

Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document

Publication Draft Development Plan Document (November 2010)

Regulation 27 Statement of Consultation

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Who was consulted?	4
2.1	Background	4
2.2	Consultation Strategy.....	4
2.3	Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)	5
2.4	Stage 1 Issues and Options (May 2007)	6
2.5	Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008).....	7
2.6	Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009).....	9
2.7	Additional Sites (July 2009).....	10
2.8	Preferred Option (November 2009).....	10
2.9	Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan (June 2010)	12
3.	Consultation methods.....	13
3.1	Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)	13
3.2	Stage 1 Issues and Options (May 2007)	14
3.3	Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008).....	14
3.4	Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009).....	15
3.5	Additional Sites (July 2009).....	16
3.6	Preferred Options (November 2009).....	16
3.7	Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan (June 2010).....	17
4.	Summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed.....	18
4.1	Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)	18
4.2	Stage 1 Issues and Options (May 2007)	30
4.3	Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008).....	38
4.4	Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009).....	50
4.5	Additional Sites (July 2009).....	55
4.6	Preferred Options (November 2009).....	55
4.7	Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan (June 2010).....	55
	APPENDIX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REFERENCED IN STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION	55
	APPENDIX B: CONSULTEES.....	55

1. Introduction

This Statement of Consultation sets out how the ten Greater Manchester Authorities have complied with the 2004 Town & Country Planning regulations (as amended 2008) and subsequent amendments, and the relevant Statements of Community Involvement (SCI) in the preparation of the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document (the 'Waste Plan') to publication stage.

Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2008 requires the ten Greater Manchester Authorities to publish, alongside the Publication Draft Waste Plan, a consultation statement setting out evidence relating to the following:

- Which bodies were invited to make representations pursuant to Regulation 25(1);
- How those bodies were invited to make representations;
- The main issues raised, and
- How those issues have been addressed in the DPD

In developing the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document, extensive consultation has been carried out in accordance with Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2008.

Various stages of consultation have been undertaken in reaching the Publication stage of the Waste Plan document. The table below identifies those various consultation stages and the dates during which these stages were undertaken.

Consultation	Timescale
Awareness Raising	19th September, 17th October and 2nd November 2006.
Stage 1 Issues and Options	14 th May 2007 to 22 nd June 2007
Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities	6 th October to 14 th November 2008
Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal	23 rd March to 1 st May 2009
Additional Sites	31st July to 11th September 2009
Preferred Options	13th November 2009 to 8th January 2010.
Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan	18 th June to Friday 16 th July 2010

Subsequent sections of this report provide detail as to who was consulted, how they were consulted, what the main issues raised were and how these issues have been addressed.

A full list of the documents described within this report and where to find them can be found in Appendix A.

2. Who was consulted?

2.1 Background

The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 incorporates a requirement to actively engage with key stakeholders and local communities during the production of Development Plan Documents. This commitment to effective public participation in the plan making process has been retained in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. The Government's aim is for everyone to be able to make their views known and have their say on how their community is planned and developed. An emphasis is also placed upon 'front loading', so that opportunities for involvement exist at the earliest opportunity, and 'continuous involvement' with clearly articulated opportunities for continuing involvement as part of an ongoing programme.

2.2 Consultation Strategy

Consultation on the Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) has been carried out in accordance with each of the ten District's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). To ensure conformity with the SCIs, a Consultation Strategy has been prepared which sets out the various methods for community and stakeholder engagement associated with plan preparation. The Strategy incorporated the Government's principles of front loading and continuous community involvement. The Consultation Strategy incorporated strategies to facilitate involvement from the widest possible range of interests, including the hard to reach groups who do not normally participate in planning, create a sense of ownership of local policy decision, whilst raising the profile of the JWDPD.

The Consultation Strategy was developed through a two-phase approach; Stage One incorporated a review of Greater Manchester SCI's. This process informed the production of the Consultation Strategy to ensure: -

- Statutory compliance across the Greater Manchester area
- The requirements of the assessment of soundness stipulated in PPS12 are met; and
- Considerations to be taken into account in the preparation of the Consultation Strategy are identified.

Best practice methods of engaging with stakeholders were assessed to provide a basis for developing an effective stakeholder engagement process in Stage Two. The methods assessed outlined the techniques available, the necessary resources and examples of their effectiveness. Opportunities for the coordination of the consultation between the ten districts were also explored.

Stage Two of the process resulted in the production of an effective Consultation Strategy, tailored to fit within the resources available and to comply with minimum statutory requirements, the requirements of the SCI and to target the 'hard to reach' groups.

A list of specific, general and other consultation bodies can be found in Appendix B of this document. The full consultation database of over 900 organisations and individuals is available to view on request from GMGU.

The following sections of this Consultation Statement highlight the various stages of consultation and the organisation / groups / individuals that attended consultation events or responded to consultation documents.

2.3 Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)

This stage of the consultation process incorporated three events as listed below:

- Officers and members event (one half day event)
- Stakeholder events (Two full day events)
- Evening drop-in sessions (held between 5pm to 7pm after the main stakeholder events)

Officers and members event

This event was held specifically for Council Officers and Members from the ten Manchester authorities and surrounding authorities. 55 participants, representing a total of 17 different authorities attended the event. The following organisations attended the event: -

- Bolton MBC
- Bury MBC
- Calderdale MBC
- Cheshire County Council
- Cumbria County Council
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- Greater Manchester Geological Unit
- Kirklees Metropolitan Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Manchester City Council
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Oldham MBC
- Rochdale MBC
- Salford City Council
- Stockport MBC
- Tameside MBC
- Trafford MBC
- Warrington Borough Council
- Wigan MBC
- Wigan Waste Disposal Authority

A full list of participants is contained within Appendix 7 of the Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (March 2007).

Stakeholder event 1 (17th October 2006)

38 stakeholders representing a total of 8 different types of organisations or companies attended the event held on the 17th October 2006. The following sectors attended the event: -

- Community Group
- District Council / Adjacent Authority
- Landowner / Individual
- Parish Council
- Industry

- Government Office
- National Interest Group
- Statutory Consultee

Of these sectors, the industrial sector was most prominently represented (37%), whilst statutory consultees, parish councils, national interest groups and the Government Office were equally the least well represented (3%).

A full list of participants is contained within Appendix 8 of the Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (March 2007).

An evening drop-in session was held between 5-7 pm and attracted three attendees.

Stakeholder event 2 (2nd November 2006)

31 stakeholders representing a total of 6 different types of organisations or companies attended the event held on the 2nd November 2006. The following sectors attended the event: -

- Community Group
- District Council / Adjacent Authority
- Industry
- National Interest Group
- Statutory Consultee
- Landowner

Of these sectors, the industrial sector was most prominently represented at the event (46%). District Councils / Adjacent Authorities were the second largest representation (26%), whilst landowners and statutory consultees were the least well represented (3%).

A full list of participants is contained within Appendix 9 of the Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (March 2007).

The evening drop-in session attracted 8 participants who were keen to learn more about the process. Most of them engaged in a round table teach-in session.

Conclusion

A total of 124 delegates attended the events (though some only stayed for short periods and some attended more than one event). An analysis of the attendees shows that 52% of attendees comprised officers and members. This reflects the fact that a separate event was held for this Group. 23% of participants comprised industry representatives with the remaining split between various other Groups.

2.4 Stage 1 Issues and Options (May 2007)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document Stage One Issues and Options Report represented the first published stage of planning for waste in Greater Manchester. The document was issued for public consultation from the 14th May 2007 to 22nd June 2007.

23 responses were received as a result of this consultation. These can be split as follows: -

- Government Office North West
- North West Regional Assembly
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- Viridor Waste Management
- The National Trust
- Environment Agency
- Trafford Green Party
- Highways Agency
- The Emerson Group
- Private individuals
- Neighbouring authorities

2.5 Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities report was published for consultation from the 6th October to the 14th November 2008. Twenty-nine responses were received as a result of this consultation from the following organisations:

- Government Office North West
- 4NW Regional Leader Forum (formerly the North West Regional Assembly)
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- The National Trust
- Environment Agency
- The Emerson Group
- Private individuals: 2
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Heaton Planning Consultants (on behalf of Lafarge Aggregates Ltd)
- Indigo Planning consultants (on behalf of Seddon Developments Ltd)
- Indigo Planning Consultants (on behalf of Chester Developments Ltd)
- Axis Planning Consultants (on behalf of Waste Recycling Group Ltd)
- Peel Holdings Ltd
- Bury MBC
- Bolton MBC
- Salford CC
- Stockport MBC
- National Grid
- Manchester Airport
- City Airport Manchester
- The Coal Authority
- ISM Waste and Recycling Services
- Ramblers Association, Manchester Area
- United Utilities (Infrastructure Holdings)
- RPS (on behalf of United Utilities Land and Property Holdings)
- MJM Strategies (on behalf of Collier Waste Ltd)

To aid and inform the preparation of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities, a stakeholder event was held on 17th March. Invitations were sent out to some 500 stakeholders on GMGU's consultation database. Forty-three participants, representing a total of 7 different types of organisation or companies attended:

- Industry
- District Council/Adjacent Authority
- Resident
- Community Group

- Statutory Consultee
- Local Interest Group
- Government Office

Of these sectors, District Councils/ Adjacent Authorities and Industry were most prominently represented (27% and 26% respectively) whilst Government Office, Community Groups and Statutory Consultees were least well represented (2%, 5% and 5% respectively).

A full list of participants is contained within Appendix 3 of the Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (April 2008).

Member briefing sessions were held at each of the 10 Greater Manchester Districts during June/July 2008.

To mark the start of the formal consultation period, a Launch Event was held on 8th October. Invitations to the Launch Event were sent out to some 500 stakeholders on GMGU's consultation database. Seventeen participants, representing 4 types of organisations or companies attended the event. The following sectors attended the event:

- District Council/ Adjacent Authority
- Industry
- Landowner
- Statutory Consultee

Of these sectors, District Councils/ Adjacent Authorities were most prominently represented (41%), whilst landowners were the least well represented (6%).

A full list of participants is contained within Appendix 2 of the Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (October 2008).

Three targeted stakeholder meetings were held on 20th October 2008 (Waste Industry), 21st October 2008 (Statutory Consultees) and 22nd October 2008 (adjacent Authorities). The following organisations attended:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veolia • Emerge Recycling • Arley Consulting • ISM Waste Recycling Co Ltd • Environment Agency • Manchester Airport • Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United Utilities • National Trust • Cheshire County Council • Cumbria County Council • Derbyshire County Council • 4NW • Lancashire County Council |
|--|--|

2.6 Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal report was published for consultation from the 23rd March to 1st May 2009. The report considered the issues and options in relation to the need for residual waste disposal facilities and put forward issues and suggested options for the development of residual waste management policies.

A total of 2488 responses were received as a result of this consultation from the following organisations:

- Natural England
- English Heritage
- The Wilton Settled Estate
- Lancashire County Council
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Cheshire Joint Planning Unit
- MJM Strategies
- Oldham Council
- Salford City Council
- Stockport MBC
- Viridor Waste Management Ltd
- Biffa Waste Services Ltd
- Peel Holdings Ltd
- Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Peak area)
- The National Trust
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- West Lancashire District Council
- Cllr Aileen Bell
- Members of Werneth Golf Club
Werneth Golf Club
- Medlock & Tame Valley Conservation
- Rt Hon M Meacher MP (Oldham West and Royton)
- Phillip Woolas MP (Oldham East and Saddleworth)
- David Heyes MP (Ashton-Under-Lyne)
- Trustees of E Bissill Marriage Settlement Reversionary Share
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Poynton Town Council
- The Coal Authority
- North West Development Agency
- Horwich Town Council
- 4NW
- National Grid Company Plc
- Environment Agency
- Oldham Labour Group-submitted by Jim McMahon
- Saddleworth Parish Council
- Moorside South Residents Association
- Culcheth and Glazebury Parish Council
- United Utilities Plc
- Daisy Chains Pre-school, Bardsley
- Government Office North West
- Veolia ES Onyx Ltd
- Heywood Against Landfill Group
- Individual responses = 2259

Two targeted stakeholder meetings were held during the formal consultation period. The first was aimed at the waste industry (10 individuals invited, 4 attended) whilst the second was aimed at statutory consultees and neighbouring authorities (15 individuals invited, 5 attended). The following organisations were represented at the meetings:

Meeting 1 – Waste Industry 3rd April 2009 (am)

- Wardell Armstrong (on behalf of Viridor)

- Caseys
- WRG
- Veolia

Meeting 2 – Statutory Consultees and neighbouring authorities 3rd April 2009 (pm)

- Environment Agency
- The National Trust
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Lancashire County Council
- Warrington Borough Council

2.7 Additional Sites (July 2009)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document Additional Sites document was issued for public consultation from the Friday 31st July to Friday 11th September 2009.

A total of 3 responses were received from individuals and 18 responses from organisations as a result of this consultation. The organisations that responded are as follows:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Ramblers Association
(Manchester and High Peak Area) | • Bury Metropolitan Borough Council |
| • Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) | • Enzygo Limited |
| • Manchester Airport | • Environment Agency |
| • English Heritage | • National Grid |
| • Target Follow | • Natural England |
| • North West Development Agency (NWDA) | • Salford City Council |
| • Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce | • Wigan Council |
| • Rixton with Glazebrook Parish Council | • Bury Council |
| | • Oldham Council |
| | • Mosaic Planning (on behalf of Stevenor Investments) |
| | • Network Rail |

2.8 Preferred Option (November 2009)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document Preferred Option Report was issued for public consultation from Friday 13th November 2009 to Friday 8th January 2010.

A total of 28 responses were received from individuals and 35 responses from organisations as a result of this consultation. The organisations that responded are as follows:

- East Lancashire Railway (ELR)
- Horwich Town Council
- Viridor Waste Management
- The Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Peak Area)
- Government Office North West
- 4NW Regional Leader Forum (formerly the North West Regional Assembly)
- Natural England
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- Environment Agency
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Peel Holdings Ltd
- Salford CC
- Stockport MBC
- Wigan MBC
- Oldham MBC
- Chadderton District Partnership
- Tameside Council
- Cheshire and Cheshire West Council
- West Lancashire District Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- National Grid
- Manchester Airport
- Ramblers Association, Manchester Area
- United Utilities (Infrastructure Holdings)
- Minerals Planning Group Sky Properties
- Carter Jonas
- Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit
- Tameside MBC
- Mosaic Planning (on behalf of Stevenor Investments)
- Indigo Planning (on behalf of Seddon Developments)
- Enzygo Ltd (on behalf of The Industrial Trust)
- The Coal Authority
- MJM Strategies
- The Emerson Group
- Network Rail

Prior to the consultation on the Preferred Option Report, a stakeholder event was held on 17th September 2009 and the outcomes from the event were used to inform the preparation of the Report.

