates two additional alternatives for possible inert waste landfill, however L(i)13 has since been granted outline planning permission for 190 homes, and L(n)8R have been allocated within the Waste Local Plan for taking hazardous waste as the only site submitted to meet such requirements throughout the plan making process.

Of the two reasonable alternatives, L(i)16 has been allocated due to scoring highly against site L(n)4R, its adherence to the spatial strategy and the fact that the majority of the site lies within an old borrow pit that has not been formally restored. The site is within the Green Belt; however it has been independently assessed through the plan-making process as having only a moderate landscape impact. Site L(n)4R is also within the Green belt, however is considerably larger than site L(i)16, and although representing a site allocated for minerals extraction in the Essex County Council Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2014), no planning application has come forward. This extraction site has a 14 year estimated life (as indicated within the Minerals Local Plan) and as such the site is not available for allocation in the Waste Local Plan within the Plan period.

Element of the SA - Table 37: Cumulative Impacts of sites W3, W20 and L(i)16

Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W3 Basildon WWTW	S / M	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
W20 Courtau- ld Road	S / M	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	0	++	+	-	+	++
	L	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	0	++	+	/	+	++
L(i)16 Dollym- ans	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	++	0	0	0	0	/	0	0

Additional / Amended Text

- As can be seen from the above comparative assessments of the sites W3, W20 and L(i)16 in Basildon, there are a number of significant positive impacts associated with minimising environmental effects, and in the sustainable management of waste (SO9).
- The cumulative impact of these sites on the localised transport network (SO10) would have to be explored in further detail for sites W3 and W20, due to the sites being located in very close proximity to another however this would not apply to site L(i)16 in response to the development principle that access should be via the A129. This was an issue raised in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding sites W3 and W20. Since then, development principles for the sites have been included within the Plan to address specific issues and / or opportunities. With regard to site W3 Basildon WWTW, confirmation will be needed as to how internal access arrangements in relation to Courtauld Road in order to adequately alleviate any cumulative impacts.

3.2 Main Modification 6 –Supporting Text to Policy 4: Areas of Search

This Main Modification ensures a minor positive impact on Sustainability Objective 13 (SO13), regarding economic growth and employment opportunities. Previously, the original text and relevant appraisal of Policy 4: Areas of Search identified an ‘uncertain’ impact (/) for SO13 due to the ‘possible eventual development of B2 or B8 land for waste management facilities (being) done so to the detriment of any alternative identified employment need in specific sectors and areas.’ This possibility is considered to have been successfully eradicated within the Main Modifications, ensuring the maximum economic potential of employment areas.

As a result, the appraisal of within paragraph 5.1.2 of the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission SA now shows this minor positive impact for SO13, as outlined below.

Element of the SA - Policy 4 – Areas of Search

	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Short Term	0	/	0	+	0	0	/	0	++	+	0	0	+
Medium Term	0	/	0	+	0	0	/	0	++	+	0	0	+
Long Term	0	/	0	+	0	0	/	0	++	+	0	0	+

3.3 Main Modifications 21 & 22 - Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms & Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area

Element of the SA - 4.1.6 Significant Effects for Inert Waste Recycling Allocations

Sites for: INERT WASTE RECYCLING														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W32 Crumps Farm	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
W8 Elsenham	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
W7 Sandon East	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	-	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++
L(n)1R Slough Farm	S / M	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
L(i)10R Blackley (Site 1)	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
W36 Sunnymead (s2)	S / M	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
W31 Morses Lane	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
L(i)17R Newport Quarry	S / M	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	-	+	+
	L	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	/	+	+

Additional / Amended Text

A 'Site 2' at Sunnymead, Elmstead & Heath Farms, Alresford, Tendring (W36) has been included for allocation as a replacement for site W13 Wivenhoe Quarry Plan Area, Colchester. This new allocation made post-Examination is a direct replacement in terms of capacity and responds similarly to the spatial strategy.

As can be seen from the above, the site will have a range of positive impacts, with only a few minor negative impacts associated with soil quality (the site is within Grade 2 agricultural land) and being in relatively close proximity to a number of sensitive receptors. To address this latter issue, it should be noted that mitigation is sought through the development principle of this site regarding bunding required on the north, east and south sides to screen the site.

The site at Wivenhoe (W13) has been removed due to the fact that extraction at the adjoining Wivenhoe Quarry has ceased and an inert recycling facility is subsequently not needed in this location. Sunnymead, Elmstead & Heath Farms (W36) are allocated within the adopted Minerals Local Plan (2014) for minerals extraction and thus the inert recycling facility has been relocated to this site where such a facility is required. It should be noted that both the Wivenhoe (W13) and Sunnymead (W36) sites have the same operator.

