

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR BRADFORD

Waste Management DPD

Issues and Options Consultation

(Regulation 25)

STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

JANUARY 2010

CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 ENVIRONMENT AND WASTE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE	3
2.0 LETTER OF CONSULTATION	4
3.0 COMMENT FORM	6
4.0 LIST OF THOSE WHO SUBMITTED A WRITTEN REPRESENTATION	13
5.0 SCHEDULE OF WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS	14
APPENDICES	55
APPENDIX 1 PETITION	56
APPENDIX 2 DISTRIBUTION LIST	64
APPENDIX 3 COPIES OF REPRESENTATIONS AS SUBMITTED	96

WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 As required by The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) 2004 Regulations, consultations have been carried out on the Waste Management DPD: Issues & Options in accordance with Regulation 25 and 27. The Regulations require Local Planning Authorities to consider any representations made within a six-week period of consultation and to have regard to them when preparing a Development Plan Document for submission to the Secretary of State.
- 1.2 Over 1000 organisations and individuals were notified by letter and email of the Issues & Options consultation and the availability of the supporting documents. Subsequently, approximately 60 copies of the Report were sent to specific and general consultation bodies as required by the Regulations and also to individuals who had requested a copy. A list of all those notified can be found in Section 6.0 of this report.
- 1.3 Respondents in many cases used only the Council's Comment Form to reply; others submitted detailed and lengthy written representations either instead of or in addition to the questionnaire. Copies of the representations can be found in Appendix 3 of this report. A copy of the comment form can be found in section
- 1.4 The attached Schedule of Representations sets out in tabular form the Representations from the 20 organisations and individuals who replied.

- 1.5 The Schedule of Representations does not include comments received at the stakeholder consultation event. These replies can be found within the event Consultation Log.

DRAFT

2.0 ENVIRONMENT AND WASTE MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

- 2.1 Following the meeting of the Council Executive Committee on 20th October 2009, it was recommended that the Waste Management DPD be referred to the Environment and Waste Management Committee for comment as part of the consultation.
- 2.2 The Waste Management DPD: Issues and Option report was presented to the Environment and Waste Management Committee on 9th December 2009. The Committee decided it would examine the report and defer this item to the next Committee meeting scheduled for the 2nd February 2010.
- 2.3 Following various questions on the Waste Management DPD: Issues and Options report at the Committee meeting of 2nd February 2010, written comments were received on 24th February 2010.

3.0 LETTER OF CONSULTATION

Department of Regeneration

Local Development Framework Group

8th Floor Jacob's Well
Manchester Road
BRADFORD
West Yorkshire BD1 5RW

Tel: (01274) 434050

Fax: (01274) 433767

Minicom: (01274) 392613

E-Mail: ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk

Web site: www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf

My Ref: TDP/P&P/LDF/WDPD/I&O

Your Ref:

9th November 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

**The Local Development Framework for Bradford District
Waste Management Development Plan Document (DPD): Issues and Options
Consultation (Regulation 25)**

I write to inform you that the Council is currently carrying out an informal consultation on the Waste Management DPD: Issues and Options for a period of twelve weeks commencing on Monday 9th November 2009 until Monday 25th January 2010.

The Waste Management Development Plan Document is one of the key documents that form part of the Bradford Districts emerging Development Plan under the new Local Development Framework (LDF). You will no doubt be aware of the considerable work already undertaken to develop the LDF Core Strategy, over recent years. The Core Strategy will establish the strategic approach to development and change in the District, including waste management. Ensuring a sustainable waste management solution for the district is a priority for the Bradford. The Waste Management DPD will establish the detailed approach to delivery the broad approach in the Core Strategy. In particular when adopted, the Waste Management DPD will:

- Set out the broad vision for the future of waste management within the District and objectives for sustainable development of waste management over the next 10 – 20 years.
- Set out spatial policies for steering and shaping the development of waste management to deliver both the vision and objectives
- In particular, set out the potential locations for new waste management facilities for the main types of waste
- Take account of national and regional policy and the Council's priorities in the and 'The Big Plan' the sustainable Community Strategy for the district and the policies of emerging Core Strategy

At this early stage in the process the Council is seeking your views on the key issues facing waste management, and the way that these can be addressed. The following documents are enclosed with this letter and are subject to public consultation:-

- Waste Management Issues and Options Report

There are also several supporting documents:

- Issues and Options Comment Form
- Engagement Plan
- Waste Management Issues and Options Report Methodology Statement
- Waste Management DPD Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
- City of Bradford MDC – A Guide to the New Development Plan System
- City of Bradford MDC – A Jargon Buster Guide to the LDF

All of the above documents can be downloaded from the Council's website via the Local Development Framework pages found at www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf

Hard reference copies are also available in the Council's Planning Offices at: Jacob's Well, Bradford, and the Town Halls at Ilkley, Keighley and Shipley. Or in the Main Libraries at: Shipley, Bingley and Bradford Central Library. In addition, hard copies are available on request from the LDF Group.

The Council welcomes your views and comments and will take these into account when producing the Preferred Options. Please make your comments in writing and return them to:

ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk

Alternatively they can be faxed to (01274) 433767

Or sent hard copy to FREEPOST address:

Bradford Local Development Framework
FREEPOST NEA 11445
PO Box 1068
BRADFORD
BD1 1BR

Please mark comments as 'Waste Management Issues and Options'.

Comments should be received by Monday 25th January 2010

Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential and a schedule of all representations received will be published.

As part of the consultation the Council is holding a half-day stakeholder event, to discuss issues surrounding waste management in the Bradford District to which members of the waste industry, stakeholders and other interest groups are invited. The event will take place on **Tuesday 8th December 2009 at the Norcroft Centre, Bradford University, Tumbling Hill Street, Bradford, BD7 1DB**. It will run from **9.30am to 1.00pm**, with refreshments provided from 9.15am.

Each event will include a number of short presentations to set the background to the Waste Management Issues and Options. There will then be a number of workshops where a range of issues raised in the report can be debated.

Above all, however, this is an opportunity for those who are involved or have an interest in the waste industry matters to let us know what issues and policies you think the Waste Management DPD should be including and addressing.

If you wish to attend this event please fill in and return the enclosed booking form by **Tuesday 1st December 2009**. Places are limited by the capacity of the venue so please book as soon as possible to avoid disappointment.

Should you require clarification on any of the above or further information, please contact the LDF Group on (01274) 434296.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Marshall
Strategy Manager

Enc.

3.0 COMMENT FORM

DRAFT

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		
Rep No	Date Entered	Officer



Form for commenting on the Waste Management DPD Issues and Options Consultation

(9th November 2009 – 25th January 2010)

The Council is consulting on the Waste Management DPD: Issues and Options. The document available for public comment is the Waste Management: Issues and Options Report.

You may photocopy this form or obtain further copies free of charge from the Council. The form is also available to download on the Council's website on www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf. It is recommended that representations be made on this form as this helps us to consider your comments properly. If you find it easier to answer the questions on separate sheets please ensure you are clear about the question you are answering. Please complete the form in black ink, clear writing or typing to aid processing. If you require any assistance completing this form or would like a copy in large print, Braille etc, please contact the LDF Group on 01274 432499.

Data Protection Act 1998
 Personal information provided as part of a representation cannot be treated as confidential as the Council is obliged to make representations available for public inspection. However, in compliance with the Data Protection Act the personal information you provide will only be used by the Council for the purpose of preparing the Local Development Framework

Your Details:

Title..... Surname..... Forename.....

Address.....

.....

Organisation:

Tele No: Home..... Work..... Mobile.....

Fax: Email:

Waste Management DPD: Issues and Options Paper

Key Questions

Bradford Council is seeking your views on the Waste Management Issues and Options raised within the Development Plan Document. (see www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf)

Cross-Boundary Considerations
<p>1. How should BMDC work jointly with neighbouring local authorities and those where the District currently exports its waste? Actions could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing relating to key waste data indicators, their analysis and interpretation; <input type="checkbox"/> • Collaborative working on emerging waste DPD's and their reviews; <input type="checkbox"/> • Commenting on waste related planning applications; and <input type="checkbox"/> • The commissioning of joint reviews, data updates and specific waste related studies. <input type="checkbox"/>

Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be more self-sufficient in managing our own waste through maximising opportunities for waste reduction and increasing the amounts of waste we re-use, recycle, compost and recover meeting regional and national targets over the period to 2026; • To minimise the amount of residual waste sent on to landfill sites within and outside Bradford District. We need to make greater efforts to deal with our own waste within the District; • To ensure that expanded and new waste developments support the planned growth and waste needs of the Bradford community; and • To work in collaboration with neighbouring local authorities and waste industry operators to ensure that sub-regional waste issues are effectively considered and planned for, recognising that each local authority will seek to manage its own waste more effectively in the plan period where this is the most suitable option.
<p>2. Are there any local circumstances which would lead us to depart from these objectives, if so what are they and what should the objectives be?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>

Forecast Future Waste Arisings	
<p>3. Do we need to allocate sites for all categories of waste or do we just need to allocate site for MSW and C&I waste?</p> <p>All Categories of Waste <input type="checkbox"/> MSW and C&I Waste Only <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<p>5. Are the levels of waste to be planned for within the DPD realistic or should we be planning for different levels of waste? If so, what level of waste do you see as being more appropriate / realistic?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>

<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
--	---------------------------

<p>4. Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	<p>6. Through the DPD the Council can include planning approaches which assist in reducing waste arisings, such as promoting the on-site reuse or recycling of waste and how waste is processed for example.</p> <p>Are there other approaches of minimising waste arisings that the Council should promote in the DPD?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
--	---

Regional and National Policy	Agricultural and Other Waste
<p>7. Are there any local circumstances that would lead us to differ from the national and regional policy aspiration to maximise the recycling and re-use of waste? Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>8. Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific? Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

ISSUES AND OPTIONS

ISSUE 1: INTERNAL WASTE MANAGEMENT	
Option 1	Option 3
Focus on consolidating and increasing capacity at existing facilities across the District, and recognise that some waste will need to be managed outside Bradford.	Provide additional sites and capacity to manage more waste than is produced in the District, allowing scope to import and handle waste from other places in the future.
Option 2	Option 4
Provide additional sites and capacity to manage growing waste arisings within the District.	Work with adjacent authorities to identify appropriate sites / facilities to accommodate waste arisings as closely as possible to their source.
Option 5	Question 9
Minimise waste production / arisings across the District through appropriate planning policies, therefore minimising site allocations required.	Which Option or combination of options for Issue 1 are the most appropriate and why?
Question 10	Question 11
Assuming Option 2 and/or 3 are preferential, what type of facilities should be provided?	What other options should be considered?

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES	
Option 1	Option 2
Concentrate waste management facilities in a small number of strategic sites / locations.	Identify a large number of small sites dispersed across the District for waste management purposes.
Question 12	Question 13
Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?	Should different approaches be applied to different waste streams?
Question 14	
Are there any other options that should be considered for Issue 2?	

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES	
Option 1	Option 2
Test all sites on the initial long list within the area of search, excluding those in the Green Belt other than existing facilities.	Test all sites on the initial long list, including new potential sites in the Green Belt.
Question 15	
Which option is the most appropriate and Why? Are there Alternative options?	

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES	
Option 1	Question 16
Test the long list of potential waste sites (appendix 1) against the Municipal Solid Waste and Commercial & Industrial waste facility location criteria as identified.	Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE		
Option 1	Option 2	
Include criteria based policies in the Waste Management DPD that require the maximisation of on-site recycling and re-use of construction and demolition waste as part of the development process to minimise waste arisings.	Include a criteria based policy for locating new and expanded construction and demolition waste management facilities.	
Option 3		
Combination of Options 1 and 2.		
Question 17		
Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?	Question 18	
	Are there any other option that should be considered?	

