

Outcomes Report on the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Consultation

Contents

1 Introduction	5
2 General Comments	7
3 Responses to Issues	9
4 Next Steps	63
1 List of Sites/Areas	66

Tables

Table 1 Responses to Question 1	9
Table 2 Responses to Question 2	10
Table 3 Additional Exclusionary Criteria	11
Table 4 Responses to Question 3	14
Table 5 Additional Site Assessment Criteria	14
Table 6 Responses to Question 4	15
Table 7 Site/Area representations	17
Table 8 Additional Sites/Areas Proposed During Consultation	28
Table 9 Responses to Question 6	33
Table 10 Additional information received with respect to 'Band D' sites and commentary	34
Table 11 Responses to Question 7	35
Table 12 Responses to Option 1	37
Table 13 Responses to Question 8	37
Table 14 Responses to Option 2	38
Table 15 Responses to Question 9	40
Table 16 Responses to Option 3	41
Table 17 Responses to Question 10	42
Table 18 Responses to Option 4	43
Table 19 Responses to Option 5	45
Table 20 Responses to Question 11	46
Table 21 Responses to Option 6	48
Table 22 Responses to Question 12	49
Table 23 Responses to Option 7	50
Table 24 Responses to Question 13	51
Table 25 Responses to Question 14	52
Table 26 Responses to Question 15	53
Table 27 Responses to Question 16	54
Table 28 Responses to Question 17	55
Table 29 Response to Option 8	56
Table 30 Responses to Option 9	58

Contents

Table 31 Responses to Option 10	59
Table 32 Responses to Question 18	60
Table 33 Responses to Question 19	61
Table 34 Sites/areas to be retained for further consideration following Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation	66
Table 35 Additional sites/areas suggested during the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation to be appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	70
Table 36 Sites awarded 'Band D' through Sustainability Appraisal to be removed from any further consideration	70
Table 37 Sites to be removed from further consideration- landowner no longer has land available for development	71
Table 38 Sites/areas to be re-appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process following the submission of additional information	71

Contents

1 Introduction

Introduction

1.1 This report sets out the results of the statutory six-week consultation on the Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities. It sets out the nature of responses received and how they will be used to inform future stages of the JWDPD.

1.2 In addition to the Stage Two consultation paper on Built Facilities, a separate consultation has taken place in relation to the issues and options for dealing with residual waste disposal. The JWDPD Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal report was published for consultation from 23rd March to 1st May 2009.

Background

1.3 The JWDPD Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Report was issued for public consultation from the 6th October to the 14th November 2008. The Built Facilities Report 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. Responses were submitted online using the Limehouse Consultation system or by written response.

1.4 The JWDPD Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Report considered the issues and options in relation to the need for waste management facilities and explored the type of facilities that might be required. It also 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.

1.5 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

1 Introduction

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)

1.6 Whilst the number of responses appears low, given the population of Greater Manchester, it should be noted that a number of key bodies and key stakeholders have responded. These include Government Office North West (GONW), North West Leaders Forum 4NW (formerly NWRA) and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) bodies. In addition, a number of waste operators and site owners provided responses. All responses are available to view online at <http://consult.gmwastedpd.co.uk/portal/wmpt/s2builtfacilities>

General Comments

2 General Comments

National and Regional Guidance

2.1 Both GONW and 4NW highlighted the need for the JWDPD to conform to relevant guidance at the national and regional level, in particular Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (PPS10) and the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RSS). On several matters GONW believed suggested policy in the DPD would serve only to duplicate existing wording in PPS10, and as it is not necessary to repeat national policy within the DPD, the suggested policy should be removed.

2.2 It is not intended that the JWDPD will depart from PPS10 guidance, although it will be locally specific. The JWDPD will not repeat national and regional policies but will provide the planning framework within which locally specific policies will be developed. In addition, national and regional policies will inform the selection of sites in the preparation of the JWDPD.

2.3 Several respondents urged that the JWDPD have regard to the results of the 'Nationally, Regionally and Sub-Regionally Significant Waste Management Facilities report' commissioned by 4NW in 2008. This study was not available at the time of preparing the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Report, however the results of the study will be used to inform future stages of JWDPD plan preparation. The study is available online from: -

http://www.4nw.org.uk/assets/files/documents/nov_08/ps_1225880831_Nationally_Regional_and_Sub-.pdf

Landscape and Historic Environment

2.4 English Heritage were pleased to note the recognition given to the historic environment. A representative of The National Trust suggested that more consideration could be given to landscape matters. The outcomes of work currently being undertaken on Landscape Characterisation in Greater Manchester will be used to inform future stages of the JWDPD to ensure that such matters are taken into account. It was noted that Listed Buildings are not specifically included in the spatial context of Greater Manchester, however, these are included within the Sustainability Appraisal and their sites and settings were used to inform the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities Report in accordance with PPG 15.

2.5 As regards Green Belt issues, the majority of respondents indicated that there may be merit in providing a policy on Green Belt which is specific to Greater Manchester. This was seen as important in a sub region where Green Belt covers a large area, and where there are Green Belt areas that have industrial sites (brownfield) designated within them, which pre-dated Green Belt policy and could be used for waste facilities. For more information on how this issue will be dealt with see the recommendation to Option 6 within 3 'Responses to Issues'.

2 General Comments

Waste Minimisation

2.6 Several respondents were keen to emphasise the importance of waste minimisation. The reduction of waste is at the top of the waste hierarchy, which the JWDPD must conform to, if it is to comply with national policy. The waste hierarchy is a key principle of both the National Waste Strategy and PPS10. In addition, the importance of education and the benefits of raising awareness of recycling was raised and will be considered further in subsequent stages of JWDPD preparation.

2.7 Other Issues

2.8 Most respondents suggested their preferred option for deciding the distribution of sites/areas would be a combination of the three put forward. These are proximity to sustainable transport modes, existing waste management facility sites and proximity to predicted areas of new growth. Therefore all types of growth will be considered in the development of the Preferred Options Report.

2.9 The decline in the economy since the first drafting of the Issue and Options report needs to be considered. A downturn in the economy is likely to impact the waste industry, but the detail and extent of the impact is yet to be fully understood. It is necessary for the JWDPD policies to be flexible enough to handle such impacts in the future.

2.10 Therefore, it will be necessary to review the Needs Assessment prior to the final stage of JWDPD preparation so that the most up to date forecasts for predicted waste arisings are used.

Responses to Issues

3 Responses to Issues

3.1 The following section sets out the questions and option choices made available for public comment, a summary of the responses received and recommendations for dealing with the responses. The number in brackets at the end of each question/option is a reference to the page number of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation report where the question/option can be found.

3.2 A summary of the Sustainability Appraisal findings for each Option have been set out where these are available. In some cases, where direct questions were asked as part of the consultation, it was not possible to appraise the range of unknown potential responses prior to consultation. At the next stage of consultation, Preferred Options, the overall approach taken will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal. So where responses received through consultation here are used to inform the Preferred Options approach it will receive assessment at that stage.

Question 1

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? (page 37)

Table 1 Responses to Question 1

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
No additional categories of land to be considered	5	MEAS/GMWDA/4NW/National Trust/EA
Additional land to be included	2	Peel Holdings Ltd/MJM Strategies

3.3 A total of seven responses to Question 1 were received. Two respondents suggested additional land for inclusion, as follows:

- 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.

