

Materials Resource Strategy

Outputs from Workshop 6

The sixth workshop of the Materials Resource Strategy was held in Winchester on the 2nd December 2004. Two sessions were held, one full day event and a second, abridged evening session. 91 stakeholders attended in total. The purpose of Workshop 6 was to:

- Present and discuss the draft overall option for managing resources in Hampshire over the period up to 2020.
- Give feedback on the work of the off-line group on unavoidable waste, which focussed on how unavoidable waste should be managed in the future
- Give feedback on the work of the off-line minerals group
- Debate spatial issues surrounding recycling, unavoidable waste and minerals supply.
- Review the aims and principles of the MRS

The debate was as lively, interesting and intelligent as ever and the workshop a very useful event for everyone that took part. The results of the discussion are summarised below.

Discussion Session 1: Overall Stakeholder Preferred Option for Resource Management in Hampshire

The overall stakeholder preferred option for resource management in Hampshire was introduced to the stakeholders. Debate then focussed on the following aspects of the overall option: the revised recycling rate of 58%; the conclusions and assumptions of the work of the off-line groups for unavoidable waste and minerals; and the number of waste management facilities required to deliver the MRS.

Issue 1: The Revised Recycling Rate of 58%

There was general agreement with the revised recycling rate of 58%. Many groups felt that this would be a difficult target to meet but that it needed to be challenging, and that ultimately the 58% figure was achievable. There was one query over whether the 43% target for hazardous waste could be too challenging. A minority wanted of stakeholders wanted to see a higher target.

Some stakeholders felt that the figure of 58% was too precise, although it was mentioned that the public may have more faith in a precise (and therefore seemingly not arbitrary) target.

Many stakeholders expressed the importance of reviewing the target and increasing if and when appropriate.

The cost of achieving the 58% target was an important issue. There was concern that it could be too expensive.

The following factors were identified which would help to meet the 58% target:

- European legislation and landfill tax
- Better separation methods
- Making it easier for people to recycle, increase kerbside collections, making the recycling bin bigger than the waste bin
- Education, information and culture change
- Improved pre-treatment

The following problems were identified:

- Lack of business confidence in the quality of recycled material
- Need for permanent facilities
- Capital investment being held up by the long time for implementation of new legislation and differing regulation in different counties
- Transport impacts (put pressure on the Strategic Rail Authority to accept movements of waste by train)
- Environmental impacts of recycling facilities, Issues of dust and noise on CDE sites.

Furthermore, the following questions were asked:

- Was the rate achievable across Hampshire?
- Were we doing enough to meet the target for CDE waste?
- Should we manage 3 or 4 key waste streams and not focus on the 58% figure?
- How will the 58% figure be used?

Some stakeholders were concerned that there was a lack of information, for example on environmental impacts of recycling technologies, measurement of tonnages, figures for agricultural waste

Issue 2: Conclusions of the Off-Line Group for Unavoidable Waste

There was overall support for the conclusions of the off-line group for unavoidable waste.

Additional comments focussed on the need to take more at waste minimisation, remove the boundaries between C&I and household waste and learn from best practice internationally. There were some concerns about site issues (i.e. the need for long term planning permission; nimbyism, how far we should pursue the idea of innovative landfill opportunities for CDE waste etc.) and about the suitability of different technologies for dealing with unavoidable waste.

Issue 3: Assumptions Applied to Arrive at a Preferred Solution for unavoidable waste

There was overall support for the assumptions applied to the work of the off-line unavoidable waste group to arrive at a preferred solution for unavoidable waste. The concepts of net self-sufficiency, pre-treatment of unavoidable waste and split between landfill and other unavoidable waste technologies were discussed in detail.

(a) Achievement of net self-sufficiency by 2016

The concept of **net** self-sufficiency was widely supported, with the proviso that waste movements into and out of the county would continue. It was emphasised that it may sometimes be more efficient to deal with waste outside the county, especially in areas on the edge of Hampshire, that economies of scale may make it more efficient to share facilities with neighbouring counties, and that sustainability and proximity do not equate to administrative areas. Regarding imports of waste from elsewhere, in particular London, two opposing views were held: either that London should itself strive to be self-sufficient, or that Hampshire should be more than self sufficient to allow for more imports from London, with payments from outside the county supplementing the Hampshire recycling industry.

