

Outcomes Report on the Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal Consultation

Contents

1 Introduction	4
2 Responses to Issues	8
3 Next Steps	38

Tables

Table 1 Responses to Question 1	9
Table 2 Responses to Question 2	11
Table 3 Responses to Question 3	13
Table 4 Responses to Question 4	15
Table 5 Responses to Question 5	17
Table 6 Responses to Question 6	19
Table 7 Responses to Question 7	19
Table 8 Responses to Question 8 and 9	21
Table 9 Responses to Question 10	23
Table 10 Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Coal Pit Lane, Oldham	23
Table 11 Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Vicars Hall Lane, Salford	26
Table 12 Responses to Question 11	29
Table 13 Responses to Question 12	30
Table 14 Responses to Question 13	30
Table 15 Responses to Question 14	31
Table 16 Responses to Question 15	32
Table 17 Responses to Question 16	33
Table 18 Responses to Question 17	35
Table 19 Responses to Question 18	36

Introduction

1 Introduction

1 Introduction

Introduction

1.1 This report sets out the results of the six-week consultation on the Joint Waste Development Plan Document (JWDPD) Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal Report from here on referred to as the 'Report'. It sets out the nature of responses received and how those responses will be used to inform future stages of the JWDPD.

Background

1.2 The Report was issued for public consultation from the 23rd March to the 1st May 2009 and was made available both online and at deposit points throughout Greater Manchester in line with the Statements of Community Involvement of the 10 Local Authorities. Consultees were able to respond online using the Limehouse Consultation system or by written response.

1.3 The Report considered the issues and options in relation to the issue of need for residual waste disposal facilities. It also put forward issues and suggested options for the development of residual waste management policies.

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

- Natural England
- English Heritage
- The Wilton Settled Estate
- Lancashire County Council
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- Cheshire Joint Planning Unit
- MJM Strategies
- Oldham Council
- Salford City Council
- Stockport MBC
- Viridor Waste Management Ltd
- Biffa Waste Services Ltd
- Peel Holdings Ltd
- Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Peak area)
- The National Trust
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- West Lancashire District Council
- Cllr Aileen Bell
- Members of Werneth Golf Club Werneth Golf Club
- Medlock & Tame Valley Conservation
- Rt Hon M Meacher MP (Oldham West and Royton)
- Phillip Woolas MP (Oldham East and Saddleworth)

Introduction

1

- David Heyes MP (Ashton-Under-Lyne)
- Trustees of E Bissill Marriage Settlement Reversionary Share
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Poynton Town Council
- The Coal Authority
- North West Development Agency
- Horwich Town Council
- 4NW
- National Grid Company Plc
- Environment Agency
- Oldham Labour Group- submitted by Jim McMahon
- Saddleworth Parish Council
- Moorside South Residents Association
- Culcheth and Glazebury Parish Council
- United Utilities Plc
- Daisy Chains Pre-school, Bardsley
- Government Office North West
- Veolia ES Onyx Ltd
- Heywood Against Landfill Group
- Individual responses = 2259

Introduction

Responses to Issues

2 Responses to Issues

2 Responses to Issues

2.1 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 them.

2.2 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.

Meeting the Need for Inert Waste Disposal

Question 1

2.3 The Needs Assessment identifies a cumulative capacity gap of 12.12 million tonnes of inert waste by 2025. Which of the following options do you consider to be the most appropriate way forward in planning to close that capacity gap?

Option JWDPD 1

1a. Do not allocate any residual inert waste disposal sites as part of the JWDPD as trends suggest that inert waste will increasingly be used as a resource, for example in the restoration of existing quarry voids, exempt activities or regeneration schemes, that will come forward over the lifespan of the JWDPD; or

1b. Allocate sites for residual waste disposal based upon those sites suggested by the waste industry (see sites identified in Appendix Search for Landfill / Landraise Sites) but only after these have been subject to further assessment; or

1c. Carry out a further call for sites and then allocate sites drawn from Appendix Search for Landfill / Landraise Sites and any new sites suggested, but only after they have been subject to further assessment; or

1d. None of the above and consider an alternative approach (please specify).

Responses to Issues

Table 1 Responses to Question 1

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondents
A	4	Ramblers Association/MEAS/Wilton Settled Estate/Cheshire Joint Planning Unit
B	4	MEAS/Wilton Settled Estate/MJM Strategies/Cheshire Joint Planning Unit /Viridor Waste Management Ltd
C	1	National Trust
D	3	2x Individuals/ Lancashire County Council

A total of thirteen responses to Question 1 were received. Options A and B received the highest response, followed closely by Option D. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- National planning policy places specific emphasis on the identification of sites/areas suitable for new or improved waste facilities. Although there is uncertainty amount of inert waste that will need to be disposed of, there is a need to make realistic assumptions about the latter so as to calculate the extent of the capacity gap. Sites could then be allocated on this basis but flexibility could be provided by indicating the criteria for identifying further sites should the need arise;
- If Option A is taken forward there would need to be restoration schemes and quarries available to accept the volume that has been identified. Option B is a better option, but there needs to be a review of current exempt sites and waste protocols from the EA;
- Although it is important to continue to press for waste to be used as a resource thus further limiting the need for land fill/raise developments, the capacity gap identified in Greater Manchester is significant so further sites will need to be identified;
- Two respondents requested the consideration of Option D, but without suggesting an alternative approach, rather they urged that a landfill site not be created at Coal Pit Lane;
- Following assessment of sites, suitable sites should be allocated. If additional sites are still required, further research should be undertaken to identify additional sites that can be allocated by relaxing exclusionary criteria; and
- The plan should allow for the possibility of windfall sites arising during the plan period.

