Review of Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan

Paper 1: Review of Policies and AMR Data

June 2025

HALTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

Knowsley Council

Liverpool City Council

St.Helens Council

Sefton Council

WIRRAL

Review of Policies and AMR Data for Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan

Introduction

1. Merseyside and Halton Authorities are required to undertake a 5 year review of the Merseyside and Halton Joint Waste Local Plan. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides advice on what authorities can consider when reviewing a plan.

2. Guidance documents recommend using evidence gathered through the annual monitoring process as part of any plan review. This report collates and analyses this data to inform whether a plan update may be required.

Method

3. Data gathered through the annual monitoring process since adoption has been used to consider the effectiveness of the Plan's policies in achieving the vision and objectives. This relates to the Waste Plan's AMRs for year 2013-14 through to 2019-2023.

4. The WLP sets out 16 policies and these each have a number of monitoring indicators that are relevant. Separate but linked to this are the SA monitoring indicators.

5. This review considers the implementation and effectiveness of the policies, the monitoring indicators and the SA monitoring indicators.

Policy Review Analysis

6. Table 1 shows analysis from each of the monitoring reports from 2013-14 through to 2019-2023. Percentages vary according to the number of applications received each year, so cannot been directly compared. A dialogue analysing each of the policies, its success in helping meet the objectives of the WLP, and difficulties come across during their application follows. The analysis concludes whether or not it is considered that the policy has worked and is fit for purpose for the remainder of the plan period.

<u>Policy WM1: Guide to Site Prioritisation</u>

7. Policy WM1 is considered one of the most important policies of the WLP and should be applied to all new applications for waste management facilities. It does not apply to existing waste management facilities which are being extended or upgraded which accounts for the variation in percentages across the monitoring period. During the early years following adoption of the WLP, there were more applications for new waste management facilities, subsequently there have been more applications for extension or improvement to existing facilities, so the policy has been applied less.

8. Between 2013-14 and 2017-18, this policy was applied fully but pragmatically. In 2018, an application for a waste transfer station was received which was subject to a Judicial Review (JR). The JR considered how policies WM1 and WM12 had been applied. The outcome of the JR was that it was considered policy WM1 had not been applied rigorously enough, with recommendations of how it should be applied going forward. With respect to policy WM12, this was found to have been applied consistently and this element of the JR was not upheld.

9. Subsequently, any applications to which policy WM1 has applied, has been required to provide significant information to demonstrate a rigorous assessment of the relevant criteria. **It is considered that policy WM1 remains an appropriate and effective means to screen all waste applications.**

Table 1: Percentage of times WLP Policies have been Applied to Waste Planning Applications Each Year Across the Monitoring Period.

Year/ Policy	2013-14 (8 apps)	2014-15 (9 apps)	2015-16 (13 apps)	2016-17 (8 apps)	2017-18 (8 apps)	2018-19 (12 apps)	2019-23 (17 apps)
WM1	100	56	38	50	25	25	29
WM2	13	33	23	63	0	17	18
WM3	38	22	31	63	0	17	35
WM4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WM5	75	44	46	50	25	17	29
WM6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
WM7	50	22	38	38	75	75	71
WM10	63	56	46	75	38	58	53
WM11	87	67	46	63	50	67	65
WM12	100	100	85	87	75	92	88
WM13	87	44	31	50	13	25	29
WM14	0	22	8	25	13	17	6
WM15	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
WM16	0	0	15	0	0	0	0

<u>Policy WM2 – Sub-regional Site Allocations</u>

10. There have been very few applications forthcoming on sites allocated for Sub-regional waste management uses. Early in the plan period there was an application on part of the sub-regional allocation in Knowsley. Permission was granted but subsequently lapsed. An application on part of the allocation in St Helens was for development ancillary to the waste use. No other applications for waste use have come forward.

11. The Knowsley sub-regional allocation is currently being marketed for non-waste use; however, it was anticipated at the time of adopting the WLP, that a large rail waste transfer station was likely to be built in Knowsley to accommodate

Merseyside Waste and Recycling Authorities Resource Recovery Contract. This being the case, any such facility would replace the need for that district's sub-regional allocation. This has been borne out, and therefore site K1 is technically not required for waste use, although currently still available.

12. The Wirral sub-regional allocation had a temporary permission as a laydown area for wind turbine parts at the time the WLP was adopted. This use is no longer taking place. There has been no interest in the site for waste use. The site has recently been subject to two applications. One for a warehouse which has taken up a small area of the site. Sufficient area remains for a sub-regional waste use should it be needed. However, temporary permission has been granted for open air storage on the remainder of the allocation.

13. Allocations H1 and L1 at the time of adoption had permissions for sub-regional size waste development. These permissions have now lapsed.

14. Allocations F1 and S1a are both occupied by existing waste operations, both with capacity and space to extend or enhance operations. An ancillary use has come forward during the plan period on S1a but no changes to the waste use.

15. **Although, there has been little interest in the sub-regional allocations, and some of the allocations are no longer available, sufficient allocations remain available should a significant sub-regional facility be needed during the remainder of the plan period. Furthermore, some of the contingency needs identified in Initial Needs Assessment have been met through increased capacity at existing facilities.**

Policy WM3: Allocations for District level Sites

16. There have been few waste applications forthcoming on sites allocated for District level waste management uses. Seven of the district sites were existing waste management facilities that had the potential for expansion or enhancement of operations. Six of these remain in waste use, the other is being used for a non-waste use now. Of the remaining 5 district-level sites, two remain available, the other 3 have alternative non-waste uses on site and are considered unavailable.

17. The most interest has related to the district level allocations in Sefton. Two of the Sefton allocations have been subject to applications Sefton (F2 and F4), both are existing waste facilities. One relates to improvements to the existing waste transfer station in addition to an anaerobic digestion facility. This permission hasn't been implemented yet but remains extant. The second is for an asphalt plant using recycled aggregate and is now operational.

18. **Whilst there has been little interest in the district sites, and some have been lost to other uses. There remain sufficient sites to serve district needs until the end of the plan period.**

Policy WM4: Allocations for Inert Landfill

19. Policy WM4 relates to inert landfill allocations. Both the allocations are now operational for inert waste. There have also been a number of applications which have involved the use of inert waste for beneficial use, such as restoration of former landfills resulting in environmental improvements. This has used at least a further 900,000 tonnes of inert waste and likely to be more.

