



**XII  
2009**

# **BILLET D'ÉTAT**

---

---

**WEDNESDAY, 27th MAY, 2009**

---

---

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT - PROPOSED  
AMENDMENTS TO THE URBAN AREA PLAN - REVIEW NO.1  
LONGUE HOUGUE LAND RECLAMATION SITE AND KEY  
INDUSTRIAL AREA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

# ***B I L L E T   D ' É T A T***

---

## **TO THE MEMBERS OF THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

---

I have the honour to inform you that a Meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at **THE ROYAL COURT HOUSE**, on **WEDNESDAY**, the **27<sup>th</sup> MAY, 2009**, immediately after the meeting already convened for that day, to consider the item contained in this Billet d'État which has been submitted for debate.

**G. R. ROWLAND**  
Bailiff and Presiding Officer

The Royal Court House  
Guernsey  
24 April 2009

## **ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

### **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE URBAN AREA PLAN - REVIEW NO.1 LONGUE HOUGUE LAND RECLAMATION SITE AND KEY INDUSTRIAL AREA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

The Chief Minister  
Policy Council  
Sir Charles Frossard House  
La Charroterie  
St Peter Port

24<sup>th</sup> March 2009

Dear Sir

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. The Environment Department is pleased to present to the States for consideration draft amendments to the Urban Area Plan-Review No.1, together with the report and recommendations of the Inspector and the Department's comments and recommendations thereon.
2. The Environment Department has brought forward these amendments as a result of changes to the Strategic Land Use Plan (SLUP) in respect of the adopted Solid Waste Strategy (Billet d'Etat I January 2007) which requires that the Environment Department makes provision for those waste facilities identified in the Waste Disposal Plan, as adopted by the States.
3. In February 2007, the States resolved to seek tenders for the design, build and operation of:
  - EITHER a Mass Burn Energy from Waste Plant;
  - OR a Mechanical Biological Treatment Plant coupled to an Energy from Waste Plant, which facility may be a Mass Burn or Advanced Thermal Treatment Plant;
  - INCLUDING consideration of modular development options for such facilities and any combination of Mechanical Heat Treatment, Mechanical Biological Treatment and Advanced Thermal Treatment.

The capacity of treatment plant to be procured remained subject to further consideration by the States.

4. Amendments to the Urban Area Plan-Review No.1 are therefore necessary in order to provide a planning policy framework to facilitate the consideration of a range of technologies for a Residual Waste Treatment Plant at the Longue Hougue Land Reclamation Area in the Parish of St. Sampson, together with other waste management facilities that may be developed by the public or private sector.
5. Following a planning inquiry held in public on the 17<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> February 2009, the Inspector has recommended no changes to the proposed amendments to Policies EMP8 and WWM6 of the Urban Area Plan. The Environment Department therefore commends these amendments to the States.
6. The States Members are now asked to consider the Inspector's recommendations and the recommendations of the Environment Department.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The reason for proposing amendments to the Detailed Development Plan at this time is in response to a request from the Policy Council, embodied within Strategic Policy 31 of its Strategic Land Use Plan (SLUP), for the Environment Department, in reviewing its Detailed Development Plans, to make provision for those waste facilities identified in the Waste Disposal Plan, as adopted by the States in February 2007.
- 1.2 It should be noted that, although the new Land, Planning and Development (Guernsey) Law, 2005 will be enacted on the 6<sup>th</sup> April 2009, the plan amendment procedure was commenced and thereby continues under the previous legislation. Hence, it is in effect 'saved' for the purpose of the new law.
- 1.3 The Waste Disposal Plan recognises the limited capacity available at the Mont Cuet landfill site and establishes a target for recycling 50% of all commercial and household waste by 2010. This is to be achieved through a variety of routes, the most significant involving the design, build and operation of a residual waste treatment plant at the Longue Hougue land reclamation area (adjacent to St. Sampson's Harbour) for which tenders have already been invited.
- 1.4 At present, the Urban Area Plan (UAP) accords with the Solid Waste Strategy originally adopted by the States in 1998 and there is no policy gateway to enable the Department to consider an application for anything other than a Waste to Energy Plant at Longue Hougue. Whilst Policy EMP8 of the UAP currently gives priority consideration to accommodating an Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) at Longue Hougue, Policy WWM6 is more focussed on solid waste management proposals, highlighting that this should be guided by an Outline Planning Brief, together with an Environmental Statement and Compliance Document, before any detailed planning applications can be considered.

- 1.5 In 2002, in parallel with the emerging UAP, an Outline Planning Brief (OPB) for Phase One of Longue Hougue was adopted by the States (Billet d'Etat V 2002) and this provided a detailed planning framework for a range of waste management facilities to be accommodated on the land reclamation area, the most significant being a Waste to Energy (WtE) plant. The OPB was supported by a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) prepared by consultants commissioned by the then Board of Administration in 2000. The Stage 2 report accompanying the SEA concluded that, assessed against several other potential sites Island-wide, Longue Hougue was the most sustainable location for a waste to energy plant.
- 1.6 By 2007, having not proceeded with 'Waste to Energy' as its preferred option, the States resolved to tender for a range of emerging technologies for treating its solid waste rather than simply incineration (Billet d'Etat I 2007). These included Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT), Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT) and Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT) as well as Mass Burn Energy from Waste. Hence, the UAP needs to be 'in step' with this recent resolution, rather than being focussed specifically on an Integrated Waste Management Facility, which previously included a Waste to Energy Plant.
- 1.7 Therefore, it is necessary to amend Policies EMP8 and WWM6 to enable consideration of a broader range of technologies that the States may determine is appropriate following the current tender process. It is understood that tenders are now being assessed by the Public Services Department, following which the States will debate the preferred technology and the contract specification for the Residual Waste Treatment Facility. It is envisaged that a formal planning application, accompanied by an Environmental Statement and Compliance Document will be submitted to the Department later this year.
- 1.8 In addition to the development of a residual waste treatment facility at Longue Hougue, the plan amendments also seek to provide a criteria-based policy framework for determining other waste management proposals that might be brought forward, either by the public or private sector. These might *inter alia* include a Civic Amenity Site(s) and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), which would collectively contribute towards increasing recycling rates.
- 1.9 The Environment Department's draft amendments to the Urban Area Plan, which are intended to **replace** the relevant sections of the Plan, are set out in full in Appendix A of this States Report.

