



PARTIAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL  
SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS) –

Consultation on the Draft Options: Waste  
June – July 2008

(Responses by Organisation)

## **North West Regional Assembly**

### **PARTIAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS) –**

Consultation on the Draft Options: Waste

A consultation report from

#### **CAG Consultants**

in association with **Concept 4 Creative and Community Consultants**

April 2008

CAG CONSULTANTS  
Gordon House  
6 Lissenden Gardens  
London NW5 1LX  
Tel/fax 020 7482 8882  
hq@cagconsult.co.uk  
www.cagconsultants.co.uk

for direct enquiries about this report please contact:

Emma Cranidge  
Ewood House, Ewood Lane, Todmorden, OL14 7DF  
tel 01706 817347 or mob 07879 017617  
[ec@cagconsult.co.uk](mailto:ec@cagconsult.co.uk)

## WRG

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	No	See response to Option 2.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	Yes	PPS 10 notes in paragraph 3 that "regional planning bodies should provide a framework in which communities take responsibility for their own waste" which would suggest that a sub-regional approach to identifying treatment requirements should be taken. Paragraph 6 of PPS 10 notes that that an RSS should... 'comprise a distribution of waste tonnage requiring management, a pattern of waste management facilities of national regional or sub regional significance, and supporting policies'. Paragraph 11 goes on to explain that the RSS should identify... 'the waste management facilities required to satisfy any need and their distribution (our emphasis) across the region.' Based on this guidance WRG considers that it is necessary for the		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			<p>RSS to identify the number and type of facilities for each sub region. Therefore Option 2: Sub- Regional Approach is considered to be the appropriate approach. The purpose of regional policy is to provide clear guidance to the constituent authorities in drawing up their development plan documents. As part of this process it is important that clear instruction is provided on the number, scale and type of key facilities required in each sub region. Failure to do this would leave the sub-regions unclear as to the extent of the requirement to provide facilities within their areas, and would provide no clarity to stakeholders as to the waste management requirements in different parts of the region. Whilst both approaches intend to apportion waste arisings by sub region/waste planning authority area, it is important to translate this into a requirement for specific numbers and types of facilities in each sub/region. Some sub regions/authorities may be unable to accommodate sufficient facilities to deal with their waste arisings, eg urban areas may be unable to accommodate sufficient landfills for their residual waste arisings. It is therefore crucial that this issue is examined at a regional level as this may impose an additional burden on other sub-regions/authorities who may not be willing to accommodate facilities from other regions without an evidence based apportionment exercise such as that carried out in the South East and East of England Regions with regards to London's residual waste. It is only by setting out each sub-region's requirements at a regional level that this issue can be identified and resolved. It is considered to be a fundamental function of regional policy to undertake this allocation. The North West Region is a large and varied Region with a pronounced elongate north- south axis. To provide a single list of key waste management facilities that are required for the whole region would provide little in the way of clear instruction or guidance for individual sub-regions/authorities.</p>		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	In part	<p>The problems of forecasting waste arisings are well understood due to the changes in growth rates that are affected by the wider economy as well as by waste minimisation initiatives. PPS 10 suggests, in paragraph 6, that the RSS should look forward for a 15 to 20 year period and that annual monitoring and five yearly capacity reviews should be carried out. Paragraph 10 of PPS 10 cautions against "spurious precision" which can equally apply to temporal forecasts as it can to detailed annual forecasts. Accordingly, Waste Recycling Group considers that the longer term forecasts are unlikely to carry significant weight in making investment or planning decisions and suggests that a 15 year horizon is adequate for plan making purposes.</p>		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Keith Owen - SLR	On behalf of WRG	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Individual

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
	Individual	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
	Individual	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
	Individual	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
	Individual	Yes	Option 2 is the better option because a sub-regional/ waste planning authority approach makes communities responsible for their own waste, encourages recycling and is a more flexible approach.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
	Individual	-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
	Individual	<b>A) Delivery:</b> 1.Large scale facilities are more likely to discourage recycling as the first stage in the treatment of waste and there is the problem of alternatives when large facilities break down.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> In the past the need for landfill fhas been over-estimated. The situation is still changing because of landfill tax and the increase in scrap metal prices. There should not be a reliance on the accuracy of tables.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Land with peat should be excluded from waste proposals
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
	Individual	-	-	-	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
	Individual	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
	Individual	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Northwest Regional Development Agency

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	Yes	The Agency would support a regional approach to this issue. Option 1 would allow for the identification of broad locations for regionally significant waste management facilities, based on regional waste arisings apportioned by sub-region without being too prescriptive about where these should be placed within individual sub-regions. The detail would then be picked up in individual sub-region/WPA waste plans. Although Option 1 is presented as a regional approach, the identification of 'broad locations' within the region will, by necessity, identify locations within a sub-region or across sub-regional boundaries.		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	The waste management policy has implications for the RSS policies relating to energy from waste.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> This is a technical issue and the Agency does not have the evidence with which to comment.



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	Don't know	This is a technical issue and the Agency does not have the evidence with which to comment.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Countryside Properties

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	Yes	National policy would require policies to cover the period to 2031. The NWRA believes that projecting beyond 2026 would be less reliable.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Government Office of Northwest

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-			There appears to be the omission of the consideration of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste arisings as recommended by the Panel.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Halton Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	No	This option relies heavily on a top-down approach to waste planning. However it is not clear how regional facilities will be dealt with if Option Two is chosen. It is anticipated that some facilities, due to commercial requirements/costs in construction and operation, would need to serve the region to be economic.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	Yes	This option is most in keeping with current work to develop a sub-regional Joint Waste Development Plan Document for Greater Merseyside. In supporting this option we have concerns over how regional facilities will be dealt with. It is anticipated that some facilities, due to commercial requirements/costs in construction and operation, would need to serve the region to be economic.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough	No	This option uses predictions further ahead than we are comfortable with.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
	Council				

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Gibbs	Halton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## The National Trust

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	No			If waste arisings are being identified at sub-regional/waste planning authority area then it is appropriate to identify broad locations within each sub-region. This would also be consistent with the 'proximity principle' in terms of treating waste as close as possible to where it arises.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	Not possible to comment in the absence of the necessary evidence, i.e. first and foremost the final



Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
		Table 9.3 in RSS, and also the Jacobs report. Given the report was produced over 6 months ago but is not currently available it suggests that there should be an opportunity to comment upon this part of the evidence base prior to RSS Partial Review proposals being put forward (or if it is abandoned altogether for an alternative evidence base to be produced and consulted upon).

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:			
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Not known without the evidence base.			
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Not known without the evidence base.			
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Not known without the evidence base.			
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Not known without the evidence base.			
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Not known without the evidence base.			