ISSUE 6 MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS	
Option 1	Option 2
Identify potential new sites for managing hazardous waste now even though such capacity may not be required in the short term plan period	Do not identify potential new sites for managing hazardous waste as they are not required in the short term period.
Option 3	Option 4
Develop a criteria based policy approach for locating 'other' waste management facilities, including hazardous and agricultural waste.	Develop a policy approach combining either Option 1 or 2 with Option 3.
Question 19	Question 20
Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?	Is it appropriate to assume that agricultural waste will be dealt with at point of origin rather than requiring new facilities / sites to be identified?
Question 21	
Should the DPD consider any other types of waste?	

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE	
Option 1	Option 2
Through the inclusion of appropriate criteria based policies, encourage the use of alternative technologies for the treatment of residual waste through limiting landfill capacity within the District.	Provide additional landfill capacity within the District through the identification of suitable sites within the Waste Management DPD.
Option 3	Option 4
Provide a combination of both Options 1 and 2.	Utilise the existing sub-regional capacity in the first instance, but still provide additional landfill capacity within the District through the identification of suitable sites within the Waste Management DPD. Any identified additional landfill capacity only to be utilised when the sub-regional capacity nears exhaustion.
Question 22	Question 23
Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?	For Issue 7 Option 2, should additional capacity be identified in existing or new sites?

Question 24	
Are there other options that should be considered for Issue 7?	

Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential and a schedule of all representations received will be published

Please detach the completed comment form and return by Monday 25th January 2010 to:

Bradford Local Development Framework Group
FREEPOST NEA11445
PO BOX 1068
BRADFORD,
BD1 1BR
email: ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk
Fax 01274 433767

Hand Deliver to the any of the districts planning offices in the City Centre, Keighley, Shipley and Ilkley.

4.0 LIST OF THOSE WHO SUBMITTED A WRITTEN REPRESENTATION

Rep No.	Customer Ref No.	Consultee	Group/Organisation	Agent
1.		Sara Robin	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	
2.		Damian Walsh	Martin Walsh Associates	
3.		Louise Nurser	Lancashire Country Council	
4.		Imogen Scotney	Earth Tech Skenska	Scott Wilson
5.		Toni Rios	Highways Agency	
6.		Ian Sanderson	West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service	
7.		Steve Gibbs	P Casey	The Arley Consulting Company
8.		Ian Smith	English Heritage	
9.		Rose Freeman	Theatres Trust	
10.		Mrs. C. Brown	Steeton-with-Eastburn Parish Council	
11.		Anne Dugdale	Aire Valley Environmental	Covanta / Walker Morris
12.		Alison Munday	Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	
13.		John Pilgrim	Yorkshire Forward	
14.		Mrs. Jo. Griffiths	Burley Parish Council	
15.		Sally Armstrong	Environment Agency	
16.		Mark. E.N. Harrison	Coal Authority	
17.		Mr Martin Millmore	Minerals Planning Group	
18.		Mrs Susan Stead	Bradford Urban Wildlife Group	
19.		Ian Bairstow / Richard Longcake	Waste Disposal Authority	
20.			Environment and Waste Management DPD	

5.0 SCHEDULE OF WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

GENERAL COMMENTS				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Steve Gibbs - The Arley Consulting Company Limited on behalf of P Casey (Enviro) Ltd (PCE)	<p>The consultation refers to preferred option, for example, at Para 5.10. In July 2009 issue of “Plan-it Bradford”, it appeared to be envisaged that two consultations would take place in parallel. Without knowing the content of this related document, we cannot know whether it would be relevant to our responses to the Waste DPD Issues and Options, for example, as discussed below in relation to Question 22.</p> <p>APPLICABILITY TO LANDFILL AND OTHER OPTIONS</p> <p>PCE consider that there is some uncertainty as to whether some of the Issues, Options and Questions are intended to apply to landfills.</p> <p>Para 2.9 includes landfills within the terminology “waste management facilities”</p> <p>However, Figures 14 and 15, within Issue 4 – “Locational criteria” do not include landfills.</p> <p>Issue 1 seems to be concerned primarily with the balance of imports, exports and the management of wastes within the district.</p> <p>Issue 7 seems concerned with similar issues in relation to landfill.</p>	Noted.	No action taken.

GENERAL COMMENTS				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>PCE's impression is therefore that Issue 7 is intended to relate to landfill, and Issues 1-6 to other options. However, para 5.45 refers to the Area of Search in the preferred option. Para 5.11 seems to envisage that that is in the public domain.</p> <p>PCE is therefore unclear as to whether Issue 2 is intended to apply to landfill/</p> <p>PCE suggests that in the next stages the applicability of the content, and the use of the terms "facilities" and "sites" is made clear.</p>		
	Environment Agency	<p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <p>The issues and options document does not mention flood risk, which is an important consideration in locating waste management sites. Please see the following comments on flood risk.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This shall be addressed in the preferred approach.</p>	See Policy WDM2 and allocation proposal statements.
	Environment Agency	<p><u>Sequential Test and Exception Test</u></p> <p>Any development proposed in either high risk flood zone 3 or medium risk flood zone 2 must pass the Sequential Test and where necessary the Exception Test, as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25).</p> <p>PPS25 advocates a sequential approach to siting developments with preference given to those sites in low</p>	Noted.	See allocation proposal statements.

GENERAL COMMENTS				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>risk flood zone 1 (defined as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding in any year). Only where no reasonably available alternative sites are available in flood zone 1 should consideration be given to locating development in medium risk flood zone 2 (defined as having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding in any year). Development should only be considered in high risk flood zone 3 (defined as having a 1 in 100 year or greater annual probability of river flooding in any year) where there are no reasonably available alternative sites in either flood zones 1 or 2. See Annex D of PPS25 for further information.</p> <p>PPS25 classifies landfill and waste management facilities for hazardous waste as uses which are 'more vulnerable' to flood risk. All other waste treatment sites are classified as being 'less vulnerable' to flood risk. When assessing potential waste management sites consideration must be given to the flood risk vulnerability classification PPS25 has assigned the proposed use. A 'more vulnerable' use proposed in high risk flood zone 3a which passes the Sequential Test, must then go on to pass the Exception Test (Table D.3, paragraph D9). Neither 'more' or 'less' vulnerable development (i.e. any</p>		

GENERAL COMMENTS				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>type of waste site) is permissible in flood zone 3b – classed as ‘functional floodplain’.</p> <p><u>Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment</u></p> <p>All development proposals in medium risk flood zone 2 and high risk flood zone 3 must be accompanied by an FRA which demonstrates that the development can remain safe in the event of a flood and will not increase flood risk to the site or elsewhere.</p> <p>All development proposals over one hectare in flood zone 1 must also be accompanied by an FRA. In this case the FRA should demonstrate that surface waters will be managed to avoid increased flood risk to the site or elsewhere.</p>		
	Environment Agency	<p>Flood risk assessments should be carried out to the appropriate degree of detail and assess the risks of all forms of flooding to and from development and must take climate change into account, as required by PPS25.</p> <p>Those developments within flood zones 2 and 3 which pass the Sequential Test and where necessary the Exception Test, must adopt a sequential approach to site layout. The site layout must aim to keep those elements of the development most vulnerable to flooding in the lowest flood risk areas of the site. The development should also have appropriate mitigation measures to</p>	Noted.	See allocation statements.

GENERAL COMMENTS				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		reduce the impact of flood events.		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	<p>Comment - Chapter 2 the waste forecasting needs to be revisited (MSW over estimates) some of the values in the table dated 2005! In 2.7 given that there is still plenty of landfill (including active waste) in the sub region, Bradford is likely to continue to export residual waste arising from waste treatment activities, and thus should not be criticised for such export of residual wastes into the sub region.</p> <p>Chapter 4 Comment - MSW values and % recycled can be updated via data held by waste management (4.9, 4.10).</p>	Noted.	See revised Forecasts for waste arisings in Preferred Approach document (Table 2)
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strengthen strategy for then than MSE ▪ Ensure Bradford MDC does take responsibility for all waste 	Noted.	Further justification for management of each waste stream is made in the Preferred Approach, with a criteria policy based approach for residual, hazardous, agricultural and CDEW waste. The management of MSW and C&I waste will be through a combination of policy and proposed allocated sites.

CROSS BOUNDARY CONSIDERATIONS				
Question 1: How should CBMDC work jointly with neighbouring local authorities and those where the District currently exports its waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Information sharing relating to key waste data indicators, their analysis and interpretation.	Noted.	See 'Policy W2:Cross Boundary Work' regarding sharing relevant information.
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>It is considered that CBMDC should work together with neighbouring local authorities within West Yorkshire to find joint solutions for waste management where such solutions offer benefits in terms of proximity¹, affordability and sustainability etc. Except in the case of specialist facilities which are designed to manage single waste streams or hazardous wastes for example, it should be recognised that proximity and sustainability criteria are unlikely to be met if such joint facilities manage waste arising from or transported to location outside of the West Yorkshire sub-region.</p> <p>Connected with this, CBMDC should consider, in preparing the Waste Management DPD, that it will be relevant not simply to plan to manage all of the waste arising within the administrative area of Bradford but that some of Bradford's waste is likely to be exported while waste from other neighbouring local authorities may be imported.</p>	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.

CROSS BOUNDARY CONSIDERATIONS				
Question 1: How should CBMDC work jointly with neighbouring local authorities and those where the District currently exports its waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>Information sharing, data updates and collaborative working on emerging DPD's and their reviews is therefore particularly important, so that CBMDC can fully appreciate, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changing circumstances in neighbouring local authorities; and ▪ Any need to change the level of waste management facility provision in Bradford as a result of changes in the type and amount of waste imported to and exported from Bradford, <p>And thus CBMDC is able to plan accordingly.</p>		
	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency sees joint working with neighbouring authorities as very important, particularly due to not only the amount of waste currently exported from the District but also the amount of waste which is currently imported. Therefore, the District also needs to work jointly with those authorities which import waste to Bradford District.	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	All of the above [options for question 1]. Cooperation with adjacent authorities will have many advantages and lead to more efficient waste planning.	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.
	Burley Parish Council	[Supported all options for joint working]	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.

CROSS BOUNDARY CONSIDERATIONS				
Question 1: How should CBMDC work jointly with neighbouring local authorities and those where the District currently exports its waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment Agency	<p><u>Cross-Boundary Considerations</u></p> <p>We agree that Bradford should work closely with neighbouring local authorities in the areas listed. We would also like to see '<i>sharing information and experience of new waste technology</i>' included in the list of actions.</p> <p>There should be a joint approach to the management of specific waste streams in order to achieve the highest levels of resource recovery. For example, despite both waste wood and food wastes having recognised treatment technologies aimed at removing them from residual waste streams, a large percentage is still disposed of as residual waste.</p>	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information sharing relating to key waste data indicators, their analysis and interpretation ▪ Collaborative working on emerging waste DPD's and their reviews ▪ The commissioning of joint reviews, data updates and specific waste related studies 	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	<p>Joint working with neighbouring councils is a 2 way process and we need to understand their views on working with us. As waste has impacts beyond the development site (traffic and emissions) consideration of neighbouring LPA's will be needed in determining waste applications, we should be open to working with neighbouring LPA's on as many levels as possible to assist in determining applications, however possible sites and policies within Bradford district are a matter for Bradford.</p>	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.
	Environment and Waste Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All actions should be explored with neighbouring authorities ▪ Need to learn lessons from the aborted interim waste contract ▪ Is there a contradiction between paragraphs 3.22 	Noted.	See 'Policy W2: Cross Boundary Working'.

