



Kirklees Council

Waste Needs Assessment

Part 2:

Growth Forecasts and Assessment of Future Capacity Requirements

4Resources

October 2016

 urbanvision

Details	Prepared by	Reviewed and approved by
Version 1	Gill Tatum, Peter Greifenberg, Natalie Blackston	Carolyn Williams

Contents

FOREWORD.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
1. INTRODUCTION	13
2. OVERVIEW OF KIRKLEES WASTE ARISING.....	16
3. CONTEXT FOR THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT	18
4. METHODOLOGY FOR PREDICTING FUTURE WASTE CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS.....	21
4.2. IDENTIFYING CURRENT WASTE ARISING AND EXISTING CAPACITY.....	21
4.3. MODELLING AND ASSUMPTIONS	23
5. POTENTIAL CAPACITY GAPS IN 2031	33
6. FUTURE REQUIREMENTS	35
6.1. INTRODUCTION.....	35
6.2. LOCAL AUTHORITY COLLECTED WASTE (LACW)	35
6.3. COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL (C&I) WASTE.....	41
6.4. CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION AND EXCAVATION (CD&E) WASTE	45
6.5. HAZARDOUS WASTE.....	47
6.6. AGRICULTURAL WASTE.....	48
6.7. LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE	50
6.8. WASTE WATER / SEWAGE SLUDGE	50
7. CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS	52
7.1. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS.....	52
GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	56

Figures

Figure 1: Relative Proportions of Principal Wastes Generated in Kirklees	17
Figure 2: Methodology for Predicting Future Waste Requirements.....	21
Figure 3: The Waste Hierarchy	24
Figure 4: Comparison of Capacity Gaps at 2031 with Maximum Growth – EfW Plant Assumed to Close in 2028.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Figure 5: Comparison of Capacity Gaps at 2031 with Maximum Growth – EfW Plant Assumed to Remain Open.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Tables

Table 1: Arisings of Controlled Wastes in Kirklees in 2013/14	16
Table 2: Summary of Growth Scenarios	25
Table 3: Summary of Behaviour Scenarios.....	28

Table 4: Assumptions about Existing and Planned Waste Management Sites	29
Table 5: Waste Management Facility Categories Used in the Model	30
Table 6: Estimated Annual Capacity Available from Licensed Operational Waste Management Facilities within Kirklees	31
Table 7: Capacity Gap Comparison for the Scenarios Modelling the Least and Most Extensive Changes in Requirements	33
Table 8: Table 8: Comparison of the LACW (H) and LACW (Other) Capacity Gaps.....	37
Table 9: Capacity Gaps for Recycling C&I Waste Over the Plan Period*	42

Foreword

Kirklees Unitary Authority commissioned this study in August 2016. The Waste Needs Assessment uses information correct at that time of publication and it is therefore a living document. This includes information on waste arisings obtained from the EA Waste Data Interrogator 2014 and the EA Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator 2014 (both published in October 2015). The study covers the local authority area of Kirklees.

Executive Summary

Content of the Data Study

- I. Urban Vision and 4Resources were contracted by Kirklees Council to prepare a Waste Needs Assessment. The Study evaluates a number of scenarios predicting future waste arisings in the period 2016 to 2031 comparing the results with existing local waste capacity to identify any gaps in provision that will need to be addressed. The Council has also specified that the work should provide forecasts over an additional five years beyond the end of the Plan period to 2036.
- II. The Study has been produced in two parts. Part 1 provides a detailed analysis of current waste arisings in Kirklees for all waste streams and of the movement of wastes into and out of the area. In both cases data refer to the situation in 2014 which is the latest year for which information is available on all the principal waste streams.
- III. This Report, Part 2, documents subsequent analysis that provides a detailed analysis of capacity gaps for managing each of the waste streams.

Waste Streams

- IV. Seven waste streams have been analysed to estimate the quantity of waste that will be produced within Kirklees as follows (with the analysis largely focused on the first five):
 - Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW): waste collected by the Local Authority which is primarily waste produced by households (LACW(H)) but which can also include waste from certain non-household sources (LACW(Other)). Residues produced by the Energy From Waste (EfW) process which is used to treat some LACW(H) have also been included (LACW(Secondary))¹;
 - Commercial and Industrial wastes (C&I): wastes produced by companies in all industry sectors, including C&I waste collected by the Local Authority;
 - Construction, Demolition and Excavation wastes (CD&E): waste produced as a result of building, engineering, renovation and maintenance activities;
 - Hazardous waste: A sub category of all waste streams, where the material produced is hazardous and requires specialist treatment;
 - Agricultural Waste: waste produced by farming and forestry activity;

¹ These distinctions are made solely for the purposes of accurately identifying the respective quantities of wastes and how they are accounted for in this assessment in terms of how they are managed. They have no wider applicability.

- Low Level Non-Nuclear Radioactive Waste (LLW): waste associated with the use of low level radioactive substances (i.e. when taking x-rays and in laboratory testing); and
- Waste Water / Sewage Sludge: waste produced from washing, cleaning, and activities to treat waste water and sewage effluents.

Modelling Future Waste Arisings and Capacity Gaps

- V. Modelling work uses baseline data (set out in the Part 1 report referred to above) comprising the capacity of existing sites and the waste management functions they perform. This information is combined with projections of future change in arisings and management methods using combinations of five growth scenarios and three behaviour scenarios.
- VI. One growth scenario ('no growth') assumes arisings will remain at current levels throughout the period to 2031, although this is recognised as improbable. The other four scenarios assume increasing growth in arisings as follows:
- LACW increasing by between 3% and 3.3% per annum in the short term, and between 2% and 2.3% thereafter;
 - The other main streams would increase by between 0.55% and 0.87% per annum over the Plan period.
- VII. The 'no growth' and four other growth scenarios reflect the assumed impact of different economic factors applied to employment sector growth for LACW, C&I, CD&E and for the hazardous components of these waste streams. These factors include changes in population which will affect the quantity of waste produced by households (LACW(H)), economic changes that may increase the waste output of businesses and services (C&I waste) and infrastructure and housing growth (CD&E waste).
- VIII. The three behaviour scenarios represent how each of the streams could be managed over the plan period and can be summarised as follows:
- Scenario 1 – current levels of recycling and recovery are maintained;
 - Scenario 2 – recycling and recovery of LACW, C&I and CD&E wastes improves to achieve relevant statutory and non-statutory targets by 2020 and continues to improve further so that the rates achieved by 2031 are the maximum that are expected to be possible using current technology and given the composition of each stream;
 - Scenario 3 – a median level (between scenarios 1 and 2) which envisages modest improvement in recycling and recovery of LACW, C&I and CD&E wastes and

LACW(H) wastes and some diversion of waste away from landfill, though the 2020 target for recycling / composting of the former is not achieved.

- IX. Improvements in recycling performance assumed for Scenarios 2 and 3 result in proportionate reduction in the use of landfill disposal.
- X. Parameters in the growth and behaviour scenarios have been agreed with officers at Kirklees Council. The former are consistent with econometric forecasts that inform other Council plans, policy and strategy, while assumptions about future changes to management behaviour reflect industry expectations or, in the case of LACW, the strategy that the Council's Waste Collection and Disposal function is pursuing.

Existing Waste Capacity

- XI. A review of existing licensed waste management facilities operating within Kirklees has been undertaken, and this identifies a total of 64 sites. Most of the facilities are household waste recycling centres and transfer stations where LACW, C&I and CD&E wastes can be sorted, bulked and separated before onward transport for further management. There is a substantial amount of metal recycling capacity also, but a limited amount of treatment capacity, the most important of which is the Huddersfield Energy from Waste Plant. There are also a number of landfill sites and other sites where inert wastes are imported for landscaping and restoration purposes. The assessment assumes capacity will be available throughout the Plan period except where it is already known that sites will close prematurely (this constraint applies to three landfill sites).
- XII. By reviewing the existing waste management sites, establishing the type and quantity of waste they can manage annually, then matching this with the amount of waste being produced each year (under the different scenarios), the model calculates how much remaining capacity there is for each waste management route over time and to identify where gaps exist at present or will develop in the future.

Summary of Future Capacity Requirements

- XIII. The various combinations of growth and behaviour scenarios define an 'envelope' within which a number of different outcomes and requirements for additional capacity can be identified. The Energy from Waste facility in Huddersfield is scheduled to operate until 2023. The Council has an option to extend this period to 2028 and has asked that the study also evaluates continued operation of the plant to 2036. Both assessments are made solely for the purpose of informing the ongoing review of the residual LACW management strategy and do not imply any commitment to pursue either option at the present time. The table below identifies the results of capacity assessment for three of the options looked at along with the gaps for other waste management routes; these are set out in Table 2 of the main report. The three scenarios illustrate the implications of assuming no change and

of the high levels rates of growth and improvement in landfill diversion. In all cases negative figures identify capacity surpluses for certain routes.

Waste Management Route & Wastes	Baseline / No Growth 2031	Growth 4 Maximised Recycling / Recovery 2031	Growth 3 Median/Recovery 2031
Landfill (C+I)	101,515	44,307	48,957
Landfill (LACW)	16,140	12,701	12,394
Landfill (Hazardous)	6,386	7,103	7,289
Landfill (C+D&E)	-19,327	-60,189	-66,636
Thermal treatment with energy recovery ('Energy from waste') + Thermal Treatment (without energy recovery)	-19,600	-3,009	37,187
Recycling (C+I, & Agricultural)	88,678	172,653	156,835
Recycling (LACW only)	37,936	126,154	98,551
Recycling (C+D)	71,531	137,283	113,639
Recycling (metals only)	- 38,227	- 32,950	- 31,115
Recycling (Hazardous)	17,706	19,049	19,670
Composting	15,406	19,487	19,017
Treatment plant	-84,612	-81,293	-81,034
Other treatment plant / transfer (Hazardous / C&I)	27,438	22,144	61,308
Land Recovery	-58,321	-55,286	-55,902

Source: Kirklees Waste Needs Assessment model August 2016. All figures in tonnes]

- XIV. The points below summarise the principal conclusions about capacity needed to manage each stream based on the results of modelling.