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	Yes	Generally this is the preferred approach as it should ensure that each sub-region/waste planning authority takes responsibility for the treatment of waste arising in its area (it is noted that for certain more specialised wastes it may not be appropriate/economic for them to be treated in the same sub-region, and in some instances treatment outside the Region will be necessary/appropriate; however, for the vast majority of the commercial, industrial and domestic waste arisings it is appropriate for it to be treated comparatively locally).		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?			
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	Not possible to comment in the absence of the necessary evidence, i.e. first and foremost the final Table 9.3 in RSS, and also the Jacobs report. Given the report was produced over 6 months ago but is not currently available it suggests that there should be an opportunity to comment upon this part of the evidence base prior to RSS Partial Review proposals being put forward (or if it is abandoned altogether for an alternative evidence base to be produced and consulted upon).			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Not known without the evidence base.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Not known without the evidence base.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Not known without the evidence base.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Not known without the evidence base.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Not known without the evidence base.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	No	The confidence level associated with projections of arisings/recycling rates/reductions in packaging are such that beyond even 10-15 years it is doubtful how helpful forecasts will be, and they certainly will need to be revisited regularly in the future. It is highly doubtful that there is much, if any, value to be gained from trying to predict the need for waste treatment facilities post 2026.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	No specific comments.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Hubbard, Alan	The National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> No specific comments.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> No specific comments.

## Cumbria County Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	No			<p>Figures for the large Commercial and Industrial waste stream (C and I) have always caused problems. I am concerned that the impression is given that the commercial and industrial figures in the Proposed Changes are actual measured figures eg from statutory returns. They are estimates derived from the sample surveys commissioned by the North West Waste Planning Authorities with no correlation to the figures published by the Environment Agency, from its waste returns, for the amounts and types of management of these wastes. There are significant differences between the two sets of figures and I think a "health warning" needs to be included. I give examples of the differences below: C and I waste managed in Cumbria from EA 2002/3 722,275 tonnes; 2004/5 541,944 tonnes; draft RSS 750,000 tonnes/year; RSS proposed changes 849,000 tonnes/year. C and I waste landfilled in Cumbria from EA 2002/3 425,224 tonnes (59%) ; 2004/5 291,500 tonnes (54%).draft RSS 350,000 tonnes/year (47%); RSS proposed changes 224,000 tonnes/year (26%). Whilst such rapid diversion from landfill would be welcomed it is not clear how realistic the assumptions are. I also do not know why such a large increase in the total C and I waste has been assumed. At the EIP I argued that the assumption made in the draft RSS that there would be no change in the way these wastes are managed was unrealistic because of the strong drivers for change. I have the opposite concern now, that too rapid a pace of change is being assumed. The most important point is that business should not be constrained because inadequate provision has been made for managing these waste, this includes adequate landfill capacity. As I say above, I would like there to be a "health warning" about the figures and an explanation of the assumptions that are being made.</p>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Evans, Richard	Cumbria County	Further consideration needs to be given to radioactive waste management, particularly in the

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
G.	Council	context of nuclear decommissioning and the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely White Paper.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	No		See previous comment. I am not convinced that the RSS has the evidence base to identify broad locations at the sub-regional level. This is what Development Frameworks do.	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	No	I think there are enough difficulties in projecting forward 15 years with the rapid pace of change in waste management.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Evans, Richard G.	Cumbria County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
--------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	Yes	The initial view is that the second option provides potentially the closest fit with the emerging Joint Waste Development Plan Document currently in preparation by the Merseyside authorities. The main concern is that the evidence-base used for the RSS projections and apportionments, and the locational criteria, should be consistent with extensive work undertaken for the Waste DPD. Close liaison with the Regional Assembly on this will be essential.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alan Young	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## South Lakeland District Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans	Yes	This option would provide a 15-year projection of waste arising (until 2026) and would identify the number and types of facilities required for each sub-region. In essence this would examine the potential for sub-regions to		



Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
	Team		<p>provide for waste management facilities that address the waste arising within each sub region. We support this option on the basis that it conforms with the self sufficiency principle (which argues that each sub region should rely on its own waste management capacity rather than export waste elsewhere) and the proximity principle (which requires for the treatment and disposal of waste should be sited as close to the source of the waste as possible. A sub regional option would also have benefit in terms of implementation – and could directly relate to targets in the Cumbrian LAA, and the Cumbria Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. However, the target should take a regional perspective and be flexible enough to allow for a small number of proposals to manage waste from outside the sub-region where it can be demonstrated that the local, social and economic benefits outweigh other sustainability criteria. It should also take account of the fact that although net self-sufficiency in waste management is broadly desirable, it may not always be the case – dependent on the existing availability of waste management facilities and the catchment areas that they serve. For example, a facility could be located just across the Cumbrian border, and therefore we wouldn't want an approach that advocated further facilities within our sub region in a location served by existing facilities that are easily accessible just outside the region.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## The Ramblers Association

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	No	The Regional approach could lead to waste being transported over long distances, causing disruption to communities and wasting energy.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High	Yes	We think that the 15 year time horizon is more realistic than the 20 year period suggested in Option 3. Not only are the ways waste is dealt with evolving rapidly, but also the population increase due to immigration is hard		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
	Peak Area		to assess over a longer period than 15 years ( and indeed may need assessing sooner). Also, the location of the proposed eco-towns will affect the need for waste facilities. We prefer a sub-regional approach, encouraging new primary residual waste treatment capacity to be located within the waste Planning Authority area in which the waste arises, whilst recognising that secondary treatments will probably have to be located on a regional basis.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Existing established sites will hopefully already have sustainable infrastructure (ie rail or water, with minimum distance of road transport) and expansion of these should be looked at prior to establishing new sites. Where it is necessary to establish new sites, proximity to rail, or possibly canal, would favour choice of these sites. Another important factor in location of sites is whether there is the possibility of locating secondary facilities nearby, thus minimising the need to create new infrastructure to transport waste between primary and secondary treatment facilities.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> The facilities will need to be situated at a reasonable distance from residential properties to avoid odour nuisance. Also, measures need to be taken to avoid waste being blown outside the site. A buffer belt of trees would avoid intrusive visual impact. Facilities for rural areas obviously need to be built near the source of the arisings, but for urban areas where large amounts of waste are produced , eg Liverpool, Manchester, land on or near to industrial estates could be used, to minimise intrusion into greenfield sites and also to minimise the distance these large amounts of waste are transported.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Designated sites should be avoided. For all proposals, surveys for the pre-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		existing biological and botanical interest of the site should be carried out. If it is not possible to choose another site (should the proposed one prove to be of considerable biological/botanical interest) mitigation measures should be carried out. Extensive tree planting should be carried out on and around the site, so that the area is not downgraded in terms of its appeal to recreational walkers. Footpath diversion proposals, if necessary, should be put out for consultation early on in the decision-making process.
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	No		The 20 year period is too long.	