Element of the SA - Table 9: Cumulative Impacts of sites L(i)15, L(i)5 and W36

Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W36 Sunny-mead (s2)	S / M	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
L(i)15 Fingring-hoe	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	++	++	0	++	++	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)5 Sunnymead	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0

Additional / Amended Text

- The sites of W36, L(i)15 and L(i)5 have been grouped where they are located in a broadly similar location, and also in regard to their possible impacts on biodiversity through the international designation of the Colne Estuary as an SPA and Ramsar. In addition to development principles for these sites stating that likely significant effects on the nearby international wildlife sites need to be considered, it should additionally be noted that the Plan, as per the recommendation of the HRA, states that 'planning permission for waste management development within or otherwise affecting an international site (Natura 2000 site) will only be granted where the conclusions of a project-level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), as required for those proposals highlighted within the HRA of the Plan, demonstrate that the proposal will have no adverse impacts on the integrity of any site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.' Screening distances are also provided as a guide for potential applicants in relation to the triggers for project-level HRA. The inclusion of this requirement in the Plan will effectively determine whether any impacts on internationally designated sites are likely. Additionally, project-level HRA will also identify the impacts of proposals in combination with other relevant projects, plans and programmes within the Plan Area. As such there will be no cumulative impacts on biodiversity.
- Any cumulative impacts associated with the individual significant negative impacts highlighted for health and well-being (SO11) on all of the sites, are effectively neutralised by development principles that require dust mitigation measures, limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) in the interests of protecting local amenity.

Element of the SA - Table 26: Appraisal of sites put forward for Open Air Facilities: Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CD&EW) Recycling Facilities (or inert recycling/soil screening and non-inert recycling)

Sites for: CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION AND EXCAVATION (CD&EW) RECYCLING FACILITIES (OR INERT AND NON-INERT RECYCLING)														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(i)4R	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	--	/	0	++	/	--	/	++
	L	/	-	++	++	/	--	/	0	++	/	/	/	++
Reason for rejection		The site is within the Green Belt.												
L(i)7	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	++	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	/	++	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Safeguarded site – Reason for safeguarding:		The granting of planning permission for this activity means that this site must now be considered to contribute towards the total waste capacity in the Plan Area. Allocation of the site to support this activity is therefore unnecessary.												
L(i)10R	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.												
L(i)17R	S / M	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	-	+	+
	L	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	-	+	+
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation		<i>Site L(i)17R Newport Quarry was put forward during the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) consultation. The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report and was identified as being able to meet inert landfill and recycling needs particularly in the west of the County. For these reasons the site has been allocated for both inert recycling and inert landfill.</i>												
L(n)1R	S / M	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.												
L(n)6R	S / M	-	-	--	++	+	--	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	-	-	--	++	+	--	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection		The site is within the Green Belt.												
L(n)7R	S / M	/	-	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	/	++	+

Reason for rejection:		<p>The WPAs do not consider that this site would be capable of operating independently for this specific use with other sites at Crumps Farm / Little Bullocks Farm having been allocated. The site however has been allocated for another use.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)7R – Little Bullocks Farm Site A22. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. In addition, the site was also previously erroneously judged to have significant positive impacts on flooding (SO3) for certain uses / facilities, however a small amount of the site is within FZ3. As such the site will now have significantly negative impacts on this objective. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate impacts on landscape which will give rise to an uncertain impact on SO6; an amendment of a significantly positive score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>													
L(n)8R	S / M	/	-	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/	
	L	/	-	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/	
Reason for rejection:		<p>The WPAs do not consider that this site would be capable of operating independently for this specific use with other sites at Crumps Farm / Little Bullocks Farm having been allocated. The site has however been allocated in the Plan for another use.</p> <p><i>There is an amendment from the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding an erroneous impact on the sustainable management of waste (SO9) at site L(n)8R. This is due to the site being Greenfield land with no planning history within the specific red-line boundary of the site. As such, the significant positive impact highlighted at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA has been amended to be a minor positive impact. A re-assessment of the site now also indicates that there will moderate to major effects on landscape which will give rise to an negative impact on SO6; an amendment of an uncertain score highlighted in the SA at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage.</i></p>													
W1	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++	
	L	+	-	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++	
Reason for rejection		<p>The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.</p>													
W3	S / M	+	-	/	++	+	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++	
	L	+	-	/	++	+	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++	
Reason for rejection:		<p>The WPAs have decided to prioritise meeting the forecasted biological recovery capacity need over the recycling of inert waste. This approach will reduce the amount of biological waste going to landfill. Sending biological waste to landfill, rather than inert waste, is considered to have greater environmental impacts, given the potential for such waste to generate bio-aerosols and greenhouse gases. As a result, this site has not been allocated for inert recycling and has</p>													

