



# Fosse Green Energy

EN010154

## 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices

Appendix 14-E: Materials and Waste Impact Assessment  
Methodology and Baseline

---

VOLUME

6

---

---

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

Regulation 5(2)(a)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as  
amended)

18 July 2025

---

## Planning Act 2008

### The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulation 2009 (as amended)

#### Fosse Green Energy Development Consent Order 202[ ]

---

#### **6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices**

#### **Appendix 14-E: Materials and Waste Impact Assessment Methodology and Baseline**

---

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| Regulation Reference                   | Regulation 5(2)(a)         |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | EN010154                   |
| Application Document Reference         | EN010154/APP/6.3           |
| Author                                 | Fosse Green Energy Limited |

| Version | Date         | Issue Purpose  |
|---------|--------------|----------------|
| Rev 1   | 18 July 2025 | DCO Submission |

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Materials and Waste Impact Assessment Methodology and Baseline ..... | 1  |
| 1.1 Introduction .....  | 1  |
| 1.2 Sensitivity .....   | 1  |
| 1.3 Magnitude of Impact .....   | 4  |
| 1.4 Significance of Effects .....                                       | 6  |
| 1.5 Baseline Conditions .....   | 7  |
| 2. References .....   | 11 |

## Tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Materials Receptor Sensitivity .....  | 1  |
| Table 2: Inert and Non-hazardous Landfill Capacity Sensitivity .....                 | 2  |
| Table 3: Criteria for hazardous landfill capacity sensitivity .....                  | 3  |
| Table 4: Materials Magnitude of Impacts .....  | 4  |
| Table 5: Inert and Non-hazardous Waste – Magnitude of Impact .....                   | 5  |
| Table 6: Hazardous Waste – magnitude of impact .....                                 | 6  |
| Table 7: Effect Thresholds .....   | 7  |
| Table 8: Significance of Effects .....   | 7  |
| Table 9 National Requirement for Steel .....   | 8  |
| Table 10 Construction Material Sales by Region (Ref 3) .....                         | 8  |
| Table 11 Potential Recycled Content (Percentage by Weight) (Ref 4) .....             | 8  |
| Table 12 Landfill Capacity (end of 2023) in the East Midlands and England (Ref 5) .. | 9  |
| Table 13 Standard, Good and Best Practice Recovery Rates by Material .....           | 10 |

# 1. Materials and Waste Impact Assessment Methodology and Baseline

## 1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This appendix presents the methodology and baseline for the assessment of materials and waste (**Section 14.5** in **Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [EN010154/APP/6.1]**).

## 1.2 Sensitivity

- 1.2.1 The sensitive receptors for the assessment of the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the materials and waste impacts are described below.

### Materials

- 1.2.2 The sensitivity of materials relates to the availability and type of construction material to be consumed by the Proposed Development. The IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) criteria described within **Table 1** is used to determine the sensitivity of materials.

**Table 1: Materials Receptor Sensitivity**

| Sensitivity | Criteria for Materials Receptor Sensitivity   |
|-------------|---|
| Negligible  | On balance, the key materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development are forecast (through trend analysis and other information) to be free from known issues regarding supply and stock.<br><i>And/or</i><br>are available comprising a very high proportion of sustainable features and benefits compared to industry-standard materials.<br>* |
| Low         | On balance, the key materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development are forecast (through trend analysis and other information) to be generally free from known issues regarding supply and stock.<br><i>And/or</i><br>are available comprising a high proportion of sustainable features and benefits compared to industry-standard materials. |
| Medium      | On balance, the key materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development are forecast (through trend analysis and other information) to suffer from some potential issues regarding supply and stock.  |

| Sensitivity  | Criteria for Materials Receptor Sensitivity  |
|--|--|
|  | <i>And/or</i><br>are available comprising some sustainable features and benefits compared to industry-standard materials.  |
| High   | On balance, the key materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development are forecast (through trend analysis and other information) to suffer from known issues regarding supply and stock.<br><i>And/or</i><br>comprise little or no sustainable features and benefits compared to industry-standard materials. |
| Very High  | On balance, the key materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development are forecast are known to be insufficient in terms of production, supply and/or stock.<br><i>And/or</i><br>comprise no sustainable features and benefits compared to industry-standard materials.  |
| <i>* Subject to supporting evidence, sustainable features and benefits could include, for example, materials or products that: comprise reused, secondary or recycled content (including excavated and other arisings); support the drive to a circular economy; or in some other way reduce lifetime environmental impacts.</i> |  |