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Mrs Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association, Manchester and High Peak Area	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	In part	It is unlikely that a regional approach as described would provide the detailed strategic policy framework sufficient for sub-regional areas to plan for, or indeed for robust sub-regional apportionments of waste to be made at the regional level through the RSS. Specifically, it would be unlikely that such an approach would be able to identify broad locations on a geographical basis in the absence of a sub-regional analysis of the gaps in capacity. However, there are aspects of this approach that could be supported: The timeframe of 15 years to 2026 would provide the better certainty for plan-making, particularly given the enormous uncertainties that surround planning for waste, in terms of growth, its changing composition, the role and suitability of new and emerging technologies, the response of, and investment choices made by, the waste industry, emerging reprocessing markets and public perceptions etc. The focus more towards regionally (and presumably nationally) scale waste management facilities, presumably on the basis that sub-regional facilities, aligned with sub-regional planning areas, do not necessitate regional consideration.		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	Comments responding to these parts are common to all questions and are presented under Question 2. Section 1 The express recognition given to the "considerable debate" underway in relation to Jacobs' study is welcomed, and, as one who shares those concerns over its approach and its findings, the Authorities support the Assemblies intention to commission a new study in this regard. Similarly, the acknowledgement of errors in the published Proposed Changes relating to commercial and industrialwaste arisings is welcomed, and indeed it was the Authorities that first raised those concerns in response to the Proposed Changes to the RSS. The statement made that it is the intension to take as given for the Partial Review process the waste arisings figures that will feature in the final published RSS is a cause for some concern, given the uncertainties over the models and methods to predict those figures, the absence of any predictive work on the figures published for consultation in the Proposed Changes, and the need to establish, and consider the implications of, the framework of targets and actions arising out of the national

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
		Waste Strategy 2007 and sub-regional strategies that are being implemented at the present time.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>			
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Comments responding to these parts are common to all questions and are presented under Question 2.			
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -			
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -			
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -			
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	In part	The description of the approach explains that the output would comprise (bullets 3,4 and 5): An amount (apportionment) to plan for in each sub-region; translated to a number and type of facilities for the sub-region; and then suitable locations for facilities in each sub-region. This would seem to totally disregard the critical output of any such approach, which is to reconcile the capacity gaps that will exist across sub-regions with opportunities and preferred locations for meeting those cross-boundary deficiencies. The proper approach would seem to be a combination of options 1 and 2, that is, to identify those capacity gaps at the sub-regional level, but then to analyse the regional significance of those gaps and whether these translate to a need for regional (and national) scale facilities (for reasons of economic scale, specialist treatments etc.) to be identified at the regional level.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for	There is a need to acknowledge the potential for regional ( and national) scale waste management facilities to occupy regional identified employment opportunities, particularly so given the scale and

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
	Strategic Planning	<p>composition of waste facilities and waste park (resource recovery) formats. this linkage between these policy areas could usefully be expressly recognised through the broad locations' approach. Section 2 The express recognition given to the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework, alongside other development plans/plan documents, is very much welcomed. As you will be aware, the Authorities are at the most advanced stage of all North West Waste Planning Authorities in the preparation of a Core Strategy. It is anticipated that adoption could occur as soon as February 2009. Similar consideration must also be given to the strategies and commitments of Waste Disposal Authorities across the North West for managing municipal waste. These programmes for delivering long-term municipal waste management capacity are at very advanced stages (for Lancashire and Blackpool facilities are already under construction and will be operational from 2010) and will render regional consideration of this waste stream largely meaningless.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> Delivery is reliant on a private waste industry that is, perhaps for understandable reasons, investment-shy at the time. In that sense, the rationale to the approach to identifying broad locations recognises the economies of scale and necessary scale of markets, or catchments that will prompt delivery of facilities of this scale. It is noted that section 1 correctly flags up the need for effective cross-boundary working relationships to support the approach to identifying broad locations and delivering this through agreement at the sub-regional level. Representations were made by the Authorities to the submitted draft RSS on this matter, which sought to highlight the approach taken to securing cross-authority agreement, specifically a form of policy wording that was progressed through the earlier partial review on waste and it is understood through initial drafts of the more recent RSS review.</p> <p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.</p> <p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.</p> <p><b>D) Environment?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.</p>



Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	No	For the reasons expressed above, that the timeframe of 15 years to 2026 would provide the better certainty for plan-making, particularly given the enormous uncertainties that surround planning for waste, in terms of its growth, its changing composition, the role and suitability of new and emerging technologies, the response of, and investment choices made by, waste industry, emerging reprocessing markets, and public perceptions etc.		

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Marcus Hudson	Joint advisory Committee for Strategic Planning	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	No	Different waste is produced in each sub-region and should be handled on a sub-regional basis where ever possible. Dealing with waste on a regional scale facilitates large scale waste transport across the region with is in direct conflict with greenhouse gas emissions reduction. It is unfair to expect Cumbria to help deliver the disposal of the vast amount of waste produced in Greater Manchester for example, and unfair of Greater Manchester to expect other sub-regions to deal with its waste problems. Municipal waste is a personal issue and the onus should be on individual households to be responsible for the waste that they produce and for Local Authorities to engage communities in satisfying the local waste needs of their neighbourhoods.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	Yes	Waste production is a local issues. Local Authorities should be guiding its citizens to reduce the amount of waste produced. Too little emphasis is placed on waste reduction and too much is placed on recycling. High levels of recycling reflect a failure of society to be responsible about the products they by and especially its associated packaging. It is unfair and unjust for Local Authorities in one particular sub-region, which fail to manage waste production in their area to off load that waste into neighbouring sub-regions. Sub-regional waste transports is unnecessary and damaging to the environment and avoidable with intelligent product purchasing. Joined up waste management solutions and use of "energy from waste" industries should be common place as seen in Denmark and Germany where such industry is helping to improve the local economy. Sub-regions should be as far as possible, self-sufficient in its waste disposal.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	-

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Large scale education by Local Authorities on how to reduce the amount of waste produced in households using the Reduce and Reuse method, and implementing the recycling and reclaiming strands of the hierarchy as a last resort. It is especially important that biodegradable waste be removed from landfill and specific collections of such waste should be delivered across each sub-region.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> With an emphasis on personal responsibility, communities should be brought together to discuss how waste can be managed in their neighbourhoods. There are opportunities for large scale employment and community cohesion.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Reducing waste is far better environmentally than recycling waste and this is where the onus should be. Utilising waste to provide energy should be sought at every

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p>opportunity and the removal of biodegradable waste from landfill will help reduce the amount of methane released into the atmosphere.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> Large scale employment from new sustainable waste treatment facilities have been seen in Germany and Denmark.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	Yes	<p>Waste management is a long term issues and needs to be addressed on a long term timescale. There is no room for shortsightedness. While it is true that waste arising may be different in the future, waste will always be produced and will always need to be handled in the most sustainable and environmentally friendly manner possible. Option 3 will take the region well into the time when the current ceiling of the landfill escalator tax will have been reached and we should be aiming to provide solutions today for the problems of the future.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Tim McMahon	Sustainable Neighbourhoods Pool Manchester	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Cheshire West and Chester

