

| | Policy WCS1: Capacity Requirements | Policy WCS2: Provision of Waste Capacity | Policy WCS3: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition | Policy WA1: Strategic Waste Management Site | Policy WA2: Safeguarding Existing and Allocated Waste Site | Policy WDC1: Development Control Criteria | Policy WDC2: Environmental Objectives | Policy WDC3: Transport | Policy WDC4: Restoration |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. |
| 1. To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health | + Meeting waste capacity requirements will have a positive impact on health and well being | + Provision of sufficient waste management capacity plays an important part in maintaining health and well-being | + Sustainable design is likely to improve health and well being across the MKC area | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Waste management sites should be protected to ensure the health and well being of the population | + Controlling waste management activities will have a beneficial impact on human health | + Provisions of policy will have an indirect benefit on human health and well being | + The control of vehicle movements will have a beneficial impact on human health | + Effective restoration schemes are important to health and well being |
| 2. To reduce crime and the fear of crime | + Meeting waste management targets should help to minimise incidents of fly tipping | + Provision of sufficient waste management capacity should help to reduce incidents of fly tipping | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Ensuring sufficient supply of waste management sites will potentially prevent fly tipping and other illegal activities | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 3. To reduce social exclusions and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Sustainable design could potentially reduce social exclusion by making waste facilities more accessible | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Waste Needs Statement could potentially include information on access to waste management facilities | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ? It is unclear how the policy will effect social exclusion | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 4. To improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services and employment areas | + No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Policy gives priority to waste management facilities in employment areas | + Sustainable design should encourage accessibility to waste management facilities | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Policy states that proposals should be close to waste arisings. This should improve accessibility to facilities | + Improved transportation will improve access to waste management facilities | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 5. To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve | + The reduction in landfill is likely to have a beneficial effect on air quality | ++ Reduction in landfill and encouragement of composting as a means of waste disposal is likely to improve air quality | + Sustainable design could reduce air pollution | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Effective control over waste management development is likely to benefit air quality | + Energy efficient designs should help to improve air quality | + Clear and consistent transport policies to control numbers of vehicles will have a beneficial impact on air quality | + Effective restoration schemes are likely to have a beneficial effect on air quality |
| 6. To reduce noise pollution | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Policy states that priority will be given to sites that are away from residential areas | + Sustainable design could reduce noise pollution | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Development control criteria are unlikely to reduce noise pollution | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + The control of transportation movements associated with waste management is likely to reduce noise pollution | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 7. To reduce road traffic and congestion through a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | ? Unclear how policy will relate to objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006) | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ? Unclear if this policy would have a significant impact on sustainable transport | + Proximity to waste arisings should contribute to a reduction in road traffic congestion | ++ This policy will significantly reduce the amount of road traffic associated with waste management | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 8. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings | + Reduced reliance on landfill will improve efficiency of land use | ++ Provision of a single site for waste management is likely to significantly improve overall efficiency of land use | + Sustainable design could help to reduce noise pollution | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Policy will prevent inappropriate development on proposed waste management sites | + Development control policies could improve efficiency of land use | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 9. To reduce waste arisings and increase reuse, recovery and recycling | + Increased recycling targets will significantly reduce waste arisings | + The policy is written against a background of reducing waste arisings and increasing reuse, recovery and recycling | + Sustainable design could help to minimise waste arisings | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Safeguarding sites will prevent loss of waste management sites and allow waste minimisation activities to take place | + Effective development control criteria are likely to reduce waste arisings | + Energy efficient designs could help to reduce waste arisings | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 10. To protect local water resources and improve the quality of surface and groundwater | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | ? Unclear how the policy will affect local water resources | + Sustainable design could help to protect water resources | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Policy is likely to minimise impact of waste management on ground water | + Policy refers to the need to ensure that water efficient designs are used | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ++ Effective restoration schemes will have a directly beneficial effect on ground water resources |