Many groups were unsure about the target date of 2016 and suggested that 2020 would be more realistic, although it was also argued that a tighter deadline will drive greater change.

It was argued that more facilities are needed to help reach achieve net self-sufficiency and that . planning and funding issues need to be resolved so that the sites can be operational soon.

(b) Requirement that 100% of unavoidable waste should be subjected to a form of pre-treatment e.g. sorting at a 'dirty metals recovery facility' (MRF)

The pre-sorting requirement received widespread support (10 out of 12 tables in the daytime agreed with this assumption).

However, several barriers were identified which may prevent 100% pre-sorting. These were:

- The financial cost of pre-treatment
- The energy cost of pre-treatment
- Difficulties of imposing this for C&I waste
- Enforceability
- Unsuitability for some types of waste

There was a need for more data on the exact definition of 'unavoidable' waste, what exactly was meant by 'pre-treatment' and lack of detail as to how this could be achieved.

Suggestions for helping to meet this requirement were to educate people in the construction industry on separation of materials for recycling and use of coloured skips for pre-sorting.

(c) Landfill provision should be made for 33% of unavoidable waste whilst the remaining 67% should be dealt with via recovery technologies

This assumption received less support from stakeholders (9 out of 12 tables in the daytime agreed with this assumption). Although it was generally accepted that some waste will always have to be landfilled (e.g. incinerator bottom ash), many people were concerned that the 33% figure for landfill was too high. It was felt that landfill should be an insurance not a solution, that there may be insufficient landfill capacity to achieve this, and that 33% should be the absolute maximum. The importance of waste minimisation and preventing waste from going to landfill unnecessarily was emphasised.

Some stakeholders wanted more background information on how these figures were arrived at and the detail of implementation.

Issues regarding the use of recovery technologies were: the need to carefully consider these technologies (e.g. environmental impacts, suitability for purpose), importance of site location and availability/affordability, and the danger that such facilities could encourage waste.

Other issues:

- Landfill should be close to waste arisings - traditional landfill in mineral workings may not therefore be the best location
- Need to improve landfill's bad reputation
- Opportunity to use construction waste as a useful product e.g. for landscaping
- Need more legislation to make things happen more easily.

Issue 4: Conclusions of the Off-Line Group for Minerals

Marine dredging: The general consensus was that marine dredging may be too environmentally damaging to be feasible. There was a lot of uncertainty about whether this option should be supported as little was known about its impacts.

Apportionment: It was questioned whether it was fair for the Government to impose minerals targets, but that if Hampshire reduced its apportionment this could have negative effects elsewhere.

Reducing demand: The benefits of sustainable construction and the use of recycled aggregate and other secondary materials were promoted. Standards and specifications may however limit the extent to which reduction of the need for virgin material is possible.

Site location: Minerals should be extracted in proximity to their markets but extraction is also constrained by geology. Issues such as quality of life and nature conservation need to be balanced when considering sites, the National Park designation should not mean blanket 'no' to extraction.

Issue 5: What the Preferred Overall Solution Means in Terms of the Number of Recycling and Unavoidable Waste Facilities Required in Hampshire Over the Life of the MRS (i.e. up to 2020)

The issue of whether Hampshire should have many small sites of few larger sites was discussed. Having more smaller sites would reduce transport impacts but larger sites could be more efficient. Planning permission was important if the MRS is to be delivered and the 58% recycling figure achieved.

There were concerns over the information provided. More detail was considered necessary on: the operation and impacts of recycling facilities, what exactly is being recycled, the effects of cross-boundary movements and biowaste from water.

The following ideas/questions were also expressed:

- Accept need for new facilities, as long as they are the BPEO.
- Educational/communication facilities should be incorporated in treatment facilities to educate and change behaviour to waste minimisation.
- The MRS must be presented to Hants residents in terms of the big picture, to show that not just one area is being targeted with another recycling facility.
- Need vigorous independent monitoring to ensure that targets are being met.
- Has an inter-regional framework of facilities been considered?
- Have textiles re-use and sorting facilities been investigated?
- What will be the impact of new housing?

Plenary Session on Aims and Principles of the MRS

The stakeholders were asked to indicate whether they supported each of the four aims and nine guiding principles of the MRS. The main comments are indicated in the table below in bold.

