

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/P/1</p> <p>UDP - Policy P3: Hazardous Installations</p> <p>IR –</p>	<p>“16.18 Hazardous substances and their specified quantities are set down in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992 as amended by The Planning (Control of Major-Accident Hazards) Regulations 1999 (COMAH). These latter regulations implemented the land use planning requirements of the Seveso II Directive [<i>Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9 December 1996</i>]. The notifiable installations under these regulations, as at May 2001, are listed in the Proposals Reports.”</p>	<p>“16.18 Hazardous substances and their specified quantities are set down in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992 as amended by The Planning (Control of Major-Accident Hazards) Regulations 1999 (COMAH). These latter regulations implemented the land use planning requirements of the Seveso II Directive [<i>Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9 December 1996</i>]. The notifiable installations under these regulations, as at May 2001, are listed in the Proposals Reports and shown on the proposals map. As part of the gas distribution network there are also several highpressure gas mains in the District. Developers should contact both TRANSCO and the appropriate local network provider to identify the location of high pressure gas mains and for advice on the location of development with regard to such hazardous infrastructure.”</p>	<p>Provide clarity as to the location of COMAH sites and cross-refer to the consideration of high pressure gas mains.</p>
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/P/2</p> <p>UDP - Policy P4: Contaminated Land</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 16.1 –</p>	<p>“Policy P4</p> <p>PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED BY THE COUNCIL TO BE CONTAMINATED WILL BE GRANTED, PROVIDED THAT</p> <p>(1) AN APPROPRIATE SITE INVESTIGATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE DEVELOPER TO DETERMINE</p>	<p>Policy P4</p> <p>PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED BY THE COUNCIL TO BE CONTAMINATED WILL BE GRANTED, PROVIDED THAT</p> <p>(1) AN APPROPRIATE SITE INVESTIGATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE DEVELOPER TO DETERMINE</p>	<p>The Council declines to accept all of the inspector's recommendation because the proposed replacement wording is not in line with government guidance.</p> <p>The Inspector's revised wording of the Policy is accepted, except for the use of the word “substantial”.</p> <p>PPG23 Annex 10 section 5-629 para 8 (Determining planning applications) does not refer to, or use the word “substantial”. Suggested alternative wording in line with PPG23 (lifted directly out of Annex 10 section 5-629 para 8) is proposed.</p> <p>It is inaccurate to believe that substantial contamination will always require a site investigation. Substantial contamination may <i>not</i></p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
16.5, Pages 205 - 206	<p>WHETHER CONTAMINANTS ARE PRESENT OR NOT, AND</p> <p>(2) IF ANY CONTAMINANTS ARE FOUND THE DEVELOPER SHALL CARRY OUT APPROPRIATE MEASURES AGREED WITH THE COUNCIL TO ADEQUATELY OVERCOME THE PROBLEM ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.”</p> <p>16.22 The scale and level of detail of a site investigation will depend on the circumstances of the particular case including the evidence revealed by a desk study which would consider previous uses of the site. In instances where it is known or there is evidence to suggest that the site is contaminated to a degree that would adversely affect the proposed development, the developers will be expected to finance and carry out a site investigation and identify appropriate remedial measures, to the satisfaction of the Council, prior to the Council determining the planning application.”</p>	<p>WHETHER CONTAMINANTS ARE PRESENT OR NOT, AND</p> <p>(2) IF ANY CONTAMINANTS ARE FOUND THE DEVELOPER SHALL CARRY OUT APPROPRIATE MEASURES AGREED WITH THE COUNCIL TO ADEQUATELY OVERCOME THE PROBLEM ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>Policy P4</p> <p>PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND WHERE CONTAMINATION IS SUSPECTED WILL BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS REQUIRING</p> <p>(1) A SITE INVESTIGATION BEFORE DEVELOPMENT IS COMMENCED, AND</p> <p>(2) A PROGRAMME OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY REMEDIAL MEASURES SHOWN BY THE SITE INVESTIGATION TO BE NECESSARY.</p> <p>WHERE THERE IS A STRONG SUSPICION OF CONTAMINATION WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OR INFRINGE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED ONLY FOLLOWING A SITE INVESTIGATION AND</p>	<p>adversely affect the proposed development (e.g. for such matters as industrial development). The contamination levels may be high, but the proposed development may be such that there will be little risk and the land is suitable for that type of development. On the other hand contamination at low levels (which could be argued is not substantial) may cause high risk to the end users, adversely affecting the proposed development and making the land unsuitable for the proposed end use, e.g. housing with gardens.