| 11. To reduce the risk of flooding | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | ? Unclear how policy will affect risk of flooding | + Sustainable design could help to reduce potential risk of flooding | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology was assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Policy does not make specific reference to flooding | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ? Policy does not make direct reference to flooding | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |

| | Policy WCS1: Capacity Requirements | Policy WCS2: Provision of Waste Capacity | Policy WCS3: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition | Policy WA1: Strategic Waste Management Site | Policy WA2: Safeguarding Existing and Allocated Waste Site | Policy WDC1: Development Control Criteria | Policy WDC2: Environmental Objectives | Policy WDC3: Transport | Policy WDC4: Restoration |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. | Performance Commentary/Explanation to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time. |
| 12. To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) | + Reduced reliance on landfill will have a beneficial impact on climate change by recudcing greenhouse gas emissions | + Increase in reuse, recovery and recycling should have a positive impact on climate change | + Sustainable design could promote energy efficient buildings and minimise the impact of development on climate change | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Energy efficient designs will help to minimise impacts on climate change | + Control of waste related transport is likely to have a beneficial effect on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions | ? Unclear of relationship between policy and objective |
| 13. To increase energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | ? Unclear how policy will relate to objective | + Sustainable design could promote energy efficient buildings and minimise the impact of development on climate change | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ? Unclear if development control criteria will result in increased energy efficiency | ++ The main purpose of the policy is to increase energy efficiency of buildings | + A co-ordinated approach to transport is likely to result in improved energy efficiency | ? Unclear of relationship between policy and objective |
| 14. To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habits | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Focus of waste management facilities will be on employment areas | ~ Sustainable design is unlikely to have a significant impact on biodiversity | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Policy contains specific reference to biodiversity | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Effective restoration schemes can have a beneficial effect on ecology and wildlife |
| 15. To protect, enhance and make accessible heritage assets and their settings | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Focus of waste management facilities will be on employment areas | ~ Sustainable design is unlikely to have a significant beneficial impact on cultural heritage | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Development control criteria are likely to protect cultural heritage resources | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 16. To protect, manage and restore soil resources | + Reduced reliance on landfill will have a beneficial impact on soil resources | + Focus of waste management facilities will be on employment areas | + Sustainable design should help to protect soil resources from waste management activities by encouraging, for example, on site re-use of soil material | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Development control criteria are likely to protect soil and other resources | + The policy should have an indirect beneficial effect on soil resources | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Effective restoration will protect soil resources from contamination |
| 17. To promote the protection and enhancement of the countryside and landscape character | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Focus of waste management facilities will be on employment areas | ~ Sustainable design is unlikely to have a significant impact on landscape character | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Safeguarding will prevent inappropriate sites from being developed for waste management use | + Policy makes specific reference to the protection of the historic environment | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Effective restoration schemes should protect landscape from degradation |
| 18. To improve the vitality of towns and local centres and encourage urban renaissance | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | ~ No direct relationship between objective and policy | + Sustainable construction could help to improve visual appearance and the vitality and viability of towns | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Development control criteria will minimise the impact of waste management activities | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | + Policy requires sites to be located in relation to rhe strategic road network. This should minimise the impact of waste management on town centres | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 19. To maintain a strong local economy | + Effective waste management policies play an important part in maintaining the local economy | + Effective waste management policies play an important part in maintaining local economy | ? Unclear to what extent sustainable construction will improve the local economy | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Safeguarding appropriate sites for waste management use will help to maintain a strong local economy | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |
| 20. To maintain high and stable levels of employment | + Increased recycling could have a beneficial impact on local employment levels | + Increased recycling could have a beneficial impact on local employment levels | ? Unclear to what extent sustainable construction will maintain high and stable levels of employment | N/A Specific site allocation policies were not appraised. However, the site assessment criteria and methodology were assessed previously in the Sustainability Report (July 2006). | + Safeguarding appropriate sites for waste management use will help to maintain a strong local economy | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective | ~ No direct relationship between policy and objective |