

Kirklees Local Plan

Stage 2 - Minerals and Waste sections

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS (MIQs)

Council Response

MATTER 12: WASTE CAPACITY

- 1.1 This statement sets out the council's response in relation to the Inspector's matters and issues Matter 12 – Waste Capacity. All of the documents referred to in this statement are referenced within the statement.

Issue: Whether the Plan makes sufficient provision to meet the capacity needs of the District over the Plan period, in accordance with strategic objectives elsewhere in the plan and national guidance.

Questions

- a) **Explain how the waste policies comply with NPPW and PPG? Also, is there any update on the regional waste position statement, dated February 2016, which seems to be a draft?**
- 1.2 The council considers that the waste policies comply with NPPW and PPG and encourage the management of waste in line with the waste hierarchy. Kirklees is committed to meeting recycling targets as set out in the National Waste Management Plan and the Kirklees Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
- 1.3 Policy PLP 43-44 addresses paragraphs 1-3 of NPPW with PLP44 also addressing the requirements of paragraphs 4-8. NPPW says that Local Plans should identify sites and or areas for new or enhanced waste facilities. In Kirklees, the need will be met through area allocations as this provides more flexibility for the industry to identify where they feel there is a need for new facilities rather than this being prescribed by the authority. It also allows for a range of facility types to come forward.
- 1.4 Kirklees has prepared a detailed waste needs assessment (LE105/LE106) which looks at how much waste is likely to be generated over the plan period and how this will be managed to increase recycling and recovery and reduce landfill. It is proposed to include more detail on this within the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies (SD1, Section 16 Waste). The proposed modifications are detailed in Appendix 1 of this response.
- 1.5 The Waste Needs Assessment identifies what needs to be managed and when, however, the information in the plan can be improved upon by the inclusion of a summary box highlighting the types of facility expected to be required, when a gap is likely to arise and the indicative land requirements to meet this need. See Appendix 1 of this response. As the requirements will be for the private sector as the authority has an existing contract for LACW, it is not possible to state when or where the industry will bring forward sites as this is commercially led. No sites were put forward

by the industry through the call for sites process. This further supports the area allocation approach.

- 1.6 Policy PLP 45 picks up the requirements of Paragraph 8, 1st bullet, to safeguard existing waste infrastructure.
 - 1.7 PPG has been used to inform the development of all of the waste policies in the Plan, as well as the Waste Needs Assessment. The technical detail on how to predict waste requirements set out in PPG (Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 28-022-20141016 to Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 28-036-20141016) informed the methodology used in the Waste Needs Assessment.
 - 1.8 Policy PLP43 considers the Waste Hierarchy. This is in line with PPG (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 28-008-20141016 to Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 28-010-20141016), which explains that all planning authorities are responsible for driving waste up the hierarchy.
 - 1.9 The identification of sites and areas for future waste management takes into account the guidance set out in PPG Paragraph: 037 Reference ID: 28-037-20141016 to Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 28-041-20141016 on how to identify such locations.
 - 1.10 The policies as worded address all waste streams, therefore the plan has covered all the requirements of NPPW and NPPF and supporting PPG.
 - 1.11 The Yorkshire and Humber Waste Position Statement (Feb 2016) (CR20) is the most up to date waste position statement produced by the Yorkshire and Humber (Y&H) region. Following discussions at the March 2017 Y&H Waste Technical Advisory Body (WTAB) it was agreed that the next update would not be produced until 2018. This agreement has been set out in the minutes under agenda item 6 and included at Appendix 2. The Council acknowledge that the February 2016 version of the Y&H Waste Position Statement still includes the words 'draft'. The council will upload the final version to the Local Plan examination library.
- b) The Council has set the objective of seeking to become self-sufficient in managing waste generated within the District. How does the plan comply with this objective? How much and what types of waste will need to be treated outside the District? Have a sufficient number and range of sites been allocated to maximise the opportunity for operators to deal with an appropriate range of waste types within the District?**
- 1.12 The plan is seeking to be **net self-sufficient** and not self-sufficient as set out in Paragraph 8.4 2nd bullet of the Waste Technical Paper (BP26). This was a typographical error, with the plan itself setting the need to be net self-sufficient. Kirklees recognise that it is not possible to become totally self-sufficient as Kirklees relies upon facilities in the wider Yorkshire and Humber region for the management of some waste streams generated within the area and likewise is also an important centre for the management of waste through both built facilities and landfill for areas both within and outside the Yorkshire and Humber region. This approach and mutual reliance is set out in Yorkshire and Humber Waste Position Paper February 2016 (CD121).