## Waste

- 1.2.3 The sensitivity of waste relates to availability of landfill capacity in the absence of the Proposed Development as outlined in the IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) *“landfill capacity is recognised as an unsustainable and increasingly scarce option for managing waste”*. The sensitivity of landfill capacity is assessed based on a review of historic landfill void capacity trends where available and information from relevant policy documents.
- 1.2.4 The criteria described within **Table 2** and **Table 3** is used to determine the sensitivity of landfill capacity.
- 1.2.5 As stated in the IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) *“due to uncertainties relating to future technologies and infrastructure, this first edition of the guidance does not incorporate a proposed methodology to assess impacts and effects during decommissioning or end of first life”*. However, the criteria in the IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) are applied to decommissioning for the Proposed Development.

**Table 2: Inert and Non-hazardous Landfill Capacity Sensitivity**

| Sensitivity | Criteria for inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity sensitivity   |
|-------------|--|
| Negligible  | Across construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non- |



**Sensitivity** **Criteria for inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity sensitivity**

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
|           | hazardous landfill capacity is expected to remain unchanged or is expected to increase through a committed change in capacity.   |
| Low       | Across construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is expected to reduce minimally by <1% as a result of wastes forecast.   |
| Medium    | Across construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e., without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is expected to reduce noticeably by 1-5% as a result of wastes forecast.  |
| High      | Across construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is expected to reduce considerably by 6-10% as a result of wastes forecast.  |
| Very High | Across construction, operation and decommissioning, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional inert and non-hazardous landfill capacity is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• expected to reduce very considerably (by &gt;10%);</li> <li>• end during construction or operation;</li> <li>• is already known to be unavailable; or</li> <li>• would require new capacity or infrastructure to be put in place to meet forecast demand.</li> </ul> |

**Table 3: Criteria for hazardous landfill capacity sensitivity**

**Sensitivity** **Criteria for Materials Receptor Sensitivity**

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| Negligible | Across the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional (or where justified, national) hazardous landfill capacity is expected to remain unchanged or is expected to increase through a committed change in capacity. |
| Low        | Across the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional (or where justified, national) hazardous landfill capacity is expected to reduce minimally by <0.1% as a result of wastes forecast.                           |

## Sensitivity Criteria for Materials Receptor Sensitivity

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Medium    | Across the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional (or where justified, national) hazardous landfill capacity is expected to reduce noticeably by 0.1-0.5% as a result of wastes forecast.  |
| High      | Across the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional (or where justified, national) hazardous landfill capacity is expected to reduce considerably by 0.5-1% as a result of wastes forecast.  |
| Very High | Across the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, the baseline/future baseline (i.e. without the Proposed Development) of regional (or where justified, national) hazardous landfill capacity is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• expected to reduce very considerably (by &gt;1%);</li> <li>• end during construction or operation;</li> <li>• is already known to be unavailable; or,</li> <li>• would require new capacity or infrastructure to be put in place to meet forecast demand.</li> </ul> |

## 1.3 Magnitude of Impact

- 1.3.1 The magnitude of impact describes the degree of variation from the baseline conditions as a result of the Proposed Development. The IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) for assessing the magnitude of impact from materials comprises a percentage-based approach that determines the influence of construction materials use on the baseline national or regional availability from the construction of the Proposed Development. The criteria used to assess the magnitude of impact for materials are provided in **Table 4**.