</p> <p>The proposed wording allows an assessment of the contamination based on the type of development, rather than the level of contamination, analysing whether the contamination is such that it may affect the proposed development. This is the 'suitable for use' approach outlined in PPG23 and the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part IIA Contaminated Land, inserted by the Environment Act 1995. The modification of the policy in line with PPG23 will permit the request for appropriate site investigation reports and make sure the site is suitable for the proposed end use.</p> <p>It is also proposed to amend paragraph 16.22 of the RUDP revised Deposit July 2002, to ensure the Inspector's recommended policy can be complied with, to take into account legislative developments in relation to contaminated land and to ensure it is clear what the Council requires. The proposed amendment requires the submission of a desktop study at the application stage. The desktop (Phase I) report should appraise the previous uses of the site, assessing various factors and providing a conclusion on the status of the site, determining the level of suspicion in relation to contamination and whether it is likely to adversely affect the development.</p> <p>PPG23 section 5-601 para 4.5 states that contamination should be identified at the earliest stage of planning. It states that the history of the site or nearby sites is the principal factor in determining whether a site is likely to be contaminated or not. Additionally, there have been developments on the study of contaminated land, in particular the development of desktop (Phase I) reports and site investigation (Phase II) reports. PPG23 does not refer to two stage reports, only to site investigation (phase II), however the reference to the history of the site and nearby sites, in PPG23, is a crucial factor that links into desktop (Phase I) reports. Furthermore, the proposed changes to</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
		<p><i>RISK ASSESMENT, AND THE SUBMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF ANY PROGRAMME OF MEASURES WHICH THE SITE INVESTIGATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT SHOW TO BE NECESSARY TO PREVENT HARM FROM CONTAMINATION.</i></p> <p>16.22 <i>In order to determine the level of suspicion in relation to contamination, developers will be required to submit with their planning application a desk top (Phase I) report on sites which have previous manufacturing or industrial activity, chemical or fuel storage, treatment or disposal of waste, or where it is suspected the land may be contaminated due to its uses now or in the past. The desk top (Phase I) report shall appraise the previous uses of the site, assess the environmental setting, including hydrology, geology and pollution incidences, and provide a risk assessment using the source-pathway-receptor model, concluding if the contamination is such that it will adversely affect the proposed development. The scale and level of detail of a site investigation will depend on the circumstances of the particular case including the evidence revealed by a desk study which would consider previous uses of the site. In instances where it is known or there is evidence to suggest that the site is contaminated to a degree that would adversely affect the proposed development, the developers will be</i></p>	<p>PPG23 refer to the omission of contaminated land from PPG23 and its inclusion in a technical advice note "Development on land affected by contamination". This technical advice note was issued for consultation in February 2002 and states that a desktop study should be part of the formal application process where the current or previous use of the land, or other information, suggest there is a potential for contamination in relation to the proposed development.</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
		<p>expected to finance and carry out a site investigation and identify appropriate remedial measures, to the satisfaction of the Council, prior to the Council determining the planning application.</p> <p><i>16.22a Where it is considered that the contamination would adversely affect the proposed development, the developer will be expected to finance and carry out a detailed site investigation (Phase II) report and identify appropriate remedial measures, to the satisfaction of the Council, prior to the Council determining the planning application. The scale and level of detail of a site investigation will depend on the circumstances of the particular case including the evidence revealed by a desk study.