CROSS BOUNDARY CONSIDERATIONS				
Question 1: How should CBMDC work jointly with neighbouring local authorities and those where the District currently exports its waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Improvement Committee	<p>and 3.23?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council should consider commissioning a comprehensive academic led review of its waste management strategies that assesses performance in relation to best practice worldwide, seeking to identify opportunities to incorporate lessons learnt. 		

OBJECTIVES				
Question 2: Are there any local circumstances which would lead us to depart from these objectives, if so what are they and what should the objectives be?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	If the objectives are read holistically, they are broadly supported. However, if the third point is read in isolation, CBMDC is invited to note it is appropriate (and in accordance with national guidance as stated in PPS10) to plan for an appropriate contribution to the waste needs of the sub-region and not just the Bradford community.	Noted.	See revised Preferred Approach Objectives.
	Highways Agency	The aim of self-sufficiency is welcomed as large amounts of waste are currently being exported, primarily to Wakefield	Noted.	See revised Preferred Approach Objectives.

OBJECTIVES				
Question 2: Are there any local circumstances which would lead us to depart from these objectives, if so what are they and what should the objectives be?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>District, resulting in HGV trips on the Agency's Strategic Road Network (SRN). However, it does appear that the commitment to self-sufficiency is a little weaker now that it was in 2007. The February 2007 Topic Paper stated that the District "<i>should look to be self sufficient</i>" in managing the waste it generates, whereas the current Issues and Options document states that the District is "<i>to be more self-sufficient</i>" in managing its own waste" and it is "<i>to minimise the amount of waste sent on the landfill sites within and outside Bradford District</i>".</p> <p>We consider that minimising transport needs should be a consideration in inter-authority discussions on sub-regional waste issues to comply with the spirit of PPS10.</p> <p>The only local circumstance which should be considered which would result in a departure from these objectives is if there is an existing waste handling facility in a neighbouring authority which is closer to the point of source than the nearest alternative particularly if that means potential HGV movements on the SRN can be removed. We have not seen a reference to the location proposed for the new waste management facility referred to in paragraphs 3.21-3.24 of the Issues and Options document.</p>		

OBJECTIVES				
Question 2: Are there any local circumstances which would lead us to depart from these objectives, if so what are they and what should the objectives be?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		
	English Heritage	In view of the Governments objectives regarding sustainable waste management, one might have expected the objectives to have included some reference to ensuring that new waste developments are provided for in a way that protects human health and the environment. Consequently, it is suggested that the third objective is amended to read:- <i>“To ensure that expanded and new waste developments support the planned growth and waste needs of Bradford and are delivered in a manner which protects the District’s environmental assets and safeguards human health.”</i>	Noted.	See revised Preferred Approach Objectives.
	Burley Parish Council	No	Noted.	See revised Preferred Approach Objectives.
	Environment Agency	<u>Objectives – waste as a resource</u> The objectives for waste management make sense but we would like more emphasis on waste as a resource. We would add to the list of objectives: <i>‘To consider and plan for the use of waste as a raw material/energy source for local industry both existing and new’.</i>	Noted.	See revised Preferred Approach Objectives.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	I believe the Bradford District is coping better than some Authorities over the collecting and to recycle more domestic waste has been achieved partially in the Bingley District (the latter being the first to provide a paper bin). The problem is supermarkets who aim to provide people with a	Noted.	See revised Preferred Approach Objectives.

OBJECTIVES				
Question 2: Are there any local circumstances which would lead us to depart from these objectives, if so what are they and what should the objectives be?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		reusable shopping bag, but do not enforce this as a necessity.		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	No Comment.		
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, even if a cheaper solution could well be purchase LATS (re: waste arisings, do we just dismiss agricultural waste in our forecast?) 	Noted.	See revised forecasts in the Preferred Approach report. (Table 2).

FORECAST FUTURE WASTE ARISINGS				
Question 3: Do we need to allocate sites for all categories of waste or do we just need to allocate sites for MSW and C&I waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals	All Categories of Waste. Allocations should be made for all waste types in order to realistically plan for the future.	Noted. Due to the volumes of waste arisings for Residual and	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred

FORECAST FUTURE WASTE ARISING				
Question 3: Do we need to allocate sites for all categories of waste or do we just need to allocate sites for MSW and C&I waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Planning Group		Hazardous wastes, it does not quantify the allocation of a site for either waste stream. Agricultural and CDEW are typically treated on site / in-situ and thus sites will not be allocated for either waste stream.	Approach report.
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	It is considered that CBMDC should prioritise, above other categories of waste, the allocation of suitable sites to deal with MSW and Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste.	Noted.	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred Approach report.
	Burley Parish Council	All Categories of Waste	Due to the volumes of waste arisings for Residual and Hazardous wastes, it does not quantify the allocation of a site for either waste stream. Agricultural and CDEW are typically treated on site / in-situ and thus sites will not be allocated for either waste stream.	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred Approach report.

FORECAST FUTURE WASTE ARISING				
Question 3: Do we need to allocate sites for all categories of waste or do we just need to allocate sites for MSW and C&I waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Domestic waste should be cut even further than at present by the removal of plastic containers from many items in supermarkets and to reuse their food waste in the right way thus reducing the necessity of more allocated sites. Education of the public and industry is the way forward.	Noted. The Council's priority aligns with the waste hierarchy to reduce, reuse, recycle.	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred Approach report.
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	No	Noted.	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred Approach report.
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 50% of Bradford MDC's waste is MSW and CI waste. We cannot dismiss the balance 	Due to the volumes of waste arisings for Residual and Hazardous wastes, it does not quantify the allocation of a site for either waste stream. Agricultural and CDEW are typically treated on site / in-situ and thus sites will not be allocated for either waste stream.	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred Approach report.
	Highways Agency	It is stated in paragraph 4.4 that the growth in total waste arisings is just 4%, however, the numbers in Figure 10 show that there is a 14% growth in waste arisings forecast. Is this a typing error in paragraph 4.4 that should read 14%?	Noted.	Please see revised forecasts within the Preferred Approach.

FORECAST FUTURE WASTE ARISING				
Question 3: Do we need to allocate sites for all categories of waste or do we just need to allocate sites for MSW and C&I waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>The need for new waste management facilities in Bradford District</p> <p>It is stated in paragraph 4.10 that existing incidences of recycling and composting in Bradford stand at around 21% of total MSW generated for 2007/08. This would equate to around 55,000 tonnes currently being recycled. It is stated that by 2021 a minimum of 158,000 tonnes of MSW is required to be recycled. Paragraph 4.10 states that infrastructure to meet the minimum need for an additional 158,000 tonnes of MSW is required. However, in the previous paragraph it states that 55,000 tonnes of waste is currently being recycled. Therefore, is there only the need for an additional 103,000 tonnes?</p> <p>Also the last bullet point of paragraph 4.11 states that further capacity would be needed for 357,000 tonnes of C&I waste. If, of the forecast 649,000 tonnes, 214,170 tonnes goes to land fill and recovery capacity has been estimated at 78,000 tonnes, this results in capacity for 357,000 tonnes of waste required. Is there not already capacity for C&I waste in the district?</p> <p>The Agency would welcome the significant improvement in re-use, recycling and composting to be delivered through</p>		

FORECAST FUTURE WASTE ARISING				
Question 3: Do we need to allocate sites for all categories of waste or do we just need to allocate sites for MSW and C&I waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>the PFI and the Waste Management DPD.</p> <p>As hazardous waste is not forecast to increase and if policies are in place that require the maximisation of on-site recycling and re-use of construction and demolition waste, which the Highways Agency would strongly support as this minimises the amount of potential HGV trips on the SRN, sites will just need to be allocated for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and Commercial & Industrial (C&I) waste.</p>		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Just sites for MSW & C&I	Noted.	Sites are allocated for the management of MSW and C&I within the Preferred Approach report.

Question 4: Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on	No Comment Made		

Question 4: Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)			
	Highways Agency	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		
	Burley Parish Council	Don't know		
	Environment Agency			
	Bradford Wildlife Group	We are a "throw away" society and this should be a way of thinking which should change. Unfortunately the economy is built upon it.	Noted.	The principals of the waste hierarchy are embedded throughout the Preferred Approach report.
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Yes	Noted.	See criteria based policy approach to 'other' waste stream in the Preferred Approach report.
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No – see answer to Q.3 		

FORECAST FUTURE WASTE ARISING				
Question 5: Are the levels of waste to be planned for within the DPD realistic or should we be planning for different levels of waste? If so, what level of waste do you see as being more appropriate / realistic?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Burley Parish Council	All forecasts see an increase in waste should we not be aiming to reduce targets? Why is construction / demolition so high? Should not more recycling on site be carried out?	Noted. The forecasts have now been revised within the Preferred Approach report. The forecasts put forward are considered the most accurate and realistic picture of what is likely to occur. Although waste will increase, policies within the Preferred Approach report will encourage waste to be managed more sustainably.	See Preferred Approach forecasts (Table 2).
	Highways Agency	The forecasts of waste arisings have been taken from the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly data presented in the RSS (proposed changes 2007), supplemented by forecasts of waste arisings obtained from research	Noted.	

Question 4: Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		undertaken by Enviros Consulting Limited on behalf of Government Office for Yorkshire and Humberside in 2007 (<i>Waste Arisings Forecast</i>). Analysis of the increase in households in the RSS (proposed changes) shows that the number of households in Bradford District is set to increase by around 19% between 2007 and 2021 taking the 2007 figures from Tempro version 5.4. Figure 10 shows that Municipal Solid Waste is set to rise by 21%. Therefore, this looks like a robust forecast.		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	If the message of 'reduce, re-use, recycle' is reinforced and sustainable systems are being followed then net MSW should be lower despite projected growth in population.	Noted. The waste arising's forecasts have now been revised in the Preferred Approach report.	Please see revised forecasts in Preferred Approach report (Table 2).
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	It is appropriate that the starting point for the Waste Management DPD is to plan for the projected waste arisings for Bradford that are contained within the published RSS (the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, 2008) – in absence of CBMDC having its own, potentially more accurate, figures. The figures that are presented in the Issue and Options consultation document are taken from the previous draft of the RSS (the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes, 2007) and not from the final, published plan (the reason for	Noted. The waste arising's forecasts have now been revised in the Preferred Approach report.	Please see revised forecasts in Preferred Approach report (Table 2). The Plan period has also been changed to 2026.

Question 4: Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste?												
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required								
		<p>this is unclear). The figures contained within the published Plan are as follows (MSW and C&I waste arisings, tonnes per annum for Bradford):</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>MSW</u></td> <td><u>C&I</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010 – 279,000</td> <td>2010 – 628,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015 – 296,000</td> <td>2015 – 638,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2021 – 318,000</td> <td>2021 – 649,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>These figures vary slightly from those contained within the draft plan (the MSW figures are slightly higher in the published version). It is these figures which it is considered should be referenced within the Waste Management DPD and which the CBMDC should use as a starting point to plan for waste management throughout the Plan period.</p> <p>As mentioned above (in response to Question 1) it will be relevant for CBMDC not simply to plan to manage all of the waste arising within the administrative area of Bradford but to consider that some of Bradford's waste is likely to be exported while waste from other neighbouring local authorities may be imported.</p> <p>Lastly, it is stated within the consultation document that it is intended the Waste Management DPD will cover a period of 15 years and it is anticipated that the DPD will be adopted in early 2011. In which case, there is a gap of 5 years where data on projected waste arisings is not</p>	<u>MSW</u>	<u>C&I</u>	2010 – 279,000	2010 – 628,000	2015 – 296,000	2015 – 638,000	2021 – 318,000	2021 – 649,000		
<u>MSW</u>	<u>C&I</u>											
2010 – 279,000	2010 – 628,000											
2015 – 296,000	2015 – 638,000											
2021 – 318,000	2021 – 649,000											

Question 4: Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		available (i.e. the figures in the RSS only go up to 2021, where as the plan period is intended to reach up to 2026). How will the waste arisings for the last five years be projected? It is thought that the DPD should contain a projection for waste arisings throughout the Plan period (i.e. 2011 to 206) and also maintain capacity sufficient (i.e. at least 10 years of the annual requirement – see PPS 10 para.18) throughout the plan period.		