- 1.13 Kirklees has undertaken Duty to co-operate (DtC) with areas known to have received waste from Kirklees, however it is important to note that waste does not respect administrative boundaries, and with the exception of LACW, the council has no control as to how or where wastes will be managed.
- 1.14 The council, through the needs assessment, has identified the level of waste arisings expected over the plan period and has indicated where a gap in local waste management provision exists. The modification proposed under Matter 12 (a) provides additional information on the levels of waste to be managed over the plan period. The council has identified that built waste management facilities would be suitable in existing industrial areas and have developed criteria based policies to facilitate their delivery. It is felt that this approach offers more flexibility than specific sites, as this allows operators to decide which locations best meet their specific requirements. The approach to areas has also not sought to be specific on facility types, this again allows greater flexibility, and allows operators, through discussions with council planning officers, to identify the best location for specific waste management facilities. That said, each application would be considered on its own merits and it is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate the suitability of the proposal put forward. See modifications outlined in Appendix 1 of this response.
- 1.15 The Local Plan has identified a requirement of 175 hectares of land to meet the objectively assessed needs (OAN) for jobs. However, an uplift has been applied to ensure the land supply provides flexibility, range of choice and enables the delivery of the Council's and Leeds City Regions economic objectives. In view of this the total supply of land for business and industry has been calculated at 264 hectares, 89 more than the OAN derived land requirement (see SD1, page 52, Table 3). It is considered the identified supply – in addition to vacancy and general churn – will provide sufficient opportunity through scale and geographic spread to accommodate waste operators needs for the duration of the plan period.

c) Give further justification for the preferred scenario (Growth 3 median recycling) and why it is the most appropriate for use in the Plan?

- 1.16 The Waste Technical Paper (BP26), paragraph 8.4 sets out the reasons for choosing the scenario Growth 3 median recycling. This option is the best reflection of the council's likely objectives for the Plan period and assumes a higher growth of waste for various sectors. This reflects the council's projections for Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) as a result of waste reduction and recycling initiatives, and includes the impact of future population growth in the district in line with the council's objectively assessed needs for jobs and homes.

Appendix 1

Proposed Modification

Insert new text within the introduction to the waste section following current Paragraph 16.7 of the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies (SD1) to read:

16.8 The WNA has identified the following requirements for Kirklees over the plan period.

Provision for Kirklees Waste to 2031

16.9 The chosen approach to future waste management in Kirklees is to reduce waste exports by identifying land for facilities to manage the equivalent of all Local Authority Collected Waste, Commercial and Industrial and Construction and Demolition waste generated in Kirklees, while recognising that some imports and exports will continue (net self-sufficiency). The Local Plan will seek to move waste up the waste hierarchy by diverting as much waste as possible away from disposal to landfill by identifying land suitable for recycling and recovery facilities.

16.10 The waste management needs in Kirklees to 2031 can be summarised as follows, full details of requirements can be found in the Waste Needs Assessment 2016 (a breakdown is provided in Appendix 4):

Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW)

16.11 Kirklees have an existing waste management contract in place with Suez which includes the following:

- processing of LACW through the existing Energy Recovery Facility in Huddersfield
- Management of waste from 5 Household Waste Recycling Centres; and
- Recycling of the co-mingled recyclables from households.

16.12 The contract is in place until 2028 with the potential for a 5 year extension which would cover the requirements until the end of the plan period. If the extension beyond 2028 is not achieved, then Kirklees will have a capacity gap of around 27,000 tonnes for EfW.

16.13 Kirklees does not have sufficient facilities for the recycling of LACW and there is a requirement for additional recycling capacity throughout the plan period.

16.14 Kirklees does not have any non-hazardous landfill and there is capacity throughout the plan period, and it is likely that export to neighbouring areas will continue throughout the plan period.

Commercial and Industrial Waste

16.15 There is insufficient capacity locally for recycling and landfilling of C&I waste throughout the plan period. The WNA identifies the need for additional recycling capacity but recognises that landfill will be met through export to neighbouring areas.

16.16 There is a small requirement for EfW, but not sufficient to warrant the development of a facility to make it economical for Kirklees waste alone.