20. Cronton Colliery had an environmental permit granted in April 2014 and began operating in August 2015. The permit allows for 100,000 tonnes per annum to be infilled although further clay extraction is expected to continue. All the clay has now been extracted and is stockpiled on site. The site has not filled as quickly as anticipated and there remains sufficient void to last beyond the plan period.

21. Bold Heath Quarry is also being infilled. Extraction of crushed sandstone has not been as fast as expected, and therefore there remains significant void space. This is likely to last for several years beyond the end of the plan period.

22. Improved recycling of inert waste and beneficial use elsewhere will have contributed to the slower filling of the inert landfills. This is a positive trend, as it moves waste up the waste hierarchy and leads to a more circular economy. Several applications during the plan period have been to use inert waste for enhanced restoration of historic landfill sites. **The inert waste allocations are sufficient to manage inert waste disposal requirements beyond the plan period.**

Policy WM5: Areas of Search for Additional Small-scale Waste Management Operations and Re-processing Facilities.

23. This policy has been applied numerous times throughout the plan period to date. Areas of search are considered as part of the site prioritisation policy WM1 and use of the policy equates to be between 17% and 75% of the applications across each monitoring period. The policy has proven to be important in determining waste applications.

24. The figures demonstrate that the right areas of search were allocated. Areas of search were chosen based on clustering of waste and other existing industrial uses amongst other criteria. The new waste sites that have come forward within areas of search are for a variety of different uses ranging from using cooking oil as a fuel to aggregate recycling and small waste transfer stations.

25. The areas of search are sufficiently large and spaced out to provide enough future waste sites for the duration of plan period, should they be needed.

Policy WM6: Additional HWRC Requirements

26. Policy WM6 relates specifically to the requirement for new household waste recycling centre (HWRC) within the City of Liverpool boundary. This was applied during 2013-14, and the new HWRC has been operational for several years.

27. As a consequence of forthcoming statutory duties, it is likely that further small-scale HWRCs may be required in the near future to help provide facility for increase separation of materials for recycling, re-use hubs etc. **Whilst the policy specifically relates to the need for a new facility within Liverpool, the principles and criteria of the policy could be applied to any future HWRC requirements. Therefore, for the time being is likely to be sufficient for the duration of the plan period, whilst recognising this is would probably be expanded to cover the whole plan area in the future.**

Policy WM7: Protecting Existing Waste Management Capacity for Built Facilities and Landfill.

28. Policy WM7 has been applied in two ways, both to ensure that consideration is given to any waste capacity lost and making sure any lost capacity has been made up for elsewhere. Secondly, it has been applied to applications for expansion and enhancement of existing waste management facilities, as this will help improve existing waste facilities and ensure sufficient waste capacity in the future.

29. Depending on the year, the policy has been used between 22% and 75%. It has been used more as the plan period has progressed, as there have been more applications for expansion and extension to existing waste facilities more recently compared to the start of the plan period where there were more applications for new waste management facilities.

30. **It is considered that policy WM7 remains useful and is a key policy for determining waste planning applications. It remains valid for the remainder of the plan period.**

Policy WM8: Waste Prevention and Resource Management

31. Policy WM8 has been used for a large number of non-waste planning applications, but application numbers has been varied. As the monitoring body for the WLP and providers of waste planning advice, MEAS is generally only consulted on large minors or major planning applications. Therefore, the information in Table 2 applies only to those applications on which MEAS is consulted, therefore is not truly representative of how the policy is working.

32. It is an important policy as it is one of the few ways that planning can influence waste prevention and resource management. Each of the districts Local Plans also has a waste policy which provides a hook for the WLP and also reiterates the key requirements of policy WM8. Since the adoption of the plan, planning

officers have progressively applied the policy more without MEAS being consulted, although generally MEAS does see applications relating to discharge of conditions associated with the policy. Information submitted in relation to the policy is varied but generally improved over the plan period.

33. Although, application of the policy is variable, it remains and important policy as one of the few ways planning can influence waste minimisation and resource management during the development process. **Therefore, it is considered that policy WM8 is still appropriate and will continue to be applied for the remainder of the period.**

Table 2: Percentage of times Policies WM8 and WM9 have been applied to Non-Waste Applications

Year/ Policy	2013-14 (8 apps)	2014-15 (9 apps)	2015-16 (13 apps)	2016-17 (8 apps)	2017-18 (8 apps)	2018-19 (12 apps)	2019-23 (17 apps)
WM8	63	24	33	46	42	27	62
WM9	0	6	16	22	25	14	22

Policy WM9: Sustainable Waste Management Design and Layout for New Development

34. Over the monitoring period for the WLP, the quality and breadth of information on waste storage and collection supplied with non-waste related planning applications appears to be improving with more information consistently provided in site layout drawings or within Design and Access Statements. MEAS only advises on planning applications received from District partners and is generally only consulted on major or complex non-waste planning applications. The number of applications where policy WM9 has been considered relevant and requests for additional information varied considerably year on year. It is important to note that Waste Management colleagues within each of the Councils may also comment on planning applications to ensure that sufficient capacity for collection and storage of waste and recycling is made.

35. A pragmatic approach has been applied from the outset to minimise impacts n developers whilst continuing to ensure that sufficient information is provided on waste storage and collection where needed, and to ensure any planning conditions applied are reasonable. For example, if the proposal is small scale for detached or semi-detached dwellings and the dwellings all have reasonable garden spaces, then it assumed that there is sufficient space to accommodate the necessary number of bins.

36. Table 2 demonstrates that in an increasing number of cases, a proposed layout plan has been submitted showing areas for bin storage, which is preferable as it demonstrates that waste management issues have been considered in the design and layout of the proposal. This is particularly important, if the development is for apartments or high density dwellings or large commercial projects.

37. Going forward, with new duties being placed on Councils in terms of collection of more recycling streams and food waste from both householders and businesses, this policy is likely to become more important in the next few years. **It is considered that Policy WM9 remains applicable and no changes are needed for the remainder of the plan period.**

Policy WM10: High Quality Design and Operation of Waste Management Facilities

38. Policy WM10 is an aspirational policy and at the time of writing the WLP was considered very important to ensure that the waste industry improved its poor image both in terms of visual impacts as well as other amenity impacts often associated with the waste industry.