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be a very strong emphasis on achieving sub-regional self-sufficiency to minimise the unsustainable movement of waste</li> <li>This will also encourage communities to take responsibilities for their own waste management</li> <li>we are concerned about the inadequacy of evidence base – the Jacobs C&amp;I figures are flawed. This needs to be addressed immediately.</li> </ul>		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be a very strong emphasis on achieving sub-regional self-sufficiency to minimise the unsustainable movement of waste</li> <li>This will also encourage communities to take responsibilities for their own waste management</li> <li>we are concerned about the inadequacy of evidence base – the Jacobs C&amp;I figures are flawed. This needs to be addressed immediately.</li> </ul>		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	No	With the inadequacy of the evidence base (the Jacobs C&I figures), it doesn't seem sensible to establish longer-term projections.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Macclesfield Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	No			Although the difficulties with predicting waste arisings over a longer time period are understood, the very long planning and construction timescale associated with waste facilities means that it would be preferable to take the longest-term view possible when planning for waste.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	No			Although the difficulties with predicting waste arisings over a longer time period are understood, the very long planning and construction timescale associated with waste facilities means that it would be preferable to take the longest-term view possible when planning for waste.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>



Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	Yes	Macclesfield Borough Council agrees with option 3(a), which takes a regional approach to apportionment of waste, identification of the number of facilities required and their broad locations, and provides projections for a 20-year period (until 2031). Although the difficulties with predicting waste arisings over a longer time period are understood, the very long planning and construction timescale associated with waste facilities means that it would be preferable to take the longest-term view possible when planning for waste. With the changing nature of waste creation and disposal, there is likely to be need for more specialist types of waste facilities. There may only be need for one particular type of facility in a region, and the development of certain facilities would depend on a critical mass in order that they become economically viable. A regional approach to planning for waste would therefore be more appropriate than a sub-regional approach.		

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Stewart House	Macclesfield Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Haslington Parish Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	In part	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> The proximity rules need to be applied to all waste including green waste for composting.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	In part	Takes better account of proximity issues of waste generation and disposal close to source.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	Don't know	Much of the overriding policy appears to be driven from Europe - too long a timescale		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Richard Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Merseyside Policy Unit

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	No	See our response to Waste Option 2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	In part	This option is most in keeping with current work in Merseyside to develop a sub-regional Waste Development Plan Document. The first relies too much on the imposition of a top-down approach, while the third takes predictions further ahead than we would be comfortable with. We are not comfortable that the evidence base should be taken as a given, and feel that a review of this should be linked to the proposed second study on regional facility		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			locations.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	No	See our response to Waste Option 2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	Yes	Stockport Council supports the submission made by AGMA and has a number of additional comments.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	There is a need for RSS to emphasise the need for new housing and other development to carefully consider design issues around sustainable waste management, promoting liaison between planners and waste management colleagues. Some new developments are poorly designed for both storage of and collection of recyclable storage of waste - e.g. insufficient clearance for waste wagons to operate, parking spaces in front of waste bin storage areas impeding collection, poor location and sizing of bins for access and management by residents, insufficient lighting in storage areas for residents. These issues should be checked as they could result in the inability to achieve targets set at a national level as well as our own regional targets for recycling etc. Links to other regional strategies - the RES should be mentioned with consideration of the potential for business development around waste management within the region and the funding of programmes to ensure achievement of commercial targets in terms of waste. Also the potential for job creation if establishing domestic and/or commercial recycling developments in sub-regions as well as their potential environmental and social impacts.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steve Johnson	Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## North West Environment Link

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	No	The regional approach appears to militate against the aims and objectives of PPS10, particularly the aim of providing a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste and that of enabling waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations. It also does not comply as well as option 2 with RSS Policy EM13 which states that at least		



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			primary treatment of waste should take place near the source of arisings.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	As NWEL favour the sub-regional approach, we did not consider this question.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	<b>A) Delivery:</b> see answer to 1.2
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> see answer to 1.2
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> see answer to 1.2
		<b>D) Environment?</b> see answer to 1.2
		<b>E) Economy?</b> see answer to 1.2

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	Yes	Section 4 on Sustainability Appraisal etc, lays down that, "when considering options...the principle priority should be the protection of human health and the environment against harmful effects caused by the collection, transport, treatment, storage and tipping of waste". The sub-regional approach best accommodates this principle in that it will encourage communities to take more responsibility for their waste, in accordance with PPS10 (being unable to export their waste should encourage minimisation and recycling) and will reduce the harmful environmental impacts of transporting waste across the region. The sub-regional approach should also reduce the need to develop 'regionally-significant' waste treatment plants. The problem with such large		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			plants, and thermal treatment plants in particular, is that they become locked into a commercial imperative which demands a centralised system guaranteeing a constant and continuous supply of waste to ensure their economic operation. NWEL believe that this system discourages waste minimisation and thus distorts the waste hierarchy in contradiction to both the Waste Strategy for England and RSS Policy EM11.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	Apart from the need to update EM10 and significantly amend EM13, already identified in the Options Paper, this option appears to fit with existing RSS policies (particularly DP5 on reducing the need to travel and DP9 on reducing carbon emissions).

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> The sub-regional approach should minimise the need for new infrastructure provision and this would accord with RSS Policy Em13 which states that, " when considering proposals for waste management facilities (including additional landfill capacity) the ability of existing established sites to meet the needs of the region/sub-region should be fully explored" and if at all possible, used in preference to new sites.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Sub-regional treatment, requiring communities to take responsibility for their own waste will remove the option of ` exporting the problem' and thus promote a positive community approach to waste minimisation and recycling. This, in turn should engender local social enterprises.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> The sub-regional approach will, by definition, reduce the need for waste to be transported in large quantities across the region, and thus reduce the air pollution and carbon emissions which trans regional waste transportation inevitably causes.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> The financial penalties arising from the EC Landfill Directive is driving present, and will drive future waste management policies. It is driving the culture change from waste as a liability to be disposed of to waste as an economic asset to be exploited through reuse, recycling and as a source of energy.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	No	On balance predicting and providing for a 15 year timescale seems more sensible than a 20 year one, though, with the rate of technological change and factors such as the potential impact of the region's housing aspirations, the plan may well have to be revisited before 2026.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	n/a see answer to 3.1

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Peter Wilson	North West Environment Link	<b>A) Delivery:</b> n/a see answer to 3.1
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> n/a see answer to 3.1
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> n/a see answer to 3.1
		<b>D) Environment?</b> n/a see answer to 3.1
		<b>E) Economy?</b> n/a see answer to 3.1

## Liverpool City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	No			This Option relies too much on the imposition of a top-down approach.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	NA

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	Yes			Option 2 is most in keeping with current work to develop a Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	No comment

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	No			Option 3 takes predictions further ahead than Liverpool and its Merseyside partners would be comfortable with.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	NA

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tim Jago	Liverpool City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Warrington Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	-	This is a general response and not specifically related to any one option. The Jacobs study which was to provide information and evidence to this topic and the emergence of options has been withdrawn. A replacement study is now outstanding this raises issues of the soundness of the evidence base on which policy is developed and the opportunities to make comment on matters arising.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Kathleen Symington	Warrington Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Ribble Valley Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	Yes	The approach would be more likely in this Councils view to enable matters to be dealt with at a spatial level more readily suited to protecting the local area.		



