

BECKFIELD LANE, HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRE RELOCATION – SITE SELECTION UPDATE

Purpose of report

1. To update Members on the site selection options for the relocation of the Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC).

Background

2. There has been a long standing requirement to find an alternative location for Beckfield Lane HWRC. As part of the policy prospectus for 07/08, Members via the Groups Leaders agreed that options relating to Beckfield Lane HWRC should be considered largely because of the position of the site within a residential area and the traffic congestion associated with the site. There have been a number of reports seeking a suitable site for the relocation of the Beckfield Lane HWRC. All have concluded that there was no option that provided an ideal solution.
3. This report updates the options appraisal (CMT report May 2007, further detailed in draft Exec report Sept 2007), in the light of further work and to reflect the current position.
4. Work has been continuing to quantify the construction and associated costs, (in September 2008 Exec approved £35,000 carry out further feasibility and design work to confirm scheme costs).
5. The need for a replacement HWRC is still valid. A site to the West of the City is required to meet current and future waste targets/legislation, whilst anti-social behaviour at the site is still prevalent. During opening hours traffic congestion both within the site and on Beckfield Lane itself is also a major problem.

Options

6. Previous reports have identified 10 options. Recent work has identified a further variant option at Harewood Whin, (option 11 below).
7. Option 1, is to maintain the status quo, i.e. continuing the operation at Beckfield Lane, as it stands. The 'do-nothing' option. An absolute base case.
8. Option 2, the Council owns 0.48ha of land at Beckfield Lane. The HWRC itself only occupies 45% of the total area. The remaining space is either derelict or used as a sub-depot for Grounds Maintenance vehicles. An option exists to rationalise the site, evaluate the needs of the grounds maintenance depot and redevelop the remaining space as a modern well-designed HWRC, using the Hazel Court facility as the model. A base case over which other options should be judged.
9. Options 3-8, as identified by the Spawforth Associates work, commissioned by the Council. This report identified 6 potential sites ranked as follows: -

- i. (option 3) Yorwaste Depot, adjacent to Rawcliffe Park & Ride.
 - i. (option 4) Land adjoining A59 (council owned) .
 - i. (option 5) Hessay (Industrial park).
 - iv. (option 6) South of Northminster Business park.
 - iv. (option 7) East of Harewood Whin.
 - vi. (option 8) Land adjacent to Harewood Whin.
10. The draft Land Use Consultants report, April 2006, for the Waste PFI project identified only one site in the West of the City which had 'high potential' for a small scale facility, Harewood Whin, covered by Options 7 and 8 above.
 11. Option 9, with the closure of the British Sugar factory which is in the catchment area for the West of the City, a HWRC could be included in the plans for the development of this area.
 12. Option 10, an area linked to the roundabout at the Moor Lane/A1237 junction.
 13. Option 11, Harewood Whin-field to east of Newgate Bridge, an area between the Harewood Whin landfill site and the B1224 Wetherby Road.

Options Analysis

14. Each of the options outlined above has been considered. In order to make the comparison easier, Annex 1 details each option, together with a list of Pro's and Con's.
15. Option 1 - 'do-nothing', continue operating the facility as it is, i.e. a 'basic' but worthwhile service to the community. The HWRC facility only occupies 0.2 ha of the total 0.48 ha council owned site. During operational hours the site is congested, and traffic queues within the site, spilling onto Beckfield Lane. This appears to be a 'queuing' problem, where the rate at which people arrive at the site is greater than the rate at which they can empty their vehicles, i.e. a 'bottleneck'. This is compounded when the contractor's vehicles remove full skips, as the contractor also has to use the same internal routes as the public. The potential for anti-social behaviour remains. This is not a viable long-term option, hence this option is not recommended to be carried forward.
16. Option 2 - Redevelop Beckfield Lane, double the HWRC effective area to 0.48 ha. Utilising the whole site would provide better access, improved internal traffic flow and segregation of public from contractors skip movements. Permits greater scope for future segregation of waste at source, i.e. increased number of skips/containers. The capital cost is estimated at £1.2M, including relocation costs for the depot. This option does not address the fundamental issue of relocating from a residential area. From a sustainability perspective, however, the site is in the right place, and it is noticeable that pedestrians are frequent users. By improving the design and layout of the facility, i.e. 'de-bottlenecking', a modest increase in capacity could reasonably be expected by increasing the throughput