LACW

- There is a capacity shortfall for preliminary sorting of LACW Recycling throughout the Plan period with the resources focused on a small footprint at the Huddersfield Materials Recycling Facility under the current contract arrangements.
- There are no operational sites composting green wastes within Kirklees and it is anticipated these materials will continue to be exported to facilities in other authorities.
- The existing EfW plant provides sufficient capacity for thermal treatment of LACW throughout the Plan period provided it remains operational beyond current contractual arrangements up to 2023/8. However under the highest growth (growth 4) there appears a small deficit in 2031 (shortfall of 3000 tonnes under the maximum recycling scenario)
- Kirklees has no landfill sites currently taking non-inert wastes such as LACW and therefore all waste that is not recycled or sent to the EfW plant is exported. If policy aims to implement the maximum level of recycling assumed in the analysis then the amount of waste sent to landfill will fall substantially although there will still be a shortfall in capacity for the disposal of LACW waste of over 57,008 tonnes by 2031. Should the median recycling option be taken forward, the requirement for landfill of C&I waste under growth 3 reduces from baseline levels but is around 4000 tonnes pa more than maximised recycling and places a greater demand on energy from waste for LACW, but existing capacity is sufficient assuming that the existing contract is extended beyond 2028 (except under growth scenario 4).

C&I Waste

- There will be a gap of around 88,678 tonnes of recycling capacity for handling C&I waste in 2016 rising to over 172,653 tonnes under the largest growth assumptions by 2031 for maximised recycling. Under median recycling the demand is slightly lower but a gap of over 156,835 has arisen by 2031 (median recycling growth scenario 3).
- As with the LACW stream it will be necessary to rely on continuing export of recyclate to external re-processors until such time as the identified local capacity comes forward. This situation applies to all scenarios but, as indicated above, the additional capacity needed will increase if the Plan seeks to promote high levels of recycling of these wastes.
- Under all the scenarios there is adequate transfer station capacity at sites handling mixed wastes and those handling specific materials such as metals.
- There is no EfW capacity for C&I wastes (the existing Huddersfield plant is currently contracted to handle LACW only). Even with recovery increasing from current

baseline by 1% to 4% by 2031 the additional capacity needed is very small and may be insufficient to make a local facility cost effective. Therefore it is likely that C&I wastes for EfW processing will continue to be exported outside the plan area.

- As with LACW there is an existing landfill capacity shortage that will persist throughout the Plan period though it will be reduced substantially under those scenarios assuming high levels of recycling and recovery. Should median recycling options be taken forward, the demand for landfill increases for C&I, but remains around the 15,000tpa for LACW.

CD&E Waste

- Kirklees at present has significant surplus landfill capacity for managing inert C&D and excavation wastes (and also capacity to use the latter in restoration projects if current rates of re-using this material are maintained)
- There is a surplus of capacity at waste transfer stations and bulking facilities for C&D over the whole Plan period throughout the plan period under all scenarios.
- At present there is a shortage of capacity for recycling CD&E wastes under all the scenarios over the whole Plan period. However the true rate may be disguised because mobile plant is being used to recycle this waste where it is created and these arisings are never reported. Similarly some transfer stations may also be making an unquantified contribution to recycling rates.

Hazardous Waste

- Kirklees currently relies on external treatment and recovery capacity to handle local arisings and it is unlikely that the small quantities involved would result in new local capacity coming forward
- Two landfill sites provide regionally significant capacity that result in the area being a net importer of hazardous wastes, however the eventual closure of both sites by 2028 will result in a small gap. This situation might be addressed if one or both facilities are granted extensions otherwise it will require new capacity or further reliance on external facilities.

Agricultural Waste

- The assessment has not identified the need for facilities to manage this stream specifically and any requirement is included in the assessed need for additional capacity to handle C&I wastes.

Sewage Sludge

- 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.

Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLW)

- 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.
- XV. If Kirklees is to become (net) self-sufficient in waste management capacity the Council will need to consider the requirements identified by this assessment and to adopt appropriate projections to plan for future waste capacity which would be delivered by the Plan.
- XVI. For any waste still requiring export to other areas, the Council should contact waste planning authorities receiving waste from Kirklees in order to establish whether they are aware of any foreseeable changes that may affect this position over the life of the Plan and in order to meet its obligations under the Duty to Co-Operate as defined in the Localism Act.

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. Kirklees Unitary Authority (hereafter, the Council) is preparing the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) which will include the planning framework for managing wastes arising within the authority area.
- 1.1.2. Urban Vision and 4Resources were contracted by the Council to prepare a Waste Needs Assessment to assess future waste capacity requirements in 2015. The purpose of this study was to enable the Council to plan for new facilities required to meet expected future waste arisings up to 2031 which represents a key part of the evidence base supporting the KLP. In addition the Council also requested that the Assessment review the implications of a change in waste management requirements over an additional 5-year period to 2036.
- 1.1.3. The Waste Needs Assessment was produced in two parts:
 - Part 1: Waste Arisings in Kirklees; and
 - Part 2: Waste Capacity in Kirklees.
- 1.1.4. Part 1 of the Waste Data Study provided a detailed analysis of current waste arisings in Kirklees for all waste streams and waste movements into and out of the area for 2013. The information in Waste Data Study Part 1 was used to inform the stage 2 report and provides the basis for estimating future capacity requirements.
- 1.1.5. The Part 2 report presents the modelling options used to identify the future requirements for the plan area over the period referred to above. It provided detailed analysis of capacity gaps for each waste stream and the various ways in which the materials in it will be managed.
- 1.1.6. In July 2016, the Council requested a further update to both reports to address changes in waste arisings over the past 12 months and to apply alternative methods of forecasting based on updated agreed jobs figures and update the requirements for each of the waste streams based on the new figures.
- 1.1.7. In the 2015 report, a number of scenarios were modelled and these options are taken forward in this report. Each scenario presents a different option for modelling waste based on a range of recycling and recovery targets and growth levels being achieved.

The specifics of each option and proposed changes in 2016 report are set out in Tables 3&4 in Chapter 4 of this report.

1.1.8. The Waste Needs Assessment addresses the following seven controlled waste streams:

- Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW): waste collected by Local Authorities which is primarily waste produced by householders (referred to as LACW(H)) but which can also include some non-household waste such as collected road sweepings (LACW(other)). It also includes secondary waste arising as a by-product from treating residual household waste in an Energy from Waste facility (LACW(Secondary));
- Commercial and Industrial wastes (C&I): wastes produced by all sectors of industry;
- Construction, Demolition and Excavation wastes (CD&E): waste produced through the undertaking of building, engineering, renovation and maintenance of structures;
- Hazardous waste: A sub category of all waste streams, where the material produced is hazardous and requires specialist treatment and which cannot be managed with other wastes;
- Agricultural Waste: wastes produced by farming and forestry activity;
- Low Level Non-Nuclear Radioactive Waste (LLW): waste associated with activities such as taking x-rays and laboratory testing which use substances with low levels of radioactive emissions; and
- Waste Water/Sewage Sludge: waste produced from washing, cleaning, and hygienic activities to create waste water and sewage effluents.

1.1.9. A detailed review of the robustness and limitations of available information on current and expected arisings of waste in Kirklees has been carried out for all waste streams and is reported in the Part 1 report referred to above.

1.1.10. The data underlying the projections in this report represents the best available information at August 2016 although the timing of this updates means that the most recent data are for 2014 for C&I and CD&E waste and 2015 for LACW, which is therefore the base year from which forecasts are projected forward. Data sources include data reported via the Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) and Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator (HWDI) (both refer to 2014), and data from Defra's WasteDataFlow reporting facility which provides information on LACW, data has also been provided from the Councils Waste Management team on LACW.

- 1.1.11. Information on C&I waste is recognised to be poor. There have been no specific surveys of Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste arisings in Kirklees and government have indicated that any future surveys are unlikely. Recent methods of calculation have been based on extrapolating data surveys of this stream that have been undertaken at national and regional levels, the latter being undertaken for North West England. The surveys which have been used for this study use data collected in 2009 and 2008/9 respectively^{2,3}. More recently Defra has suggested that future calculations should be based on a method devised by Jacobs which takes information from the EA's WDI. This method has not been used in this latest report as this is updating previous work which used the national and regional surveys. Any future detailed updates should look at using this alternative approach. This Needs Assessment Update is based on interpolating the results of a 2009 survey of the former North West region which represented the best available proxy for estimating the size of this stream locally and how it is managed at the time of preparing the original report.
- 1.1.12. It is acknowledged that this Study presents a picture at a particular point in time and requirements will need to be reviewed periodically throughout the preparation of the Plan as appropriate.

² Commercial and Industrial Waste Survey 2009 Final Report, May 2011 (Jacobs, for Defra).

³ North West of England Commercial and Industrial Waste Survey 2009 (Urban Mines, for the Environment Agency March 2010).

2. Overview of Kirklees Waste Arisings

2.1.1. Waste in Kirklees is generated by a wide range of sources and processes. The most familiar is waste collected from households, such as packaging and food. However this material only accounts for part of the overall waste arisings and much larger quantities are generated by the construction industry (Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste – CD&E), such as broken bricks and cables; and from business activities (Commercial and Industrial waste – C&I), such as food from restaurants and paper from offices. These three streams make up the majority of waste produced within Kirklees.

2.1.2. Table 1 and Figure 1 show the estimated waste arisings (and the relative proportions of each stream) in Kirklees in 2014/15. **Collectively these figures define the baseline arisings on which the subsequent needs assessment is based.**

Table 1: Arisings of Controlled Wastes in Kirklees in 2014/15

Waste Type	Tonnage	Percentage
Local Authority Collected Waste (H) (all household waste but excluding trade waste) ⁴	160,974	23%
Local Authority Collected Waste (Other) (all other waste from non-household sources but excluding trade waste)	17,400	
LACW (Secondary) secondary waste from energy recovery includes – this includes some LACW that is classed as hazardous	27,734	
Commercial Waste (CI) (including the trade waste element of LACW)	180,820	20%
Industrial Waste (I)	181,843	20%
Construction Demolition Waste (C&D)	77,000	9%
Excavation(E) ⁵	216,000	24%
Hazardous waste (is a sub set of other waste categories and can originate from CD&E, C&I & LACW sources)	32,516	4%


⁴ Trade waste is material collected under contract by the local authority from business premises. It is also contained in the estimates of C&I waste generated by businesses. It is excluded from the LACW stream in this study to prevent double-counting.

⁵ C&D and E wastes are assessed separately as there is more scope to recycle the former which has implications for estimating how much waste will need to be disposed to landfill.