Aim/Principle	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Aim 1 : To extract primary material resource only where it can be shown that the need cannot be met in a more acceptable way	75	12	Define acceptable Too vague, an opt-out statement How will this be demonstrated? It is impractical Must consider market forces, cost and economic efficiency More research necessary to assess need Acknowledges acceptance of using virgin material
Aim 2: To change minds and practices to use all resources efficiently, minimising wastage at all stages	84	3	Noble aim Should also aim to minimise resource use Involve people 'on the ground' who have to put plans into action

Aim/Principle	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Aim 3: Where waste is produced, maximise opportunities for everyone to re-use, recycling and recover value of these waste materials	81	4	<p>Noble aim but will require great effort</p> <p>Not ambitious enough</p> <p>Must consider cost</p> <p>Importance of product design</p>
Aim 4: To dispose of unavoidable waste in the best possible way	55	18	<p>Must be more specific, what does 'best' mean?</p> <p>What is the definition of 'unavoidable waste'? As technology changes need to review what is 'unavoidable'</p> <p>Does this assume BPEO?</p> <p>'Best possible' must be cost effective</p> <p>Aim should be waste minimisation</p> <p>Regulation will create more unavoidable waste</p>
Principle 1: Change attitudes and behaviour towards material resources using the most appropriate and effective means available e.g. awareness raising, education, financial incentives and/or legislation	82	3	<p>Essential to get grass roots opinion and understand practical issues</p> <p>Also need sanctions</p> <p>Consultation is important</p>
Principle 2: Inform and influence local, national and European debates, practise and legislation to promote sustainable material resources management in the community, private and public sectors	82	6	<p>How would this be achieved? Easier said than done</p> <p>Principles 1 and 2 are essentially the same</p> <p>Need to realistically consider the cost of doing this</p> <p>Use videos and pictures</p> <p>Probably the most important objective</p> <p>Hants should introduce legislation as Private Member's Bill</p> <p>Good publicity is important</p>
Principle 3: Ensure that material resources management is guided by social, economic and environmental best practise	84	0	<p>Legislation also important to guide best practice</p> <p>Best practice must be continually developed</p> <p>Must consider impacts on local community</p>

Aim/Principle	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Principle 4: Ensure that materials resources management is ethically grounded in terms of global markets and material standards and qualities	63	11	<p>What does this mean?</p> <p>Unrealistic</p> <p>How do global markets affect local circumstances?</p> <p>A grand aspiration but what about the cost of achieving it?</p> <p>Not if it makes Hants less competitive, there must be a level playing field</p>
Principle 5: Make decisions based upon the best available scientific research and data, coast and economies of scale. Adapt a precautionary approach in the assessment and management of risks	70	9	<p>Depends upon acceptance of impact assessments</p> <p>What about the proximity principle?</p> <p>Why make decisions based on economies of scale?</p> <p>Seems unattainable</p> <p>Sometimes necessary to take risks to make progress</p> <p>Need scientific basis for risk management</p>
Principle 6: Manage materials close to their extraction or point of use to reduce the need to transport them, whilst recognising the need for sustainable markets	72	8	<p>Will be an outcome of previous principles</p> <p>Must balance against economies of scale (i.e. principle 5)</p> <p>Must be realistic, regional facilities are acceptable</p> <p>Must consider economic effects and commercial influence</p> <p>Is it practical from a planning point of view?</p>
Principle 7: Involve all those likely to be affected. Create transparency and ownership in the through honest and inclusive consultation	75	4	<p>Absolutely essential</p> <p>Are all those involved in design-making committed to the MRS?</p> <p>Inclusive does not mean who shouts loudest</p> <p>Too time-consuming to involve everyone</p> <p>How to avoid nimbyism?</p> <p>The expression of the aims and principles is in itself alienating to people outside the MRS process</p> <p>How about having a sponsor?</p>

Aim/Principle	Agree	Disagree	Comments
Principle 8: Monitor and review implementation and achievements under the MRS regularly and amend policies and practices accordingly	74	0	How will this be achieved? Improve targets wherever possible Communicate findings to all involved, continue to involve stakeholders Need a robust monitoring method
Principle 9: Ensure compliance with central government and regional requirements impacting on the MRS	68	12	Be proactive in influencing government Share best practice Providing government and regional requirements are based on objective, robust criteria (as in MRS) and principles of sustainable development. Central government can make mistakes. Do we have a choice? This is essential Applies also to the EU

Discussion Session 2: Assessment Criteria for Identifying Suitable Sites for Recycling and Unavoidable Waste Facilities

The purpose of this session was to discuss what site selection/assessment criteria would be appropriate to identify and evaluate what types of sites would be suitable for the location of recycling and unavoidable waste facilities.