Invitations to the 'Towards Preferred Option' event were sent out to some 500 stakeholders on GMGU's consultation database. Thirty-six participants, representing 6 types of organisations or companies attended the event. The following sectors attended the event:

- District Council/ Adjacent Authority
- Industry
- Landowner
- Statutory Consultee
- National Interest Group
- Regional Planning Body

Of these sectors, District Councils/ Adjacent Authorities were most prominently represented (28%) with industry also being well represented (25%). Statutory consultees and regional planning bodies were the least well represented (6% and 3% respectively).

A full list of participants is contained within Appendix 2 of the Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (October 2008).

2.9 Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan (June 2010)

Following consultation on Greater Manchester Waste Plan Preferred Options in November 2009 a revision of the Wigan Municipal Waste Strategy led to the requirement to reconsider three locations which may be suitable for development of built waste management facilities. These locations were considered at an earlier stage of the Waste Plan but were not included at the Preferred Option Stage. These are important locations which may contribute towards Wigan meeting the requirements of their Municipal Waste Management Strategy and were consulted on to ensure a robust decision is taken on their future inclusion within the Waste Plan. Therefore an additional consultation on areas in Wigan was issued from Friday 18th June to Friday 16th July 2010.

One response was received, from the Environment Agency, as a result of this consultation

3. Consultation methods

The following section of the report highlights the various consultation methods utilised during the different production stages of the Joint Waste Development Plan Document.

3.1 Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)

23,000 postcards advertising the Waste Plan and inviting people to join the Waste Plan database were distributed to libraries, supermarkets and other publically accessible places across Greater Manchester, as well as being sent to everyone on the 10 Greater Manchester Council's UDP consultee databases. In addition, 600 posters were distributed using a specialist company to a wide variety of venues across Greater Manchester, including health centres, community centres, shops and supermarkets.

The Stakeholder Events took place on 19th September, 17th October and 2nd November 2006 in Urbis in central Manchester. The first event was arranged specifically for Council Members and Officers over a half day and was designed to tap into their specialist local knowledge. The remaining whole day events were aimed at a wider audience and were supplemented by two evening drop-in sessions and the provision of web based information and an on-line Forum.

All Stakeholder Events followed a similar format, incorporating presentations on the pertinent issues to be discussed, followed by a series of workshop groups and feedback sessions covering a range of topic areas.

The first Stakeholder Event comprised a whole day event (10 am -4 pm) and an evening drop-in session (5pm -7pm). The day was comprised of two presentations: An introduction to the new planning system and an overview of the Sustainability Appraisal work.

Three Workshops followed these presentations, focusing on: -

- Sustainability Objectives
- Spatial Vision and Key Objectives
- Key Issues and Options

The meeting concluded with a plenary session enabling the Lead Facilitator to summarise the key outcomes from the day. The outcomes were summarised on a Power Point presentation and played back on a loop system during the drop-in session following the day event.

The second Stakeholder Event was a whole day (10.00 am - 4 pm) and an evening drop in session and was centred around three workshop sessions: -

- Workshop 1 – Options for waste planning versus objectives for the Plan
- Workshop 2 – General Locational Principles
- Workshop 3 – Spatial Distribution of Sites

The event also included an interactive session, allowing individual delegates to record their views on a number of specific issues. This was conducted using a PC and remote access handsets allowing individual and immediate responses to a set of questions.

The meeting concluded with a plenary session enabling the Lead Facilitator to summarise the key outcomes from the day. The outcomes were summarised on a Power Point presentation and played back on a loop system during the drop-in session following the day event.

A Greater Manchester Waste Plan website was established. This provides information on the background to the Plan and also contains background and consultation documents.

3.2 Stage 1 Issues and Options (May 2007)

Six call for sites exercises were carried out during the process of Issues and Options (Stage 1 and Stage 2), this included adverts in local press, on the Waste Plan website and direct contact with landowners and the waste industry.

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) Stage One Issues and Options Report set out options for the development of strategic aims and objectives and put forward issues and suggested options for the development of waste management policies. The Document was issued for public consultation from 14th May 2007 to 22nd June 2007. The Report was made available both online and at deposit points throughout Greater Manchester in line with Districts' Statements of Community Involvement. Respondents were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation facility or by written response.

The 10 Greater Manchester Council websites were updated with text advertising the consultation and directing users to the Waste Plan website. The Waste Plan website was updated to advertise the consultation. Posters and newsletters were displayed and made available at deposit points (libraries and planning departments) across Greater Manchester. An advert was placed in the Manchester Evening News on the day before consultation started.

3.3 Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008)

Six call for sites exercises were carried out during the process of Issues and Options (Stage 1 and Stage 2), this included adverts in local press, on the Waste Plan website and direct contact with landowners and the waste industry.

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) Stage Two Issues and Options Report: Built Facilities was issued for public consultation from 6th October to 14th November 2008. Respondents were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation facility or by written response.

To aid and inform the preparation of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities, a stakeholder event was held on 17th March 2008 at the Thistle Hotel in central Manchester.

Four sub-group meetings with cross-party attendance by Members were held to inform development of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities. In addition, Member briefings were held at Councils across Greater Manchester with all Members invited to attend. Targeted consultation with Development Control Officers was undertaken to inform the Development Management section of the Report.

As part of the consultation process, a Launch Event was held on 8th October 2008 at the MERCi Centre, central Manchester. The invitations encouraged stakeholders to get involved in the process and influence the preparation of the JWDPD by providing views on, for example, the type of waste facilities likely to be required and how locations for these facilities in Greater Manchester should be selected.

The Launch Event comprised a half-day event (11:30am – 2:45pm) and followed a similar format to that used in previous Stakeholder Events held earlier in 2008 and 2006 to ensure that there was consistency of approach ensuring continued participation. A series of presentations were given and then a short interactive session was carried out to establish how much attendees knew about waste arisings in Greater Manchester. A question and answer session then followed to end the session.

The 10 Greater Manchester Council websites were updated with text advertising the consultation and directing users to the Waste Plan website. The Waste Plan website was updated to advertise the consultation. Posters and newsletters were displayed and made available at deposit points (libraries and planning departments) across Greater Manchester. An advert was placed in the Manchester Evening News on the day before consultation started.

BBC North West Tonight ran a story about the consultation on 2nd October 2008¹. This included an interview with the Chair of the Joint Waste Committee, Councillor Antrobus.

3.4 Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009)

Six call for sites exercises were carried out during the process of Issues and Options (Stage 1 and Stage 2), this included adverts in local press, on the Waste Plan website and direct contact with landowners and the waste industry.

Three sub-group meetings with cross-party attendance by Members were held to inform development of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal.

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) Stage Two Issues and Options Report: Residual Waste Disposal was issued for public consultation from 23rd March to the 1st May 2009. The document was made available both online and at deposit points throughout Greater Manchester in line with the Statements of Community Involvement of the 10 Local Authorities. Consultees were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation system or by written response.

The 10 Greater Manchester Council websites were updated with text advertising the consultation and directing users to the Waste Plan website. The Waste Plan website was updated to advertise the consultation. Posters and newsletters were displayed and made available at deposit points (libraries and planning departments) across Greater

¹ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/7648846.stm>

Manchester. An advert was placed in the Manchester Evening News on the day before consultation started.

BBC Radio Manchester interviewed Councillor Antrobus, Chair of the Joint Waste Committee about the Waste Plan consultation.

3.5 Additional Sites (July 2009)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) Report on Additional Sites was issued for public consultation from 31st July to 11th September 2009 and was made available both online and at deposit points throughout Greater Manchester in line with the Statements of Community Involvement of the 10 Local Authorities. Consultees were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation system or by written response.

The 10 Greater Manchester Council websites were updated with text advertising the consultation and directing users to the Waste Plan website. The Waste Plan website was updated to advertise the consultation. Posters and newsletters were displayed and made available at deposit points (libraries and planning departments) across Greater Manchester. An advert was placed in the Manchester Evening News on the day before consultation started.

Councillor Young, a Joint Committee Member, was invited to take part in a BBC Radio Manchester breakfast show on Friday 31st July 2009. Cllr Young was interviewed about the Waste Plan as part of a themed programme on waste and there was an accompanying interview with a representative from a Salford-based plastics recycling company.

3.6 Preferred Options (November 2009)

Two sub-group meetings with cross-party attendance by Members were held to inform development of the Preferred Option Report.

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD): Preferred Option Report was issued for public consultation from 13th November 2009 to 8th January 2010 and was made available both online and at deposit points throughout Greater Manchester in line with the Statements of Community Involvement of the 10 Local Authorities. Consultees were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation system or by written response.

As part of the consultation arrangements, a Stakeholder Event took place on the 17th September 2009 at the Britannia Hotel in Manchester City Centre. Invitations were sent to all stakeholders on the consultation database, which at that time included over 500 invitees. The database includes a range of people such as community groups, environmental groups, individuals, industry representatives, site owners, agents, councillors and statutory consultees.

The Stakeholder Event followed a similar format to that used in previous meetings to ensure there was consistency of approach. A number of key presentations were given on the day including by Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority on the Greater Manchester PFI scheme, and stakeholders were able to question speakers on waste issues. At the end of the workshop sessions feedback from each group was presented

by a spokesperson and opportunities were given to raise questions about the topics under discussion.

Thirty-six stakeholders attended the Event and participated in discussions. A series of key outcomes were identified relating to the development of policy directions for the Preferred Option Report.

The 10 Greater Manchester Council websites were updated with text advertising the consultation and directing users to the Waste Plan website. The Waste Plan website was updated to advertise the consultation. Posters and newsletters were displayed and made available at deposit points (libraries and planning departments) across Greater Manchester. An advert was placed in the Manchester Evening News on the day before consultation started.

BBC Radio Manchester interviewed Councillor Antrobus, Chair of the Joint Waste Committee about the Waste Plan consultation.

Representatives from the Waste Industry and other key stakeholders were invited to meet with GMGU to discuss the Waste Plan. All landowners and waste industry representatives were invited and meetings were held with the following organisations:

United Utilities 26th August 2009
Veolia 14th September 2009
Entec 14th September 2009
Arley Consultants 16th September 2009
Peel Environmental 16th September 2009
Caseys/TargetFollow 7th & 23rd July 2009
DTZ 1st December 2009

3.7 Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan (June 2010)

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD): Consultation on Areas in Wigan took place from 18th June to 16th July 2010. Consultees were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation system or by written response. Wigan Council's website was updated to alert users to the latest consultation and directing them to the Waste Plan website, which was also updated.

4. Summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed

4.1 Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)

Officers and members event

The event incorporated two workshops. Workshop one required each group to identify the key issues facing planning for waste in Greater Manchester and the means by which these issues can be overcome (options).

Theme	Waste Data
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are inconsistencies in the availability of data across the waste streams to be catered for the Plan. Data for municipal solid waste (arising and disposal) is very reliable and up to date. Data for commercial and industrial waste is not up to date and therefore not reliable. • There is a need to establish how much waste the plan needs to deal with before establishing how it can be catered for over the Plan period. • The problems surrounding waste data are not unique to Manchester and are experienced by other Waste Planning Authorities
Recommendation	There is a need to tighten the evidence base and put in place work necessary to plug the gaps in the availability of robust data. A number of surveys being carried out e.g. regional C&I waste survey, Need Assessment (ERM) and other information from the National waste data survey may assist and should feed into the Waste Plan.

Theme	Waste Targets
Issues Raised	Discussed the range and types of targets and how these should be taken on board. There was a general understanding that targets for municipal waste are readily available and understood but that this represents only a small percentage of the waste to be catered for. The ability to achieve or control targets for commercial and industrial waste was discussed in the context of lack of base data. Some of the Groups raised questions regarding how targets should be applied. Should they be viewed as absolutes or should the Plan be more aspirational? Overall it was agreed that targets are challenging.
Recommendation	There is a need to define appropriate targets for recycling construction and demolition waste. There needs to be consensus and commonality on approach to achieving targets across the Plan area.

Theme	Waste Technologies
Issues Raised	There are significant political and public perception issues associated with various technologies and this was regarded as a key issue when viewed alongside a need for the plan to be flexible and respond to

	emerging technologies and not rule out specific technologies. These issues will have a bearing on the location of facilities. Certain technologies will require a guaranteed throughput to provide appropriate economies of scale and this too will have a bearing on waste management methods adopted. Generally there was concern about flexibility versus certainty.
Recommendation	Existing facilities should be used as a good starting point and that the plan needs to be flexible enough to cope with changes. There is a need to emphasise through the plan and appropriate education and awareness campaigns that many issues surrounding technologies are misconceived.

Theme	Availability of Sites
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability of sites was identified as a key issue for the Plan as sites not coming forward will affect the robustness of the plan and overall deliverability of key objectives. • Identifying appropriate geographical locations for facilities and ensuring equitability of facilities across administrative boundaries was also identified as important though it was recognised that there may need to be a trade-off between areas e.g. landfill provision only possible in some areas. • Equitability may be a problem given amounts of waste generated and appropriate sites being available. The type of technology adopted, economies of scale and proximity will all have a bearing on sites. The choice of transport will also have a bearing on the availability of sites e.g. if a rail / canal based strategy is adopted.
Recommendation	Carry out a wide trawl of sites in the first instance, sieving down as appropriate. Reserve sites to be considered to cope with allocated sites not coming forward. Existing sites may not be able to accommodate the need for new facilities and preferred areas were suggested as a way forward. Joint working recognised as the only way to address many of the issues. This will ensure that sites are identified in an appropriate and controlled way without necessarily falling into poorer / less desirable areas.

Theme	Transport
Issues Raised	All groups identified transportation and road-based transport as a key issue. The choice of transport would be influenced by the nature and location of waste arisings and proximity. Cost of transportation is a key issue facing the Plan along with the environmental impacts associated with transporting waste.
Recommendation	Need to consider alternative means of transport including rail and particularly canal options, although it is recognised that this could result in a conflict between competing land uses Need to develop an appropriate network of local facilities

Theme	Meeting objectives across national/regional and local context
Issues Raised	Different authorities have different waste collection arrangements (MSW) and this may result in conflict. The Groups generally felt there is a need to look at all objectives and filter them down.
Recommendation	Use inter-authority agreement / memorandum to assist with this issue Use Supplementary Planning Documents to assist in achieving waste minimisation targets

Theme	Interface with PFI
Issues Raised	How can the plan properly plan for Greater Manchester when it will be restricted to a certain extent by the outcomes from the PFI process.
Recommendation	The PFI agreement for municipal waste is a reality the Waste Plan must accommodate. The PFI agreement gives confidence and assurance to the Waste Plan's implementation proposals.