2 Responses to Issues

Sustainability Appraisal

2.4 Option A would have positive effects on many of the SA objectives through encouraging the sustainable management of waste. This option scored well against the SA objectives related to the local environmental quality, air quality, the protection of culture, the built environment and landscape character. Options B and C would have a positive impact on developing the waste sector in the sub-region and making residual inert waste disposal sites more accessible, however they will have negative impacts on many of the environmental related SA objectives. Option D was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

2.5 It is proposed that a combination of Options A and B are taken forward, which would result in the encouragement of reuse and recycling of inert wastes, but also recognises that sites will still be required even after all recycling is complete. In practise this would result in the allocation of fewer sites than indicated by the Needs Assessment but would still provide opportunities to increase the number of allocations if trends in waste generation and reuse change over time. This will be explored through the development of Preferred Options. This is in line with the consultation responses received and also is also consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal.

2.6 It is proposed not to pursue Option C because a 'call for sites' exercise has taken place on several occasions already:

- As part of the development of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities during August 2007; and
- As part of the development of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Residual Waste Disposal during April 2008.

2.7 However, in accordance with the statutory process for preparing development plan documents, landowners, site operators and other interested parties can bring forward additional sites for consideration until Submission stage of plan preparation.

2.8 Option D is not proposed to be pursued as the alternative approaches suggested by respondents will be addressed by the pursuit of Options A and B. The other respondents suggesting Option D did not suggest an alternative approach for consideration therefore this cannot be evaluated.

Responses to Issues

Meeting the Need for Hazardous Waste Disposal

Question 2

2.9 The Needs Assessment identifies a cumulative capacity gap of 911,000 tonnes of Hazardous Waste by 2025. Which of the following options do you consider to be the most appropriate way forward in planning to close that capacity gap?

Option JWDPD 2

2a. Continue to rely on sites outside Greater Manchester; or

2b. Carry out a further 'Call for Sites' for hazardous waste disposal sites; or

2c. None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

Table 2 Responses to Question 2

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondents
A	2	2 x Individual
B	4	Wilton Settled Estate/ Viridor Waste Management Ltd/ National Trust/ West Lancashire District Council
C	7	Ramblers Association/ MEAS/Lancashire County Council/MJM Strategies/ Cheshire Joint Planning Unit/ West Lancashire District Council/GMWDA

2.10 A total of thirteen responses to Question 2 were received. The most favoured approach was Option C, which suggests that the most appropriate way forward in planning to close the identified capacity gap for hazardous waste is to consider an alternative approach as suggested by the respondents. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- Two respondents suggested that continued reliance on sites outside Greater Manchester is the best way to address the capacity gap identified for hazardous waste.
- A number of respondents voiced concern over the export of waste out of Greater Manchester, stating that the transport of waste is unsustainable and also supporting further work on identifying sites in Greater Manchester, possibly through a further call for sites.
- There seems to be considerable uncertainty about how to deal with future hazardous waste disposal once current capacity has been taken up. It would seem that further work is needed to identify how future needs will be met either within Greater Manchester or elsewhere in regional or national facilities.

2 Responses to Issues

- As the capacity gap is not apparent until 2018, the situation for hazardous waste should be reviewed again at this time, when there may be significant changes in the options for waste treatment, and demand for hazardous waste disposal sites.
- To reduce demand in the future there needs to be additional research undertaken to identify the types of hazardous waste being landfilled, where it is produced, and undertake a waste minimisation campaign together with stimulating the treatment market.
- Restrictions on the types of wastes which can be landfilled are likely to get stricter, therefore stimulating the need for highly specialised treatment facilities (e.g. batteries). As these facilities are likely to be of regional and national importance the need for them may be determined at this level.
- Continuing to use the facilities named in the document appears appropriate, recognising that Greater Manchester probably has hazardous waste facilities which take materials from outside the sub-region. However, given the policy direction in the JWDPD of seeking self-sufficiency it may be prudent either to call for additional sites or to define the criteria which would indicate a suitable site and then leave it to the waste industry to propose new locations.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.11 Option A does not score well against many of the SA objectives and does not represent the most sustainable method of managing hazardous waste. It will not help to develop the waste sector in Greater Manchester and the likely transportation of waste to neighbouring areas leads to a negative impact on many of the environmental related SA objectives. Option B would have a more positive impact on meeting the capacity gap of hazardous waste within Greater Manchester. Option B was considered to be the most sustainable option for managing hazardous waste. It encourages the disposal of hazardous waste within Greater Manchester and reduces the need to transport it out of the sub-region. Option C was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

2.12 Given that Option A does not score well against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives and Option B, an additional call for sites will not be pursued (as raised within the response to Question 1 above), it is proposed that Option C is taken forward. This Option suggests that the most appropriate way forward in planning to close the identified capacity gap for hazardous waste is to consider an alternative approach as suggested by the respondents, which indicated that the JWDPD continues to rely on existing hazardous waste disposal sites as capacity is available until 2018. Option C, although not appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal, will enable sites within Greater Manchester to come forward in future, but reflects the lack of available sites at present. It is also proposed that this option be supported by criteria based policies against which applications for future hazardous waste disposal sites can be assessed. This will be explored through development of Preferred Options

Responses to Issues

Meeting the Need for Non-Hazardous Residual Waste Disposal

Question 3

2.13 The Need Assessment identifies a cumulative capacity gap of 9,132,000 tonnes of non-hazardous waste by 2025. Which of the following options do you consider to be the most appropriate way forward in planning to close that capacity gap?

Option JWDPD 3

- 3a. Explore the potential for extensions to existing landfill sites; or
- 3b. Identify new sites; or
- 3c. Carry out a further call for sites; or
- 3d. None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify).

Table 3 Responses to Question 3

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondents
A	3	Ramblers Association/Wilton Settled Estate/Viridor Waste Management Ltd
B	0	
C	0	
D	5	MEAS/MJM Strategies/Joint Cheshire Planning Unit/National Trust/GMWDA

2.14 A total of eight responses to Question 3 were received. The most favoured approach was Option D, this was closely followed by Option A . The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- The additional sites submitted by industry could contribute towards meeting the capacity gap, but it is not clear exactly what capacity these sites have available and how suitable they are in terms of the plan’s objectives or national and regional planning policies.
- There are very limited options to allocate further sites but ways will need to be found to deal with the remaining non-hazardous waste. It is not clear whether there is suitable capacity in neighbouring areas or whether this has been explored. In addition, you will be aware that ‘Planning for Sustainable Waste Management: A companion guide to PPS10’ indicates that the limited alteration

2 Responses to Issues

to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific identified need for a waste management facility can be considered in exceptional circumstances.