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	No			Concerns that applying varied time scale approach would be more difficult to link with locational planning and as such this option was favoured less by members than Option 2.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Emery Planning Partnership

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	No	We consider that a sub regional approach would be appropriate to ensure a geographic spread of facilities throughout the region. Our reasons are set out in our subsequent answers.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>			
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>			
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>			
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>			
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>			
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning	In part	We consider that a sub regional approach is appropriate as this will ensure		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
	Partnership		the necessary facilities in locations which are close to the sources of waste. This would result in shorter journey times from where the waste is generated to where it can be recycled. We consider that a longer term period is appropriate which is why we support Option 3.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	Yes	We consider that a sub regional approach is appropriate as this will ensure the necessary facilities in locations which are close to the sources of waste. This would result in shorter journey times from where the waste is generated to where it can be recycled. We consider that a longer term period is appropriate as this will provide greater certainty to the local community as to the need and the broad locations for the facilities to be located. Our client ADS Recycling, has proposed a site to Halton Borough Council during their call for sites in December 2007 for a dedicated waste recycling plant. The site is bounded to the east by Cholmondeley Road, the		

Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			Weaver Navigation Council to the south, the M56 to the east and the A557 / Weaver View to the north. The site was previously used as part of the ICI waste arena for the disposal and containment of hydrofluoride residuals. The survey work is ongoing on this site, however it is our client's intention to work with the council to remediate and reclaim the site and construct a dedicated reclamation park, which would provide for significant re-cycling of waste within the borough. The proposed uses can be seen from the submitted concept plan, setting out the various uses that could be brought forward on the site.		

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Stephen Harris	Emery Planning Partnership	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Our client ADS Recycling, has proposed a site to Halton Borough Council during their call for sites in December 2007 for a dedicated waste recycling plant. The site is bounded to the east by Cholmondeley Road, the Weaver Navigation Council to the south, the M56 to the east and the A557 / Weaver View to the north. The site was previously used as part of the ICI waste arena for the disposal and containment of hydrofluoride residuals. The survey work is ongoing on this site, however it is our client's intention to work with the council to remediate and reclaim the site and construct a dedicated reclamation park, which would provide for significant re-cycling of waste within the borough. The proposed uses can be seen from the submitted concept plan, setting out the various uses that could be brought forward on the site.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Carlisle City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	No	Whilst it may be appropriate to have some information on the waste arisings for the region. RSS should not concentrate on just regional provision of facilities. The region is large and regional facilities may not be the most sustainable solution. In addition it would be a less sustainable option to consider the region in isolation rather than cross boundary issues as waste facilities are expensive to deliver.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	Yes	This option would at least address issues on a sub-regional basis and minimise distance to deal with any waste arisings		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	In part	Whether projections should run for a 20 year period is entirely dependent upon the reliability of information and forecasting/prediction of waste arisings. Inevitably it will be reviewed. The main consideration is what implications arise in the subsequent 5 years that will affect how waste arisings are dealt with over the 15 year period.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Lancashire County Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	In part	<p>It is unlikely that a regional approach as described would provide the detailed strategic policy framework sufficient for sub-regional areas to plan for, or indeed for robust sub-regional apportionments of waste to be made at the regional level through the RSS. Specifically, it would be unlikely that such an approach would be able to identify broad locations on a geographical basis in the absence of a sub-regional analysis of the gaps in capacity. However, there are aspects of this approach that could be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the timeframe of 15 years to 2026 would provide the better certainty for plan-making, particularly given the considerable variables that surround planning for waste, in terms of its growth, its changing composition, the role and suitability of new and emerging technologies, the response of, and investment choices made by, the waste industry, emerging reprocessing markets, and public perceptions etc.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the focus more towards regionally (and presumably nationally) scale waste management facilities, presumably on the basis that sub-regional facilities, aligned with sub-regional planning areas, do not necessitate regional consideration. It does appear that this and Option 2 confuse the critical consideration for the RSS at this time, that is, in the view of the Authorities, to identify broad locations within the region for significant scale facilities to manage cross-boundary waste arisings, building upon an appreciation and analysis of the 'gaps' in capacity that can be identified at the sub-regional planning level. For that reason no one option is preferred and instead the response below seeks to identify those elements of each that together would be supported, and could readily be combined to generate a robust, coherent, and deliverable policy framework for the provision of necessary waste management capacity across the region at the waste planning authority level. The approach under all options to "use the</li> </ul>		

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			figures for waste arisings to 2020...that will feature in the final published RSS... are an agreed given" mistakenly assumes that those figures represent the output of a robust prediction model. In truth, it is the Authorities' understanding that the figure is a simple presentation of the reported waste arisings at a recent survey date. It may be that these also present of prediction under zero growth but that has to be specified through the approach.		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	There is a need to acknowledge the potential for regional (and national) scale waste management facilities to occupy regional identified employment opportunities, particularly so given the scale and composition of waste facilities and waste park (resource recovery park) formats. This linkage between these policy areas could usefully be expressly recognised through the broad locations' approach.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Delivery is reliant on a private waste industry that is, perhaps for understandable reasons, investment-shy at this time. In that sense, the rationale to the approach to identifying broad locations recognises the economies of scale and necessary scale of markets or catchments that will prompt delivery of these scale of facilities. It is noted that Section 1 correctly flags up the need for effective cross-boundary working relationships to support the approach to identifying broad locations and delivering this through agreement at the sub-regional level. Representations were made by the Authorities to the submitted draft RSS on this matter, which sought to highlight the approach taken to securing cross-authority agreement, specifically a form of policy wording that was progressed through the earlier partial review on waste and it is understood through initial drafts of the more recent RSS review.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.



Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		control processes.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Please note comments under Delivery, in relation to economics of delivery. These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	In part	The description of the approach explains that the output would comprise (bullets 3, 4 and 5): <input type="checkbox"/> an amount (apportionment) to plan for in each sub-region; <input type="checkbox"/> translated to a number and type of facilities for the sub-region; <input type="checkbox"/> and then suitable locations for facilities in each sub-region. This would seem to totally disregard the critical output of any such approach, which is to reconcile the capacity gaps that will exist across sub-regions with opportunities and preferred locations for meeting those cross-boundary deficiencies. The proper approach would seem to be a combination of Options 1 and 2, that is, to identify those capacity gaps at the sub-regional level, but then to analyse the regional significance of those gaps and whether these translate to a need for regional (and national) scale facilities (for reasons of economies of scale, specialist treatments etc) to be identified at the regional level. It does appear that this and Option 1 confuse the critical consideration for the RSS at this time, that is, in the view of the Authorities, to identify broad locations within the region for significant scale facilities to manage cross-boundary waste arisings, building upon an appreciation and analysis of the 'gaps' in capacity that can be identified at the sub-regional planning level. For that reason no one option is preferred and instead the response below seeks to identify those elements of each that together would be supported, and could readily be combined to generate a robust, coherent, and deliverable policy framework for the provision of necessary waste management capacity across the region at the waste planning authority level. The approach under all options to "use the		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			figures for waste arisings to 2020...that will feature in the final published RSS... are an agreed given" mistakenly assumes that those figures represent the output of a robust prediction model. In truth, it is the Authorities' understanding that the figure is a simple presentation of the reported waste arisings at a recent survey date. It may be that these also present of prediction under zero growth but that has to be specified through the approach.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	There is a need to acknowledge the potential for regional (and national) scale waste management facilities to occupy regional identified employment opportunities, particularly so given the scale and composition of waste facilities and waste park (resource recovery park) formats. This linkage between these policy areas could usefully be expressly recognised through the broad locations' approach.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Delivery is reliant on a private waste industry that is, perhaps for understandable reasons, investment-shy at this time. In that sense, the rationale to the approach to identifying broad locations recognises the economies of scale and necessary scale of markets or catchments that will prompt delivery of these scale of facilities. It is noted that Section 1 correctly flags up the need for effective cross-boundary working relationships to support the approach to identifying broad locations and delivering this through agreement at the sub-regional level. Representations were made by the Authorities to the submitted draft RSS on this matter, which sought to highlight the approach taken to securing cross-authority agreement, specifically a form of policy wording that was progressed through the earlier partial review on waste and it is understood through initial drafts of the more recent RSS review.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		control processes.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Please note comments under Delivery, in relation to economics of delivery. These are matters that are likely to be more appropriate to detailed location and site level considerations through subsequent sub-regional and development control processes.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	No			For the reasons expressed in response to Options 1 and 2, that the timeframe of 15 years to 2026 would provide the better certainty for plan-making, particularly given the considerable variables that surround planning for waste, in terms of its growth, its changing composition, the role and suitability of new and emerging technologies, the response of, and investment choices made by, the waste industry, emerging reprocessing markets, and public perceptions etc.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Marcus Hudson	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## RPS

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Gareth Gardener	RPS	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Gareth Gardener	RPS	<p>The RSS needs to provide a policy framework that achieves greater inter-relationship between spatial issues and related policy objectives. In particular in making provision for strategic waste management and capacity for communities to manage waste close to where it arises, combined with the consideration of planned growth areas/points within the region, measures for mitigation of and adaptation to climate change as well as opportunities for securing renewable energy supply. In accordance with Paragraph 13 of Planning Policy Statement: Planning and CLimate Change, policy within the RSS should include scope for securing decentralised energy supply systems especially from renewable or low carbon energy sources which include energy from waste facilities. RSS should acknowledge energy from waste facilities as a significant renewable energy supply especially where opportunities exist to supply existing or potentially nearby energy users and planned growth areas. The integration of policy objectives indicated above is consistent with national guidance for waste management, energy and climate change strategies. In addition, in planning for future growth RSS should include provision within policy that recognises the potential role of the Green Belt in meeting the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities. This is recognised within the key planning objectives of PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management with Particular reference to:- "Protecting Green Belts but recognizing the particular location needs of some types of waste management facilities when defining green belt boundaries..."</p>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Gareth Gardener	RPS	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		D) Environment? -
		E) Economy? -

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Gareth Gardener	RPS	-	-		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Gareth Gardener	RPS	<p>The RSS needs to provide a policy framework that achieves greater inter-relationship between spatial issues and related policy objectives. In particular in making provision for strategic waste management and capacity for communities to manage waste close to where it arises, combined with the consideration of planned growth areas/points within the region, measures for mitigation of and adaptation to climate change as well as opportunities for securing renewable energy supply. In accordance with Paragraph 13 of Planning Policy Statement: Planning and CLimate Change, policy within the RSS should include scope for securing decentralised energy supply systems especially from renewable or low carbon energy sources which include energy from waste facilities. RSS should acknowledge energy from waste facilities as a significant renewable energy supply especially where opportunities exist to supply existing or potentially nearby energy users and planned growth areas. The integration of policy objectives indicated above is consistent with national guidance for waste management, energy and climate change strategies. In addition, in planning for future growth RSS should include provision within policy that recognises the potential role of the Green Belt in meeting the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities. This is recognised within the key planning objectives of PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management with Particular reference to:- "Protecting Green Belts but recognizing the particular location needs of some types of waste management facilities when defining green belt boundaries..."</p>

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Gareth Gardener	RPS	A) Delivery: -
		B) Infrastructure provision? -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Gareth Gardener	RPS	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Gareth Gardener	RPS	The RSS needs to provide a policy framework that achieves greater inter-relationship between spatial issues and related policy objectives. In particular in making provision for strategic waste management and capacity for communities to manage waste close to where it arises, combined with the consideration of planned growth areas/points within the region, measures for mitigation of and adaptation to climate change as well as opportunities for securing renewable energy supply. In accordance with Paragraph 13 of Planning Policy Statement: Planning and CLimate Change, policy within the RSS should include scope for securing decentralised energy supply systems especially from renewable or low carbon energy sources which include energy from waste facilities. RSS should acknowledge energy from waste facilities as a significant renewable energy supply especially where opportunities exist to supply existng or potentially nearby energy users and planned growth areas. The integration of policy objectives indicated above is consistent with national guidance for waste management, energy and climate change strategies. In addition, in planning for future growth RSS should include provision within policy that recognises the potential role of the Green Belt in meeting the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities. This is recognised within the key planning objectives of PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management with Particular reference to:- "Protecting Green Belts but recognizing the particular location needs of some types of waste management facilities when defining green belt boundaries..."