DRAFT

Question 4: Is it sufficient to have criteria based policy in place for 'other' (all categories of waste excluding MSW and C&I waste) categories of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment Agency	The approach to forecasting is reasonable. As the document states, information on construction and agricultural waste is not so reliable and is also dependent on economic activity. We will keep you informed as new data becomes available.	Noted.	
	Bradford Wildlife Group	These are realistic. As a society we are producing more waste than is necessary. The education of the public, industry and the farming communities should be as essential plan forward. There is nothing in the Document concerning the education of the public.	Noted. In regards to education of the public, this will be covered by the Council's corporate waste management strategy, rather than the Waste Management DPD which will only cover planning related waste issues.	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Concern over levels of waste predictions, this forecasting needs to be remodelled using more up to date values. It may be helpful to understand how other LPA's are forecasting waste growth.	Noted. The waste arising's forecasts have now been revised in the Preferred Approach report.	Please see revised forecasts in Preferred Approach report (Table 2).
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility needs to be incorporated within DPD to accommodate change in levels of waste i.e. effect of more recycling, more regeneration. 	Noted.	See revision to forecasts in Preferred Approach report (Table 2).

Question 6: Through the DPD the Council can include planning approaches which assist in reducing waste arisings, such as promoting the on-site reuse or recycling of waste and how waste is processed for example.				
Are there other approaches of minimising waste arisings that the Council should promote in the DPD?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Co-Mingling collections and recycling.	Noted.	
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	CBMDC should encourage education initiatives which are aimed at improving public understanding of waste and resource management generally and which promote waste minimisation, reuse and recycling. Although most of the means by which this objective can be achieved fall outside the influence of the planning system, visitor/education centres for example can be provided alongside large scale waste recycling, recovery and treatment facilities, allowing the public access to appreciate and support sustainable forms of waste management.	Noted. In regards to education of the public, this will be covered by the Council's corporate waste management strategy, rather than the Waste Management DPD which will only cover planning related waste issues.	
	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency would support any planning approaches which assist in reducing waste arising. It is suggested that as C&I waste represents a large proportion (38%) of the total waste arisings in Bradford, the Council	Noted. In regards to education of the public, this will be covered by	

Question 6: Through the DPD the Council can include planning approaches which assist in reducing waste arisings, such as promoting the on-site reuse or recycling of waste and how waste is processed for example.

Are there other approaches of minimising waste arisings that the Council should promote in the DPD?

Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		should consider encouraging small and medium sized enterprises in the application of waste minimisation processes and set an example by setting targets for in-house waste minimisation and recovery. A public information programme for environmental issues in general and waste management in particular. The Council could also set realistic disposal charges will be imposed which further waste minimisation objectives.	the Council's corporate waste management strategy, rather than the Waste Management DPD which will only cover planning related waste issues.	
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Clear messaging • Community training/workshops • Directory/signposting of alternative waste disposal i.e. second hand furniture stores, local recycling centres (Orinoco, Oxford for e.g.), homeless shelters, composting schemes. • Charity run businesses adjacent to waste disposal sites where material which could be taken out of the waste stream is sold. There are a number of successful operations and apparently there is one at Kings Lynn. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In regards to education, messaging and training of the public, this will be covered by the Council's corporate waste management strategy, rather than the Waste Management DPD which will only cover planning related waste issues.</p>	
	English Heritage	Given the proportion of waste that comes from construction and demolition, the LDF, as a whole, should seek, in the	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This approach to the</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach report.

Question 6: Through the DPD the Council can include planning approaches which assist in reducing waste arisings, such as promoting the on-site reuse or recycling of waste and how waste is processed for example.

Are there other approaches of minimising waste arisings that the Council should promote in the DPD?

Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		first instance, to encourage the reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings. Only where this is clearly shown not to be feasible or to be the most sustainable option, would buildings be allowed to be demolished and the site redeveloped. Where demolition is allowed, provision should be made to reuse the materials wherever possible.	management of CDEW will be taken into the Preferred Approach.	
	Burley Parish Council	Reduction in packaging and encourage this at the national legislative level. Promote recycling e.g. cheap composting bins.	Noted. These issues shall be covered by the Council corporate waste management strategy rather than the Waste Management DPD.	
	Environment Agency	The council could promote sustainable construction through a Supplementary Planning Document. This document could flag the need for Site Waste Management Plans and good building design so as to encourage and facilitate waste segregation.	Noted. The Core Strategy will cover areas of sustainable construction methods. The Council will also explore how this can be incorporated into the Preferred Approach report.	See Policy WDM4 of the Preferred Approach report.
	Bradford	As mentioned above to try and educate and encourage	Noted.	

Question 6: Through the DPD the Council can include planning approaches which assist in reducing waste arisings, such as promoting the on-site reuse or recycling of waste and how waste is processed for example.

Are there other approaches of minimising waste arisings that the Council should promote in the DPD?

Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Wildlife Group	private companies etc to cut down their waste individually and industry.	In regards to education, messaging and training of the public, this will be covered by the Council's corporate waste management strategy, rather than the Waste Management DPD which will only cover planning related waste issues.	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Over the full spectrum of planning development, waste prevention, re use, recycling needs to be considered as part of proposed development.	Noted. The Waste Hierarchy is incorporated throughout the Waste Management DPD and is a material consideration in proposed development.	
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Yes. Dialogue with industry bodies (building / construction and highways / other councils.	The Council will continue to engage with industry bodies through the course of plan production.	

REGIONAL AND NATIONAL POLICY				
Question 7: Are there any local circumstances that would lead us to differ from the national and regional policy aspiration to maximise the recycling and reuse of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	There needs to be flexibility in Bradford’s attitude towards development of recycling facilities within worked out quarries albeit that they are often located in the Green Belt.	Noted. The use of mineral extraction sites (quarries) for waste management shall be considered in the production of the Preferred Approach report.	The use of mineral extraction sites for waste management facilities is considered for a range of waste types in the Preferred Approach report. For all waste types, the use of mineral extraction sites is included within the sequential assessment for preferential sites.
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		

REGIONAL AND NATIONAL POLICY				
Question 7: Are there any local circumstances that would lead us to differ from the national and regional policy aspiration to maximise the recycling and reuse of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency would always support the national and regional policy aspiration to maximise the recycling and re-use of construction and demolition waste. It would not encourage a departure from this policy aspiration as this could result in additional HGV movements on the SRN.	Noted. The maximisation of the re-use and recycling of CDEW shall be investigated further in the Preferred Approach report.	The Preferred Approach report encourages the management of CDEW in-situ / on site.
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		
	Burley Parish Council	No	Noted.	
	Bradford Wildlife Group	No	Noted/	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	No	Noted/	
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	No – firm commitment to national and regional policy	Noted.	

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Agricultural waste is frequently valuable for the production of methane	Noted.	
	Burley Parish Council	Yes	Noted.	
	Bradford Wildlife Group	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Yes	Noted/	

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Most definitely	Noted.	
ISSUE 1: INTERNAL WASTE MANAGEMENT				
Question 9: Which option or combination of options for Issue 1 are the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	<p>Issue 1</p> <p>Accepting that Bradford has to become more self sufficient in waste provision, and also plan for the future, it must first aspire to option 5, after this option 1 and 2 will be needed.</p> <p>Option 3 may be of interest only if there are sound environmental, economic and employment benefits in dealing with waste imports.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach will be a combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that the Waste DPD has sufficient flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.</p>	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	No Comment Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>It is thought that a combination of options one, two and three is preferable.</p> <p>Firstly, there is a need to safeguard existing waste management facilities that will continue to contribute significantly to waste management infrastructure in Bradford in the future. The inclusion of such facilities/sites within the Waste Management DPD should be conditional on the sites being appropriate in planning terms – i.e. in close proximity to urban areas, within 1km of the strategic highway network and not subject to significant environmental constraints (e.g. within the Green Belt or adjacent to a SSSI, etc).CBMDC should, in the first instance, seek to utilise the potential for developing existing waste management facilities and opportunities to develop these sites (e.g. to increase operational efficiency and/or to maximise opportunities for recycling and recovery of waste) should be supported. This has a number of benefits, such as:</p>	<p>The preferred policy approach will be a combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that the Waste DPD has sufficient flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.</p>	<p>See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.</p>

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Established waste management use (in planning terms); ▪ Established highway infrastructure and routing vehicles; ▪ Established facility for customers; ▪ Local acceptance of the site for waste management use; and ▪ Sustainable use of existing assets. <p>The document does not currently include provision for safeguarding (and, potentially, development) of suitable existing waste management sites but it is understood, from attendance at the Stakeholder Event held in Bradford on 8th December 2009, that it is intended the Waste Management DPD will do so.</p> <p>It is recognised that, in addition to developing/expanding existing facilities where possible (and appropriate in planning terms), there will be a need to allocate new sites for development in order to manage the waste arisings within Bradford and also (</p>		
	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency feels that in order to reduce the number of HGV movements on the SRN, Option 5 , to	The preferred policy approach will be a	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>minimise waste production/arising across the District through appropriate planning policies, therefore, minimising the site allocations required is important. However, there will still be a need to increase waste disposal within the District, particularly as currently a large proportion of waste is exported to other districts. All moves towards self-sufficiency will be welcomed and therefore the Agency would prefer Option 2 - providing additional sites and capacity to manage growing waste arisings in the District over Option 1. The Highways Agency does recognise that some waste will need to be transported across LPA boundaries to sub- regional facilities. However, there is the risk that there would be some impact on the SRN and therefore the Agency would only encourage Option4 (working with adjacent authorities to identify appropriate sites) in order to identify sites in neighbouring authorities which are closer to the source if it had no impact on the SRN.</p> <p>In general, the Agency would not support Option 3 providing additional sites and capacity to manage more waste than is produced in the District, allowing scope to import and handle waste from other places in the future as</p>	<p>combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that the Waste DPD has sufficient flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.</p>	

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		this could result in additional HGV trips on the SRN. The Agency would only have no objection if it would benefit a neighbouring authority without producing additional trips on the SRN.		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Options 4&5 offer the most sensible and sustainable solutions. Minimising waste should always be the main priority but where this has not been possible facilities should be located close to their source to reduce their carbon footprint.	The preferred policy approach will be a combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that the Waste DPD has sufficient flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.
	Burley Parish Council	Option 4 and 5	The preferred policy approach will be a combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that the Waste DPD has sufficient	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.	
	Environment Agency	We support Bradford's commitment to take responsibility for its own waste by providing facilities within the district but would ask that development of waste capacity (both public and private) in other districts is kept in view so as to achieve the most sustainable solution.	The preferred policy approach will be a combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that the Waste DPD has sufficient flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Option 1 and option 5 because there is not enough room in the District for additional sites and having to accommodate waste closely to the source could damage the environment.	The preferred policy approach will be a combination of Options 2, 3 and 4 in order to reflect consultation and SA findings and the need to ensure that	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

AGRICULTURAL AND 'OTHER' WASTE				
Question 8: Should criteria based policies be considered for the provision of waste management facilities for agricultural and 'other' types of waste arising rather than site specific?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			the Waste DPD has sufficient flexibility and adaptability to respond to future circumstances and approaches to waste management.	