- An approach which combines all options, together with identifying which sites would come available if one or more of the exclusionary criteria were relaxed may be appropriate.
- If meeting this capacity gap is still an issue, can former sites be 'landfill mined' as this has already taken place to a small extent in Greater Manchester.
- Extensions to existing sites can take advantage of existing infrastructure and treatment facilities which is economically and environmentally advantageous.
- It is considered that a phased approach should be adopted pursuing the identified Options for meeting the capacity gap for non hazardous waste in the following order: Option A (explore extensions to existing sites), C (carry out a further call for sites), B (identify new sites) .

Sustainability Appraisal

2.15 Option A has a positive impact on many of the economic related SA objectives as it will help to boost the waste sector of Greater Manchester and could potentially create additional job opportunities. This option demonstrates the sustainable management of existing sites as no new sites would be required for non-hazardous waste disposal. However, this option is likely to have a negative cumulative impact on the local environmental quality and this must be taken into consideration when deciding upon which sites to extend. Both Options B and C introduce the potential development of new sites within the Greater Manchester area. Both are likely to have a significant positive impact on developing the waste sector within Greater Manchester and generating additional employment opportunities. An increase in the amount of sites available within Greater Manchester for non-hazardous waste disposal also has the advantage of increasing the accessibility of this service throughout the area. There is the possibility that the identification of further sites in Option C could lead to an oversupply of non-hazardous waste disposal facilities.

2.16 All of the options within this issue have a negative impact on a number of environmental related SA objectives. This includes the local environmental quality, air quality and the protection of land and soil. As methane gas will be emitted during decomposition, none of the above options will help to mitigate against the impacts of climate change. However it is recognised that landfill for residual waste is required therefore Option B is considered the more sustainable Option. Option D is at present impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

2.17 It is proposed that Option D is taken forward, which would reflect the responses received through consultation which suggest the JWDPD continues to rely on existing non hazardous waste disposal sites until capacity is no longer available and where possible allocate new sites in line with Options A and B. This is supported by the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal. As this approach is still likely to result in an under provision of sites for non hazardous waste disposal, it is also proposed that

Responses to Issues

this option be supported by criteria based policies against which applications for future non hazardous waste disposal sites can be assessed. This will be explored through development of Preferred Options.

2.18 A further 'call for sites' will not be undertaken under this option, however, in accordance with the statutory process for preparing development plan documents, landowners, site operators etc can bring forward additional sites for consideration until Submission stage of plan preparation

Allocation of Sites/Areas for Residual Waste Disposal

Question 4

2.19 How can the JWDPD best ensure that residual waste disposal is directed towards the most appropriate locations within Greater Manchester?

Option JWDPD 4

4a. Allocate specific sites for residual waste disposal; or

4b. 'Identify areas of search' ⁽¹⁾ for provision of residual waste disposal facilities, together with a set of criteria to guide the identification/selection of sites within those areas; or

4c. Do not allocate any sites or areas and rely instead on criteria based policies against which planning applications for the provision of residual waste disposal facilities will be assessed; or

4d. A combination of the above (please specify which combination); or

4e. None of the above and consider an alternative (please specify)

Table 4 Responses to Question 4

Option Choice	Outcome	Respondents
A	1	Lancashire County Council

1 For the purposes of this consultation an 'Area of Search' can be defined as a broad area of land with the potential to accommodate some aspect of waste disposal. No specific operational boundary is identified, usually such areas are described rather than mapped and any maps are to be considered indicative. The purpose of identifying such areas is to direct developers away from areas not suitable for residual waste disposal and towards areas considered more suitable. This also has benefits to the local community as it provides an understanding of where residual waste disposal could be located in future.

2 Responses to Issues

Option Choice	Outcome	Respondents
B	0	
C	3	2 x Individuals/ Ramblers Association
D	5	MEAS/Wilton Settled Estate/ MJM Strategies/ Viridor Waste Management Ltd/ National Trust
E	1	GMWDA

2.20 A total of ten responses to Question 4 were received. The most favoured approach was Option D, which is a combination approach based on Options A, B and C. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- Several respondents supported the approach set out under Option C, which sets out not allocating any sites or areas and rely instead on criteria based policies against which planning applications for the provision of residual waste disposal facilities will be assessed.
- A number of respondents suggested that the allocation of specific sites should be carried out as an initial and key measure in securing sites, but this should be supported by the identification of either areas of search or criteria based policies to ensure that where sites are not currently available the potential to bring forward additional sites is recognised.
- Extensions to existing sites should include both vertical and lateral extensions thereby utilising existing infrastructure.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.21 Option A performed particularly well against many of the SA objectives as it offers certainty in terms of where residual waste disposal sites will be located. This can be used to ensure that sites are chosen that have minimal impact on the environmental SA objectives and would help to support the development of the waste sector. In contrast, both Options B and C offer less certainty in terms of where residual waste disposal sites could be located. This leads to difficulties in ensuring the SA objectives are met. However, Option C does offer the opportunity to use criteria based policies that will help to deliver residual waste disposal sites in the most suitable locations.

2.22 Option D (a combination of Options A, B and C) is considered to be the more sustainable Option for Policy Option 4. This would consist of a combination of Options A and C as these have a number of positive impacts on the SA objectives. This Option offers the certainty of site specific allocations and also the potential for windfall sites to arise through the criteria-based policies. In order for waste to be managed sustainably through the criteria-based policies, there is a need to provide a flexible set of policies that enable an assessment of suitability for different types of waste facilities. Option E was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Responses to Issues

Response

2.23 It is proposed that Option D (a combination of Options A, B and C) is taken forward, which would reflect the responses received through consultation, suggesting a combination of options leading to the allocation of specific sites for residual waste disposal where possible. This is supported by the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal. As sites for residual waste disposal are required in the future, the site search process along with the call for sites exercise has shown that availability of these sites is limited within Greater Manchester. Therefore it is also proposed that in addition to Option D, a criteria based policy be developed, against which planning applications for residual waste disposal sites can be assessed. This approach will be explored through the development of Preferred Options.