3.4 Any land with planning consent for waste uses, implemented or not, has been included in the Need Assessment and is therefore considered as part of the baseline waste treatment capacity in Greater Manchester. Any land coming forward from the above will be considered in the development of the preferred options. Emerging

3 Responses to Issues

Core Strategies across Greater Manchester will be closely monitored to ensure any additional land identified for new/existing employment or strategic sites will be considered as part of the JWDPD.

Response

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.

Question 2

Do you think there are any other exclusionary criteria that should be taken into consideration? (page 38)

Table 2 Responses to Question 2

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
No additional exclusionary criteria to be considered	3	GMWDA/4NW/MJM Strategies
Additional exclusionary criteria suggested	6	MEAS/City Airport Manchester/EA/Ramblers Association/English Heritage/National Trust

3.5 A total of nine responses to Question 2 were received, with most respondents suggesting additional exclusionary criteria for consideration. The additional exclusionary criteria suggested are summarised in Table 3 'Additional Exclusionary Criteria' below, together with recommendations for dealing with them.

Responses to Issues

Table 3 Additional Exclusionary Criteria

Additional Exclusionary Criteria	Already considered (Y/N)	Recommendation
Nitrate vulnerable zones	N	As part of the development of the Preferred Options, sites/areas will be further appraised and this appraisal will include consideration of nitrate vulnerable zones.
City Airport Manchester (Barton) airfield safety/bird strike zone	N	The airfield safety zone information has been provided by City Airport Manchester. Any sites which are to be included within the Preferred Options report for consideration as open facilities which may attract birds will be subject to consultation with City Airport Manchester.
Country Parks	N	There are different definitions between Districts of what is a Country Park. Country Parks were not considered as part of the inclusionary or exclusionary criteria although, as they are likely to fall under other categories of land (e.g. Local Nature Reserve, Site of Biological Importance, etc), they are likely to have been considered through the methodology. Some reclamation activities using waste can result in the creation of new Country Parks and therefore in the development of Preferred Options, impacts upon Country Parks will be included within the overall appraisal of sites/areas.
The Historic Environment Record (HER) should be consulted to ensure all impacts on such features are considered.	N	The HER will be consulted to ensure that any potential impacts that have not been covered already are fully considered.
Food processing facilities	Y	Neighbouring uses such as food processing facilities have been considered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process where information is available.

Responses to Issues

Additional Exclusionary Criteria	Already considered (Y/N)	Recommendation
		During the development of Preferred Options this will be taken a step further through work on deliverability of sites/areas.
Other formal open or green space designations other than Green Belt.	Y	These have been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and also the desk based exercise as described within the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation document.
Air Quality Management Areas	Y	These have been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and also the desk based exercise as described within the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation document.
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.	Y	Although the exclusionary criteria included designations such as SAMs, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, the setting of these assets has not yet been considered due to the sheer number of sites/areas included at this stage. As the final list of sites/area becomes more firm, it will be necessary to include consideration of additional factors including any impact on the setting of such assets.
Local biodiversity and geodiversity designations	Y	Local biological designations have been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and also the desk based exercise as described with it. Information on geodiversity designations is limited in Greater Manchester, however progress on the Local Geodiversity Action Plan is likely to bring additional information forward in the coming years, which can be used to further assess the impact of sites/areas.

Responses to Issues

Additional Exclusionary Criteria	Already considered (Y/N)	Recommendation
Outcomes of the Greater Manchester Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Y	The initial outcomes of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment have been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal, however work on this is ongoing and it is recognised that each stage of the plan, including monitoring will need to consider work in this area as it emerges.

3 Responses to Issues

Response

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.

Question 3

Are there any other additional criteria that you think should be considered? (page 38)

Table 4 Responses to Question 3

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
No additional criteria to be considered	3	4NW/National Trust/EA
Additional criteria suggested	4	Sustainability Network Manchester/MEAS/GMWDA/MJM Strategies

3.6 A total of seven responses to Question 3 were received. The additional criteria suggested for inclusion are as follows:

Table 5 Additional Site Assessment Criteria

Additional Exclusionary Criteria	Already considered (Y/N)
Proximity of sites/areas for waste management facilities to areas of high unemployment and or good public transport links to areas of high unemployment;	Y
Proximity to public transport links to enable sustainable worker commuting;	Y
Locating sites/areas for waste management facilities at current or former waste management or minerals extraction sites;	Y

Responses to Issues

Additional Exclusionary Criteria	Already considered (Y/N)
Locating sites/areas for waste management facilities where there is access to alternative transport modes (not simply road);	Y
Consideration of carbon impacts on developments;	N
Encouraging facilities, including those which generate heat and power, required to meet the needs of communities whilst encouraging competitiveness.	Y

Response

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.

Question 4 and 5 ⁽¹⁾

3.7 Do you think that the sites/areas identified as potentially suitable for waste management facilities in Annex 1 are acceptable? Do you know of any other sites/areas that should be considered as part of the JWDPD? (page 40)

Table 6 Responses to Question 4

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Representation made regarding acceptability of specific site/area	12	United Utilities/Salford City Council/Stockport MBC/Bolton MBC/Manchester Airport/Sustainability Network Manchester/ Waste Recycling Group Ltd/Emerson Group/Peel Holdings Ltd/EA/Ramblers Association/WRG Ltd

1 Considered together because a number of respondents answered both questions simultaneously

3 Responses to Issues

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Additional sites/areas suggested	4	Seddon Developments Ltd/Chester Developments Ltd/GMWDA/Peel Holdings Ltd
No additional sites/areas suggested	5	MEAS/National Trust/4NW/EA/GMWDA

3.8 A total of twenty responses to Questions 4 and 5 were received. The comments relating to specific sites/areas are set out in Table 7 'Site/Area representations' below and the additional sites/areas suggested for inclusion are set out in Table 8 'Additional Sites/Areas Proposed During Consultation' below.

Responses to Issues

Table 7 Site/Area representations

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
BL3	Mabels Brow	<p>Bolton Council- This site should be removed from further consideration for the following reasons:</p> <p>The site has been removed from the Bolton MBC employment land assessment because it is not attractive to the market, nor would its development fulfil strategic planning objectives;</p> <p>There may be significant ground condition problems and access is through a developing residential area to the north; and as it is unviable for employment uses, it is highly unlikely to come forward for waste related uses.</p>	Y	<p>The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.</p>
BL4	Land to the rear of Halliwell Mills, Raglan Street	<p>Bolton Council- This site should be removed from further consideration because traffic movements associated with a waste management facility development would have an adverse impact on the residential setting of this area. The only access to the site is</p>	Y	<p>The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred</p>