rate of customers emptying vehicles thus reducing queuing time. But the limiting factor will still be the site's restricted opening hours, which are currently set at less than those for which the Council has a licence. It may be possible to seek revisions to the licence by applications to Planning and to the Environment Agency. Considering the other user of the site, Grounds Maintenance storage, this could be designed into the facility or alternative premises found, (easier than finding a site for an HWRC). Given appropriate funding this option should be deliverable within 2 years, although local opposition could be anticipated. Whilst the potential for anti-social behaviour will still remain, suitable design of the facility should reduce the opportunity and motivation for this type of behaviour. The site however is still adjacent to the residential area. In overall terms this option is not recommended to be carried forward.

17. Option 3 - Yorwaste Depot adjacent to Rawcliffe Park & Ride, the proposed land of 0.3 ha, adjacent to a sewage treatment plant, is Council owned, currently leased to Yorwaste who use it as a vehicle and skip maintenance and storage depot. (Yorwaste have recently been making enquiries about further extending the lease to 2025.) Additional land, 0.3 ha would be required for a best-practice HWRC facility, and this could be met by a reduction of about 20 car-parking spaces from the adjacent over-flow park & ride car park. Reduction of park & ride parking spaces however, is in conflict with the Local Transport Plan which requires more spaces. (There are now plans for a further 3 park & ride schemes within York). Concerns have also been expressed that a HWRC would give a poor visual impact and impression from the main A19 entry road into the city. The existing Yorwaste depot is well screened, and a HWRC would require screening to a similar standard. This site has some sustainability benefits, in that visits to the HWRC can be combined with trips to the Park & Ride. A net estimated capital cost is £1.8M, deliverable within 3 years. It should be noted that operational costs would increase by £150,000 per year, due to increasing the opening hours. This site is considered to be 'on the wrong side of the river' to meet the needs of the population, and would add to the traffic flows on an already saturated stretch of the ring-road. This option is not recommended to be carried forward.
18. Option 4 - Land adjoining the A59. (6.7 ha) Utilisation of this piece of Council owned land has been superseded by the building of the New Manor School. This option has therefore been discounted.
19. Option 5 - Hessay, (1.1 ha), in earlier discussions, 2005, it was stated that the landowners would not consider a HWRC at this location. This is still believed to be the position. The main attraction for this location was the proximity of a Yorwaste 'MRF' plant on the same site. At some 9km from the city centre this option is the least sustainable. This option has therefore been discounted.
20. Option 6 - South of Northminster Business Park, (3.05 ha), adjacent to land earmarked for future expansion of the Business Park. The developers of the Business Park object to the location of a HWRC as a neighbour, as they view an incompatibility between a waste site and their desire for a 'high-tech/quality' business park. From a sustainable transport perspective, this option is a compromise, being about halfway between the customers and the disposal point at Harewood Whin. A net estimated capital cost is £2.6M, deliverable within 5 years.

Operational costs would increase by £150,000 per year, due to increasing the opening hours. This option is not recommended to be carried forward.