Waste Type	Tonnage	Percentage
Agricultural Waste (leaving farm holdings)	4,012	<1%
Total	872,300	100%

[Source: Waste Needs Assessment Part 1: Waste Arisings in Kirklees, August 2016]

Figure 1: Relative Proportions of Principal Wastes Generated in Kirklees



[Source: analysis using Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator, 2014, WasteDataFlow, Extrapolated NW 2009 C&I Survey and Extrapolated Agricultural 2003 survey]

- 2.1.3. Responsibility for managing waste water and sewage lies with Yorkshire Water. Additional capacity to meet population growth is most likely to be provided by expanding existing treatment facilities. This situation only has implications for the Plan if it requires the allocation of land outside the curtilage of existing waste water treatment facilities.
- 2.1.4. Arisings of low level radioactive wastes are negligible and cannot be readily identified by weight. A single site in the Plan area generates these wastes the quantity and nature of which means they can be safely disposed to foul sewer with other waste water.
- 2.1.5. Further detail on managing waste water and sewage and low level radioactive wastes is provided later in this report.

3. Context for the Needs Assessment

- 3.1.1. Most waste is produced as a result of demand for products or the creation of new infrastructure. The need to reduce waste creation directly, or indirectly by greater use of recycled materials is at the heart of strategies promoting sustainable consumption that apply at EU and national levels and which impact local waste strategies equally. Promoting change at local level for LACW is achieved through mechanisms such as the local Municipal Waste Management Strategy. Voluntary agreements such as the Courtauld Commitment - whereby manufacturers seek to reduce packaging waste by better design and use of predominantly recyclable materials – also contribute significantly to the reduction of wastes.
- 3.1.2. Planning for future waste management must also reflect the external influence of relevant legislation and the obligations this places on the Council as Waste Collection and Disposal Authority as well as its role as competent authority in preparing a Waste (and Minerals) Plan to provide for sustainable management of locally arising of wastes. Some legislative influences are readily identified; others are proposed and their implications cannot be taken into account at this time and represent risks that have to be considered when establishing policy.
- 3.1.3. Key aspects of the legislative landscape and their implications for this assessment and the Council’s waste planning are summarised below. Several matters impact the options for managing residual LACW in the future and aspects of this assessment will assist the Council in moving towards an appropriate strategy for dealing with this stream in the period after the current PFI contract ends. Other matters, such as future changes to mandatory targets, will need to be taken into account when assessing appropriate growth and performance assumptions that will be taken forward into the Plan.

EU Landfill Directive **What is in force or proposed?:** Sets target of reducing biodegradable waste sent to landfill to 35% of 1995 levels by 2020.

What are the implications?: Local performance currently exceeds the EU target substantially (7% household waste to landfill in 2013/14) as a result of a reliance on the EfW plant for residual disposal. A key issue for the medium/long-term will be the evolution of the strategy for managing residual LACW, whether current diversion rates can be maintained, and the technical solution(s) that can be used to achieve this.

EU Waste Framework Directive & Waste **What is in force or proposed?:** Directive sets target of recycling, composting or re-using 50% of household waste by 2020.

Management Plan for
England

What are the implications?: Local performance in 2013/14 was below the national average and action to address it in the short-term is being taken. 'Direct' diversion to recycling was relatively low (30%). In addition to this, the Council has a high rate of waste diversion classed as 'recovery'. This recovery does not count towards the government's 50% recycling target. The Council therefore needs to make further improvements on its recycling levels to meet national targets. With the EfW plant apparently operating at close to full capacity there is limited scope to divert more household waste down this route using existing local facilities. The local opportunity to implement increased recycling measures is dependent on the terms of the Authority's PFI contract with Sita Kirklees Ltd. The Council's upcoming waste strategy review may need to consider the viability and desirability of introducing organic waste collections.

Waste Management
Plan for England

What is in force or proposed?: In addition to the proposals from the EU, publication of the national Waste Management Plan introduced policy directions promoting the circular economy. One key aspect is the proposal for quality controls on materials collected and sorted by Materials Recycling Facilities. The aim of the proposal is to meet the standards required from organisations reprocessing plastics, glass, paper, etc. into secondary or recycled products thereby stimulating the development of a national recycling sector with the intention of reducing the export of recyclate (and therefore loss of a resource). At present these proposals refer only to monitoring of materials against defined standards and thresholds but without specific legislation enforcing them, although the latter is likely to emerge in due course.

A second policy direction of note involves promoting separate collection of food waste where this is not already provided. The Plan devolves this decision to individual authorities though, as referred to above, it may be necessary to deploy it widely in order to achieve further improvement in recycling and composting performance.

What are the implications?: In the short-term this development primarily has implications for Sita Kirklees Ltd in managing the wastes handled under the PFI contract. However the implications of this development will need to be followed through in the review of the residual waste management strategy so that infrastructure brought forward later in the plan period to replace the PFI facilities will meet any emerging standards.

EU Waste Framework
Directive

What is in force or proposed?: Sets target of recycling 70% of CD&E wastes by 2020. Performance against this target is difficult to assess and affected by significant differences in the size and recycling opportunities for the C&D and E streams separately.


What are the implications?: Local C&D recycling performance already significantly exceeds the EU target (89% in 2013) but this is offset by limited recycling of E wastes (only 10%). Overall performance is therefore 32% but rises to 53% if E waste re-used in restoration or land recovery is included in the total. However there is no mechanism for reporting the quantity of E wastes that are used in backfilling and restoring the sites where they were generated. The level of recycling and re-use is likely to be significantly underestimated though an accurate figure cannot be identified. This situation is not necessarily critical of local performance. Defra claims

that national performance outstrips the EU target and that in many other Member States, but the inclusion of E wastes will have the same effect at national level as it does in the Authority and assessment is again hampered by a lack of accurate data. This is not a matter that the Authority can plan for proactively as the opportunity to maintain potentially higher rates of E waste re-use will depend on demand for landscaping material from future development projects and for fill to restore mineral sites. Conversely, high levels of local C&D recycling are likely to be maintained as the cost of alternative management methods is expensive by comparison and secondary materials should be cheaper than virgin material provided quality standards can be met.

4. Methodology for Predicting Future Waste Capacity Requirements

- 4.1.1. The Waste Needs Assessment has employed the structure shown in Figure 2 to assess future capacity requirements.

Figure 2: Methodology for Predicting Future Waste Requirements



4.2. Identifying Current Waste Arisings and Existing Capacity

- 4.2.1. In order to identify future waste arisings and capacity it is important to gain as accurate a picture as possible of current waste arisings and the capacity of existing permitted waste management facilities. Economic and waste trends are then used to forecast future waste growth and subsequently the need for new facilities can be projected based on any capacity gaps that are identified.
- 4.2.2. Data on waste arisings across the streams listed in Table 1 has been analysed and identified in the Part 1 report which defines the situation in the baseline year of 2014.
- 4.2.3. A review of existing licensed waste management facilities operating within Kirklees has been undertaken in parallel. Appendix 1 provides detail of the existing waste management sites in the Borough, the functions they provide, and the type of wastes

that each manages. Appendix 2 summarises the aggregate capacity of all facilities of a particular type.

4.2.4. There are currently 69 facilities operating in Kirklees carrying out a range of waste management activities across the principal waste streams. They include:

- facilities such as household waste recycling centres;
- transfer stations, where waste can be sorted, bulked and separated before onward transport for further management;
- sites recycling mixed wastes and specific materials such as metals;
- a range of treatment facilities dealing with common residual wastes;
- energy recovery facilities such as the Energy from Waste (EfW) plant in Huddersfield; and
- other facilities taking material such as hazardous wastes, electrical equipment, etc. that may require special handling.

4.2.5. There are also a number of landfill sites and other locations accepting inert wastes for backfilling, restoration and landscaping purposes (collectively referred to as land recovery operations). Planning permissions for three landfill sites in the Plan area will expire during the plan period.

4.2.6. Operational waste sites were identified from those locations listed in the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator tool for 2014 which were cross-checked against a list of permitted facilities provided by the EA and against the Public Registers⁶. The Council also provided details of recently permitted sites that have yet to start operations but which are expected to contribute to local capacity during the Plan period. The resulting list was reviewed by council officers to identify any further information from relevant planning permissions or other sources regarding the capacity and end date for the existing use of a site.

4.2.7. Some capacity data has been compiled from the EA licence, and/or Planning Permission information (where available). However the EA has recently ceased

⁶ In the course of identifying site capacity (as subscribed in the following paragraphs) a number of sites were identified that had reported accepting waste in previous years but not in 2013. Sites that had only recently apparently stopped accepting waste recently were assumed to be mothballed for a short time and included in the capacity assessment except where Council officers advised a facility was known to have shut permanently. Sites that stopped accepting waste in 2010 or earlier were excluded based on the expectation that the recession had forced them to shut.

supplying details of licensed capacity for a site as this is a theoretical value and may not accurately reflect the physical throughput that the site can provide⁷. As a result a review of past annual throughputs was also undertaken to ascertain the most accurate information for the actual available capacity at each site. The past 6 years' data was reviewed in identifying the maximum perceived capacity for each facility based on how much material it actually handled.


- 4.2.8. The capacity of all existing waste sites validated through this process has been included in the model for purposes of estimating future waste requirements for the KLP. The maximum throughput capacity identified over the last 6 years is assumed to be available for the duration of the KLP, unless the operator/landowner has advised otherwise.
- 4.2.9. All companies currently or recently operating waste sites were contacted by email to check details about their operations; however the response rate was extremely poor and did not identify any significant changes or new information.

4.3. Modelling and Assumptions

- 4.3.1. The Waste Needs Assessment provides information on future waste arisings for the principal waste streams shown in Table 1, and identifies where there may be a capacity gap at any time in the period 2016 -2031. Information is also provided on hazardous waste, which is a sub category of LACW, C&I and CD&E waste. The data study provides a level of detail and consistency that has not previously been available to Kirklees. The projection of future waste capacity requirements must consider how much waste arises and must evaluate the potential for recycling or energy recovery with the aim of managing waste more sustainably and moving it up the Waste Hierarchy as shown in Figure 3.

⁷ Environmental Permits for waste operations are issued in capacity bands and therefore the site capacity may be substantially less than the maximum allowed by its Permit. When such inaccuracies are repeated across a substantial number of sites there is a risk that the available capacity will be significantly over-estimated and therefore it is necessary to estimate capacity in other ways.