16.17 There is a surplus in capacity of treatment facilities for C&I and CD&E waste throughout the plan period. There is also surplus capacity at transfer stations throughout the plan period. Although not classed as recycling facilities, some

transfer stations do undertaken this role and may aid in providing local recycling capacity during the plan period.

Construction, demolition and excavation waste (CD&E)

- 16.18 Kirklees has sufficient capacity for landfill of CD&E waste and currently imports a significant amount of this waste for management within Kirklees.
- 16.19 There is a requirement for recycling facilities for CD&E waste. However, to counteract this there is surplus capacity for land recovery and treatment facilities. The latter is also available for the management of C&I waste.
- 16.20 There is also surplus capacity at transfer stations throughout the plan period. Although not classed as recycling facilities, some transfer stations do undertaken this role and may aid in providing local recycling capacity during the plan period.

Agricultural Waste

- 16.21 The small amount of agricultural waste generated in Kirklees is not expected to increase over the plan period and there is no requirement to plan for additional facilities to manage this waste stream.

Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLW)

- 16.22 Kirklees contains a single location generating a very small amount of low-level radioactive waste, the nature of which means it can be disposed via the foul sewer network with other wastes. Therefore there is no need for specialised local management capacity

Waste Water

- 16.23 Yorkshire Water has advised the Council that additional capacity is likely to be needed at two plants within the Borough. The timescale for improvement has not been established yet and will be identified through ongoing dialogue with the company.

Land Requirement

- 16.24 Using indicative information on facility sites across West Yorkshire, it is estimated that to meet the requirements for built facilities across the plan period, a maximum of 10ha of land will be required for the provision of new waste management infrastructure. It is assumed that due to economies of scale it is unlikely that a hazardous waste recycling/treatment facility will be required for Kirklees based on existing capacity within the Region, however should a facility be required this would need up to 2 Ha of land.
- 16.25 It is important to note that a number of transfer stations also undertake recycling as part of their operations, but due the way their status is recorded in the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator it is not possible to distinguish which sites provide this without more detailed analysis. In addition, some facilities classed as treatment may also provide recycling capacity. As such it is important to keep the requirements under review throughout the plan period as this indicative requirement could change

if further information on recycling capacity of existing sites can be shown to provide capacity for Kirklees.

Proposed Modification

Insert new Appendix 4 into the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies (SD1) to read:

Appendix 4

The following tables provide information on the chosen option for the management of waste arising within Kirklees throughout the plan period. Table 1 provides details at 5 yearly intervals of the waste management requirements for each waste stream by facilities type.

Table 2 provides information on indicative land requirements for a range of waste management facilities based on information provided to inform the Bradford Waste Needs Assessment.

Table 3 provides an estimate of the land requirements for Kirklees over the plan period based on the information in Table 2.

Table 1: Waste management requirements over the plan period at 5 yearly intervals by waste type and facility type. (Source: Kirklees Waste Needs Assessment 2016.)

Facility Type	Gap2016	Gap2021	Gap2026	Gap2031	Gap2036
Landfill (C+I and LACW)	78,599	55,350	72,665	61,351	62,189
Landfill (Hazardous)	-218,053	-161,886	-161,915	7,289	7,176
Landfill (CD&E)	-67,652	-91,976	-62,730	-66,636	-69,412
Energy from waste	-11,253	1,161	18,195	37,187	53,224
Recycling (C+I, Agri)	109,162	131,202	143,683	156,835	161,405
Recycling (C+D)	88,182	103,618	109,684	113,639	109,998
Recycling (Metals)	-32,401	-28,933	-29,566	-31,115	-32,617
Recycling (Hazardous)	19,542	20,581	20,280	19,670	19,064
Recycling (LACW)	52,498	75,678	86,532	98,551	111,855
Composting	16,294	17,321	18,049	19,017	21,135

Facility Type	Gap2016	Gap2021	Gap2026	Gap2031	Gap2036
Treatment plant	-82,951	-81,381	-81,217	-81,034	-80,815
Other Treatment	51,678	78,169	70,253	61,308	58,881
Land recovery	-58,248	-52,013	-53,649	-55,902	-57,209
Total	-65,856	68,052	168,459	377,347	418,098

Table 2: Indicative land requirements for waste management facilities. (Source: Bradford Waste Needs Assessment, 2016).

