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1 Introduction

1.1 Greater Manchester Joint Waste DPD

1.1.1 The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) is currently preparing the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD). The JWDPD is expected to cover the period to 2010 or 2021 and deal with various types of commercial, industrial and construction and demolition wastes.

1.1.2 Work on the JWDPD is being co-ordinated and managed by the Greater Manchester Geological Unit (GMGU) on behalf of each District. In addition, a Joint Committee has been established to act as an Executive, with responsibility for all documents except those prepared for submission and adoption, which must be agreed by each District’s Full Council.

1.1.3 Importantly, the JWDPD will determine the location of sites for Waste Management Facilities (WMF) within Greater Manchester. The initial consideration of potential sites for WMF is one element of the Stage Two Issues & Options for the JWDPD.

1.2 Appraising potential sites

1.2.1 According to Government guidance, Waste Planning Authorities – in this case AGMA – should identify and subsequently allocate areas and sites suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities in order to support the apportionment of waste quantities and targets for recycling etc. set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

1.2.2 With this in mind, Scott Wilson and GMGU have worked closely together to develop, pilot and refine a site appraisal pro forma which could be completed for each potential site put forward. In this way, GMGU can ensure that all the sites put forward are evaluated on a consistent basis.

1.2.3 The criteria in the pro forma also include sustainability criteria, so completion of the pro forma will obviate the need for a separate Sustainability Appraisal of each site. This report introduces the pro forma and provides guidance on how it has been completed. The pro forma may be revisited in the light of experience in using it or changes to regional and national policy for the Preferred Options stage of the JWDPD, when the appraisals of the preferred sites are revisited.

1.2.4 To prepare a shortlist of sites or areas for the site appraisal, an initial sieving process was carried out to narrow down the list of sites / areas from the initial “long-list” of sites / areas gathered from a series of land databases, studies, land allocations in Local Planning Policies and sites suggested by public bodies, commercial enterprises and the general public of Greater Manchester. This involved excluding sites / areas that were deemed wholly inappropriate for WMF based on established exclusionary criteria. The remaining sites were taken forward for the full site appraisal using the pro forma.
2 Site appraisal pro forma

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The site appraisal pro forma – see Table 2.1 below – provides the basis for evaluating all the potential sites for waste management facilities in Greater Manchester on a consistent basis. The pro forma includes a range of sustainability criteria which test the performance of the site in relation to economic, social and environmental objectives set out in the wider Sustainability Appraisal of the JWDPD. The pro forma also includes deliverability criteria which explore the likelihood of the site being realistically brought into use (and therefore contributing to meeting the regional policies and apportionment).

2.2 Structure of the pro forma

2.2.1 The pro forma is divided into eight sections:

- **Introduction** – provides basic information on the site including site name, reference number, size etc.
- **Level 1 criteria** – criteria for testing the performance of the site in relation to international and national considerations (e.g. wildlife and landscape designations).
- **Level 2 criteria (constraints)** – criteria for testing the performance of the site in relation to local economic, community and environmental considerations (e.g. local conservation designations).
- **Level 2 criteria (opportunities)** – criteria for testing the performance of the site in relation to local considerations which might lend weight to its potential allocation (e.g. water or rail access).
- **Deliverability** – criteria for testing the likelihood of the site realistically being brought into use (e.g. potential land use conflicts).
- **Conclusions** – conclusions on the general merits of the site for accommodating waste management facilities.
- **Potential uses** – an analysis of the type or types of waste management facility that could be appropriately located on the site should it be allocated (e.g. landfill, energy recovery, etc.).
- **Overall site performance** – in light of the appraisal each site will banded from Band A (best) to Band D (worst).

2.2.2 It should be noted that the various criteria will not be weighted; however, the failure of a site to pass the Level 1 criteria may mean that it is discounted from further consideration. Also, for some sites, the pro forma will be filled in on a gradual basis as more information emerges about the site and its suitability for particular waste management uses. Some criteria may therefore be scored initially as ‘not assessed’.
Table 2.1: Greater Manchester JWDPD Site Appraisal Pro Forma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site name:</td>
<td>Map(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site reference number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of surrounding uses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS grid reference:</td>
<td>Photo(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (ha):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of appraisal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraised by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of site suggestion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1 CRITERIA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the site in proximity to and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR Sites)?</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the site in proximity to a Site(s) of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the site located within or in proximity to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or Heritage Coast?</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Is the site in proximity to a site or building with a nationally recognised designation (Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Historic Battlefields and Registered Parks and Gardens)? Yes / No

5. Is the site located within or in proximity to a Major Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2? Yes / No

Should the site be taken forward for further consideration? Yes / No

Are there any issues arising from Level 1 which should be carried forward? Record any issues here

**LEVEL 2 CRITERIA – CONSTRAINTS**

**Communities**

6. Is the site within 250m of individual houses / dwellings? Yes / No (if yes, state distance)

7. Is the site within 250m of a settlement? Yes / No (if yes, state distance and identify settlement)

8. Is the site within 250m of any other sensitive receptors existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals, sensitive business uses, airfields, public or outdoor recreation uses, and tourist / visitor attractions)? Yes / No (if yes, state distance)

**Protection of water resources and managing flood risk**

9. Is the site within zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain or in an area with a history of groundwater flooding? Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing

10. Are there likely to be other impacts on the quality and quantity of groundwater or on surface water drainage? Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing

**Land instability**

11. Is the site subject to any known stability issues? Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Landscape and visual intrusion</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em><em>12. Is the site located within or in proximity to any area designated for its local landscape importance</em> or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?</em>*</td>
<td><strong>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Does the site have public footpaths and rights of way?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Green Belt and Strategic Gaps</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would location of a facility here be consistent with the proximity principle, would it cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation, and are there alternative sites?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Nature conservation</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Is the site home to protected species and / or habitats?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Is the site in proximity to areas designated to be of local nature conservation importance?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Is the site in proximity to woodlands including ancient woodlands?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Is the site in proximity to Regionally Important Geological / geomorphological Sites (RIGS) and other sites identified for their geological or geomorphological importance?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic environment and built heritage</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Is the site in proximity to archaeological sites or remains?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Traffic and access</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. How suitable is the road network to accommodate the transportation of waste / products from resource recovery to and from the site?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Record details of the nature / classification of the relevant roads and any potential problems (e.g. in terms of lack of road capacity or existing congestion)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are lorries likely to pass through settlements on their way to the primary road network and are adverse impacts on amenity likely?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air emissions, including dust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Impact of dust, fumes and emissions to air on nearby residents / sensitive receptors</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Is the site in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to amenity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Potential for adverse impact of odours on nearby residents / sensitive receptors</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Potential for adverse impact of vermin and birds on nearby residents / sensitive receptors</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Potential for adverse impact of noise and vibration on nearby residents / sensitive receptors</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Potential for the creation of a litter hazard</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft hazard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Could waste management facilities at the site attract birds and pose a hazard to aircraft?</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Is the site located on the best and most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, including in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, including in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?

Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing

32. Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, including in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?

Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing

---

**LEVEL 2 CRITERIA – OPPORTUNITIES**

### Accessibility and sustainable transport

33. Does the site have good accessibility from existing urban areas or major new or planned development (i.e. the major sources of waste arisings)?

Yes / No

34. Is there a navigable waterway or wharf adjacent or very close to the site?

Yes / No

35. Is there a railway line suitable for freight traffic adjacent or very close to the site?

Yes / No

### Existing use for waste management

36. Is the site already in use for waste management?

Yes / No

37. If the site is already in use for waste management, does it have good transport connections?

Yes / No

### Co-location and compatible land uses

38. Is the site located in an area of major new developments?

Yes / No

39. Would the site allow for the co-location of waste management facilities?

Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing

40. Would the site allow for co-location with complementary activities?

Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing

41. Is the site an active mineral working site?

Yes / No

42. Is or has the site been subject to an employment land use?

Yes / No

43. Is the site contaminated or derelict land?

Yes / No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. Is the site used for sewage treatment works or adjoin a sewage treatment works?</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The efficient use of land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Is the site previously developed land?</td>
<td>Yes – Previously developed land / No – greenfield land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat and / or power generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Could development at the site generate heat and / or power?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELIVERABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential land use conflict</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Are there any potential land use conflicts (e.g. active or permitted mineral sites, where the location of a waste facility would sterilise permitted mineral reserves)?</td>
<td>Record potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?</td>
<td>Record details of land ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?</td>
<td>Record details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Has the site previously been used for waste management if it is not currently being used as such?</td>
<td>Record details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply and wastewater treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Can adequate provision be made for water supply and wastewater treatment?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Possibly – needs testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSIONS**

Record conclusions on the general merits of the site for accommodating waste management facilities
## POTENTIAL USES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility type</th>
<th>Broad suitability</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Landfill / Landraise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Open Air Waste Management Recycling Facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Open Windrow Composting (OWC)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conventional Thermal Treatment (CTT), with potential for Combined Heat &amp; Power (CHP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT), including Gasification and Pyrolysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Material Recycling Facility (MRF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (AD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>In-Vessel Composting (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential mitigation measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In light of the appraisal above, are there any potential mitigation measures which might be necessary for development on the site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record any potential mitigation measures and the rationale behind these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL SITE PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band A</th>
<th>Band B</th>
<th>Band C</th>
<th>Band D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Record which band A – D the site has been categorised as being under

### Should this site be taken forward for further consideration?

Yes / No
2.3 Assumptions and limitations in the pro forma

2.3.1 In arriving at the final pro forma, and in completing a pro forma for any given site, a series of assumptions have been made and certain limitations recognised. These are factors that need to be considered in reviewing the appraisals as a whole.

2.3.2 A key issue in preparing a series of site appraisals such as these is that, however much the pro forma is structured to facilitate objective answers, there is an element of subjectivity, especially where sustainability plays such a central role in the appraisal. Ultimately, many of the criteria involve issues that are not fixed or are difficult to predict and these rely on an individual's professional judgement, informed by their experience and knowledge of the subject.

2.3.3 For example, in appraising the social or economic impacts of a WMF there is a great deal of uncertainty because there are so many other factors affecting social and economic trends. Similarly, while the presence of sensitive environmental receptors can be determined for certain, the precise impact of a WMF on them can be uncertain because there are a range of other factors that can influence the situation, all with their own variables.

2.3.4 To partially address these limitations, some of the questions in the pro forma (either explicitly in the question or in the guidance on how to answer the question below) utilise a set distance from the site being surveyed within which it is assumed a sensitive receptor could be affected by a WMF on the site, though the certainty of the likelihood of this affect may vary. This does not discount the fact that receptors outside the threshold may be affected, but the likelihood is significantly lower. Unfortunately, there is little in the way of national or regional guidance from relevant bodies indicating what such thresholds should be for different sensitive receptors. Therefore, in the main, the thresholds have been established on the basis of previous experience, including work on the Kent Waste Development Framework.

2.3.5 A further consideration is the slight variances in answers between different individuals completing the pro formas. To counter this, the completed pro formas will be reviewed by one person within Scott Wilson, one person within GMGU and one person within each District (for the sites / areas within their District), ensuring that the answers are calibrated and any inconsistencies resolved. This has the added value of drawing upon the professional experience and understanding of four planning and sustainability professionals on each pro forma (including the individual who completed the pro forma) in order to arrive at a robust and consistent appraisal.

2.3.6 In relation to the waste facility types in the ‘Potential Uses’ section of the pro forma, assumptions have necessarily been made as to what the typical impacts of each type of facility are. The five types of facility reflect groupings of similar facilities but within these are more specific types of facility which may have slightly different characteristics and therefore slightly different impacts. However, it is necessary to group the facilities in this way to avoid being too prescriptive as to the use of specific sites within the JWDPD, which is a strategic document.