Theme	Public Perception
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General lack of understanding about waste planning and individual / collective responsibilities. • Lack of investment in education and awareness.
Recommendation	Planning and investment in public awareness campaigns and education would assist in addressing public perception.

Theme	Market for recyclates
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a general problem with a local market for recyclates. Products arising from recycling / recovery processes have to travel considerable distance to be re-processed
Recommendation	The role of the plan in addressing this issue needs to be considered early in the process

Theme	Interface with Adjoining Authorities
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative boundaries are not necessarily conducive to effective waste planning and cooperation between authorities is essential
Recommendation	The inter authority agreement will assist in respect of this issue.

Theme	Ranking of Options
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No agreement reached as to the ranking of sites through type of facility (technology), scale of facility and site location
Recommendation	Role of the Waste Plan is to identify and facilitate market provision, not to prescribe in detail this provision.

Next steps following Officers and Members Event Workshop 1: The recommendations from Workshop 1 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Workshop 2 was designed to identify the key locational principles for waste management sites and the criteria considered important in assessing the suitability of individual sites. Groups considered the following issues: -

- Existing sites in waste management use
- Industrial areas
- Transportation linked solutions
- Environmental designations
- Proximity to waste arisings
- Markets for recyclables
- Scale and throughput
- Pattern / distribution of sites - spatial distribution
- Buffer zones
- Apply different criteria to different sites
- Need to look at waste streams
- Land ownership and availability
- Look at other growth sector regeneration
- Deliverability
- Flexibility
- Need to think about co-location
- Need
- Sustainability
- Brown field land
- Social equity
- Cost
- Green belt
- Cumulative impact
- Health

Participants were asked to rank locational criteria. Groups found this a difficult task but broadly agreed the following: -

- 1 Type and scale of facility
- 2 Access
- 3 Environmental impact
- 4 Proximity to waste arisings

The second part of this workshop was designed to focus on criteria which should be applied to assess individual sites. Overall the Groups considered that the site assessment criteria as identified in Topic Paper 5 were acceptable as a starting point, though residual concerns relating to site availability permeated the discussions.

Next steps following Officers and Members Event Workshop 2: The recommendations from Workshop 2 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Stakeholder Event 1

Three workshops were carried out during the stakeholder event focusing on: -

- Sustainability Objectives
- Spatial Vision and Key Objectives
- Key Issues and Options

Workshop 1 – Sustainability Objectives

As part of the Draft Scoping Report a number of over-arching sustainability objectives were proposed covering economic, social and environmental matters. The workshop considered the following: -

- Are the sustainability objectives appropriate?
- If not record the reasons why and suggest appropriate amendments.
- Are the sustainability objectives comprehensive?
- If they are not deemed to be comprehensive, identify the gaps.

A summary of the key points are set out below: -

Objectives	Summary Comments
<i>To exploit the growth of potential business sectors</i>	Difficult to apply directly to waste but could strengthen with reference to promoting business up the waste hierarchy. Recognition that exploitation should not be at the expense of all else e.g. environmental objectives
<i>Encourage sustainable economic growth and assist in reducing the disparities of sub-regional economic performance</i>	What is the sub-region? There is no mention of disparities or what they are. It was felt that social and health implications would also have a bearing.
<i>To develop the region's image</i>	Generally agreed that needs to be marketed but what is the region's image? If this is unknown then how can such an objective be applied? What are the financial implications? It was suggested that this would assist in marketing as a sustainable city (in waste management terms).
<i>To develop and maintain a healthy labour market</i>	Principle laudable but how should it be applied to waste? Some groups felt there was ambiguity surrounding "healthy" and suggested this should be replaced by "adequate".
<i>5. To reduce the need to travel, improve choice and use of sustainable transport modes</i>	This can be applied and every encouragement should be given to alternative means of transportation.
<i>To improve physical health and mental health and reduce health inequalities</i>	There is a general responsibility to ensure that waste facilities do not continue to be sited in the poorest areas.
<i>To improve access to good quality affordable and resource efficient housing</i>	It was felt that as waste technologies improve, their contribution to sustainable communities and integration should be essential.
<i>To enable groups and communities to contribute to decision making, and to reduce social exclusion</i>	It is a common view that "fairies deal with their rubbish". Education and awareness and contribution to decision making will assist in delivering change. Some groups felt that this was more of an aim for the LPAs.
<i>To improve access to and use of basic goods, services and amenities for all groups</i>	This is particularly important as it ensures equitability and local facilities likely to promote greater awareness.
<i>To protect, enhance, manage and restore where appropriate, the rich diversity of cultural, built environment and archaeological assets</i>	This can be applied to siting of facilities. Use of the word "appropriate" is ambiguous.
<i>To protect, enhance, manage and restore where appropriate</i>	This can be applied to waste activities. Use of the word "appropriate" is ambiguous.

<i>biodiversity, landscape accessibility, endangered species, habitats and sites of geological importance</i>	
<i>To protect and improve local environmental quality and reduce crime</i>	The design of waste management facilities should incorporate “designing out crime”.
<i>To protect and improve the quality of inland waters</i>	Use of canals can be promoted through the Plan and this can be linked to appropriate regeneration / stewardship
<i>To protect and improve air quality</i>	The Groups generally agreed with this objective, some commenting on air quality issues and buffer zones required.
<i>To restore and protect land and soil and to manage contaminated land</i>	This objective can be applied, particularly when considering the location of sites and any sequential approach. In the context of this and other objectives, one Group was concerned that this is effectively a push towards Brownfield land, which may not always be appropriate.
<i>To mitigate and adapt to climate change</i>	This objective can be applied to waste management to ensure increases efficiency less impact on climate change
<i>To ensure prudent use of natural resources and the sustainable management of existing resources</i>	Generally agreed but felt covered elsewhere. What does prudent mean?
<i>To minimise the requirement for energy use, promote efficient use and increase the use of energy from renewable sources</i>	This objective can assist in delivering new and suitable technologies. It was felt that the financial burden should not preclude or disadvantage certain sectors of the community.
<i>To manage waste sustainably, minimize waste, its production, and increase re-use, recycling and recovery rates.</i>	The Groups felt this was effectively the waste hierarchy and was a sensible objective. One Group felt the objective should be reordered so that the need to minimise waste comes first or repunctuated as follows: To manage waste sustainably; minimize waste; its production and increase re-use, recycling and recovery rates.

Next steps following Stakeholder Event 1 Workshop 1: The recommendations from Workshop 1 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Workshop 2 - Spatial Vision and Key Objectives

Groups were asked to define an appropriate spatial vision for the JWDPD. Four alternative visions were identified.

“To manage Greater Manchester’s waste through the promotion of the waste hierarchy (minimise, re-use, recycle, recover) so that by 2015 residual waste amounts to no more than 50% and by 2020 no more than 30% ultimately resulting in zero residual waste. All waste producers should be encouraged to take responsibility for their own waste. Provision should be made for waste to be managed at the nearest facility.”

“To create an inclusive land use and environmental strategy to ensure the Greater Manchester area can manage its waste in an appropriate and effective way within our community.”

“Waste: what, where, how and why – we are going to build waste management facilities in Greater Manchester and this document tells you where they might be acceptable.”

“The provision and distribution of adequate facilities to meet the waste management needs of Greater Manchester (and all of its stakeholders) whilst satisfying social, economic and environmental constraints.”

Next steps following Stakeholder Event 1 Workshop 2: The recommendations from Workshop 2 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Workshop 3 – Key Issues and Options

The following tables identify the key issues considered and the actions proposed.

Theme	Waste Data
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important data is missing or unavailable. Key concerns were identified in relation to commercial and industrial waste. Waste projections, forecasting and assumptions can be unreliable. There is also a lack of data on construction and demolition waste.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection is required locally but requires funding. • RSS survey work should be brought forward and used at local authority level. • Appropriate to tap into the various data sources e.g. CIWM, ESA, EA, BRE. • Collect appropriate baseline information locally to ensure that it is reliable and what is needed. • Clarify the various definitions of waste at a national level.

Theme	Waste targets
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste apportionment at a sub-regional level may not be possible given the lack of data and it is impossible to have accurate targets without an accurate baseline. There are currently no targets for commercial and industrial waste and this places greater focus on municipal waste targets. More ambitious targets are desirable but they do need to be justified. However it was recognised that the targets for municipal waste have already been exceeded.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets should generally be set at higher levels • A range of targets based on an over-estimation of need should be set. • The DPD could produce separate targets or simply reflect those in the RSS, which would provide consistency in approach. • Education identified as a key to achieving targets along with the provision of appropriately sited facilities to facilitate recycling and recovery.

Theme	Waste Technologies
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a range of technologies on the market and flexibility is required to accommodate these. The plan needs to be realistic in terms of the likelihood of technologies coming forward and that there needs to be a recognition that residual waste needs to be planned for. The Environment Agency need to provide permits for new facilities and it is anticipated that this may lead to further problems in terms of promoting new technologies. Public perception is a key issue even with proven technologies.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public acceptability is important and education is required to ensure that the public is engaged and understand the various technologies and resultant benefits / impacts. • The plan should be flexible and not over prescriptive. • Land should be protected with the JWDPD to allow for future changes of technology. • Co-location would assist in providing flexibility.

Theme	Availability of sites
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for sites is considerable and regeneration of areas can compromise the use of sites for waste management related activities. Some facilities e.g. composting will require open land and that may be difficult to find. There is a landfill shortage that requires consideration. There is a need for more reprocessing / handling sites in Greater Manchester. Even if appropriate sites are found there was a concern that they may not actually come forward. A key issue relates to the fact that facilities should be located close enough to centres of population to make best economic use of a site but far enough away such that environmental impact is minimised.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to provide a range of sites of various size and type to cater for changes in the future. • Green belt policy should be reviewed and boundaries amended locally. • Industrial sites in urban areas may be appropriate for MRF's and waste transfer. • Existing waste management sites must be protected. • Areas of search could be used (windfalls), specific allocations would provide certainty along with criteria based policies to provide appropriate controls. • Sites need to be identified close to source of waste arisings, close to appropriate transport and infrastructure, co-located with industry (effectively a sequential approach).

Theme	Transport
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged that there is a need to minimise journeys. Acknowledged that current waste activities rely on road-based haulage and there is a lack of sustainable sites providing opportunities to change this.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to identify sites that have sustainable transport links.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific allocations for large sites would be beneficial, as this would allow consideration of transport impacts at the outset. • Consensus reached that more waste should be transported using canals and railways though it was recognised that some materials would degrade quickly so transportation time is a critical factor in determining the appropriate means.
--	---

Theme	Meeting Objectives
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are ranges of competing objectives, which may result in conflict at the various government levels. Education for all was viewed as important.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was felt that the balance to be struck between the various tiers of objectives is one for politicians. • There is a need to consider the various targets but it was felt that at least consistent targets across the ten authorities would assist. • In terms of education, it was suggested that financial incentives would assist e.g. understanding the direct correlation between waste disposal /collection and Council Tax.

Theme	Scale of Facilities
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In discussing the scale of facilities it was felt that this was dependent on both the technology and waste stream (economies of scale issue). This has an obvious bearing on location.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of facilities needs to be such that efficiency (at all levels) is maximised. • Co-location was raised as a means of delivery through the provision of regional facilities. • A flexible approach was preferable.

Theme	Interface with adjoining Authorities
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the main issues identified was the lack of communication and knowledge sharing. The issues are both inter (between authorities in the Plan area) and intra (interface with those on the borders). A key issue is the fact that administrative boundaries are artificial and do not correlate with waste arisings.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A standardised approach across the Greater Manchester area would assist. • Planning at a regional level reduces the likelihood of conflict.

Theme	Education and training
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and training is key. This includes, educating planners, MPs Councillors, the public and wider stakeholders.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This can be achieved through consultation and providing information in a non-technical way so that the various groups can respond to the potential issues.

Theme	Green Belt, Greenfield, Brownfield
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the Green Belt should be sacrosanct.
Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to consider the Green Belt and options for delivering waste management facilities within it.

Next steps following Stakeholder Event 1 Workshop 3: The recommendations from Workshop 3 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Stakeholder Event 2

The Groups discussed the overarching objectives and sub objectives as set out in the Draft Scoping Report. Details of this are included in the table below.

Objectives	Summary Comments
Waste Hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater Manchester should aim to exceed recycling targets set by the GM waste authority. • The JWDPD must adhere to the waste hierarchy • The Plan will follow the principles of the waste hierarchy to reduce, reuse, recycle, recover and dispose as a last resort. • To minimise the production of waste in the first instance, following which the priority should be to re-use, recycle and recover as much waste as possible with only the residual going to landfill.
Proximity principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan will follow the principles of the proximity principle to • minimise the travel distance between collection point and first treatment of waste • To encourage the co-location of facilities to minimise the transportation of waste. This should include waste producers, waste management facilities and end users of waste derived products (such as heat, energy or residues). • Where appropriate waste should be managed as close to source as possible taking into account the type of facility and the waste stream
Self sufficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As far as is reasonably possible, neighbourhoods, districts and Greater Manchester as a whole, should deal with its own waste, in line with the proximity principle. • The Region should be self-sufficient and should aim for self sufficiency at sub-regional level, particularly further up the waste hierarchy but recognising that self-sufficiency in terms of disposal may not always be possible at Greater Manchester, sub-regional or regional level
Sustainable Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All facilities should accord with the principles of sustainable development (e.g. energy efficiency, sustainably located)
Environmental factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To have regard to all environmental factors relating to air, water land and people in identifying sites for waste management facilities. To strike a balance between environmental factors and the need for facilities.
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To minimise transportation and use the most economically and environmentally viable mode. • To encourage the bulk loading of vehicles. • To identify and safeguard sites with connections to the non-road transport network. Sites for waste facilities should be identified following a robust assessment of transport impacts in order to ascertain whether the proposed mode of transport is the most appropriate for the waste stream.
Provision of sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites should be provided in the optimal location, taking into account sustainable development, proximity principles and the waste hierarchy.

Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To remain in compliance with all current legislation and targets whilst making the best use of available technology to achieve other objectives.
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To educate and lead by example

The second part of the workshop required the Groups to identify 5 options for managing waste in the future. The options highlighted in bold are those that could form options to be considered in the Issues and Options report: -

- Obtain accurate data
- Implement a programme of engagement
- Escalate landfill tax
- Rationalise relationship between collection and disposal authorities
- Provide facilities to meet local needs
- Don't produce any waste – Zero landfill strategy
- Plan on achieving zero residual waste accepting that waste will be produced.
- Maximise recycling (at source) and landfill only residues
- Dispose of all waste to landfill
- Energy from Waste strategy
- Compost based strategy
- Integrated waste management strategy

Next steps following Stakeholder Event 2 Workshop 1: The recommendations from Workshop 1 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Workshop 2 – General Locational Principles

Groups were asked to consider the following questions: -

- Should the Plan adopt an exclusionary approach?
- Should general principles be applied?
- Should the Plan have strategic locations?
- Should areas of search / preferred areas be identified?