21. Option 7 - East of Harewood Whin, (2ha), the site is sustainable, in that it is co-located with the landfill site, however there is greater distance for customers to travel, about 5-6km from the main catchment areas. A review of traffic has identified that a new ring road roundabout will not be needed, but some small modifications will be necessary. (Hence the Harewood Whin options have reduced significantly in cost.) A preliminary schematic layout showed that this site (Harewood Whin Option – A) was just possible, but recent investigations suggest that the site may be too small as a result of the landscaping which has been planted as part of the screen for the land fill site. Additional engineering works in and around the landfill site have been identified as necessary. The site is accessed by a bridleway, about 0.75km from the Wetherby Road, B1224, which is subject to flooding. A road will need to be constructed to enable traffic to enter/exit the facility. The junction with the B1224 will also need careful re-design to meet highways requirements. A net estimated capital cost is £3.1M, deliverable within 4 years. Operational costs would increase by £150,000 per year, due to increasing the opening hours.
22. Option 8 - Land adjacent to Harewood Whin, (11.03 ha), similar issues apply to this site as to option 7, above, except that a new road is not required. The land, to the west of the landfill site is an open field in agricultural use on a long term lease, surrounded by land of a similar nature. It is open to views from Rufforth, which will inevitably cause some opposition. A net estimated capital cost is £2.3M, deliverable within 5 years. Operational costs would increase by £150,000 per year, due to increasing the opening hours.
23. Option 9 - British Sugar, since the Spawforth's report, the closure of the British Sugar Factory has been announced. There appears to be a number of potential sites alongside the railway tracks, and with apparent road linkage. From a traffic perspective there will be a reduction in HGV movements resulting from the decrease of the sugar beet operations, although traffic generation from the site following redevelopment of the area is likely to increase. An Area Action Plan (AAP) is currently being produced for York Northwest which includes the British Sugar site. The timescales and anticipated phasing of the redevelopment are still emerging, but it is estimated that the lead-time to get a HWRC operational would be approximately 5 - 8 years. It is anticipated that residential use will be a significant element of the land use mix outlined in the AAP and there is likely to be incompatibility issues from siting the HWRC within the redeveloped area. A net estimated capital cost is £2.6M. Operations cost would increase by £150,000 per year, due to increasing the opening hours.
24. Option 10 - Moor Lane / A1237 roundabout, this option is where an HWRC could be designed into the new junction/roundabout giving good traffic access to and from the main catchment area. It would meet the proximity principle hence it would be a relatively sustainable solution. This particular area suffers from fly-tipping, possibly an HWRC at this location might encourage people to use the proper facilities. Because of the exposed position of this location it may attract opposition from local residents. A net estimated capital cost is £2.1M, deliverable within 4

years. Operational costs would increase by £150,000 per year, due to increasing the opening hours.

25. Option 11 - Harewood Whin, field to east of Newgate Bridge, is a new option, which has evolved from recent discussions with Yorwaste. There are good sustainability arguments for this site (in common with the other Harewood Whin options) due to the co-location with the landfill site. A preliminary schematic layout shows that this site (Harewood Whin Option – B) gives an excellent layout with space for stacking traffic queues off the main highway, and with good access on to the main highway. Of the 3 Harewood Whin options this appears to be the best in terms of design, accessibility, time to deliver (3yrs) and cost (£2.4M).
26. It should be noted that the Spawforth's analysis was unable to locate sites in the York area that complied with PPS10 (Planning for Sustainable Waste Management), which (amongst other criteria) requires dealing with waste where it arises, and co-location of facilities. Consequently the search was spread further afield, i.e. encompassing areas in the green belt. The selected site will have to comply with Policy GB1 in the City of York Draft Local Plan and paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 (Green Belts). These policies outline a list of purposes which are appropriate development in the Green Belt. This proposal does not specifically correspond with any of these uses and therefore further work will have to be carried out to justify a 'very special circumstances' argument, as outlined in paragraph 3.2 of PPG2. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location.
27. Consequently the search was spread further afield, i.e. encompassing areas in the green belt. Whilst it is the aim to keep this land open, it is possible to develop within these areas under exceptional circumstances. All the relocation options (with the exceptions of Hessay and British Sugar) fall into this category.
28. A key consideration for any option is deliverability. For the purposes of this report it is considered that the main criteria are cost and time to deliver. The net capital costs have been estimated; see Annex 2, which shows a matrix of the options together with a 'shopping list' of major items of expenditure. A value of £0.6M has been included for the proceeds of the sale of the Beckfield Lane site, which is lower than previously anticipated. (It may be that with affordable housing taken into account, the receipt may be even lower.) The totals quoted in this report are the net capital costs. Note that the costs presented in this report are indicative of the order of magnitude of the anticipated costs, they are based on 'best estimates' from recent projects/tenders. Further detailed analysis will be required to finalise the capital costs of the selected option.
29. The information contained in this report is brought together into the 'bubble-chart', Annex 3, which aims to show the relationship in terms of net capital cost and an estimate of the time-scale to deliver the recommended options. A third dimension, is also shown, the diameter of the 'bubble' representing capacity or anticipated performance of each option.