2.3.7 The nature of the JWDPD as a strategic document identifies a key understanding of how the site appraisals should be viewed as a whole. Any allocations for sites / areas for WMF that ultimately emerge from the final version of the JWDPD are meant to guide development and, through exercises such as this site appraisal exercise, to provide a reliable indication as to the general suitability of those sites / areas for particular waste uses given the site context.
2.3.8 As such, these appraisals are not intended to go into extremely detailed coverage of every specific issue, as this is a matter for the ultimate developer of the site and the Planning Authority any application is submitted to. They are intended to provide sufficiently detailed information to enable a strategic comparison of sites / areas to identify those which are most suitable for WMF uses given the individual site contexts and the direction the overall strategy for waste management within the JWDPD takes.
3 Completing the pro forma

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section provides guidance on how to accurately complete each section of the pro forma and, where appropriate, sets out the rationale for the criteria. As noted in Section 2.2.2 above, for some sites, the pro forma will be filled in on a gradual basis as more information emerges about the site and its suitability for particular waste management uses. In practice, some criteria may therefore be initially scored as ‘Possibly – needs testing’, where a more definitive answer might be expected at this stage, and some text provided to explain that the data is not yet available.

3.2 Introduction section

Site name

3.2.1 If no local name for the site is obvious, it should be given a name reflecting its location - e.g. ‘West of Manor Farm’ or ‘Corner of Church Street and Market Street’.

Site reference name

3.2.2 GMGU will give each site a unique reference number of the structure GMGUSA#.

Town

3.2.3 Where appropriate, the town the site lies within or on the edge of should be recorded to assist with locating the site in the District.

District

3.2.4 Record which Greater Manchester district the site is located in:

- Bolton
- Bury
- Manchester
- Oldham
- Rochdale
- Salford
- Stockport
- Tameside
- Trafford
- Wigan

Description of site

3.2.5 Provide a broad description of the site including the existing land use.

Description of surrounding uses

3.2.6 Provide a broad description of the land uses surrounding the site.
OS Grid reference

3.2.7 GMGU will provide an OS grid reference for each site.

Size (ha)

3.2.8 Record the size of the site in hectares.

Date of appraisal

3.2.9 Record the date on which the appraisal was undertaken.

Appraised by

3.2.10 Record the name of the person(s) undertaking the appraisal.

Source of site suggestion

3.2.11 Record the organisation / individual(s) which proposed the site, where appropriate.

3.3 Level 1 criteria

Question 1: Is the site in proximity to and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR Sites)?

3.3.1 Answer yes or no. For the purposes of completing the pro forma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 5km of an internationally designated site (a Special Protection Area under the ‘Bird Directive’, a Special Area of Conservation under the ‘Habitats Directive’ or a RAMSAR site under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands).

3.3.2 The actual impacts of development on the site will need to be determined through a separate Habits Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment (HRA / AA). Under the Habitats Regulations, where a land use plan (a) is likely to have a significant effect on a European site in Great Britain or a European offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), and (b) is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site, the plan-making authority for that plan shall, before the plan is given effect, make an appropriate assessment of the implications for the site in view of that site's conservation objectives. Furthermore, in the light of the conclusions of the assessment, and subject to regulation 85C (considerations of overriding public interest), the plan-making authority shall give effect to the land use plan only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the European site or the European offshore marine site (as the case may be). As a matter of Government policy, RAMSAR sites should receive the same protection as designated SPAs and SACs and should therefore be included in the HRA / AA.
**Question 2: Is the site in proximity to a Site(s) of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?**

3.3.3 **Answer yes or no.** For the purposes of completing the pro forma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Any reasonably anticipatable impacts arising from waste management activities on the site on SSSIs within 2km should also be flagged up (e.g. the potential impact of pollutant emissions from a waste management facility).

3.3.4 **According to Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (PPS10), in testing the suitability of sites and areas, Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) should consider factors including any adverse effects on a site with a nationally recognised designation (SSSIs, National Nature Reserves, which are also designated as SSSIs). According to Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, where a proposed development on land within or outside a SSSI is likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments), planning permission should not normally be granted.**

**Question 3: Is the site located within or in proximity to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or Heritage Coast?**

3.3.5 **Answer yes or no.** For the purposes of completing the pro forma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 5km of an AONB or Heritage Coast (except in relation to impacts arising from the transportation of waste where, in some cases, it may be appropriate to examine impacts over a greater distance). Any reasonably anticipatable impacts arising from waste management activities on the site on AONB or Heritage Coast within 5km should also be flagged up.

3.3.6 **According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including (i) the setting of the proposed location and the potential for design-led solutions to produce acceptable development; and (ii) the need to protect landscapes of national importance (National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coasts).**

**Question 4: Is the site in proximity to a site or building with a nationally recognised designation (Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Historic Battlefields and Registered Parks and Gardens)?**

3.3.7 **Answer yes or no.** For the purposes of completing the pro forma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 250m of a site with a nationally recognised designation. Any reasonably anticipatable impacts arising from waste management activities on the site on sites with a nationally recognised designation within 250m should also be flagged up.

3.3.8 **According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including any adverse effect on a site of international importance (e.g. World Heritage Sites) or a site or building with a nationally recognised designation (e.g. Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Historic Battlefields and Registered Parks and Gardens).**
Question 5: Is the site located within or in proximity to a Major Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2?

3.3.9 This criterion only applies to sites that could be allocated for landfill or land raising. **Answer yes or no.** For the purposes of completing the pro forma, any site located within or near to a Major Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2 will **not** be taken forward for use as landfill or land raising.

3.3.10 The Environment Agency has identified Major Aquifers and Source Protection Zones (SPZs) for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for public drinking water supply. SPZs show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. According to the Agency, the closer the activity, the greater the risk. The Agency identifies four zones including Zone 1 – inner protection zone – and Zone 2 – outer protection zone – which will be considered here. According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including the proximity of vulnerable surface and groundwater. For landfill or land raising, geological conditions and the behaviour of surface water and groundwater should be assessed both for the site under consideration and the surrounding area.

**Should the site be taken forward for further consideration?**

3.3.11 **Answer yes or no.** If the site is not being taken forward, then the reasons should be recorded here. All sites not rejected at this stage will pass forward for further consideration under Level 2.

**Are there any issues arising from Level 1 which should be carried forward?**

3.3.12 Record any issues arising from the Level 1 appraisal which may have a bearing on the site's potential allocation but did not prevent it from being taken forward. For example, the site may be within 250m of a site with a nationally recognised designation (e.g. a Conservation Area) and this may have a bearing on the nature of the waste management facility(ies) ultimately permitted on the site or it may be near a major aquifer and so landfill should not be considered on that site.