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
		through residential roads past houses on Raglan Street.		Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.
BL5	Land off Derby Street	Bolton Council- This site should be removed from further consideration because of the site's location on a busy main road. Any waste facility development brought forward on this site would also cause an adverse impact on surrounding uses, including residential and retail.	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.
BL7	Adjacent to Hanbury's Mill, Emlyn Street	Bolton Council- This site should be removed from further consideration because there would be an adverse impact on housing on Campbell Street and surrounding area.	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
BL8	Weston Street	Bolton Council- This site should be removed from further consideration because it is believed the owner has aspirations for a residential use. The site was originally identified as a potential replacement HWRC for Raikes Lane, but that is no longer being pursued by GMWDA / Viridor. Highway improvements are likely to limit the size of the site and therefore its suitability for a waste management facility.	Y	JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites. The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.
BL9	Watersmeeting C South Triangle, Watersmeeting Road	The Emerson Group- This site should be removed from further consideration for the following reasons: The development is likely to be unattractive; Land currently allocated in the Unitary Development Plan for B1, B2, B8. It seems inappropriate in land use planning	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
		<p>terms to allocate an MBT and AD next to a new employment facility which needs to attract investment – The Valley;</p> <p>Noise from traffic generated as part of the development may be noisy or smelly and generally inappropriate in business park;</p> <p>Proximity to water course is of concern;</p> <p>Low employment generating use in comparison to other B1, B2 and B8 uses;</p> <p>Size of site may preclude the development of an MBT facility;</p> <p>The site has been graded as a Band C through the sustainability appraisal therefore better facilities are likely to exist;</p> <p>Landscaping and buffer zones required;</p> <p>Monitoring of the facility with regard to smell, noise and pests etc;</p>		<p>JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.</p>

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
SL6	Oakhill Trading Estate/Norfolk Road	<p>Design of facility should reflect the prominence of the site; and</p> <p>Site should be adequately screened and any impacts on surrounding land uses carefully considered.</p> <p>Peel Holdings Ltd- commented that it is unclear which land or buildings at SL6 and SL8 could be used for a waste management use, since much of the land is seemingly already occupied or built upon.</p>	N/a	<p>It is recognised that the areas identified as SL6 and SL8 may not currently have any available land. However this does not rule out the possibility that specific sites will become available in the future.</p> <p>As with all sites/areas to be taken forward for further consideration, additional discussions with landowners, site operators and neighbours will be required to ensure the JWDPD is</p>

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
SL8	Wardley Industrial Estate			informed by the most up to date information on availability and deliverability.
SL10	Swinton Hall Road	<p>Salford City Council- This site should be removed from further consideration as a result of the following factors:</p> <p>Site access to motorway is poor and local site access is through established residential areas.</p> <p>The site is being considered for alternative uses including housing through the Salford City Council Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation;</p>	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
		<p>The site received a Band C through the Sustainability Appraisal and it is likely that there are more appropriate sites;</p> <p>In relation to the three spatial options for the distribution of sites as presented in the Stage Two Issues and Options report, this site does not fit well with any or even a combination of the options.</p>		
ST3	Crossley Park Industrial Estate	<p>Stockport MBC- commented that if the site is to be considered as a potential location for a waste management facility the access should be restricted to ensure that the site is only accessed from Crossley Road in the north and not from Tatton Road North in the south, due to the impact on residential amenity.</p>	N/a	<p>The points raised within the objection have been noted. The inclusion of this site at this stage only indicates the potential that the site may be included within the final JWDPD. However should the site ever be brought forward as a firm allocation this issue would be dealt with through the Development Control process.</p>
OL2	Lumm Farm	<p>Sustainability Network Manchester- suggested this site should be removed as a result of the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal which found that</p>	N/a	<p>In line with the proposals to remove all sites/areas which have been appraised as 'Band D' through the Sustainability Appraisal, unless information to the</p>

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
		the site was not suitable for any waste management facilities.		contrary is received, this site will be removed from further consideration.
RD11	Summercastle	The Ramblers Association- These two sites should be removed from further consideration as they are unsuitable for waste management facilities owing to their proximity to the Rochdale Canal and the potential for surface water run-off and consequent damage to the Rochdale Canal SAC.	N	<p>The Rochdale Canal is recognised within the Sustainability Appraisal as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). SACs form part of a pan-European network of sites known as 'Natura 2000' sites and are protected against development through Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). An independent HRA is being done on the JWDPD. These sites have already been flagged up through the HRA with regards to the Rochdale Canal and this will be assessed further as part of the HRA process</p>

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
RD12	Todmorden Road Employment Zone			This will ensure that any potential adverse impact of the JWDPD on any Natura 2000 site, including the Rochdale Canal, will be identified and assessed and can be used to inform the development of the JWDPD.
TA5	Former Primestock Building	Sustainability Network Manchester- expressed concerns about the site in relation to the road network. The site has been cited as potentially suitable for MBT and AD facilities and as a result could expect to receive between 20 and 30 lorries per day. These vehicles would have to travel long distances through residential areas in order to connect to the main arterial roads and motorways.	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
TA8	Denton Waste Water Treatment Works	<p>Stockport MBC- supported the exclusion of this site in line with the intention to remove from further consideration all sites which received a Band D through the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Note: Site owner has submitted additional information about this site (see Table 10).</p>	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.
TR12	Davyhulme WWTW	Manchester Airport Plc- commented that the site is located close to City Airport Manchester (Barton). If it is likely to be allocated for any open waste facility which may risk the attraction of birds to the area, consultation with City Airport Manchester will be necessary.	N/a	The points raised within the response have been noted. If any open facility, with the potential to attract birds is considered in close proximity to City Airport Manchester, the airport will be consulted, as with any other airfield/airport.
W4	Kirkless CA Site, Makerfield Way	Waste Recycling Group- supported consideration of this site and commented that additional uses could be accommodated at the site, which would complement the existing on-site Material Recycling Civic Amenity and leachate		Support for site noted. Site will be further considered during development of Preferred Options.

Responses to Issues

Site Reference	Site Name	Representation	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
W11	Coal Pit Lane, Atherton	<p>treatment facilities and gas utilisation plant.</p> <p>Environment Agency- commented that part of the site appears to be on or within a Site of Biological Importance (SBI).</p>	N/a	<p>The majority of this site lies within an area designated as a Grade A SBI which is considered to be a local habitat/species designation under the exclusionary criteria set out in paragraph 3.21. Therefore this site has been removed from further consideration as part of the JWDPD.</p>

3 Responses to Issues

Table 8 Additional Sites/Areas Proposed During Consultation

Site Name	District	Site to be Appraised?	Commentary
Fletcher Bank Quarry- Peel Holdings Ltd	Bury	N	<p>This site has planning permission for a residual waste management facility, and has already been included within the baseline information on existing capacity of waste facilities within Greater Manchester. Existing permissions for Quarry extension, landfill, construction and demolition waste recycling facility and green waste composting facility are conditioned to cease by 2036 with restoration by 2038. The site will not therefore be considered further for built waste management facilities.</p> <p>However the site will be considered further within the Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal consultation paper due to be published in March 2009.</p>

Responses to Issues

Site Name	District	Site to be Appraised?	Commentary
Reliance Street- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority	Manchester	Y	The additional information will be used to inform a re-appraisal of this site through the SA process. Any change to the SA Banding as a result of the re-appraisal will be taken into account in reaching a final decision on which sites to include within the Preferred Options. At this next stage of the JWDPD clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites.
Arkwright Street- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority	Oldham	N	Site already appears within the Issues and Options: Built Facilities report, with Appendix 1: Background. The site has permission for a household waste recycling centre, a transfer/loading station and a Mechanical Biological Treatment facility.