Facility Type	Tonnage	Land take
Materials Recycling/Reprocessing Facilities (LACW & C&I waste)	128,000 tonnes	1 ha
Materials Recycling/Reprocessing Facilities (C&D waste)	63,000 tonnes	1 ha
Hazardous Waste Recycling/Treatment	10,000	1 Ha
Non-hazardous non-inert landfill	100,000 to 500,000 tonnes (or the equivalent void space)	N/A
Non-hazardous inert landfill	100,000 tonnes	N/A
Hazardous landfill	20,000 tonnes	N/A
Composting	25,000 to 35,000 tonnes.	1 – 2 ha
Energy Recovery	100,000 – 200,000 tonnes	2 – 3 ha
Residual Mechanical Treatment	100,000 tonnes	1 ha

Table 3: Indicative land requirements for built waste management facilities over the plan period

Waste Management	Year	Scenario 3 Med. Recycling	Min no Facilities	est. Land take (ha)
Energy recovery	2016	-11,253	Surplus	Surplus
	2021	1,161	1	2 – 3 ha
	2026	18,195		
	2031	37,187		
Recycling (LACW)	2016	52,498	1	1 Ha
	2021	75,678		
	2026	86,532		
	2031	98,551		
Recycling (C&I and Agriculture)	2016	109,162	1	1 ha
	2021	131,202	1	1 ha
	2026	143,683		
	2031	156,835		
Recycling (Hazardous)	2016	19,542	1	2 Ha
	2021	20,581		
	2026	20,280		
	2031	19,670		
Recycling (aggregates CD&E)	2016	88,182	2	2 ha
	2021	103,618		
	2026	109,684		
	2031	113,639		
Recycling (specialist materials– including metal recycling, End	2016	-32,401	Surplus	Surplus
	2021	-28,933	Surplus	Surplus

Waste Management	Year	Scenario 3 Med. Recycling	Min no Facilities	est. Land take (ha)
of Life Vehicles and WEEE	2026	-29,566	Surplus	Surplus
	2031	-31,115	Surplus	Surplus
Composting	2016	16,294	1	1-2 Ha
	2021	17,321		
	2026	18,049		
	2031	19,017		
Treatment Plant (including Anaerobic Digestion, specialised treatment of biodegradable liquids and wastes, organic waste treatment by distillation)	2016	-82,951	Surplus	Surplus
	2021	-81,831	Surplus	Surplus
	2026	-81,217	Surplus	Surplus
	2031	-81,034	Surplus	Surplus
Other Treatment	2016	51,678	1	1 HA
	2021	78,169		
	2026	70,253		
	2031	61,308		
Land Recovery	2016	-58,248	Surplus	Surplus
	2021	-52,013	Surplus	Surplus
	2026	-53,649	Surplus	Surplus
	2031	-55,902	Surplus	Surplus

Reason for the Proposed Modification:

Clarification of waste needs assessment contained in existing evidence Waste Needs Assessment (LE105 and LE106)

Appendix 2

Yorkshire & Humber Waste Technical Advisory Body
27th March 2017
2.00 pm
Environment Agency Offices, Leeds

Minutes

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
Rob Smith (Chair)	North Yorkshire County Council
James Whiteley	North Yorkshire County Council
Carole Howarth	Bradford MD Council
James Barker	Kirklees Council
Paul Copeland	Calderdale Council
Jane Palmer	Stockton Borough Council (<i>on behalf of the Tees Valley Authorities</i>)
Stephen Littlejohn	Leeds City Council
Roger Gray	Hull City Council
Louise Milwain	Environment Agency
Rachel Jones	Environment Agency (<i>Sustainable Places Team</i>)
Ian Garrett	Wakefield Council
Iain Cunningham	North Lincolnshire Council
Helen McCluskie	Doncaster MB Council
Leo Oliver	Durham County Council

Apologies

Dave Parrish	Yorkshire Dales NP
Chris Hanson	Sheffield City Council
Vicky Perkin	North Yorkshire County Council
James Durham	East Riding of Yorkshire Council