Figure 3: The Waste Hierarchy



Source: DCLG, National Planning Policy for Waste, Appendix A

- 4.3.2. In order to comply with the EU Waste Framework Directive and the National Planning Policy for Waste, each type of waste must be managed at the highest technically and economically feasible level in the Waste Hierarchy, while recognising that landfill will remain the only realistic option for disposing of certain wastes. The need for waste management facilities to deal with the waste in a more sustainable way will form an integral part of the waste element of the KLP. This approach is consistent with the Government's wider sustainable development agenda and its approach to sustainable waste management in particular.
- 4.3.3. As noted in section 3 of this report, local performance in recycling LACW is currently not on track to achieve the statutory target for 2020, while the combined levels of recycling and energy recovery mean that the corresponding target for diverting biodegradable waste from landfill is already being exceeded five years ahead of the 2020 target date.
- 4.3.4. Forecasting future requirements involved constructing a number of scenarios based on different levels of arisings growth, and different levels of recycling, recovery and landfill performance.
- 4.3.5. The growth scenarios considered for the LACW, C&I, CD&E and agricultural waste streams are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of Growth Scenarios

Scenario	Annual growth rate assumptions	
1.Growth (1) Lowest Growth	C- Variable growth over plan period	
	I - Variable growth over plan period	
	C,D &E - Variable growth same as industrial	
	Hazardous - Variable growth same as industrial	
	Agricultural - As baseline (Extrapolated for 2016)	
	LACW(H) - Population growth and waste growth total 2% 2016-2036	
	LACW (Other) Population, no waste growth at 0.6565% all plan years	
	LACW (Secondary) - Population growth and waste growth total 2% 2016-2036	
2.Growth(2) Moderate Growth	C - Variable growth over plan period	
	I - Variable growth over plan period	
	C,D &E - Variable growth same as industrial	
	Hazardous - Variable growth same as industrial	
	Agricultural - As baseline (Extrapolated for 2016)	
	LACW (H)- Population growth and waste growth at 2.0354 % 2016 and thereafter for plan period	
	3. Growth (3) Higher Growth	C - Variable growth over plan period
		I - Variable growth over plan period
C,D &E - Variable growth same as industrial		
Hazardous - Variable growth same as industrial		
Agricultural - As baseline (Extrapolated for 2016)		
LACW(H) - Population growth and waste growth combined at 2.1341% 2016 and thereafter for plan period		
LACW(other) Population growth, no waste growth at 0.7906% for whole plan period		

4.Growth(4) Maximum Growth	C - Variable growth over plan period
	I - Variable growth over plan period
	C,D &E - Variable growth same as industrial
	Hazardous - Variable growth same as industrial
	Agricultural - As baseline (Extrapolated for 2016)
	LACW(H) Population growth and waste growth combined at 2.2728 2016 and then whole plan period
	LACW(other) Population growth , waste growth at 0.9293% for whole plan period

[Sources: Kirklees Council WDA forecasts; Demographic Analysis and Forecasts, August 2016, Edge Analytics for Kirklees Council]

4.3.6. Growth rates reflect both external influences on future waste arisings and the Council's own expectations. The Council's Waste Disposal Authority provided the projections for LACW(H) which reflects the effects of changes in waste arisings as a result of waste reduction and recycling initiatives promoted through the Municipal Waste Management Strategy together with the impact of future population growth in the Borough.

4.3.7. Forecast growth rates for other streams are based on demographic projections of employment in Kirklees, drawing forecasts from econometric modelling undertaken for the Council that informs, and is therefore consistent with, other plans and strategies. They reflect:

- future anticipated levels of economic activity;
- the impact of fiscal financial/legislative factors such as landfill tax charges driving waste away from landfill (which affects LACW also);
- financial incentives such as Renewable Obligations Certificates which increase the economic viability of energy recovery).

4.3.8. Three waste management behavioural scenarios were defined in order to assess the implications of different options for managing these streams in terms of the proportion of material recycled, treated, used for energy recovery, and disposal. Table 3 sets out the three scenarios chosen to reflect the potential changes in practice in the management of waste arisings. It takes into account the increasing recycling potential through the changes in waste collection, processing and treatment practices, particularly for Commercial and Industrial waste, and the corresponding reduction in landfill disposal.

- 4.3.9. These 'behaviour modifiers' are based on professional judgement of realistic maximum levels of landfill diversion that might be achieved and were agreed with Council officers. They also reflect the best available information at the time this report was prepared and can be amended and re-modelled to take account of any future changes if performance falls below or exceeds these assumptions.
- 4.3.10. The LACW(H) targets have been selected to model the government target of recycling of LACW(H) for a combined country approach to 50% recycling by 2020 (Maximum recycling) and a lower target of 40% recycling (Median recycling) by 2020 (the baseline position for LACW(H) is 27% at 2014/15).

Table 3: Summary of Behaviour Scenarios

Behaviour Scenario 1 (Baseline)	
No change - the Part 1 report identifies the proportions of each waste stream that are currently recycled, composted, treated, sent to energy recovery or to landfill.	
Behaviour Scenario 2 (Maximised Recycling and Recovery)	
By 2020	By 2031
LACW(H) 50% recycled or composted; 45% to energy recovery 5% to landfill	LACW (all types) – no change from 2020
Other LACW as for baseline	Other LACW as for baseline
Secondary LACW as for baseline	Secondary LACW as for baseline
C - 75% recycled (66% <i>Baseline</i>); 6% to EfW (<i>baseline 1%</i>); 3% to other treatment (<i>baseline 3%</i>); 16% to landfill (<i>baseline 23%</i>)	C – 80% recycled; 6% to EfW; 4% to other treatment; 10% to landfill
I – 81% recycled or composted (71% <i>baseline</i>) ; 16% to landfill (23% <i>baseline</i>) ; 3% to land recovery (<i>baseline 3%</i>)	I – 85% recycled or composted; 12% to landfill; 3% to land recovery
C&D – 40% recycled (<i>baseline 32%</i>); 50% treated (<i>baseline 56%</i>); 10% to landfill (<i>baseline 13%</i>)	C&D – 45% recycled; 45% treated; 10% to landfill
E – 40% recycled (<i>baseline 24%</i>); 1% treated (<i>baseline 1%</i>); 43% to landfill (<i>baseline 59%</i>); 16% to land recovery (<i>baseline 16%</i>)	E –45% recycled; 1% treated; 38% to landfill; 16% to land recovery
Agricultural and hazardous as for baseline	Agricultural and hazardous as for baseline
Behaviour Scenario 3 (Median Recycling and Maximised Recovery)	

By 2020	By 2031
LACW (H) – 40% recycled or composted; 55% to energy recovery; 5% to landfill	LACW(all types) – no change from 2020
Other LACW as for baseline Secondary LACW as for baseline	Other LACW as for baseline Secondary LACW as for baseline
C – 70% recycled; 4% treated; 10% to energy recovery; 16% to landfill	C – 75% recycled; 4% treated; 15% to energy recovery; 6% to landfill
I – 76% recycled or composted; 21% to landfill; 3% to land recovery	I – 80% recycled or composted; 18% to landfill; 2% to land recovery
C&D – 35% recycled; 55% treated; 10% to landfill	C&D – 40% recycled; 50% treated; 10% to landfill
E – 30% recycled; 19% treated; 35% to landfill; 16% to land recovery	E – 35% recycled; 15% treated; 34% to landfill; 16% to land recovery

4.3.11. The approach summarised above allows up to 12 future scenarios to be modelled using different combinations of growth and behaviour assumptions. A summary of the waste arisings forecast for each combination of scenarios is provided in Appendix 3.

4.3.12. The approach to estimating capacity has been explained earlier in this chapter. In addition, assumptions have been made on specific existing waste management sites using information from the Council in regard to landfill sites, with total capacity void space remaining figures obtained from the Environment Agency. This is set out in Table 4. The estimated site closure dates may be subject to change and the model will be updated to reflect any new information.

Table 4: Assumptions about Existing and Planned Waste Management Sites

Waste Site	Capacity	Assumption
Kirklees Energy from Waste plant	132,000 tonnes (annual)	Funded through PFI between Council and Sita Kirklees Ltd. Contract expires in 2023 with an option for a 5 year extension to 2028. The model has 2 options – site closes in 2028 site continues to operate up to 2036 ⁸

[Source: Kirklees Council]

4.3.13. Many of the existing waste management operations can treat more than one waste type - eg. sites using technologies to treat residual can also treat residual C&I waste. Waste management site licences and planning permissions do not specify limits on the proportions of waste from each waste stream that can be handled at different sites. As a result professional judgement has to be applied to identify which waste streams each site handles, but it is not possible to determine the relative proportions except on those sites contracted to handle LACW only or which have permissions to handle hazardous wastes.

4.3.14. It is therefore not possible to assess each existing waste management facility by individual waste stream and so results are grouped together to gain an overall picture of capacity by waste management type. The resulting waste management types are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Waste Management Facility Categories Used in the Model

Waste Management Facility Type
Landfill (C&I and LACW)
Landfill (Hazardous)
Inert Landfill (CD&E)
Energy from Waste (LACW, C&I)
Recycling (C&I, Agricultural)
Recycling (LACW)
Recycling (C&D)
Recycling (Metals) ⁹

⁸ These options are included for the purpose of modelling the effects of continued operation of the plant on residual waste disposal needs and do not imply any commitment at the present time to operation beyond 2023.

Recycling (Hazardous)
Recycling (LACW)
Composting (C&I, LACW)
Treatment (C&I)
Other Treatment/Transfer (Hazardous/CI)
Land Recovery (CD&E)

4.3.15. Utilising the latest data (at August 2016), existing information was assembled and collated into a Waste Facility Capacity Database, with each site allocated to managing one or more waste streams. Table 6 summarises the available capacity by stream and management function, which is assumed to be available for the duration of the plan unless information has been obtained from the operator indicating earlier closure.

Table 6: Estimated Annual Capacity Available from Licensed Operational Waste Management Facilities within Kirklees

	Transfer station	Recycling (MRF)	Recycling (special)	Treatment	Energy recovery	Land recovery	Landfill
LACW only	252, 962	32, 497			132,000		
LACW + C&I							
C&I only	9	78,451	3,246	6,352			
C&I + CD&E	61,736	37,214	24,389	65,494			
CD&E only	16,980						
E only						98,336	
Hazardous	1,266	3,012	67,368	24,786			

[Source: Kirklees Waste Needs Assessment model August 2016.]