Level of Provision

Question 5

2.24 What level of residual waste provision should the JWDPD plan for?

Option JWDPD 5

5a. The level of capacity requirement identified in Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment, which assumes that recycling and recovery will be maximised; or

5b. The level of capacity requirement identified in Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment, plus an additional allowance should recycling and recovery targets envisaged in Scenario 2 not be met (this option would need to be accompanied by policies on phasing of release of sites so as not to result in over provision); or

5c. None of the above and identify an alternative (please specify)

Table 5 Responses to Question 5

Option Choice	Outcome	Respondents
A	5	MEAS/Lancashire County Council/ Cheshire Joint Planning Unit/ National Trust/ GMWDA
B	3	Ramblers Association/ The Wilton Settled Estate/ Viridor Waste Management Ltd
C	0	

2.25 A total of eight responses to Question 5 were received. The most favoured approach was Option A, which suggests that in relation to residual waste the JWDPD should plan for the capacity requirement set out within Scenario 2 of the Needs

2 Responses to Issues

Assessment. This was closely followed by Option B which plan for level of capacity required under Scenario 2, but with additional capacity. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- It would seem to be reasonable to plan for the capacity requirement identified in Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment provided that there is evidence that the recycling and recovery rates that inform this scenario are deliverable. It will be necessary, though, to indicate how further requirements would be dealt with if the recycling and recovery targets envisaged in this scenario are not achieved.
- Although reduction in landfill inputs are seen to be taking place it is important to allow for capacity in case of an increase in waste arisings resulting in greater volumes overall.
- Phasing of sites is very important as it would help to address the issue of over provision of waste management facilities at the bottom of the waste hierarchy, which may act as a disincentive to recycling and other sustainable waste management facilities
- It should be assumed that recycling and recovery will be maximised, as this will act as a driver to achieving targets and the aims of the waste hierarchy, if a short-term need arises then available capacity outside the area should be considered. This approach will act as a driver to attaining targets, and it is better to use rail-linked sites outside the area than use less suitable sites within the area.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.26 Options A and B perform well against the economic SA objectives as they will both help to support the development of the waste sector within the sub-region. However, Option B will have a negative impact on developing the regions image as an indication that an over provision of residual waste disposal facilities could potentially display a negative attitude towards meeting recycling targets within the sub region. Option B is less sustainable than Option A when compared to the environmental related SA objectives. This can be attributed to the additional negative impacts that additional residual waste disposal sites are likely to have on the environment. There is also a risk that the selection of Option B will not assist in the promotion of achieving recycling targets although the purpose of phasing sites is to reduce the risk of this option been a disincentive to recycling. Option A is considered to be the most sustainable option as it will help to demonstrate a commitment form the Greater Manchester local authorities to meeting recycling targets. In addition, the option has less of an impact on the environmental objectives, although site selection will be important to consider, to ensure that the impact on the environment is mitigated. Option C was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives were unknown.

Response

2.27 It is proposed that Option A is taken forward, which is the provision of residual waste sites in line with the capacity requirements identified in Scenario 2 of the Needs Assessment, which assumes that recycling and recovery will be maximised. This

Responses to Issues

approach will be explored through the development of Preferred Options. This approach is consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal and was supported by the majority of respondents

Locational Requirements for Residual Waste Disposal

Question 6

2.28 Are there any other categories of land that you think would be appropriate to consider in generating a long list of potential sites? (Please state reasons).

Table 6 Responses to Question 6

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Yes	3	English Heritage/ Viridor Waste Management Ltd/ GMWDA
No	1	Cheshire Joint Planning Unit

2.29 A total of four responses to Question 6 were received. The majority of respondents stated they would like additional categories of land to be considered when generating a long list of potential sites. See Question 7 for the detailed response.

Question 7

2.30 If so, what categories of land would you like to see included? (Please specify or give reasons for their inclusion).

Table 7 Responses to Question 7

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Additional categories of land suggested	3	GMWDA/Viridor Waste Management Ltd/ English Heritage

2.31 A total of three responses to Question 7 were received. The following list contains all suggested categories of land:

- Waste disposal should be considered acceptable within the Green Belt particularly where it may be linked to the extraction of minerals and, therefore, is an acceptable means by which to restore an area.
- Existing or worked out quarries are included, however the potential for such quarries to supply local building and roofing stone (as heritage quarries) should not be overlooked, this should be assessed and any potential not sterilised.
- Explore potential for extending existing landfill sites or older 'capped' landfill sites for landraise opportunities;
- Sites where there is a landscaping need for leisure facilities e.g. ski slopes.

2 Responses to Issues

Comments

2.32 The issues raised above have already been considered and assessed during the development of the Report, the following commentary explains the approach taken.

2.33 Green Belt comprises up to 60% of some Greater Manchester Authorities land area. Much of the remaining land is urban in nature and there are very few pockets of land which are neither Green Belt nor urban area. The urban area is a constraint when identifying potential non hazardous landfill/landraise. National Planning Policy Guidance 2 states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. In light of these two points it has been necessary to consider sites within the Green Belt for potential inclusion in the final JWDPD, but it is not appropriate to simply include all land designated as Green Belt across Greater Manchester within the initial site search process.

2.34 Although existing and worked out quarries are included within the inclusionary criteria, it is recognised that these sites could only be used as residual waste disposal sites following the extraction of all viable mineral resources, which would avoid sterilisation of any mineral resource. This is in line with National Mineral Planning Statement 1 which sets out national planning policy for minerals including a requirement to avoid unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources.

2.35 The site search process included both a 'call for sites' along with close communication with industry, landowners and local authorities, sites with potential for restoration through residual waste disposal can only be considered if brought forward through these routes. Additional consultation is planned through out the next stages of plan preparation, should additional sites be brought forward for any type of residual waste use they will be assessed and considered in line with the methodology used to consider all sites.