39. In reality, it has proved very hard to enforce the sustainable design and performance element of the policy, particularly in relation to achieving a BREEAM Excellent rating or similar. Generally, because waste facilities are not heated, there has been push back that BREEAM is not applicable to waste facilities.

40. However, the policy has been very useful in driving up standards in the waste industry and improving the acceptability of waste proposals. Most of the applications received have demonstrated some elements of sustainable design or environmental improvements, and also the visual and amenity impacts associated with developments. This information is not always forthcoming with the original application but is always requested prior to determination if it is missing.

41. **Whilst the policy is not necessarily working as originally envisaged, it is still resulting in some sustainable design and environmental improvement at new waste management facilities, therefore, it is still considered to be working and relevant for the remainder of the plan period.**

Policy WM11: Sustainable Waste Transport

42. Implementing and monitoring of policy WM11 has been quite difficult as compliance falls largely to Highways Departments within each of the districts. In the first year following adoption of the WLP, there were a couple of applications for large sub-regionally/nationally significant waste management that use rail transport to either export or receive waste to the site. Subsequently, the majority of applications have been entirely dependent on road transport due to the size, nature or locality of the site. One site used conveyors to transport the processed product to the adjacent site for re-use. When reviewing waste applications, consideration is always given to whether a more sustainable form of transport is available, other than road. However, most applications do attempt to ensure access to sustainable transport for future employees.

43. **Going forward, consideration would be given to as to whether this policy is needed or whether reliance on national and local plan policy is sufficient. However, for the remainder of the plan period policy WM11 is considered fit for purpose.**

Policy WM12: Criteria for Waste Management Development

44. Policy WM12 is applied to all waste planning applications regardless of whether they are for new facilities or extension and enhancement of existing facilities. Not all of the criteria are applicable to all applications, but at least some of the criteria are applied to each application. Where the policy hasn't been applied it is likely to relate to ancillary development on an existing facility where there are no specific waste impacts.

45. The policy has been particularly useful for obtaining additional information to aid understanding of the site or processing activity on site prior to determination. Sometimes, several requests for additional information have been required before compliance with the policy is achieved.

46. **This is a critical policy for assessing waste planning applications to ensure all the correct, relevant information is submitted. It remains fit for purpose for the duration of the plan period.**

Policy WM13: Planning Applications for New Waste Management Facilities on Unallocated Sites.

47. Policy WM13 applies to new waste management facilities only and generally ties in with policy WM1. However, it has not been applied to all the same applications, as it's only relevant to those on unallocated sites. It has been applied between 13-87% across the plan period to date. The policy has been useful for ensuring that a similar approach has been applied to unallocated sites, as to those allocated. This includes consideration use of sustainability appraisals, site selection criteria and deliverability assessments.

48. **The policy is considered important in ensuring consistency and equity of applications on unallocated sites with the objectives and allocated site criteria of the WLP. It remains fit for purpose for the remainder of the plan period.**

Policy WM14: Energy from Waste

49. Policy WM14 has been used several times during the monitoring period. Early in the implementation of the WLP there were several speculative applications for energy from waste facilities, some of which are now operational. The policy has also been applied to small scale combined heat and power plants using waste to generate heat and power at non waste manufacturing plants. It is also relevant to anaerobic digestion facilities, as these facilities generate gas and can have an element of CHP too.

50. As the plan area already had a large amount of energy from waste capacity at the time of adoption, criteria were included within the policy to demonstrate local need. All of the applications to which this policy has been applied have been to generate electricity and/or heat to serve a particular manufacturing facility or other use with high power consumption. The smaller facilities have been implemented, but the larger facilities have not, although permissions remain extant.

51. Since adoption of the WLP, the energy from waste market has become more saturated and nationally there is enough energy from waste capacity. With incoming legislation on simpler recycling and moving waste up the waste hierarchy coupled with changes to the Carbon Emissions Trading Scheme, there is a downward pressure on waste going to energy from waste facilities.

52. **Therefore, policy WM14 will remain important in ensuring that any future EfW capacity specifically serves a local need for the duration of the plan period.**

Policy WM15: Landfill on Unallocated Sites

53. This policy has been applied to one planning application during the plan period. This was a historic landfill that was undergoing further capping works to improve environmental outcomes from the site. The policy was useful for ensuring that all relevant information was secured prior to determination, particularly in relation to Green Belt and visual impacts.

54. **Although no new landfill has been forthcoming during the plan period, landfill resource is now considered to be a nationally significant issue. As such, it remains a relevant policy.**

Policy WM16: Restoration and Aftercare of Landfill Facilities

55. This policy has been applied to one planning application during the plan period. This was a historic landfill that was undergoing further capping works using inert materials to improve environmental outcomes from the site. The policy was useful for ensuring that all relevant information was secured prior to determination, particularly in relation to Green Belt and visual impacts.

56. **Although the policy has only been applied once during the plan period, the policy remains relevant should any future applications come forward, or applications relating to improvements to existing closed landfill's restoration works.**

Conclusion of Policy Review

57. Overall, it is concluded that all the WLP policies continue to be relevant and are fit for purpose for any future waste planning applications for the remainder of the plan period.

Analysis of Monitoring and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Indicators

Monitoring Indicators

58. Analysis of the AMR data for the monitoring and SA indicators has shown mixed results, some of the targets have been met and others have not been achieved, although have been useful in showing a direction of travel. For the monitoring indicators, this has been partly because elements of a policy have been difficult to implement, or that few allocated sites have come forward. Details on the review of the monitoring indicators are shown in Table 2.

59. On reflection, at the time of preparing the WLP, there were few suitable sites available, some of those allocated had extant permissions for waste use at the time, but these have subsequently not come forward. Furthermore, these sites are not always in the right ownership or location for the uses that come forward. However, the policies have been used successfully to achieve the necessary additional waste capacity and Areas of Search in particular, have been helpful in achieving this.

60. For the monitoring and SA indicators relating to carbon reduction and impacts of waste management on carbon emissions, this data has not been available at a fine enough detail to demonstrate impact. However, in the future this data is likely to be more readily available as more information on carbon reduction is being measured to help meet climate emergency targets across the LCR.

