



## AGMA Executive Board

Date: 28th March 2025

Subject: Joint Waste and Minerals Plan review

Report of: City Mayor Paul Dennett Portfolio Lead for Housing First and Steve Rumbelow  
Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Housing First

---

### Purpose of Report

The ten authorities are responsible for waste and minerals planning and a review of the existing Joint Greater Manchester Waste and Minerals Plans shows them to be out of date and in need of updating. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to progress a new Joint Greater Manchester Waste and Minerals Plan.

### Recommendations:

**The AGMA Executive Board is requested to:**

1. Agree the outcome of the review of the Joint Waste and Minerals Plans outlined in Section 3.
2. Agree the recommended approach to produce a single Joint Waste and Minerals Plan (Option 1 in Appendix 1), as set out in paragraph 5.1

**Ask each full Council to**

3. Approve the making of an agreement with the other 9 Greater Manchester councils (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan \* delete as appropriate) to prepare a joint development plan document to cover planning for waste and minerals across Greater Manchester.
4. Note that the [Council's Executive / Cabinet] will be asked to delegate the formulating and preparing of the draft joint development plan document to AGMA Executive Board.
5. Note that there will be further reports to full Council in respect of, matters, which are within the remit of full Council including approval of the joint development plan document.

BOLTON  
BURY

MANCHESTER  
OLDHAM

ROCHDALE  
SALFORD

STOCKPORT  
TAMESIDE

TRAFFORD  
WIGAN

**Ask each Executive / cabinet/ leader/ the City Mayor (depending on each Council's own arrangements and in the event that the Councils have approved the above recommendations):**

- i. Note that full Council has approved the making of an agreement with the other 9 Greater Manchester councils [state] to prepare a joint development plan document to cover planning for waste and minerals across Greater Manchester.
- ii. Delegate to AGMA Executive Board the formulating and preparing of the joint development plan document to cover planning for waste and minerals across Greater Manchester insofar as such matters are executive functions.
- iii. Note that the following **are the sole responsibility of full Council**:
  - Responsibility for giving of instructions to the executive to reconsider the draft plan submitted by the executive for the authority's consideration.
  - The amendment of the draft joint development plan document submitted by the executive for the full Council's consideration
  - The approval of the joint development plan document for the purposes of submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
  - The adoption of the joint development plan document.

## **Contact Officers**

David Hodcroft – [david.hodcroft@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk](mailto:david.hodcroft@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk)

Philippa Lane – [philippa.lane@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk](mailto:philippa.lane@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk)

## **Equalities Implications**

A Joint Development Plan Document is a statutory plan which seeks to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, delivering economic, social and environmental benefits together in a mutually reinforcing way. It will be informed by an Integrated Appraisal which includes an Equalities assessment.

## **Equalities Impact, Carbon and Sustainability Assessment:**

## Recommendation - Key points for decision-makers

The assessment of proposal for a Joint Waste and Minerals Plan has achieved a positive impact score and a good level of awareness on carbon and is recommended for approval.

### Impacts Questionnaire

Impact Indicator	Result	Justification/Mitigation
Equality and Inclusion	G	National planning policy requires plans to be shaped by effective community engagement. Public consultation on the plan is required at various stages of development and a consultation report will be published. Consultation will be informed by a Consultation Strategy, which is based on the Statement of Community Involvement prepared by each of the participating authorities. An Equality Impact Assessment will assist understanding of the extent of any impact on different groups and inform plan preparation.
Health	G	The plan would be accompanied by an integrated impact assessment that would incorporate a health impact assessment and inform plan preparation. This tool will identify the health impacts of the plan and develop recommendations to maximise the positive impacts and minimise the negative impacts, while maintaining a focus on addressing health inequalities.
Resilience and Adaptation	G	The plan would facilitate waste management as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable and the steady and adequate supply of aggregates. There are overall benefits to the climate of this approach.
Housing		National planning policy requires minerals planning authorities to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates and the plan will assist in this. Estimated that 22% aggregates are used for new housing. The construction of a typical new house requires on average around 200 tonnes of aggregates and associated mineral products. Estimated that 17% aggregates are used for repair and maintenance. The plan would seek to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates.
Economy	G	The minerals and waste plan would consider the issue of a steady and adequate supply of aggregate, which is required in order for GM to realise its growth ambitions. New solutions for dealing with waste are being found in the form of clean, hi-tech processes, that include recycling or reprocessing technologies and converting used materials into high value products.
Mobility and Connectivity	G	The plan would be accompanied by an integrated assessment or highway impact assessment as required. Aggregates are required for construction and maintenance of railways (ballast). The plan will seek to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates and road stone required for new roads or railway.
Carbon, Nature and Environment	G	The plan would be accompanied by an integrated impact assessment. Development management policies would require impacts to be considered through the assessment of any planning applications.
Consumption and Production	G	National waste planning policy requires waste planning authorities, through waste plans, to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy. The Plan would not set recycling rates but would identify if there is a need for additional recycling facilities and set out a policy approach on where these should be located. The Plan would be informed by the Resources and Waste Strategy (2018) Waste (Circular Economy) (Amendment) regulations 2020, Waste Management Plan for England which look at moving towards a circular economy.