Implications

Financial

30. There are no current plans for capital expenditure at the levels indicated in this report. The capital costs shown in Annex 2 are preliminary estimates to describe the order of magnitude of the anticipated expenditures, further work is required to confirm more accurate figures. It is believed that no source of funding is currently available, e.g. Defra grants. Hazel Court was part funded, £338,000 by the National Waste Minimisation and Recycling fund, which has now come to the end of its life and no further rounds of funding are planned. This has been replaced by the Waste Performance and Efficiency Grant, which the Council is using on other waste and recycling projects. There is no opportunity to prudentially borrow against potential savings.
31. Beckfield Lane HWRC is only open about 20-25% of the hours of the other sites. Any option that envisages increasing opening hours to the 'standard hours' (that is all of them except the 'do-nothing', and 'redevelop' Beckfield Lane options), will attract an increase in operating costs of approx £150,000 pa. It is expected that there will not be an increase in collected/recycled/composted tonnage for the City as a result of this investment. The benefits (in addition to the relocation from a residential area) would lead to improvements in customer care, a safer operational environment and more space to deal with the increasing requirement of segregating more waste types.

Property

32. There is currently an outline planning application for residential development pending for the Beckfield Lane site, and the site is HRA owned.

Way Forward / Recommendation

33. Earlier reports were unable to identify a clear way forward to find an acceptable replacement site for Beckfield Lane HWRC. The recent work shows that potentially a site at Harewood Whin can be turned into a viable HWRC at significantly less cost and delivered earlier than the other sites. This is dependent upon sufficient funding being made available.

Roger Enzor
Interim Waste Project Advisor

Background Papers:

Executive Report: Household Waste Sites – Relocation and Site Development, 1st June 2004.

Planning Feasibility Report, Assessment of Short listed Sites for Beckfield Lane HWS, Spawforth Associates, September 2005

CMT Report: Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre relocation, May 2007

Executive Report: Draft - Beckfield Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre relocation, September 2007, (not received by committee)

Executive Report: Waste Update, 9 September 2008

Further Annexes

Annex 1 – Beckfield Lane – Resiting options Pros & Cons.

Annex 2 – Beckfield Lane, Relocation Options, Estimate of Net Expenditure.