⁹ The work distinguishes between Materials Recycling Facilities that accept and separate a range of mixed wastes, and specialised facilities that only manage certain types of material. Virtually all the latter type of local capacity is located in metal recycling sites and vehicle dismantlers with Kirklees containing a considerable surplus of both in common with many other local authorities. At the same time there may be a shortfall of capacity for recycling LACW and C&I wastes, but such specialised sites lack facilities for handling these materials and therefore any surplus of this type of capacity must not be traded against a shortfall of other capacity as there is no scope for this to happen.

4.3.16. The modelling process calculates the total available capacity for particular types of waste management sites and matches this to the arisings which can be managed through these sites. The process involves the following stages:

- For each stream or combination of streams the amount of capacity available for each management route is summed (eg. the amount of recycling capacity available to handle LACW and C&I wastes);
- The chosen Growth Modifier scenario (see Table 2) is used to forecast the change in arisings over the Plan period
- The chosen Behaviour Modifier scenario (see Table 3) is used to distribute the quantity of arisings between the different management routes reflecting the relative levels of recycling, recovery and disposal that are assumed;
- The available capacity is subtracted from the forecast quantity of waste that will need to be managed and the result indicates whether there is a gap or a surplus of capacity.

4.3.17. The model cannot show capacity surpluses or gaps for any single site or waste stream unless there is only one site entered in the model which is designated to take only one category of waste. In all other cases figures identify the total available capacity for the waste management type across all sites. The model has been designed to assume that all available waste management capacity is used to manage waste arising in Kirklees and no allowance is made for the use of capacity at merchant sites to accept wastes from outside the Authority.

5. Potential Capacity Gaps in 2031

- 5.1.1. The model allows the results of modelling all 12 scenario options as defined in the previous chapter to be used to assess future capacity requirements. At the time of writing this report no decision has been taken on which scenario the KLP would aim to deliver. This chapter documents and summarises the gap analysis for the scenarios.
- 5.1.2. The model projects capacity gaps across each of the modelling scenarios for the period 2016-2031. The detailed results of the requirements for each waste management route are set out in Appendix 4 and a summary of the position at the end of the Plan period is shown in Table 7. These three scenarios are presented as they represent the least and most extensive changes from the current position and the impact of choosing a median recycling option. Note that negative figures in the tables and figures below, and those in Appendix 4, identify capacity surpluses.
- 5.1.3. Table 7 also distinguishes between the EfW capacity available if the plant closes when planned, or if it continues to operate as referred to in Table 4.

Table 7: Capacity Gap Comparison for the Scenarios Modelling the Least and Most Extensive Changes in Requirements by 2031

Waste Management Route & Wastes	Baseline / No Growth 2031	Growth 4 Maximised Recycling / Recovery 2031	Growth 3 Median/Recovery
Landfill (C+I)	101,515	44,307	48,957
Landfill (LACW)	16,140	12,701	12,394
Landfill (Hazardous)	6,386	7,103	7,289
Landfill (C+D&E)	-19,327	-60,189	-66,636
Thermal treatment with energy recovery ('Energy from waste') + Thermal Treatment (without energy recovery)	-19,600	-3,009	37,187
Recycling (C+I, & Agricultural)	88, 678	172,653	156,835

Recycling (LACW only)	37,936	126,154	98,551
Recycling (C+D)	71,531	137,283	113,639
Recycling (metals only)	- 38,227	- 32,950	- 31,115
Recycling (Hazardous)	17,706	19,049	19,670
Composting	15,406	19,487	19,017
Treatment plant	-84,612	-81,293	-81,034
Other treatment plant / transfer (Hazardous / C&I)	27,438	22,144	61,308
Land Recovery	-58,321	-55,286	-55,902

[Source: Kirklees Waste Needs Assessment model May 2016. All figures in tonnes – negative figures indicate capacity surpluses]

6. Future Requirements

6.1. Introduction

6.1.1. This section of the report sets out the future requirements for each of the principal waste streams in turn, setting out:

- Current arisings and capacity of existing facilities;
- Capacity of additional facilities that will be required to deal with forecast future arisings¹⁰.

6.1.2. This aspect of the assessment can now also inform the Council's review of the strategy for managing residual LACW once the current PFI contract has ended.

6.2. Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW)

6.2.1. The collection and management of LACW across Kirklees is the responsibility of Kirklees Council as statutory Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Authority. LACW includes some "trade waste" which the council collects from businesses and other organisations. For the purpose of modelling and the waste needs assessment this material has been deducted from LACW as it is already captured under C&I waste management. For modelling purposes LACW has been further separated as LACW (H) (waste collected from households) and LACW (Other) (non-household wastes such as street sweepings) to allow assessment against the Waste Framework Directive recycling target (50% by 2020) which applies only to waste collected from households. The secondary waste by-products created from the first stage EfW recovery process have been further included as LACW (Secondary). The term residual waste refers to the waste that cannot be or is not separated for recycling or composting. The Council currently diverts most of its residual waste away from landfill through the waste disposal contract with Sita Kirklees Ltd (formerly Sita), principally through the Huddersfield EfW Plant.

¹⁰ The summary of the LACW stream includes a specific section reviewing future arisings due to the importance attached to understanding the implications of continued operation of the EfW facility and requirements for other infrastructure beyond the end of the PFI contract.

LACW: Current Arisings, Facilities and Management Mix

- 6.2.2. In 2014/5 arisings of LACW (H) totalled 160,974 tonnes with a further 17,400 tonnes of LACW(Other) and 27,734 tonnes of LACW (secondary). Therefore the total quantity of LACW waste was 206,108 representing 23% of all waste arisings in the Plan area¹¹.
- 6.2.3. As stated above, Kirklees currently relies on the EfW facility at Huddersfield as the primary method of disposing of residual LACW and at present the plant currently handles a total of 102,395 tonnes of LACW(H) and LACW(Other)).
- 6.2.4. Mixed recyclables are handled at the dedicated Materials Recycling Facility in Huddersfield and the Thornhill integrated Waste Management Facility in Dewsbury. In 2014 33,725 tonnes were recycled at these two sites with separated wastes sent to third party-operated reprocessing plants outside the Plan area. Some materials that require more specialised recycling (eg. batteries) are taken to other reprocessing sites operated by Suez (Sita's parent company) which serve several regions and which are located outside the authority.
- 6.2.5. There are no operational non-hazardous landfill sites in Kirklees (although one site Laneside Quarry Landfill was permitted until the end of 2015 to accept such material) and as a result any residual waste that cannot be sent for energy recovery is currently exported out of the Plan area. Currently the main export routes are to landfills in Scunthorpe, Wakefield and Leeds, however it is understood that from 2015 all waste will start to go to Skelton Grange landfill in Leeds. In 2014/15 the quantity of LACW(H) disposed to landfill was 15,236 tonnes.
- 6.2.6. There is a single site in Huddersfield that has a composting pad and which has permission to compost green waste. However the PFI contractor currently sends around 13,588 tonnes of material to a facility in Wakefield and the capacity gap assessment assumes this arrangement will continue in the foreseeable future.

LACW: Future Arisings

- 6.2.7. Table 8 summarises an analysis of the LACW capacity gap for all management routes for four combinations of growth and management scenarios covering the range of

¹¹ Further to the comment in the previous paragraph, the quantity of trade waste collected in 2014/15 and deducted from total LACW arisings was 25,147 tonnes.

possible outcomes. It also allows comparison of the impact of closure of the EfW facility in 2028 and if it remains in operation subsequently.

6.2.8. Table 8 shows that while the Growth 2, 3 and 4 scenarios would result in greater landfill diversion rates, the limited quantity of certain local capacity results in a corresponding increase in the capacity gap for facilities for recycling LACW(H) including a small amount of inert waste in that stream.

Table 8: Table 8: Comparison of the LACW (H) and LACW (Other) Capacity Gaps

Scenarios:	Behaviour	Baseline	Med. Recycling	Med Recycling	Max. Recycling
	Growth	No Growth	Growth 2	Growth 3	Growth 4
Recycling (LACW)	2016	37,936	52,253	52,498	60,288
	2020	37,936	72,919	73,636	93,673
	2031	37,936	96,287	98,551	126,154
	2036	37,936	108,676	111,855	143,695
Recycling (Metals)	2016	2,223	2,385	2,392	2,401
	2020	2,223	2,585	2,602	2,627

Scenarios:	Behaviour	Baseline	Med. Recycling	Med Recycling	Max. Recycling
	Growth	No Growth	Growth 2	Growth 3	Growth 4
	2031	2,223	3,226	3,283	3,364
	2036	2,223	3,568	3,648	3,764
Composting	2016	13,588	14,246	14,287	14,346
	2020	13,588	14,974	15,076	15,219
	2031	13,588	18,689	19,017	19,487
	2036	13,588	20,671	21,135	21, 805
EfW to 2028	2016	- 28,345	-27,244	26,940	-33,973
	2020	- 28,345	-27,732	-27,025	-45,048
	2031	103,655	129,917	132,197	111,105
	2036	103,655	143,587	146,814	124,212
EfW to 2031	2016	- 28,345	-27,244	-26,940	-33,973
	2020	- 28,345	-27,732	-27,025	-45,048
	2031	-28,345	-2,083	197	-20,895
	2036	-28,345	11,587	14,814	-7788

Scenarios:	Behaviour	Baseline	Med. Recycling	Med Recycling	Max. Recycling
	Growth	No Growth	Growth 2	Growth 3	Growth 4
Landfill	2016	15,677	13,487	13,527	13,581
	2020	15,677	9,822	9,888	9,982
	2031	15,677	12,180	12,394	12,701
	2036	15,677	13,436	13,738	14,174

[Source: Kirklees Waste Needs Assessment model May 2016 – all figures in tonnes; negative values identify where there is a capacity surplus]

LACW: Required Facilities – Energy Recovery

6.2.9. The modelling scenarios assume that the existing energy recovery facility with a capacity of 132,000 tonnes will be available until 2028 and a further modelling exercise examines the effect of extended operations to 2036. Current operations allocate this capacity for managing LACW only and the assessment therefore assumes that any spare capacity that may be identified would not be available for energy recovery of residual C&I wastes.