61. Understanding the successes and/or failures of the monitoring indicators will be useful in preparing the next iteration of the WLP, both in terms of allocations, areas of search and future monitoring indicators.

SA Indicators

62. The SA indicators were created to ensure that WLP was as sustainable as possible across the three strands of sustainability – economic, social and environmental. There are 30 SA indicators. The monitoring results are mixed. Nine of the SA indicators overlap with the monitoring indicators and are reported above.

63. Half of the SA indicators have been straightforward to measure either spatially or through the waste planning application process and have shown that the policies have been successful in ensuring sites are coming forward in the right locations without impacting key assets or communities, such as Green Belt or heritage.

64. For two of the indicators, (SA3 Number of pollution incidents and SA12 Emissions from landfill sites) there has been no data available beyond 2016/17

reporting period, so these have been difficult to report. However, this should not significantly impact the effectiveness of the WLP.

65. Data sources for four of the indicators (SA20-23) has changed during the course of the plan period to date, so although results are reported for these indicators the results will not be consistent. However, these all relate to Local Authority Collected Waste statistics and regular liaison with Merseyside Recycling and Waste Authority is undertaken. Therefore, a good understanding of the data is possible despite the change in datasets.

66. For future iterations of the WLP, consideration would be given to the availability of data when determining what indicators would be most useful to monitor the plan.

Table 2: Review of Monitoring Indicators

Indicator Ref	Indicator	Links to SOs	Target	Performance	Limitations
Single Data List 082-01	Method of collection & tonnage of waste e.g. kerbside, civic amenity, flytipped	S02, SO3, SO4, SO5	None	Performance has been reported each year for method of collection. Food waste collections dropped off during monitoring period. Green waste collection is now charged by most authorities. Only St Helens have kerbside sorting, all others have co-mingled collection for recyclables. Flytipping incidents continue to increase in all authorities other than Halton and St Helens. Amount of waste recycled at civic amenity/HWRC sites has been declining over the plan period.	
Single Data List 082-02	Tonnage of waste sent for recycling, composting, re-use, split by material type	S02, SO3, SO4, SO5, SO8	Progressive increase year on year but 50% by 2020	Recycling rates from households have decreased from 33.6% to 30.36% over the period of the plan period. Therefore, the target for year-on-year increases in LACW recycling to 2020 has not been met in recent years, and the target of 50% is set to be missed in 2030.	Very few areas of the country have achieved or maintained these levels. Nationally the levels peaked about 43%.
Single Data List 082-03	Method of disposal & tonnage of waste (e.g. landfill, incineration)	S01, SO3, SO4, SO8	Achieve a maximum of 10% to landfill by 2020, with remaining residual waste (40%) to treatment	Latest figures show around 54% of waste to EfW and only 4% to landfill. The target is for a maximum of 10% to landfill by 2020 with 40% residual waste sent for treatment. Targets are being met in Merseyside and Halton.	Changes to the way this has been reported for Q100 (raw data) early in the plan period within Waste Data Flow. Latest figures have been extracted via Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator.
Single Data List 067-01	Contribution made by LACW management to CO2 reduction from local authority managed estate & operations	SO6, SO7, SO8	Initial target of year on year reduction. Requirement to review and set formal target if appropriate	Target for year-on-year reduction met in terms of MRWA's household waste and recycling contract. Data for contributions made by LACW	Monitoring of this indicator has been challenging throughout the plan period, due to gaps in data sources

Indicator Ref	Indicator	Links to SOs	Target	Performance	Limitations
				management to CO_2 reduction from District estate and operations however is very limited. Therefore, we are unable to report on this contribution.	and a lack of waste-related CO_2 information at a Local Authority level. The Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reports, which are produced by the Districts for this single data list indicator (067-01), generally do not cover waste-related contributions to CO_2 reduction as they are outside of the mandatory scope for emissions (i.e. scope 1 and 2).
Former National Indicator 186	Contribution made by sustainable waste management to per capita reduction in CO2 emissions in local authority	SO6, SO7, SO8	Initial target of year-on-year reduction. Requirement to review and set formal target if appropriate	National waste management trends show that waste-related CO_2 emissions are reducing over the long term. However, at a sub-regional / Local Authority level data is very limited and it remains unclear whether targets for year-on-year CO_2 emissions reductions are being met across the whole waste management sector. Without complete data for all waste streams, it is not possible to make any conclusions for the whole waste management sector at a sub-regional level.	Monitoring of this indicator continues to be challenging due to a lack of up-to-date waste-specific data sources. The official data for reporting against Former National Indicator 186 is the Local and Regional CO_2 Emissions Estimates. However, this does not provide waste specific data at a Local Authority area level and the latest data is 2017
Single Data List 024-15 AMRW-1	Capacity of new waste management facilities by waste planning authority	SO1	Requirements in line with needs assessment	The amount of new consented capacity has fluctuated greatly year on year, with significantly more coming forward in the early years of the plan period compared to more recent years. The plan area is now a significant net importer of waste	

Indicator Ref	Indicator	Links to SOs	Target	Performance	Limitations
				compared to being a net exporter of waste at adoption. Sufficient additional consented capacity has come forward since adoption of the plan to address the needs. Capacity has been reported in AMRs.	
Single Data List 024-16 AMRW-2	Amount of municipal waste arisings by waste management type and by waste planning authority	SO1, SO3	Annual figures should be available via MWDA/ waste collection authorities	The data has been reported in a range of ways across the plans life and so it is difficult to compare figures. Generally (over the last 4 years reported) recycling gis at 29%, composting at 17-21%, landfill around 4-7% and energy recovery 48%.	Due to changes to reporting in WasteDataFlow the 2015-16 tonnages are now derived from the raw Q100 data. MRWA only report for the 5 Merseyside districts so information for Halton as a unitary authority has to be added separately.
Single Data List 024-12 AMRE-3	To show the contribution the waste sector will make to the amount of renewable energy generation by installed capacity (report in MW to include both heat and electrical energy)	SO3, S08	No target set it will vary year on year depending on the type of facilities being developed and the amount of waste recovered that qualifies for Renewables Obligation Certificates	Total 1,272,297MWh across different facilities varying from large scale EfW, biomass, Anaerobic Digestion, gasification and small- scale biomass facilities.	
WLP 1	Number of sub-regional sites which are taken up for waste management use	SO1	Requirements in line with needs assessment	2 - One application on sub-regional site early in plan period, but permission now lapsed. Second for ancillary use to existing waste operation.	4 sub-regional allocations were subject to planning consent for waste use at adoption (2 now lapsed). Other 2 dependent on extension by the existing operator. 1 sub-regional allocation subject to temporary non waste planning consent.
WLP 2	Number of district allocated sites which are taken up for waste management use	SO1	Requirements in line with needs assessment	2 Sefton district allocations taken up.	4 district allocations lost to non waste uses.

