

**MILTON KEYNES
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**MILTON KEYNES
WASTE
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT
EXAMINATION**

**SCHEDULE OF
MATTERS AND ISSUES
FOR EXAMINATION**

Hearings commence:

2 October 2007

Hearings venue:

Civic Offices
1 Saxon Gate East
Central Milton Keynes
MK9 3HQ

Programme Officer:

Jamie Chalmers
Milton Keynes Council
Civic Centre
PO Box 5499
Milton Keynes MK9 3XH
Telephone no: 01908-252356
e-mail: programme.officer@milton-keynes.gov.uk

Inspector:

Stephen J Pratt BA(Hons) MRTPI

MILTON KEYNES WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT EXAMINATION

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION

1. The Inspector has prepared this Schedule of Matters and Issues for Examination to guide and focus the discussion at the hearing sessions of the Examination into the Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document ("Waste DPD"). It has been prepared using the Planning Inspectorate's *Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents*¹, having regard to the representations made to the Waste DPD and the guidance in PPS12 & PPS10.
2. The Paper lists the main topics and issues which are likely to be discussed. For each topic, it sets out a series of questions on which the Inspector invites responses from the participants. A list of the relevant participants follows at the end of each topic, based on the current database. The Council and other participants are invited to respond to the questions raised in brief statements (no more than 3000 words per Matter), to be received by the Programme Officer **no later than Tuesday 4 September 2006**. Responses can be made on the various topics and questions by all participants listed under that topic, related to the points raised in the original representation, by those attending the hearing. Those making written representations need not submit any further material unless it is directly related to the Matters & Issues for Examination and is essential to support or understand their original representation.
3. **All further representations should address the Matters & Issues for Examination.** Participants may refer to information in earlier representations and statements, but please note that the Inspector only has copies of the representations made at formal submission stage. The Council should refer to information in the Self-Assessment of Soundness, Core Documents and Topic Papers, and may wish to respond to relevant points raised in the representations. It is important that representations and responses include all the evidence and supporting material, and for the Council, reference to the "core" evidence base, since the inspector is unlikely to accept further/new information once the hearing sessions commence. The submission of late information or evidence can seriously disrupt the hearing sessions and could disadvantage the participants, including the Inspector. All material which participants wish to put before the Inspector or refer to at the hearings should be submitted by the deadlines indicated. If participants wish to rely only on their original representation, no further statement is needed, but this approach should be confirmed with the Programme Officer.
4. As a result of the responses received to the Schedule of Matters and Issues for Examination, detailed agendas for the hearing sessions will be issued shortly before they commence. However, it is unlikely that the Inspector will introduce new issues or questions that do not arise from the topics and issues identified. Please note that not all matters and issues will be discussed at the hearing sessions; this will partly depend on those who wish to have an oral hearing, and some matters will be dealt with by written representations. Participants should let the Programme Officer know as soon as possible whether or not they wish to attend a particular session.
5. Participants are reminded that the Examination focuses on the tests of soundness set out in PPS12 (¶ 4.24), with the presumption that the Waste DPD is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise by evidence considered at the Examination. Participants are expected to explain why the plan is unsound in terms of a specific soundness test and specify how the plan should be altered, with precise wording and clear evidence to support this course of action.

¹ *Development Plans Examination – A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents (Planning Inspectorate; December 2005)*

MILTON KEYNES WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT
SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION

1. PROCEDURAL & CONFORMITY MATTERS²
[Soundness Tests 1; 2A; 2B; 3; 4A; 4B; 4C; 5; 7]

Key issues:

- i. Has the Waste DPD been prepared in accordance with the current Local Development Scheme and have the relevant details been met?
- ii. Has the Waste DPD been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the 2004 Regulations?
- iii. Has the Waste DPD been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, which has identified the process carried out, the baseline information used and the outcomes of the process?
- iv. Is the Waste DPD a *spatial plan*, which properly reflects national guidance on spatial planning?
- v. How does the Waste DPD take account of the relationship between policies in the plan and the requirements and infrastructure investment programmes of other agencies and service providers?
- vi. How does the Waste DPD relate to other relevant plans and strategies which influence the delivery of its proposals, including the Milton Keynes Municipal Waste Strategy, Milton Keynes Local Plan, Local Transport Plan etc.
- vii. Does the Waste DPD integrate effectively with plans prepared by other local planning authorities in the area (eg. unitary, district, county and adjoining local planning authorities)?
- viii. Is the Waste DPD consistent with national planning policy, particularly as set out in PPS10 & PPS12, and is there sufficient local justification for any policies which are not consistent with national planning policy³?
- ix. Is the Waste DPD in general conformity with the current Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG9) and draft South-East Plan, and is there sufficient local justification for any policies which are not consistent with regional planning policy⁴?
- x. How does the Waste DPD have regard to the Council's Community Strategy, and does reflect its vision and set out policies which deliver key components of this strategy in so far as they are consistent with strategic planning policy and the use and development of land?
- xi. Has an Appropriate Assessment been undertaken under the Habitats Directive (Articles 6(3) & (4)) relating to European sites, if necessary?
- xii. Has a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken, if necessary?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council
GO-SE