6.2.10. Two other assumptions about EfW capacity should be noted:

- the capacity shown above reflects the maximum throughput reported over the period 2010-2014 and is therefore considered to be a realistic estimate of what can be accepted once the effect of partial closure for periodic scheduled maintenance is taken into account;
- it is expected that the plant will need to be refurbished if it continues operation beyond 2028 though it is not known whether this would result in a change in capacity. The model assumes the capacity referred to above would continue to be available throughout the extended operating period.

6.2.11. If the EfW plant closes in 2028, under the No growth/Baseline scenario combination there will be a shortfall of capacity of over 100,000 tonnes (103,655 tonnes at 2031) annually for the remainder of the Plan period, and under Growth 4 /maximised recycling combination this gap increases 33,900 tonnes in 2016 to 111,105 tonnes by 2031.

Under median recycling, growth 2 if the plant closes by 2028, there will be a shortfall by 2031 of 129,917 tonnes. If the Efw plant is not continued then the plan will need to address this gap.

6.2.12. This aspect of the assessment can now inform the Council's review of the strategy for managing residual LACW once the current PFI contract has ended.

LACW: Required Facilities – Recycling

6.2.13. The requirement for additional recycling capacity to achieve net self sufficiency increases over the plan period in all of the growth scenarios. The gap at primary processing facilities increases from 60,288 to 143,695 tonnes over the Plan period by 2036 under the Growth4/Maximum recycling scenario combination, under Growth 3/Median recycling the requirements rise from 52,498 in 2016 to 111,855 tonnes in 2036.

6.2.14. However it is important to recognise that recycling is a multi-stage process and the current assessment can only assess requirements for the initial stage of separating materials, whether this occurs at MRFs or HWRCs. The separated material requires further downstream capacity to reprocess it into secondary products and at present this activity occurs outside Kirklees. As recyclate comes from both LACW and C&I sources and from a wide geographic range of sources the delivery of new capacity locally will depend on whether it is commercially attractive to private waste contractors and it is not clear that the Plan can provide for these facilities specifically. Any continued reliance on external capacity has implications for matters the Council needs to address with respect to the Duty to Cooperate.

6.2.15. Additional non-inert capacity may be provided by expansion of the existing facilities however this will depend on the approach taken by the current PFI contractor. The small scale of the inert capacity gap and the current quantity of arisings suggests these materials will be handled at merchant sites locally or in other authorities, or that the contractor is moving them to a centralised facility outside Kirklees.

LACW: Required Facilities – Landfill

6.2.16. Even though all the Growth scenarios result in falling levels of landfill disposal there will still be a shortfall throughout the Plan period due to a lack of local capacity. The shortfalls for disposal of LACW(H) and LACW(other)) wastes fall from 15,677 tonnes

tonnes under the baseline position to 9,888 tonnes (median Recycling/Growth 3) by 2020 and 13,738 tonnes by 2036 as a result of the assumptions of continued growth in arisings under each scenario.

6.3. Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Waste

6.3.1. There have been no specific surveys of C&I waste arisings in Kirklees and therefore the quantities of C&I waste arisings have been extrapolated from a survey of this stream in the North West region as it is geographically close to Kirklees and data is published in sufficient detail with respect to the number, size and sector distribution of businesses to allow the results to be extrapolated to the Plan area.

C&I Waste: Current Arisings, Facilities and Management

6.3.2. Industrial waste makes up 54% of C&I arisings with the principal sources being Textiles / Wood / Paper / Publishing (27%), Other Manufacturing (25%) and Chemical and Non-metallic Minerals Manufacturing (23%). Commercial waste makes up 46% of C&I arisings with the main producing sectors being Retail and Wholesale, Other Services (i.e. banks, insurance, solicitors, service providers) and the Hotel and Catering sectors.

6.3.3. Combined C&I arisings at present amount to 362,000 tonnes of which around 32,000 tonnes is classified as hazardous waste.

6.3.4. Extrapolation of the NW survey results suggests of C&I waste, 65% is recycled (recycling tends to be higher in Industrial waste and this sector is more important in the NW and Yorks and Humber side than in the National average), 22% goes to landfill, 6% is managed by other treatment routes and it is not known how the other 7% is managed. Many of the existing waste management operations can treat more than one waste stream. However the facilities serving the PFI contract handle LACW only and therefore it is possible to identify the capacity available to manage C&I waste.

6.3.5. Currently there is estimated to be approximately 247,000 tonnes of capacity for recycling C&I wastes. However it should be recognised that some of these facilities also manage CD&E wastes with the respective quantities varying from year to year as the materials are normally managed under short-term contracts, making it difficult to establish requirements accurately.

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Transfer Stations

6.3.6. Waste transfer stations and bulking facilities provide a valuable component in the efficient management of waste materials though they do not contribute to recycling or recovery rates directly. They are particularly useful when waste arisings are relatively small in quantity and widely distributed within high density populated areas.

6.3.7. However, there is no certainty that transfer capacity is in the right location to serve future waste management needs and the Plan needs to be flexible up to a point, allowing additional facilities to come forward if it can be demonstrated that there are local shortages of capacity close to where waste arises.

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Recycling Facilities

6.3.8. The Baseline Scenario/no growth indicates that a gap of 88,678 tonnes in capacity appears for the baseline position and increases under all growth scenarios and with increased recycling. The gap becomes significant for C&I under both Growth options 2 and 4 when seeking to achieve the Maximised recycling scenario by 2031. Table 9 shows the growth in the capacity gap under this scenario combination.

Table 9: Capacity Gaps for Recycling C&I Waste Over the Plan Period*

Year	Baseline No Growth	Median Recycling Growth 2	Median Recycling Growth 3	Maximised Recycling Growth 4
2016	88,678	110,448	109,162	117,134
2021	88,678	133,350	131,202	148,865
2031	88,678	160,101	156,835	172,653

*Due to the nature of licensed waste management sites being able to treat both C&I and some agricultural wastes for (origin in this classification is not distinguished when reporting to the Environment Agency from sites) local knowledge has also been applied to aid separation of LACW wastes.

[Source: Kirklees waste needs assessment model, August 2016]

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Composting

6.3.9. The summary of LACW capacity requirements refers to a single site in Kirklees that is equipped and permitted to compost green waste. This facility has never been in service

and is operated by the PFI contractor which currently makes alternative arrangements using capacity outside Kirklees. It is unlikely this site will open for this purpose or that the capacity would be available to manage similar waste in the C&I stream.

- 6.3.10. Around 2,600 tonnes of C&I waste is currently composted. All modelling scenarios based on increase recycling performance also assume a proportionate increase until around 2020, then this requirement tapers out by 2031.. This level of requirement is typical of a small-scale green waste composting facility and suggests it would be realistic for the Plan to make provision for such a facility to come forward and reduce dependence on external capacity.

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Specialised Recycling

- 6.3.11. Modelling shows a surplus capacity for this type of facility throughout the Plan period under all scenario combinations though there are small differences in the size of the surplus (between 31,115 and 38,227 tonnes). Therefore no further capacity is needed to manage local wastes

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Treatment

- 6.3.12. Treatment includes a wide range of processes that may be required to deal with specific materials prior to recycling, energy recovery or final disposal. There is a current surplus of some 81,000 tonnes capacity within Kirklees throughout the entire Plan period. It is expected this will primarily be available to treat C&I wastes as the management route for LACW is determined by the terms of the PFI contract until 2023.

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Energy from Waste

- 6.3.13. Existing energy recovery capacity is dedicated to managing LACW through the PFI contract and, as stated previously, the assessment assumes there is no spare overhead available to manage locally arising C&I waste.
- 6.3.14. The baseline position suggests that a small proportion of C&I waste is currently going to thermal treatment with or without energy recovery. Even under the median recycling and maximum growth assumptions which create the highest demand for energy recovery, the requirement would be around 31,000 tonnes and would account for around 8% of arisings. This situation is likely to reflect the existing high level of recycling

which leaves only a moderate amount of residual waste, much of which may be unsuitable for this form of treatment.

6.3.15. This quantity is too small to make a local facility economically viable unless it serves a wider market. Published reports suggest the UK currently has a surplus of operational or planned EfW capacity. Therefore there would be limited incentive to bring forward additional capacity locally. It will be necessary to continue relying on capacity in other authorities.

C&I Waste Required Facilities: Non-Hazardous Landfill

6.3.16. There is a single landfill (Laneside Quarry) permitted to accept non-hazardous waste but it has only accepted inert waste in the past and this was due to close in 2015, however there was still over 600,000CM³ of void space available at the end of 2014. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this study the capacity it offers has been taken into account in the very early years of the Plan period while the site remains open.

6.3.17. Closure of the site will create a capacity gap of over 100,000 tonnes from 2016, rising to around 114,000 tonnes under the highest growth option by 2031 if there is no further improvement in recycling performance. Note that while further improvement could be envisaged for LACW in order to work towards EU and national targets, the high existing level of diversion of C&I wastes suggests the existing level may be a more accurate reflection of capacity needs in the longer term. In contrast the higher recycling performance assumed for the Growth 4/Maximised Recycling scenario combination would reduce the capacity shortfall to around 44,000 tonnes by 2031 and under Growth3/Median Recycling the requirement would be around 49,000 tonnes.

6.3.18. The fate of the site cannot be judged at this time. However if it was granted a further operational extension and if it began to take non-hazardous waste then the capacity gap of 100,000 tonnes would not materialise until 2026. However if higher recycling performance is achieved the shortfall would be around 48,000 tonnes from 2026 assuming not growth.

6.3.19. Given the previous history of this site it appears unlikely to expect that the operator would begin to take biodegradable waste, not least because of the complications this would entail in minimising environmental impacts, some of which should not arise while it takes inert waste only. As a result the Council will need to assume that disposal of

residual C&I waste will continue to depend on external capacity and it will need to take appropriate steps to contact receiving authorities to establish that capacity will continue to be available through the Plan period.

6.4. Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) Waste

6.4.1. Waste materials generated from Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) operations include surplus waste construction materials as well as a range of materials generated by the demolition of buildings and soils and sub-soils from excavation. Most of these materials are inert with respect to their pollution potential though small quantities of materials containing gypsum or asbestos, or that have been contaminated by previous land uses, are classified as hazardous waste.

CD&E Waste: Current Arisings, Facilities & Management

6.4.2. Kirklees at present has significant capacity for managing inert C&D and excavation wastes. This is primarily in the form of landfill capacity, though there is some treatment plant, recycling and transfer facilities.