</i></p>	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/P/3</p> <p>UDP - Policy P6: Unstable Land</p> <p>IR –</p>	<p>“Policy P6 PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED TO BE POTENTIALLY UNSTABLE WILL BE GRANTED, PROVIDED THAT:-</p> <p>(1) A FULL SITE INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE DEVELOPER TO DETERMINE WHETHER INSTABILITY MAY OCCUR OR NOT, AND</p> <p>(2) IF ANY INSTABILITY IS FOUND, THE DEVELOPER SHALL CARRY OUT ANY MEASURES REQUIRED TO ADEQUATELY</p>	<p>“Policy P6 PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED TO BE POTENTIALLY UNSTABLE WILL ONLY BE GRANTED, PROVIDED THAT IF THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS ARE MADE:-</p> <p>(1) A FULL SITE INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE DEVELOPER TO DETERMINE WHETHER INSTABILITY MAY OCCUR OR NOT, AND</p> <p>(2) IF ANY INSTABILITY IS FOUND, THE DEVELOPER SHALL CARRY OUT ANY</p>	<p>Pre inquiry change published January 2003 not subject to an objection.</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	OVERCOME THE PROBLEM, ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.”	MEASURES REQUIRED TO ADEQUATELY OVERCOME THE PROBLEM, ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.”	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/P/4</p> <p>UDP - Policy P11: Waste Incineration & Para. 16.50-52</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 16.13 –16.20, pages 207-209</p>	<p>“Land Use Waste Strategy</p> <p>16.36 However, there is an increasing amount of recycling and treatment of waste being carried out in the district and the WPA expects this to continue during the life of the plan unless the Regional Waste Management Strategy dictates otherwise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan will support all recycling, treatment and handling proposals provided the applicant provides evidence that it is the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for that waste stream, and the impact of the development on environment and people is minimised. • Landfilling of inert material will only be considered if it is proved to be the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) and involves either derelict land, contaminated land or agricultural land that cannot be improved by other means. The WPA will expect inert material to be recycled and reused wherever possible. • Landfilling of biodegradable waste will be considered against set criteria. Given the lead in time required for large scale alternatives it is likely that a large scale landfill will be required during the life of the plan. Any such proposal will need to prove Best 	<p>“Land Use Waste Strategy</p> <p>16.36 However, there is an increasing amount of recycling and treatment of waste being carried out in the district and the WPA expects this to continue during the life of the plan. unless the Regional Waste Management Strategy dictates otherwise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan will support all recycling, treatment and handling proposals provided the applicant provides evidence that it is the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for that waste stream, and the impact of the development on environment and people is minimised. • Landfilling of inert material will only be considered if it is proved to be the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) and involves either derelict land, contaminated land or agricultural land that cannot be improved by other means. The WPA will expect inert material to be recycled and reused wherever possible. • Landfilling of biodegradable waste will be considered against set criteria. Given the lead in time required for large scale alternatives it is likely that a large scale landfill will be required during the life of the plan. Any such proposal will need to prove Best 	<p>The Council accepts the Inspector’s recommendation except for part (a), where it requires an explanation under “Land use waste strategy” of factors to be taken into account in deciding BPEO.</p> <p>It is considered that this is inappropriate in the Policy Framework of a UDP. Government guidance in PPG12 states that Part I of the UDP should avoid over elaborate or detailed polices. The inclusion of the factors to be taken into account in deciding BPEO would be substantial, as each waste stream and each waste management option would have to be assessed.</p> <p>Furthermore PPG11 states that the RPG should address regional or sub-regional matters; and BPEO is a regional matter. PPG10 states that the Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB) should determine the BPEO. Consequently it is for the RTAB to determine the factors to be taken into account in deciding BPEO. The RTAB for the Yorkshire and Humber Region’s current agenda includes an examination and the scope of BPEO assessments.</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) and ensure that it has a minimum impact on the environment.”</p> <p>“16.50 Many types of waste require treatment before being landfilled and incineration</p>	<p>Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) and ensure that it has a minimum impact on the environment.</p> <p><i>When assessing BPEO consideration should be given to the waste hierarchy which is a theoretical framework ranking the four main ways of dealing with waste, with the most effective environmental solution being first:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reduction - reduce the generation of waste.