## 2. THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

- 2.1 At its meeting of the 11<sup>th</sup> June 2007, the Policy Council recommended amendments to the Strategic Land Use Plan in respect of the State's Solid Waste Strategy. These were duly endorsed by the States at the July 2007 meeting

(Billet d'État XVIII 2007) as part of deliberations on the 2007 Government Business Plan.

- 2.2 The Strategic Land Use Plan is formally denoted the Strategic and Corporate Plan and is prepared by the Policy Council in pursuance of Section 2 (1) of the Island Development (Amendment) (Guernsey) Law 1990 and is laid before the States in pursuance of Section 2 (3) of that Law. It sets out the strategic objectives to be followed by the Environment Department in implementing the Island Development (Guernsey) Law 1966, as amended.
- 2.3 The Environment Department is obliged by law to take the Strategic Land Use Plan into account when preparing or amending its Detailed Development Plans. The Policy Council's Strategic Land Planning Group (SLPG) has confirmed by letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> January 2009 that the draft amendments, subsequently considered at the Planning Inquiry, are in conformity with the strategic objectives of the States.
- 2.4 Strategic Objective 6 of the Strategic Land Use Plan addresses the need to ensure that adequate provision is made for the sustainable management of water, stone reserves and waste with the aim of minimising the environmental impact and making the most effective use of existing resources and infrastructure.
- 2.5 Strategic Policy 31 acknowledges the importance of developing the approved site at Longue Hougue for waste treatment facilities in accordance with the principles of the Solid Waste Strategy and that this should be embedded in the Detailed Development Plan.
- 2.6 Strategic Policy 31(A) provides interim guidance highlighting the need to accommodate temporary waste management infrastructure at Longue Hougue pending the approval of the Island's long term waste management proposals.
- 2.7 Accordingly, the Environment Department prepared appropriate amendments to the Urban Area Plan, which are now submitted for consideration by the States in accordance with Section 12 of the Island Development (Guernsey) Law, 1966, as amended.

### **3. THE PLANNING INQUIRY**

- 3.1 In accordance with Sections 9 and 10 of the Island Development (Guernsey) Law 1966, as amended, an Inspector was appointed to hold a public inquiry and to hear representations on the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan.
- 3.2 The draft amendments were published and made available for public inspection, as required by Law, on the 19<sup>th</sup> November 2008 and a Planning Inquiry was held, in public, on the 17<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> February 2009. The Policy Council appointed Mr Ian McPherson JP, BSc (Hons), CEng, CEnv, MICE, MCIWEM of the

Planning Inspectorate of England and Wales as an independent, qualified and experienced adjudicator to hear all representations received.

- 3.3 The Inspector considered the Proposed Amendments together with a total of 8 representations over an inquiry sitting period of about 7 hours. He then supplemented this with an accompanied visit to the site and its surroundings at Longue Hougue, as well as several other locations specifically requested by representors.
- 3.4 The Inspector's Report, together with his conclusions and recommendations, has been submitted to the Environment Department and is attached at Appendix B.

#### **4. THE INSPECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 The Inspector's Report is framed around the key issues put forward by representors which broadly fall under the following headings:-

- Export of Waste off the Island
- Waste hierarchy
- Technology and Capacity
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Alternative Sites and/or Use
- Environmental Considerations
  - Explosion/Fire Hazard
  - Water Quality
  - Noise
  - Traffic
  - Visual Impact
- Environmental Regulation
- Complete Review of the UAP
- Specific Changes to the Proposed Amendments

- 4.2 Having deliberated on each of the key issues, the Inspector concludes and recommends that the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan would be appropriate and that there is no need for any further changes to those that are proposed.

#### **5. THE RESPONSE OF THE ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

- 5.1 The Environment Department has considered the Inspector's Report and welcomes the recommendation that the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan be accepted.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 On behalf of the Environment Department, I would like to thank the Inspector and the Programme Officer (Adrian Nicolle) for their efficient and professional handling of the Inquiry.
- 6.2 The Environment Department recommends the States to approve the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan-Review No.1.
- 6.3 Should the States approve the proposed amendments; addenda will be printed and included within the Urban Area Plan. The addendum will then be lodged at the Greffe after being signed by the President of the States, in accordance with Section 13 (2) of the Island Development (Guernsey) Law 1966, as amended. The Plan Amendments however will become operative immediately following approval by the States.

Yours faithfully

Peter Sirett  
Minister



## **APPENDIX A**

### **Urban Area Plan – Review No.1 - Draft Amendments proposed by the Environment Department**

## **Policies for Employment (Chapter 6)**

### **6.2.2.4 Development of the Land Reclamation Site**

The land created by the extension of the Longue Hougue reclamation scheme (known as Longue Hougue II) is an important resource for development. Whilst a proportion of the area will be required for port-related industrial development, the remainder should accommodate activities with a high environmental impact, including waste management facilities and uses which could potentially create a pollution threat to Longue Hougue Reservoir.

The Land Reclamation Site is part of the Key Industrial Area bisected by Bulwer Avenue. It is the area of land being created by landfill on the south side of St. Sampson's Harbour, abutting a previous land reclamation site known as Longue Hougue I. It is planned to accommodate port-related land uses on part of the reclamation area (see Policy ETL2), thereby taking advantage of the proposed deep water harbour facilities, with the remainder being made available for industrial development.

In May, 2000, the then Board of Administration commissioned consultants to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of potential sites, on an island-wide basis, to identify the most sustainable location for an integrated waste management facility (Solid Waste Strategy EIA Study - Stage 2 Report -May 2000). The preferred location was identified on reclaimed land to the east of Bulwer Avenue, St. Sampson known as Longue Hougue.

In 2002, an Outline Planning Brief (OPB) was approved for part of the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area (Phase One) in accordance with the State's adopted Solid Waste Strategy (Billet d'État XII, June 1998) which at that time required the provision of an Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) to process the Island's waste comprising certain specified elements, including a waste to energy plant.

In early 2007 (Billet d'État I January 2007), the States resolved to seek competitive tenders for the design, build and operation of a broader range of technologies, in accordance with Strategic Policy 31 of the Strategic Land Use Plan (2006), rather than simply a Waste to Energy plant. In the light of this more recent resolution, the OPB does not provide a policy framework covering all the potential development options for the site. The requirement to prepare an OPB has therefore been removed and replaced by a requirement to prepare a Development Brief, which will provide for all potential options, whilst allowing for more flexibility.