3.4 Level 2 criteria – constraints

**Question 6: Is the site within 250m of individual houses / dwellings?**

3.4.1 **Answer yes or no.** If yes, state the distance and any other potentially relevant information (e.g. broad number of houses). According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should assess their suitability against the physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses.

**Question 7: Is the site within 250m of a settlement?**

3.4.2 **Answer yes or no.** If yes, state the distance and identify the settlement(s). According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should assess their suitability against the physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses.
Question 8: Is the site within 250m of any other sensitive receptors existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals, sensitive business uses, airfields, public or outdoor recreation uses, and tourist / visitor attractions)?

3.4.3 **Answer yes or no.** If yes, state the distance and any other potentially relevant information. According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should assess their suitability against the physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses.

Question 9: Is the site within zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain or in an area with a history of groundwater flooding?

3.4.4 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should carefully consider the suitability of locations subject to flooding, utilising data from the Greater Manchester Level 1 SFRA. At this stage, the answer to this question is not expected to go into the detail of a site-specific flood risk assessment, merely highlight where they may be a risk of flooding which should be investigated further at a later stage should the site be taken forward.

Question 10: Are there likely to be other impacts on the quality and quantity of groundwater or on surface water drainage?

3.4.5 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including the proximity of vulnerable surface and groundwater. For landfill or land raising, geological conditions and the behaviour of surface water and groundwater should be assessed both for the site under consideration and the surrounding area.

Question 11: Is the site subject to any known stability issues?

3.4.6 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** When completing the pro forma, this criterion is likely to have a standard response in almost all cases – ‘Possibly – no known problems but needs to be investigated later in the planning process’ because, in many cases, such detailed information will not be available on a site-by-site basis. According to PPS10, locations, and / or the environs of locations, that are liable to be affected by land instability will not normally be suitable for waste management facilities.

Question 12: Is the site located within or in proximity to any area designated for its local landscape importance or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?

3.4.7 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including (i) the setting of the proposed location and the potential for design-led solutions to produce acceptable development; and (ii) the need to protect landscapes of national importance (National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coasts). Proximity in the context of this question is meant to highlight where the site is close enough to an area of local landscape importance that a
WMF development on the site could possibly harm the character of the area of local landscape importance even though it may not be in the actual area itself.

**Question 13: Does the site have public footpaths and rights of way?**

3.4.8 **Answer yes or no.** While the question relates mainly to those public footpaths and rights of way that are on the site, any in the immediate vicinity of the site should be highlighted as well.

**Question 14: Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would location of a facility here be consistent with the proximity principle, would it cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation, and are there alternative sites?**

3.4.9 **Answer yes or no.** A site being in the Green Belt does not necessarily automatically rule out WMF on that site as some waste uses are compatible with objectives of the Green Belt and, even where a WMF may not be compatible with these objectives, any local exception sites, major development sites (as defined by PPG2, Annex C) or previously developed land may enable the re-use of that site for WMF. Where Strategic Gaps are relevant, they should also be highlighted where a site is within or adjacent to a Strategic Gap.

**Question 15: Is the site home to protected species and / or habitats?**

3.4.10 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** When completing the pro forma, this criterion is likely to have a standard response in almost all cases – ‘Uncertain – needs to be investigated later in the planning process’ as any site taken forward for development requires detailed ecological surveys on a site-specific basis.

3.4.11 According to PPS9, through policies in plans, local authorities should also conserve other important natural habitat types that have been identified in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 74 as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England and identify opportunities to enhance and add to them. According to PPS9, many individual wildlife species receive statutory protection under a range of legislative provisions. Other species have been identified as requiring conservation action as species of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. Local authorities should take measures to protect the habitats of these species from further decline through policies in local development documents. Planning authorities should ensure that these species are protected from the adverse effects of development, where appropriate, by using planning conditions or obligations. Planning authorities should refuse permission where harm to the species or their habitats would result unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh that harm.

**Question 16: Is the site in proximity to areas designated to be of local nature conservation importance?**

3.4.12 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** Proximity in the context of this question is within approximately 250m, in line with Questions 6 to 8, although any areas within 500m should be flagged as well, especially where the topography of the locality of the site could mean that
impacts travel further. Areas designated to be of local nature conservation importance are typically Sites of Biological Interest (SBI) or Local Nature Reserves (LNR).

**Question 17: Is the site in proximity to woodlands including ancient woodlands?**

3.4.13 Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation. Proximity should be considered in the same way as Question 16.

**Question 18: Is the site in proximity to Regionally Important Geological / geomorphological Sites (RIGS) and other sites identified for their geological or geomorphological importance?**

3.4.14 Answer yes or no. This is a criteria where data may not be readily available at this stage so may be the standard answer ‘Possibly – needs testing’.

**Question 19: Is the site in proximity to archaeological sites or remains?**

3.4.15 Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation. According to Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning, where nationally important archaeological remains and their settings, whether scheduled or not, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. Cases involving archaeological remains of lesser importance will not always be so clear cut and planning authorities will need to weigh the relative importance of archaeology against other factors including the need for the proposed development. Invariably, at this stage, it will be unclear whether this is the case for a specific site but any known areas of archaeological interest within 1km should be flagged.

**Question 20: How suitable is the road network to accommodate the transportation of waste / products from resource recovery to and from the site?**

3.4.16 Record details of the nature / classification of the relevant roads and any potential problems (e.g. in terms of lack of road capacity or existing congestion). In practice, sites should be excluded if they are known to have inadequate local access which cannot reasonably be improved to the standard required for handling substantial numbers of lorries. Note that when discussing the road hierarchy, reference should be made to the primary and secondary road network and it would be helpful to have approximate driving distances to the nearest major A-road and motorway junction. Site access may also be addressed in this question in terms of whether the site actually has access to the road network and its quality.

