

- 1 Question a) National Planning Policy for Waste 2014 requires KC to consider “potential land-use conflict”. This has not been considered with respect to WS16, which has “commandeered” existing agricultural land within the waste designation and will safeguard surrounding land to a non-conflicting use. This is unsound, and does not accommodate the needs of the local farm.
- 2 The plan (PLP26 Renewable energy and low carbon energy) has not considered the relationship between on -farm bio waste plants, in terms of anaerobic digestion(AD), and agriculture.
- 3 NPPF does not require sites to be safeguarded. The safeguarding of the only on-farm anaerobic digestion facility within KC is unnecessary and detrimental to the growth and ongoing viability of the adjacent farm, which are under the same ownership. This is because PLP45 Safeguarding Waste Management Facilities” aims to ensure “sites are not hindered by encroachment of development near to existing sites, which could cause conflict with the existing waste use”. Para 16.15.
- 3 WS 16 designates areas of green belt as a waste site. KC have stated landowners have all agreed to safeguarding designations. This is not true in this case and therefore does not comply with community involvement.
- 4 Question b) WS 16 has been safeguarded for the reason it is an existing strategic waste site and critical to KC waste needs assessment (PLP 45, para 16.14 “Theses sites are considered critical in continuing “). However, the site is not a municipal site and does not/never has taken waste from the Kirklees area, and is therefore not critical. It is unique in KC as being the only anaerobic digestion plant on the local plan and is on-farm.
5. The Waste Needs Assessment 2016 dismissed agricultural waste as having a nil net effect on waste output. WS 16 accepts agricultural waste and so the safeguarding of the site is not critical in this respect.
6. WS16 has been designated as a waste site, when other farms’ lagoon sites in Kirklees have not been designated. This is inconsistent, unjustified and not sustainable. The site will shortly have PAS110 certification, which means the digestate will not be classified as waste. The lagoons are under agricultural permitted development rights applied for by the farm and owned by the farmer.
- 7 WS16 is a renewable energy Anaerobic digestion facility, unique in KC. AD has a low priority and is barely mentioned in KC Technical Paper: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. Nov.2016, and yet is purported to be critical to KC waste needs, so as to need safeguarding.
- 8 WS 16 is unique as being the only on-farm anaerobic digestion facility within KC. It has been included in KC’s waste needs as a general waste site. There is no statutory duty under NPPF to safeguard such a site. The designation would have a detrimental effect on the adjacent working farm, which would have to prove any existing and future farm activities “would have no impact on the digesters”. I would contend this site is exceptional and, as such, should not be designated as a waste site.

9 Proposed modification to delete WS16.