### **Policy EMP8**

**At the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site, the priority will be to accommodate:**

- **Waste management facilities;**

- **Industrial uses with a high environmental impact;**
- **Uses falling within Use Classes 48-59 inclusive; and**
- **Port-related industrial uses.**

**To ensure that the Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site are planned comprehensively, a Development Brief will be prepared for the phased development of the land to the east of Bulwer Avenue, St. Sampson, the underlying principles of which will be to optimise the use of the available land and achieve a good overall development which enhances the Key Industrial Area and recognises the importance of the site's 'Gateway to Guernsey' location.**

**All planning applications for significant waste related facilities shall be supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment.**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Policies for Water and Waste Management (Chapter 9)**

### **9.2.5 Solid Waste Management**

Whilst the States have adopted a Solid Waste Strategy (Billet d'État I January 2007) which involves the construction and management of a facility at Longue Hougue that is capable of dealing with waste arisings on the Island for the next 25 years, it is anticipated that other forms of waste related development such as a Civic Amenity Site and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) could also be developed in the Urban Area to meet the need for solid waste infrastructure. Where appropriate, the Environment Department will require applications to be supported by an Environmental Statement and Compliance Document.

#### **Policy WWM6**

**Proposals for solid waste management facilities will generally be supported, subject to them satisfying other relevant policies of the plan. Where appropriate, the Environment Department will require applications to be supported by an Environmental Statement and a Compliance Document, the latter demonstrating how requirements relating to environmental impacts have been complied with.**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Proposals Map**

There are no proposed amendments to the Proposals Map that accompanies the Urban Area Plan-Review No.1, but Section 2.3.2 of the UAP currently refers to the Proposals Map and its relationship to the various policy areas. Indeed, paragraph 2.3.2.12 makes specific reference to Longue Hougue Industrial Area and Reclamation Site. It is therefore proposed to amend the plan as follows:

#### **2.3.2.12 Longue Hougue Industrial Area and Reclamation Site**

This area has been identified as being suitable for the accommodation of waste management facilities and it is an important reserve for the development of industrial uses with a high environmental impact as well as port-related industrial development.

*See especially: Policy EMP8*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **APPENDIX B**

### **The Inspector's Report**



# **Report to the Environment Department of the States of Guernsey**

**by J I McPherson JP**  
**BSc CEng CEnv MICE MCIWEM MCMI**  
an Inspector appointed by the Policy Council of  
the States of Guernsey

The Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ GTN 1371 8000

Date 4 March 2009

## **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS To**

### **THE URBAN AREA PLAN - REVIEW NO 1**

**Longue Hougue  
Land Reclamation Site and Key Industrial Area  
Solid Waste Management**

**Policies EMP8 and WWM6  
and  
their Supporting Paragraphs**

Planning Inquiry held on 17 and 18 February 2009 at Les Cotils Christian Centre

File Ref: LDF 987

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Paragraph No
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</b>	7
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<b>The Site</b>	10
<b>Policy</b>	14
<b>Environmental Impact Assessment</b>	19
<b>THE REPRESENTATIONS</b>	
<b>Export of Waste off the Island</b>	22
<b>Waste Hierarchy</b>	24
<b>Technology and Capacity</b>	28
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	35
<b>Alternative Sites and/or Uses</b>	37
<b>Environmental Considerations</b>	42
<b>Air Quality</b>	43
<b>Explosion/Fire Hazard</b>	45
<b>Water Quality</b>	47
<b>Noise</b>	53
<b>Traffic</b>	55
<b>Visual Impact</b>	58
<b>Environmental Regulation</b>	60
<b>Complete Review of the UAP</b>	64
<b>Specific Changes to the Proposed Amendments</b>	66
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	69
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	78
 <b>ANNEX A – Proposed Amendments to the UAP</b>	
<b>APPEARANCES</b>	
<b>DOCUMENTS</b>	

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with Section 9 of the Island Development (Guernsey) Law 1966, I was appointed by the Policy Council to hold a Planning Inquiry into the representations made to the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan (UAP) – Review No 1, adopted in July 2002. These amendments relate primarily to the range of processes that may be acceptable for solid waste management on the Longue Hougue Site.
2. The Environment Department prepared an Explanatory Leaflet (Doc 19) setting out the background to the proposed amendments and the process for their adoption. Following the appropriate notice in the Gazette, eight representations were received by the closing date of 5 January 2009 (Doc 23) and all eight were heard at the Inquiry on 17 and 18 February 2009.
3. At the Inquiry, the Environment Minister provided a letter from the Chief Minister confirming that the proposed amendments would be in conformity with the provisions of the Strategic Land Use Plan (Strategic & Corporate Plan) (SLUP).
4. I carried out a preliminary unaccompanied site visit on 16 February 2009. The Inquiry sat on 17 February and part of the morning of 18 February, after which I was accompanied on a further site visit by representatives of the Environment Department and Mrs S Breton, Representor No 4.
5. Mr Adrian Nicolle, Manager Government Business Support at the Policy Council, greatly assisted me in the programming and administration of the Inquiry; for which I am most grateful.
6. In addition to confirming the proposed amendments, my report gives some background information and then considers the main topics raised by the representations before reaching overall conclusions and a recommendation.

## THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

7. The proposed UAP amendments relate to the policies for the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site, and they are set out in Annex A to this report.
8. In essence the proposed amendments would broaden the scope of the technologies that might be used in the treatment and disposal of waste on the Longue Hougue Site. They would also require significant waste management proposals to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement and a Compliance Document.



9. The Environment Department confirmed at the Inquiry that they sought no changes to the proposed amendments.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **The Site**

10. The Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area and Landfill Reclamation site is situated on the eastern side of the Island, to the southeast of St Sampson Harbour (Doc 1- Proposals Map). The earlier development area to the east of Bulwer Avenue was, at least in part, formed by landfilling (Longue Hougue I), and it is now occupied by various commercial and industrial uses, including gas storage tanks, a boat builder's yard, a vehicle repair business and an area currently used for the storage of cars.
11. Further to the east, beyond the spine road, a new area of land is currently being reclaimed from the sea by filling the lagoon formed by the encircling rock breakwater with inert waste (Longue Hougue II). The southern part of this latter area has already been filled to the planned ground level, but the northern part is still an area of water which, with a gap in the breakwater, currently provides temporary boat moorings off the channel into the harbour at St Sampson; the Island's second 'Town' (Aerial photograph at Doc 29).
12. There is a public recycling centre and building containing an animal carcass incinerator on the southern part of the reclaimed land. At the time of my visit, most of the rest of this reclaimed land was unused, apart from some very limited temporary storage uses.
13. The relevant policies apply to the whole of the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area and Reclamation Site (Doc 1 – Proposals Map). Figure 1 of the Non-Technical Summary of the 2001 Environmental Statement for an integrated waste management facility (IWMF) (Doc 6) shows a 'red line' area which includes the current car storage area on Longue Hougue I. However, it is currently envisaged that the waste management facilities would be on the southern land that has more recently been reclaimed as part of Longue Hougue II. Without any firm proposals there is no definitive landtake, but an area of at least 2ha has been mooted (Doc 6).