Indicator Ref	Indicator	Links to SOs	Target	Performance	Limitations
					6 allocations already in waste use and dependent on extension of operations by existing operator.
WLP 3	Number of applications received for waste management facilities and on unallocated sites; and number of waste management facilities that are developed on unallocated sites	SO1	<10% of requirement stated for targets WLP1 and 2	A total of 75 applications received during the plan period. Of which between 13-87% were unallocated sites. Clearly missing the target. However, many of these applications are on existing waste management facilities, so technically are not new sites. The development rate relates to sites that are built out and are operational. There are 38 applications that have been built out and are operational, or where the permission remains extant.	Many of the unallocated sites are actually existing operational waste management sites, so the % figures don't present a truly realistic picture.
WLP 4	No. of planning applications for new waste management facility buildings which achieve a 'very good' or 'excellent' BREEAM rating or equivalent standard	SO2, SO4, SO5, SO6, SO7, SO8	100%	Varies between 0% and 28% over the plan period, clearly falling below the target of 100%. However, it is has still led to sustainability measures and environmental measures being incorporated into designs, such as rainwater harvesting.	Low percentage achieving BREEAM or equivalent appears to be partly due to the type and scale of waste facility applications received which are not always appropriate for these design standards. E.g. changes to existing facility, open air facility etc.
WLP 5	No. of new waste management facilities which use an element of sustainable transport as part of their operation	SO6, SO7	25%-30%	0%-14%, some sites have proposed use of conveyors for movement between sites.	The shortfall on the target is in part explained by many new waste consents being small scale as well as sites not being located near rail connections, canals or docks. Also, size and geographic spread of waste

Indicator Ref	Indicator	Links to SOs	Target	Performance	Limitations
					contracts which could make rail or water transport unviable. The majority of larger municipal waste contracts are long term and have already been secured therefore many waste operators rely on multiple small scale short term contracts. These smaller contracts, from various commercial and industrial sources, may not be viable for sustainable waste transport.
WLP 6	Recycle and recover value from commercial and industrial wastes in line with regional /national targets	SO2, SO3, SO4, SO5, SO8	65% recycled by 2020; recover value from 90% by 2020 (includes recycling)	Between 71% and 100% of consented sites will be recycling and recovering value from commercial and industrial waste. The % recycled/recovered is likely to be high.	Regional/national targets are no longer relevant since the regional tier of reporting has been removed, and the publication of the Waste Management Plan for England 2013 removed national targets. Therefore, it is not possible to report against this indicator.

Sustainability Appraisal Monitoring Indicators Review 2013-23

67. There are 30 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Indicators. Monitoring of these indicators has been undertaken in each of the AMRs. Some of the SA indicators overlap with other WLP indicators and where this occurs this is shown. During the lifetime of the plan to date, there have been 75 waste planning applications reviewed under the plans policies, 29 of which were for new facilities. Each of the SA indicators is reference below with a commentary on how easy it's been to monitor its effectiveness.

SA1 – Number of waste management facilities located within 1km of sites covered by regional, county or local nature and earth science conservation designations (Biodiversity).

68. During the plan period, 53 waste applications have been received (2013-2023), of these 35 were within 1km of sites covered by regional, county or local nature and earth science conservation designations. Between 2013 and 2019, 94% of sites were within 1km, but subsequently, during 2019-2023 none of the 15 applications within these years were within 1km. This has been straightforward to monitor spatially.

SA2 – Area landfill restored to support improved biodiversity (Biodiversity)

69. Lymes and Wood Pits Landfill was still operational at the start of the plan period. It has also been in a restoration phase throughout the lifetime of the plan, with 78% restored in 2013/14 increasing to 90% in 2015/16. It was reported the following year that the final phase was imminent in May 2017, then in 2017/18 Variation of planning condition to allow for the importation of soils for the restoration of the Lyme & Wood Pits up to 28th February 2019. The site closed at this point. This indicator is important for the tracking of landfill restoration within the plan area, there are a couple more landfills still operating in the plan area which are undergoing phased restoration.

SA3 – Number of pollution incidents (Human)

70. Across the life of the plan so far there has been 26 environmental pollution incidents, some of these will be at waste facilities but the data is not available to provide specific numbers. However, these incidents are only reported for 2013-2017, there has been no dataset has been available for 2017/18 onwards.

SA4 – Number and type of fly tipping events (Human)

71. Information reported under Single data list 082-101

SA5 – Number and type of reported accidents involving staff of, or visitors to, waste management facilities (Human)

72. This indicator has been monitored within each AMR with all years, except 2018/19, involving an incident. There has been a total of 9 incidents reported between 2013 and 2023

SA6 – Water quality (chemical & biological) classification of rivers, canals, estuaries and coastal waters impacts by waste developments (within 250m) ((Water Resources))

73. This indicator repeatedly reports on the sites since 2013, with the addition of any within the new monitoring period. The site in 2013 in Widnes had poor ecology status and a good chemical status but was last reported on in 2016/17. In Knowsley, a site reported in 2014 had moderate ecological status and fail chemical status but was not updated in 2015/16 to have good chemical status. A new site was added in 2017/18 in Sefton to have ecological status of moderate and no chemical status surveyed.

Nothing was reported in 2017/18. The update for 2019-23 showed 6 of the 15 sites to be within 250m of a water body, all with moderate water quality generally the River Mersey, but with no specific ecological or chemical status.

SA7 – Area of grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land taken by new waste development (land and soil)

74. Throughout the plan period, so far, there is only 1 site which falls into this category, in 2017/18 an application for regularisation and improvement to an existing open window composting site was granted in an area of grade 1 Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land (Orrell Wood, Hightown facility). There have been no new facilities in areas of BMV.