Contribution to achieving the GM Carbon Neutral 2038 target	The plan would assist in the delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency. National waste planning policy requires waste planning authorities to plan to move waste up the waste hierarchy and national planning policy includes specific policy on climate change which relates to all forms of development and
---	---

#### Further Assessment(s):

Carbon Assessment

G

Positive impacts overall, whether long or short term.

A

Mix of positive and negative impacts. Trade-offs to consider.

R

Mostly negative, with at least one positive aspect. Trade-offs to consider.

RR

Negative impacts overall.

## Carbon Assessment

<b>Overall Score</b>	#DIV/0!			
<b>Buildings</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Justification/Mitigation</b>		
New Build residential	#DIV/0!			
Residential building(s) renovation/maintenance	#DIV/0!			
New build non-residential (including public) buildings	N/A			
<b>Transport</b>				
Active travel and public transport	#DIV/0!			
Roads, Parking and Vehicle Access	#DIV/0!			
Access to amenities	#DIV/0!			
Vehicle procurement	N/A			
<b>Land Use</b>				
Land use	#DIV/0!			
No associated carbon impacts expected.	High standard in terms of practice and awareness on carbon.	Mostly best practice with a good level of awareness on carbon.	Partially meets best practice/ awareness, significant room to improve.	Not best practice and/ or insufficient awareness of carbon impacts.

## **Risk Management**

Work programme to be reported at the February Leaders meeting

## **Legal Considerations**

The recommendations in the report reflect the relevant functions and who has the power to carry them out. Other relevant legal considerations are set out in the relevant part of the report.

## **Financial Consequences – Revenue**

To be reported at the February Leaders meeting

## **Financial Consequences – Capital**

There are no direct capital financial consequences to AGMA.

## **Number of attachments to the report:**

n/a

## **Comments/recommendations from Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

n/a

## **Background Papers**

n/a

## **Tracking/ Process**

Does this report relate to a major strategic decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution

Yes

## **Exemption from call in**

n/a

## **GM Transport Committee**

n/a

## **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

n/a

# **1. Background**

- 1.1 The ten Local Authorities in Greater Manchester are the waste and minerals planning authorities for their respective area. Each authority is responsible for land use planning matters for waste and minerals development. The 10 Greater Manchester authorities worked together to produce a Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document (the Waste Plan), adopted in 2012, and a Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Development Plan Document (the Minerals Plan) which was adopted in 2013.
- 1.2 The Waste Plan considers all types of waste arisings, including: construction, demolition and excavation waste; commercial and industrial waste; hazardous waste; and Local Authority Collected Waste. It allocates sites and areas to provide sufficient opportunities for waste management facilities across Greater Manchester and provides a policy framework for determining planning applications for new waste management facilities.
- 1.3 In terms of household waste collected by the authorities, Wigan manages its own waste whilst GMCA manages waste collected by the other nine authorities. The sites needed to deliver household waste management strategies and individual waste management streams e.g. recovery, recycling anaerobic digestion of food waste are identified and then safeguarded in the Waste Plan.
- 1.4 The Minerals Plan provides a guide to operators and the public about where mineral extraction may take place in future and safeguards mineral resources from other forms of development.
- 1.5 By law, local authorities must ensure that waste and minerals planning policies are regularly monitored and kept up-to-date. This will give greater certainty to both industry and communities about where waste facilities and minerals infrastructure will be located.