**Table 4: Materials Magnitude of Impacts**

| Magnitude of Impact | Criteria for Materials Magnitude of Impacts   |
|---------------------|---|
| No change           | Consumption of no materials is required.  |
| Negligible          | Consumption of no individual material type is equal to or greater than 1% by volume of the regional or national* baseline availability.   |
| Minor               | Consumption of one or more materials is between 1-5% by volume of the regional or national* baseline availability; and<br>The Proposed Development has the potential to adversely and substantially** impact access to one or |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
|          | more allocated mineral site (in their entirety), placing their future use at risk.   |
| Moderate | Consumption of one or more materials is between 6-10% by volume of the regional or national* baseline availability; and<br>One allocated mineral site is substantially** sterilised by the Proposed Development rendering it inaccessible for future use.  |
| Major    | Consumption of one or more materials is >10% by volume of the regional or national* baseline availability; and<br>More than one allocated mineral site is substantially** sterilised by the Proposed Development rendering it inaccessible for future use. |

\*a national baseline is used in the absence of regional construction material availability data for steel.

\*\*justified using professional judgement, based on the scale and nature of the allocated mineral site being assessed.

- 1.3.2 The IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) offers two methods to assess waste effects (Method W1 – Void Capacity and Method W2 – Landfill Diversion). For this assessment, Method W1 has been applied.
- 1.3.3 In a worst case, where landfill sensitivity is very high, a significant effect would occur at a magnitude of minor, which for the Proposed Development equates to non-hazardous and inert waste generation being more than 1% of landfill capacity and hazardous waste generation being more than 0.1% of landfill capacity.
- 1.3.4 The criteria used to assess the magnitude of impact for inert and non-hazardous and hazardous waste is provided within **Table 5** and **Table 6** respectively.

**Table 5: Inert and Non-hazardous Waste – Magnitude of Impact**

| Magnitude of Impact | Criteria for Waste Magnitude of Impacts  |
|---------------------|--|
| No change           | Zero waste generation and disposal from the Proposed Development.  |
| Negligible          | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by <1%.   |
| Minor               | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by 1-5%.  |
| Moderate            | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by 6-10%. |
| Major               | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by >10%.  |



# - forecast as the worst-case scenario, during a defined construction and/or operational phase.

**Table 6: Hazardous Waste – magnitude of impact**

| Magnitude of Impact | Criteria for Waste Magnitude of Impacts  |
|---------------------|--|
| No change           | Zero waste generation and disposal from the Proposed Development.  |
| Negligible          | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by <0.1%.     |
| Minor               | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by <0.1-0.5%. |
| Moderate            | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by <0.5-1%.   |
| Major               | Waste generated by the Proposed Development will reduce Expansive Study Area landfill capacity baseline <sup>#</sup> by >1%.       |

# forecast as the worst-case scenario, during a defined construction and/or operational phase.

## 1.4 Significance of Effects

- 1.4.1 **Table 7** describes the effect thresholds used in determining the significance of potential effects, whilst **Table 8** indicates which effects are deemed to be significant. Materials and waste have specific IEMA Guidance (Ref 1) and does not use the thresholds outlined in **Chapter 5: EIA Methodology and Consultation [EN010154/APP/6.1]**.

**Table 7: Effect Thresholds**

|                         |            | Magnitude of Impact |                   |                    |                     |                     |  |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Sensitivity of receptor |            | No Change           | Negligible        | Minor              | Moderate            | Major               |  |
|                         | Very High  | Neutral             | Slight            | Moderate or Large  | Large or Very Large | Very Large          |  |
|                         | High       | Neutral             | Slight            | Slight or Moderate | Moderate or Large   | Large or Very Large |  |
|                         | Medium     | Neutral             | Neutral or Slight | Slight             | Moderate            | Moderate or Large   |  |
|                         | Low        | Neutral             | Neutral or Slight | Neutral or Slight  | Slight              | Slight or Moderate  |  |
|                         | Negligible | Neutral             | Neutral           | Neutral or Slight  | Neutral or Slight   | Slight              |  |

**Table 8: Significance of Effects**

| Effect     | Materials       | Waste           |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Neutral    | Not Significant | Not Significant |
| Slight     |                 |                 |
| Moderate   | Significant     | Significant     |
| Large      |                 |                 |
| Very Large |                 |                 |

## 1.5 Baseline Conditions

### Existing Baseline

#### National and Regional Availability of Key Construction Materials

- 1.5.1 **Table 9** outlines the national requirement (providing an indication of availability) in 2023 for steel (Ref 2).
- 1.5.2 Regional data from the Mineral Products Association's Profile of the UK Mineral Products Industry (Ref 3) is presented in **Table 10**. Sales of construction materials are provided for the region in which the Proposed Development is located (East Midlands).
- 1.5.3 Potential recycled content for the main construction materials is outlined in **Table 11**. These good practice rates are derived from the Waste and

Resources Action Programme (WRAP) Designing Out Waste Tool for Civil Engineering (Ref 4).