3.4.17 According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should assess their suitability against the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking where practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport. In addition, WPAs should consider factors including the suitability of the road network and the extent to which access would require reliance on local roads.
**Question 21: Are lorries likely to pass through settlements on their way to the primary road network and are adverse impacts on amenity likely?**

3.4.18 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** In answering this question, settlements can be deemed as any built-up area as well as individual villages or towns. In an area like Greater Manchester, where the main proportion of area is a virtually continuous conurbation with few distinct settlements separated from each other by open land, especially in central areas of the sub-region, any site traffic would almost certainly need to pass through a built-up area. Therefore, in answering this question, a distinction needs to be made as to whether the “settlements” the traffic pass through are predominantly residential or commercial uses.

3.4.19 There is also a need to consider the impacts of site traffic once it reaches the primary road network if the nearest main A-road is actually quite narrow or congested, as is often the case in a busy urban area such as Greater Manchester. In this situation, the built-up areas or settlements that the congested / narrow A-road passes through before reaching a larger A-road or a motorway should be considered, as these built-up areas could also be affected by an increase in traffic caused by the use of the site for WMF.

**Question 23: Is the site in an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?**

3.4.20 **Answer yes or no.** The cumulative impact that the development of a site for WMF can have on air quality together with other existing local sources of air emissions is an important factor. Therefore, a site's proximity to an AQMA should be recorded.

**Question 22 and 24 to 27: Potential for adverse impacts on nearby residents / sensitive receptors of:**

- dust, fumes and emissions to air
- odours
- vermin and birds
- noise and vibration
- litter

3.4.21 This relates to Questions 22 and 24 to 27. **Record potential impacts.** These questions begin to identify, given all the data collected so far in the pro forma, what adverse impacts a WMF development may have on the locality of a site, bearing in mind that different types of WMF have different impacts. Answers, which will be fairly similar for each question, should identify what sensitive receptors may be affected and how.

3.4.22 According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including the proximity of sensitive receptors and the extent to which adverse emissions or odours can be controlled through the use of appropriate and well-maintained and managed
equipment and vehicles. Some waste management facilities, especially landfill, that accept putrescible waste, can also attract vermin and birds. The numbers and movements of some species of birds may be influenced by the distribution of landfill sites. Where birds congregate in large numbers, they may be a major nuisance to people living nearby. The operation of large waste management facilities can also produce noise both inside and outside buildings. Intermittent and sustained operating noise may be a problem if not kept to acceptable levels and particularly if night-time working is involved. Litter can be a concern at some waste management facilities.

**Question 28: Could waste management facilities at the site attract birds and pose a hazard to aircraft?**

3.4.23 **Record potential impacts.** According to PPS10, some waste management facilities, especially landfill which accept putrescible waste, can attract birds. The numbers and movements of some species of birds may be influenced by the distribution of landfill sites. Where birds congregate in large numbers, they can provide a hazard to aircraft at locations close to aerodromes or low flying areas. As part of the aerodrome safeguarding procedure (ODPM Circular 1/2003) local planning authorities are required to consult aerodrome operators on proposed developments likely to attract birds. Consultation arrangements apply within safeguarded areas. The primary aim is to guard against new or increased hazards caused by development. The most important types of development in this respect include facilities intended for the handling, compaction, treatment or disposal of household or commercial wastes. In answering this question, proximity to the nearest aerodrome / airport should be given and, specifically, whether the site lies within the safeguarding zone for Manchester Airport, which is the sub-region’s major, international airport.

**Question 29: Is the site located on the best and most versatile agricultural land?**

3.4.24 **Answer yes, or no.** According to PPS7, the presence of the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations when determining planning applications. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land (grades 3b, 4 and 5) in preference to that of a higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.
Questions 30 to 32: Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, including in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity:

- Have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?

- Be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?

- Be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?

3.4.25 This relates to Questions 30 to 32. Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation. According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should assess their suitability against the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential.

3.4.26 For Question 30, from the data thus far gathered for a site in the pro forma, a good general impression of the environmental quality and character of the area surrounding the site should have been gained. Based on this evidence, a judgement is required in this question as to whether the development of a WMF will adversely impact the way the environmental quality or character of the area is perceived as well as whether it will actually affect environmental quality or character, bearing in mind the fact that different types of WMF will have different levels of impact and will impact in different ways.

3.4.27 By way of example, if the site is located in a low-end industrial estate the environmental quality and character is likely to already be low and so the impact of a WMF is unlikely to be great or adverse and may, in the case of a high-end WMF, actually slightly improve the environmental quality and character. However, if the site is located within a residential area, the environmental quality and character will likely be higher in the first place and so a WMF may well have an adverse impact on this quality and character.

3.4.28 With regards to Question 31, the way that a WMF impacts social cohesion and inclusion will vary depending on what type of facility it involves but the impact it has will affect all groups in society equally. Therefore, it will only be the cause of a lack of social cohesion or inclusion if its geographical placement affects one geographical community more than another, perhaps by forming a barrier to movement between two communities or between one community and key community services and facilities.

3.4.29 The social impacts will be based on the perceived environmental impact of a WMF. Therefore, if developing a site for WMF was seen to have an adverse impact in Question 30 and there was a residential community or a district / local centre close to the site, the perceived environmental impact could have an adverse impact on the community or the communities that access the district / local centre. In addition, an adverse impact on social cohesion and inclusion could be felt because of the route site traffic has to take to and from the site, potentially forming a barrier across a road between two communities or a community and key services.
3.4.30 However, a high-end WMF could also bring positive social / community impacts to an area by redeveloping an existing low-end use or a vacant / derelict site and many WMF uses could provide local jobs, so it is important to consider what positive affects a WMF development may have as well as the often obvious negative ones.

3.4.31 Question 32 addresses the economic impact of a WMF development. This also links back to perceived environmental quality because if an area is perceived to be of poor environmental character because of a WMF development, it can inhibit the economic potential of that area. However, depending on the type of WMF and the existing environmental quality of an area, a high quality WMF can actually boost the local economy through the provision of local jobs and by improving the environmental character of the area.

3.4.32 The impacts appraised in Questions 31 and 32 can often have a similar effect but while Question 31 considers the effect on residential communities and their services, Question 32 considers the impact on business communities, particularly any located in the vicinity of the site. Therefore, while the environmental impact for a site will remain consistent, the impact on social cohesion / inclusion and economic potential may differ depending on what land-uses surround the site.