		<p>been allocated in the Plan for biological treatment.</p> <p><i>An amendment to the impacts previously highlighted in the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding health and well-being (SO11) on Site W3 (Basildon WWTW) has also been made. This is due to there being sensitive receptors within 250m of the site. As such the previously highlighted uncertain impacts are now judged to be negative. The site is also now recognised as being in FZ2 (previously erroneously judged to be in FZ1 for some uses) which sees an amendment to the impacts highlighted for flooding (SO3) as uncertain, where previously they were considered significantly positive.</i></p>													
W7	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
	L	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++	
<p>Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:</p>		<p>The site scored relatively highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>The WPAs have decided to prioritise meeting the forecasted biological recovery capacity need over the recycling of inert waste. This approach will reduce the amount of biological waste going to landfill. Sending biological waste to landfill, rather than inert waste, is considered to have greater environmental impacts, given the potential for such waste to generate bio-aerosols and greenhouse gases. As a result, this site was a preferred site for biological treatment at the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage. It scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report, was also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conformed to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</i></p> <p><i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, it has been determined that the previous five preferred sites for biological treatment can deliver a total of 259,000tpa which is over and above the 217,000tpa needed. As the site W7 Sandon East scored significantly lower than the other four sites and those four sites on their own would provide sufficient capacity it has been discounted for biological waste treatment. The site has instead been allocated for inert recycling.</i></p>													
W8	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/	
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/	
<p>Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:</p>		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. It is also considered suitable to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative.</i></p>													

W13	S / M	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	/	--	+	++
	L	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	/	/	+	++
Reason for rejection:		Despite scoring highly, the site has been rejected due to extraction at the adjoining Wivenhoe Quarry having ceased and an inert recycling facility subsequently not being needed in this location.												
W14	S / M	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	--	-	--	++
	L	/	-	++	++	++	++	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W15	S / M	-	-	++	/	+	-	/	0	++	/	-	+	/
	L	-	-	++	/	+	-	/	0	++	/	/	+	/
Reason for rejection:		Not as sustainable, and did not score as highly as other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report. In addition, there is an application for another incompatible use (housing) on the site which is pending. <i>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the impact highlighted in the SA for landscape (SO6) has needed amendment from significantly negative to minor negative. This is due to a re-assessment of the site.</i>												
W18	S / M	/	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	++
	L	/	++	++	++	+	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	++
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												
W19	S / M	+	++	++	-	++	--	++	0	+	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	-	++	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection		<i>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage the Council initially allocated this site, despite it failing the Stage 2 sieving criterion of being located within the Green Belt. Despite being located in the Green Belt, W19 was at that stage deemed to have fewer other negative impacts than the sites for inert recycling that passed Stage 2. At this Pre-Submission stage however, the decision to allocate has been reversed which is consistent with other sites that also failed at Stage 2 due to being located within the Green Belt.</i>												
W21	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		The site is within the Greenbelt.												
W24	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	0	++	--	/	--	-
Reason for rejection		The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.												

W31	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scored highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report in consideration also of its suitability to meet the capacity gap requirements and conforms to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle.</p> <p><i>An amendment since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage SA regards the previous positive impact stated for the sustainable management of waste (SO9). This has been amended to a significant positive impacts associated with its positive waste use / permission history.</i></p>												
W32	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p><i>At the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, this site was not selected. The site promoter put forward three proposals for inert recycling in this location: L(n)7R (55,000tpa), L(n)8R (30,000tpa) and W32 (80,000tpa) and previously L(n)7R was selected for inert recycling. The WPAs do not consider that three separate inert waste facilities at each of these three sites within the Little Bullocks / Crumps Farm operation would be capable of operating independently of each other and simultaneously from a practical standpoint. For this reason only one of the proposed sites has been included as a site allocation for inert waste recycling.</i></p> <p><i>W32 Crumps Farm has been selected because it provides for the most efficient use of the total waste site in conjunction with other existing and permitted operations. It has the largest potential capacity of the three proposals (80,000tpa), is located closer to the highway and would not displace any part of landfill operation on L(n)7R. L(n)8R is a less appropriate location for an inert recycling operation and has been selected for taking hazardous waste.</i></p> <p><i>W32 Crumps Farm will see an amendment from the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) SA. This responds to impacts regarding the sustainable management of waste (SO9) and an amendment from the significantly positive impact previously stated to a minor positive. This has been reassessed due to parts of the site not having relevant planning / history.</i></p>												
W35	S / M	/	-	++	-	/	/	/	0	++	--	-	--	+
	L	/	-	++	-	/	/	/	0	++	--	/	--	+
Reason for rejection		<p>The site is not considered to be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy.</p>												
W36	S / M	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
Allocated Site – Reason for allocation:		<p>The site scores highly against other sites considered for allocation in the Waste Site Assessment Report in consideration also of its suitability to meet the capacity gap requirements and conform to the general principles of the Spatial Strategy and the proximity principle. The site is allocated post-Examination in response to site W13 Wivenhoe Quarry not being required due to the cessation of mineral</p>												