SA8- Proportion of new waste development on previously developed, derelict, or under-utilised land (land and soil)

75. Generally, most new waste developments have been consented on previously developed land, with a couple on derelict land. Over the monitoring period, 26 new sites out of 29 have been consented on land in these conditions.

SA9 - Number of new waste management facilities located within Air Quality Management Areas (Air Quality)

76. Over the lifetime of the plan there has only been 3 new sites consented within areas of Air Quality Management, these have been within the Liverpool Council AQMA, which covers the whole District area. There have been applications for existing sites within this area also, but only 3 new sites.

SA10 - Number of new waste management facilities situated in high flood risk areas (Climate Change)

77. In total there are 4 new sites within high flood risk areas, largely due to proximity to the River Mersey, which had high flood risk zones related to coastal flooding. There is a likely risk to facilities located along the coast. Within the 2019-23 monitoring period, 2 sites where in flood risk areas due to the River Mersey. There are also many smaller main rivers and brooks across the plan area which also pose a risk, in 2013-14 there is one site in a Flood Zone 3 related to Stewards Brook and a further site in 2017-18 within Flood Zone 3 associated with the River Alt floodplain.

SA11 - Estimated greenhouse gas emissions from the waste sector (Climate Change)

78. See indicator Single data list 067-01.

SA12 - Emissions of landfill gas from landfill sites (Climate Change)

79. Only one site was being monitored between the periods of 2013-14 and 2015-16, which showed methane levels dropping from 1400 to 10 tonnes between 2013 and 2015. There has been no data available since 2016-17.

SA13 - Quantity of renewable and alternative energy generated from waste management activities (Climate Change)

80. See indicator Single data list 067-01.

SA14 - Proportion of waste transported other than by road by waste stream (Transport)

81. See Local Indicator WLP 5

SA15 - Number of new waste development sites for which a travel plan has been prepared (Transport)

82. During the lifetime of the plan, between 46-87% of waste applications received have submitted either a Transport statement or Assessment, which also covers Travel Planning for employees.

SA16 - Number of new waste facilities located within 1km of scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens and other major heritage or cultural assets (Historic Environment)

83. This indicator tracks new sites consented to be built within 1km of WHS, SAM parks and gardens or listed buildings and they are monitored separately. There have been no sites within a WHS area, 6 within SAM, 5 within parks and gardens and 21 within listed building areas. This does include some double counting of sites as a site may be within 1km of multiple factors.

SA17 – Area of publicly accessible open space and green space permanently lost as a result of new waste management facilities (Landscape and Townscape)

84. No new waste sites have been consented on open or green spaces. This is very unlikely to happen, as due to the impacts of waste facilities they tend to be located away from public spaces in more industrial areas or on derelict or previously developed land as shown in SA8.

SA18 – Number of new waste development in areas of designated landscape value (including Green Belt) ((Landscape and Townscape))

85. Over the lifetime of the plan so far there has been only 1 new waste sites consented within Green belt. There have also been 3 applications regularising and enhancing operations at existing open windrow composting facilities within Green Belt.

SA19 – Total annual volume of waste generated by waste stream (Sustainable Waste Management)

86. The data for this SA was previously taken from the initial needs assessment, the updated AMR (2019-23) takes data from the revised waste needs assessment. The revised WNA shows that total LACW is decreasing and falls below estimates, Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste is slightly above estimates but only by 20,000 tonnes, Construction, Demolition & Excavation (CD&E) waste is half of what was expected and Hazardous arisings are slightly higher by 5,000 tonnes.

SA20 - Municipal waste collected per household (Sustainable Waste Management)

87. Data was extracted from the Joint Recycling and Waste Management Strategy: Environmental Monitoring Report for each retrospective year up until the 2019-23 AMR review, which uses Waste Data Flow data. (Note: The Joint Recycling and Waste Management Strategy: Environmental Monitoring Report is no longer produced.) The data shows that waste per household is decreasing and decreased significantly between 2018/19 to 2022/23 by around 500kg per household per year. Levels have decreased back to similar levels of the first AMR in 2013-14 report (Merseyside = 645kg and Halton 631kg per household per year) after huge increases in 2014-2018 with a peak of 1,187kg per household per year in 2016-17. There were very slight increases in 2020 and 2021, which could be attributed to the Covid-19 pandemic as

people were spending more time at home and so more waste became LACW. Levels have averaged out to 577,6kg per household per year in 2022/23.

SA21 – Volume and % of waste disposed to landfill by waste stream (Sustainable Waste Management)

88. SA21 was first monitored using the Merseyside and Halton Waste Partnership Annual reports which ceased being produced in 2014. Subsequently, this has been assessed against the initial waste needs assessment. A revised needs assessment is now available which updates figures using the WDI, this has been used for the 2019-23 review.

89. LACW is only reported for between 2013 and 2016 and figures are generally similar with an average of around 62%, LACW is then combined with C&I from 2020. HIC is the combination of LACW and C&I reported through the WDI. C&I was estimated to be at 18.5% from 2013 to 2017 and subsequently falling to 13.5%. The combined figures for C&I and LACW show just 3.3% going to landfill in 2023, which has decreased from 6% in 2020.

90. CD&E was estimated to be 15% in 2013 to 2015, falling to 10% from 2016, the updated review reports that the percentage has been decreasing since 2020 to just 3.07% in 2023.

91. Hazardous waste was estimated to be 10% to landfill. In 2020, the actual figure was just 6%, however 2023 saw a huge increase to 36% of hazardous waste being disposed of by landfill. This may be as a result of a particular waste stream, but the reason is not clear.

SA22- Volume of % of waste recycled/composted by waste stream by method of disposal (Sustainable Waste Management)

92. Again, this indicator was first monitored using the Merseyside and Halton Waste Partnership Annual reports which ceased being produced in 2014. Subsequently, this has been assessed against the initial waste needs assessment. A revised needs assessment is now available which updates figures using the WDI, this has been used for the 2019-23 review.

93. In 2013-14, the LACW recycling rate is reported to be at 33.6%, this is updated in the 2019-23 review which shows 2020/21 recycling rates to be at 17.74% and composting at 12.35%.