1. Welcome and Introductions	
2. Matters arising from previous meeting (5.9.16)	
	LM circulated the revised EA RDF consultation paper on 6.9.16
	RS and CH have discussed issues related to the next update of the Y&H Waste Position Statement, further detail provided under Agenda Item 6.
3. Update from EA on current issues	
LM	The definition of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) was published on 16.2.17 by Defra: <i>“Refuse derived fuel (RDF) consists of residual waste that complies with the specifications in a written contract between the producer of the RDF and a permitted end-user for the thermal treatment of the waste in an energy from waste facility or a facility undertaking co-incineration such as cement and lime kilns. The written contract must include the end-user’s technical specifications relating as a minimum to the calorific value, the moisture content, the form and quantity of the RDF.”</i>
	<i>Action Point: LM will circulate a link to the Defra Statement</i>
LM	Small Waste Incineration Plants (capacity under 3 tonnes per hour): Permit requests for these facilities have increased recently, especially those managing waste wood, partly as a result of Renewable Energy Incentives. Confusion is occurring regarding the relevant permit required. If in doubt notify the EA who will determine what permitting requirements apply.
CH	A recent increase in applications for Biomass Boilers and similar facilities has been experienced which are intended to supply electricity into the national grid during times of high demand. These facilities are not being processed as ‘waste’ applications due to the claim that they are processing ‘clean wood’ (not treated), but the veracity of this claim is hard to prove. There are also issues regarding impact upon air quality to consider.
LM	Impacts of Brexit remain unclear. EU Regulations requiring the separate collection of waste are being enforced by the EA with current focus on major businesses such as retailers.
LM	2015 Waste Data Interrogator (and Hazardous WDI) released in October 2016 – Available to download via https://data.gov.uk/data The 2016 WDI is due to be released in early Autumn 2017.
LO	Experienced technical issues with WDI such as the layout requiring macros to be enabled, top bar not being visible and multiple restarts required.

	<i>Action Point: LM will pass these concerns onto the relevant EA Team</i>
4. Update on current position with waste plans	
HM	Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster – Joint Waste Plan adopted in 2012. Consideration being given to preparation of a Plan on a wider Sub-regional basis i.e. including Sheffield CC area. The requirement for a Waste Needs Assessment will be investigated. The South Yorkshire Waste Strategy commits to a 95% recycling target.
RG	East Riding of Yorkshire and Hull CC – A Joint Plan is currently progressing but at a very early stage.
LO	Durham CC – A Local Plan including waste policies is being progressed. An Issues & Options Consultation paper was published last year, but this received very few waste responses. Currently reviewing impacts of the Housing White Paper and updates to the evidence base.
JP	Tees Valley Authorities – Joint Minerals and Waste DPDs adopted in 2011. These require updating but nothing formalised as yet, potentially to be resolved in 2018.
IG	Wakefield MDC – Adopted Waste Core Strategy in 2009. Plan to be reviewed in 2017 with a focus upon specialist treatment and recycling facilities.
IC	North Lincolnshire Council – A Local Plan, including waste policies, is under preparation. Issues & Options consultation will be undertaken in 2018 and adoption in 2019. A Local Capacity Assessment will be required.
JB	Kirklees Council – Producing a Local Plan which includes minerals and waste policies. Publication was undertaken in Autumn 2016 with c. 7,000 responses but very few waste responses. Submission expected April 2017.
CH	Bradford MDC – Core Strategy currently has a Holding Direction from DCLG (October 2016) (<i>Update – 28.3.17 Holding Direction withdrawn</i>). Waste DPD – Currently with PINS, but likely to be adopted when the Core Strategy Holding Direction is removed. However, legal advice suggests that policy in the Waste DPD holds weight for planning applications.
SL	Leeds CC – Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan Adopted in 2013 – No current plans for review. Revised wharves and rail sidings policy was adopted in September 2015. Site Allocations DPD underway.