Annex 3 – Bubble chart of options

Beckfield Lane – Resiting Option

Annex 1

Pro's & Con's

| SPAWFORTH RANKING | OPTION & LOCATION | PRO'S | CON'S |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| Not Applicable | 1 'Do – nothing' Beckfield Lane (The "Base" case) | Close to customer base, serves need of local population, particularly pedestrian. Well used during opening hours. Nil capital cost. Low operating cost. | Doesn't meet prime requisite to relocate. Usage has changed from 'tip' to HWRC. Limited opening hours. Traffic congestion within the site and on public highway. H&S: mixed traffic, customers and contractors. HWRC area, 0.2 ha is under-sized. Remainder of site looks derelict. Environmental effect on local residents, noise, odour etc remains. Potential for anti-social behaviour remains. |
| Not Applicable | 2 Redevelop Beckfield Lane (An improved "base" case) | Close to customer base, serves need of local population, particularly pedestrian. Well used during opening hours. Design can improve facility as HWRC, and partially alleviate internal traffic congestion. Separation of customer/contractor traffic. Environmental effect on local residents, noise, odour etc improved by redesign. Gained small incremental capacity. Achievable within 2 years. 'Low' capital cost, £1.2M. Low operating cost, as existing. | Doesn't meet prime requisite to relocate. Limited opening hours. Capacity still limited. Merge with Grounds Maintenance depot. Risk of upsetting local residents/neighbours who are expecting site to move. Potential for Traffic congestion on public highway still exists. Potential for anti-social behaviour remains. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 3 Rawcliffe Park & Ride, and Yorwaste Transport Depot | <p>Good vehicular access from ring road. Would be a redevelopment of 'brownfield' area, in-line with national policy. Site owned/leased by CYC. Sustainable, combined trip HWRC & parking. Space freed up from recycling bins. Close to similar facility, sewerage plant. Achievable within 3 years. 'Low' net capital cost, £1.8M.</p> | <p>Site is too small, (0.3ha), would need to extend into Park & Ride overflow car park by additional 0.3 ha, (~20 parking spaces lost). Park & Ride also have designs on depot site, for increased parking spaces. Site is at risk of flooding. Anticipate planning objections, land is Green Belt and HWRC are not appropriate uses within the Green Belt unless the applicant can justify a 'very special circumstances' argument. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location. Need for visual screening from A19. Increased traffic flow on ring road, additional congestion. Just outside maximum travelling distance, from main catchment area. Yorwaste require additional lease to 2025. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa.</p> |
| 1 | 4 Land adjoining A59 | | <p>Site used by new Manor School. Option no longer possible.</p> |
| 1 | 5 Hessay (Land owner against a waste facility, this option discounted) | <p>Close to major highway. Within an existing industrial site, so brownfield development. Does not adjoin residential development.</p> | <p>Development of site requires third party land, owners not prepared to lease for use as HWRC. Furthest site away from catchment area, however just within acceptable driving time. Time delay if CPO needed. Could have been achievable within 4 years. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. 'High' net capital cost, £2.6M.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 4 | 6 South of Northminster Business Park (Land owner against a waste facility, this option discounted) | Close to catchment area. Reasonable existing access to site. Could fit well with proposed A59 Park & Ride scheme. Located away from main residential area. Well screened from nearby dwellings. 3.05ha area of land, only need 0.6ha. | Development of site requires third party land, owners not prepared to release for use as HWRC. Development of Greenfield land in Green Belt, for a HWRC is not appropriate uses within the Green Belt unless the applicant can justify a 'very special circumstances' argument. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location. Planning consent may be difficult as a stand-alone facility, combine with other plans. Achievable within 5 years. 'High' net capital cost, £2.6M, (assumes new roundabout required). Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. |
| 4 | 7 Land to East of Harewood Whin | Very sustainable, close proximity to landfill site. Just within max. customer driving distance, from catchment area. Co-location of waste facilities. Exact site area unknown – appears to be adequate for HWRC. | Site access is an area subject to flooding. Requires upgrading of existing bridleway access, i.e. building 0.75km new road, legal & planning issues anticipated. Third party land acquisition required. Green Belt land and HWRC are not appropriate uses within the Green Belt unless the applicant can justify a 'very special circumstances' argument. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location Site will need screening. 'High' net capital cost, £3.1M. Achievable within 4 years. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. |
| 6 | 8 | Very sustainable, close proximity to landfill | Site has poor access, & congested with HGV's, |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | Land adjacent to Harewood Whin | site. Just within max. customer driving distance, from catchment area. Co-location of waste facilities. Main area identified is 11.03ha. | will need improvement. Green Belt land and HWRC are not appropriate uses within the Green Belt unless the applicant can justify a 'very special circumstances' argument. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location. Site will need screening. 'High' net capital cost, £2.3M. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. Achievable within 5 years. |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---|