Response

2.36 As the additional categories of land have already been considered, as set out above, there is no need to reconsider this land at the present time. As Core Strategies and other key land use documents emerge across Greater Manchester it will be necessary to continue to monitor the availability of land that may be appropriate for the future development of residual waste disposal.

Question 8 and 9

2.37 Do you agree with the above exclusionary criteria ? And if so, do you think any other criteria should be taken into consideration?

Responses to Issues

Table 8 Responses to Question 8 and 9

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Yes	7	MEAS/Lancashire County Council/MJM Strategies/ English Heritage/Viridor Waste Management Ltd/ Natural England/ Environment Agency/The Wilton Settled Estate/ Cheshire Joint Planning Unit/
No	7	Individual x 2/ Ramblers Association/ National Trust/ GMWDA

2.38 A total of fourteen responses to Question 8 and Question 9 were received. The following observations represent a summary of the comments received suggesting additional criteria for consideration:

- Landfill development does not need to be excluded from SPZ II, only SPZ I and sites over major aquifers;
- Provided a landfill site passes certain tests it can be located in flood risk zone 3a , so it is not necessary to treat the whole of this zone as an absolute exclusion area;
- It may be necessary to include exclusionary buffers around criteria such as conservation areas, SSSIs, etc. to reflect impact on visual amenity or similar;
- Sites smaller than 5 hectares may be appropriate for inert waste and should not be excluded;
- National parks have waste they generate and need to dispose of and should therefore not be excluded from consideration;
- Sensitive human receptors need to be included but better defined;
- The presence of Agricultural Land Grade 1 and 2 on a large site may not rule out the development of a landfill, and Grade 3a should not be considered an exclusionary criteria at all;
- The exclusionary criteria include a range of heritage assets, however it is also important that the setting for these assets is also included and this should be added to the criterion;
- The 250m buffer to houses etc should be reduced from 250m to 150m taken from the actual edge of an active landfill cell to the nearest property. If this is buffer is measured by the distance between the edge of a site and any sensitive receptor, then 150m is more than adequate which then does not pose a risk of sterilising potential available airspace;
- Exclusionary criteria should also include known habitats of protected species and/or Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitat to add a local dimension;
- The exclusionary criteria should ensure a fair distribution of landfill sites across Greater Manchester;
- National Nature Reserves and Country Parks should be added to the list of exclusionary criteria;

2 Responses to Issues

- The settings of nationally important assets (National Parks, SACs, SPAs, SSSIs, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, and SAMs) should be added to the exclusionary criteria, together with a note that the impacts upon the settings of other designated assets will require careful consideration on a case by case basis;
- Tourist attractions and their surroundings should be added to the exclusionary criteria;
- The exclusionary criteria should include avoidance of land raise in low-lying areas, or where it will have a detrimental visual impact on a significant number of residents.

Comments

2.39 National Parks, as planning authorities in their own right, prepare plans and policies for the land within their administrative boundaries. Although the Peak District National Park undoubtedly produces waste requiring management and disposal, the plans policies and site allocations within the final adopted JWDPD will not have any legal bearing on the land within the Peak District National Park. However we will work closely with neighbouring authorities during development of the JWDPD to ensure consideration of all cross boundary issues.

2.40 The comments and additional exclusionary criteria suggested by respondents will be considered during the development of Preferred Options and where appropriate they will be used to further refine the long list of sites, if they have not already been used so far. However it is important to note that a number of those suggested are likely to be considered for mitigation or final boundary placement rather than used to exclude sites altogether, such as local biodiversity/geodiversity designations, local green spaces, tourist attractions and the setting of heritage designations.

2.41 Due to the specific technical requirements of a landfill, including geology and hydrology, and the range of constraints (as shown within the maps contained within the Stage Two Issues and Options Residual Waste Disposal consultation report after page 37) the importance of ensuring an equal distribution of sites for residual waste disposal across Greater Manchester is less of a consideration.

Response

2.42 The comments and additional exclusionary criteria suggested by respondents will be considered during the development of Preferred Options and where appropriate they will be used to further refine the long list of sites, if they have not already been used so far. However it is important to note that a number of those suggested are likely to be considered for mitigation or final boundary placement rather than used to exclude sites altogether, such as local biodiversity/geodiversity designations, local green spaces, tourist attractions and the setting of heritage designations.

Responses to Issues

Potential Sites for Residual Waste Disposal

Question 10

2.43 Do you think that the sites put forward as part of the 'call for sites' exercise referred to above should be allocated for residual waste disposal in the JWDPD? (Please state the reasons why you do or do not consider them to be acceptable)

Table 9 Responses to Question 10

Response received	Outcome
Support for sites brought forward through the 'call for sites' process	1
Representation against sites brought forward through 'call for sites process	2233

2.44 A total of 2234 responses to Question 10 were received, the following represents a summary of the issues raised regarding each specific site:

Table 10 Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Coal Pit Lane, Oldham

Key Issue Raised	Commentary
The allocation of a landfill in this location is likely to result in increased levels of dust, noise, birds, flies and other vermin	Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have resulted in the site falling within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues will need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies in the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage.
Leachate from the site is likely to pollute the rivers and other local water bodies around the site	Leachate is a recognised issue with landfill developments, therefore it is an area which is subject to environmental permitting regulations. Consequently this issue would be considered at the planning application stage to mitigate any adverse impacts occurring if this was a recognised concern for this development.
Medlock Valley/ Medlock Valley Country Park and Daisy Nook Country Park will be damaged and recreational uses will be affected	The proposals considered at this site included the restoration of land previously used for mining operations which would utilise residual inert waste. Therefore the proposals may have the potential to bring long term benefit to the