### **Policy**

14. The present Policy EMP8 (Review No 1- 2002) says that priority will be given at the Longue Hougue site to an integrated waste management facility (IWMF), along with a range of other possible industrial commercial and port related uses. Policy WWM6 requires an outline planning brief and an environmental statement for such a development.

15. When the UAP was adopted in 2002 these policies were in accordance with the Island's 1998 Solid Waste Strategy, but in February 2007 the States approved an interim Waste Disposal Plan (Doc 22) and resolved to seek tenders for the design, build and operation of:
  - *Either a Mass Burn Energy from Waste Plant;*
  - *Or a Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) Plant coupled to an Energy from Waste Plant, which facility may be a Mass Burn or Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT) Plant;*
  - *Including consideration of modular development options for such facilities and any combination of mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT), Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) and Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT).*
16. The policies of the Island's Development Plans must be in conformity with the Strategic Land Use Plan (SLUP) (Docs 20 & 21) and Policy 31 says that the waste facilities to be provided at Longue Hougue will be in accordance with the Solid Waste Strategy.
17. The proposed amendments are therefore intended to permit the wider range of possible waste treatment and disposal technologies envisaged by the States and to encompass any other technologies that might be appropriate.
18. At the time of the States resolution in 2007, the capacity of the treatment plant remained for further consideration, but tenders have now been obtained on the basis of accommodating a combined residual waste stream of 45,000 tonnes per annum (tpa), rising to 70,000 tpa, with the possibility of the full capacity being provided in stages.

#### **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

19. Although not within the European Union, the States of Guernsey generally follow the spirit of EU legislation and in 2005 adopted their own Code of Practice on Environmental Impact Assessment (Doc 17) and, despite the concerns of some local residents (R4), the Public Services Department (PSD) confirmed that the consultation process set out in the code had been undertaken.
20. The original Environmental Statement (ES) and Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) (Doc 31) prepared in 2001 in connection with, the then, amendments to the UAP considered only a mass burn incinerator. Accordingly, an addendum (Doc 18) was prepared to consider the full envelope of the likely environmental effects of the other technologies that might be considered appropriate in accordance with the proposed amendments.

21. Under the amended policies, a new Environmental Impact Assessment and a Compliance Document would be required in connection with any significant waste management planning applications (see Annex A).

### **THE REPRESENTATIONS**

(In this section references such as (R2 or R5) refer to the Representor's Number and my comments are in italics)

#### **Export of Waste off the Island**

22. Deputy Gollop (R2) advocated reconsideration of the States' policy decision not to export putrescible waste to Jersey, or even to France or Germany (Doc 19 – para 2.8).
23. *I am not aware of any sound reason to re-examine that decision. It is not part of the Island's Waste Disposal Plan and, in any case, it would run contrary to the principle of treating and disposing of waste as close to the source as is reasonably practicable – the Proximity Principle. I do not therefore support any proposals for the export of waste that can realistically be treated and disposed of on the Island. In any case, the proposed amendments to a Development Plan should conform to the Island's Strategic Land Use Plan, which in turn calls for it to accord with the Solid Waste Strategy. Export off the Island, to Jersey or elsewhere, would not do so.*

#### **Waste Hierarchy**

24. Almost without exception the representors endorsed the principle of reducing, reusing and recycling waste and only then disposing of the residual material. Particular emphasis was placed on composting and recycling; even aiming for zero waste (R2, R6). Nevertheless, in the longer term, Mr Falla (R5) was very keen to make use of the Island's waste to reclaim more land from the sea; as is currently being carried out at Longue Hougue.
25. The Island's Waste Disposal Plan (Doc 22) includes a target of recycling 50% of all commercial and household waste by 2010 (Doc 19 - Para 1.2) and the PSD's Quarterly Waste Management Report for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2008 (Doc 23/8) shows that about 30% of household waste is currently being recycled via a number of recycling sites around the island, including the Mont Cuet Civic Amenity Facility and the kerbside collection trial (Doc 23/8). That same report indicates that, with the introduction of green waste composting, there has been a reduction in the amount of waste being placed in the Mont Cuet Landfill on the Chouet Headland; the Island's only landfill site for non-inert waste. This site is about 60% full. At the current rate of filling, and without the anticipated Longue Hougue waste management facility, it would be full in about 10 years (this was a revision to the former 5 years quoted in both the Explanatory Leaflet and the

Minister's Statement (Docs 19 & 27)). A 10 year remaining life more nearly equates to the end date of 2021 envisaged by Deputy Gollop (R2). PSD said at the Inquiry that, with the proposed Longue Hougue facility, Mont Cuet would probably be able to accept the residual waste for another 50 years. They also confirmed that no further non-inert landfill is proposed on the Island.

26. Despite the suggestion by Deputy Gollop (R2), the Environment Department (ED) confirmed that the Les Vardes Quarry is unsuitable for landfilling putrescible waste (Doc 22, para 2.4) and that it is intended for continued stone extraction, followed by surface water storage for potable uses. It is not therefore planned to use it for landfill purposes. Likewise, there are no plans to landfill the former quarry void that was used to contain the oil from the Torrey Canyon shipwreck.
27. *The States' approach to waste management already fits with the generally accepted hierarchy of reduction, re-use, recovery (eg recycling, composting and energy recovery) and finally disposing of the residue. That, in itself, would no doubt justify the development of new recycling/recovery and disposal facilities on the Island. However, whatever the exact timescale, it is clear that the only landfill suitable for putrescible and other non-inert wastes is rapidly filling up and that adds more urgency to such a development.*