3 Responses to Issues

Site Name	District	Site to be Appraised?	Commentary
Mitchell Shackleton site, accessed off Green Lane, Salford- Chester Developments Ltd	Salford	Y	This site is within in a wider area already being considered for inclusion within the JWDPD and received a 'Band B' through the Sustainability Appraisal. This proposed addition relates to a specific site within the wider area and the specific boundary of the site will be appraised and included for public consultation within the Preferred Options report.
Ashtons Field, Salford- Seddon Developments Ltd	Salford	Y	The site is adjacent to an area (SL6, Oakhill Trading Estate, Salford) which has been appraised as Band B through the sustainability appraisal. The site will be considered in line with the process adopted for all sites, including the desk based appraisal, site visit and sustainability appraisal prior to inclusion for public consultation within the Preferred Options report.

Responses to Issues

Site Name	District	Site to be Appraised?	Commentary
Additional land adjacent to TR8- Colliers Industrial Waste Ltd	Trafford	Y	The site has been suggested for consideration by the landowner. The site will be considered in line with the process adopted for all sites, including the desk based appraisal, site visit and sustainability appraisal prior to inclusion for public consultation within the Preferred Options report.
Ince in Makerfield Waste Water Treatment Works- United Utilities	Wigan	Y	The site has been suggested for consideration by the landowner. The site will be considered in line with the process adopted for all sites, including the desk based appraisal, site visit and sustainability appraisal prior to inclusion for public consultation within the Preferred Options report.

3 Responses to Issues

Site Name	District	Site to be Appraised?	Commentary
Tyldesley Waste Water Treatment Works- United Utilities	Wigan	Y	The site has been suggested for consideration by the landowner. The site will be considered in line with the process adopted for all sites, including the desk based appraisal, site visit and sustainability appraisal prior to inclusion for public consultation within the Preferred Options report.

Responses to Issues

Response

3.9 The representations to the sites/areas received and the additional sites/areas will be dealt with as set out in Table 7 ‘Site/Area representations’ and Table 8 ‘Additional Sites/Areas Proposed During Consultation’ respectively. 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 the corresponding Sustainability Appraisal.

3.10 A full list of **all sites/areas to be retained for further consideration** at this stage can be found within Table 34 ‘Sites/areas to be retained for further consideration following Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation’.

3.11 A list of **all additional sites/areas suggested through the consultation** on the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities to be considered further can be found within Table 35 ‘Additional sites/areas suggested during the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation to be appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process.’

3.12 A list of **all sites to be removed from further consideration** in line with the proposal to remove all Band D sites/areas can be found within Table 36 ‘Sites awarded ‘Band D’ through Sustainability Appraisal to be removed from any further consideration’.

3.13 A list of all sites/areas to be re-appraised following the submission of additional information can be found within Table 38 ‘Sites/areas to be re-appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process following the submission of additional information’.

Question 6

3.14 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 retain these sites. If you know of any sound planning reasons/justifications for the retention of these sites/areas, please give details. (page 40)

Table 9 Responses to Question 6

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Removal of all ‘Band D’ sites/areas supported	5	National Trust/GMWDA/MEAS/Chester Developments Ltd/Peel Holdings Ltd
Retain specific ‘Band D’ sites/areas	2	United Utilities/ISM Waste Ltd

3 Responses to Issues

3.15 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:

Table 10 Additional information received with respect to 'Band D' sites and commentary

Site reference	Site Name	District	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
BL10	Bolton Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW)	Bolton	Y	The site owner/operator has submitted additional information about the site. Therefore this information will be used to re-appraise the site through the development of Preferred Options.
BU10	ISM Waste, Kenyon Street	Bury	Y	The site owner has submitted additional information about the site and potential operations. This information will be used to re-appraise the site and will be considered in the development of Preferred Options.
TA8	Denton WWTW	Tameside/Stockport	Y	The site owner has submitted additional information about the site. Therefore

Responses to Issues

Site reference	Site Name	District	Site to be re-appraised? (Y/N)	Commentary
				this information will be used to re-appraise the site through the development of Preferred Options.

3.16 In addition to the removal of all Band D sites, one respondent stated that consideration should be given to removing some of the least sustainable sites that have been included in Band C, or at least removing those parts of the Band C sites which pose the greatest planning problems. Therefore as part of the development of the Preferred Options document, Band C sites/areas will be subjected to a further desk-based assessment.

Response

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.

Question 7

3.17 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. (page 43)

Table 11 Responses to Question 7

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Suggested rail sidings for inclusion	2	Sustainability Network Manchester/MEAS
No suggested rail sidings	2	EA/National Trust

3.18 A total of four responses to Question 7 were received. Suggested additional rail sidings for consideration include:

3 Responses to Issues

- 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.
- As the only sidings currently included within the JWDPD are limited to two operated by GMWDA, others should be considered, including disused sidings capable of being reactivated.

Response

3.19 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.

3.20 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. However the potential for future development of rail sidings to be developed alongside sites with potential for waste management facility development can be highlighted. 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.

Option 1

3.21 Which of the following options offers the best approach when identifying the spatial distribution of sites/areas? (Please give reasons) (page 46)

Option 1

- Option 1: Transport Nodes;
- Option 2: Growth Areas;
- Option 3: Clusters;
- A combination of Option 1, Option 2 and Option 3 (please specify); or
- Consider an alternative approach to the above options (please specify).

Responses to Issues

Table 12 Responses to Option 1

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondents
A	2	Chester Developments/Ramblers Association
B	0	
C	1	WRG
D	8	MEAS/4NW/Lafarge Aggregates/Peel Holdings Ltd/EA/MJM Strategies/National Trust/Manchester Airport
E	1	Sustain Network Manchester

3.22 A total of twelve responses for this option were received. The most favoured response was option D, a combination of transport nodes, growth areas and clusters as the best approach when identifying the spatial distribution of sites/areas.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.23 All the Options proposed have both positive and negative elements to the strategic concept, so no single option truly stands out as the most sustainable option. On the other hand none stand out as being entirely unsustainable. What is more, the appraisal shows that each option generally has a similar effect on any given objective as the other options.

Response

3.24 A combination approach will be developed which encompasses all three spatial options, this approach is consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal and was supported by the majority of respondents.

Question 8

3.25 Do you have any other comments regarding this option, e.g. size of buffer zone or selection of transport network or growth areas? (page 46)

Table 13 Responses to Question 8

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Additional buffers or comments on options identified	3	MEAS/National Trust/Peel Holdings Ltd

3 Responses to Issues

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
No additional comments	0	

3.26 A total of three responses to Question 8 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- 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.

Response

As set out above, 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. 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.

Option 2

3.27 Which of the following options offers the best approach when considering sustainable waste management as part of development management? (page 49)

Option 2

- Include a specific development management policy on sustainable waste management;
- Integrate sustainable waste management into other development management policies within the JWDPD; or
- None of the above and consider an alternative (Please specify).

Table 14 Responses to Option 2

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	4	Sustain Network M/cr/EA/Ramblers

Responses to Issues

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
		Association/National Trust
B	3	MEAS/GMWDA/Lafarge Aggregates
C	3	4NW/GONW/MJM Strategies

3.28 A total of ten responses for this option were received. No specific option was favoured and responses were relatively evenly split between the options.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.29 The Sustainability Appraisal identified Option A as the most sustainable option. Option B would also have a very positive impact on waste management but its aims may be lost if integrated with other development management policies in the JWDPD. Option C was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown. Option A directly encourages sustainable resource use and will have a significantly positive impact on the minimisation, production and recycling of waste. The policy should include the requirement to provide new facilities and space within all new developments (not just waste developments) to enable occupiers to separate and store waste. This policy should stress the importance of treating waste as a resource and not as a problem. This policy should seek to promote the use of partnerships across Greater Manchester in order to deliver a consistent approach to planning for waste within the sub-region.