Question 10: Assuming Options 2 and / or 3 are preferential, what type of facilities should be provided?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comments Made		

Question 10: Assuming Options 2 and / or 3 are preferential, what type of facilities should be provided?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>It is thought that CBMDC should prioritise the development of large recycling, recovery and treatment facilities, preferably with a range of facilities co-located on one site, in close proximity to urban areas and within 1km of the strategic highway network.</p> <p>All of the above will help to ensure that the Council move towards more sustainable waste management solutions, with fewer waste miles travelled and movement of a significant proportion of Bradford's waste higher up the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach will identify a range of suitable waste management sites capable of accommodating Bradford's MSW and C&I waste arisings with a further contingency allowance to ensure that the District can contribute to meeting wider sub-regional waste management needs where appropriate and to ensure flexibility in supply over the plan period.</p>	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.
	Highways Agency	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	N/A		
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Wildlife Group	No Comment Made		

Question 10: Assuming Options 2 and / or 3 are preferential, what type of facilities should be provided?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	We should not try to limit technology choice but seek to embrace all of those technologies previously described.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach will identify a range of suitable waste management sites capable of accommodating Bradford's MSW and C&I waste arisings with a further contingency allowance to ensure that the District can contribute to meeting wider sub-regional waste management needs where appropriate and to ensure flexibility in supply over the plan period.</p>	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 10: Assuming Options 2 and / or 3 are preferential, what type of facilities should be provided?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Depends on the outcome of the PFI contract – however, Council may want to consider options that are linked to but not necessarily part of the eventual contract such as CHP.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach will identify a range of suitable waste management sites capable of accommodating Bradford's MSW and C&I waste arisings with a further contingency allowance to ensure that the District can contribute to meeting wider sub-regional waste management needs where appropriate and to ensure flexibility in supply over the plan period.</p>	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 11: What other options should be considered?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency believes that all of the options have been considered and that it is a combination of options which is required as discussed in our response to Question 9.	Noted. See response to Q9.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.
	Yorkshire Wild Trust	Increase recycling capacity or look to neighbouring LAs to accommodate increased recycling.	Noted. See response to Q9.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Simply increase capacity at existing sites and expect to send some waste to be managed outside Bradford.	Noted. See response to Q9.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 11: What other options should be considered?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Waste minimisation policies	Noted. See response to Q9.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Energy from waste facilities not dismissed, subject to stringent environmental protection and with guarantees that recycling will be maximised rather than made subordinate to some extent to an Energy from Waste contract.	Noted. See response to Q9.	See Policy W4 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comments Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>It is considered that the most appropriate option for CBMDC, with regard to the management of MSW and C&I waste is to concentrate the development of waste management facilities (including residual waste treatment) in a small number of sites, strategically and appropriately located.</p> <p>It is likely that large scale, strategic waste treatment facility(s) should be supported by a range of other, smaller facilities (e.g. in the case of MSW this could include Bring Sites, Household Recycling Facilities and Transfer Stations).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.</p>	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Highways Agency	<p>The Agency would be happy to comment on the long list of sites at the appropriate time – we note that, in the Methodology Statement, that this list has been reduced to 65 sites. When would be the appropriate time to comment on these sites?</p> <p>The Highways Agency would prefer Option 2 as this would reduce the need to travel and hence potential HGV trips on the SRN.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.</p> <p>A long list of sites will be published alongside the Preferred Approach within the Site Assessment Report.</p>	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	A combination of Options 1 and 2. Smaller local sites are more sustainable and will be easier to decommission should less sites be needed in the future. Larger sites may be more appropriate for some types of infrastructure.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.</p>	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Burley Parish Council	Option 2	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.</p>	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment Agency	The chosen solution must be the one that extracts the most value from waste and is also flexible enough to accommodate advances in technology and changes in waste composition.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.</p>	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Wildlife Group	[Option 1 ticked] Concentration of a small number of sites is more environmentally acceptable. We do not have the room for a large number.	Noted. The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Issue 2 Site sizes/ capacity can vary from 0.5h to 10.0h easily, so providing for only a small number of strategic (large) sites seems inappropriate, can compromise to some extent on proximity principles and desires to concentrate traffic and potential polluting activities, thus selecting option 2 but including also larger strategic sites seems more realistic approach to cater for the differing waste streams.	Noted. The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 12: Which option for Issue 2 is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more environmentally friendly - least public resistance - existing facilities <p><u>Additional comment:</u> environmental benefits depend to some extent on transportation issues (few sites mean more transport?) and the nature of the facility (very localised CHP plants may not be feasible, but other waste sorting centre might be).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach to the location of potential waste sites for MSW and C&I combine both Options 1 and 2, but the sites will be restricted to 1ha, or above, to ensure that appropriate sites, rather than numerous sites are identified. There will be the potential to accommodate a combination of waste technologies and offer sufficient choice to the waste operators on the market.</p>	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 13: Should different approaches be applied to different waste streams?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Yes – Green Waste recycling for instance should occur away from residential / industrial areas – it is best placed in the countryside which is likely to be in the Green Belt.	Noted. The Preferred Approach will state the need to treat different waste streams in individual ways using the drivers of their particular requirements and location preferences relevant to the individual types of waste facility.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		

Question 13: Should different approaches be applied to different waste streams?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Burley Parish Council	Yes there may be economics of scale for some streams.	Noted. The Preferred Approach will state the need to treat different waste streams in individual ways using the drivers of their particular requirements and location preferences relevant to the individual types of waste facility.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	I think these have to be in certain cases.		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Probably yes, as MSW treatment will require larger capacity facilities strategically sited.	Noted. The Preferred Approach will state the need to treat different waste streams in individual ways using the drivers of their particular requirements and location preferences relevant to the individual types of waste facility.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 13: Should different approaches be applied to different waste streams?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Yes, depending on Q.12	Noted. The Preferred Approach will state the need to treat different waste streams in individual ways using the drivers of their particular requirements and location preferences relevant to the individual types of waste facility.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 14: Are there any other options that should be considered for Issue 2?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Yes – Best solution is probably a combination of 1 + 2.	Noted. See response to Q12.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 14: Are there any other options that should be considered for Issue 2?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	No Comment Made		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Some mineral extraction sites may have very high potential for restoration to increase biodiversity and connectivity of habitat. To use such sites for landfill would be contrary to PPS9.	Noted. See response to Q12 / Q13.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Environment Agency	The chosen solution must be the one that extracts the most value from waste and is also flexible enough to accommodate advances in technology and changes in waste composition.	Noted. See response to Q12 / Q13.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	To combine both options.	Noted. See response to Q12 / Q13.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 2: LOCATION OF WASTE SITES				
Question 14: Are there any other options that should be considered for Issue 2?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Perhaps – for chemical / hazardous waste	Noted. See response to Q12 / Q13.	See Policy W5 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Must follow option 2 or opportunities to utilise worked out minerals sites will be lost or restricted mineral sites can only have been approved if they have no unacceptable impacts and thus are often well-suited for the establishment of waste management facilities.	The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>All sites (excluding those within the Green Belt and those which do not meet the minimum site size of 0.5 ha) should be tested.</p> <p>ETS supports CBMDC's approach, which is not to include any sites within the Green Belt unless an insufficient number of sites are identified as suitable in the area of search not within the Green Belt (this reflects national planning guidance and to adopt an alternative approach would be unsound).</p>	<p>The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.</p>	<p>See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.</p>

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Highways Agency	The Highways Agency prefers Option 1, that sites in the Green Belt should not be considered. However, if a site outside the Green Belt would result in a significant number of HGV movements on the SRN, then alternative sites within the Green Belt should be considered.	The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	There does not appear to be a criteria in the list of factors considered in para 5.10 to take account of biodiversity or the potential to enhance sites and increase habitat connectivity. A further option would be to exclude sites which if used would have a negative effect on biodiversity. Some brownfield sites in urban areas may be very biodiverse and valuable for wildlife and some sites in the green belt may not be so valuable.	The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Burley Parish Council	Option 1. Option 2 if for very good reasons the first is not possible. Sites should be near where waste is generated.	The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Option 1. We do not agree with new potential sites in the green belt. Development cannot take place within the green belt, so why should waste facilities be allocated. Many wildlife areas and sites of ecological importance are situated in the green belt.	The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	<p>Issue 3</p> <p>Would opt for option 2, to include very limited green belt to within say 1km of primary road network for limited waste management options (note comment in methodology statement 2.7), yet fully accepting the need for all other constraints also.</p>	<p>The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.</p>	<p>See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.</p>

ISSUE 3: IDENTIFYING SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 15: Which option is the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Option 1 – no green belt unless part of existing facility	<p>The Council's preferred policy approach will adopt Option 2 both on the basis of the findings of consultation and SA but also on the basis of ensuring effective, proactive and robust evidence underpins the identification and selection of Waste Management sites. All sites on the pre-eligibility list will be taken into account. All will be considered with the Green Belt designation applied as an additional site assessment filter following the assessment of all sites. This is to ensure an objective and robust site assessment process is capable of being undertaken to select the most appropriate waste management sites for MSW and C&I waste.</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach and Accompanying Site Assessment Report.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comments Made		
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Yes (with some qualification, energy from waste not necessarily the first resort for waste management)	Noted The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning policy.	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.
	Imogen Scotney – Scott	With regard to Figure 14 (Site Location Impact Criteria), it is considered there are flaws with the approach taken. The	Noted	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>minimum site size values given for most of the facilities generally appear reasonable. However, the value given for in-vessel composting and anaerobic digestion is not particularly helpful (<2.5 ha) as it can be interpreted as a minimum site size of anywhere between 0 and 2.5 ha is required for these two technology types. The remainder of the assessment criteria (i.e. 'creates air/noise/water pollution, etc.') are thought to be flawed, since arguably any/every waste management facility has the potential to give rise to impacts on the environment (depending on the specifics of the scheme and the site itself). Furthermore, no modern waste management facility, permitted by the Environment Agency, will be designed without effective pollution control/abatement technology. Lastly, surely it is preferable that all waste management facilities are developed in proximity to waste arisings (for sustainability reasons) and proximity to other facilities is, similarly, beneficial in all cases where there are process outputs/residues that need further management.</p> <p>It is not considered that this approach (i.e. trying to identify the impacts of different technology types in order to identify suitable/unsuitable sites for each specific type of technology) is necessarily the best. An alternative approach</p>	<p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning policy.</p>	