### **Technology and Capacity**

28. There was considerable acceptance among the representors that some form of new waste management facilities were required on the Island and that they should include a civic amenity site (CA) and a materials recovery facility (MRF) with the residue being processed by one or more of the processes identified in the States' 2007 resolution (see para 15 above) (R2, R4).
29. Even so, it was argued that any high temperature / incineration process should be kept to the minimum possible capacity (R2, R4). With the introduction of green waste composting and the intended greater recycling rate in the future, the Waste Disposal Peoples' Panel Report (2008) saw no need for a capacity of more than 20,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) (R4 & R7).
30. In response, PSD pointed out that the 45,000 tpa initial capacity on which tenders had been sought (rising to 70,000 tpa) was for the whole waste stream that would be diverted from Mont Cuet, together with the estimated quantity of other materials at present being disposed of elsewhere on the Island, eg timber that is being burnt. As referred to by Mrs Breton (R4), there are already two incinerators on the Island; a clinical waste incinerator at the hospital and an animal carcass incinerator on the Longue Hougue site. However, these have very small capacities and are for specialist purposes. They are not therefore relevant to the treatment of the Island's main waste streams.

- 
31. When the present policy was adopted, it was assumed that a mass burn incinerator would be provided and that it would generate electricity for use on the Island. PSD still envisage that, whatever the chosen technology, there is likely to be some form of high temperature / incineration process with electricity generation. According to the document from the Sustainable Development Commission for Scotland submitted by Prof Day (R7), electricity generation on its own would achieve an efficiency of only about 20%, whereas up to about 80% can be achieved if the waste heat is also put to good use in nearby developments (Doc 23/7).
  32. *The whole purpose of the proposed amendments is to provide a 'policy gateway' that would permit the best available technology to be employed and I don't consider any of the Representors seriously questioned that objective.*
  33. *I have no knowledge of the proposed technologies in the recent tenders but, if as expected, they propose the reduction of the mixed waste stream by sorting, composting, MBT, ATT etc, with only the residual material being 'incinerated', the capacity of that latter plant would be substantially less than the full waste stream; possibly closer to the 20,000 tpa anticipated by the Waste Disposal Peoples' Panel. The capacity of such a plant can only be determined as part of the complete process and is not something that should be pre-determined in the policy amendments. Providing every effort is made to reuse and recycle the waste, an unnecessarily large capacity for the 'incineration' plant would presumably lead to increased costs, but that should be avoided through the competitive tendering process.*
  34. *If amended as proposed, these policies would permit the co-location of the waste management facilities with other industrial developments that could benefit from the surplus heat. That would certainly be very desirable in efficiency terms, but I do not see any realistic way of requiring that to be the case through the UAP.*

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

35. In addition to Deputy Gollop's and Deputy de Lisle's comments on global warming (R2, R6), Prof Day (R7) expressed strong concerns about the harmful greenhouse gases that would be released through electricity generation from an 'incineration-type process' compared with the lack of such gases from nuclear energy from France, or perhaps the development of tidal energy in future. Whilst this is a matter that was not included in the ES, PSD pointed out that it was included in their analysis of the tenders that had recently been received.
36. *At least 'incineration' would produce mainly carbon dioxide, rather than the more harmful methane gas generated from a landfill process. Although greenhouse gasses have not generally been identified in the scoping exercise for an EIA, it would seem appropriate to do so where they are likely to form a significant environmental consideration.*

**Alternative Sites and/or Uses**

37. Most Representors accepted the need for a civic amenity site (CA) and a materials recycling facility (MRF) at Longue Hougue and Deputy de Lisle also accepted composting (R6), but a significant number of the Representors argued that it would be the wrong location for any large scale composting, heat treatment, MBT, ATT or similar processes. Instead, they mostly advocated any such plant being sited in the vicinity of the present Mont Cuet landfill (R1, R2, R3, R4), and it was claimed that there was strong local support for such a change in policy (R4). In some cases, this was because of the perceived advantages of using the reclaimed land at Longue Hougue for other purposes, such as waterside residential accommodation (R1) or a mixed residential and green industrial park form of development (R2), therefore necessitating any high temperature / incineration process being sited elsewhere; perhaps at Mont Cuet or Les Vardes. Deputy Gollop (R2) saw no need for the Les Vardes Quarry to be retained for public water supply storage when a desalination plant could be employed instead. Deputy de Lisle (R6) considered there was a need for more high quality industrial development and he wished to see the range of possible uses widened to include Use Class 41- the storage of materials for use in the construction of buildings. Mrs Breton (R4) acknowledged the benefits of co-locating a range of waste processes, but she still argued that any high temperature treatment should be sited elsewhere – probably at Mont Cuet. Mostly the arguments hinged on environmental concerns about such matters as air quality, water quality, visual impact, noise or traffic (see the section on Environmental Considerations below).
38. Mrs Breton (R4) considered that it would cost significantly more to build on the unstable reclaimed land at Longue Hougue than it would on other sites, such as Mont Cuet.
39. *I am more used to an assessment of the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) determining the treatment process rather than comparing alternative sites. However, for the 2002 Plan amendments a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) concluded that the Longue Hougue Site was the BPEO for an integrated waste management facility for the Island. This assessment was revisited in the 2009 Addendum, which considers the wider range of possible technologies (Doc 18, Appendix C). Table B.1 conveniently summarises the comparison of alternative sites and shows that the reclaimed land at Longue Hougue would still be the best site; with Mont Cuet the next best. Deputy Gollop called into question the individual judgements within the BPEO assessment (R2). From the information before me, I do not consider these judgements to be in error, or at least not to an extent that would affect the overall conclusion.*

40. *There is already a swathe of commercial and industrial uses on the western side of this Key Industrial Area and DE said that the site had been considered suitable for the currently proposed range of industrial and port-related uses since 1995. I also understand from DE that there are three other substantial Key Industrial Areas on the Island. However, I have no sound information on which to properly consider any alternative uses, such as residential development. I also see no reason why one particular storage use should be singled out and added to the range of more intrusive industrial developments that would be considered appropriate for the site.*
41. *It may be that there would be unusual construction costs on this recently filled land and also additional costs in connection with the necessary architectural treatments in this visually prominent location. However that is not to say that there would not be other off-setting benefits on this site or costs at other sites.*

### **Environmental Considerations**

42. As indicated above, many Representors expressed concerns about such matters as air quality, fire and explosion hazards, water quality, traffic, noise and visual impact. In some cases, they highlighted the changed environmental standards since the original ES was prepared and questioned why there was still a need for more information, even after the 2009 addendum (R2, R4, R6). Some also questioned the effectiveness of the regulatory system (R2, R4).