Response

3.30 It is proposed that Option A is taken forward, which is the development of a specific Development Management policy on sustainable waste management. As such a policy is likely to cover 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. Given that no clear option was identified as the most favoured approach by respondents, this approach is largely based on the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Question 9

3.31 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)? (page 50)

3 Responses to Issues

Table 15 Responses to Question 9

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for policy which requires the prioritisation of facilities which recover both heat and power from waste where possible (over those which only recover heat or power)	6	Sustainability Network Manchester/ MEAS/GMWDA/4NW/National Trust/EA
No support for policy	2	Ramblers Association/MJM Strategies

3.32 A total of eight responses to Question 9 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- 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?

Response

3.33 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.

Option 3

3.34 Which of the following options offers the best approach when considering the need for waste management facilities? (page 51)

Responses to Issues

Option 3

- a. Include a separate development management policy on the need for waste management facilities and their phasing;
- b. Combine the need for waste management facilities and their phasing with another policy (please specify);
- c. None of the above and consider an alternative (Please specify).

Table 16 Responses to Option 3

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	7	Sustainability Network Manchester/GMWDA/4NW/Lafarge Aggregates/EA/National Trust/ Ramblers Association
B	0	
C	3	GONW/MJM Strategies/MEAS

3.35 A total of ten responses for this option were received. The most favoured response was Option A, to include a separate development management policy on the need for waste management facilities and their phasing.

3.36 It should be noted that over time the need for facilities may change as facilities are developed on allocated sites and/or waste streams alter and the situation in neighbouring authorities changes. Therefore it is considered necessary for a policy to be developed which deals with the need for waste management facilities. Such a policy should also require justification of the need for facilities to deal with sub regional, regional or even national waste arisings. This will allow the justification of the need for any waste facility development to be considered against up to date information through the development management process.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.37 Option A is considered to be the most sustainable option as it would establish a key policy against which planning applications for new facilities could be judged. Importantly Option A would also enable a flexible approach in order to accommodate such changes and would also provide a sound basis for providing and assessing the facilities which will be needed and help to reduce the potential for over-provision and

3 Responses to Issues

unnecessary land take as it releases sites based on need. Option B would also have a positive impact on waste management but its aims may be lost if combined with another development management policies in the JWDPD. Option C was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

3.38 A Development Management policy on the need for waste management facilities and their phasing will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. Such a policy will also be required to include the consideration of the need for facilities built within Greater Manchester but which may serve a wider need to treat waste generated outside the area. This is in line with the consultation responses received and is also consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Question 10

3.39 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? (page 52)

Table 17 Responses to Question 10

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for policy setting out how proposals on allocated areas will be dealt with	9	Sustainability Network Manchester/MEAS/4NW/Natural England/EA/Ramblers Association/MJM Strategies/English Heritage/National Trust
No policy required	2	GMWDA/Chester Developments

A total of eleven responses to Question 10 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- 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;

Responses to Issues

- 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;
- 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.

Response

3.40 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.

Option 4

3.41 Which of the following options offers the best approach when dealing with applications for waste development on windfall sites? (Please state reasons) (page 53)

Option 4

- Availability/suitability of allocated sites for the proposed development;
- Need for the proposed development not met by allocated sites/areas;
- Any other relevant policies included in the relevant Authority's Local Development Framework;
- A combination of the above;
- A combination of the above but consider additional issues; (please specify) or,
- None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

Table 18 Responses to Option 4

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	0	

3 Responses to Issues

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
B	2	Chester Developments/Ramblers Association
C	0	
D	7	Sustainability Network Manchester/GMWDA/4NW/Lafarge Aggregates/EA/MJM Strategies/ English Heritage
E	1	MEAS
F	1	GONW

3.42 A total of eleven responses for this option were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- development on windfall sites should not be precluded;
- phasing should also be considered as should facilities with new requirements (if different to established waste operations);
- no policy required.

3.43 The most favoured response was option D, a combination of 'Availability/suitability of allocated sites for the proposed development', 'need for the proposed development not met by allocated sites/areas' and 'any other relevant policies included in the relevant Authority's Local Development Framework' as the best approach when dealing with applications for waste development on windfall sites.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.44 Option E is considered to be the most sustainable approach as the combination of Options A, B and C and a consideration of any additional issues is likely to ensure that a range of considerations are included in the process of guiding development to the most sustainable locations. This option will also ensure the exploitation of new opportunities for a range of other facilities to be brought forward on non-allocated sites, if the right circumstances were to apply. Whilst Option D would have a positive impact on sustainable waste management this approach would not be conducive with a waste management sector that is responsive to new and emerging technologies and practices. Option F was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Responses to Issues

Response

3.45 It is proposed that Option E is taken forward, which is the inclusion of a Development Management policy on the development of waste management facilities on windfall sites which combines the following issues:

- availability/suitability of allocated sites for the proposed development;
- need for the proposed development not met by allocated sites/areas; and
- any other relevant policies included in the relevant Authority's Local Development Framework

3.46 This is in line with the consultation responses received and is also consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Option 5

3.47 Which of the following options offers the best approach when including criteria-based development management policies in the JWDPD? (page 54)

Option 5

- Sites/areas supported by broad criteria-based policies;
- Sites/areas supported by detailed criteria based policies which are specific to each site / area;
- Combination of a) and b); or
- None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

Table 19 Responses to Option 5

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	4	MEAS/Chester Developments/4NW/Lafarge
B	1	National Trust
C	5	Sustainable Network Manchester/GMWDA/EA/Ramblers Association/English Heritage
D	2	GONW/MJM Strategies

3 Responses to Issues

3.48 A total of twelve responses for this option were received. The most favoured response was option C, a combination of 'sites/areas supported by broad criteria-based policies' and 'sites/areas supported by detailed criteria based policies which are specific to each site/area' as the best approach when including criteria-based development management policies in the JWDPD.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.49 Option C (a combination of both A and B) has a number of positive impacts on the SA objectives and would result in net positive environmental, social and economic impacts. The provision of a flexible set of criteria-based policies will enable an assessment of suitability for different types of waste facilities at both the site-specific and the broader spatial level. Option D was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

3.50 It is proposed that Option C is taken forward, which is the development of criteria based Development Management policies which combine the following issues:

- Sites/areas supported by broad criteria-based policies; and
- Sites/areas supported by detailed criteria based policies which are specific to each site / area.

3.51 This is in line with the consultation responses received and also is also consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Question 11

Do you agree that the following issues each require development management policies in the JWDPD? (Please give reasons) (page 55)

- Sustainable transport of waste;
- Agricultural land policy; and
- Airfield safeguarding zones.

Are there any other impacts that you think should be considered?

Table 20 Responses to Question 11

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Policy required for all issues listed	5	Sustainability Network Manchester/City Airport Manchester/GMWDA/Ramblers Association/National Trust
Policy required for sustainable transport	1	MEAS

Responses to Issues

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
No policies required in these areas	0	
Suggested additional policy areas	3	Ramblers Association/National Trust/Sustainability Network Manchester

3.52 A total of nine responses to Question 11 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- 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.

Response

3.53 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.