3.5 Level 2 criteria – opportunities

**Question 33:** Does the site have good accessibility from existing urban areas or major new or planned development (i.e. the major sources of waste arisings)?

3.5.1 **Answer yes or no.** This question relates to whether the site is close to, and accessible from, likely sources of waste arisings. Given that the JWDPD is addressing the need to manage waste from commercial sources and not municipal waste, these major sources of waste arisings will be concentrations of industry, business, commercial and office space and areas where a large amount of new development is expected over the plan period (creating Construction & Demolition waste). Accessibility relates to access mainly, but not exclusively, by road. Access via rail and waterways should also be a consideration.

**Question 34:** Is there a navigable waterway or wharf adjacent or very close to the site?

3.5.2 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should assess their suitability against the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking where practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.

**Question 35:** Is there a railway line suitable for freight traffic adjacent or very close to the site?

3.5.3 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** It may also be useful to consider if there is also a railway siding adjacent or very close to the site.
Question 36: Is the site already in use for waste management?

3.5.4 Answer yes or no.

Question 37: If the site is already in use for waste management, does it have good transport connections?

3.5.5 Answer yes or no.

Question 38: Is the site located in an area of major new developments?

3.5.6 Answer yes or no. By “major” new developments, consideration should be given to developments of sufficient size or weight to be of district-wide or sub-regional importance, for example, housing market renewal areas, regeneration areas, building schools for the future sites, large employment areas, etc. To be considered “in the area” of these developments, it is suggested that the site be within 2km of any one such development.

Question 39: Would the site allow for the co-location of waste management facilities?

3.5.7 Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation. According to PPS10, in searching for sites and areas suitable for new and enhanced waste management facilities, WPAs should consider a broad range of locations, including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate facilities together and with complementary activities (reflecting the concept of resource recovery parks).

3.5.8 In answering this question, the principle consideration is the size of the site. Any site in excess of 2 ha could conceivably allow the co-location of WMF, although specific constraints of sites between 2 and 5 ha may rule co-location out. Over and above the constraint of size, the ability of the site to enable co-location will depend on how many plots are available on the site where the site is actually an area of search (e.g. an existing industrial estate) and on specific issues that might limit the use of the site for more than one WMF, e.g. the site being in the greenbelt. In addition, where there are a number of sites in close proximity, the benefits of these, together, serving the function of co-location should also be flagged.

Question 40: Would the site allow for co-location with complementary activities?

3.5.9 Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation. As with Question 39, size of the site is the central consideration in this question as well as whether complementary activities would be suitable on the site. Complementary activities predominantly include low- to mid-end industrial / employment areas, depending on what WMF is proposed. Site-specific issues and availability of plots can also influence this question.

Question 41: Is the site an active mineral working site?

3.5.10 Answer yes or no. If yes, details of the mineral working should be recorded.
Question 42: Is, or has, the site been subject to an employment land use?

3.5.11 **Answer yes or no.** If yes, details of the employment land use, whether existing or historical, should be recorded here as well, if available.

Question 43: Is the site contaminated or derelict land?

3.5.12 **Answer yes or no.** If yes, details of the contamination and state of dereliction should be recorded. It may be that this question is often given the answer ‘Possibly – needs testing’ because details of land contamination, or whether the site is officially classed as derelict within the NLUD Register of Derelict Sites, may not be available and should be researched at a later stage if the site is taken forward. However, if a site is vacant and appears as though it has been disused for a number of years, this should be noted in the pro forma, as should if the site was formerly used for industrial or similar purposes, as this may indicate the likely possibility of contamination.

Question 44: Is the site used for sewage treatment works or adjoin a sewage treatment works

3.5.13 **Answer yes or no.**

Question 45: Is the site previously developed land?

3.5.14 **Answer ‘Yes – previously developed land’ or ‘No – greenfield land’.** According to PPS10, in deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities, WPAs should give priority to the re-use of previously developed land. Previously developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings), and associated fixed-surface infrastructure. The definition covers the curtilage of the development.

Question 46: Could development at the site generate heat and / or power?

3.5.15 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** In making a judgement on this issue, size of the site is an important criteria as any site of less than 1 ha will certainly not be large enough for a heat or power generation facility and even some slightly larger sites may be too small depending on site constraints. Other issues affecting this judgement will include proximity to sensitive receptors, especially residential, and whether such a large facility (usually with a tall chimney) is appropriate in the location, both environmentally and visually.
3.6 Deliverability

**Question 47:** Are there any potential land use conflicts (e.g. active or permitted mineral sites, where the location of a waste facility would sterilise permitted mineral reserves)?

3.6.1 **Record potential impacts.** According to PPS10, in testing the suitability of sites and areas, WPAs should consider factors including likely proposed development in the vicinity of the location under consideration.

**Question 48:** Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?

3.6.2 **Record details of land ownership.** According to PPS10, WPAs should avoid unrealistic assumptions on the prospects for the development of waste management facilities, or of particular sites or areas, having regard in particular to any ownership constraint which cannot be readily freed, other than through the use of compulsory purchase powers.

**Question 49:** Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?

3.6.3 **Record details.** Sites with a history of planning enforcement against waste or similar uses could be reasonably excluded.

**Question 50:** Has the site previously been used for waste management if it is not currently being used as such?

3.6.4 **Record details.**

**Question 51:** Can adequate provision be made for water supply and wastewater treatment?

3.6.5 **Answer yes, no or possibly – needs investigation.** If site is being, or has previously been, used for industrial / employment uses the site may already be connected to water supply and wastewater treatment.