SEERA

² Most of these issues should be covered in the Council's Self-Assessment of Soundness

³ Detailed aspects of consistency with national policy will be dealt with under individual policies

⁴ Detailed aspects of conformity with regional policy will be dealt with under individual policies

2. CORE STRATEGY [POLICIES WCS1, WCS2 & WCS3]

[Soundness Tests: 4A; 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]

Key issues:

Is the Core Strategy for waste soundly based and appropriate for Milton Keynes, consistent with national and regional policy, reflecting community views, and providing a sound basis for the strategic and other policies in the Waste DPD?

(i) The soundness of the overall Core Strategy

Is the Core Strategy sound in terms of:

- (a) its Guiding Principles and Vision?
- (b) properly reflecting the objectives, policies and requirements of the adopted RSS and draft South-East Plan, and providing sufficient flexibility to deal with changing circumstances?
- (c) properly reflecting local issues and circumstances relevant to Milton Keynes?
- (d) setting out a strategy for sustainable waste management with spatial guidance to enable sufficient opportunities for waste management facilities, including waste disposal and recovery, in appropriate locations?
- (e) supporting the provision of new or enhanced waste management facilities and technologies, in line with the adopted/draft RSS, Municipal Waste Management Strategy, the latest National Waste Strategy, and the key planning objectives in PPS10?

(ii) Capacity, Targets and Requirements

- (a) Are the waste recycling and composting targets and figures for existing tonnage of waste managed and additional capacity required appropriate and soundly based (Tables WCS2-4)?
- (b) Are the waste management capacity requirements soundly based and appropriate, and how will they be delivered? (Policy WCS1);

(iii) Provision for particular types of waste

Does the Core Strategy make sufficient provision for:

- (a) non-hazardous landfill capacity to meet regional requirements?
- (b) recycling and composting capacity, including in-vessel and on-farm composting and kitchen waste?
- (c) treating and disposing of construction and demolition waste?
- (d) treating, managing and disposing of hazardous waste, and should it include a specific policy to deal with hazardous waste?
- (e) treating and disposing of commercial and industrial waste?
- (f) facilitating biomass, including implementing and monitoring its use?
- (g) Does the Core Strategy give sufficient emphasis to waste minimisation, reduction of packaging, and waste recovery/disposal methods?
- (h) Should Policy WCS2 be more specific about the type(s) of facilities envisaged and the alternative sites considered?

(iv) Sustainable Design, Construction & Demolition

- Is Policy WCS3 soundly based and founded on a robust and credible evidence base, consistent with national and regional guidance?

(v) London's waste - Should the Core Strategy make specific provision to accommodate a proportion of London's waste, in line with RPG9 and the draft South-East Plan?

(vi) Role of existing waste sites

- (a) Should the Core Strategy acknowledge that Bletchley Landfill Site will be accepting increased imports of waste from outside Milton Keynes, including from London?
- (b) Does the text adequately describe the Brooklands Ridge site and should it be excluded from Fig W1?

(vii) Alternative options - What alternative waste management options were considered and how was the preferred option selected?

(viii) Cross-boundary issues - How does the Core Strategy address longer-term cross-boundary issues, such as dealing with waste arising from possible future development at Newton Longville in Aylesbury Vale district and the relationship with Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council
Waste Recycling Group

SEERA

GO-SE

3. ALLOCATIONS [POLICIES WA1 & WA2]

[Soundness Tests 4A; 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]

Key issues:

Will Policies WA1 & WA2 deliver the required strategic waste management facilities identified in the Core Strategy and adequately safeguard existing and allocated waste management facilities?

(i) Preferred Strategic Waste Management Site at Old Wolverton

- (a) How was this site selected, is the methodology for its selection and allocation soundly based, and is it deliverable in planning terms?
- (b) Have the environmental, locational, traffic and amenity consequences of allocating the preferred site been properly addressed?
- (c) Is the plan sound and credible, by selecting a preferred site before the type of waste management plant has been decided?
- (d) Were local residents properly consulted about the preferred site?

(ii) Reserve Strategic Waste Management Site at Wymbush

- (a) How was this site selected, is the methodology for its selection and allocation soundly based, and is it deliverable in planning terms?
- (b) Have the environmental, locational, traffic and amenity consequences of allocating the reserve site been properly addressed?
- (c) Would the reserve site provide the same facilities as the preferred site, or is a reserve site needed for a final waste treatment plant?
- (d) Were local residents properly consulted about the reserve site?
- (e) Does Policy WA1 give sufficient guidance about the circumstances when the reserve site will be released?