**Table 9 National Requirement for Steel**

| Material | National Availability (Million Tonnes, Year) | 10% National Availability (Million Tonnes, Year) * | of Baseline Data Year | Data Description         |
|----------|--|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Steel    | 15   | 1.5  | 2023                  | UK's requirement (Ref 2) |

\*10% of national availability noted as the point of significance for materials based on a sensitivity of low (see Table 1 and Table 7).

**Table 10 Construction Material Sales by Region (Ref 3)**

| Construction Material  | Regional availability (million tonnes) | (East Midlands) | 10% of regional availability* (tonnes) |
|--|--|-----------------|--|
| Crushed rock   | 30.6                                   |                 | 3,600,000                              |
| Sand and gravel  | 6.1                                    |                 | 610,000                                |
| Ready-mixed concrete (converted to million tonnes from m <sup>3</sup> using a density of 2.4t/m <sup>3</sup> ) | 1.3                                    |                 | 130,000                                |

\*10% of national availability noted as the point of significance for materials based on a sensitivity of low (see Table 1 and **Table 7**)

**Table 11 Potential Recycled Content (Percentage by Weight) (Ref 4)**

| Material Type       | Potential Recycled Content (% by Weight) |
|---------------------|--|
| Concrete            | 16                                       |
| Asphalt             | 25                                       |
| Aggregates          | 50                                       |
| Steel reinforcement | 100                                      |
| Structural steel    | 60                                       |

## Landfill Capacity

- 1.5.4 The remaining landfill capacities at the end of 2023 for the non-hazardous and inert waste Expansive Study Area (East Midlands) and the hazardous waste Expansive Study Area (England) (Ref 5) are shown in **Table 12**.
- 1.5.5 Merchant landfills are operated for commercial purposes, accepting waste from construction projects and operating businesses. Merchant landfills are therefore considered to form the baseline. In contrast, restricted landfills are sites that deal with their own produced waste (i.e. not operating for commercial purposes). Therefore, additional capacity is excluded from the baseline. Some non-hazardous landfills have a Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW) cell (e.g. for asbestos). SNRHW cells usually form only a small fraction of the overall capacity. Therefore, for assessment purposes non-hazardous landfills with SNRHW cells are considered in the same way as non-hazardous landfills.

**Table 12 Landfill Capacity (end of 2023) in the East Midlands and England (Ref 5)**

| Landfill Type                        | East<br>Landfill<br>(‘000s m <sup>3</sup> )                               | Midlands<br>Capacity | England<br>Capacity (‘000s m <sup>3</sup> )                               | Landfill<br>Capacity (‘000s m <sup>3</sup> ) | Point of significance<br>based on a sensitivity<br>of “very high” (m <sup>3</sup> ) |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|--|---|
| Non-hazardous<br>with SNRHW cell     | 16,069  |                      | Not applicable,<br>assessment is<br>completed at a<br>regional level only | 307,690                                      | (1% of<br>national<br>landfill<br>capacity)   |
| Non-hazardous                        | 14,700  |                      |   |  |   |
| Inert                                | 18,917  |                      |   | 189,170                                      | (1% of<br>national<br>landfill<br>capacity)   |
| <b>Total<br/>hazardous<br/>inert</b> | <b>non-<br/>and<br/>49,686</b>  |                      |   | <b>496,860</b>                               | <b>(1% of<br/>national<br/>landfill<br/>capacity)</b>                               |
| Hazardous<br>merchant                | Not applicable,<br>assessment is<br>completed at a<br>national level only |                      | 9,680   | 9,680  | (0.1% of<br>national<br>landfill<br>capacity)                                       |

## Waste Targets

- 1.5.6 Standard, good and best practice recovery rates by material are provided by WRAP (Ref 11). Recovery rates for key construction materials and other construction wastes relevant to the Proposed Development are provided in **Table 13**.