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Gareth Gardener	RPS	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Chorley Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	Yes	The RSS Partial Review should take into account the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>



Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		B) Infrastructure provision? -
		C) Community and social issues? -
		D) Environment? -
		E) Economy? -

## AGMA (the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities)

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?	1.1a. If so why?	1.1b. If not, why not?	1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	No	See comments on Option 2		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	-

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	A) Delivery: -
		B) Infrastructure provision? -
		C) Community and social issues? -
		D) Environment? -
		E) Economy? -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	Yes	AGMA's preference would be for Option 2 since this appears to provide sufficient clarity on the number and type of facilities required in Greater Manchester and the rest of the North West, and the proposed timescale would be in line with GM's current baseline data and would not require further work to extend this information to a longer time period.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	It is not clear at this stage what other changes may be required and what the implications of the options are (section 2.3 which follows) since the evidence underpinning the consultation is not yet available.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	<b>A) Delivery:</b> It is not clear at this stage what the implications of the options are since the evidence underpinning the consultation is not yet available. This applies to all categories a - e.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	No	See response to Option 2.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
--------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeffrey Lee	AGMA	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## MJM Strategies Ltd

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	In part	Without the results of the updated broad locations study it is not possible to confirm if the study and its inputs to the RSS will cover the main requirements for dealing with waste in the region. The estimates of arisings will need to consider delays in both the provision of new facilities and the markets for recovered materials. The types of facilities will also change as technologies are developed. The study needs to safeguard linked facilities i.e. treatment plants that need landfill or incineration plants for residues after treatment. These facilities may be in other planning areas or sub regions. In the case of regional landfill sites all landfill may be considered regional, but it is essential that the provision is not so restricted as to restrict competition and create monopoly situations.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	The waste policies re broad locations and the renewable energy locations should be reviewed together as some locations may be common. The emerging technologies re gasification and biogas

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
		will use waste to produce electricity. The importance is demonstrated by the INES Chlor and Ince Moss proposals.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:		
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	<b>A) Delivery:</b> The ability to secure planning quickly is essential for delivery. Before that there needs to be secured sites which have the right locations and infrastructure in respect of power, sewers and in the case of landfill geology. The new facilities may need to operate 24/7 and this has implications re location and communities.		
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> The actual provision will be down to the bankability of the project and the provision of finance. The provision of sites that are too small or with excessive development costs will result in infrastructure not being delivered.		
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -		
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Modern waste recovery and processing facilities should help to improve the environment and safeguard raw materials.		
		<b>E) Economy?</b> The investment in new waste recovery and disposal facilities will be great which should help the NW economy.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	In part	There will need to be flexibility in the approach to cover facilities owned and operated that cross sub regions. The economics of the land and the markets for the recovered materials will also need to be considered. The economics of plants may require regional or intra regional markets and not dependant and arisings within a sub region.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?			
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	-			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	In part	The emerging technologies and producer responsibilities makes forecasting that far ahead difficult. IT is essential that some flexibility is provided and that delays in provision of facilities are inevitable.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
M Mundy	MJM Strategies Ltd	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Wirral Metropolitan Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	No	The Council has already invested in the preparation of a joint Merseyside Waste DPD to identify potential needs and locations at sub-regional level. The identification of regional scale facilities could cut across this work. The accompanying sustainability appraisal appears to indicate that Option 1 would be less likely to promote opportunities for waste to be managed close to source and would be less likely to allow for the better consideration of local opportunities.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Regional scale facilities are likely to have a far greater and more disproportionate impact on the capacity of local infrastructure.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Regional scale facilities are likely to have a far greater and more disproportionate impact on the local environment.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	Yes	Option 2 would better support work that has already been undertaken by the		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			Merseyside authorities to identify potential needs and locations at subregional level. A sub-regional approach, which would be more likely to better promote the consideration of local opportunities for management closer to source, also appears to be supported by the accompanying sustainability appraisal.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	No	Projecting beyond 2026 would be less reliable given the current pace of change. Were Option 3 to be taken forward, contrary to the Council's wishes, a sub-regional approach would be preferred, for the reasons set out by the Council in support of Option 2 above.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Congleton Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	Yes	Although it is understood that predicting waste arising for a 20-year period leads to concerns with regard to the accuracy of the figures involved, consideration will need to be given to the local authorities that will have to plan for the facilities required by these predictions. In some cases the shorted timescale could lead to issues in relation to the time horizon it will be possible for these more local documents to consider. This is a particular issue in relation to waste facilities, which frequently suffer from long planning and construction timescales. Therefore Option 3 is supported. The scale of the approach is likely to be dependent on the nature of waste facilities. On the one hand waste facilities are a key element of the		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			infrastructure required for the additional housing proposed by the Partial Review and may be required to provided in close proximity to the areas of development in order to provide a sustainable service, e.g. to reduce waste transportation by motor vehicles. On the other hand, where there are more specialist types of waste facilities, there may only be a need for one facility in the region, or the facilities would depend on a critical mass in order that they become economically viable, suggesting the need for a more Regional approach.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Cheshire East Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	Yes	Regional approach preferred over sub regional approach.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>			
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>			
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>			
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>			
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>			
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	-			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>			
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>			
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>			
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>			
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>			
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>			

## Chester City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	No	The Council supports the principle of 'reducing' waste as advocated in the waste hierarchy in national, regional and local policy. The Council believes that regional scale facilities could result in the importing and transportation of waste between regions in order to maintain the longevity of the facility. This would breach the 'proximity principle'. Regional scale developments – being concentrated in one location - also raise concerns over the potential impact on traffic, landscape, nature conservation and air quality.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	In part	See previous comments		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	No	See previous comments		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## CPRE North West

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	No	See answers to question 2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	In part	This option is the best fit with the aims and objectives of PPS10; in particular in comparison with Option 1 it would better "provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities;" and "enable waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations" (PPS10 para 3). It would also be more consistent with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o EM13, which states that at least primary treatment of waste should take place near to the source of arisings,</li> <li>o the</li> </ul>		

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			<p>requirement in EM10 to reduce harm to the environment, including reducing climate change impacts, to the general requirement of DP5 to reduce the need to travel and manage travel demand, and to the requirement of DP9 to reduce carbon emissions. All these considerations point a priori to the treatment of waste near to the source of its' arisings wherever possible, ie a primarily sub-regional rather than regional approach. There may in individual cases be reasons why this is not the most sustainable option, but this should be the basis of policy. Caution should be exercised with regard to identifying the type and number of facilities required. The RSS Panel Report recommended that the tables of waste arisings in RSS were simplified to indicate only the amount of waste to be treated, and the amount of residual waste requiring landfilling. They made this recommendation in response to arguments that being overly prescriptive about the type of treatment required could prevent the waste hierarchy being implemented, ie waste treatment being driven up the hierarchy and all waste being treated at as high a level in the hierarchy as possible (eg paras 8.79 &amp; 8.86-87, in particular para 8.87 "The objective should be to move waste management up the hierarchy as far as possible"). Identifying the precise type and number of facilities believed to be required at present could have the same effect, ie preventing waste management being driven up the hierarchy in future. There should also be considerable caution about developing plans for "regionally-significant", ie large scale, thermal treatment plants in particular. The very large capacity and inflexibility of processes of such plants would demand a constant and continuous supply of waste to ensure efficient and economic operation. This would lock the region into a centralised system which would tend to work against waste minimisation and driving the treatment of waste further up the hierarchy, in direct contradiction of the Waste Strategy for England and RSS policy EM11. There should be a general presumption in favour of a more decentralised pattern of waste management facilities wherever possible, as being more effective at driving waste up the hierarchy and reducing the need to travel. This presumption should only be overturned where there are clear and long-lasting sustainability benefits to be gained from larger installations. Due to the high levels of uncertainty about future waste arisings and management techniques, it would be unwise to attempt to predict arisings and</p>		



Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			requirements for treatment beyond 2026.		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	This option fits better with existing RSS policy than the alternatives.