2 Responses to Issues

Key Issue Raised	Commentary
	Country Park areas identified although this would need to be tested and any potential negative impacts would need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage.
Proposals are likely to cause detrimental impact on wildlife and flora, a large variety of birds have been sighted in the proposed area (some red listed)	Natural England have confirmed that the potential development of a residual waste disposal facility will not impact directly on land designated for wildlife or landscape value in this area.
Inappropriate development in Green Belt	<p>Green Belt comprises up 47% of Oldhams land area. Government guidance on Green Belt is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2:Green Belts. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances,such as uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of land in it.</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 10 suggests that the locational needs of some types of waste management facilities, together with the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management, are material considerations that should be given significant weight when determining whether proposals for waste development within the Green Belt should be given planning permission.</p>
Increased traffic visiting the site is likely to have a detrimental impact on road safety	Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have resulted in the site being within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage.
The proposed site is in close proximity to housing, busy roads and golf courses and local	Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have

Responses to Issues

Key Issue Raised	Commentary
<p>schools and also may have a detrimental impact on the health of local residents</p>	<p>resulted in the site being within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Proposals are likely to have detrimental visual impacts on the local area</p>	<p>Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have resulted in the site being within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Economic impacts of the proposal have been overlooked, the reputation of Limeside and Bardsley would be tarnished further and local businesses will suffer.</p>	<p>Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have resulted in the site being within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Gas produced by the breakdown of wastes will migrate towards properties</p>	<p>As the site is being considered for use for the disposal of residual inert waste only, it is not anticipated that landfill gases will be produced.</p>
<p>In addition to helping to address the capacity gap for inert waste in the area the proposals are intended to remediate a currently despoiled area of land and bring it back into a productive after-use, compatible with the Green Belt. The development will provide a number of benefits to the local area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The remediation of an old colliery site, which is currently waste land. • The removal of an existing colliery spoil tip. Treatment of a number of old mine shafts lying within the site. 	<p>The land encompassed by the current site boundary may not be suitable for importation of inert waste, this is supported by the objections outlined within this table.</p>

2 Responses to Issues

Key Issue Raised	Commentary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of an improved restoration of a previously tipped area. • Provide a basis for effective ongoing management of the site and control over unauthorised access and use. • It is considered that the proposals will be of long term benefit to the local area and will provide an improvement to the local environment. 	

Response

2.45 In light of the volume and nature of responses received and the planning reasons for objection raised by the Local Planning Authority, it is proposed that this site be removed from further consideration for use as a residual waste disposal site as part of the JWDPD.

Vicars Hall Lane, Salford

Table 11 Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Vicars Hall Lane, Salford

Key Issues Raised	Commentary
The allocation of a landfill in this location would cause damage to wildlife and flora and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in the vicinity of site would be adversely affected.	Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have resulted in the site being within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage. Potential impacts on the SSSI at Astley Moss (also known as the Manchester Mosses which is an SAC) have been raised by Natural England and will need to be considered through the Habitats Regulations Assessment. This site will be subject to further assessment as part of the development of Preferred Options.
Inappropriate development in Green Belt	Green Belt comprises up 35% of Salford's land area. Government guidance on Green Belt is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts. There is a general

Responses to Issues

Key Issues Raised	Commentary
	<p>presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances, such as uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of land in it. As there is no void / previous extraction on this site, residual waste disposal in this location are likely to constitute a landraise operation which may not be considered appropriate within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 10 suggests that the locational needs of some types of waste management facilities, together with the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management, are material considerations that should be given significant weight when determining whether proposals for waste development within the Green Belt should be given planning permission.</p>
<p>Increased volume of traffic would cause congestion and hazards</p>	<p>These proposals would not necessarily result in additional traffic rather the existing levels of traffic would be maintained for a longer period of time. Access to this site is likely to be gained through the existing approved access for the Whitehead landfill. However a traffic impact assessment will be required as part of a planning application at this site. Impacts on the environment have been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and any cumulative impacts on the environment from other developments close to the site will be taken into account at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Inert waste should be recycled, not landfilled.</p>	<p>The JWDPD will be a resource-recovery led document, looking to manage waste more sustainably and moving towards the top of the waste hierarchy. This means that disposal is the last resort for waste, following waste prevention, reuse, recycling and energy recovery. Although the disposal of inert waste is a last resort, the JWDPD will still need to make provision for this waste stream.</p>
<p>If Salford Forest Park is built near-by, this will add to damage to natural environment</p>	<p>Impacts upon the environment, the economy and society are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. These impacts have resulted in the site being within Sustainability Appraisal Band C, which recognises that issues need to be resolved or mitigated against through policies of the JWDPD and/or at the planning application stage. Such issues will be assessed further as part of the development of Preferred Options.</p>

2 Responses to Issues

Key Issues Raised	Commentary
New contours created by the importation of waste will be out of place with existing land form.	No detailed contours have been provided at this stage but such detail will need to be provided as part of a planning application for development at this site. This is when a judgement will be made on the impacts of the detailed proposal upon the landscape.
The site is only suitable for inert waste disposal	The landowner has indicated that they would not want to exclude the consideration of non hazardous waste disposal at this site. The sustainability appraisal of the site considered that it was suitable for inert waste disposal only, as it lies over a major aquifer. A number of consultees, operators and other waste planning authorities commented through the consultation process that the site's location over a major aquifer does not necessarily mean that it is unsuitable for the disposal of non hazardous waste. Whilst this may be the case, the Environment Agency have however confirmed through their response to the consultation that this site would only be suitable for the disposal of inert waste as it lies within a source protection zone.

Response

2.46 In light of the volume and nature of responses received through the consultation it is proposed that the inclusion of this site within the JWDPD is subject to reassessment. Additional appraisal of the issues raised within Table 11 'Summary of consultation responses and commentary for Vicars Hall Lane, Salford' and further consultation with the land owner, the Environment Agency and potential operators would enable a more detailed understanding of the site and possible operations. The site will also reappraised through the Sustainability Appraisal 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.

Highmoor Quarry, Oldham

2.47 Following the consultation process, the land owner and site operator have requested that this site be removed from further consideration for use as a residual waste disposal site as part of the JWDPD.

Response

2.48 This site will cease to be considered and will not be subject to further consideration unless information is received which advises otherwise.