3.7 Conclusions

3.7.1 **Record conclusions on the general merits of the site for accommodating waste management facilities.** In particular, draw together the potential issues, constraints and opportunities in relation to the site identified in the pro forma and, if appropriate, any further information that might be assembled in order to reach firmer conclusions.
3.8 Potential uses

3.8.1 According to PPS10, WPAs should identify the type or types of waste management facility that would be appropriately located on the allocated site or in the allocated area, taking care to avoid stifling innovation, in line with the waste hierarchy. In light of this, an appraisal of the suitability of the site for accommodating a range of waste management facilities should be undertaken with reference to Government guidance - ODPM (2004) Planning for Waste Management Facilities – A Research Study. The suitability of the site in relation to a range of facility types should then be indicated using a series of symbols (✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓, ✓✓, X) and a commentary provided. The characteristics of the five facility types considered in the site appraisals are set out in the List of Waste Management Technologies in the Annex to this guidance, but the ten Waste Management Technologies considered are as follows:

- A: Landfill / Landraise
- B: Open Air Waste Management Recycling Facilities
- C: Open Windrow Composting (OWC)
- D: Conventional Thermal Treatment (CTT)
- E: Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT), includes Gasification and Pyrolysis
- F: Material Recycling Facility (MRF)
- G: Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT)
- H: Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)
- I: Anaerobic Digestion (AD)
- J: In-Vessel Composting (IVC)

In light of the appraisal above, are there any potential mitigation measures which might be necessary for development on the site?

3.8.2 Record any potential mitigation measures and the rationale behind these. If any of the constraints identified in the appraisal can be effectively guarded against then the relevant mitigation measures should be recorded here. According to PPS10, it should not be necessary to use planning conditions to control the pollution aspects of a waste management facility where the facility requires a permit from the pollution control authority. In some cases, however, it may be appropriate to use planning conditions to control other aspects of the development. For example, planning conditions could be used in respect of transport modes, the hours of operation where these may have an impact on neighbouring land use, landscaping, plant and buildings, the timescale of the operations, and impacts such as noise, vibrations, odour, and dust from certain phases of the development such as demolition and construction.
3.9 Overall site performance

3.9.1 Record which band A – D the site has been categorised as being under.

3.9.2 To avoid giving over-precise and possibly-misleading impressions of the relative merits of each site relative to each other site, sites will be banded from Band A (best) to Band D (worst) according to the appraisal findings. We propose that Band A should be reserved only for sites where virtually no significant planning problems have been identified. In practice very few sites will be found meeting this description. This approach has the merit of making it clear at all subsequent stages (and to all subsequent audiences) that the sites which have emerged from this process as the 'best' are nevertheless recognised as being by no means problem-free.

3.9.3 Band B sites will have several issues identified which, if the site were to be developed for WMF, would need mitigation to address, but are generally suitable for WMF if the issues can be resolved. Band C sites may possibly be used for WMF but likely are not the most appropriate as they have significant planning problems and issues that would require significant mitigation to resolve if they are brought forward for WMF. However, both Band B and Band C sites should be taken forward for further consideration.

3.9.4 Band D sites are those that are wholly unsuitable for WMF due to many significant planning problems and issues. Band D sites should not be taken forward for further consideration.

**Should this site be taken forward for further consideration?**

3.9.5 **Answer yes or no.** In light of the appraisal and the band in which the site has been categorised, a decision will be made by GMGU as to whether the site should be taken forward and considered in preparing strategic options for waste management and the ultimate preferred option.

3.10 A note on health

3.10.1 According to PPS10, modern, appropriately located, well-run and well-regulated, waste management facilities operated in line with current pollution control techniques and standards should pose little risk to human health. Furthermore, the detailed consideration of a waste management process and the implications, if any, for human health is the responsibility of the pollution control authorities. For this reason, health has not been included in the pro forma criteria. However, as PPS10 recognises, planning operates in the public interest to ensure that the location of proposed development is acceptable and health can be material to such decisions.
Annex

Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD)
List of Waste Management Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Typical Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT)</td>
<td>Includes pyrolysis and gasification. Like thermal treatment, ATT recovers energy from residual waste. It differs in how the waste is processed and the energy liberated for recovery. Thermal treatment directly releases the energy in the waste through combustion. ATT thermally treat the waste to generate secondary products (gas, liquid and/or solid) from which energy can be generated.</td>
<td>Throughput: 50,000 tpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours for waste acceptance: 24 hrs 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site area: 1 -2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building footprint: 60m x 60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building height: 15m – 25m with 30m – 70m stack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General: Compatible with most B1/B2 activities. Facilities closer than 250m of housing should generally be avoided unless scale and improved environmental performance standards would enable plants to be located closer, particularly when part of a combined heat and power (CHP) district heating scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (AD)</td>
<td>A process where biodegradable material is broken down in the absence of oxygen in an enclosed container. It produces a mixture of carbon dioxide, methane and solids/liquids known as digestate which can be used for fertiliser, compost or Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF). The methane gas released by the process is normally burnt to generate heat and power.</td>
<td>Throughput: 5,000 – 40,000tpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of waste delivery: eight hours per day, 20 days per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site area: 0.15 – 0.6ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building footprint: 30m x 15m to 40m x 25m with between 2 and 4 tanks up to 15m diameter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building height: 7 -10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General: Are compatible with Class B1/B2 activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Key Features</td>
<td>Typical Characteristics&lt;sup&gt;iii&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Thermal Treatment (CTT)</td>
<td>The controlled high temperature burning of waste, either to reduce its volume or its toxicity. Energy recovery is achieved by utilising the calorific value of the materials burnt. The most efficient facilities combine the production of heat (usually in the form of steam) with power (electricity) (combined heat and power referred to as CHP). For specialist waste streams smaller facilities are used to meet the required need</td>
<td>Throughput: 50-250,000 tpa&lt;sup&gt;iii&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of waste delivery: 8 hours per day, 5-6 days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site area: 2-5ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building footprint: 180 x 60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building height (including stack): 70m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General: Compatible with most B1/B2 activities. Facilities closer than 250m of housing should generally be avoided unless scale and improved environmental performance standards would enable plants to be located closer, particularly when part of a combined heat and power (CHP) district heating scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasification</td>
<td>A type of advanced thermal treatment that involves the thermal breakdown of organic material by heating waste in a controlled oxygen atmosphere to produce a synthetic, energy rich gas. This is then used to produce heat/electricity. Similar to Pyrolysis.</td>
<td>Throughput: 50,000 tpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of waste delivery: eight hours per day, 20 days per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site area: 1-2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building footprint: 60 x 60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building height: 15-25m (chimney height 50-70m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General: Compatible with most B1/B2 activities. Facilities closer than 250m of housing should generally be avoided unless scale and improved environmental performance standards would enable plants to be located closer, particularly when part of a combined heat and power (CHP) district heating scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Key Features</td>
<td>Typical Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incineration</td>
<td>Also known as mass burn incineration. Although monitored and regulated, it involved the burning of mixed waste within a poorly controlled furnace atmosphere. The process did not include prior separation of recyclable material nor power production. This technology is no longer considered sustainable and is no longer permitted.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In-vessel Composting (IVC) | The composting of biodegradable waste in an enclosed environment, ranging from enclosed halls to tunnels, reactors, vessels and containers. In the process the water content of the waste (feedstock) is reduced. This process can be controlled to regulate moisture and temperature to increase the rate at which the composting process occurs. | Throughput: 25,000 tpa
Hours of waste delivery: eight hours per day, 20 days per month.
Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days
Site area: 1-2 ha
Building footprint: 25m x 30m
Building height: 4.5m
General: Are compatible with Class B1/B2 activities. |
| Landfill/Landraise       | The deposit of waste into land (landfill) or where land is raised by the deposit of waste material above existing or original ground level (landraise) in such a way that pollution or harm to the environment is prevented and, through restoration, to provide land which may be used for another purpose. Planning permission can be time limited and ‘temporary’. | Throughput: 250,000 tpa
Operational hours: 8 hours per day, 24 days per month
Site area: 5-50 ha
General: Sites close to housing, commercial, or recreational areas should be avoided. Specific guidance on locational restrictions has been published by the Environment Agency |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Typical Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Material Recycling Facility (MRF) | A site where recyclable waste is mechanically or manually separated, baled and stored prior to reprocessing. Where these facilities accept organic (biodegradable) waste they are referred to as ‘dirty MRFs’ and will have to operate 24hrs a day 7 days a week to avoid the rotting of stockpiled material. | Throughput: 50,000 tpa  
Hours of waste delivery: eight hours per day, 20 days per month.  
Operational hours: 10 hours per day 6 days a week.  
Site area: 1-2ha  
Building footprint: 70 x 40m  
Building height: 12m  
General: may be compatible with Class B1/B2 and B8 activities. Juxtaposition of facilities close to residential development should be avoided. |
| Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) | A process which treats residual waste after recycling has taken place. Reusable materials and contaminants are separated from the waste stream by a variety of mechanical processes and the remaining residue is then treated biologically prior to landfilling or energy recovery, typically through AD or the IVC treatment process. The process reduces the water content of the waste (feed stock) and increases its calorific value allowing its use as a solid recovered fuel (SRF) | Throughput: 50,000 tpa  
Hours of waste delivery: eight hours per day, 20 days per month.  
Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days  
Site area: <1-2 ha  
Building footprint: 100m x 30m or less  
Building height: 10-20m  
General: juxtaposition of facilities close to residential development should be avoided. |
### Mechanical Heat Treatment