Issue 1: Recycling Facilities

The stakeholders discussed possible site assessment/selection criteria for recycling facilities in Hampshire. It was not felt possible to prioritise the criteria. However, the most frequently mentioned criterion was transport. Use of industrial areas, brownfield land, environmental impacts, the proximity principle and impacts on local communities were also all popular.

Most Frequently Listed Criteria:

Criterion	Comments
Transport	Minimise transport impacts. Use sites with good transport infrastructure and encourage transport by rail (and possibly water). Sites must be easily accessible. Avoid congestion in small villages and rural roads.
Industrial areas	Use industrial and semi-industrial areas
Brownfield/greenfield	Use brownfield sites. Consider however the impacts on adjacent land uses especially housing. Avoid greenfield land, although may be suitable for smaller facilities
Environmental impacts	Environmental criteria should be a high priority. Issues to consider include noise, odour and debris.

Most Frequently Listed Criteria contd:

Criterion	Comments
Proximity	Facilities should be located close to where waste is produced and where outputs from recycling facilities will be used. Should be close to new development.
Local communities	Avoid housing development close to recycling facilities. Minimise impacts on local people. Consult.
New housing	Criteria for new housing should include integrated waste facilities.
Site re-use	Re-use existing sites e.g. landfill sites, land which is already contaminated
Design	Facilities should be well designed, proven technologies and the BPEO.

Less Frequently Listed Criteria:

Criterion	Comments
Co-location	Co-locate recycling facilities with processing industries for outputs
Cross boundary facilities	Consider cross boundary facilities to provide economies of scale
Visual impact	Facilities should be visually acceptable.
Public perception	Sites should be as cleanly run as possible, to improve public perception and widen the acceptability of sites for waste management.
Size	Smaller sites have lower environmental impacts individually and are more acceptable to local communities, but larger sites are easier to regulate.
Agricultural land	Use agricultural land for green waste. Farm sites suitable for WEEE.
MOD land	Use MoD land.
Resource parks	Support this concept
National park designation	The national park designation should not automatically exclude sites in the park from consideration for recycling, brownfield land which may be suitable is found within the park boundary.
Nature conservation	Avoid SSSIs and AONBs.
Economic	Consider economic issues in site selection

Less Frequently Listed Criteria contd:

Criterion	Comments
Land availability	<p>Recycling facilities must compete with other land uses, especially housing, from which more money is available.</p> <p>Industrial uses may be more desirable than waste management facilities.</p> <p>In areas of economic regeneration it is more important to safeguard land for jobs rather than for waste facilities</p> <p>Need to safeguard land for facilities</p> <p>Local authorities in Hants should make land available.</p>
Spatial balance	There should be a good spatial balance i.e. sites spread out around Hants.
Operation	Consider operating hours. Sites should be operated and regulated to high standards.

Criteria Listed by One Group Only:

- Groundwater protection areas
- Historical and cultural importance
- Use of docklands
- Flood risk
- Redevelop ELV sites into recycling facilities
- Ease of use
- End of life planning
- Sustainable construction
- Viability and sustainability
- Mobile sites
- Health impact
- Tranquillity: tranquil areas in urban areas are rarer and hence relatively more valuable than those in rural areas
- Areas of new development and housing growth

Issue 2: Unavoidable Waste Facilities

Many groups felt that the same criteria which were listed for recycling facilities could also be applied to unavoidable waste facilities. The criteria described below were also mentioned.

Most Frequently Listed Criteria:

Criterion	Comments
Proximity	Depends on type of transport e.g. if water transport is used then longer transportation distances would be acceptable
Transport	

Less Frequently Listed Criteria:

Criterion	Comments
Size	Criteria should be applied differently according to size and function of facility
Brownfield/greenfield	Brownfield sites only OR are rural areas suitable for smaller facilities?
Local communities	Minimise impacts for local people and give importance to quality of life (e.g. freedom from pollution, noise, congestion)
New development	Integrate into new development
Design	Use good design and the best available technology
Existing facilities	Re-use
MoD land	-
Visual impact	-
Accessibility	-

Criteria Listed by One Group Only:

- Use: industrial sites, former landfill sites, former minerals sites, expansion of existing facilities
- Odour/debris
- Geological availability
- Noise and vibration
- Hours of operation
- After-use and restoration
- Cross boundary facilities
- Stakeholder engagement
- Hydrology
- Flood risk
- Land restoration as a use for inert waste
- Topography: minimise noise from fly tipping
- Link to community facilities/CHP schemes in new development.