Responses to Issues

Question 11

2.49 Do you know of any other sites that should be considered as part of the JWDPD? (Please give details)

Table 12 Responses to Question 11

Response received	Respondents
Additional sites suggested by respondents	The Wilton Settled Estate/ Viridor Waste Management Ltd

2.50 A total of two responses to Question 11 were received, these included the suggestion of the following additional sites/areas for consideration:

- Approximately 145 hectares of land to the immediate south of the existing Pilsworth South Quarry;
- Existing landfill facilities at Whitehead (Wigan), Pilsworth North and Pilsworth South (Bury) offer considerable potential for both vertical and lateral extensions. The capacity shortfall of 9.0M tonnes could be accommodated at Whitehead (circa.3.0M tonnes) and at Pilsworth South (circa. 6.0M tonnes) over the plan period 2010 to 2025. Also land exists adjacent these sites that needs further consideration as potential lateral landfill extension areas. In the case of Pilsworth South additional capacity could be provided for hazardous wastes such as asbestos.

Response

2.51 The additional sites suggested for consideration will be assessed in line with the process adopted for all sites, including the desk based appraisal, site visit and Sustainability Appraisal prior to a period of public consultation. Following this the information will be used to refine the list of sites/areas further and to produce a list of preferred sites/areas which to be included within the Preferred Options Report. This list will be generated with consideration of the specific issues raised through the Issues and Options consultation stages and clear reasoning will be given for the inclusion or exclusion of specific sites

Question 12

2.52 Do you have any information on whether or not these sites could make an additional contribution to meeting the capacity gap for residual waste disposal? (Please give details)

2 Responses to Issues

Table 13 Responses to Question 12

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Additional information supplied	2	Lancashire County Council/ The Wilton Settled Estate

2.53 A total of two responses to Question 12 were received, the following represents a summary of the comments received:

- Any quarry site that has a low level restoration requirement obviously has the potential to be restored at a higher level thus taking more waste and this possibility should be pursued with the operator/owner;
- Development of available land adjacent to Pilsworth South would provide further capacity in respect of hazardous, non-hazardous and inert waste in the region; and

Response

2.54 The comments suggested by respondents will be considered during the development of Preferred Options and where appropriate they will be used to further refine the long list of sites, if they have not already been used so far. The additional site referred to will be considered in line with the recommendation for Question 11.

Question 13

2.55 Do you have any information on whether or not the sites in the 'inert' list above could be considered for disposal of non-hazardous residual waste? (Please give details)

Table 14 Responses to Question 13

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Additional information supplied	2	GMWDA/ Stockport MBC

2.56 Two responses to Question 13 were received, as set out below:

- Sites already permitted to accept inert wastes are unlikely to be brought forward to accept non-hazardous waste;
- Offerton Sand and Gravel is not appropriate for the disposal of non hazardous wastes as the site is affected by several planning and licensing constraints, it also lies within a protected alignment for a major road scheme.

Response

2.57 As supported by the comment above, waste disposal sites currently permitted to accept inert wastes will not usually be able to accept any other waste types. As no additional information has been submitted it is not proposed to consider existing

Responses to Issues

inert waste disposal sites to accept non hazardous wastes as part of the JWDPD. Whilst this may be the case, any proposed amendment to an existing operation and the waste types to be accepted would be subject to the planning and environmental permitting regimes.

Options for the Distribution of Sites

Question 14

2.58 In Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities we asked if you knew of any other rail sidings that may be appropriate for transferring waste to the railway network. We would now like to ask this question specifically in relation to Residual Waste Disposal. Therefore, if you know of any rail sidings that may be appropriate for transferring waste to the railway network in relation to Residual Waste Disposal, please give details.

Table 15 Responses to Question 14

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
Additional information relating to rail linkages	2	GMWDA/ MEAS

2.59 A total of two responses to Question 14 were received, the following represents a summary of the comments received:

- Greater Manchester Waste Ltd has four rail-linked residual waste treatment sites, which are suitable for transporting waste via the rail network.

Response

2.60 During the development of the JWDPD, sustainable transport links relating to rail sidings were explored. However, there are only limited commercial rail freight sidings capable of handling large volumes of waste in Greater Manchester. Any new sidings will require major financial investment and infrastructure development which is outside of the remit of the JWDPD.

2.61 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 residual waste disposal facilities across Greater Manchester.

Question 15

2.62 Which of the following options offers the best approach when identifying the spatial distribution of residual waste disposal sites? (Please give reasons)

2 Responses to Issues

Option JWDPD 6

- 6a. Option 1: Transport Nodes; or
- 6b. Option 2: Growth Areas; or
- 6c. Option 3: Clusters; or
- 6d. A combination of Option 1, Option 2 and Option 3 (Please specify); or
- 6e. Consider and alternative approach to the above options (Please specify).

Table 16 Responses to Question 15

Option Choice	Supporters	Respondents
A	1	Viridor Waste Management Ltd
B	0	
C	1	The Wilton Settled Estate
D	0	
E	6	MEAS/ Lancashire County Council/ Ramblers Association/ National Trust/ Cheshire Joint Planning Unit/ GMWDA

2.63 A total of eight responses to Question 15 were received. The following observations represent a summary of the comments recieved.

- In view of the economic downturn B may not be appropriate as growth is hard to predict at the moment;
- The distribution of landfill sites will be dictated by availability of void space, either existing or capable of being created rather than the spatial options;
- The approach to spatial options will be influenced by the previous option which suggests that a decision is yet to be made between site allocations and use of land use criteria
- Transport nodes should be given a very high priority since residual waste sites typically deal with a very large number of vehicle movements. Following transport, clusters should be considered as such areas are more likely to be suitable for the siting of waste facilities, providing that the cumulative pollution impacts are not too high.
- Growth areas are less important for landfill residual waste treatment as there are likely to be few facilities serving large areas. In many cases landfill will be a secondary residual waste treatment so geographical spread will be less important as the waste will already be bulked, and the volume reduced.