</i> • <i>Re-use - material for the same or different purpose.</i> • <i>Recovery - through recycling, composting or energy recovery.</i> • <i>Disposal - of waste to landfill, incineration.</i> <p><i>The most effective environmental solution may often be to reduce the amount of waste generated. Where further reduction is not practical products and materials can sometimes be used again, either for the same or a different purpose. Failing that, value should be recovered from waste, through recycling, composting or energy recovery. Only if none of the above offers an appropriate solution should waste be disposed of. “</i></p> <p>16.50 Many types of waste require treatment before being landfilled and incineration</p>	

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	is a form of treatment that has the potential to reduce the volume and pollution from waste during final disposal.”	is a form of treatment that has the potential to reduce the volume and pollution from of waste during final disposal.”	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/P/5</p> <p>UDP - Policy P13: Inert Waste - Landfill</p> <p>IR - Policy Framework Paragraphs 16.23 –16.278, page 210</p>	<p>“Policy P13 LANDFILLING WILL BE AN ACCEPTABLE MEANS OF DISPOSAL FOR INERT WASTES THAT CANNOT BE REUSED OR RECYCLED PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSALS:</p> <p>(1) INVOLVE THE RESTORATION OF DESPOILED LAND INCLUDING QUARRIES AND THE LAND CANNOT REASONABLY BE RESTORED BY ANY OTHER MEANS; OR</p> <p>(2) LEAD TO THE RECLAMATION OF CONTAMINATED LAND WHICH CANNOT REASONABLY BE RECLAIMED BY ANY OTHER REASONABLE MEANS; OR</p> <p>(3) IN THE CASE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND LEAD TO A SIGNIFICANT AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT THAT CANNOT REASONABLY BE ACHIEVED BY ANY OTHER REASONABLE MEANS; AND</p> <p>(4) DOES NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL, LANDSCAPE OR GEOLOGICAL FEATURES;</p> <p>(5) THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THE PROPOSAL IS THE BEST PRACTICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL OPTION (BPEO) FOR THE IDENTIFIED WASTE STREAM;</p>	<p>“Policy P13 LANDFILLING WILL BE AN ACCEPTABLE MEANS OF DISPOSAL FOR INERT WASTES THAT CANNOT BE REUSED OR RECYCLED PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSALS:</p> <p>(1) INVOLVE THE RESTORATION OF DESPOILED LAND INCLUDING QUARRIES AND THE LAND CANNOT REASONABLY BE RESTORED BY ANY OTHER MEANS; OR</p> <p>(2) LEAD TO THE RECLAMATION OF CONTAMINATED LAND WHICH CANNOT REASONABLY BE RECLAIMED BY ANY OTHER REASONABLE MEANS; OR</p> <p>(3) IN THE CASE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND LEAD TO A SIGNIFICANT AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT THAT CANNOT REASONABLY BE ACHIEVED BY ANY OTHER REASONABLE MEANS; AND</p> <p>(4) DOES NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL, LANDSCAPE OR GEOLOGICAL FEATURES;</p> <p>(5) THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THE PROPOSAL IS THE BEST PRACTICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL OPTION (BPEO) FOR THE IDENTIFIED WASTE STREAM;</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report.</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>(6) THE SITE WOULD BE SAFELY ACCESSIBLE FROM THE PRIMARY ROAD NETWORK;</p> <p>(7) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT GIVE RISE TO UNACCEPTABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON PEOPLE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN TERMS OF VISUAL AMENITY, NOISE, DUST, AIR, GROUND OR WATER POLLUTION OR OTHER NUISANCE;</p> <p>(8) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT THE REQUIREMENTS OF POLICY P14 ARE MET;</p>	<p>(6) THE SITE WOULD BE SAFELY ACCESSIBLE FROM THE PRIMARY ROAD NETWORK;</p> <p>(7) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT GIVE RISE TO UNACCEPTABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON PEOPLE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN TERMS OF VISUAL AMENITY, NOISE, DUST, AIR, GROUND OR WATER POLLUTION OR OTHER NUISANCE;</p> <p>(8) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT THE REQUIREMENTS OF POLICY P14 P15 ARE MET;</p> <p>THE FOLLOWING SITES ARE ALLOCATED FOR THE DISPOSAL OF INERT WASTE AND ARE SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAND AT BLACK MOOR ROAD • LAND AT THE SHAY, BRIGHOUSE AND DENHOLME ROAD • LAND AT EAST MANYWELLS FARM, DOLL LANE, CULLINGWORTH • BRAITHWAITE EDGE QUARRY, KEIGHLEY” 	