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> If waste treatment facilities are primarily considered on a sub-regional basis, the need for new infrastructure is likely to be less than if consideration is primarily regional.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Sub-regional treatment, enabling communities to take more responsibility for their own waste, is likely to generate significantly less community opposition than the alternative. It is a more equitable and fairer approach, which will be more likely to raise public awareness of the practical need to minimise the generation of waste and to manage unavoidable arisings as high up the waste hierarchy as possible.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Focusing on treating waste close to the source of its arising will generally be more sustainable than taking a regional approach and is likely to reduce the need to travel and thus (by comparison) reduce carbon emissions and air pollution. The availability of sustainable means of transport should also be taken into account when considering locations for treatment facilities.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Economic considerations are likely to drive future waste management behaviour, eg the increasing cost of landfill and competitive advantage to be gained from eliminating waste generation or treating it at higher levels of the hierarchy.

Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
-------	---------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	No	See answers to question 2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Environment Agency

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	In part	It is possible that there will be the need for some regional (even national) scale facilities in the NW to deal with certain types of waste. However, an approach which only identified a suite of regional scale facilities will not fit with the emphasis within RSS policy EM12 around communities taking more responsibility for their own waste and for waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations. What is likely to be needed is a blend of facilities (and identified broad locations) which sets out the most sustainable option for the management of waste in the NW. Please see our response to option 2.		

Name:	Organisation:	1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	An approach which only identified a suite of regional scale facilities to manage waste would as a minimum require a change to policy EM12 as there would be potential for facilities to be located further away from sources of waste. EM13 could also require change (beyond that which is already envisaged) as this specifically suggests that the focus for treatment of commercial and industrial and municipal waste should be close to the source of arisings.

Name:	Organisation:	1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> The Environment Agency makes this point in relation to both option 1 and 2. Para 1.2 of the options paper highlights the need to consider the development of a mechanism for cross authority working to aid implementation/delivery on the ground. The Environment Agency would like further clarification on the need for such a mechanism and the role it would play as we currently do not perceive there to be a problem with the existing informal arrangements.</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> An option which only identified regional scale facilities would potentially need to consider the transport infrastructure implications of this (particularly the impact on greenhouse gas emissions and links to delivery of regional and national targets). In order to ensure such an option was as sustainable as possible, opportunities (possibly new infrastructure) would need to be maximised in relation to the sustainable transport of the waste.</p>
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues? -</b></p>
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> There will be potentially be impacts from waste management facilities on the environment, regardless of their scale. At the level of setting out broad locations, environmental issues will need to be considered and should guide this process. However, site specific and local impacts will be hard to identify until sites are looked at within the broad locations and schemes themselves come forward. We would expect the normal planning process to address these issues through things like EIA or development control conditions (attached to any grant of permission to control impacts). The waste management licensing process will also address environmental issues.</p>
		<p><b>E) Economy? -</b></p>

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
-------	---------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

Name:	Organisation:	2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?	2.1a. If so why?	2.1b. If not, why not?	2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	In part	<p>Similarly to option 1, a purely sub-regional approach will be unlikely to be appropriate or even achievable. Firstly, there will be certain waste streams where for commercial and other reasons it will be more appropriate to manage these at a regional (or even national) scale. Secondly, waste management is a commercial activity. If someone wants to transport waste outside the sub-region it arose from (or even into or out of a region itself) and pay for its disposal/treatment at a facility with capacity, they can. What is needed is likely to be a blend of options 1 &amp; 2, possibly with consideration of the need for national scale facilities. This is our understanding of what is required in PPS10. RSS policy EM13 also reflects this by suggesting Municipal &amp; C&amp;I waste is expected to be managed more sub-regionally, that there is the possible need for regional scale facility in the Mersey Belt and that national scale facilities may be appropriate in the region where they offer a particularly advantage. In terms of the identification of numbers, types and broad locations, we would expect an option to be taken forward which sets out the required suite of facilities needed to most sustainably manage waste in the NW for the next 15 years.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	<p>Similarly to Option 1, as a minimum EM12 and 13 would need altering to reflect that this option only considered sub-regional scale facilities for managing waste generated within the sub-regions themselves.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> The Environment Agency makes this point in relation to both option 1 and 2. Para 1.2 of the options paper highlights the need to consider the development of a mechanism for cross authority working to aid implementation/delivery on the ground. The Environment Agency would like further clarification on the need for such a mechanism and the role it would play as we currently do not perceive there to be a problem with the existing informal arrangements.</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b></p>
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues? -</b></p>

Name:	Organisation:	2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> There will be potentially be impacts from waste management facilities on the environment, regardless of their scale. At the level of setting out broad locations, environmental issues will need to be considered and should guide this process. However, site specific and local impacts will be hard to identify until sites are looked at within the broad locations and schemes themselves come forward. We would expect the normal planning process to address these issues through things like EIA or development control conditions (attached to any grant of permission to control impacts). The waste management licensing process will also address environmental issues.</p>
		<p><b>E) Economy?</b> -</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?	3.1a. If so why?	3.1b. If not, why not?	3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	No			<p>RSS will be PPS10 compliant if it provides at least a 15 year time horizon. We agree with the statements on page 2 of the options paper and the uncertainty there is around the ability of models to accurately predict waste management requirements in the long term. As the paper correctly states, the accuracy of these models is questionable in the longer term due to changing ways waste is generated, the volume of waste, changing attitudes towards waste management (particularly viewing waste as a resource) and changes to potential technologies for its treatment, re-use and eventual disposal. As a result we feel an option which has a 20 year time horizon will not provide the accuracy needed to assist waste planning at a sub-regional and local level. We also feel that developing an option for 20 rather than 15 years is unnecessary as there will have been several opportunities to revisit waste policy by then (most immediate probably likely to be through the development of a Single Integrated Regional Strategy).</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	-

Name:	Organisation:	3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Matthew Ellis	Environment Agency	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Biffa Waste Services Ltd

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	No		SHould be a 20 year period	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	No	SHould be a 20 year period		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	Yes	20 years is the correct period. The options should be identified sub regionally.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 1?</b>	<b>1.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	Yes	Regional approach preferred over sub regional approach.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 2?</b>	<b>2.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>2.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>2.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.1. Do you agree with Waste Broad Locations Option 3?</b>	<b>3.1a. If so why?</b>	<b>3.1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>3.1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	No	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3.3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>