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| Not Applicable | 9 British Sugar | Sustainable, close proximity to existing and future customer base. Development of 'brownfield' site. Facility could be included in York North West Area Action Plan. A number of potential locations within overall site, close to rail boundary and with road access. | This option has the longest lead time to completion, approx 5-8 years. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. 'High' net capital cost, £2.6M. |
| Not Applicable | 10 Moor Lane Roundabout | Sustainable, close proximity to existing customer base. Area currently experiences high levels of fly tipping. Could be designed into new roundabout scheme. | May attract waste from outside City. Green belt land and HWRC are not appropriate uses within the Green Belt unless the applicant can justify a 'very special circumstances' argument. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location. Site will need screening. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. 'High' net capital cost, £2.1M. Achievable within 4 years. |
| Not Applicable | 11 Harewood Whin Field to east of Newgate Bridge | Very sustainable, close proximity to landfill site. Just within max. customer driving distance, from catchment area. Good access to road network. Co-location of waste facilities. Main area identified is 2ha. Achievable within 3 years. | Green belt land and HWRC are not appropriate uses within the Green Belt unless the applicant can justify a 'very special circumstances' argument. It must be demonstrated that the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by the need for the development in that location. Site will need screening. 'High' net capital cost, £2.4M. Operating cost, existing + £150k pa. |

Beckfield Lane, Relocation Options, Estimate of Net Expenditure

| | Land Purchase £ M's | Construction Costs £ M's | Roundabout mods £ M's | Access/ Infrastructure £ M's | Other £ M's | Capital Receipts ⁶ £ M's | NET TOTAL £ M's |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|--|--------------------|
| (1) Beckfield Lane (do nothing) | CYC own | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 |
| (2) Beckfield Lane (redevelop) | CYC own | 1.2 ¹ | | | | 0 | 1.2 |
| (3) Rawcliffe (Park & Ride) | CYC own | 2.2 ¹ | | 0.2 ² | | -0.6 | 1.8 |
| (4) Land adjacent to A59 | CYC own | 2.2 ¹ | | 0.3 ³ | | -0.6 | 1.9 |
| (5) Hessay | 0.5 + | 2.2 ¹ | | 0.5 | | -0.6 | 2.6 |
| (6) South of Northminster Business Park | 0.5 + | 2.2 ¹ | | 0.5 ⁴ | | -0.6 | 2.6 |
| (7) East of Harewood Whin | CYC own | 2.2 ¹ | 0.3 | 0.2 ⁷ | 1.0 ⁵ | -0.6 | 3.1 |
| (8) Adjacent Harewood Whin | CYC own | 2.2 ¹ | 0.3 | 0.4 | | -0.6 | 2.3 |
| (9) British Sugar | 0.5 | 2.2 ¹ | | 0.5 | | -0.6 | 2.6 |
| (10) Moor Lane/A1237 | 0.2 | 2.2 ¹ | | 0.3 ³ | | -0.6 | 2.1 |
| (11) Harewood Whin, field to east of Newgate Bridge | 0.2 | 2.2 ¹ | 0.3 | 0.3 | | -0.6 | 2.4 |

Notes

Enquiries indicate that there are no longer grants available for construction/improvement of HWRC's.

¹ includes a sum allocated for relocation/rebuild grounds maintenance depot, £0.2M.

² additional high quality screening.

³ more substantial screening, to 'hide' facility.

⁴ expect additional costs for infrastructure shared with developer.

⁵ requirements for new 0.75km road and junction to B1224.

⁶ estimate of capital receipt from sale of Beckfield Lane site, (max expected receipt, could be as low as £350-400,000).

⁷ additional engineering works to landfill site, bunding etc.

Beckfield Lane Relocation Options