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>would simply be to assess the long list of sites in terms of key criteria, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proximity to urban areas; ▪ Proximity to strategic highway network; ▪ Physical constraints; ▪ Environmental constraints, etc. <p>Sites which have been assessed and do not meet the criteria can then be discounted and sites which do not meet the criteria can be put forward together with a note advising on the likely types of technology (broadly speaking) which would be suitable for development on a particular site (e.g. sites of .25 ha are likely to be suitable for a full range of technologies; sites with a particular constraint (e.g. residential properties with 250m) may be unsuitable for [say] windrow composting).</p>		
	Highways Agency	The Methodology Statement states that only the short listed sites will be tested against the locational criteria not the long list as stated in Issue 4 Option 1. Will it be the long list of sites or the short list of sites which are	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>tested against the locational criteria?</p> <p>One additional criterion should be impact on the SRN as a facility may be close to the waste arisings but still have impact on the SRN.</p>	<p>simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning policy.</p>	
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	See above, answer to question 15.	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			contravene national planning policy.	
	English Heritage	<p>In some cases, a site would be so wholly contrary to national policy guidance that it should not be taken forward – no matter what it scores against other criteria. For example, a site which resulted in the destruction of a Scheduled Monument would wholly conflict with the advice in PPG 16 and, as a result, the site would unlikely gain consent – unless there were no other sites available.</p> <p>As part of this first sift of the long list, the cases where sites are so in conflict with national policy guidance should be able to be ruled out no matter what they score.</p> <p>Given the Council's stated intention that the LDF, as a whole, should deliver sustainable development, the waste strategy should include a category which scores the potential site to use a non-road distribution (i.e. rail, river or canal).</p> <p>It would be helpful to set out how it envisaged the likely effects upon the surrounding environment might be scored using the proposed matrix. One can envisage that sites may score well against one aspect (e.g. landscape) but poorly against another (e.g. biodiversity). In such a case, would the score for Surrounding Environment simply be</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning policy.</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		averaged out? If so this could mask some areas where there are particularly harmful effects. In some cases the impact upon one aspect of the environment might be so severe that the score would be 0 no matter how high it scored against other elements of the environment. It may well be necessary to a further sift of sites to address this issue.		
	Burley Parish Council	Unable to comment		
	Environment Agency	<p>Any waste management facility would be subject to a permit under the environmental permitting regulations. The objective of the permit is to prevent harm to the environment or human health. For incinerators emission limits are set to comply with those in the Waste Incineration Directive which are based on World Health Organisation Standards. A permit would not be issued in a particular location if air quality standards would be breached as a result of the installation.</p> <p>Impacts can be considered in the context of the controls required by the permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission limits for air (with an assessment against the Waste Incineration Directive), land and water. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An odour management plan • A noise assessment • A consideration of energy efficiency • A consideration of how to minimise waste produced and raw material used. • An Environmental Management System • An accident management plan • Requirement to use 'Best Available Techniques' to ensure compliance. <p>The Health protection Agency have issued guidance on the potential health effects of modern waste incinerators : Below is the first paragraph of the summary of the report '<i>The Impact on Health of Emissions to Air from Municipal Waste Incinerators</i>' - Health Protection Agency - September 2009'</p> <p>.</p> <p><i>'The Health Protection Agency has reviewed research undertaken to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from modern, well regulated municipal waste incinerators with complete certainty, any potential damage to the health of those living close-by is likely to be very small, if detectable. This view is based on detailed assessments of the effects of air pollutants on health and on the fact that modern and well managed municipal waste incinerators make</i></p>	policy.	

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<i>only a very small contribution to local concentrations of air pollutants.'</i>		
	Environment Agency	<p>We accept that permits cannot control the public's perception of how their quality of life is affected by a facility because the experience of odour or noise for example is personal. There may be no direct threat to health or environment but some people may still find the facility unacceptable. We would advise separating odour from air emissions as an impact, experience tells us that odour is the most common cause of complaint and has to date been more of a problem with technologies designed to handle large quantities of mixed biodegradable waste.</p> <p>Proximity to markets/uses for heat or recycle should be considered when assessing sites for locating waste management sites. The closer the end user of any heat or recycle the more sustainable the transaction to the end user.</p> <p>There is no specific criterion for flood risk. Please see the section at the end of this letter on the requirements of PPS25: Development and Flood Risk.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning policy.</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	<p>Appendix 1 – S/E1.6. John Escritt Road: This is not advisable to place on this list. Too near Bingley South Bog SSSI. Not advisable for Waste facilities.</p> <p>Sites should not be allocated in sensitive Ecological Areas. List needs to be checked out with sensitivity in mind.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste management facilities would contravene national planning policy.</p>	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Comment on the location criteria etc already made above.	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Council will take forward Option 1 as the preferred approach but with a simplified and revised approach to site assessment criteria and the use of a preeligibility site identification process to discount those sites where development for MSW or C&I waste</p>	See Policy W6 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 4: LOCATIONAL CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE AND COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES				
Question 16: Are these the right criteria and weighting? If not, then please say why. Are there any additional criteria required?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			management facilities would contravene national planning policy.	

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Option 1 initially appears to be sensible but only really applies to large demolition projects. The bulk of C&D waste still comes from a plethora of small sites where on-site recycling is impractical and unacceptable.	Noted. The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.</p>	
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	The Agency would encourage Option 1, the maximisation of on-site recycling and re-use of construction and demolition waste to minimise waste arisings. However, it does recognise that there may still be a need to dispose of some	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt</p>	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE

Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?

Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>waste off site, therefore would welcome the criteria based approach for locating new expanded waste management facilities as long as it includes a criterion relating to impact on the SRN.</p>	<p>Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford’s established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.</p>	
	Yorkshire	Option 1.	Noted.	See Policy W7 of the

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Wildlife Trust		<p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing</p>	Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.	
	Burley Parish Council	Option 1	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional</p>	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.	
	Environment Agency	<p>We agree that the first priority is to reduce and reuse construction waste on site through the use of sustainable construction methods and site waste management plans. A building materials reuse infrastructure should be encouraged - some councils are considering building material 'shops' at civic amenity sites.</p> <p>Reuse and recycling on site is the most sustainable option but sometimes this is not viable on smaller construction sites. Lots of unsorted builders waste is still landfilled and it is widely fly tipped. In order to increase recycling and reduce fly tipping we would advocate some offsite provision for small builders.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's</p>	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>established waste hierarchy.</p> <p>A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.</p>	
	Bradford Wildlife Group	<p>[Option 1 ticked on form]</p> <p>Recycling and reuse ideally should be done on site if possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings</p>	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.</p>	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Preference is for option 3 as this seems the most flexible and complete position.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is</p>	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.</p>	
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Option 1	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to adopt Option 3. This is on the basis that there is strong consultee support provided the policy distinguishes between CDEW generated through large-scale demolition and</p>	See Policy W7 of the Preferred Approach report.

ISSUE 5: MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTE				
Question 17: Which option do you consider the most appropriate and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>development projects and those on smallscale sites where on-site recycling is often impractical or not possible. It is further supported by the SA findings provided the generation of further CDEW is minimised in accordance with Bradford's established waste hierarchy. A criteria based approach will be established with additional policy wording emphasising the preference for re-use / adaptation of existing buildings where viable as an initial policy imperative.</p>	
Question 18: Are there any other options that should be considered?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required

Question 18: Are there any other options that should be considered?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	C&D waste recycling and disposal facilities can be located in disused (and indeed some active) quarries. Policies should not dismiss this option.	Noted. The use of mineral extraction sites considered within the sequential assessment of preferred sites.	
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		

Question 18: Are there any other options that should be considered?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	English Heritage	<p>As set out in our response to Question 6, in order to reduce the amounts of construction and demolition waste, the LDF needs to start from the principle that the most sustainable strategy is to reuse/adapt the existing building stock. Clearly there will be cases where this is either impracticable or can be shown not to be the most sustainable option. In such cases, demolition of the building would be permitted. However, the Plan should seek to reuse the materials especially those, such as dressed stone and roofing slates, which are typically used within the District's settlements and can help reduce the need for extraction of building stone.</p> <p>Only where such materials cannot be reused for building, should they be allowed to be crushed as aggregate or hardcore. This approach might be able to be pursued through though Conditions on Planning Approvals and the plan may need to make provision for the establishment of facilities to recycle such buildings materials.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will cover areas of sustainable construction methods.</p> <p>The Council will also explore how this can be incorporated into the Preferred Approach report.</p>	See Policy WDM4 of the Preferred Approach report.
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Wildlife Group	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	No Comment		

Question 18: Are there any other options that should be considered?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Option 3	See response to Q18.	

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	The option 1 scenario is covered in negative comments. Hazardous waste arisings should, wherever practical / possible, be dealt with within the district and not transported vast distances.	Noted. The Council's preferred policy approach is to take forward Option 3 including the development of a criterion based policy for locating Agricultural waste and for Hazardous waste streams. Detailed matters of the environmental, transport, energy generation and site restoration will be dealt with	See Policy W8 and W9 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			through separate Waste Development Management policies This option is preferred on the basis of the need to ensure flexibility and choice in the District's approach to handling other waste streams. It also reflects the balance of waste management facilities and forecast need identified in the Waste Management DPD.	
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	The Agency does not have a favoured option but would like to have an opportunity to be consulted in future on locations of potential new sites for managing hazardous waste.	Noted. The Council's preferred policy approach is to take forward Option 3 including the development of a	See Policy W8 and W9 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>criterion based policy for locating Agricultural waste and for Hazardous waste streams. Detailed matters of the environmental, transport, energy generation and site restoration will be dealt with through separate Waste Development Management policies This option is preferred on the basis of the need to ensure flexibility and choice in the District's approach to handling other waste streams. It also reflects the balance of waste management facilities and forecast need identified in the Waste Management DPD.</p>	
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		
	Burley Parish Council	Option 3	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred</p>	See Policy W8 and W9 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>policy approach is to take forward Option 3 including the development of a criterion based policy for locating Agricultural waste and for Hazardous waste streams. Detailed matters of the environmental, transport, energy generation and site restoration will be dealt with through separate Waste Development Management policies This option is preferred on the basis of the need to ensure flexibility and choice in the District's approach to handling other waste streams. It also reflects the balance of waste management facilities and forecast need identified in the Waste Management DPD.</p>	
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Option 2. How much hazardous waste are we producing and will produce in future? Can it not be cut down.		

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment Agency	<p><i>Hazardous waste</i></p> <p>Planning provision for hazardous waste management is likely to benefit from regional consultation and consultation with neighbouring authorities. Sites for a proposed hazardous waste facility would be subject to rigorous environmental risk assessments before a permit could be granted. This should be borne in mind when proposing sites for hazardous wastes.</p> <p><i>Agricultural waste</i></p> <p>We agree that criteria based policies would be better for agricultural waste. We have little reliable data on agricultural waste but anecdotally our feeling is that some types of agricultural waste are being dealt with on farms and that there is increasing interest in anaerobic digestion and composting for dealing with slurries and vegetable waste, on a relatively small scale. Criteria based policies which recognise the impacts of these types of technologies would prove useful.</p> <p>Other types of agricultural waste such as packaging, scrap metal and construction waste are more likely to be dealt</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to take forward Option 3 including the development of a criterion based policy for locating Agricultural waste and for Hazardous waste streams. Detailed matters of the environmental, transport, energy generation and site restoration will be dealt with through separate Waste Development Management policies This option is preferred on the basis of the need to ensure flexibility and choice in the District's approach to handling other waste streams. It also reflects the balance of waste management facilities and forecast need identified in the</p>	<p>See Policy W8 and W9of the Preferred Approach.</p>

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		with off farm as commercial industrial waste.	Waste Management DPD.	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Issue 6 Option 2 – the small values of hazardous wastes and the many varying types of specialised treatments required makes new site identification as suggested in option 1 inappropriate.	Noted. The Council's preferred policy approach is to take forward Option 3 including the development of a criterion based policy for locating Agricultural waste and for Hazardous waste streams. Detailed matters of the environmental, transport, energy generation and site restoration will be dealt with through separate Waste Development Management policies This option is preferred on the basis of the need to ensure flexibility and choice in the District's approach to handling other waste streams. It also reflects the balance of waste management facilities and	See Policy W8 and W9 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			forecast need identified in the Waste Management DPD.	
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Option 3 – need a policy for all types of waste (could be a combination of 1 and 3?)	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred policy approach is to take forward Option 3 including the development of a criterion based policy for locating Agricultural waste and for Hazardous waste streams. Detailed matters of the environmental, transport, energy generation and site restoration will be dealt with through separate Waste Development Management policies This option is preferred on the basis of the need to ensure flexibility and choice in the District's approach to handling other waste streams. It also reflects the balance of waste</p>	See Policy W8 & W9 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 6: MANAGEMENT OF 'OTHER' WASTE STREAMS				
Question 19: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 6 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			management facilities and forecast need identified in the Waste Management DPD.	

