

CHAPTER 17: WASTE

W/2 i) - Existing Waste Facilities - Entwistle Road Transfer Site

Objection: 285/5 Sainsburys Supermarket Ltd

Key Issue:

- **should this retained site for a waste transfer station be deleted from the UDP and developed for a comprehensive mixed-use scheme?**

Inspector's Reasoning:

17.1 The site is near Rochdale Town Centre and the objector has not disputed the evidence of the Council that it represents an important element in the Council's waste management strategy processing - I am told - a substantial proportion of weekly municipal waste. No significant evidence is before me from the objector that would justify a redevelopment for mixed uses - not least how the waste facility would be replaced over the period of the plan. I have dealt with the objector's view that land should be part of a designated Area of Opportunity at Chapter 12 of my Report. Pre-Inquiry Change 19 (Map 3) amends the boundary of the site. I have no reason to disagree.

Recommendation:

17.2 I recommend that the plan be modified along the following lines:

- **Modify the Proposals Map in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 19.**

W/3 – Criteria for the Location of Waste Disposal Facilities

Objection: 381/58 Government Office North West

Key Issue:

- **does the policy reflect the varying levels of protection afforded to different designations?**

Inspector's Reasoning:

17.3 Paragraph 18 to PPG 9: Nature Conservation indicates, generally, that varying weight should apply to nature conservation interests - depending on their designation. The objector has not, however, suggested the precise way that should be reflected in the policy statement as it applies to different designations -

“considerable”, “substantial”, “limited” or “little”, for example. It is not necessary, in my view, for the policy to do so - this for the decision-maker to assess in the light of any local, regional, national and international designation as it relates to a proposal. Criterion b) appears to me to restate, at excessive length, all interests that would be the subject of assessment. While the Council tells me that it has followed a “generic” approach to that criterion, it is somewhat rambling and needs to be shortened - reflecting the broad categories established by the interests. In the light of the above, it follows that criterion e) is acceptable - the decision-maker again being required to apply relevant weight in the assessment of a proposal. At Revised Deposit Draft, the Council has fairly reflected the need to recognize the best and most versatile agricultural land [criterion c)]. The addition made to the reasoned justification at paragraph 17.9 of the Revised Deposit Draft version needs to be simplified. Finally, I record that the tests of the 9 criteria refer variously to “unacceptable” and “satisfactory”. Whether, for example, “adversely affect” would be more applicable, I leave with the Council.

Recommendations:

17.4 I recommend that the policy be modified along the following lines:

- **Delete criterion b) and substitute: “b) will not adversely affect natural, recreational, ecological, archaeological or historic interests;”**
- **Delete the fourth sentence to paragraph 17.9 of the reasoned justification to the policy and substitute: “In assessing development proposals against criteria b) and e), the Council will apply the relevant weight required by international, national and local (including regional) designations.”**

.....