In relation to locational criteria, the groups identified the following issues as important: -

- Access and transportation
- Proximity to centres of population
- Industrial areas
- Contaminated / derelict and previously developed land (use waste management facilities as a means of regenerating difficult sites)
- Existing infrastructure and waste sites
- Disused or current mineral working sites and utility works
- Explore opportunities for co-location
- Potential exclusionary criteria (e.g. SSSI, Green Belt)

Workshop groups noted that a balance must be struck between competing interests and that exclusionary criteria may have a place but “no-go” areas will only serve to reduce flexibility and frustrate development.

Strategic locations have a role to play and these should be identified in the JWDPD, though the Groups felt that it was important to ensure consistency using a defined criteria based approach for site identification. Such an approach would allow flexibility to be built into the plan to take into account new information.

The Groups also felt that areas of search may have a role to play but they have to be “sold” in a positive way so as not to cause planning blight.

The Groups then discussed topics they considered should be covered by planning policies. The list of topics generated are as follows: -

- Policies covering PPS 10 parameters
- Need
- Locational criteria
- Transport and encouraging alternative sustainable transportation
- Provision for additional facilities on existing sites and brownfield land and policy protection to ensure that other development does not encroach on such land and prejudice the use
- Policies to maximise the use of recycled materials and energy efficiency
- Minimise environmental harm and protect local amenity
- Enhance local environmental quality
- The need to include provision within proposals for appropriate mitigation
- Policies should seek to “rebrand” waste
- An overarching education and awareness policy (and provision of funding of such campaigns through new waste development)
- Policy to promote high quality design
- Planning obligations

Next steps following Stakeholder Event 2 Workshop 2: The recommendations from Workshop 2 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

Workshop 3 – Spatial Distribution of Sites

Groups were asked to identify the likely spatial distribution of future facilities and potential areas of search for such facilities. It was generally felt that the range of constraints provided was sufficient in terms of identifying a theoretical distribution, although it was acknowledged that much ground work would be needed to take the work forward to a meaningful conclusion. Some attendees were reluctant to identify specific sites, in case these were taken forward to the next stage.

Next steps following Stakeholder Event 2 Workshop 3: The recommendations from Workshop 3 were used to inform the development of Stage One Issues and Options.

4.2 Stage 1 Issues and Options (May 2007)

Fifteen questions were posed through the consultation document for consultees to respond to. The following tables highlight the consultation questions, the issues raised and the recommendations taken forward.

Issue	Strategic Aim
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the most appropriate strategic aim for the JMDDP?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All strategic aims identified are appropriate • A combination of the options would be most appropriate • Suggested alternative put forward for Preferred Options stage • Sustainability Appraisal reveals that no clear option can be considered 'better' in sustainability terms.
Recommendation	It is proposed that two suggested strategic aims are taken forward to the Preferred Options stage. One should be a combination of the options set out in the Stage One Issues and Options Report, whilst the other should be the new strategic aim put forward by a respondent to the Stage One Issues and Options consultation. It is recommended that the suggestions put forward as part of the SA are incorporated into the 'combination of options' to ensure that the aim is explicit and covers social, environmental and economic concerns.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform further development of the Strategic Aim as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Strategic Objectives
Question	<i>With regards to the above objectives which of the following options do you think is the most appropriate for the development of the JWDDP?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All strategic objectives considered appropriate, however objectives could be developed further e.g. numerical targets, more specific, locally distinctive, reflective of climate change etc. • Flexibility a key issue. • Sustainability Appraisal indicates that the options are consistent with sustainability principles.
Recommendation	Retain objectives as a starting point for the JWDDP as they reflect PPS 10 and no respondents felt that it is necessary to consider alternative objectives. These objectives should be developed in future stages of the JWDDP and reworded to incorporate the recommendations set out in the SA.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform further development of the Strategic Objectives as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Waste Streams to be Managed
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for dealing with the different waste streams produced in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JWDDP should make provision for all significant waste streams as identified in PPS10. • The SA identifies the potential positive sustainability benefits through planning for all significant waste streams produced by Greater Manchester.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Preferred Option A 'The JWDDP should make provision for all significant waste streams as detailed in PPS10' should be taken forward in the JWDDP.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Meeting Future Waste Management Needs
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for meeting future waste growth in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JWDPD will follow the approach set out in PPS10 • The JWDPD should seek to provide additional facilities but only allow a phased release of sites based on a plan, monitor and manage approach. • The JWDPD should seek to provide for the maximum facilities to meet future waste growth.
Recommendation	<p>It was recognised that this issue will be informed by the forecasts set out within the Revised Needs Assessment. This document will feed into the JWDPD and is likely to offer more clarity.</p> <p>The SA suggests that Option C is the most sustainable, however, at this stage, it is recommended that Preferred Options A, B and C are taken forward. How these Options conform with the approach set out in PPS 10 should also be described.</p>
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Managing Waste as a Resource
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach to waste management in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JWDPD should not provide for facilities to meet Greater Manchester's apportionments through RSS only. • Majority of respondents felt that the JWDPD should provide for the required type of facilities to achieve net self-sufficiency. • Approach should reflect that set out within RSS, bearing in mind consideration of PPS10 Companion Guide. • SA indicates clear benefits from following the proximity principle and looking to deal with waste in the locality of its production.
Recommendation	It is recommended that both Option B and C are taken forward to preferred options. However, to make clear the potential impact of RSS and regionally significant facilities on the JWDPD, it is recommended that this is included within Option B.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Waste Minimisation and New Development
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for achieving sustainable waste management in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts should not prepare guidance as part of their LDFs • JWDPD should provide policy in the form of strategic guidance on waste minimisation to assist individual districts in preparing policies within their LDDs. • A quarter of respondents felt that the JWDPD should include policies that encourage waste minimisation as part of waste and non-waste related developments. • SA indicates strong benefits from minimising waste; therefore all

	options would result in benefits.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Option A 'The JWDPD includes policies which encourage waste minimisation as part of waste and non-waste related developments' and Option C 'The JWDPD provides policy in the form of strategic guidance on waste minimisation to assist individual districts in preparing policies within their LDFs i.e. through the production of an SPD' are taken forward to Preferred Options.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Option 7 as part of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities ('Minimising Waste During Development').

Issue	Providing for Future Landfill Needs
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach in terms of the provision for landfill in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of respondents preferred 'to provide further landfill to meet a combination of the above'. A Revised Needs Assessment will assist with finding the best approach to this and the likely landfill requirements.
Recommendation	It is recommended that all the options are taken forward in the JWDPD. The completion of the Revised Needs Assessment and its use to inform Stage Two Issues and Options will enable this Issue to be considered in light of information regarding the likely need for future landfill requirements.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Providing Sites/Areas for Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for identifying areas/sites for waste management facilities in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of consultees preferred Option F 'a combination of broad locations and specific site allocation supported by criteria identifying suitability of certain types of development on specific sites. 30% of consultees selected Option D 'identify specific site allocations (preferred areas) supported by criteria identifying suitability of certain types of development on specific sites.' SA indicates that site-specific locations can be identified with greater certainty of the effects that waste facilities may have on the receiving environment, whilst broad locations may provide opportunities to reduce travel between facilities.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Options B, D, E and F are taken forward as Preferred Options. The SA suggested that Option F offers the greatest benefits in terms of sustainability. No respondents selected Options A, C or G and these will not be taken forward to Preferred Options.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Size and Distribution of Sites/Areas for Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for the distribution of waste management sites/areas across Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JWDPD will conform to the approach set out in PPS10 paragraphs 17 –21 • SA suggests that the economic success of the waste industry has a great deal of importance and can help promote innovation in dealing with this resource.
Recommendation	It is recommended that the Preferred Options A, B and C are taken forward to the next stage of the JWDPD. Option C was highlighted by the SA as being the most sustainable.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Option 1 as part of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (which considered various options for distributing waste management facilities). This recommendation was also used to inform Option 6 of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (which considered various options for distributing landfill).

Issue	Identifying Sites/Areas for Particular Types of Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for the identification of suitable sites/ areas for particular types of waste management facilities in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority (just over 60%) of those who answered this question selected Option B as respondents felt that this Option offers the greatest flexibility for the JWDPD and would ensure sites were made available for new technologies. • Heritage assets and an understanding of the potential impacts on the historic environment were highlighted. • The SA identified the benefits of identifying sites for waste per se, in terms of allowing the industry to evolve and not be constrained. SA suggests that Option C has the best all round sustainability performance.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Preferred Options B and C are taken forward. In addition, it is recommended that a Preferred Option, which combines Options A, and B is also taken forward.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Sustainable Transportation of Waste
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for the sustainable transport of waste in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of respondents felt that sites, which offer access by a combination of modes of transportation, should be promoted. • SA indicates that to ensure the management of all waste streams can be satisfactorily implemented, a range of transport modes should be promoted. Large volumes of waste are best served by

	sustainable transport where large volumes can be moved easily. Sites that are accessible by road will be more effective to collect other waste streams, such as hazardous waste and will provide proximity to waste producers such as domestic recycling.
Recommendation	<p>The majority of respondents stated that the sustainable transport of waste was an important issue. Many expressed a desire for rail/water to be utilised where feasible. This conforms with advice given in paragraph 21 of PPS 10 which states that one of the criteria used when deciding which sites and areas to identify for waste management facilities should include 'the capacity of the existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste and products arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport'.</p> <p>Given the above, it is recommended that Options C and D are taken forward as Preferred Options.</p>
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform the development of Spatial Distribution Option 1: Transport Nodes as part of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities. It was also used to inform the development of Spatial Distribution Option 1: Transport Nodes as part of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal.

Issue	Identification of Sites/Areas for Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for the location of waste management facilities in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of respondents believe that the best approach would be to 'prioritise the location of new waste management facilities in a combination of both urban and rural locations, according to the type of facility needed. • Option C would minimise transportation costs and environmental impact and would allow for flexibility in enabling new technologies. • PPS10 should be taken into account, particularly the need to test the suitability of sites/areas against the criteria set out in paragraph 21 (i), taking account of Annex E. • SA considered that the most sustainable option is for a mix of locations and this should be influenced by waste management type.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Options A and C be taken forward to Preferred Options, bearing in mind the need to take account of PPS 10.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Option 1 as part of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (which considered various options for distributing waste management facilities). This recommendation was also used to inform Option 6 of Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (which considered various options for distributing landfill).

Issue	Criteria for the Identification of Sites/Areas for Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach for identifying sites for waste management facilities in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 60% of consultees selected Option B 'adopt the search criteria as set out in PPS10 and develop this to offer a more defined and locally distinctive set of search criteria.' • A Greater Manchester focus to the criteria would be more relevant and take account of local issues • The results of the study into broad locations for regionally significant waste facilities should be taken into account. • SA indicates that greater sustainability could be reached if locally distinctive and robust criteria can be added to those listed in PPS10.
Recommendation	It is recommended that both Option A and B are taken forward as Preferred Options. It is intended that the JWDPD will be a locally specific document and therefore Option B should be considered. Therefore, it should be recognised that these options are not mutually exclusive; Option B merely gives a local focus to the criteria set out in PPS 10 (Option A).
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the development of a methodology for the selection of sites/areas in Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities. It was also used to inform the development of a methodology for the selection of sites/areas in Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal.

Issue	Safeguarding Existing Waste Management Sites
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach regarding the issue of safeguarding of existing waste management facilities in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents prefer Option C 'only safeguard certain types of waste management facility for which there is an identified need'. • The criteria for the identification of sites for waste management facilities are set out in PPS10 and existing sites would need to be tested against these criteria. The JWDPD must meet the requirements of PPS10 and therefore the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities upon communities should be taken into account. • SA recognises that safeguarding waste sites has been identified as a useful tool in providing sites for future waste management whilst avoiding potential impacts from the location of new sites.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Options A, B and C are taken forward as Preferred Options. It is likely that the Revised Needs Assessment will inform this issue and provide more information in the future.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the development of Policy Direction 8 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Expansion of Existing Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach regarding the issue of expansion of existing waste management facilities in Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents selected Option A ‘consider the potential for expansion of all safeguarded sites.’ One respondent suggested this option would be appropriate provided that sound development control policies are in place and implemented effectively. • 30% of respondents selected Option C ‘Expansion of existing sites should be dealt with through Development Control on individual applications basis only, and not considered at all through policies of the JWDPD. • SA states that the considering the expansion of only major sites (Option B) may help to minimise local deterioration in environmental and social quality from the expansion of smaller sites, but will also then fail to capitalise on potential; significant economic benefits of expansion of smaller sites and associated practices. The use of Development Control policies alone (Option C) to control site expansion is not considered sustainable as this will not produce a strategic vision to control possibly contentious waste streams and will not be sufficient to considers the cumulative effects of expansion on Greater Manchester and its population.
Recommendation	It is recommended that Options A, B and C are taken forward as Preferred Options. The Revised Needs Assessment, which will be used to inform site work for the JWDPD, will provide information on existing facilities in Greater Manchester and the likely future requirements. This will assist in considering this issue future.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