**Table 13 Standard, Good and Best Practice Recovery Rates by Material**

| <b>Material</b>      | <b>Standard<br/>Recovery (%)</b> | <b>Practice<br/>Recovery (%)</b> | <b>Good<br/>Recovery (%)</b>   | <b>Practice<br/>Recovery (%)</b> | <b>Best<br/>Recovery (%)</b> | <b>Practice<br/>Recovery (%)</b> |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Metals               | 95                               |                                  | 100  |                                  | 100                          |                                  |
| Packaging            | 60                               |                                  | 85   |                                  | 95                           |                                  |
| Concrete             | 75                               |                                  | 95   |                                  | 100                          |                                  |
| Inert                | 75                               |                                  | 95   |                                  | 100                          |                                  |
| Plastics             | 60                               |                                  | 80   |                                  | 95                           |                                  |
| Miscellaneous        | 12                               |                                  | 50   |                                  | 75                           |                                  |
| Electrical equipment | Limited information              |                                  | 70   |                                  | 95                           |                                  |
| Cement               | Limited information              |                                  | 75   |                                  | 95                           |                                  |
| Liquids and oils     | 100                              |                                  | 100  |                                  | 100                          |                                  |
| Hazardous            | 50                               |                                  | Limited information, cannot be 100% since some hazardous waste (e.g. asbestos) must be landfilled. |                                  |                              |                                  |



## 2. References

- Ref 1 IEMA (2020). IEMA Guide to: Materials and Waste in Environmental Impact Assessment, Guidance for a Proportionate Approach. Available at: <https://www.iema.net/media/0t5fwyhj/iema-materials-and-waste-in-eia-march-2020.pdf>
- Ref 2 UK Steel (2023). Steel UK's Key Statistics Guide May 2024. Available at: <https://www.uksteel.org/reports-and-publications>
- Ref 3 Mineral Products Association (MPA) (2023). Profile of the UK Mineral Products Industry: 2023 Edition. Available at: [https://www.mineralproducts.org/MPA/media/root/Publications/2023/Profile of the UK Mineral Products Industry 2023.pdf](https://www.mineralproducts.org/MPA/media/root/Publications/2023/Profile%20of%20the%20UK%20Mineral%20Products%20Industry%202023.pdf)
- Ref 4 Waste & Resources Action Programme (WRAP) (2010). Designing out Waste: A design team guide for civil engineering. Available at: <https://www.ciria.org/Resources/REK/Guidance/Designing%20out%20waste%20guidance%20a%20design%20team%20guide.aspx>
- Ref 5 Environment Agency (2024). 2023 Waste Data Interrogator, 2023 Waste Summary Tables for England – Version 1. Available at: <https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/59ab8448-3905-49c6-9122-ae762f96f66b/2023-waste-data-interrogator>
- Ref 6 Environment Agency (2024). Environmental Permitting Regulations - Waste Sites. Available at: <https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/e2cc8101-d8b7-434d-a26a-9115061bb57c/environmental-permitting-regulations-waste-sites>
- Ref 7 Environment Agency (2024). 2023 Waste Data Interrogator – Wastes Received (Excel) – Version 1. Available at: <https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/59ab8448-3905-49c6-9122-ae762f96f66b/2023-waste-data-interrogator>
- Ref 8 European Commission (2008). Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on Waste and repealing certain Directives (Waste Framework Directive). Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02008L0098-20180705>
- Ref 9 Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021). The Waste Management Plan for England 2021. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/waste-management-plan-for-england-2021>
- Ref 10 DEFRA (2024). UK Statistics on waste. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uk-waste-data/uk-statistics-on-waste#recovery-rate-from-non-hazardous-construction-and-demolition-cd-waste>

- Ref 11      WRAP (2007). Waste Recovery Quick Wins, Improving Recovery Rates Without Increasing Costs. No longer available online.