PC	Calderdale Council - Local Plan including minerals and waste. Draft Plan expected May/June 2017, Publication version end of 2017 and intention to Adopt the Plan by the end of 2018. Currently undertaking updates to the waste evidence base which will be completed prior to Publication version of the Plan.
RS	North Yorkshire CC, City of York Council & North York Moors NP – Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Publication Stage began in November 2016. Number of waste focused responses has reduced from preferred options stage. Currently considering the need for a Proposed Changes consultation prior to Submission.
	Yorkshire Dales NP - Local Plan adopted in December 2016. Agreements with NYCC that waste generated in YDNP will primarily be managed in NYCC (<i>updated to reflect current position</i>).
5. Progress on local evidence – waste capacity requirements	
CH	West Yorkshire Combined Authority Heads of Planning have determined the need for a combined Capacity Gap Analysis for West Yorkshire WPAs up to 2035-36. HoP were conscious of the need for up-to-date information which required the production of a model to be utilised by all West Yorkshire WPAs. It is expected this project will be finalised end of 2017.
RS	RS commented that the intention to do this for the WY sub-region, combined with the joint working on waste planning now taking place in the SY and NY sub-regions was a positive move and would help ensure that cross-boundary strategic issues were addressed.
6. Yorkshire & Humber Waste Position Statement (Feb 2016)	
RS	Separate discussions with CH regarding the Y&H WPS concluded it would benefit from the inclusion of waste capacity research that is being undertaken at Sub-region level (e.g. in NY, SY and WY and other WPA specific capacity information where available) and is due to be undertaken in the West Yorkshire Sub-region and potentially in the South Yorkshire Sub-region. The Humber area is a potential gap in data.
IC	Due to the differences in timescales of plan production the development of joint waste capacity gap research may not be without issues but this can be raised with the other Humber WPAs.
	<i>Action Point: IC to report to next meeting any discussions regarding joint working in Humber area to produce waste capacity gap research.</i>

CH	<p>The Y&H WPS and WTAB were noted by the Inspector at the Waste DPD EiP, demonstrating their effectiveness at contributing to meeting DtC requirements. To coordinate with WPA evidence base updates, 2018 would be the next appropriate date to update the WPS.</p> <p>To ensure the data supporting the WPS is maintained the WPAs should provide any relevant data when possible (see action point below relating to circulating the 'major waste applications and infrastructure table' every two months).</p>
RS	<p>The WPS is currently focused towards the Y&H WPAs but in future it could incorporate relevant headline data from Tees Valley and County Durham, and other surrounding areas if appropriate, to further help demonstrate coordination in planning.</p>
<p>7. Addressing the Duty to Cooperate</p>	
CH	<p>Housing White Paper (Feb 2017) emphasised the need for joint working which may have potential implications on DtC requirements and redefined certain requirements as optional rather than statutory.</p>
JB	<p>Wider cooperation with WPAs outside of Y&H may be required as waste is transported over an extensive area.</p>
LO	<p>WPAs should reconsider the need to consult WPAs where very small scale movements of waste have occurred, with the exception of LLRW and Hazardous waste.</p>
CH	<p>Potential issues may arise regarding the export of RDF to Europe as a result of Brexit due to increased costs, approximately 4 million tonnes of waste is exported out of the UK annually.</p>
	<p><i>Action Point: LM to circulate any EA guidance on this issue</i></p>
<p>8. Consultation on major waste applications and infrastructure</p>	
JW	<p>Information on applications to be included in the Table should be sent to James Whiteley at NYCC (James.Whiteley@northyorks.gov.uk) prior to WTAB meetings.</p>
LM	<p>EA provided update (27.3.17) on sites that it is aware of, including operational status and permit related issues.</p>
CH	<p>Aire Valley EfW Incinerator in Keighley Planning Application was approved by members on 9th February 2017 but a Holding Direction has been issued by DCLG prior to determining if the application will be Called In.</p>
	<p><i>Action Point: JW to circulate an updated collated table every two months as specific dedicated email and prior to each meeting of the WTAB.</i></p>

9. Any other business	
CH	It has been noted that fracking objectors have also objected to applications for facilities that support the fracking industry, e.g. Waste Treatment Facilities which could manage fracking waste water and Silica Sand extraction.
	<i>Action Point: CH to forward any relevant info on this matter to JW to circulate to the WTAB members</i>
SL	Request to commence future WTAB meetings at 1pm to allow greater involvement.
RS	Should future WTAB Meetings be held immediately after Aggregates Working Party (AWP) Meetings to encourage greater attendance?
HM	Holding AWP and WTAB Meetings immediately after one another would lead to unreasonably long meetings reducing input from all members.
RS	Retain current approach to organisation of WTAB meetings
CH	As this would be RS last meeting representing NYCC at WTAB meetings, CH offered her thanks on behalf of the meeting for his contributions in the past.
10. Next meeting	
	<i>Action Point: LM to confirm with JW a date in September 2017 to hold the next meeting at the EA Offices in Leeds.</i>