4.3 Stage 2 Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008)

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 1	<i>Are there any other categories of land that you think would be appropriate to consider in generating a long list of potential sites? If so, what categories of land would you like to see included?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional categories/types of land were suggested by respondents: • Land in waste producers landholding where it may be possible to reuse and/or process waste on site; • Land which already has the benefit of planning consent for waste uses; • Land which has planning consent for waste uses, but as yet has not been implemented; and • Land included within emerging Core Strategies for new/existing employment or strategic sites
Recommendation	As the additional categories of land have already been considered it is proposed that there is no need to reconsider this land at the present time. As Core Strategies and other key land use documents emerge across Greater Manchester it will be necessary to continue to monitor the availability of land which may be appropriate for the future development of waste management facilities.
Next step...	These categories of land had already been taken into account through the development of the site selection methodology and were not considered further.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 2	<i>Do you think there are any other exclusionary criteria that should be taken into consideration? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of respondents suggested the exclusion or consideration of the following factors when choosing sites for waste facilities: • Nitrate vulnerable zones; • City Airport Manchester (Barton) airfield safety/bird strike zone • Country Parks; • The Historic Environment Record (HER) should be consulted to ensure all impacts on such features are considered; • Food processing facilities; • Other formal open or green space designations other than Green Belt; • Air Quality Management Areas; • The setting of assets listed as exclusionary criteria (such as SAMs, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens) as set out within PPG15 and 16.; • Local biodiversity and geodiversity Designations; and • Outcomes of the Greater Manchester Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
Recommendation	The additional criteria suggested by respondents will be considered

	during the development of Preferred Options and where appropriate they will be used to further refine the long list of sites, if they have not already been used so far. However it is important to note that a number of those suggested are likely to be considered for mitigation or final boundary placement rather than used to exclude sites altogether, such as local biodiversity/geodiversity designations, local green spaces and the setting of heritage designations. The impact on food processing facilities and nitrate vulnerable zones may only need to be considered when siting open facilities such as landfill, composting or open recycling plants
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the site selection methodology and informed development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 3	<i>Are there any other additional criteria that you think should be considered? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity of sites/areas for waste management facilities to areas of high unemployment and or good public transport links to areas of high unemployment; • Proximity to public transport links to enable sustainable worker commuting; • Locating sites/areas for waste management facilities at current or former waste management or minerals extraction sites; • Locating sites/areas for waste management facilities where there is access to alternative transport modes (not simply road); • Consideration of carbon impacts on developments; • Encouraging facilities, including those which generate heat and power, required to meet the needs of communities whilst encouraging competitiveness.
Recommendation	The majority of the suggested additional criteria have been considered through the development of the site search options and also the Sustainability Appraisal of specific sites. The only issue not yet considered relates to carbon impacts of potential waste management facilities. This is complicated at this stage of the JWDPD, as without knowing exactly what type and scale of facility will come forward on which sites there is no way of quantifying the carbon impact of such a development. It may be possible that the consideration of carbon impacts becomes more feasible later in the process. This issue will be considered during the development of the Preferred Options.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the site selection methodology and informed development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 4	<i>Do you think that the sites/areas identified as potentially suitable for waste management facilities in Annex 1 are acceptable? (Please give details)</i>
Issues Raised	<p>Respondents made reference to additional information pertinent to the consideration of the sites listed below. These sites were subjected to re-appraisal through the Sustainability Appraisal process. Where the re-appraisal resulted in the following sited being classified as a 'band D' and removed from further consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BL3, • BL4, • BL5, • BL7, • BL8, • BL9, • SL6, • SL8, and • SL10 • TA5 • TA8 <p>Respondents made comments on the sites listed below, but their comments did not warrant the reappraisal of the sites, but rather raised issues which were dealt with through the HRA process or would be dealt with through a planning application. Therefore these sites were retained for further consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ST3 • OL2 • RD11 • TR12 • W4 • W11
Next Step...	The sites retained for further consideration were used to inform the development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 5	<i>Do you know of any other sites/areas that should be considered as part of the JWDPD? (Please give details)</i>
Issues Raised	<p>The sites listed below were suggested by respondents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fletcher Bank Quarry- Bury • Reliance Street- Manchester • Arkwright Street- Oldham • Mitchell Shackleton site, Salford • Ashtons Field, Salford • Additional land adjacent to TR8- Trafford • Ince in Makerfield Waste Water Treatment Works- Wigan

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tyldesley Waste Water Treatment Works- Wigan
Recommendation	<p>Sites not already considered were subjected to the appraisal process, including Sustainability Appraisal. Some sites had already been included.</p> <p>A comprehensive report on the inclusion and exclusion of all sites considered through the JWDPD process has been carried out: Evidence Base document: Site Search Process.</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 6	<i>A number of sites/areas have been allocated as 'Band D' by the Sustainability Appraisal which means that they are considered unsuitable for waste uses by the Sustainability Appraisal. An additional sieving process has been undertaken and it is our intention to remove sites/areas submitted by the commercial sector and allocated as 'Band D' unless there are sound planning reasons/justifications to leave these sites in. If you know of any sound planning reasons/justifications for leaving these sites/areas in, please give details.</i>
Issues Raised	<p>A total of seven responses to Question 6 were received, with the most responses received supporting the decision to remove all 'Band D' sites unless further sound planning reasons/justifications for retaining these sites are presented. Two respondents have presented evidence to retain specific sites. Information presented in the table below sets out those Band D sites that will now be considered further:</p> <p>BL10, BU10 & TA8: The site owner/operator submitted additional information about these sites. Therefore this information will be used to re-appraise the site through the development of Preferred Options.</p>
Recommendation	A list of preferred sites/areas will be included within the Preferred Options Report. This list will be generated with consideration to the specific issues raised through the Issues and Options consultation stages, in line with the recommendations made in the tables above and that of the corresponding Sustainability Appraisal.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 7	<i>Option 1 looks at rail sidings associated with existing waste management facilities. If you know of any other rail sidings that may be appropriate for transferring waste to the railway network, please give details.</i>
Issues Raised	<p>The area to the North West of Dean Lane Rail station in Manchester correlates well to locations of existing facilities according to the map of existing waste management facilities supplied in the consultation document.</p> <p>As the only sidings currently included within the JWDPD are limited to</p>

	two operated by GMWDA, others should be considered, including disused sidings capable of being reactivated.
Recommendation	<p>During the development of the spatial options sustainable transport links relating to rail sidings were explored. However, there are only limited commercial rail freight sidings capable of handling large volumes of waste in Greater Manchester. Any new sidings will require major financial investment and infrastructure development and this cannot be delivered by the JWDPD, as this is dependent on the site ownership and would be subject to further consideration through the development management process.</p> <p>Therefore it is not feasible to identify sites for waste development in locations where new rail sidings are only a possibility and not guaranteed to be delivered.</p> <p>However the potential for future development of rail sidings to be developed alongside sites with potential for waste management facility development can be highlighted.</p> <p>Further consultation with Network Rail and other operators will be undertaken during the development of Preferred Options to assess this issue in more detail. Where appropriate this information will be used to further refine the spatial strategy used to guide the location of waste facilities across Greater Manchester.</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Selection of Sites/Areas for Waste Management
Question 8	<i>Do you have any other comments regarding this option, e.g. size of buffer zone or selection of transport network or growth areas?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 500m buffer in Option 1: appears too big. Option 2: does aligning new sites with growth areas mean sites will be in the best locations? Option 3 presupposes the existing clusters are well-located. • Options 1 and 2 seem to be the most important factors and emphasis should be focused on locating sites together, in clusters so that the benefits of co-location are utilised. • The transportation of waste by more sustainable means avoiding road haulage is important, especially at major facilities
Recommendation	<p>A combination approach is to be developed which encompasses all three spatial options. The comments and suggestions received regarding the spatial options will be considered when developing the combination approach.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that buffer distances have been developed through consultation with a range of industry representatives, elected members and statutory bodies. These will be considered further during the development of Preferred Options but only amended where absolutely necessary.</p>
Next Steps...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Directions 2 and 3 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Development Management Issues and Options
Question 9	<i>Do you think it is appropriate for the JWDPD to include a Development Management policy which gives priority to thermal treatment plants that recover value from the waste in the form of both electricity generated to the national grid or a local energy network and also heat provided to local housing and businesses (Combined Heat and Power)? (Please give reasons)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for inclusion of a policy which prioritises the recovery of both energy and heat from waste so long as this policy is viewed within the context of the waste hierarchy. • Recognition that the market for recovered heat is not well developed at present but may improve with strong policy support. Heating networks could be encouraged through the implementation of the 'Merton Rule'. • Important to secure new sources of energy. • National Waste Strategy and any national guidance is all that is required. It is difficult to get a balance for a priority, are you prioritising output or the efficiency of the operation?
Recommendation	A Development Management policy which gives priority to thermal treatment plants that recover value from the waste in the form of both electricity and heat will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. This is in line with the consultation responses received and represents sustainable waste management practice.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the development of Policy Direction 5 as part of the Preferred Option.

Issue	Development Management Issues and Options
Question 10	<i>Do you think that it is appropriate for the JWDPD to contain a Development Management policy setting out how proposals for waste development on allocated sites/areas will be dealt with? (Please give reasons) If so, what are the considerations that such a policy should take account of? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and detailed explanations should be delivered to residents who live in the areas surrounding new waste facilities; • The process must be transparent, possible complications in devising an approach or format which is consistent with equivalent policies for other (non-waste) developments in each of the 10 Districts; • Policy not required to deal with proposals on a site by site basis – general principles can be applied. A better approach would be to set guidelines based on the facility or development type, together with a checklist of items that the developer needs to consider; • Policy should take account of conserving and enhancing biodiversity (including sites and species) and geodiversity, conserving and enhancing landscape and townscape character and quality, recreation and access to countryside; • Consideration of visual appearance of the buildings, the means of access and the measures to be employed to prevent contamination of the surrounding area;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should require detailed appraisal of any impacts upon the historic environment together with requirement to measure and mitigate any harmful effects; and • The policy should consider the impacts on nearby residents or on the natural/built environment so controls on operating hours, emission, noise, odours, dust, traffic movements etc will be necessary.
Recommendation	A Development Management policy setting out how proposals for waste development on allocated sites/areas will be dealt with will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. The development of this policy will reflect, as far as possible, the consultation responses set out above.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the introduction to the chapter on Development Management Policies in the Preferred Option Report (page 56, paragraph 6.1 of the Preferred Option Report). The introduction says that “the Development Management policies contained within the Waste Plan will address waste specific issues as the Waste plan forms part of a wider development framework and each Authority will prepare policies in their individual Local Development Frameworks common to all types of development”.

Issue	Development Management Issues and Options
Question 11	<i>Do you agree that the above issues each require development management policies in the JWDPD? (Please give reasons) Are there any other impacts that you think should be considered? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy guiding development on Agricultural Land Grade 3a and 3b should also be considered; • Sustainable transport is directly relevant to locating new waste facilities. It is not evident whether the other two should be singled out in this way; • A policy should be included which covers all the issues relevant to site selection for landfill; • A policy should be included which safeguards all airfield safeguarding zones within Greater Manchester to ensure the safety of aircraft; • Suggested inclusion of a policy on environmental assets and their settings.
Recommendation	During development of the Preferred Options the responses received will be considered and where appropriate they will be used to inform any decision on the inclusion of a development management policy on the issues highlighted above which include sustainable transport of waste, agricultural land policy or airfield safeguarding zones.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the introduction to the chapter on Development Management Policies in the Preferred Option. This lists the types of information applicants will be expected to submit and, because they are also common to non-waste development, will be set out elsewhere in the Local Development Framework.

Issue	Development Management Issues and Options
Question 12	<i>Should the JWDPD contain a Development Management policy on waste minimisation?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimisation per se is not an outcome of the JWDPD process therefore the effectiveness of the DPD should not be based on monitoring arisings growth; • The JWDPD should not contain a Development Management policy on waste minimisation. It should instead rely on guidance set out in The Site Waste Management Plans Regulations 2008 for developments with costs greater than £300,000; and • The policy should consider how waste would be minimised during the three phases: construction, the use of the buildings/developments during their life, and how construction materials will be dealt with at end of their life.
Recommendation	Development Management policy on waste minimisation will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. It should be noted that such a policy will be aimed at minimisation in relation to all types of developments not just waste facility development and all waste streams, not just Construction and Demolition wastes.
Next Step...	This issue was considered in more detail in the Preferred option Report. Waste minimisation is incorporated within the assumptions in the Need Assessment and so there was no need to include a specific policy on this issue.

Issue	Development Management: Issues and Options
Question 13	<i>What types of development should be covered by such a policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of six responses to Question 13 were received, the following • observations represent a summary of the comments: • A policy on waste minimisation of C&D wastes only required for developments under £300,000 SWMP threshold. The requirements of such a policy would need to be proportionate to scale of development- not to overburden project. Policy may not be necessary; and • Threshold based on cost of the development may not be effective and also considered that a greater range of projects should be subject to waste minimisations during construction.
Recommendation	In line with the responses to Question 13, a Development Management policy on waste minimisation which covers all types of development not just waste facility development and all waste streams, not simply Construction and Demolition wastes will be developed. As such a policy is likely to include non waste related developments also, it may be appropriate to locate it within emerging Local Development Frameworks across Greater Manchester rather than within the JWDPD, this will be explored through the development of Preferred Options
Next steps...	This issue was considered in more detail in the Preferred option Report. Waste minimisation is incorporated within the assumptions in the Need Assessment and so there was no need to include a specific policy on this issue.

Issue	Development Management: Issues and Options
Question 14	<i>Do you think it is appropriate for the JWDPD to include a Development Management policy on the design of waste management facilities? (Please give reasons) If so, are there any further considerations that such a policy should take account of? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of eleven responses to Question 14 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments: • Buildings for waste management facility should conform to a BREEAM Industrial Pre-Assessment Estimator for Fitted-out Buildings score of 55 or more. • Existing design guides produced at a regional and local level could be used in place of a specific policy on the design of waste management; • This is probably not needed since applications are now required to be accompanied by Design and Access Statements; • The design of waste management facilities is a very important issue because of the scale and size of some facilities it can have profound effect on the character, quality and appearance of a locality; • Existing local policy should not be duplicated; • The design policy should stipulate that the use of recycled materials in the construction of the buildings should be maximised; and • There may be a specific design requirement for waste facilities that will not ordinarily apply to other forms of development, especially in respect of external plant and on some cases, storage. Particular consideration should be given to boundary treatments.
Recommendation	Development Management policy on the design of waste management facilities will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. The development of this policy will reflect, as far as possible, the consultation responses set out above.
Next Step...	The issue the design of waste management facilities was considered further at Preferred Option Stage. It was decided at Preferred Option Stage that the Waste Plan should not contain a policy on the design of waste management facilities because this would duplicate policies on design elsewhere in each District's Local Development Framework.

Issue	Development Management: Issues and Options
Question 15	<i>Do you think it is appropriate to include a Development Management policy on planning obligations within the JWDPD? (Please give reasons) If so, are there any areas that you think such a policy should cover? Examples could include restoration guarantee, site management and vehicle routing. (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of nine responses to Question 15 were received, the following • observations represent a summary of the comments:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues which a waste-specific policy might need to cover include: • habitat compensation • road and junction improvements, • improvements to sewers and drains, • open space provision or other compensation for loss of amenity. • Policy should include issues concerning the historic environment. This could range from mitigation of harmful effects, to the enhancement of nearby areas or the interpretation of the local historic environment; • Planning obligations may be used to provide environmental benefits/mitigation resulting from the development but this may be sufficiently covered by other planning documents; • No requirement for a DM policy on planning obligations; • For final residues going to landfill there is already landfill tax; • There is also national guidance on this matter emerging.
Recommendation	The issues raised by consultation in support of a development management policy on planning obligations are already covered by national planning policy and Development Management policies in place across Greater Manchester. It is not therefore considered necessary to pursue production of a separate development management policy on planning obligations at this stage.
Next Steps...	This issue was not considered further.