Option 6

3.54 Which of the following options offers the best approach when managing waste development in the Green Belt? (page 56)

Option 6

- Do not include development within the Green Belt as a separate development management policy in the JWDPD and rely only on guidance set out within Planning Policy Guidance 2;
- Develop development management policies relating to the Green Belt which are specific to Greater Manchester but which comply with Planning Policy Guidance 2;
- None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

3 Responses to Issues

Table 21 Responses to Option 6

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	1	EA
B	7	Sustainable Network Manchester/Chester Developments/GMWDA/4NW/Lafarge Aggregates/Ramblers Association/ National Trust
C	3	MEAS/GONW/MJM Strategies

3.55 A total of eleven responses for this option were received. The most favoured response was option B, 'develop development management policies relating to the Green Belt which are specific to Greater Manchester but which comply with Planning Policy Guidance 2' as the best approach when managing waste development in the Green Belt.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.56 Option B is considered the most sustainable option, as it offers relative benefits in terms of reducing waste transport, reducing development pressure on sites outside the Green Belt and providing greater flexibility in meeting the future need for waste management. It also provides a flexible approach in relation to the location of waste operations, increases the likelihood that targets for recovery of value from waste are achieved, decreases the transportation of waste within the sub-region and also reduces the development pressure on sites outside the Green Belt. Option A was found to give more weight to the Green Belt policy than the need for waste facilities and may not allow for sufficient waste management developments to meet needs. Option C was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

3.57 From the responses received it would seem that industry requires further clarification on locally specific application of Green Belt Policy in Greater Manchester. Therefore it is proposed that Option B is taken forward, which is the inclusion of Development Management policies which relate to the Green Belt and are specific to Greater Manchester, but which comply with Planning Policy Guidance 2. 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. This is in line with the consultation responses received and is also consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Responses to Issues

Question 12

3.58 Should the JWDPD contain a Development Management policy on waste minimisation? (page 57)

Table 22 Responses to Question 12

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for the inclusion of a waste minimisation policy	5	Sustainability Network Manchester/GMWDA/EA/Ramblers Association/National Trust
No policy required	3	MEAS/Chester Developments Ltd/4NW

3.59 A total of eight responses to Question 12 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- 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.

Response

3.60 A 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.

Option 7

3.61 Which of the following options offers the best approach when considering the type of information that should be sought from applicants as part of a development management policy on waste minimisation? (page 57)

3 Responses to Issues

Option 7

- a. How on-site reuse of materials is to be maximised;
- b. How the reuse/recycling of materials not being reused on site can be maximised;
- c. Other considerations (please specify);
- d. Combination of a) and b); or
- e. None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

Table 23 Responses to Option 7

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	0	
B	0	
C	0	
D	5	GMWDA/EA/Ramblers Association/English Heritage/National Trust
E	2	Sustainable Network Manchester/MEAS

3.62 A total of seven responses for this option were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- A combination of A, B, and C plus applicants should also provide assurance that new developments score 55 or above on the BREEAM Industrial Pre-Assessment estimator for Fitted-out Buildings;
- no policy required as likely to be covered by SWMPs.

3.63 The most favoured response was Option D, a combination of 'how on-site reuse of materials is to be maximised' and 'how the reuse/recycling of materials not being reused on site can be maximised' when considering the type of information that should be sought from applicants as part of a development management policy on waste minimisation.

Responses to Issues

Sustainability Appraisal

3.64 The implementation of Option D (a combination of Options A and B) would have a positive impact on sustainable waste management in Greater Manchester. Option D has a number of positive impacts on the SA objectives including:

- the implementation of sustainable waste management practises makes economic sense and is likely to result in improved use of resources and less money spent on transport and waste collection; and
- minimisation at source of waste arisings, moving waste up the hierarchy at the point of generation is likely to have positive economic impacts.

3.65 Options C and E were considered impossible to appraise as other considerations or potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Comment

3.66 From the consultation responses received it is further evident that some of the information to be sought from applicants is already covered by the requirements of Site Waste Management Plans Regulations 2008, that can be found at: (<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/topics/construction/pdf/swmp-guidance.pdf>). However, this only requires information to be submitted on the management and disposal of Construction and Demolition wastes produced on site for developments with a value of £300,000 or over.

Response

3.67 In line with the responses to Question 12 and the Sustainability Appraisal, a Development Management policy on waste minimisation which covers all types of development, not just waste facility development and also all waste streams, will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options.

Question 13

What types of development should be covered by such a policy? (page 57)

Table 24 Responses to Question 13

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Policy should cover all types of development	5	Sustainability Network Manchester/GMWDA/4NW/Ramblers Association/EA
Policy should cover specific types of development	1	National Trust/MEAS

3.68 A total of six responses to Question 13 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

3 Responses to Issues

- 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.

3.69 The responses received again point out that some of the information to be sought from applicants is already covered by the requirements of Site Waste Management Plans Regulations 2008, which can be found at (<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/topics/construction/pdf/swmp-guidance.pdf>).

Response

3.70 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

Question 14

3.71 Do you think it is appropriate for the JWDPD to include a Development Management policy on the design of waste management facilities? If so, are there any further considerations that such a policy should take account of? (Please specify) (page 58)

Table 25 Responses to Question 14

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for a policy on the design of waste management facilities	8	Sustainable Network Manchester/MEAS/Chester Developments Ltd/GMWDA/EA/Ramblers Association/National Trust/NE
No policy required	3	4NW/Peel Holdings Ltd/MJM Strategies

3.72 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.

Responses to Issues

- 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.

Response

3.73 A 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.

Question 15

3.74 Do you think it is appropriate to include a Development Management policy on planning obligations within the JWDPD? If so, are there any areas that you think such a policy should cover? Examples could include restoration guarantee, site management and vehicle routing. (page 59)

Table 26 Responses to Question 15

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for a policy on planning obligations	6	Sustainability Network Manchester/MEAS/GMWDA/Natural England/English Heritage/National Trust
No policy required	3	Chester Development/EA/MJM Strategies

3.75 A total of nine responses to Question 15 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- 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.

3 Responses to Issues

- 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.

Response

3.76 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.

Question 16

3.77 Do you think it is appropriate that the JWDPD includes a Development Management policy on the monitoring of waste management sites? If so, are there any areas that you think such a policy should cover? (Please specify). (page 61)

Table 27 Responses to Question 16

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for a policy on monitoring of waste management facilities	8	Sustainability Network Manchester/MEAS/GMWDA/4NW/Ramblers Association/EA/National Trust/English Heritage
No policy required	2	Chester Develeopments Ltd/MJM Strategies

3.78 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.

Responses to Issues

Response

3.79 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.

Question 17

3.80 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? If so, what are the considerations that such a policy should take account of? (Please specify). (page 61)

Table 28 Responses to Question 17

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support for a policy on national, regional or sub-regional waste management facilities	3	MEAS/GMWDA/Ramblers Association
No policy required	2	4NW/National Trust

3.81 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.

3 Responses to Issues

Response

3.82 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.

Option 8

3.83 Which of the following options offers the best approach when considering the final land use of restored sites? (Please specify) (page 59)

Option 8

- a. Environmental - biodiversity and nature conservation;
- b. social - recreation, leisure;
- c. economical - agriculture, forestry;
- d. Combination of the above; or
- e. None of the above and consider an alternative (Please specify).