94. The CDE recycling rate is reported using the pessimistic projections to be 67% between 2013 and 2016, this increases to 71% in 2017-18 onwards. This figure cannot be verified as some CD&E is generally recycled on site and so accurate recycling figures are not recorded.

95. Commercial and industrial wastes recycling rates were originally reported separately but have subsequently been combined with household in the 2019-23 update. Commercial waste was estimated to be 60% recycled and 7.4% composted up to 2016-17. In 2017-18, the rate increases to 65% recycled and 11.6% composted. Industrial waste was estimated to be 65% recycled across all years. C&I is reported

within HIC on the WDI and so difficult to separate C&I disposal routes, WDI HIC shows 4.34% Recycling and 0.4% Composting.

96. Hazardous waste was estimated to be 90% recycled/treated however, the HWDI does not show Hazardous waste composted or recycled fate and so cannot be verified.

SA23 - Percentage of the four main waste streams which are managed outside Merseyside and Halton (Sustainable Waste Management)

97. Different data sources have been used for monitoring this indicator through the lifetime of the plan and so there are some discrepancies. LACW was reported on using Merseyside and Halton Waste Partnership Annual Report and the Defra Local Authority Collected and Household Recycling and Waste Management Strategy: Environmental Monitoring and Report 2016-17 between 2013-14 and 2016-17. These show LACW residual waste sent to landfill outside of plan area, the amount fell to 42% in 2016-17. Subsequently, the WDI has been used for monitoring, and this data shows 51-82% is exported, but does include Merseyside not codable wastes too, the next year 95% is reported for recovery.

98. The 2019-23 update shows LACW figures combined with C&I waste of 30% exported in 2020 decreasing to 13% in 2023. C&I waste increases from 60-71% in 2013-14 to 77% in 2017-18, but as the area has become more self sufficient less waste is managed outside the plan area which is reflected in the HIC figure of just 13% in 2023.

99. CD&E waste is reported to fall from 60-64% in 2013-14 to just 10-16% in 2017-18, increasing again slightly in 2018-19 to 22-25%. The 2019-23 review shows further increases. CD&E is at 30% in 2020, 42% in 2021, 52% in 2022 and 47% in 2023 and so there is more leaving the plan area, however overall tonnages of CD&E are less than estimated in the initial WNA. It should be noted that there are several large CDE recycling facilities just outside the LCR boundary, which probably explains the export figures for CDE wastes.

100. Hazardous wate generally decreased between 2013-14 and 2017-18 from 77% to 63%. There was no report for 2018-19. The 2019-23 reports figures to be lower than previous but they are decreasing, 2020 shows 39% and 2023 shows 44%.

SA24 – Number of waste facilities using renewable or recovered energy (Sustainable Use of Resources)

101. See Single data list 024-12 AMRE-3.

SA25 – Proportion of new development meeting appropriate standards (BREEAM) ((Sustainable Use of Resources))

102. See Single data list 024-12 AMRE-3.

SA26 – Waste planning applications submitted by type and position of the waste hierarchy (Sustainable Economic Growth)

103. See Single data list 024-015 AMR W-1.

SA27 – EA Environmental Permits for waste management issued (Sustainable Economic Growth)

104. See Single data list 024-015 AMR W-1 (WFD Article 28 requirements).

SA28 – Number and type of personnel employed in waste management sector (new facilities) in Merseyside classified according to waste hierarchy (Employment)

105. In total, during the plan period to date, a total of 585 waste management jobs have been created this includes 277 in preparation for reuse, 152 in recycling, 155 in other recovery and 1 in disposal. This shows more jobs have been created higher up the waste hierarchy, although none recorded for waste prevention.

SA29 – Number of waste management facilities located within 250m of conservation areas (Landscape and Townscape)

106. Overall, there has been one waste site developed within 250m of conservation areas. During 2015-16, a small scale biomass CHP was consented 200m from Newsham Park. Also, in 2013-14, a new HWRC in Liverpool was developed 260km from a conservation area.

SA30 – Number of existing renewable energy and energy recovery schemes (by type) in the waste sector and quantity of electricity generated from each (Sustainable Use of Resources)