		<p>extraction at the adjoining Wivenhoe Quarry.</p> <p>The site adjoining W36 is allocated within the adopted Minerals Local Plan (2014) for minerals extraction and thus the previously preferred inert recycling facility of W13 has been relocated to this site where such a facility is required. It should be noted that both the Wivenhoe (W13) and Sunnymead (W36) sites have the same operator.</p>												
SIE5	S / M	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	++	++	++
	L	+	++	++	++	++	+	/	0	++	--	/	++	++
Reason for rejection:		<p>Since the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) stage, the site has been considered to not be suitable in Highway Terms and/or does not comply with Transport Policy. This is due to Grange Road being of an insufficient width to allow two HGVs to pass satisfactorily.</p>												

Element of the SA – Conclusions: The Strategic Site Allocations (Policy 3)

The following table shows the sustainability impacts of the strategic site allocations of the Plan.

Sites for: BIOLOGICAL WASTE MANAGEMENT														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W29 Bellhouse	S / M	/	-	++	++	/	-	/	/	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	-	++	++	/	-	/	/	+	+	/	++	++
W3 Basildon WWTW	S / M	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	/	-	/	/	+	/	++	0	++	+	/	++	++
W20 Courtauld Road	S / M	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	0	++	+	-	+	++
	L	/	-	++	/	++	/	++	0	++	+	/	+	++
IWMF2 - Rivenhall	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	/	++	++
Sites for: INERT WASTE RECYCLING														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
W32 Crumps Farm	S / M	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
	L	/	-	--	-	/	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	+
W8 Elsenham	S / M	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	-	++	/
	L	+	++	++	/	-	-	/	0	+	+	/	++	/
W7 Sandon East	S / M	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	-	+	++
	L	+	-	--	/	+	+	++	0	++	/	/	+	++

L(n)1R Slough Farm	S / M	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	+	-	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
L(i)10R Blackley (Site 1)	S / M	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	+	-	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	/	++	++
W36 Sunny- mead (s2)	S / M	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	-	+	++
	L	/	++	++	-	+	/	++	0	+	/	/	+	++
W31 Morses Lane	S / M	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	-	++	++
	L	+	++	++	/	/	/	/	0	++	+	/	++	++
L(i)17R Newport Quarry	S / M	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	-	+	+
	L	/	-	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	/	+	+
Site for: OTHER WASTE MANAGEMENT														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
IWMF2 Rivenhall	S / M	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	++	++	+	--	++	/
	L	+	-	++	-	++	/	++	++	++	+	/	++	/
Sites for: INERT LANDFILL														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(n)7R Little Bullocks A22	S / M	/	--	--	++	/	/	/	0	+	+	--	++	+
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(n)1R Slough Farm	S / M	+	--	++	++	/	/	++	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)10 Blackley (Site 1)	S / M	+	--	++	++	+	/	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)6 Sandon	S / M	-	--	--	++	+	/	++	0	++	/	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)5 Sunnym- ead	S / M	/	--	++	++	/	++	/	0	+	/	--	+	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)17R Newport Quarry	S / M	/	--	++	-	+	++	++	0	+	/	--	+	+
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0

L(n)5 Bellhouse	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	+	/	0	++	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)15 Fingringhoe	S / M	/	--	++	/	+	++	++	0	++	++	--	++	++
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
L(i)16	S / M	+	--	--	/	+	--	++	0	+	+	--	++	++
	L	/	--	--	/	0	++	0	0	0	0	/	0	0
Sites for: (STABLE NON-REACTIVE) HAZARDOUS WASTE LANDFILL														
Site Ref.	Temp Effect	Sustainability Objectives (SO)												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
L(n)8R Little Bullocks	S / M	/	--	++	++	+	-	/	0	+	+	--	++	/
	L	/	--	++	/	0	/	0	0	0	0	/	0	0

This information is issued by
Place Services Team at Essex County Council

You can contact us in the following ways:

Visit our website:
www.placeservices.co.uk

By telephone:
03330 136840

By post:
**Place Services, Essex County Council
PO Box 11, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH**

Read our online magazine at **essex.gov.uk/ew**

Follow us on  **Essex_CC**

Find us on  **facebook.com/essexcountycouncil**

The information in this document can be translated, and/
or made available in alternative formats, on request.