Responses to Issues

Sustainability Appraisal

2.64 Out of the Options A to C above, Option A (Transport Nodes) is the most sustainable and Option B (Growth Areas) is the least sustainable when considered alongside the SA objectives. However, the most appropriate way forward is to combine Options A to C and take the most sustainable elements of all of them in an attempt to create a comprehensive Preferred Option that is more sustainable for the inclusion of all three Options (i.e. Option D).

2.65 In an area as constrained as Greater Manchester, the opportunities for residual waste disposal sites will be limited. This is why only three sites have been short listed in the site appraisal exercise and none of these three are ideal for residual waste disposal. Therefore, if provision for residual waste disposal is to be provided within Greater Manchester, there may not be significant scope to consider the strategic and spatial distribution of such sites. However, it is interesting to note that two of the three short listed sites are extensions to existing landfill and the third has a history of use as landfill. This suggests that Option 3: Clusters may be the most realistic option for residual waste disposal. Option E was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives were unknown

Response

2.66 As discussed within the Residual Waste Disposal report and highlighted by the sustainability appraisal commentary (see above) the constraints across Greater Manchester make it difficult to identify residual waste disposal sites. The approach to the spatial distribution of residual waste disposal sites should be broadened to incorporate all three considerations, together with other criteria. This approach is consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal and will be explored further through the development of the Preferred Options.

Development Management policies for landfill and land raise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare

Question 16

2.67 Should the JWDPD include specific Development Management policies relating to landfill and landraise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare?

Table 17 Responses to Question 16

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
JWDPD should include Development Management policies	8	MEAS/Ramblers Association/ The Wilton Settled Estate/ Environment Agency/ National Trust/ Natural

2 Responses to Issues

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
		England/GONW/Cheshire Joint Planning Unit

2.68 A total of eight responses to Question 16 were received. All those who responded said that the JWDPD should include specific Development Management policies relating to landfill/landraise issues. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- The scope of such policies should be developed through consultation with district Planning Officers to establish what will already be covered by generic policies in other LDDs.
- It would be particularly beneficial to have a specific policy for the restoration and aftercare of landfill/landraise that maximised potential benefits in terms of landscape and townscape character and quality, biodiversity (sites and species), geodiversity, habitat, recreation and access to green space and the countryside.
- Ensure proposals achieve balance in terms of biodiversity through preparation of an evidence base of existing biodiversity in the proposed area.
- Consider a review of existing restoration schemes to ensure they meet high standards.
- Useful information on best practise can be found at www.afterminerals.com.
- Policies should be of sufficient detail to give certainty to developers and the local population.

Response

Specific Development Management policies relating to landfill and landraise (including extensions), landfill mining, ancillary developments and restoration and aftercare will be developed for inclusion in the Preferred Options. These will reflect, as far as possible, the consultation responses set out above.

Question 17

2.69 [Following on from Question 16] If so, which of the policy options provides the best approach?

Option JWDPD 7

7a. Develop policies in line with the results of the 'Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities' consultation

7b. Do not develop specific residual waste disposal policies, relying on national, regional and Local Development Plan Documents

7c. None of the above and consider an alternative (Please specify)

Responses to Issues

Table 18 Responses to Question 17

Option Choice	Outcome	Respondents
A	6	Environment Agency/Viridor/Ramblers Association/National Trust/The Wilton Settled Estate/Natural England
B	0	
C	0	

2.70 A total of six responses to Question 17 were received, in addition to these GONW and Cheshire Joint Planning Unit responded to say that the JWDPD should include specific Development Management policies and did not indicate a preferred approach. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- Consider specific types of ancillary that would be acceptable at or on former landfill sites; PPS 10 supports the co-location of waste management facilities.
- Need to cover specific landfill/landraise issues, in particular landfill gas potential and restoration.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.71 Option A is likely to ensure that residual waste disposal facilities are developed in locations that will help to achieve many of the SA objectives. As the policies will be specific to residual waste disposal, the most appropriate sites will be selected for the development of residual waste disposal facilities. This will ensure that waste is managed in the most sustainable manner. Option B does not score as well as Option A on many of the SA objectives. However, Option B performs well on the economic related SA objectives, particularly on developing and marketing the regions image. Although Option B will provide a broader range of policies when deciding on residual waste disposal sites, it will be difficult to ensure that all the SA objectives are achieved. Option C was considered impossible to appraise as potential alternatives are at present unknown.

Response

It is proposed that Option A is taken forward, which is that Development Management policies should be developed in line with the results of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation. These policies will supplement those developed for built facilities to ensure specific landfill/landraise issues, e.g. restoration, ancillary development, etc are addressed. This approach is consistent with the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal and the responses recieved through consultation, and will be explored further through the development of the Preferred Options.

2 Responses to Issues

Question 18

2.72 Do you agree with the proposed monitoring methodology for residual waste disposal set out above?

Are there any other indicators or measurable, achievable targets which need to be considered? (please specify)

Table 19 Responses to Question 18

Response received	Outcome	Respondents
No additional comments on monitoring methodology	2	The Wilton Settled Estate/ National Trust
Additional comments on monitoring methodology	7	MEAS/ Ramblers Association/ Lancashire County Council/ MJM Strategies/ Cheshire Joint Planning Unit/ Environment Agency/ Natural England

2.73 A total of nine responses to Question 18 were received. The following observations represent a summary of the comments:

- Landscape character and quality, and recreation opportunities should also be considered through the monitoring methodology;
- Linkages with the objectives of the GM Biodiversity Action Plan would be better than simply monitoring 'biodiversity increases' of restoration schemes;
- The National Indicator series and other core output indicators may be the best way of monitoring the implementation of the JWDPD
- Monitoring of landfill provision and uptake of sites through the JWDPD should only be through monitoring of the amount of void space applied for, granted permission and/or refused, against requirement.

Response

2.74 The monitoring methodology will be amended to include reference to the targets of Biodiversity Action Plans and Landscape Character Assessments and appropriate targets will be developed for inclusion within the Preferred Options.

Next Steps

3 Next Steps

3 Next Steps

3.1 The results of the Stage Two Issues & Options: Residual Waste Disposal 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 and also the outcomes of the Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities consultation and used to inform the preparation of Preferred Options for the JWDPD.