107. Yes – Single data list 024-12 AMRE-3

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
HA13-007 13/00274/FUL West Bank Dock Site Riverside, Widnes	Wood Storage & Waste Wood Processing	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	2013 -14
KN13-034 13/00384/FUL Vacant Warehouse, Bradman Road	Healthcare Waste Treatment and Transfer facility	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
KN13-033 13/00434/FUL Unit 1,2 &3 The Lombard Centre, Link Road, Huyton	WEEE recycling facility	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
KN13-038 13/00781/COU Eclipse Glass, Ashcroft Road, Knowsley Industrial Estate	Vehicle Breakers (ELV) Facility	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
KN13-045 14/00586/FUL 90 Arbour Lane, Kirkby	Scrap metal storage yard	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
LI13-009 14F/0203	New HWRC	Y	Y	Y	Y (WM 6)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
Land at Cheadle Avenue, Old Swan															
SH13-010 P/2013/0325 Burtonhead Rd HWRC, St.Helens	Redeveloped Household Waste Recycling Centre	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SH13-039 P/2013/0569 Unit O, Mossbank Industrial Estate, Dairy Farm Rd, Rainford	Autothermophillic Aerobic Digestion (ATAD)	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
HA14-005 14/00613/FUL IBA Recycling, Johnsons Lane	Incinerator Bottom Ash Recycling	Y	N	N	Y AoS	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	2014-15
HA14-008 15/00060/FUL	Solar farm, L/F Restoration	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	
KN14-022 14/00657/FUL Land at Butlers Farm, North Perimeter Road, Knowsley Industrial Park	Anaerobic Digestion	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
KN14-031 14/00481/FUL Image Business Park, Acornfield Road	Physio-Chemical Treatment	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SH14-017 P/2014/0399 18 Jackson Street, St Helens	Change of use to an end of life vehicle salvage business, the storage of scrap cars and part worn tyre sales	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
SH14-047 P/2014/0778 Universal Tanker Services, Bold Industrial Park	Waste plant for treatment of portable toilet waste	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
APP/14/00314 Eastham Refinery, North Road	Gasification and Materials Recycling Facility with CHP	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	
WI14-027 APP/14/00805 Wheatland Lane, Seacombe	Erection of vehicle repair unit, forming an office from re-cycled	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
	container units, construction of concrete crushing plant														
HA15-002 15/00256/FUL Refood UK Ltd	Extension to REFOOD	N	N	N	Y AoS	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	2015 -16
HA15-004 & HA14-008 15/00332/FUL Land Bounded by Dismantled Railway and situated to the South of Johnsons Lane, Widnes	Landfill reclamation	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	y	N	N	N	Y	
HA14-010 15/00180/FUL Hedco Closed Landfill	Landfill restoration	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	
HA15-027 16/00124/FULEIA WSR Recycling Ltd	Increased capacity 200-300k	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
15/00506/FUL 3 Webber Road, Knowsley Industrial Park, Kirkby	Inert Waste Recycling Facility	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
15/00509/FUL Future Industrial Services, Acornfield Road	Waste Treatment Facility (provision of additional capacity at oil recovery unit)	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
LI15-043 15F/2399 Panorama Kitchens	Biomass boiler (small scale – exempt)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	
P/2016/0027/WASTE 2-3 Withins Road, Haydock	Waste Transfer Station	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
SH15-009 P/2015/0322 Land Adjacent and 8a Reginald Rd Industrial Park	Recycling Centre	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
SH15-044 P/2015/0601/FUL Hunts Brothers Warehouse Ltd, Junction Lane	Recycling/re processing centre	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SH15-027 P/2015/0494 Starbank Site, Junction Lane	Biomass facility	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
WI15-005 APP/15/00553	Anaerobic Digestion	Y	Y	Y	Y AoS	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
Riverside House, East Street, Seacombe															
HA16-013 16/00158/COU Land To The North West Of Junction Between Ditton Brook And Stewards Brook,	Processing and storage of wood facility	Y	Y	Y	Y AoS	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	2016-17
HA17-012 17/00094/FUL Secanim, Desoto Road	Demolish tallow farm, replace with raw material reception	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
DC/2016/00534 55 Crowland Street, Southport	Waste transfer station, AD facility and biomass boiler	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	
DC/2016/00639 Land Corner Of Heysham Road/Leckwith Road Netherton	Salt depot with recycling area	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
SH16-055 P/2016/0440/ful Pocket Nook Gas Holder, Navigation Road, Sutton	Ancillary vehicle depot repair to waste facility	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
P/2016/0628/FUL Knauf Insulation, Ravenhead Road	Glass processing facility	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
P/2016/0804/FUL Greengate Works Sherdley Road	Energy recovery facility with CHP	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	
HA17-032 17/00435/WST GSH Waste Recycling Ltd	Biomass boiler at Waste Transfer Station	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	2017-18
17/00278/FUL Dams Furniture Ltd	Wood waste biomass boiler	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	
SF17-081 (VOC) DC/2017/00727 Southport Skip Hire	Integrated Waste Management Facility	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SF17-123 DC/2017/01328 Hightown Composting	Bio Sludge Liming Treatment	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SF17-124 DC/2017/01327 Hightown Composting	Open windrow composting	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SF18-005 DC/2017/02198 491 Hawthorne Road, Bootle	Road planing storage facility	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
P/2017/0419/S73 Lyme and Wood Pits Reclamation Site	Non-hazardous landfill	N	N	N	N	y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	
P/2017/0779/S73 Mossborough Hall Farm	Open windrow composting	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A	
HA19-001 19/00008/FUL Secanim	Extension of processing hall	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	2018-19
HA18-021 18/00285/WST J Bryan (Victoria) Ltd, Pickerings Road		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
HA18-031 18/00417/S73 Runcorn Energy From Waste Facility		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
HA18-038 18/00567/FULEIA WSR Recycling Ltd		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
HA18-035 18/00509/FUL Secanim Desoto Road	Extension to provide space for new boiler	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
KN18-047 18/00553/FUL Jaguar Plant		N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
LI18-034 18F/1405		N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
Barrys Skips															
LI18-073 18F/3064 Stalbridge Docks		N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SF19-020 DC/2019/00229 Hightown Recycling,		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
P/2018/0221/FUL Palletland Limited,		Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	
SH18-070 P/2018/0675/WEIA Greengate Works, Sherdley Road		Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	
WI18-081 APP/18/01019 Bidston Moss Landfill Gas Utilisation Compound, Bidston		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	Y	
HA19-022 19/00323/ful (Tesco biofuel)		Y	N	Y	Y AoS	N	N	Y (not BREEAM)	Y	Y	Y	Y (Small scale)	N/A	N/A	2019-20
HA19-029 19/00391/FUL (ASH Waste)		Y	Y	Y	Y Aos	N	N	Y (not BREEAM)	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
HA19-030 19/00389/COU (PVCR)		N	N	N	N	y	N	Y (not BREEAM)	Y	y	n	n	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
KN20-004 (3 Webber Rd)		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
LI19-022 (S Norton ancillary)	Ancillary to Scrap yard	N	N	N	N	Y		N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A	
HA20-009 20/00150/FUL (Tesco biofuel)		Y	N	Y	Y AoS	N	N	Y (not BREEAM)	Y	Y	Y	Y (Small scale)	N/A	N/A	2020-21
HA20-012 20/00164/WST (Site B, Johnsons Lane)		Y	Y	Y	Y AOS	N	N	Y (not BREEAM	Y	Y	Y	N	N/A	N/A	
HA19-034 20/00396/FUL (GSH Ancillary)		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SF21-002 (Agrimas)		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
HA21-055 21/00679/FUL (GSH Ancillary)		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N/A	N/A	2021-22
KN22-007 (Mulberry Waste)		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
LI21-037 (Veolia Garston)		N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
SF21-178 (Southport Skip Hire)		N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N/A	N/A	

Appendix 1: Usage of Waste Local Plan Policies for Planning Applications received during the Waste Local Plan Monitoring Periods 2013-14 to 2022-23.															
Site		WM1	WM2	WM3	WM5	WM7	WM8	WM10	WM11	WM12	WM13	WM14	WM15	WM16	Year
HA22-041 22/00434/WST Blue Phoenix, Johnsons Lane		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	2022-23
HA22-042 22/00436/WST Blue Phoenix, Johnson's Lane		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
KN22-049 (Stericycle)		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	
LI22-088 (Veolia Garston)		N	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N/A	