

**WELSH GOVERNMENT**

**Examination Hearing Statement**

**Bridgend Local Development Plan**

**Hearing Session 11: Waste**

**09<sup>th</sup> January 2013**

## **SP7 –Waste Management**

**Qn1a. As policy REG1 suggests that the allocated employment sites are protected for industrial and business uses specified in that policy, which do not include waste treatment, should there be a cross reference in respect of those REG1 sites that are also proposed for waste treatment in Policy SP7 or which include B2 uses and may therefore be acceptable for waste management? If so could this be similar to the asterisk cross reference to Policy PLA3 and should it be explained in supporting text to REG1?**

Yes. At present the absence of a cross reference in this respect could be confusing

While this is not considered to be an issue of ‘soundness’, the inclusion of a reference to identify those sites in REG1 (as is the case with the current cross reference to PLA3) along with an explanation within supporting text would aid the clarity of the plan.

**Qn1b. As SP7 and its supporting text does not mention that four of the identified waste sites are also allocated for employment uses, should there be a cross reference to Policy REG1?**

In addition to the above, a cross reference within the supporting text of SP7 in regards to those sites also included within REG1 would aid the clarity of the plan.

**Qn1c. May policy REG2 hinder the conversion of industrial land on the SP7 sites or other B2 sites to waste treatment facilities?**

No comment.

**Qn1d. How is the paragraph 4.5.1 identification of a need for 3 to 4 in-building facilities on sites totalling up to 11.9ha reconciled with the Background Paper identification of available sites that are as small as 0.2ha? If the 4.5ha Heol-y-Splott site is fully developed there could be a residual need for 2 to 3 facilities averaging 2.5-3.7ha? Are sites of sufficient size likely to be available on the identified land?**

No comment.

**Qn1e. Paragraph 4.5.4 refers to the requirement to designate sites suitable for regional facilities but the plan does not do so. As the Background Paper at paragraph 3.4 identifies Heol-y-Splott as possibly the only suitable site should paragraph 4.5.5 be amended to make this clear?**

The Council should clarify if sites SP7 (2-5) are of a suitable scale to accommodate a regional facility. Para 3.4 of the Waste Background Paper

suggests that Heol Y Splott SP7 (1) is the only suitable site of sufficient scale that could accommodate such a facility.

**Qn1f. What is the scale of the waste management facility permitted at Heol-y-Splott and does that affect its suitability for a regional facility?**

No comment.

**Qn1g. Apart from the Stormy Down site, has any consideration been given to whether any of the identified waste sites are suitable for the production of energy from waste in accordance with Regional Waste Plan First Revision Objectives?**

No comment.

### **ENV14 Inert Waste & ENV16 Commercial and Industrial Waste**

**Qn2a. Will policy ENV14 be sufficient to meet the acknowledged need for inert waste disposal?**

No comment.

**Qn2b. Similar issues have arisen in earlier sessions. Is CCW content that the Plan is to be read as a whole and that the amendment is not needed?**

No comment.

**Qn2c. Has the Background Paper suitable addressed the Representor's concerns?**

No comment.

**Qn2d. Unless there are cross references between Policies REG1 and SP7 would an SP7 (3) waste facility developer be aware of all relevant considerations for the REG1 (37) site including the potential impact on the SAC?**

No comment.

**Qn2e. Will the online database include cross references when sites feature in several allocation policies?**

No comment.