#### **Air Quality**

43. The concerns over air quality centred primarily on the possible public health effects of the emissions from an incinerator in relatively close proximity to the residential neighbourhood of St Sampson, and in particular the nearby schools (R4, R6). It was said that, under light wind conditions, the flue gases from the Vale Power Station on the northern side of the harbour already settle over the community, and the emissions from an incinerator would do the same (R1, R4, R6). Similarly, there were concerns about windblown dust from the site (R1). The French nuclear power plants tend to be on relatively isolated promontories and that would be the right approach for a waste facility on Guernsey (R1). It was said that waste processing could well produce odours (R2), but PSD noted that, depending on the process involved, there are a number of different techniques available for their control.
44. *The nearest residential properties are on Bulwer Avenue just to the south of the access to the Longue Hougue site and the supporting documentation to any planning application would have to demonstrate that the air quality there would not be unacceptable. That includes the effects of odours.*

**Explosion/Fire Hazard**

45. Deputy de Lisle (R6) argued that an incinerator, or similar process, could be subject to explosions and its location in close proximity to the gas and oil storage tanks on the western part of the Longue Hougue site would be very unwise. He supplied a number of internet reports of fires and explosions at incinerators. Mr Falla (R5) expressed similar concerns, however, PSD emphasised that the Health and Safety Executive had been consulted and had raised no objections in principle.
46. *Again the details would need to be considered in the light of any particular proposal, but the responsible authority has no objection at this stage.*

**Water Quality**

47. The anticipated development could impact on the marine environment with its sensitive shellfish beds just to the south of the site and/or on Longue Hougue Reservoir, a source of public water supply. Both aspects were referred to by the Representors (R1, R3, R4, R6).
48. The water contained within the reclaimed land is in hydraulic continuity with the surrounding sea and, apart from the gap in the breakwater, there is also no filter barrier in the rock structure to prevent fines being washed out into the adjoining marine environment; for instance by tidal movements. The concern is that excavations within the filled material, or the placing of bottom ash as part of future filling operations, could result in sediment or chemical contamination of the surrounding coastline.
49. However, PSD said that the progressive filling of the lagoon with inert material had been taking place for some considerable time and that occasional surveys had not indicated any sediment plumes or harm to the shellfish beds. Depending on the technology, any bottom ash may be used in concrete blocks or road construction, but it had anyhow been assessed as suitable for landfilling. It is envisaged that any fly-ash would be classified as a hazardous waste and exported to a suitable landfill off the Island.
50. Although some distance inland, it is known that there has been some saline intrusion into the old Longue Hougue quarry through water paths in the surrounding strata. The main concern is that construction operations, or possible bottom ash deposition in the lagoon, might lead to pollution of this source of potable water for the Island. As pointed out by PSD this is a matter that is flagged up in the existing ES and would have to be considered in any future ES.
51. *More definitive information would certainly be required in the ES to accompany any future application(s), but there is no reason at this stage to consider water quality considerations should rule out the scheme.*



52. *In line with predictions of future sea level rise, I would expect a full assessment of the flood risk to any development on the Longue Hougue site.*

#### **Noise**

53. Both fixed and mobile plant at a waste treatment facility can generate significant levels of noise; a matter of concern to Mrs Breton (R4). PSD responded that the likely noise levels had been considered in the ES for the most noise sensitive properties and found to be acceptable.
54. *Until the process and the plant itself is determined it is a little difficult to establish its noise generation characteristics, but that would be done and assessed in the ES to be submitted with any planning application. Despite the comments in the Addendum about including the car storage area within the possible site, that does not seem likely. Therefore, the main noise generation would probably be more or less as assumed in the ES.*

#### **Traffic**

55. The processing of greater quantities of waste at the Longue Hougue site would clearly increase the traffic to and from the site and some Representors expressed concerns about the effect of additional traffic on the surrounding road network, in particular on Church Road and The Bridge in St Sampson (R1, R4).
56. PSD referred to the Traffic Impact Assessment that forms part of the ES. It was based on certain assumptions and indicated that acceptable traffic conditions could be maintained. PSD also mentioned the road improvements that had already been carried out at the junction of the access road to the site and Bulwer Avenue.
57. *It is clear that there is already significant congestion on The Bridge and many of the roads in the area may not be ideal for increased HGV traffic. Much of the waste would be diverted from the Mont Cuet Landfill, but that does not necessarily mean a corresponding increase in the traffic from that direction. The waste would be brought directly from its source to the site. Subject to the chosen process, there might be a residue that would have to be taken to Mont Cuet for final disposal, but that might be via a route that would avoid The Bridge. Again the choice of process would determine the traffic generation characteristics of the development and would have to be considered in detail as part of a future ES.*

#### **Visual Impact**

58. Without an established process, the necessary buildings cannot be determined with any precision, but the original ES was based on an energy from waste

incinerator housed in a building of about 100m by 40m by 25m high, with a 55m high, 5m diameter, stack (Doc 31, para 8.12). It was argued (R4) that this would be visually unacceptable in this shoreline location.

59. *As with many of the other considerations, the visual impact would depend very much on the choice of process. This is undoubtedly a prominent site when seen from the sea, including the channel into St Sampson's Harbour and Herm. It has been described as a 'Gateway to Guernsey'. It is also very visible from various public vantage points such as Delancey Park and Vale Castle. The development would have a considerable zone of visual influence, as illustrated in Figure 8.3 of the ES which also contains a number of photomontages. The latter do not however show any of the other surrounding developments envisaged in the UAP. These other uses may or may not arise but if, for example, the port related uses were developed on the northern part of the site, they would be seen in conjunction with the waste plant, thereby materially reducing its overall impact. The Inspector who considered the 2002 amendments made some recommendations about the outline planning brief with the intention of achieving a good standard of design (Doc 26). He certainly did not conclude that such a development should be ruled out as visually unacceptable, and I see no reason to disagree.*