# **2. Introduction**

- 2.1 The Waste Plan and the Minerals Plan form part of the development plan for each of the 10 authorities and planning applications for minerals and waste development are determined in accordance with these plans.
- 2.2 The Waste Plan and Minerals Plan are required by law to be reviewed at least once every five years, starting from the date of adoption. Such a review is focused on

deciding whether plan policies remain relevant and effective in addressing local needs. Where policies are no longer considered to be relevant or effective, the plan should be updated in whole or part. Minerals and waste planning authorities are also required to prepare and maintain a 'minerals and waste plan timetable' which sets out key information relating to the coverage of their minerals and waste plans, as well as a timetable for preparation.

- 2.3 Concerns were raised during the preparation of Places for Everyone (PfE) regarding the provision of aggregate supply to serve the growth set out in PfE. In response to these concerns, the PfE Submission Duty to Cooperate and Log of Collaboration committed to adding the need to review the Minerals and Waste plans to the PfE districts' individual Local Development Schemes (LDS). Several authorities have since included a commitment to review the Minerals and Waste Plans to determine if an update is required in their most recent LDS.
- 2.4 Both the Waste and Minerals plans have been reviewed using the Planning Advisory Service Local Plan Review Assessment Toolkit. The toolkit contains a checklist of the key requirements as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW).
- 2.5 The 2014 Waste Needs Assessment (WNA), which identified future waste management requirements, was reviewed and updated by consultants in 2024. The 2024 WNA update identifies changes in the methodology used to calculate waste arisings and forecast arisings since the 2014 WNA and provides a baseline and forecast of waste arisings for the principal waste streams up to 2037. The 2024 WNA update has informed the plan review.

### **3. Findings of the Review**

- 3.1 The review found there have been numerous national policy and legislative changes since adoption of the Waste and Minerals Plans, including the publication of the Greater Manchester Sustainable Consumption and Production Plan 2022-2025. The policies in the plans are no longer effective in addressing specific local issues. The review concludes that both plans should be updated in whole.
- 3.2 There are numerous benefits to updating the plans, including the development of a planning policy approach to waste and resources which takes account of priority areas set out in the Sustainable Consumption and Production Plan 2022-2025. Furthermore, Duty to Cooperate with mineral producing authorities outside Greater



Manchester, as part of work on a new plan, will support the delivery of homes, economic and infrastructure development through the flow of aggregates. Updating the plans will also ensure that the 10 authorities are able to demonstrate they are meeting obligations to plan for waste and minerals at the examination of their own Local Plans.

- 3.3 The risk of not updating the plans includes the potential for poorly located planning permissions and inadequately planning for future waste arisings. There is also a risk if Greater Manchester's growth ambitions are impacted by uncertainties in aggregate supply, which could delay projects. The authorities are required to plan for minerals and waste otherwise there is a risk emerging Local Plans could be found unsound at examination.

## **4. Options to update the plans**

- 4.1 The findings of the review show there is a clear need to update the Waste and Minerals Plans to comply with national policy and it is recommended that they are updated in whole, to take account of changing circumstances since they were adopted. There are a number of options for updating the plans as set out at appendix 1 of this report.

## **5. Recommended Approach to updating the Plans**

- 5.1 Minerals are increasingly likely to become a priority in future as Greater Manchester lacks its own mineral resources (required for construction and infrastructure) and therefore it is recommended that minerals and waste should be progressed at the same time (Option 1).
- 5.2 There are resource and time efficiencies associated with producing a single joint Waste and Minerals Plan and this would ensure that both plans were updated for all authorities at the same time. Furthermore, such an approach would ensure that minerals planning issues, which are becoming increasingly relevant (to support new developments, housing and infrastructure) in Greater Manchester, are considered at the same time as waste planning.

## **6. Process for producing a Joint Waste and Minerals Plan**

- 6.1 The AGMA Executive Board would oversee development of a Joint Waste and Minerals Plan and, as happened with the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, it will be necessary for the constituent local authorities to delegate its plan-making powers in respect of minerals and waste to the Joint Committee up to the point of 'Publication', the Regulation 19 stage. A report will be prepared for the AGMA Executive Board to set out the delegation process. Each Local Authority would be required to obtain full council approval to prepare a new joint plan as well as the approval of its executive (whether that is the Cabinet, Leader or City Mayor) to delegate the preparation of the Joint Waste and Minerals Plan to the AGMA Executive Board up to Publication stage. Full council approval by all 10 will be required prior to submission of the draft plan to the secretary of state and to adopt the final plan once it has been through the examination in public.
- 6.2 The preparation of a Joint Waste and Minerals Plan would need to be reflected in each District's Local Development Scheme (LDS) which sets out the three-year project plan identifying which local development documents will be produced, in what order, and when.