6.4.3. Data published by the Environment Agency suggests that around 65,000 tonnes of C&D waste and 225,000 tonnes of excavation waste was produced in Kirklees in 2014. Around 61% of C&D and 85% of excavation waste arising locally was also managed locally. C&D waste that arose locally and was then exported went mainly to treatment facilities (21,119 tonnes or 83% of exported C&D waste) while 72% of locally arising excavation waste went to landfill, reclamation and land recovery.

6.4.4. The current management mix for C&D wastes is 49% transfer facilities, 37% treatment, 8% inert landfill, 5% recycling, and 1% through household waste recycling facilities. Current management mix for excavation wastes (2014) are 34% landfill, hazardous landfill 3%, 24% reclamation, 16% land recovery, 21% transfer station (non hazardous) and 2% through household waste recycling facilities.

6.4.5. In both cases these figures may disguise potentially higher rates of recycling or other diversion from landfill. Current requirements mean that some wastes managed or re-used at source go unreported however such practice makes no use of capacity at third party-provided facilities that the Plan may need to provide for. Therefore the figures

above are a reasonable estimate of the current position recognising the limitations of the data sources.

CD&E Waste Required Facilities: Transfer Stations

- 6.4.6. Waste transfer stations and bulking facilities often provide a valuable component in the transfer and bulking of CD&E waste materials. There is a surplus of such capacity over the whole Plan period, reflecting a situation common with other authorities.

CD&E Waste Required Facilities: Recycling

- 6.4.7. There is a shortfall of capacity for recycling of CD&E materials over the whole Plan period. The baseline situation (change in requirement driven by arisings growth only not by increased recycling performance) suggests a gap of almost 86,383 tonnes (growth 1/baseline situation) at 2031. This figure increases assumed by the growth 4/ maximised recycling scenario combination and reaches 137,283 tonnes by 2031.
- 6.4.8. Several local sites that may be capable of handling CD&E wastes are classified as transfer stations as this was their original function. Recycling provides operators with an additional revenue stream and is therefore a logical diversification of use at these locations. Experience from other needs assessment studies suggests they can contribute a potentially significant amount of additional recycling capacity that is hidden from the current analysis.
- 6.4.9. The Council may wish to undertake further research to identify whether any local sites are contributing extra recycling capacity which may reduce or possibly eliminate the gaps identified above. Note that this issue also applies to the C&I stream as many of these facilities manage both C&I and CD&E wastes though it may be difficult to establish the respective quantities and the implications for the individual capacity gaps.
- 6.4.10. The only means of recycling Excavation waste is through re-use of the material in landscaping development sites, engineering and restoration of landfill sites or minerals workings. Provision of future capacity lies outside the scope of the Plan because it will be dictated to a large extent by the scale and timing of development and regeneration activities that may require this material, both of which are unpredictable. It should also be noted that Excavation wastes extracted and re-used at source are not reported and therefore the 'capacity' (actually the demand for this material) will arise elsewhere in Kirklees or in other authorities.

CD&E Waste Required Facilities: Landfill

6.4.11. Kirklees at present has significant capacity for managing inert C&D and excavation wastes through existing landfill capacity throughout the plan period for all scenarios.

6.5. Hazardous Waste

6.5.1. Materials are classified as hazardous if they have characteristics that make them harmful to human health, or to the environment, either immediately or over an extended period of time. Such wastes require specialised handling during movement and management and usually arise in small quantities at sites spread over a wide area. As a result a network of specialised facilities has evolved to process the UK's hazardous wastes, with sites typically serving regional or national catchments.

Hazardous Waste: Current Arisings, Facilities & Management

6.5.2. A total of 32,537 tonnes of hazardous waste was recorded as arising in Kirklees in 2014 with 7,669 tonnes of these materials being managed locally as shown in Table 10. This is a reduction of 8% from the 2013 HWDI reports of 35,390 tonnes of hazardous waste arisings in Kirklees and a reduction of the amount of Kirklees arisings being managed locally, 23% (25%, 9,001 tonnes of materials being managed locally in 2013).

6.5.3. The principal local management capacity is in the form of two landfill sites. The Bradley Park landfill has shown an increase in the disposal of hazardous waste from 2013 to 2014 data (92,000 tonnes in 2013 and 104,000 tonnes in 2014), whilst the hazardous waste accepted at Thornhill Quarry, recorded as asbestos waste, has increased by 1000 tonnes (7000 tonnes in 2013 and 8000 tonnes in 2014).

6.5.4. There is also a small amount of transfer station capacity and a modest amount of treatment capacity (around 17,000 tonnes). The latter is specialised and is discussed below in the section on agricultural wastes.

6.5.5. Landfill disposal accounted for 86% of wastes that arose and were managed locally, which is unsurprising given the availability of this capacity and limited facilities for other management methods. Over 60% of local wastes that were exported were treated or recovered with the quantity being almost four times that landfilled locally. These figures

suggest local management of hazardous wastes conforms well to the Waste Hierarchy even if there is a dependence on external capacity.

Hazardous Waste Required Facilities: Landfill

- 6.5.6. The existing landfills mean that Kirklees is a net importer of hazardous wastes and the limited demand for capacity means there is no requirement during most of the Plan period.
- 6.5.7. However both facilities have time-limited permissions and it is not known whether applications to extend operations will be sought or granted. The projected capacity shortage following closure of both facilities is limited, ranging from just over 6,000 tonnes to just over 7,000, tonnes.
- 6.5.8. If no further time extension is possible it will be necessary to use facilities in other authorities unless additional local sites can be identified. However the implications of closure will probably be greater for other authorities that make use of these sites.

Hazardous Waste Required Facilities: Treatment & Recovery

- 6.5.9. The details above indicate the level of reliance on external capacity to treat and/or recover local hazardous wastes and this situation is unlikely to change significantly over the Plan period. As explained previously, the small quantities and diverse management requirements for handling these wastes mean that local facilities handling only small quantities of waste are unlikely to be economically viable. Consequently the KLP cannot make specific provision for such facilities though it might identify any allocated sites that might be suitable for this use in the event that a future planning application is submitted.
- 6.5.10. Instead the priority is to contact those Waste Planning Authorities receiving hazardous waste from Kirklees in order to establish whether they are aware of any foreseeable changes which may affect the availability of capacity over the Plan period, and in order that the Council complies with its obligations under the Duty to Cooperate. The accompanying Part 1 report on this study identifies the authorities that received local wastes in 2014 and the quantities involved.

6.6. Agricultural Waste

- 6.6.1. Agricultural premises are defined in the Agriculture Act 1947 as land used for: horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, livestock breeding and keeping,

grazing land, meadow land, osier land (growing willow), market gardens and nursery grounds. It should be noted that accurate assessment of arisings and management methods is hampered by the lack of current data, with the principal sources used to calibrate these estimate being from 2001 and 2003.

Agricultural Waste: Current Arisings, Facilities & Management

- 6.6.2. There are 856 farm holdings in Kirklees which are estimated to generate almost 586,000 tonnes of waste. However over 99% of this material comprises organic by-products (e.g. waste milk, slurry) that is spread or buried on the farm where arises, while other material such as waste straw, wood, etc. is either re-used, buried or burned at source. As a result only 4,166 tonnes of these wastes are estimated to require external, off-farm capacity and to fall within the scope of capacity planning that the Plan needs to address.
- 6.6.3. Most of the material leaving the holdings is either incinerated or recycled. The majority of the former occurs at specialised facilities in order to comply with Animal By-Products legislation. The waste involved falls within the category of hazardous waste and again this means treatment capacity is specialised, centralised, and typically serves a national catchment. Residual waste suitable for recycling typically comprises wood, glass, paper, etc. It is therefore indistinguishable from parts of the C&I stream and managed at the same facilities, albeit in much smaller quantities.

Agricultural Waste: Required Facilities

- 6.6.4. The future projections assume no growth in arisings or significant change in agricultural practices have occurred since the original surveys were undertaken or that such changes will not occur over the Plan period. Such changes are considered to be unlikely. Any facilities to manage off site recycling and hazardous landfill would only be economically viable if larger quantities of these wastes arose locally and, as stated above, recyclable wastes can be managed at the same sites as C&I waste.
- 6.6.5. Capacity for specialised treatment is already available locally at facilities in Dewsbury (storage and rendering) and Huddersfield (high temperature incineration) and it is not anticipated that additional capacity will be needed.

6.7. Low Level Radioactive Waste

Arisings and Required Facilities

- 6.7.1. Information provided by the EA shows that a single site within the Plan area generates these wastes in very small quantities. The emissions are sufficiently harmless and in liquid form which enables their safe disposal to foul sewer along with other non-hazardous wastes.
- 6.7.2. Given the limited number of sources and quantity and nature of material involved there does not appear to be a requirement to provide any specialised facilities for managing low-level wastes within the Plan area.
- 6.7.3. Local disposal also implies the Council does not need to check on the availability of capacity in other authorities. However it should be noted that the EA no longer reports the quantities and sources of these arisings and it may be prudent for the Council to consider a future, small-scale survey of potential local sources of these materials to check that the current situation has not changed, and to take appropriate action if it has.

6.8. Waste Water / Sewage Sludge

Arisings and Required Facilities

- 6.8.1. Relevant waste water infrastructure falls into two categories: waste water treatment works (WWTWs) which process materials delivered by foul sewer, and sewage sludge treatment works (SSTWs) that treat semi-liquid treatment residues. In addition to a network of the former, a single SSTW operates within the Plan area.
- 6.8.2. The quantity of arisings is largely immaterial for the Plan insofar as treatment separates purified liquids (discharged to controlled waters) from residual sludge for which there are a number of disposal options (landfill, land spreading following decontamination in a sludge treatment works, or incineration). The choice of management methods lies with the statutory local undertaker: Yorkshire Water. Of these methods only landfill disposal has implications for the waste management capacity needs addressed by this study, but this material is already included as part of the C&I waste stream.
- 6.8.3. The key issue for the Plan is whether land will be needed outside the curtilage of existing WWTWs and SSWs to provide the additional capacity to meet future demand as a result of housing growth and industrial activity in the Plan area.

6.8.4. Recent discussions between Kirklees Council and Yorkshire Water have identified a need for infrastructure improvements at treatment facilities serving the Meltham and Clayton West areas. No date for the implementation of increased capacity has been identified as yet and both parties remain in discussion to determine the timing and whether any additional land take will be needed.

7. CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS

7.1. Principal Conclusions

7.1.1. Chapter 6 provides detailed commentary on the findings of this study and its implications for the capacity that the KLP will need to provide for with regard to future waste management capacity. The principal conclusions from the capacity assessment – in terms of the need for extra facilities - are as summarised below, recognising that the requirements vary depending on the choice of growth and landfill diversion assumptions that are used. These points focus on the maximum capacity requirement that has been identified.

- A significant amount of additional capacity is needed for managing recycle LACW (60,288 tonnes in 2016 rising to 93,673 tonnes by 2020 and 126,154 tonnes by 2030 if the highest levels of recycling are achieved and assumed highest growth (scenario growth4/maximised recycling).
- The existing EfW plant provides adequate capacity until such time as it closes (although there is a tiny shortfall of approximately 3000 tonnes at 2031 assuming the highest growth and maximised recycling/recovery (Growth 4/max recycling/recovery). If this occurs during the Plan period (in 2028) it will result in a capacity gap of around 100,000 tonnes over the rest of the Plan period.
- There is no operational green waste composting capacity at present and components of the LACW and C&I streams are managed outside Kirklees. The former occurs within the terms of the PFI contract but it would be prudent for the Kirklees Local Plan to provide for a small merchant facility to address the latter gap.
- Substantial increase in the recycling rate for C&I waste could lead to a capacity gap of up to 100,000 tonnes by the end of the Plan period if the highest levels of recycling are realised, this would be reduced to around 83,000 tonnes under Growth 3/Median recycling. Some of this capacity may be available at sites that are currently identified as transfer stations and this may warrant further survey to establish whether this is available or whether the Plan will need to provide land for further facilities.
- Local EfW capacity is assumed to be dedicated to managing LACW. The estimated high level of existing recycling performance for C&I wastes results in a correspondingly low requirement for additional EfW and treatment capacity. The requirement for the former is around 31,000 tonnes by 2031 and it is unlikely this is sufficient to make an additional facility economically viable. Consequently it will be necessary to rely on external capacity in the future.

- There is a permanent shortage of non-hazardous landfill capacity for the disposal of residual LACW and C&I waste. The maximum requirements are for 10,000 tonnes and 114,000 tonnes respectively, with the former reflecting the existing high level of landfill diversion.
- The capacity shortfall for recycling CD&E wastes is substantial, rising from 65,000 tonnes to 95,000 under the highest performance assumptions and just under 74,000 tonnes under Growth 3/Median recycling. However, as with C&I wastes, some of this shortfall may be available already at sites currently categorised as transfer stations. It may be prudent to undertake further review of their waste management functions in order that the Plan does not over-provide this capacity if it is greater than currently estimated.
- The capacity shortfall for recycling CD&E wastes is substantial, rising from 99,897 tonnes in 2016 under the highest performance assumptions (highest growth 4 assumed and maximum recycling scenario assumed) to 137,283 tonnes by 2031. This reduces slightly under Growth 3/median recycling at 2016 by 88,182 tonnes and by 2031 to 113,639 tonnes. However, as with C&I wastes, some of this shortfall may be available already at sites currently categorised as transfer stations. It may be prudent to undertake further review of their waste management functions in order that the Plan does not over-provide this capacity if it is greater than currently estimated.
- Three quarters of locally-produced hazardous wastes are exported to management facilities in other authorities due to a lack of local capacity. This situation is commonplace due to the specialised nature of the materials and how they must be managed and consequently most authorities rely on capacity at external facilities that are part of a network of sites with regional or national catchments. The Plan can continue to rely on this approach provided the Council continues to check the availability of this external capacity with the authorities where the facilities are located.
- A small shortfall in hazardous landfill capacity will occur towards the end of the Plan period once both of the sites currently operating have closed. This situation may require reliance on external capacity unless operations can be extended at one or both of these sites.

7.1.2. Otherwise the Plan area is well-served by transfer station capacity, specialised recycling facilities (eg. those handling metal wastes), and voidspace at inert and hazardous landfills. Existing disposal and recycling arrangements for agricultural and low-level radioactive wastes are not expected to require additional capacity during the Plan period.

Next Steps

- 7.1.3. The information presented in this report is based on the best available data as at September 2016 when the principal analysis was undertaken.
- 7.1.4. If Kirklees is to become net self-sufficient in managing its waste then it will need to consider the implications and requirements of the modelling scenarios and select an appropriate scenario to identify the capacity gap and plan for future waste facilities in Kirklees.
- 7.1.5. Based on the findings of this study, the Council will need to identify sites/areas suitable to accommodate new waste management facilities to address the identified gaps. The number of sites and land area required cannot be established at this time and the next step will be to review the implications of the different analyses and to select the combination of Growth and Behaviour scenarios that defines the level of waste management performance the Council will aim to deliver through the KLP within the context of also meeting its statutory and non-statutory targets.
- 7.1.6. Assessment is not a one-off exercise and it will be prudent to re-assess capacity of existing sites periodically – as well as checking whether any new facilities have come forward in the interim – in order to assess the implications of both for the meeting the needs identified by this study.
- 7.1.7. Some capacity gaps result from a lack of local facilities and may persist because waste contractors will continue to take wastes to sites outside Kirklees rather than bringing forward new local capacity. This situation currently applies to green waste composting, reprocessing of separated recyclables into secondary products, and landfill disposal of non-hazardous waste. Detail on the destination and quantity of wastes involved has been provided in the Part 1 report.
- 7.1.8. In such circumstances, the Council should make contact with those Waste Planning Authorities receiving waste from Kirklees in order to establish whether they are aware of any changes which may affect the availability of external capacity over the life of the Plan. Again, this is not a one-off process and will need to be reviewed periodically.
- 7.1.9. Any loss of access to external capacity will increase certain existing capacity gaps, or create new ones where the current assessment assumes reliance on external facilities

will persist and this will need to be reflected in site allocations for future waste capacity included in the KLP.

Glossary of Terms

Acronym	Term	Definition
AD	Anaerobic Digestion	A process where biodegradable material is encouraged to break down in the absence of oxygen. Material is placed into a closed vessel and in controlled conditions the waste breaks down to produce a mixture of carbon dioxide, methane and solids/liquids known as digestate which can be used for fertiliser, compost or Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF)
APCRs	Air Pollution Control Residues	Bi-product produced from treatment of wastes through an energy from waste plant
C&I	Commercial and Industrial Waste	Waste generated by shops, offices, factories and other businesses and industry
-	Composting	A biological process which takes place in the presence of oxygen in which organic wastes, such as garden and kitchen waste, are converted into a stable, granular material. This can be applied to land to improve soil structure and enrich nutrient content.
CD&E	Construction Demolition and Excavation Waste	Controlled waste arising from the construction, repair, maintenance and demolition of buildings and structures.
EfW	Energy from Waste	The controlled high temperature burning of waste. 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) which is usually referred to as combined heat and power (CHP).
ELV	End of Life Vehicle	Motor vehicles that fall into the category of 'waste' as defined by the EU Waste Directive.
EA	Environment Agency	Agency which regulates waste management activities by issuing waste management licenses and other permits and exemptions. The EA also conducts national surveys of waste arising and waste facilities.
GVA	Gross Value Added	A measure of the value of the goods and services produced in the economy.
-	Hazardous waste	A sub category of all waste streams, where the material produced is hazardous and requires specialist treatment
-	Inert waste	Inert waste is waste that does not undergo significant physical, chemical or biological changes following disposal and does not adversely affect other matters that it may come into contact with, and does not endanger surface or groundwater.

Acronym	Term	Definition
-	Landfill	Restoration of land (for example, a former quarry) using waste.
-	Land recovery	The restoration of land using inert waste to enable the land to be used for a new purpose.
LACW	Local Authority Collected Waste	Previously known as municipal waste, LACW refers to all waste collected by a Local Authority.
LACW(H)	Local Authority Collected Waste Household	Household waste collected by a Local Authority
LACW (Other)	Local Authority Collected Waste other	Non-household waste collected by a Local Authority (such as street cleaning collection, rubble from household waste recycling sites).
LACW (Secondary)	Local Authority Collected Waste secondary	Secondary bi-products from initial treatment of LACW household waste through EfW producing metals, APCRs and bottom ash
LLW	Low level Radioactive Waste	Radioactive waste having a radioactive content not exceeding four GBq/te of alpha or 12 GBq/te of beta/gamma activity.
	Recycling	Turning waste into a new substance or product, includes composting if it meets quality protocols.
ROCs	Renewable Obligations Certificates	Green certificates issued to operators of accredited renewable generating stations for the eligible renewable electricity they generate.
SSTW	Sewage Sludge Treatment Works	Infrastructure providing initial treatment of material delivered by foul sewer from homes, businesses and the network draining the wider public realm.
	Thermal Treatment without energy recovery	Management of waste by incineration without use of facilities to capture heat given off for the purposes of energy recovery. Some facilities using this technology to manage LACW still exist while others involve very high temperature incineration due to the properties of specific wastes (ie.clinical, animal by-products and other hazardous wastes)
	Transfer/Transfer Station	Facility for receiving and 'bulking up' waste before its onward journey for treatment, recycling or disposal elsewhere.
	Treatment	Physical, chemical, biological or thermal waste management processes which change the characteristics of waste.

Acronym	Term	Definition
-	Waste facilities	Waste facilities include: Transfer stations Energy from Waste (Incineration with energy recovery) Recycling facility Treatment facility (e.g. mechanical biological or mechanical heat treatment) Household waste recycling centre Landfill/landraise Materials recovery facility
-	Waste streams	Waste streams include: LACW C&I CD&E Hazardous Agricultural LLW Waste Water/Sewage Sludge
-	Waste management routes	Waste management routes include: Recycling Composting (in vessel or open windrow) Treatment (recovery via thermal, physical, chemical or biological treatment) Landfill/landraise Transfer onwards to other waste management facility
WDI/HWDI	Waste Data Interrogator / Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator	Data tool prepared by the EA based on information provided by waste operators. It allows for assessments of strategic waste and general waste flow.
WEEE	Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment	Term used to describe old, end-of-life or discarded appliances using electricity.
WWTW	Waste Water Treatment Works	Infrastructure providing initial treatment of material delivered by foul sewer from homes, businesses and the network draining the wider public realm.