Table 29 Response to Option 8

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	0	
B	0	
C	0	
D	7	GMWDA/4NW/EA/NE/Ramblers Association/EH/ National Trust
E	5	Sustainable Network Manchester/MEAS/Lafarge Aggregates/Peel Holdings Ltd/MJM Strategies

3.84 A total of eleven responses for this option were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- must include historic environment;
- sites should be restored to uses most deficient to that particular community or environment. This should be decided by referendum within the relevant Local Authority;

Responses to Issues

- appropriate restoration needs to be judged on a site by site basis. For example, inert landfills in urbanised areas can be redeveloped for new land uses, whereas landfill sites in rural or semi-rural areas are more likely to be restored for leisure use;
- when considering the final land use of restored sites it is not appropriate to limit the use. Therefore our preferred option would be for environmental/social/economic uses to be considered so that the best balance of land use for the area in question is pursued;
- this must depend on the site itself, and any proposals for final land use of the restored sites must be treated on a site by site basis;
- requirements will depend on site specifics.

3.85 The most favoured option was option D, a combination of ‘environmental - biodiversity and nature conservation’, ‘social - recreation, leisure’ and ‘economical - agriculture, forestry’ as the best approach when considering the final land use of restored sites.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.86 Option D (a combination of Options A, B and C) has a number of positive impacts on the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, in particular to promote beneficial after-use of restored sites, including innovative restoration and after-care practises that incorporate sustainable development. Option E was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Comment

3.87 Although the Sustainability Appraisal recognises that the final land use of restored waste management sites should include a diverse range of options, it is likely to be influenced by the circumstances of each particular site.

Response

3.88 A Development Management policy on the final land use of restored sites will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options. This policy will aim to reflect the circumstances of each restoration project thereby allowing the most appropriate final land use to be adopted. However, it should be noted that such a policy will only be required for waste disposal activities such as landfill/landraise rather than built waste management facilities. This reflects the consultation preferences for Options D and E.

Option 9

3.89 Which of the following options offers the best approach when considering planning applications for the restoration of sites? (page 60)

3 Responses to Issues

Option 9

- a. Timescale of the aftercare management programme and completion of restoration;
- b. Financial provision;
- c. Appropriateness of the restoration;
- d. Combination of the above (please specify); or
- e. Other areas (please specify).

Table 30 Responses to Option 9

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	0	
B	0	
C	2	Lafarge Aggregates/Peel Holdings Ltd
D	8	Sustainable Network Manchester/MEAS/4NW/EA/NE/Ramblers Association/National Trust/GMWDA
E	1	MJM Strategies

3.91 A total of eleven responses for this option were received. The most favoured response was for option D, a combination of ‘timescale of the aftercare management programme and completion of restoration’, ‘financial provision’ and ‘Appropriateness of the restoration’ offers the best approach when considering planning applications for the restoration of sites.

Sustainability Appraisal

3.92 Option D was considered the most sustainable option as a combination of timescale (Option A), financial provision (Option B) and the appropriateness of restoration and aftercare (Option C) is likely to ensure that restoration and aftercare is of a sustainable nature.

Responses to Issues

Response

3.93 A Development Management policy based on Option D, which requires planning applications for waste management facilities to consider a combination of the following when planning the aftercare of restored sites will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options:

- timescale of the aftercare management programme and completion of restoration;
- financial provision; and
- appropriateness of the restoration.

Option 10

3.94 Which of the following options offers the best approach when considering specific types of waste development? (Please state reasons) (page 62)

Option 10

- Broad policies setting out what applicants must demonstrate in order to gain planning permission for a waste management facility;
- Detailed policies setting out what applicants must demonstrate in order to gain planning permission and additional information to be provided by applicants;
- Combination of the above (please specify); or
- None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

Table 31 Responses to Option 10

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondent
A	3	4NW/Lafarge Aggregates/EA
B	2	Sustainability Network Manchester/GMWDA
C	1	Ramblers Association
D	0	
E	1	GONW

3.95 A total of seven responses for this option were received. The most favoured response was that option A, 'broad policies setting out what applicants must demonstrate in order to gain planning permission for a waste management facility' offers the best approach when considering specific types of waste development.

3 Responses to Issues

Sustainability Appraisal

3.96 It is considered that Options A, B and C would perform equally well against social, economic and environmental issues and therefore Option D, a combination of the three, was considered the most sustainable. Option E was considered impossible to appraise as potential other areas are at present unknown.

Response

It is proposed to develop a policy which reflects Option D to provide clarification on what type of development would be suitable on specific sites/areas. This will need to consider the suitability of sites/areas for specific waste management facilities in line with the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal. It is not the intention of this policy to repeat national guidance, rather to provide locally specific information to ensure the most appropriate development is realised.

Question 18

3.97 Would you like to see Development Management policies relating to any other types of waste related development? (please specify what types) (page 62)

Table 32 Responses to Question 18

Response received	Outcome	
Support for a policy on any other waste related development	1	Sustainability Network Manchester
No other policy required	3	MEAS/GMWDA/EA

3.98 A total of four responses to Question 18 were received. The support for an additional policy related to the following:

- Policy suggested specifically for hazardous waste management facilities and storage.

Response

3.99 It would appear that there is no specific need for separate policies covering any other types of waste related development. The issue of hazardous waste management will be pursued as part of the recommendation to Option 10 above. Therefore a separate policy on hazardous waste management will not be included as part of the Preferred Options.

Question 19

3.100 Do you agree with the proposed monitoring methodology set out? Are there any other indicators or measurable, achievable targets which need to be considered? (please specify) (page 65)

Responses to Issues

Table 33 Responses to Question 19

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Support monitoring methodology as set out	1	EA
Additional monitoring methodology suggested	1	Natural England

3.101 A total of two responses to Question 19 were received, the following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- The monitoring methodology should include reference to Biodiversity Action Plan targets and Landscape Character Assessments.

Response

3.102 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.

3 Responses to Issues

Next Steps

4 Next Steps

4.1 The results of the Stage Two Issues & Options: Built Facilities consultation, along with the outcomes of the stakeholder events held during March and October 2008, will be combined with the outcomes of the Stage One Issues and Options Consultation Outcomes and also the outcomes of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Management consultation (which took place at the end of March 2009) and will be used to inform the preparation of Preferred Options for the JWDPD.

Next Steps

List of Sites/Areas

1 List of Sites/Areas

1 List of Sites/Areas

1.1 The table below contains the complete list of sites/areas which will be retained for further consideration during the development of Preferred Options.