## **7. Issues to be explored**

### Residual Waste Landfill Capacity

- 7.1 Whilst sending waste to landfill should be a last resort, the updated Waste Needs Assessment (2024) indicates that there will be an ongoing need for landfill capacity beyond the current plan period for waste which cannot be managed higher up the waste hierarchy. Options to deal with this that would need to be explored through the plan would include extending existing operations or consideration of any alternative sites or disposal methods.
- 7.2 Pilsworth South landfill was the only landfill in Greater Manchester recorded as accepting non-hazardous waste in 2022 (latest available data). Issues relating to odour from Pilsworth South Landfill have resulted in a number of letters and emails to GMCA from Unsworth and West Heywood Councillors and the Leader of Rochdale Council between March-September 2024. The site is currently subject to air quality monitoring by the Environment Agency.

### Aggregate Supply

7.3 Minerals are likely to become a priority in the future as aggregates are needed to meet growth and housing delivery, including that set out in Places for Everyone. Minerals can only be worked where they are found and it is unlikely that Greater Manchester will ever be self-sufficient regarding aggregates. Greater Manchester is therefore dependent on working with aggregate producing areas to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates to support the levels of development proposed. The only way do to this is through Duty to Cooperate through an update to the Minerals Plan.

## **8. Resources**

- 8.1 Updating the Waste and Minerals Plans would require resources additional to the single existing Minerals and Waste Planner. This could be through expanding the Minerals and Waste planning team, or by procuring consultancy support to prepare the plan as needed and to be managed by the existing Minerals and Waste Planner. Administrative support would also be required, to help with finances, communications and consultation processes, mapping, and at examination.
- 8.2 There will be a requirement for officer support from each of the Greater Manchester authorities to guide plan progress in relation to the priorities in their emerging Local Plans, providing local knowledge into the site search process, as well as liaising and assisting Members in their authority.
- 8.3 Updating the plans will also require financial resources relating to:
- Preparing the evidence base, including consultants costs.
  - Drafting updated policies and associated appraisal work
  - Community engagement and consultation
  - Public examination, including costs for an Inspector and Programme Officer, as well as room hire.
- 8.4 We are in the process of engaging the Local Authorities to determine a cost comparison bench marked against Local Plan budgets with a view to freeing up embedded capacity within the combined authority wherever possible. Budgeting will be considered as part of the GMCA budgeting process.

## 9. Example Timetable

9.1 Any proposal to update the joint plans would need to go through each Council for agreement before formal commencement:

Approval by AGMA Executive Board	March 2025
Formal approval by each Authority Cabinet or Executive	Spring 2025
Full Council Approval	Spring 2025

9.2 Early work on updating the plans would include reviewing existing waste management capacity across Greater Manchester and comparing this with the WNA forecast arisings to identify where there are any gaps in capacity which would require addressing over the plan period. A 'call for sites' exercise inviting landowners and operators to submit land for assessment as to its suitability for waste facilities or mineral extraction would be undertaken.

9.3 It is anticipated that the plan would take 36 months to prepare and as an example would include the following stages:

Key Stage	Date (tbc)
Evidence Gathering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comparison of needs against supply</li> <li>- Call for sites</li> <li>- Consultation Strategy</li> <li>- Scoping Report (for SA/SEA)</li> </ul>	Spring - Autumn 2025
Draft Plan consultation ('Regulation 18')	Winter 2025
Proposed Submission Joint Plan published for representations ('Regulation 19')	Autumn 2026
Submission for independent examination	Spring 2027
Examination in Public	Summer/Autumn 2027
Adoption	Spring 2028

## **10. Next Steps**

- 10.1 Subject to discussion at this meeting, a report will be taken to each Council including an update to each Council's Local Development Scheme, to allow work to start on a joint minerals and waste plan in a timely fashion, as set out in this report.