- Redevelop ELV sites into sites for unavoidable waste
- Land reclamation from the sea
- National Park should not be automatically discounted

Other Comments:

Many groups raised the issue of the planning system and its importance in delivering facilities for the MRS. Planning should be flexible, strategic and encourage investment. Planning criteria may need to change. Other, isolated, comments were:

- Site suitability depends on the type of waste treatment being carried out. Criteria should be applied on a site specific basis.
- If there are too many criteria this will limit the number of available sites.
- Recycling facilities more acceptable than unavoidable waste facilities.

Discussion Session 3: Identification of the Broad Location of Future Recycling and Unavoidable Waste Facilities

Stakeholders discussed where in Hampshire future recycling and unavoidable waste facilities should be located. This was carried out using a map to identify the **broad** location of future facilities (see attached).

The main overall issues to emerge from the discussion were that facilities should be close to new development and centres of population. The north of Hampshire was the main area identified for new facilities (i.e. Basingstoke/Aldershot/Andover area). The south coast was also identified as needing more facilities. Other specific locations to consider were:

- Winchester, Petersfield and Andover (i.e. do not exclude these towns)
- Small sites in central Hampshire
- Blackwater Valley - work with neighbouring authorities to manage waste collectively for the whole area.
- Two (flagship) strategic resource parks, one in the north and one in the south. Two recycling facilities per local authority area
- The National Park (i.e. should not be automatically excluded)
- Mixture of large strategic facilities in areas of greatest demand and more local facilities elsewhere

Co-location of facilities and cross-border facilities were generally supported.

It was felt that additional information was needed to make more informed judgements about the location of facilities. Specific information requirements were:

- Location of existing landfill sites, which could potentially be used for recycling or waste processing facilities
- Location of facilities in adjacent counties and the Isle of Wight
- Catchment of recycling facilities
- Location and life-span for mineral extraction sites

Stakeholders made specific comments about different waste streams and types of facilities:

Waste stream/facility	Comments
Hazardous waste	<p>Why is there no hazardous waste site in Hants?</p> <p>Could a hazardous waste site be co-located with a non-hazardous waste site?</p> <p>Potential to use industrial, MoD, contaminated or brownfield land, in less populated areas</p>
CDE waste	<p>Locate CDE recycling centre in each major development area (and principle towns)</p> <p>Integrate into planning permission for developments</p> <p>Locate facilities on construction sites for recycling and reuse</p> <p>Link with soil treatment site</p> <p>Consider land raising or land reclamation</p> <p>Use rail/canal corridor</p>
Wood	<p>Consider situating in High Wycombe (furniture industry) and near large industrial areas</p> <p>Link to construction sites</p> <p>Consider local facilities in market towns (for energy generation)</p>
WEEE	<p>WEEE processing plant in central area or north east Hants (to serve whole region)</p> <p>Link to resource parks</p>
Organic waste	<p>Locate in open agricultural area</p>
Green waste/composting	<p>Locate in the open countryside with transfer stations in surrounding urban areas.</p> <p>Scope for in-vessel composting on farms</p>
Metals	<p>Pre-treatment facility near new ATF</p> <p>Near ports (for export)</p>
ELVs	<p>Large scale site, near ports</p>
Unavoidable waste	<p>One treatment facility in each area/town</p>
Sorting/pre-treatment/recovery facilities	<p>Locate some near landfill, EFW, centres of population, growth areas or disused industrial sites</p> <p>Locate close to technology parks/innovation hubs/universities</p>
Landfill	<p>Use old extraction sites</p> <p>Need to consider landfill for CDE and household waste separately</p> <p>Geology is main criterion</p>
Incinerators	<p>More incinerators are needed</p>

Waste stream/facility	Comments
Energy from waste	Need fewer larger plants, only 2 additional facilities needed Make it as efficient as possible
MRF	Expand existing facilities Locate near docks
Anaerobic digestion	Locate near to communities Odour problems may mean that countryside is best location, link to farms