Issue	Development Management: Issues and Options
Question 16	<i>Do you think it is appropriate that the JWDPD includes a Development Management policy on the monitoring of waste management sites? (Please give reasons) If so, are there any areas that you think such a policy should cover? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of ten responses to Question 16 were received, the following • observations represent a summary of the comments: • Policy should cover pollution control, continued adherence to BREEAM Industrial standards, to ensure follow through with Planning Obligation, planning permission and restoration and after-care. • It is likely that the monitoring framework can utilise information already gathered by organisations such as the Waste Disposal Authorities and the Environment Agency. Therefore, attention needs to focus on additional information that may be considered useful; • Policy only required if monitoring area not covered by the Environmental Permit
Recommendation	A Development Management policy on monitoring waste management facilities will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. The areas to be covered by this policy will reflect, where possible, the consultation responses set out above. It is not the intention of such a policy to repeat the provisions of national policy

	(Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management), but rather to develop a monitoring framework which will enable the policies of the JWDPD to be informed by the changing climate of waste activities such as minimisation and management across the sub region and beyond.
Next Steps...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the 'Monitoring and Implementation' chapter of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Development Management: Issues and Options
Question 17	<i>Do you think it is appropriate for the JWDPD to include a Development Management policy on waste management facilities of national, regional or sub-regional importance? (Please give reasons) If so, what are the considerations that such a policy should take account of? (Please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of five responses to Question 17 were received, the following • observations represent a summary of the comments: • Such a policy is necessary to support the chain of conformity to the Regional Spatial Strategy. However it is not clear what it could say other than flagging that some waste facilities will need to be built to accommodate wastes from outside Greater Manchester; • It is important that the National or Regional need is considered when developing: hazardous waste treatment facilities, energy from waste, mechanical and biological treatment facilities, construction and demolition, Landfill, • Such a policy is not required as it will duplicate the current Regional Spatial Strategy and recent work on broad locations for national, regional and regional facilities.
Recommendation	It is proposed that a Development Management policy on waste management facilities of national, regional or sub-regional importance be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. The areas to be covered by this policy will take account of the consultation responses set out above and will not duplicate the policy set out within the Regional Spatial Strategy
Next Step...	The study on 'Nationally, Regionally and Sub-regionally significant Waste Management Facilities' by Urban Mines (November 2008) waste used to inform development of the Needs Assessment and the Preferred Option Report. The policies within the Waste Plan are adequate to deal with waste management development at all scales and so there was not need to develop a specific policy on this issue.

Issue	Development Management: Issues and Options
Question 18	<i>Would you like to see Development Management policies relating to any other types of waste related development? (please specify what types)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of responses to this question confirmed that there were • no other issues to be covered by Development Management policies. One respondent suggested that a policy should be

	included specifically for hazardous waste management facilities and storage.
Recommendation	The issue of hazardous waste management will be pursued as part of the recommendation to Option 10. Therefore a separate policy on hazardous waste management will not be included as part of the Preferred Options.
Next Step...	This issue was not considered further.

Issue	Monitoring and Implementation
Question 19	<i>Do you agree with the proposed monitoring methodology set out above? Are there any other indicators or measurable, achievable targets which need to be considered? (please specify)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The monitoring methodology should include reference to Biodiversity Action Plan targets and Landscape Character Assessments.
Recommendation	The monitoring methodology will be amended to include reference to the targets of Biodiversity Action Plans and Landscape Character Assessments as such strategies are developed.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the development of the chapter on Monitoring and Implementation in the Preferred Option Report.

4.4 Stage 2 Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009)

Eighteen questions were posed through the consultation document for consultees to respond to. The following tables highlight the consultation questions, the issues raised and the recommendations taken forward.

Issue	Meeting the Need for Inert Waste Disposal
Question	<i>The Needs Assessment identifies a cumulative capacity gap of 12.12 million tonnes of inert waste by 2025. Which of the following options do you consider to be the most appropriate way forward in planning to close that capacity gap?</i>
Issues Raised	<p>5 Options A and B received the highest response, followed closely by Option D.</p> <p>6 If Option A is taken forward there would need to be restoration schemes and quarries available to accept the volume that has been identified. Option B is a better option, but there needs to be a review of current exempt sites and waste protocols from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>7 The plan should allow for the possibility of windfall sites arising during the plan period.</p>
Recommendation	It is proposed that a combination of Options A and B are taken forward, which would result in the encouragement of reuse and recycling of inert wastes, but also recognises that sites will still be required even after all recycling is complete.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Meeting the Need for Hazardous Waste Disposal
Question	<i>The Needs Assessment identifies a cumulative capacity gap of 911,000 tonnes of Hazardous Waste by 2025. Which of the following options do you consider to be the most appropriate way forward in planning to close that capacity gap?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most favoured approach was Option C: consider an alternative approach. • Two respondents suggested that continued reliance on sites outside Greater Manchester is the best way to address the capacity gap identified for hazardous waste. • A number of respondents voiced concern over the export of waste out of Greater Manchester, stating that the transport of waste is unsustainable and also supporting further work on identifying sites in Greater Manchester, possibly through a further call for sites. • There seems to be considerable uncertainty about how to deal with future hazardous waste disposal once current capacity has been taken up.
Recommendation	Given that Options A and B do not score well against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, it is proposed that Option C is taken forward. Option C, although it is not possible to be appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal, will enable sites within Greater Manchester to come forward in future, but reflects the lack of available sites at present. It is also proposed that this option be

	supported by criteria based policies against which applications for future hazardous waste disposal sites can be assessed.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Meeting the Need for Non-Hazardous Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>The Need Assessment identifies a cumulative capacity gap of 9,132,000 tonnes of non-hazardous waste by 2025. Which of the following options do you consider to be the most appropriate way forward in planning to close that capacity gap?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most favoured approach was Option D, this was closely followed by Option A. • The additional sites submitted by industry could contribute towards meeting the capacity gap. • An approach which combines all options, together with identifying which sites would come available if one or more of the exclusionary criteria were relaxed may be appropriate.
Recommendation	It is proposed that Option D is taken forward: the JWDPD continues to rely on existing non hazardous waste disposal sites until capacity is no longer available and where possible allocate new sites in line with Options A and B. As this approach is still likely to result in an under provision of sites for non hazardous waste disposal, it is also proposed that this option be supported by criteria based policies against which applications for future non hazardous waste disposal sites can be assessed.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Allocation of Sites/Areas for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>How can the JWDPD best ensure that residual waste disposal is directed towards the most appropriate locations within Greater Manchester?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents supported the approach set out under Option C, which sets out not allocating any sites or areas and rely instead on criteria based policies against which planning applications for the provision of residual waste disposal facilities will be assessed. • A number of respondents suggested that the allocation of specific sites should be carried out as an initial and key measure in securing sites, but this should be supported by the identification of either areas of search or criteria based policies to ensure that where sites are not currently available the potential to bring forward additional sites is recognised. • Extensions to existing sites should include both vertical and lateral extensions thereby utilising existing infrastructure.
Recommendation	Option D (a combination of Options A, B and C) is considered to be the more sustainable Option for Policy Option 4. This would consist of a combination of Options A and C as these have a number of positive impacts on the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. This Option offers the certainty of site specific allocations and also the potential for windfall sites to arise through the criteria-based policies. In order for

	waste to be managed sustainably through the criteria-based policies, there is a need to provide a flexible set of policies that enable an assessment of suitability for different types of waste facilities.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Level of Provision
Question	<i>What level of residual waste provision should the JWDPD plan for?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most favoured approach was Option A, which suggests that in relation to residual waste the JWDPD should plan for the capacity requirement set out within Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment. This was closely followed by Option B which plan for level of capacity required under Scenario 2, but with additional capacity. It is reasonable to plan for the capacity requirement identified in Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment provided that there is evidence that the recycling and recovery rates that inform this scenario are deliverable. Phasing of sites is very important.
Recommendation	It is proposed that Option A is taken forward, which is the provision of residual waste sites in line with the capacity requirements identified in Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment, which assumes that recycling and recovery will be maximised.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 1 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Locational Requirements for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Are there any other categories of land that you think would be appropriate to consider in generating a long list of potential sites?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of respondents stated they would like additional categories of land to be considered when generating a long list of potential sites.
Recommendation	Additional categories of land are set out in responses to the next question.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Locational Requirements for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>If so, what categories of land would you like to see included? (Please specify or give reasons for their inclusion).</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste disposal should be considered acceptable within the Green Belt particularly where it may be linked to the extraction of minerals. Existing or worked out quarries are included, however the potential for such quarries to supply local building and roofing stone (as heritage quarries) should not be overlooked. Explore potential for extending existing landfill sites or older 'capped' landfill sites for landraise opportunities. Sites where there is a landscaping need for leisure facilities e.g.

	ski slopes.
Recommendation	As the additional categories of land have already been considered there is no need to reconsider this land at the present time. As Core Strategies and other key land use documents emerge across Greater Manchester it will be necessary to continue to monitor the availability of land that may be appropriate for the future development of residual waste disposal.
Next Step...	This issue was not considered further but will be monitored through the Waste Plan annual monitoring as recommended.

Issue	Locational Requirements for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you agree with the above exclusionary criteria ? And if so, do you think any other criteria should be taken into consideration?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following additional criteria were suggested: • SPZ II • Flood risk zone 3a • Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitat • National Nature Reserves and Country Parks • Tourist attractions and their surroundings • Other comments included: • Buffer zone around environmental and heritage designations (incorporating setting) • Consider sites smaller than 5 hectares • Agricultural land should not be excluded • National parks have waste they generate and need to dispose of and should therefore not be excluded from consideration. • Sensitive human receptors need to be included but better defined; • The 250m buffer to houses etc should be reduced from 250m to 150m taken from the actual edge of an active landfill cell to the nearest property. • The exclusionary criteria should ensure a fair distribution of landfill sites across Greater Manchester. • The exclusionary criteria should include avoidance of land raise in low-lying areas, or where it will have a detrimental visual impact on a significant number of residents.
Recommendation	The comments and additional exclusionary criteria suggested by respondents will be considered during the development of Preferred Options and where appropriate they will be used to further refine the long list of sites, if they have not already been used so far. However it is important to note that a number of those suggested are likely to be considered for mitigation or final boundary placement rather than used to exclude sites altogether, such as local biodiversity/geodiversity designations, local green spaces, tourist attractions and the setting of heritage designations.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the Policy Directions 2 and 3 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Potential Sites for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward as part of the 'call for sites' exercise referred to above should be allocated for residual waste disposal in the JWDPD?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Coal Pit Lane, Oldham • Potential issues relating to dust, noise, vermin, leachate, country parks, wildlife, Green Belt, traffic, residential amenity, visual impact, economic impacts, gas. • Could restore former colliery area. • Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Vickers Hall Lane, Salford • Potential impacts relating to wildlife, SSSI, Green Belt, traffic, landscape. • Summary of consultation responses and commentary for High Moor, Oldham • Site removed at request of owner/operator.
Recommendation	Coal Pit Lane to be removed from further consideration. Vickers Hall Lane to be re-assessed in light of new information. High Moor withdrawn.
Next Step...	Vickers Hall Lane re-assessed as part of Preferred Option but considered unsuitable for residual waste disposal and exclude from the waste plan.

Issue	Potential Sites for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you know of any other sites that should be considered as part of the JWDPD?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 145 hectares of land to the immediate south of the existing Pilsworth South Quarry. • Existing landfill facilities at Whitehead (Wigan) and Pilsworth South (Bury) offer considerable potential for both vertical and lateral extensions. The capacity shortfall of 9.0M tonnes could be accommodated at Whitehead (circa.3.0M tonnes) and at Pilsworth South (circa. 6.0M tonnes) over the plan period 2010 to 2025. Also land exists adjacent to both of these landfill sites that needs further consideration as potential lateral landfill extension areas. In the case of Pilsworth South it could also provide additional capacity for hazardous wastes such as asbestos disposal.
Recommendation	The additional sites suggested for consideration will be assessed in line with the process adopted for all sites, including the desk based appraisal, site visit and sustainability appraisal prior to a period of public consultation.
Next Step...	The sites proposed at this stage were assessed and the used to inform the report on Additional Sites (July 2009).

Issue	Potential Sites for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you have any information on whether or not these sites could make an additional contribution to meeting the capacity gap for residual waste disposal?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any quarry site that has a low level restoration requirement obviously has the potential to be restored at a higher level thus taking more waste and this possibility should be pursued with the operator/owner. Development of available land adjacent to Pilsworth South would provide further capacity in respect of hazardous, non-hazardous and inert waste in the region.
Recommendation	The comments suggested by respondents will be considered during the development of Preferred Options and where appropriate they will be used to further refine the long list of sites, if they have not already been used so far.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Potential Sites for Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you have any information on whether or not the sites in the 'inert' list above could be considered for disposal of non-hazardous residual waste?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites already permitted to accept inert wastes are unlikely to be brought forward to accept non-hazardous waste. Offerton Sand and Gravel is not appropriate for the disposal of non hazardous wastes as the site is affected by several planning and licensing constraints, it also lies within a protected alignment for a major road scheme.
Recommendation	As supported by the comment above, waste disposal sites currently permitted to accept inert wastes will not usually be able to accept any other waste types. As no additional information has been submitted it is not proposed to consider existing inert waste disposal sites to accept non hazardous wastes as part of the JWDPD.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Options for the Distribution of Sites
Question	<i>In Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities we asked if you knew of any other rail sidings that may be appropriate for transferring waste to the railway network. We would now like to ask this question specifically in relation to Residual Waste Disposal. Therefore, if you know of any rail sidings that may be appropriate for transferring waste to the railway network in relation to Residual Waste Disposal, please give details.</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater Manchester Waste Ltd has four rail-linked residual waste treatment sites, which are suitable for transporting waste via the rail network.