**Key Features:**
A process which uses a combination of heat, air and moisture to clean and sanitise mixed recyclables to produce easily segregated recyclate and a residual organic material that can be used as a solid recovered fuel in other processes. (Also known as the autoclave process)

**Typical Characteristics:**
- Throughput: 100,000 tpa
- Hours of waste delivery: eight hours per day, 20 days per month.
- Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days
- Site area: 2ha
- Building footprint: 50 x 90m
- Building height: 10-20m
- General: juxtaposition of facilities close to residential development should be avoided

### Open Windrow Composting

**Key Features:**
The composting of organic waste in open air windrows which are not enclosed in any building, tunnel, reactor, vessel or other container.

**Typical Characteristics:**
- Throughput: 25,000 tpa
- Hours of waste delivery: 8 hours per day, 5-6 days per week.
- Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days
- Site area: 2-3ha
- Building footprint: Often no building is required for this operation
- General: Should be located at least 250m from sensitive receptors, which may include business premises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Typical Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Open Air Waste Management Recycling Facilities | These facilities include scrap yards, skip hire, construction and demolition yards, outdoor waste transfer stations and Household Waste Recovery Centres. They generally have unenclosed machinery and their throughput varies depending on the size of the site. | Throughput: approx 25,000 tpa  
Hours of waste delivery: 8 hours per day 5-6 days per week  
Operational hours: 8 hours per day 5/6 days per week  
Site area: >1-2ha  
General: Should be located at least 250m from sensitive receptors, which may include business premises |
| Pyrolysis                          | A type of advanced thermal treatment. The heating of waste in a closed environment (i.e. in the absence of oxygen) to produce a secondary fuel product.                                                      | Throughput: 50,000 tpa  
Hours of waste delivery: 8 hours per day, 5-6 days per week.  
Operational hours: 24 hrs 7 days  
Site area: 1-2ha  
Building footprint: 60 x 60m  
Building height: 15-25m (chimney height 50-70m)  
General: Compatible with most B1/B2 activities. Facilities closer than 250m of housing should generally be avoided unless scale and improved environmental performance standards should enable a reasonable case for such plants to be located closer, particularly when part of a combined heat and power (CHP) district heating scheme. |
Endnotes


2 Heritage Coasts are a non-statutory landscape definition, unlike the formally designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) and are defined by agreement between the relevant maritime local authorities and Natural England. Most are part of a National Park or AONB.

3 Note that there are three types of landfill: inert, non-hazardous or hazardous. There is unlikely to be any difference in the location criteria for new non-hazardous and hazardous landfill, as they will have to be located in areas which present no risk to groundwater.

4 According to PPS7, the Government recognises and accepts that there are areas of landscape outside nationally designated areas that are particularly highly valued locally. The Government believes that carefully drafted, criteria-based policies in Local Development Documents, utilising tools such as landscape character assessment, should provide sufficient protection for these areas, without the need for rigid local designations that may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas.

5 ‘Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing’ (p.26, Annex B) defines previously-developed land. The definition includes defence buildings, land used for mineral extraction and waste disposal sites where provision for restoration has not been made through development control procedures. It excludes land and buildings that are currently in use for agricultural or forestry purposes, and land in built-up areas which has not been developed previously (e.g. parks, recreation grounds, and allotments).

6 This list does not include municipal waste management facilities such as household waste recycling centres or waste transfer stations. Such facilities were not identified in the need assessment as being required to be included in this plan at this time.


8 tonnes per annum