<p>Mod– Mod/PF/P/6</p> <p>UDP – Policy P14: Biodegradable Waste - Landfill</p>	<p>“POLICY P14</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR THE DISPOSAL OF BIODEGRADABLE WASTE BY LANDFILL WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IF:</p> <p>(1) THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL,</p>	<p>“Policy P14</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR THE DISPOSAL OF BIODEGRADABLE WASTE BY LANDFILL WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IF:</p> <p>(1) THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL,</p>	<p>The Council accepts that Policy P14 should be amended to include a reference to Buck Park Quarry as it has been identified as a landfill site capable of taking household waste and is considered to provide sufficient capacity for the plan period. Any proposals for landfilling will have to prove that they meet all the criteria as set out within the other relevant policies of the plan for the protection of people and the environment.</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
<p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 16.30 –16.34, pages 211 -212</p>	<p>LANDSCAPE OR GEOLOGICAL FEATURES;</p> <p>(2) THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THE PROPOSAL IS THE BEST PRACTICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL OPTION (BPEO) FOR THE IDENTIFIED WASTE STREAM;</p> <p>(3) THE SITE WOULD BE SAFELY ACCESSIBLE FROM THE PRIMARY ROAD NETWORK;</p> <p>(4) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT GIVE RISE TO UNACCEPTABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON PEOPLE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN TERMS OF VISUAL AMENITY, NOISE, DUST, AIR, GROUND OR WATER POLLUTION OR OTHER NUISANCE;</p> <p>(5) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT THE REQUIREMENTS OF POLICY P15 ARE MET.”</p>	<p>LANDSCAPE OR GEOLOGICAL FEATURES;</p> <p>(2) THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THE PROPOSAL IS THE BEST PRACTICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL OPTION (BPEO) FOR THE IDENTIFIED WASTE STREAM;</p> <p>(3) THE SITE WOULD BE SAFELY ACCESSIBLE FROM THE PRIMARY ROAD NETWORK;</p> <p>(4) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT GIVE RISE TO UNACCEPTABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON PEOPLE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN TERMS OF VISUAL AMENITY, NOISE, DUST, AIR, GROUND OR WATER POLLUTION OR OTHER NUISANCE;</p> <p>(5) THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT THE REQUIREMENTS OF POLICY P15 ARE MET.</p> <p><i>BUCK PARK QUARRY, DENHOLME, IS ALLOCATED FOR THE DISPOSAL OF BIO-DEGRADABLE WASTE AND IS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP.”</i></p>	
<p>Mod– Mod/PF/P/7</p> <p>UDP – Policy P15: Landfill Operational Matters</p> <p>IR – Policy</p>	<p>“16.35 When drafting policies for waste development it is necessary for the planning authority to plan for current and future waste management requirements. The UDP must deal with municipal and non-municipal waste, in other words ALL waste that is generated in the district. Until the Council’s Waste Municipal Waste Strategy and the Regional Waste</p>	<p>“16.35 When drafting policies for waste development it is necessary for the planning authority to plan for current and future waste management requirements. The UDP must deal with municipal and non-municipal waste, in other words ALL waste that is generated in the district. Until the Council’s Waste Municipal Waste Strategy and the Regional Waste</p>	<p>The wording of Paragraph 16.35 is now out of date. The Council’s Municipal Waste Strategy and the Regional Waste Management Strategy have now been adopted. However, these documents do not identify the number of facilities needed for all types of waste treatment as expected. The regional strategy focuses on municipal waste and work on the regional BPEO has still not been completed.</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – POLICY FRAMEWORK CHAPTER 16 POLLUTION, HAZARDS AND WASTE

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
<p>Framework Paragraphs 16.35 –16.41, pages 212 - 213</p>	<p>Management Strategy are available the planning authority is not in a position to provide site specific allocations for large scale waste treatment facilities. Buck Park Quarry, Denholme has been identified as a landfill site capable of taking household waste and is considered to provide sufficient capacity for plan period.</p>	<p>Management Strategy are available The planning authority is not in a position to provide new site-specific allocations for large-scale waste treatment facilities as a result of the lack of guidance from both the government and regional bodies on the number of facilities required.</p> <p>16.35a The Council’s Municipal Waste Strategy and the Regional Waste Management Strategy have now been adopted. However, these documents do not detail the number and type of waste facilities or waste management options for all waste streams. The current government guidance requires BPEO at a strategic level. Without undertaking a BPEO at a regional level there is insufficient information to begin to allocate sites for all types of waste management facilities across the Region. Buck Park Quarry, Denholme, has been identified as a landfill site capable of taking household waste and is considered to provide sufficient capacity for the plan period. Further, existing sites for the disposal of inert waste, containing additional capacity, are listed in Policy P13 and identified on the Proposals Map.”</p>	