# 1. Appendix 1: Options for updating the Minerals and Waste Plans

Option	Pros and cons of approach
<p>1. Produce a single joint Waste and Minerals Plan</p>	<p><b><u>Pros</u></b></p> <p>Planning for both waste and minerals at the same time will ensure Greater Manchester can continue to deliver housing and infrastructure and ensure that recent policy changes relating to the environment and climate change are considered. A single consultation and appraisals at each stage, and one examination by a Planning Inspector.</p> <p>Resource efficiencies (economy of scale) at each stage of plan preparation as a single public consultation can be done at each stage.</p> <p>Issues identified in the review of the plans could be addressed simultaneously rather than concurrently meaning that up-to-date minerals and waste plan coverage would be in place sooner than if two separate plans were produced. This would enable future decisions on planning applications for waste and minerals facilities to be assessed against up-to-date policies.</p> <p>Duty to cooperate requirements for both waste and minerals would be met sooner than if two separate plans were produced.</p> <p><b><u>Cons</u></b></p> <p>There is a risk that delays to work on either waste or minerals would adversely impact timescales of a joint plan. This could be mitigated through implementing mechanisms for monitoring and managing the plan making process through a project plan.</p> <p><b><u>Estimated timescale</u></b></p> <p>The estimated time to prepare a single Plan is 3 years.</p>
<p>2. Produce a separate joint Waste Plan and joint Minerals Plan (progressing waste first and then minerals)</p>	<p><b><u>Pros</u></b></p> <p>Updating the plans independently of each other would mean that progress on one plan is not impacted by any potential difficulties of the other. In addition, any future national policy change could be managed through updating a single plan.</p> <p><b><u>Cons</u></b></p> <p>This approach would require more resources (people and financial) than a single plan as there would be duplication of appraisal work, consultations and would require two examinations.</p>

	<p>It the plans were prepared consecutively, e.g. Waste Plan followed by Minerals Plan, there would be a delay in addressing minerals planning issues and consequently Greater Manchester authorities could face challenges in terms of a steady and adequate aggregate supply for future housing and infrastructure development. In addition, authorities progressing Local Plans could be questioned by Inspectors on how they are delivering minerals planning given that this issue was raised through the PfE process and a commitment was made at that time to include a review of the Minerals and Waste Plans in Local Development Schemes.</p> <p><u>Estimated timescale</u></p> <p>It is estimated that each plan would take 3 years to prepare so it could take up to 6 years to progress separately.</p>
<p>3. Produce a joint Waste Plan and incorporate minerals policies into each authority's Local Plan</p>	<p><b><u>Pros</u></b></p> <p>Likely to cost less than producing a single joint waste and minerals plan or two separate joint plans.</p> <p><b><u>Cons</u></b></p> <p>This approach would depend on agreement from each of the 10 authorities to incorporate minerals policies in their Local Plans which might not be straightforward depending on where they are up to in the plan process. Some authorities are already advanced in preparing a Local Plan and therefore can not incorporate minerals policies within their plan timetable. It could result in delays to Local Plans as the evidence base for minerals policies is developed. There is also a risk that the policy approach across the authorities is different, resulting in an inconsistent approach to minerals planning across Greater Manchester.</p> <p><u>Estimated timescale</u></p> <p>The estimated time to prepare a single Joint Waste Plan is 3 years. Incorporating minerals policies into each Local Plan would depend on the timescales for preparation of the Local Plan as set out in each authority's Local Development Scheme.</p>
<p>4. Do not update – 'do nothing scenario'</p>	<p>This would be contrary to national policy and legislation. If the plans were considered out-of-date by decision makers there is a risk of poorly located planning permissions, particularly as they are reaching the end of their respective plan periods.</p> <p>Changes to waste capacity needs and cross boundary waste movements need to be considered through a new plan otherwise there is a risk that future waste arisings are not adequately planned for.</p> <p>The opportunity to develop waste policies for use in the determination of planning applications that are informed by up-to-</p>

date waste requirements, driving waste up the hierarchy, would be missed.

There is a risk that emerging Local Plans prepared by the authorities will be found unsound at examination because existing waste and minerals policies are out of date.

There are benefits to Greater Manchester's reputation if it demonstrates how it is planning for the facilities to achieve a circular economy and these reputational benefits might not be realised in the absence of an up-to-date Waste Plan.

There is also a risk if Greater Manchester's growth ambitions are impacted by uncertainties in aggregate supply, which could delay projects.