Question 20: Is it appropriate to assume that agricultural waste will be dealt with at point of origin rather than requiring new facilities / sites to be identified?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No – There may be a need for new facilities. Not all farms are suitable for disposal at the point of origin.	See response to Q19. The preferred policy approach will respond to comments made relating to the appropriateness of encouraging on-site treatment of Agricultural waste in accordance with GAEC requirements in the Common Agricultural Policy.	See Policy W8 of the Preferred Approach report.

Question 20: Is it appropriate to assume that agricultural waste will be dealt with at point of origin rather than requiring new facilities / sites to be identified?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	This is the practice that is promoted to farmers under the GAEC requirements of the CAP.	See response to Q19. The preferred policy approach will respond to comments made relating to the appropriateness of encouraging on-site treatment of Agricultural waste in accordance with GAEC requirements in the Common Agricultural Policy.	See Policy W8 of the Preferred Approach report.

Question 20: Is it appropriate to assume that agricultural waste will be dealt with at point of origin rather than requiring new facilities / sites to be identified?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Burley Parish Council	It is certainly desirable	See response to Q19. The preferred policy approach will respond to comments made relating to the appropriateness of encouraging on-site treatment of Agricultural waste in accordance with GAEC requirements in the Common Agricultural Policy.	See Policy W8 of the Preferred Approach report.
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Yes. It is appropriate.	See response to Q19. The preferred policy approach will respond to comments made relating to the appropriateness of encouraging on-site treatment of Agricultural waste in accordance with GAEC requirements in the Common Agricultural Policy.	See Policy W8 of the Preferred Approach report.

Question 20: Is it appropriate to assume that agricultural waste will be dealt with at point of origin rather than requiring new facilities / sites to be identified?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Yes	See response to Q19. The preferred policy approach will respond to comments made relating to the appropriateness of encouraging on-site treatment of Agricultural waste in accordance with GAEC requirements in the Common Agricultural Policy.	See Policy W8 of the Preferred Approach report.
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	No – policy must be in situ – policy not left to be abused. Council needs to be proactive in this area	See response to Q19. The preferred policy approach will respond to comments made relating to the appropriateness of encouraging on-site treatment of Agricultural waste in accordance with GAEC requirements in the Common Agricultural Policy.	See Policy W8 of the Preferred Approach report.

Question 21: Should the DPD consider any other types of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Yes – Green Waste	Noted. The site put forward within the Preferred Approach will take into account the possibility of locating facilities capable of managing green waste.	See proposed allocation sites within the Preferred Approach report.
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		
	Highways Agency	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment		
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Wildlife Group	I think the DPD has listed most of the waste “Streams” affected.	Noted.	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	No		

Question 21: Should the DPD consider any other types of waste?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Without a doubt – we need to control all waste generated	Noted.	

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Option 1 – Encourages Fly Tipping	Noted. The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	
		Option 2 – Best Option	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council’s preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	
		Option 4 – Unsustainable due to excessive transport distances.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	<p>It is understood, from attending the Stakeholder Event held in Bradford on 8th December 2009 that, in relation to Issue 7, the term ‘residual waste’ is taken to mean the very last proportion of the waste (i.e. post recycling/recovery/treatment, etc) and an example of this is the ash from an Energy-from-Waste (EfW) facility. It does not mean, for example, the residual MSW that remains after kerbside recycling. This is not currently clear in the document.</p> <p>Generally speaking, residual waste facilities should be located near the source of the waste (co-located if at all possible). An example of this is an incinerator bottom ash processing facility located on the same site or adjacent to an EfW or wastewater treatment facility located on the same site or adjacent to an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) facility.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council’s preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	
	Highways Agency	Option 4 is the least preferable of the options for the Agency, but recognises the need for a transition period in moving from reliance on external sites to a high level of self-sufficiency.	Noted. The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Steve Gibbs - The Arley Consulting Company Limited on behalf of P Casey (Enviro) Ltd (PCE)	<p>Option 1</p> <p>PCE support the principal of the waste hierarchy, and recognise that landfill is at the foot of the hierarchy. Nevertheless, as para 5.42 recognises, it is likely that some residual waste will remain to be landfilled.</p> <p>We would have thought that the encouragement of movement up the hierarchy through alternative technologies is more properly a matter for the Core Strategy, for which the Preferred Option consultation is not yet available.</p> <p>Option 1 suggests “limiting landfill capacity”, which we assume would reinforce any positive support for the other technologies.</p> <p>The question is, then, how to match availability with need.</p> <p>The need for landfill is likely to vary both with progress in the provision of the other technologies, and the quantitative and qualitative suitability of the wastes for treatment. The latter are likely to vary according to development of the economy, technology and legislation.</p> <p>Landfill can provide a robust final disposal option that is less sensitive to changes in waste quantity and composition than other options.</p> <p>The availability of landfill is difficult to control. The overall capacity of a landfill is largely determined by site-specific</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council’s preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>factors. The rate of release of that capacity is usually determined by factors such as traffic impacts or operational capacity of site plant.</p> <p>To attempt to control the rate of release (annual input) for policy reasons may risk the landfill being uneconomic to operate, as many costs are fixed.</p> <p>Whilst Option 1 is superficially attractive in policy terms, PCE wish to see much greater detail of the mechanisms for limiting capacity.</p> <p>Option 2</p> <p>It follows from our views on Option 1 that we consider that landfill capacity should be provided within the District.</p> <p>Option 3</p> <p>The combination of options is reasonable in policy terms subject to the mechanism for limiting capacity. We would be open to discussion as to how capacity could be limited so as not to prejudice the waste hierarchy.</p>		

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Steve Gibbs - The Arley Consulting Company Limited on behalf of P Casey (Enviro) Ltd (PCE) continued.	<p>Option 4</p> <p>We consider that the proximity principle clearly favours the provision of capacity in the District, and Bradford's emerging Core Strategy Vision also clearly favours this. Our reading of the Consultation paper is that the Council continues to rake this view – for example, paras 1.2, 1.4, and 2.7.</p> <p>It is unlikely that all areas will be equally able to provide landfill capacity, and therefore to use up the sub-regional capacity without assurance that all authorities would then be equally able to replace it on a self-sufficient basis is unacceptable.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, PCE prefer Option 2, but Option 3 could be acceptable subject to the mechanism of capacity limitation.</p>		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Option 1. This would send out a robust message to the public and encourage a concerted effort to reduce waste.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.</p>	
	Burley Parish Council	Option 1	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.</p>	
	Bradford Wildlife Group	<p>Option 1. The other options advice that we cannot cut down our waste and it will increase over the years. Since the Council's intention is to send less.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term</p>	<p>See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.</p>

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Option 1 would seem the most appropriate in having policies to reduce waste/residual wastes, but recognising that most waste treatment technologies will only divert between 80-95% of input away from landfill, leaving some of the residual still biologically active, but having no other practical economic means of disposal other than landfill. (See comment in Question 1 on sub regional landfill capacity and need to export residue to landfill). There should be consideration for an Option 1 + 4 in combination for Question 22.	Noted. The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			<p>approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.</p>	
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	<p>Option 1. We must limit the easy option of falling back on landfill. Landfill is no longer a policy option that we can tolerate if alternatives can be found to deal with our waste.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to</p>	<p>See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.</p>

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
			support alternative technologies for treating Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	
	Environment Agency	<p>There is certainly still scope for reducing the amount of 'residual waste' which needs to be dealt with. Plans are in place to increase recycling of MSW. The position with Commercial Industrial and Construction waste however is less clear. The first step should be to ensure that all waste is treated as far up the hierarchy as possible, and that as much as possible is reused or recycled.</p> <p>An emerging issue over the past 12 months has been the disposal or further treatment of the outputs from Mechanical Biological Treatment and Autoclave type facility commonly referred to as Compost Like Output or in some cases Refuse derived Fuel. These outputs remain waste and as such require waste permits for their onward treatment or disposal. They cannot be spread to land without authorisation or burned for energy except in a Waste Incineration Directive compliant incinerator.</p> <p>There is a need to plan for productive outlets for these residual wastes, alongside the proposals for initial</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's preferred approach is to identify where additional Residual waste capacity within existing facilities can be used alongside a criteria based policy for the identification of any new residual waste facilities in the District in the medium and long term subject to future monitoring and identified need. This approach accords with and emphasises the need to support alternative technologies for treating</p>	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

ISSUE 7: MANAGEMENT OF RESIDUAL WASTE				
Question 22: Which option do you consider the most appropriate for Issue 7 and why?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
		<p>treatment.</p> <p>Landfill is a last resort and any requirement for further capacity should be assessed on this basis.</p>	Residual waste and reflects the need to (co)locate facilities in close proximity to waste arisings.	

Question 23: For Issue 7 Option 2, should additional capacity be identified in existing or new sites?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comment Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		

Question 23: For Issue 7 Option 2, should additional capacity be identified in existing or new sites?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Steve Gibbs - The Arley Consulting Company Limited on behalf of P Casey (Enviro) Ltd (PCE)	The key factor in identifying additional capacity must be the suitability of the candidate sites.	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.
	Highways Agency	The Agency would welcome the consideration of new sites if these were located closer to the point of source and therefore reduced the impact on the SRN.	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No Comment Made		
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Wildlife Group	Waste to landfill sites options 2 and 4 contradict this aspiration.	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	As Bradford doesn't have much landfill capacity (zero for active wastes?) any additional capacity will probably be new capacity if it is to be provided within the district (see response in Question 22).	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 23: For Issue 7 Option 2, should additional capacity be identified in existing or new sites?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	Only in existing sites	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 24: Are there other options that should be considered for Issue 7?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	No Comments Made		
	Imogen Scotney – Scott Wilson on behalf of Earth Tech and Skanska (ETS)	No Comment Made		

Question 24: Are there other options that should be considered for Issue 7?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Steve Gibbs - The Arley Consulting Company Limited on behalf of P Casey (Enviro) Ltd (PCE)	We can see no other options.	Noted.	
	Highways	No Comment		
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	As a nation we should be looking to other EU states who are managing their waste more effectively.	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.
	Burley Parish Council	No Comment Made		
	Bradford Wildlife Group	The way forward is surely: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Waste prevention – educate public etc. 2. Reuse “ “ “ 3. Recycle - & compost “ “ “ 4. Although we do not have the room for more landfill sites – Some that are in use should be restored to a natural landscape for encouraging Biodiversity. 5. Try some alternative technologies and Biological Treatment 	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.