### **Environmental Regulation**

60. Without a directly comparable body to the Environment Agency (EA) in England and Wales, several Representors (R2, R4, R6) questioned the effectiveness of the Guernsey Public Health Department in enforcing appropriate environmental controls on a major waste facility. In this respect it was said that the Vale Power Station and the Jersey Waste Incinerator had both been operating for some time outside the currently accepted environmental standards (R4, R6).
61. PSD explained that, although not part of the EU, Guernsey generally applied similar environmental standards to those in England. The ES and its addendum had shown that any of the likely technologies could be expected to comply with the current emission standards. The details would be contained in the ES and the associated Compliance Document. The appropriate environmental licences and/or permits would be required before planning permission could be given. Thereafter, the appropriate conditions would be enforced by the Public Health Department, very much along the lines that the EA enforces the pollution control regime in England.
62. ED said that both the Vale Power Station and the Jersey Incinerator were examples of old technologies and were not therefore particularly relevant to a new plant.
63. *The planning system in England operates on the basis that the various environmental controls would operate effectively and, despite the reservations*

*expressed by certain representors, I see no sound reason why the same assumption should not be made for Guernsey.*

### **Complete Review of the UAP**

64. Deputy Gollop considered the previous amendments to the UAP to have been an interim measure and stated that the whole plan should now be reviewed in the light of current developments and the changing economic and ecological circumstances (R2). He considered the Planning Policy Framework to be no longer fit for purpose. In this context, he considered a mass burn waste to energy plant was unacceptable and that the Plan policies should not limit the options to simply ATT, MBT or MHT but should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate all other possible options.

65. *In my view, the proposed amendments are designed for just that purpose.*

### **Specific Changes to the Proposed Amendments**

66. Deputy de Lisle advocated certain specific changes to the proposed UAP amendments (R6). He recommended that the proposed Policy EMP8 be changed to exclude any high temperature heat treatment or waste incineration processes, to include the prospect of Use Class 41 on the site and to call for the former Outline Planning Brief to be revised and updated.

67. ED considered the proposed rewording to be outwith the States' resolution and therefore not appropriate. In any case, the intention was to achieve additional flexibility with a much wider 'policy gateway' and not to restrict the possible options at this stage.

68. *I agree with the views expressed by ED.*

### **CONCLUSIONS**

*(The figures in brackets in this section indicate the relevant paragraphs above)*

69. I support the States' approach to the waste hierarchy and see no reason to reconsider the decision not to export the Island's bulk waste to Jersey or elsewhere (23,27).

70. The present Policies EMP8 and WWM6 were adopted some time ago and are not sufficiently flexible to permit the best technical solutions that may now be available for the treatment and disposal of the Island's waste (15,17,32).

71. Whilst the recent tendering process called for bids to handle a combined waste stream of 45,000 to 70,000 tonnes per annum, that does not mean that any high temperature / incineration process to deal with the residual material need necessarily be of that capacity. Until the proposed technologies are known, the

capacities of the individual plant processes can not be determined but, whatever they may be, there would be little point in calling for a larger capacity than necessary, if only because of the likely cost penalty (18,33).

72. With the proposed amendments, there would be the possibility of co-location with other developments that could benefit from any waste heat; thereby greatly increasing the overall efficiency of the operation (34).
73. Part of the assessment process for the tenders would include their greenhouse gas emissions, which may also be included in the Environmental Statement if they would be likely to have material environmental consequences (36).
74. There is always the possibility of some different use for a particular area of land. However, after reclamation from the sea, this site has been intended for industrial, port-related and waste uses for a long time and it is shown to be the best location for a major waste facility for the Island. Accordingly, I am far from convinced of the need to change the basis of the policy (39,40,41).
75. In accordance with the proposed plan amendments, any significant waste planning applications for the site would have to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement and Compliance Document. These would have to demonstrate that the environmental impact of the development would be acceptable in terms of such matters as air quality, explosion/fire hazard, water quality, noise, traffic and visual appearance. There may well be other environmental considerations for a particular process, eg greenhouse gas emissions (21,36,44,46,51,52,54,57,59).
76. The necessary environmental licences/permits would have to be obtained before planning permission would be granted and the Public Health Department would enforce the necessary standards (61,63).
77. I therefore conclude that the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan would be appropriate, and I see no need for any further changes to those that are proposed (65).

## **RECOMMENDATION**

78. I recommend that the proposed alterations, as published and set out in Annex A, be made to the Urban Area Plan.

J I McPherson  
INSPECTOR

**Annex A****Proposed Amendments to the Policies and Supporting Text  
(Taken from Annex A to the Explanatory Leaflet - Doc 19)****Employment (Chapter 6)****6.2.2.4 Development of the land reclamation site**

The land created by the extension of the Longue Hougue reclamation scheme (known as Longue Hougue II) is an important resource for development. Whilst a proportion of the area will be required for port-related industrial development, the remainder should accommodate activities with a high environmental impact, including waste management facilities and uses which could potentially create a pollution threat to Longue Hougue Reservoir.

The Land Reclamation Site is part of the Key Industrial Area bisected by Bulwer Avenue. It is the area of land being created by landfill on the south side of St. Sampson's Harbour, abutting a previous land reclamation site known as Longue Hougue I. It is planned to accommodate port-related land uses on part of the reclamation area (see Policy ETL2), thereby taking advantage of the proposed deep water harbour facilities, with the remainder being made available for industrial development.

In May, 2000, the then Board of Administration commissioned consultants to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of potential sites, on an island-wide basis, to identify the most sustainable location for an integrated waste management facility (Solid Waste Strategy EIA Study - Stage 2 Report -May 2000). The preferred location was identified on reclaimed land to the east of Bulwer Avenue, St. Sampson known as Longue Hougue.

In 2002, an Outline Planning Brief (OPB) was approved for part of the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area (Phase One) in accordance with the State's adopted Solid Waste Strategy (Billet d'État XII, June 1998) which at that time required the provision of an Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) to process the Island's waste comprising certain specified elements, including a waste to energy plant.

In early 2007 (Billet d'État I January 2007), the States resolved to seek competitive tenders for the design, build and operation of a broader range of technologies, in accordance with Strategic Policy 31 of the Strategic Land Use Plan (2006), rather than simply a Waste to Energy plant. In the light of this more recent resolution, the OPB does not provide a policy framework covering all the potential development options for the site. The requirement to prepare an OPB has therefore been removed and replaced by a requirement to prepare a Development Brief, which will provide for all potential options, whilst allowing for more flexibility.