Recommendation	During the development of the JWDPD, sustainable transport links relating to rail sidings were explored. However, there are only limited commercial rail freight sidings capable of handling large volumes of waste in Greater Manchester. Any new sidings will require major financial investment and infrastructure development which is outside of the remit of the JWDPD.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Options for the Distribution of Sites
Question	<i>Which of the following options offers the best approach when identifying the spatial distribution of residual waste disposal sites?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option B may not be appropriate as growth is hard to predict at the moment. • The distribution of landfill sites will be dictated by availability of void space, either existing or capable of being created rather than the spatial options. • Transport nodes should be given a very high priority. • Growth areas are less important for landfill residual waste treatment as there are likely to be few facilities serving large areas. In many cases landfill will be a secondary residual waste treatment so geographical spread will be less important as the waste will already be bulked, and the volume reduced.
Recommendation	The constraints across Greater Manchester make it difficult to identify residual waste disposal sites. The approach to the spatial distribution of residual waste disposal sites should be broadened to incorporate all three considerations, together with other criteria.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Development Management policies for landfill and land raise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare
Question	<i>Should the JWDPD include specific Development Management policies relating to landfill and landraise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of such policies should be developed through consultation with district Planning Officers to establish what will already be covered by generic policies in other LDDs. • It would be particularly beneficial to have a specific policy for the restoration and aftercare of landfill/landraise that maximised potential benefits in terms of landscape and townscape character and quality, biodiversity (sites and species), geodiversity, habitat, recreation and access to green space and the countryside. • Ensure proposals achieve balance in terms of biodiversity. • Consider a review of existing restoration schemes to ensure they meet high standards. • Policies should be of sufficient detail to give certainty to developers and the local population.

Recommendation	Specific Development Management policies relating to landfill and landraise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare will be developed for inclusion in the Preferred Options. These will reflect, as far as possible, the consultation responses set out above.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform Policy Directions 6 and 7 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Development Management policies for landfill and land raise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare
Question	<i>[Following on from previous question] Which of the policy options provides the best approach?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider specific types of ancillary that would be acceptable at or on former landfill sites; PPS 10 supports the co-location of waste management facilities. • Need to cover specific landfill/landraise issues, in particular landfill gas potential and restoration.
Recommendation	It is proposed that Option A is taken forward, which is that Development Management policies should be developed in line with the results of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation. These policies will supplement those developed for built facilities to ensure specific landfill/landraise issues, e.g. restoration, ancillary development, etc are addressed.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform Policy Directions 6 and 7 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Development Management policies for landfill and land raise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare
Question	<i>Do you agree with the proposed monitoring methodology for residual waste disposal set out above?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape character and quality, and recreation opportunities should also be considered through the monitoring methodology. • Linkages with the objectives of the GM Biodiversity Action Plan would be better than simply monitoring 'biodiversity increases' of restoration schemes. • The National Indicator series and other core output indicators may be the best way of monitoring the implementation of the JWDPD. • Monitoring of landfill provision and uptake of sites through the JWDPD should only be through monitoring of the amount of void space applied for, granted permission and/or refused, against requirement.
Recommendation	The monitoring methodology will be amended to include reference to the targets of Biodiversity Action Plans and Landscape Character Assessments and appropriate targets will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options.

Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the development of the Chapter on Monitoring and Implementation in the Preferred Option Report.
---------------------	--

4.5 Additional Sites (July 2009)

Two questions were posed through the consultation document for consultees to respond to in relation to eight sites for built facilities and three sites for residual waste disposal. The following tables highlight the consultation questions, the issues raised and the recommendations taken forward.

Issue	SL11- Mitchell Shackleton, Salford
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will be important that the conclusions of the forthcoming Eccles masterplanning work are taken into account as the Joint Waste Plan progresses. More housing may be planned within 50-100m of the site which may not be a compatible neighbouring use for waste technologies. If allocated it is important to note that routing of vehicles into/out of the site would only be possible via Monton village- due to the low clearance railway bridge on Green Lane.
Recommendation	The site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report. The site was subsequently removed from consideration as part of the Waste Plan.

Issue	SL12- Ashton's Field, Salford
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A C&D facility at this location may have serious implications for residential amenity given the close proximity of housing and the travelling showperson's site. Should this site emerge as a potential waste allocation within the Joint Waste Plan, any such site allocation policy should be heavily caveated so as to ensure that any such impacts are adequately mitigated.
Recommendation	As the site is likely to be suitable for enclosed waste facilities, and the fact that the range of issues raised could be overcome through mitigation measures, the site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	TA3a- Shepley Industrial Estate North, Tameside
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency expect that the river Tame's, riparian wildlife corridor is retained and enhanced as part of this development and that an FRA is carried out prior to planning permission being granted for any development.
Recommendation	<p>It is likely that the range of issues raised can be overcome through mitigation measures. Should the site be included as an allocation these issues would be dealt with through a combination of policies within the Waste Plan and the Development Management process.</p> <p>The site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process.</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	TA8a- Land Adjacent to Tank Farm Chemical Treatment Works, Nash Road, Trafford
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency - It may be inappropriate to have a waste facility next to a COMAH site due to fire risk. However the site is within a solely industrial area and would not cause nuisance to residential areas, nor would access to the site be through residential areas.
Recommendation	<p>It is likely that the range of issues raised can be overcome through mitigation measures. Should the site be included as an allocation, these issues would be dealt with through a combination of policies within the Waste Plan and the Development Management process.</p> <p>The site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process.</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	TR16- Carrington Vehicle Storage Site, Carrington, Trafford
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surrounding industrial uses and need for employment opportunities make this a highly suitable area. Environment Agency expects that the FRA is carried out prior to

	planning permission being granted for any development.
Recommendation	The comments are mainly positive and support the inclusion of this site within the Waste Plan. Should the site be included as an allocation any issues requiring mitigation would be dealt with through a combination of policies within the Waste Plan and the Development Management process. The site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process.
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	W18- Ince in Makerfield Waste Water Treatment Works, Wigan
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Grade II listed buildings of Westwood Gardens House and Westwood Hall and attached cottage lie to the north of the site. • Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce commented that poor access and environmental and wildlife considerations make this site unsuitable. • The bottom section of the site is within Pearsons Flash Site of Biological Importance and supports a range of protected species. • The site is bisected by Ince Brook. The Environment Agency would require a minimum 8m undeveloped buffer strip between top of the bank of the watercourse and any aspect of the development. • Site is close to Bryn Marsh and Ince Moss Site of Special Scientific Interest.
Recommendation	In line with the proposals to remove all sites awarded a Band D through the Sustainability Appraisal process, this site will be removed from further consideration.
Next step...	This site was not considered further.

Issue	W19- Tyldesley Waste Water Treatment Works
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage - Site is adjacent to the Scheduled Monument of Morley's Hall moated site, the Grade II* listed Morley's Hall and the Grade II listed Morley's Hall Barn. • Site is within the Green Belt.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce commented that environmental and wildlife considerations make this site unsuitable. Natural England commented that allocation of this site for a waste development would result in loss of agricultural land within an area of mossland habitats
Recommendation	In line with the proposals to remove all sites awarded a Band D through the Sustainability Appraisal process, this site will be removed from further consideration.
Next Step...	This site was not considered further.

Issue	W20- Land Adjacent to Gibfield Park Avenue
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce commented that the site benefits from a supportive planning framework but possible impacts on traffic congestion are unclear. The apparent isolation of this site from other complimentary facilities and alternative transport would limit the economic and environmental benefits associated with the development of waste management facilities at this location. Environment Agency expects that the FRA is carried out prior to planning permission being granted for any development.
Recommendation	<p>It is likely that the range of issues raised can be overcome through mitigation measures. Should the site be included as an allocation, these issues would be dealt with through a combination of policies within the Waste Plan and the Development Management process.</p> <p>The site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process</p>
Next step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	BU11 and BU12- Pilsworth North Quarry and Landfill and Pilsworth South Quarry and Landfill, Bury
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for residual waste disposal facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bury Council commented that any additional landfilling which may come forward in this area should be carefully controlled to ensure that imported materials are of a non-hazardous/inert nature and that restoration, finished levels and after-use treatment are in-keeping with the Special Landscape character of the surrounding area.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce commented that it is important that any assessment of potential for each of these sites takes into account whether or not their ability for use as quarries has been exhausted. Environment Agency expects that the FRA is carried out prior to planning permission being granted for any development.
Recommendation	<p>It is likely that the range of issues raised can be overcome through mitigation measures. Should the site be included as an allocation, these issues would be dealt with through a combination of policies within the Waste Plan and the Development Management process.</p> <p>The site will remain for further consideration through the Preferred Option development process</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	W21- Whitehead Landfill, Wigan
Question	<i>Do you think that the sites put forward in this document as potentially suitable for residual waste disposal facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Key Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Salford CC commented that a key impact with regard to the suitability of this site for vertical extension through tipping would be the impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location, as the proposal would involve further land-raise. The city council also wishes to highlight concerns in relation to the potential impact on the adjacent Bridgewater Canal which lies to the north of the site. The Bridgewater Canal is an identified Site of Biological Importance. A number of individuals made comments that the site may be unsuitable due to wildlife interest. Astley Village experience odours from the existing landfill. Noise and pollution – noise from the burners and machinery. Wigan Council - Should be rated as a Band D site – “One which is unsuitable for waste purposes due to many significant problems and issues” – due to the cumulative effect of further raising the height and extent of the landform to the detriment of the environmental quality of the area. Environment Agency - Parts of this site that adjoin Whitehead Brook on the south and eastern boundary are within flood zone 3 and is therefore considered to be at high risk. Landfillsites are considered a 'more vulnerable' use in PPS25 Table D2 and will only be permitted in Flood Zone 3 if the Exception Test is passed. Any proposals would need to be supported by a FRA in

	accordance with PPS25
Recommendation	It is clear from the representations received that there are significant issues pertaining to the expansion of this landfill site. However there is an urgent requirement for non hazardous waste disposal sites across Greater Manchester, and this site represents one of few potentially viable opportunities for such development. This site will therefore be retained for consideration through the Preferred Option consultation which will allow for the issue raised to be explored more fully. If this exploration does not reveal satisfactory reasons for the inclusion of the site as an allocation within the Waste Plan it will be removed.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 4 of the Preferred Option Report.

4.6 Preferred Options (November 2009)

Fourteen questions are posed through the consultation document for consultees to respond to. There were a total of 28 responses received from individuals and 35 responses from organisations. The following tables highlight the consultation questions, the issues raised and the recommendations taken forward.

Issue	Strategic Aim
Question	<i>Do you agree with the strategic aim as expressed in the Preferred Option approach? Is there anything else we need to include in the strategic aim?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The period covered by the Plan should be set out in the strategic aim. • The strategic aim should make reference to meeting the waste management needs of Greater Manchester. • The strategic aim should refer to the protection of the natural environment within the provision of waste facilities. • Consideration should be given to sustainable development, sustainable consumption & production, climate change and renewable energy.
Recommendation	The wording of the strategic aim will be reviewed in light of the comments received, where suggested changes improve the overall aim of the Waste Plan, these will appear in the Publication stage of the Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the Strategic Aim in the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Strategic Objectives
Question	<i>Do you agree with the objectives as expressed in the Preferred Option Approach? Is there anything else we need to include in the strategic objectives, or do any need to be removed or amended?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives should be expanded to cover Green Belt. • The objectives should be expanded to make reference to 'communities taking responsibility for their own waste'. • The objectives should have a built in element of flexibility. • Objective 1 should be expanded to make a specific reference to meeting identified needs. • Objective 3 should be expanded to recognise the potential for the utilisation of waste in renewable energy generation. • Objective 4 seeks to decouple waste growth from economic growth but this may be difficult for the planning system to achieve. Amend to 'assist' rather than 'ensure'. • Objective 5 focuses on a 'flexible approach' however it is more important to allow the delivery of facilities in a timely manner to meet demand. • Objective 6 should be expanded to include the protection of human health. Consider expanding to refer to communities taking more responsibility for the waste they produce. • Objective 7 should be expanded to refer to the protection and enhancement of the landscape.

Recommendation	All representations regarding the Strategic Objectives support the current wording with the addition of a number of useful amendments. The wording of the Strategic Objectives will be reviewed in light of the comments received, where changes improve the overall objectives of the Waste Plan these will appear in the Publication stage of the Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of the Strategic Objectives in the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Future Waste Management Capacity
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach to future waste requirements as set out in Policy Direction 1: 'Capacity requirements'? Is there anything else we need to include?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be important to establish the role of the Ince Marshes plant and to examine the sustainability implications of this alternative. • The policy should be explicit about the need to ensure waste is treated as high up the waste hierarchy as possible. • The potential of all facilities which meet a regional need should be recognised and included within any assessment of need for waste management facilities. • One respondent queried why the Waste Plan should strike a balance between over and under provision of waste management facilities and said that over-provision was better than under-provision. However, other respondents agreed with the Policy Direction and said that additional facilities should only be provided where there is an identified need. • The choice of waste management developments should not be restricted. • Sites can have permission for several different developments so the fact that a site may, as a result of 'over-provision', have an unimplemented waste permission need not prevent it being developed. • The policy assumes the capacity gap estimate is sufficiently reliable to provide a basis for restricting development. Linking the overall capacity to an equivalent facility number could be misleading. • The policy conflicts with the Plan's aim of 'maximising recycling and recovery of waste' and diverting from landfill, which implies a need to encourage an abundance of recovery sites. • The document does not include a clear statement indicating how the Waste Plan will deliver a net self-sufficient solution.
Recommendation	The response received showed general support for the inclusion of this policy, however it will be essential that the final capacity requirements presented in Policy Direction 1 are based on the most up to date information. An update of the needs assessment is planned in the early spring of 2010, and alongside the consideration of comments received here, will be used in the development of the next stage of the Waste Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Site and Area Allocation: Built Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Do you agree with the sites/areas allocated for provision of built waste management facilities? Do you agree with the approach to planning permission within these areas? Is there anything else we need to include in the policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit identified a number of sites/areas that would require desk-based assessment to establish the potential archaeological resource. They also refer to the Historic Environment Record. • Highway access and traffic impacts were raised as important considerations at a number of sites/areas. • Impact on residential amenity was raised as a key issue. • National Grid identified sites/areas close to underground gas transmission pipelines which would need to be addressed at the planning application stage. • The list of waste management facility types that may be suitable of particular sites/areas should be clarified.
Recommendation	Where comments have been made in relation to specific sites/areas these will be taken into consideration during the development of the next stage of the Waste Plan. In particular it is envisaged that clear policy wording will be developed to support the final allocations, this wording will include reference to the particular constraints and limitations of each allocation as appropriate.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policies 4 and 5 of the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Site Allocation: Inert Residual Waste Disposal Facilities
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach to inert residual waste set out above? Is there anything else we need to consider?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents agreed with the approach to inert residual waste but said that it should be set out more clearly and that it is important to ensure any revised Needs Assessment is taken into account.
Recommendation	An update of the Needs Assessment is planned in the early spring of 2010 and alongside comments received here, will be used in the development of the next stage of the Waste Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform Policy 6 of the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Site Allocation: Residual Hazardous Waste Disposal Facilities
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach to hazardous residual waste? Is there anything else we need to consider?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents broadly agreed with the policy direction but considered that the Plan should be clearer about how hazardous waste will be dealt with, either identifying sites in Greater Manchester or suitable cross-boundary solutions. • The Plan should consider how residual hazardous waste will be disposed of between 2018 and 2016.