Table 34 Sites/areas to be retained for further consideration following Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation

Site reference	Site Name	District
BL1	Salford Road (Cutacre Tip)	Bolton
BL2	Bolton Road Kearsley (Singing Clough)	Bolton
BL6	Mill Street/Mule Street	Bolton
BL11	Waterloo Street	Bolton
BL12	Raikes Lane Industrial Estate	Bolton
BU1	Dumers Lane EGA, Radcliffe (inc York Street)	Bury
BU2	Eton Hills Industrial Estate, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe	Bury
BU3	Pilsworth Industrial Estate, Bury	Bury
BU4	Part of Fernhill EGA, Bury	Bury
BU5	Freetown EGA, Bury	Bury
BU6	Warth Mills (Former Macphersons factory) Warth Road	Bury
BU7	Daisyfield Industrial Estate, Wellington Street	Bury
BU8	Land at Pimhole, Pimhole Road, Bury	Bury
BU9	Former Drum Works, Park Road	Bury
MC1	Part of Ardwick Yard & Kay Street	Manchester
MC2	Central Park (Southern part)	Manchester
MC3	Roundthorn Industrial Area	Manchester
MC4	Sharston Industrial Area	Manchester
MC5	Teesland IDG, Queens Road	Manchester

List of Sites/Areas

Site reference	Site Name	District
OL1	Land in the area between Higginshaw Lane and the Oldham to Shaw railway line	Oldham
OL3	Land off Higginshaw Lane (part of former Higginshaw Gas Works)	Oldham
OL4	Land at Mosstown Road	Oldham
OL5	Land at Millstream Lane, Clayton Bridge	Oldham
RD1	Fieldhouse Industrial Estate	Rochdale
RD2	Grimshaw Lane, Middleton	Rochdale
RD3	Heap Bridge Industrial Estate	Rochdale
RD4	John Lee Fold, East Middleton	Rochdale
RD5	Manchester Street, Heywood	Rochdale
RD6	Mandale Park, Manchester Road	Rochdale
RD7	Phoenix Industrial Estate, Heywood	Rochdale
RD8	Rhodes Business Park AKA Bernsteins	Rochdale
RD9	Spring Vale CA Site	Rochdale
RD10	Stakehill Industrial Estate, Bentley Avenue	Rochdale
RD11	Summercastle, Chichester Street	Rochdale
RD12	Todmorden Road, Littleborough	Rochdale
SL1	Agecroft Industrial Estate	Salford
SL2	Clifton Industrial Estate	Salford
SL3	Cobden Industrial Estate	Salford
SL4	Nasmyth and Lyntown Industrial Estate	Salford
SL5	Northbank Industrial Estate	Salford
SL6	Oakhill Trading Estate	Salford
SL7	Lester Road Industrial Estate	Salford
SL8	Wardley Industrial Estate	Salford

List of Sites/Areas

Site reference	Site Name	District
SL9	Wharton Lane, Cutacre Extension (West and East)	Salford
ST1	Vacant plot at junction of Ashton Road/Bredbury Parkway, Bredbury Industrial Estate	Salford
ST2	Plot 4&5 Bredbury Parkway	Stockport
ST3	Crossley Park Industrial Estate	Stockport
ST4	Green Lane Industrial Estate	Stockport
ST5	White Hill Industrial Estate	Stockport
ST6	Whitefield Road Industrial Estate	Stockport
ST7	Bredbury Industrial Estate (North)	Stockport
ST8	Bredbury Industrial Estate (South)	Stockport
ST9	Land east of Former Council Yard, Whitefield Road, Bredbury	Stockport
TA1	Windmill Lane, Denton	Tameside
TA2	Broadway Industrial Estate, Dukinfield, Hyde	Tameside
TA3	Land at Sheply Industrial Estate (North), Audenshaw	Tameside
TA4	Tame Valley	Tameside
TA6	Reminder of Park Mill Site, Park Road Dukinfield	Tameside
TA7	Vacant land at Gate Street, of Ashton Street, Dukinfield	Tameside
TR1	Land at Partington Wharfside including former BP Depot Manchester Road Partington	Trafford
TR2	Blagden Packaging N.V 1130 Nash Road, Trafford Park	Trafford
TR3	Carbo Site- Churchill Way, Trafford Park	Trafford

List of Sites/Areas

Site reference	Site Name	District
TR4	G Gervin and Sons Ltd, Thompson Road, Trafford Park	Trafford
TR5	Land at Former Partington Gas Works, Common Lane	Trafford
TR6	Land North of Nash Road, Trafford Park	Trafford
TR7	Plot A, Central Park Estate, Trafford Park	Trafford
TR8	Tank Farm Chemical Treatment Works, Nash Road	Trafford
TR9	Progressive Waste Disposal- 9 Nash Road, Trafford Park	Trafford
TR10	Lavelle & Sons- Churchill Way Trafford Park (contains Lavelle & Sons, Trafford Wharf Road)	Trafford
TR11	Thompson Road, Trafford Park	Trafford
TR14	Shell Site, Common Lane, Carrington	Trafford
TR15	Britannia ImportExport Ltd- Twining Road, Trafford Park	Trafford
W1	Springfield & Miry Lane Employment Area	Wigan
W2	South Lancashire Industrial Estate	Wigan
W3	Chanters Industrial Estate	Wigan
W4	Kirkless (CA Site Makerfield Way)	Wigan
W5	Victoria Street, Leigh	Wigan
W6	Prescott Street	Wigan
W7	Westleigh Lane, Leigh	Wigan
W8	Ince Moss Junction Sidings, Cemetery Road	Wigan
W9	Lamberhead Industrial Estate, Pemberton	Wigan
W10	Warrington Road Industrial Estate	Wigan
W12	Templeton Road, Platt Bridge	Wigan

List of Sites/Areas

Site reference	Site Name	District
W13	Walthewhouse Lane	Wigan
W14	Cemetery Road, Ince	Wigan
W15	Platt Bridge Sewage Works	Wigan
W16	Cale Lane	Wigan
W17	Edge Green Colliery (Kelbits)	Wigan

1.2 Additional sites suggested during the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation which will be retained for further consideration are included within the table below.

Table 35 Additional sites/areas suggested during the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation to be appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process.

Site Name	District
Former Mitchell Shackleton site	Salford
Ashtons Field	Salford
Arkwright Street	Oldham
Colliers Industrial Waste Ltd- additional land	Trafford
Ince in Makerfield Waste Water Treatment Works	Wigan
Tyldesley Waste Water Treatment Works	Wigan

Table 36 Sites awarded 'Band D' through Sustainability Appraisal to be removed from any further consideration

Site Reference	Site Name	District
OL2	Lumm Farm	Oldham

List of Sites/Areas

Table 37 Sites to be removed from further consideration- landowner no longer has land available for development

Site reference	Site Name	District
RD13	Rochdale Waste Water Treatment Works	Rochdale
TR12	Davyhulme Waste Water Treatment Works	Trafford
TR13	Altrincham Waste Water Treatment Works	Trafford

1.3 Following the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation, the outcomes of which are reported within this document, the sites/areas listed in the table below will be re-appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal during the development of the Preferred Options.

Table 38 Sites/areas to be re-appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process following the submission of additional information

Site Reference	Site Name	District
BL3	Mabels Brow	Bolton
BL4	Land to the rear of Halliwell Mills, Raglan Street	Bolton
BL5	Land off Derby Street	Bolton
BL7	Adjacent to Hanbury's Mill, Emlyn Street	Bolton
BL8	Weston Street	Bolton
BL9	Watersmeeting C South Triangle, Watersmeeting Road	Bolton
BL10	Bolton Waste Water Treatment Works	Bolton
BU10	ISM Waste, Kenyon Street	Bury
MC6	Reliance Street	Manchester
OL6	Arkwright Street	Oldham
SL10	Swinton Hall Road	Salford
TA5	Former Primestock building, Edge Lane and Fairfield Road/Vacant land near Bridge Street, Droylsden	Tameside

List of Sites/Areas

Site Reference	Site Name	District
TA8	Denton Waste Water Treatment Works	Tameside
TR12	Davyhulme Waste Water Treatment Works	Trafford
W11	Coal Pit Lane	Wigan