**Policy EMP8**

**At the Longue Hougue Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site, the priority will be to accommodate:-**

- **Waste management facilities;**
- **Industrial uses with a high environmental impact;**
- **Uses falling within Use Classes 48-59 inclusive; and**
- **Port related industrial uses.**

**To ensure that the Key Industrial Area and Land Reclamation Site are planned comprehensively, a Development Brief will be prepared for the phased development of the land to the east of Bulwer Avenue, St Sampson, the underlying principles of which will be to optimise the use of the available land and achieve a good overall development which enhances the Key Industrial Area and recognises the importance of the site's 'Gateway to Guernsey' location.**

**All planning applications for significant waste related facilities shall be supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment.**

**Water and Waste Management (Chapter 9)****9.2.5 Solid waste management**

Whilst the States have adopted a solid waste strategy (Billet d'État I, January 2007) which involves the construction and management of a facility at Longue Hougue that is capable of dealing with waste arisings on the Island for the next 25 years, it is anticipated that other forms of waste related development such as a Civic Amenity Site and Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) could also be developed in the Urban Area to meet the need for solid waste infrastructure. Where appropriate, the Environment Department will require applications to be supported by an Environmental Statement and Compliance Document.

**Policy WWM6**

**Proposals for solid waste management facilities will generally be supported, subject to them satisfying other relevant policies of the plan. Where appropriate, the Environment Department will require applications to be supported by an Environmental Statement and a Compliance Document, the latter demonstrating how requirements relating to environmental impacts have been complied with.**

**Proposals Map**

There are no proposed amendments to the Proposals Map that accompanies the Urban Area Plan – Review No 1, but Section 2.3.2 of the UAP currently refers to the Proposals map and its relationship to the various policy areas. Indeed, paragraph 2.3.2.12 makes

specific reference to Longue Hougue Industrial Area and Reclamation Site. It is therefore proposed to amend the plan as follows:

**2.3.2.12 Longue Hougue Industrial Area and Reclamation Site**

This area has been identified as being suitable for the accommodation of waste management facilities and it is an important reserve for the development of industrial uses with a high environmental impact as well as port-related industrial development.

*See especially: Policy EMP8*

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Deputy Peter Sirett - Environment Minister

Damon Hackley MA MRTPI - Principal Forward Planning Officer

Geoff Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI - Principal Forward Planning Officer

Faith Rose BA MA MRTPI - Director of Planning Policy

### REPRESENTORS

- |               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Representor 1 | Mr G Willson, Aquastar Ltd, Ocean Yard, Bulwer Avenue, St Sampson, GY2  |
| Representor 2 | Deputy J A B Gollop, Mermaid Lodge, 2 Clifton, St Peter Port, GY1 2PW   |
| Representor 3 | Mr P Edge, Gorselea, Bulwer Avenue, St Sampson, GY2 4LD   |
| Representor 4 | Mrs S Breton, Lulworth Cove, Church Road, St Sampson, GY2 4LN   |
| Representor 5 | Mr P J Falla, Savannah, Barras Lane, Vale, GY6 8EN  |
| Representor 6 | Deputy Dr D de Lisle PhD, Le Douit Farm, Les Reveaux, St Pierre du Bois, GY7 9DH  |
| Representor 7 | Prof N Day, La Cordonnerie, La Bellieuse, St Martin, GY4 6RP  |
| Representor 8 | The Public Services Department represented by:-<br><br>Mr A Richards CEng FIMechE MIMarEST – Senior Waste Project Manager,<br><br>Mr P Collins BSc(Hons) MA AIEMA – Senior Environmental Consultant with Ramboll Whitby Bird<br><br>Ms S Cobb BSc(Hons) AIEMA – Associate Ramboll Whitby Bird |



**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BEFORE THE INQUIRY**

- 1 Urban Area Plan - Review No 1 – Written Statement July 2002
- 2 Solid Waste Strategy EIA Study May 2000 – Stage 2 Report
- 3 Solid Waste Strategy EIA Study May 2000 – Stage 2 Report  
Appendix 1 – WtE Plant Sites Information
- 4 Solid Waste Strategy EIA Study May 2000 – Stage 2 Report  
Appendix 3 – Air Quality Issues
- 5 Solid Waste Strategy EIA Study May 2000 –  
Scoping Document Version 2 – Final
- 6 Guernsey Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF)  
Environmental Statement - Non Technical Summary – May 2001
- 7 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix – Air Quality
- 8 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix – Landscape and Visual Effects
- 9 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix – Land Use and Community Effects
- 10 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix – Solid Residues
- 11 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix - Water
- 12 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix - Traffic
- 13 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix - Noise
- 14 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix – Natural Heritage
- 15 Guernsey IWMF - Environmental Statement – May 2001  
Technical Appendix – Cultural Heritage
- 16 Adopted Alteration to the UAP and Outline Planning Brief - 2002
- 17 Environmental Impact Assessment – Code of Practice – Feb 2005
- 18 Addendum to 2001 ES - Feb 2009
- 19 Explanatory Leaflet on the Proposed Amendments
- 20 Projet de Loi – The Island Development Plan
- 21 Strategic Land Use Plan
- 22 Billet d'Etat I 2007 – Waste Disposal Plan
- 23 Representations 1-8 with some supporting documents
- 24 Press Cutting
- 25 Longue Hougue Planning Inquiry Timetable
- 26 Inspector's Report from the 2001 Alterations Inquiry

**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY**

- 27 Opening Statement by Deputy P Sirett – Minister for the Environment  
Department
- 28 Letter confirming compliance with the Strategic Land Use Plan
- 29 Aerial Photograph of the Longue Hougue site
- 30 Plan of part of the Longue Hougue site
- 31 Guernsey Integrated Waste Management Facility – Environmental Statement  
2001
- 32 The Island Development (Uses Classes) Ordinance 1991
- 33 Consultative Leaflet on Land for Low Key Industry
- 34 Attendance Lists

**(NB The Policy Council has no comment on the proposal.)**

**(NB The Treasury and Resources Department has no comment on the proposal.)**

The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2009, of the Environment Department, they are of the opinion:-

To approve the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan - Review No.1.

**IN THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY  
ON THE 27<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MAY, 2009**

**The States resolved as follows concerning Billet d'État No XII  
dated 24<sup>th</sup> April 2009**

**ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE URBAN AREA PLAN – REVIEW NO.1  
LONGUE HOUGUE LAND RECLAMATION SITE AND KEY INDUSTRIAL  
AREA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

After consideration of the Report dated 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2009, of the Environment Department:-

To approve the proposed amendments to the Urban Area Plan - Review No.1.

**S M D ROSS  
HER MAJESTY'S DEPUTY GREFFIER**