Recommendation	All opportunities for the location of hazardous waste disposal sites in Greater Manchester have been exhausted, further site searches will not be undertaken, although any additional sites brought forward by landowners will be considered in line with the adopted methodology. It is intended that the current approach to hazardous waste disposal will be clarified in light of the comments received and the final policy for hazardous waste disposal will be set out within the next stage of the Waste Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform the Publication Waste Plan although no specific policy was developed. Instead, the Publication Waste Plan contains text explaining that no sites will be allocated for hazardous residual waste disposal but applications will be assessed against policies in the Waste Plan and other relevant planning documents.

Issue	Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach to residual waste disposal? Is there anything else we need to consider?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents broadly agreed with the policy direction but considered that the Plan should be clearer about how non-hazardous waste will be dealt with. • Respondents agreed that there was little opportunity in Greater Manchester for new non-hazardous waste disposal facilities and that extensions to existing sites are likely to provide the best approach. • GMAU identified that sites would require desk-based assessment to establish the potential archaeological resource.
Recommendation	The approach to residual waste disposal will be clarified in light of the comments received in line with the commentary above and the final policy will be set out within the next stage of the Waste Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy 7 of the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Site Allocation: Non-Hazardous Residual Waste Disposal
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach set out in Policy Direction 4 'Non hazardous residual waste disposal'? Is there anything else we need to include in the policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of respondents expressed concern about the extension of Whitehead Landfill, citing nature conservation, impact on Green Belt, impact on the Bridgewater Canal and the hydrological regime as potential issues. • The policy should indicate how much capacity would be provided by the three extensions and should require energy recovery from landfill gas.
Recommendation	The supporting text and the policy approach to non hazardous residual waste disposal sites will be clarified in line with the commentary above and the final policy will be set out within the next stage of the Waste Plan.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy 7 of

	the Publication Waste Plan.
--	-----------------------------

Issue	Additional Sites
Question	<i>Do you think that the Rugby Mill/Ram Mill site, identified as potentially suitable for waste management facilities, is acceptable? (Please give details)</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents raised a number of issues relating to this proposed site, including: proximity to Kingfisher Special School, proximity to residential areas, traffic and proximity to Rochdale Canal SAC. • United Utilities provided details of features on the proposed site that would need to be taken into consideration.
Recommendation	In light of the comments received in relation to transport, the proximity to sensitive receptors and also the access and right of way upheld by United Utilities, it is proposed that Rugby/Ram Mill will be subject to reassessment through the Sustainability Appraisal process. If the issues raised result in a reappraisal of the site as a 'band D' the site will be removed from further consideration. This process will be carried out in consultation with the landowner and the relevant organisations submitting objections at this stage because a decision must be made in relation to this site in advance of the publication stage.
Next Step...	This site was reappraised in light of the new information and was classified as a Band D. It was removed from further consideration in the Waste Plan.

Issue	Requirement for Combined Heat and Power
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach set out in Policy Direction 5 'Requirement for Combined Heat and Power'? Is there anything else we need to include in the policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents broadly supported this policy direction and said it was in line with the waste hierarchy. • A number of respondents suggested ways to strengthen it and MPG suggested removing the word 'only' as this was superfluous.
Recommendation	It is proposed that the wording change suggested by MPG will be made and additional supporting text will be included as part of the justification.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy 8 of the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Restoration and Aftercare
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach set out in Policy Direction 6 'Restoration and Aftercare'? Is there anything else we need to include in the policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy direction was supported by respondents • One respondent suggested that the end use of restored land would not be limited to certain types.
Recommendation	It is proposed to take the policy direction as set out in the Preferred Option and additional information will be included in the supporting text.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy 9 of

	the Publication Waste Plan.
--	-----------------------------

Issue	Unallocated Sites
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach set out in Policy Direction 7 'Unallocated Sites'? Is there anything else we need to include in the policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents generally agreed with the policy direction and said it provided a flexible approach. • One respondent disagreed with the policy and said that the Waste Plan did not explain why a balance needed to be struck between over and under-provision of sites. • Respondents said that the policy should be clear that proposals would be required to meet development management criteria relating to the environment and be in line with the Needs Assessment (although another respondent suggested that the policy would be too restrictive if applicants were required to demonstrate need).
Recommendation	It is proposed that the supporting text to this policy will be amended. Further guidance will be sought regarding whether applicants can be required to demonstrate need for a development.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy 10 of the Publication Waste Plan.

Issue	Safeguarding
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach set out in Policy Direction 8 'Safeguarding'? Is there anything else we need to include in the policy?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents generally agreed with the policy direction, suggesting ways in which it could be strengthened to ensure sites allocated for waste use would not be lost to alternative development.
Recommendation	It is proposed to amend the policy wording.
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy 11 and Policy 12 of the Publication Waste Plan

Issue	Waste Minimisation
Question	<i>Do you agree with the Preferred Option approach to waste minimisation? Is there anything else we need to include?</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of those who responded to this question agreed with the approach. • One respondent suggested that the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy is the mechanism for delivering waste minimisation initiatives and any policy in the LDF would be a duplication.
Recommendation	Respondents agreed the importance of including waste minimisation in the Waste Plan. Waste minimisation is incorporated within the assumptions in the Need Assessment and so there was no need to include a specific policy on this issue.
Next Step	The issue of Waste Minimisation is taken account of through the Waste Plan Needs Assessment and a specific policy on this issue has

	not been developed.
--	---------------------

General Comments

Manchester Airport responded to explain that the Plan should consider an aerodrome safeguarding policy.

Response: The inclusion of a specific policy relating to Aerodrome safeguarding has been explored at previous stages of the Waste Plan following extensive consultation. Due to the range of development to be covered by such a policy it is intended that it is not appropriate to include a specific policy within the Waste Plan, instead the Local Development Frameworks of Greater Manchester will include such a policy in an appropriate document.

Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service responded to say that that the range of indicators looks quite limited and does not include any National Indicators.

Response: Comments regarding indicators for monitoring purposes, clarity of expression for facility types and the forecasting period for the Plan have been noted. These areas will be revisited during the development of the next stage of the Waste Plan.

4.7 Additional Consultation on areas in Wigan (June 2010)

One question was posed through the consultation document for consultees to respond to. The following tables highlight the consultation question, the issues raised and the recommendations taken forward.

Issue	Expansion of Existing Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Do you think that the areas put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W1a- Miry Lane Employment Area • This area is currently occupied by a number of Environment Agency permitted and exempt waste management sites. We consider this area to be generally acceptable for waste facilities. • The site is over 1 hectare and lies within Flood Zone 1 although Barley Brook does run in culvert through the site so any Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must consider the proposals and any affects they might have. We would not allow any building over this culvert or within 8m of the culvert walls. We would encourage any development to open up the culverted section of watercourse if possible. • An appropriate buffer should be left along the canal. There are Water voles in the canal and adjacent basin immediately north west of the proposed site which must be taken into account.
Recommendation	<p>General support for the allocation of this area for future waste management facilities is recognised. The area will be included within the Waste Plan as an allocation at the Publication stage.</p> <p>The requirement for an FRA would be picked up at the Planning Application stage.</p> <p>The presence of the culverted watercourse will be included within the Profile for this area.</p> <p>The information relating to the need for a development buffer along the canal will be included within the Profile for this area. The extent of the buffer would be agreed through any planning application.</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Expansion of Existing Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Do you think that the areas put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W8a- Ince Moss Junction Sidings, Cemetery Road, Ince

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is currently occupied by 2 waste management sites, 2 closed EA permitted landfills and several historic unlicensed landfills. We consider this area to be generally acceptable for waste facilities. • However, the Site is adjacent to The Wigan Flashes LNR, Pearson's Flash SBI and Turners Flash SBIs and in close proximity to Horrocks Flash SSSI. The impact that any new development would have on these sites would need to be assessed, including such things as disturbance and surface water run off. This could also result in certain permit applications being refused. 'Standard Rules Permits' for in-vessel composting and anaerobic digestions stipulate the site cannot be within 1km and 500metres respectively of a SSSI. However, this does not mean we will not issue a permit as an operator could apply for a 'Bespoke Permit', it is just that the operator may be deterred by the higher costs involved. • There is known to be Japanese knotweed present in the area and this would need to be surveyed for and eradicated prior to any development. • The site is over 1 hectare and lies within Flood Zone 1 so will require an FRA looking at the surface water drainage.
Recommendation	<p>General support for the allocation of this area for future waste management facilities is recognised. The area will be included within the Waste Plan as an allocation at the Publication stage.</p> <p>Information in relation to the proximity to the LNR, SBIs and SSSIs was used to inform the decision to exclude open waste management facilities from this allocation. Any subsequent planning permission for a waste use at this location should take into account the need for mitigation to prevent unacceptable impacts on the surrounding landuses.</p> <p>Reference to the presence of Japanese Knotweed at this location will be included within the Profile for this area.</p> <p>The requirement for an FRA would be picked up at the Planning Application stage</p>
Next Step...	This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.

Issue	Expansion of Existing Waste Management Facilities
Question	<i>Do you think that the areas put forward in this document as potentially suitable for built waste management facilities are acceptable? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable).</i>
Issues Raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W13a- Martland Park

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EA consider this area to be generally acceptable for waste facilities. • However, the surface water network feeds Scot Lane Fishery. We have had several significant pollution incidents affecting this pond from businesses on the estate. Any waste management facilities could potentially increase the risk. However, this is probably something that could be addressed during the planning and permit application stages and should not be justification to rule the area unsuitable. • This site is also over 1 hectare, but lies partially within Flood Zone 2, therefore a FRA will be required to look at surface water drainage and the affects that the proposals will have on Flood Zone 2 with mitigation factors proposed. • The site also contains a number of ditches which should be considered within the FRA and must not be culverted unless it is for access purposes only. • We have historic records of Water voles and Great crested newts on this site. Any new development should include surveys for these species where appropriate. Invasive species such as Japanese knotweed may also be a problem. Any development should retain any pond or watercourses on site along with appropriate buffer zones
Recommendation	<p>General support for the allocation of this area for future waste management facilities is recognised. The area will be included within the Waste Plan as an allocation at the Publication stage</p> <p>The water quality issues in this locality are noted, but would be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The requirement for an FRA would be picked up at the Planning Application stage.</p> <p>The requirement for surveys on protected species will be covered at the planning application stage. Reference to the presence of Japanese Knotweed at this location will be included within the Profile for this area.</p>
Next Step...	<p>This recommendation was used to inform development of Policy Direction 2 of the Preferred Option Report.</p>

APPENDIX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REFERENCED IN STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

The following documents are available to download from www.gmwasted.co.uk .

Awareness Raising (September – November 2006)

- Stakeholder Events Outcomes Report (March 2007)

Stage One Issues and Options (May 2007)

- Stage One Issues and Options Report (May 2007)
- Consultation on Stage One Issues and Options Outcomes Report (October 2007)

Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities (October 2008)

- Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Report (October 2008)
- Consultation on Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Outcomes Report (July 2009)
- Stakeholder Event 17th March 2008 Report of Outcomes (April 2008)
- Stakeholder Event 8th October 2008 Report of Outcomes (November 2008)

Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009)

- Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal (March 2009)
- Consultation on Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal Outcomes Report (June 2009)

Additional Sites (July 2009)

- Additional Sites Consultation Report (July 2009)
- Outcomes Report from Issues and Options: Additional Sites Consultation Outcomes Report (October 2009)

Preferred Options (November 2009)

- Preferred Option Consultation Report (July 2009)
- Outcomes Report from Preferred Option (February 2010)
- Stakeholder Event 17th September 2009 Report of Outcomes (October 2009)

Additional Consultation on Areas in Wigan (June 2010)

- Additional Consultation on Areas in Wigan (June 2010)
- Consultation on Areas in Wigan Outcomes Report (July 2010)

APPENDIX B: CONSULTEES

The following lists set out specific consultation bodies, general consultation bodies and other consultation bodies that were consulted as part of preparation of the Waste Plan. This list is not exhaustive. The full Waste Plan database contains approximately 900 consultees and is available to view on request at GMGU's office.

Specific Consultees

- 4NW
- British Telecom
- Department for Transport (Rail Group)
- Dunham Massey Parish Council
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- United Utilities
- Greater Manchester Police Authority
- Highways Agency
- High Peaks National Park
- Mobile Operators Association
- Natural England
- North West Development Agency
- North West Strategic Health Authority
- Norweb Energi
- Nuclear Electric Ltd
- Powergen Plc
- SP Energy Networks
- The Coal Authority
- United Utilities
- All Local Planning Authorities which share a border with Greater Manchester
- All Parish and town councils both within and sharing a border with Greater Manchester

General Consultees

- Church Commissioners for England
- Disability Rights Commission
- Friends of the Earth
- GM Chamber of Commerce
- Healthy Living Partnership
- Manchester Friends of the Earth

Other consultation bodies

- Advisory Council for Education of Romany & Traveller
- Age Concern Salford
- Altrincham Association Football Club Ltd
- Ashiana Housing Association
- British Geological Survey
- British Waterways (North West)
- Campaign for Real Ale
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
- Cheshire Wildlife Trust
- Church Commissioners
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
- Crown Estate Office
- Disability Rights Commission
- DTZ
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- Forestry Commission
- Friends of the Earth (Manchester & Trafford branches)

- Freight Transport Association
- Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People
- GM Ecology Unit
- GM Fire and Rescue Service
- GM Geological Unit (Urban Vision Partnership Ltd)
- GM Learning and Skills Council
- GM Passenger Transport Executive
- GONW
- Health and Safety Executive
- Help the Aged
- Higham & Co
- Home Builders Federation
- How Commercial Planning Advisers
- Indigo Planning Ltd
- King Sturge LLP
- Knight Frank
- Lafarge Aggregates
- Manchester Airport
- Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- National Grid (NW Area)
- National Grid Property Ltd
- National Playing Fields Association
- National Trust
- Network Rail
- NFU
- North West Development Agency
- Peel Holdings
- Post Office property holdings
- Phil Woolas MP
- Ramblers Association (Manchester & High Peak)
- Road Haulage Association Ltd
- RSPB (NW Region)
- Savills
- Sport England North West
- Targetfollow
- The Gypsy Council
- United Utilities
- Viridor Waste Management
- Women's National Commission
- Woodland Trust