(iii) Alternative/additional sites

- (a) Should alternative sites suggested at the Preferred Options stage be considered, and if so, which sites?
- (b) Should Policy WA1 identify Bletchley Landfill Site as a third potential strategic waste management site?
- (c) Should the DPD refer to proposals for a thermal process to deal with hazardous waste (*omission site to be clarified*)

(iv) Safeguarding Existing and Allocated Waste Sites

- (a) Will Policy WA2 adequately safeguard existing and allocated waste management facilities?
- (b) Does Policy WA2 safeguard and refer to all existing and allocated waste sites to be safeguarded, and should they be shown on the Proposals Map?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council	GO-SE	Waste Recycling Group
Tetlow King Planning	Pamela Furniss	Cllr J Holroyd Cllr J Irons

4. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES [POLICIES WDC1 – WDC4]

[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]

Key issues:

Do the policies represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, are they founded on a sound, robust and credible evidence base, and are they consistent with national and regional guidance and other policies in the Waste DPD?

Policy WDC1 – Development Control Criteria

- (i) Are the criteria set out in the Policy relevant, soundly based and appropriate?
- (ii) How will the criteria be implemented and monitored?

Policy WDC2 – Environmental Objectives

- (i) Are the criteria set out in the Policy relevant, soundly based and appropriate and how will they be implemented and monitored?
- (ii) Does the Policy give sufficient guidance for composting?

Policy WDC3 - Transport

- (i) Is the Policy more a matter of process rather than policy?
- (ii) Does the Policy impose unnecessary requirements on developers of proposed waste management developments, particularly for Transport Assessments?
- (iii) Should the Policy safeguard waste transfer infrastructure, including sites for waste transfer and bulking facilities?

Policy WDC4 – Restoration

- (i) Is the wording of the Policy strong enough?
- (ii) Are the criteria set out in the Policy relevant, soundly based and appropriate, and how will they be implemented and monitored?
- (iii) Should the Policy set out the opportunities that restoration could create and the role of restored land for other activities?
- (iv) Should restoration be considered as a greater priority than landraising?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council
SEERA (Policy WDC3)
Cllr J Holroyd (Policy WDC3)

GO-SE (Policies WDC1, WDC3 & WDC4)
Leonard Lean (Policy WDC3)

5. OTHER MATTERS

[Soundness tests 6, 7 & 8]

(i) Appendices

- (i) What is the status of the appendices; are they formally part of the Development Plan Document?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council

(ii) Appendix 1 – Monitoring & Implementation

- (i) Does the Waste DPD contain sufficient targets, indicators and milestones to monitor the performance and delivery of the strategy and the policies, which are realistic and achievable?
- (ii) Does the Waste DPD include clearly identified delivery mechanisms and timescales for the implementation of policies, along with a clear indication of who is intended to implement each policy?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council

(iii) Appendix 2 – Practical Issues to be addressed in New Developments

- (i) Should the Appendix address the provision for management of hazardous waste, in accordance with current and emerging regional guidance?

Written representations

Milton Keynes Council

SEERA

(iv) Appendix 3 – Waste Treatment Options

- (i) Is the policy opposing the use of mass-burn incineration soundly-based and appropriate for Milton Keynes?
- (ii) Is the description of autoclaving appropriate and correct?

Written representations

Milton Keynes Council
Nigel Richards
M E Morris

Shenley Brook End PC
StereCycle

P M George
O Hayward

(v) Key Diagram and Proposals Map

- (i) Does the Key Diagram meet the requirements specified in PPS12 & PPS10?
- (ii) Is the Proposals Map clear and adequate, in terms of the guidance in PPS12 & PPS10?

Attendance at hearing

Milton Keynes Council

(vi) Other matters

to be decided

MILTON KEYNES WASTE DPD EXAMINATION

KEY DATES

Summary of representations made at submission stage and Council's responses available at Council offices and on the Council's web-site	29 June 2007
Initial Core Documents list produced	18 July 2007
Draft programme for hearing sessions of the Examination	18 July 2007
Inspector's draft Schedule of Matters & Issues for Examination	18 July 2007
Pre-Examination Meeting	<u>18 July 2007</u>
Topic Papers published including Proposed Changes	27 July 2007
Notes of PEM, including Schedule of Matters & Issues for Examination and programme for hearings	27 July 2007
Final date for making representations on "omission" sites	15 August 2007
Submission of written statements responding to Matters & Issues for Examination	<u>4 September 2007</u>
Hearing sessions commence	<u>2 October 2007</u>