Question 24: Are there other options that should be considered for Issue 7?				
Rep ID	Name / Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Action Required
	Bradford Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)	Option 1 + 4 combined.	See response to Q22.	See Policy W10 of the Preferred Approach.
	Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee	No		

RESPONSE TO CALL FOR SITES			
Rep No.	Consultee	Site	Location
	Mr Martin Millmore – Minerals Planning Group	Hallas Rough Quarry	Adjacent to the A629 Halifax Road 1km to the south west of the village of Cullingworth.
	Mr Damien Walsh	Associated Waste Management Limited Victoria Works	Barnard Road Bradford BD4 7DY
		AWM at Canal Road	Canal Road Shipley BD2 1AU
		Hardcore Recycling	Hammerton Street Bradford
		Scrap yard	Corner of Shipley Fields Road and Canal Road Shipley BD2 1AU
	P. Casey	Buck Park Quarry	Whalley Lane Denholme Keighley
	Aire Valley Environmental	Esholt WwTW. Additional information supplied for original sites of Ref: 123 + 124 Esholt Sewage Treatment Works.	Esholt Bradford National Grid Reference 4193, 4390

APPENDICES

PAGE

1.0 APPENDIX 1 Petition	56
2.0 APPENDIX 2 Distribution List	64
3.0 APPENDIX 3 Copy's of Representations as submitted	96

DRAFT

6.0 APPENDIX 1 - PETITION

Deleted for email (file size)

DRAFT

7.0 APPENDIX 2 – DISTRIBUTION LIST

LIST OF SPECIFIC STATUTORY CONSULTEES

Statutory and Specific Consultation Bodies and Infrastructure Organisations:

- British Telecom
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber
- Highways Agency – Yorkshire & Humber
- Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
- Natural England
- Natural England – West Yorkshire Team
- Network Rail
- North West Regional Assembly
- North West Regional Development Agency
- Telewest Communications
- Transco (North of England)
- Yorkshire Electricity
- Yorkshire Forward Regional Development Agency
- Yorkshire Water Services Ltd

Adjoining Local Planning Authorities:

- Calderdale Metropolitan District Council
- Craven District Council
- Harrogate District Council
- Kirklees Metropolitan District Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Leeds Metropolitan District Council
- North Yorkshire County Council
- Pendle Borough Council
- Wakefield Metropolitan District Council

Bradford Council Elected Members:

- 90 Councillors
- 5 MP & MEPs in Bradford, Shipley and Keighley Constituencies

Town and Parish Councils in Bradford District:

- Addingham Parish Council
- Baildon Parish Council
- Burley Parish Council
- Clayton Parish Council
- Cullingworth Parish Council
- Denholme Town Council
- Harden Parish Council
- Haworth, Cross Roads & Stanbury Parish Council
- Ilkley Parish Council
- Keighley Town Council
- Menston Parish Council
- Oxenhope Parish Council
- Sandy Lane Parish Council
- Silsden Town Council
- Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council
- Wilsden Parish Council
- Wrose Parish Council

Town and Parish Councils in

Neighbouring Local Authorities:

- Bradleys Both Parish Council
- Cononley Parish Council
- Cowling Parish Council

- Denton Parish Council
- Draughton Parish Council
- Drighlington Parish Council

- Farnhill Parish Council
- Gildersome Parish Council
- Glusburn Parish Council
- Laneshaw Bridge Parish Council
- Middleton Parish Council
- Nesfield with Langbar Parish Council
- Otley Town Council
- Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Trawden Forest Parish Council
- Wadsworth Parish Council
- Weston Parish Council

LIST OF SPECIFIC CONSULTEES – ASSOCIATED WASTE INDUSTRY PARTIES

- Abitibibowater
- Advanced Plasma Power
- Aire and Calder Rivers Group
- Aire Valley Conservation Society
- Airedale Partnership
- Albion Environmental Limited
- AmeyCespa
- Apperley Bridge Development Residents Association
- Ascot Environmental Ltd
- AWM Ltd
- Babcock & Brown
- Baildon Community Council
- Bank of Ireland
- Bank of Scotland Corporate
- Barclays Asset Finance
- Barhale Construction PLC
- Becksides Works
- Bedminster International
- Berwin Leighton Paisner LLP

- Biffa Waste Services
- Bingley Environmental Transport Association
- Bioganix Ltd
- BioGen Power
- Birse Process Engineering Ltd
- BOCS
- Bolton Woods Community Association
- Bradford & District Chamber of Trade
- Bradford Business Link
- Bradford Centre Regeneration
- Bradford Chamber of Commerce & Industry
- Bradford Community Environment Project
- Bradford Hospitals NHS Trust
- Bradford Organics Collection Scheme
- Bradford Ornithological Group
- Bradford Teaching Hospital Trust
- Bradford Ramblers Association Group
- Bradford University
- Bradford Urban Wildlife Group
- British Waterways
- Burges Salmon
- Burley Community Council
- CABE
- Catalyst Lend Lease
- CBMDC – Environmental Protection
- Cemex UK
- Clarke Energy
- CNIM UK
- Comex Environmental Limited
- Community Waste Ltd
- Cory Environmental
- Costain Ltd
- Covanta Energy Ltd
- CPRE Bradford District
- CPRE West Yorkshire
- Cranmore Farm

- Cyclerval
- DCT Civil Engineering Ltd
- DEFRA
- Deloitte and Touche
- Denholme Residents Action Group
- Dexia Public Finance Bank
- Donarbon Ltd
- Doric Energy
- Earth Tech UK
- ECS Engineering ServicesLtd
- Eeco Ltd
- Elliniki Technodomiki
- ENERGOS
- ENER-G PLC
- Enpure
- Entec UK Ltd
- Environmental Waste Controls Ltd
- Estech Europe Limited
- Euclid Infotech
- Excelar Resource ltd
- Fairport Engineering Ltd
- Fagley Lane Action Committee
- Fagley Tenants & Residents Association
- Fernwood waste Recycling
- Fortis Bank
- Future Energy Yorkshire
- Gleeds
- Global Renewables
- Graphite Resources Limited
- Greenfinch Ltd
- GVA Grimley
- Harden Village Society
- Hills Waste Solutions Ltd
- Hotrot Composting
- H W Martin Waste Ltd
- Inland Waterways Association

- Interserve Project Services Limited
- JN Bentley
- John Laing
- Kelda Water Services Limited
- Kier Group
- Kier Construction Limited
- KPMG
- Laing O'Rourke Integrated Solutions
- Leeds Environmental Organisation Ltd
- Leeds Friends of the Earth
- Leeds/Bradford International Airport
- May Gurney Ltd
- Mott MacDonald
- MWH Global
- National Farmers Union
- NBC Project Development GmbH&Co.KG
- New Earth Composting
- New Earth Solutions Ltd
- Nord LB
- Novera (Gasification)
- Novera Energy Plc
- Npower Renewables
- Oaktech Environmental
- OAPL
- Orchid Environmental
- PHS Group Ltd
- Pickford Contracting Ltd
- PPS Recovery Systems Limited
- Premier Waste Management Ltd
- Railtrack Property
- Ramblers Association
- RBC Capital Markets
- Reliant Technical Services
- Renewables Developer
- RSPB (Northern England region)
- Scot Gen (Gasification Systems)

- Schofield Sweeney
- Scottish & Southern Energy
- Scott Wilson Ltd
- Shanks
- Shephard Engineering Services
- Sita Uk
- Skanska Infrastructure Development
- SLR Consulting
- SSE
- Sterecycle
- Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation
- TEG Environmental Ltd
- Tetronics Ltd
- The City Centre Project
- Thetford International Products
- Tradebe Ltd
- Trading Pictures
- Trident
- T Shea and Sons
- Urbaser LTD
- United Utilities Business Development & International
- Veolia Environmental Services (UK)
- Viridor
- Vital Earth Derby Ltd.
- VT Group
- Walker Morris
- Waste Recycling Group
- Waste Research Limited
- West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service
- West Yorkshire Ecology
- Whitebay Ltd
- Yorkshire Planning Aid
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
- Yorwaste Ltd

LIST OF SPECIFIC CONSULTEES - WASTE SITE OPERATORS

- Associated Waste Management Limited
- Autospares Bingley Limited
- Berry And Marshall (Bolton Woods) Limited
- Bradford Organic Composting Scheme
- Bradford Waste Traders
- CBMDC – Department of Regeneration (Dockfield Road)
- Dennis Gillson And Son (Haworth) Limited
- Dial A Skip Service Limited
- George M Watson (Construction) Limited
- Gill Demolitions
- GW Butler Limited
- Harry Sanders Ltd
- John Hornby And Sons Limited
- Leeds Environmental Organisation Limited
- Miles J Delaney
- Mineral Resources (Yorkshire) Limited
- Mr Bryan Scott
- Omega Proteins Ltd
- P Waddington And Sons Ltd
- Skipton Properties
- Thomas Crompton Developments Ltd
- University Of Bradford - Estates And Facilities
- West Riding Crushing Services
- West Riding Waste Disposal Limited
- Yorkshire Poultry Products
- Yorkshire Water Services Ltd

Notification List (Possibly delete – discuss with Andrew)

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Mr Matt Olley Regional Planner Countryside Properties (Northern) Ltd Countryside House	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Lakeside Drive Centre Park WARRINGTON WA1 1RW	
	Mr Jim Smith Group Asset Manager Group Asset and Development Team Bradford Community Housing Trust Trust House 5 New Augustus Street BRADFORD BD1 5LL	
	Mr Mike Benner Chief Executive Campaign For Real Ale 230 Hatfield Road ST. ALBANS Herts AL1 4LW	
	Ms Mhora Samuel Director The Theatres Trust 22 Charing Cross Road LONDON WC2H 0QL	
	Mr Paul Stock Strategic Land Manager North Country Homes Group Ltd North Country House Barlborough CHESTERFIELD S43 4WP	
	Mr Sebastian Hanley Dialogue Communicating Planning 136 – 148 Tooley Street LONDON SE1 2TU	
	Katie Adderley Planning Advisor British Wind Energy Association	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Renewable Energy House 1 Aztec Row Berners Road London N1 0PW	
	Beverley Green Littman Robeson 21 Buckingham Street LONDON WC2N 6EF	
	Nathan Smith/Dan Mitchell Barton Willmore Planning Partnership 3360 The Pentagon Century Way Thorpe Park LEEDS LS15 8ZB	
	C P Holland Development Director George Wimpey Northern Yorkshire Ltd Sandpiper House Peel Avenue Calder Park WAKEFIELD WF2 7UA	
	Robert Taylor Plot of Gold Ltd Priory Park Bunkers Hill The Great North Road ABERFORD West Yorkshire LS25 3DF	
	Dianne Bowyer DPDS Consulting Group Old Bank House 5 Devizes Road SWINDON SN1 4BJ	
	Mick Young Little Germany Developments Ltd	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Victoria House Southampton Row LONDON WC1B 4DA	
	David Short The Emerson Group Emerson House Heyes Lane Alderley Edge Cheshire SK9 7LF	
	Penny Trepka 142 Wilmer Road Heaton Bradford BD9 4AH	
	Chris Creighton Peacock and Smith 2a Josephs Well Hanover Walk LEEDS LS3 1AB	
	Depol Associates 44 Garstang Road PRESTON PR1 1NA	
	Rev. John Nowell The Vicarage Browgate Baildon	
	Rev Sarah Groves The Moravian Manse Browgate Baildon BD17 6BP	
	The Parish Priest St Aidan's Presbytery Baildon Road Baildon	
	Baildon Community Link 35 Cliffe Avenue Baildon BD17 6NX	
	Ancient Monuments Society	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	St Ann's Vestry Hall 2 Church Entry LONDON EC4V 5HB	
	Council for British Archaeology 66 Boothman YORK YO30 7BZ	
	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings 37 Spital Square LONDON E1 6DY	
	The Georgian Group 6 Fitzroy Square LONDON W1T 5DX	
	The Victorian Society 1 Priory Gardens Bedford Park LONDON W4 1TT	
	The Twentieth Century Society 70 Cowcross Street LONDON EC1M 6EJ	
	The Garden History Society 70 Cowcross Street LONDON EC1M 6EJ	
	Andrew Bower Renewables Developer Npower Renewables 14b Redwell Court Harmire Enterprise Park Barnard Castle Co. Durham DL12 8BN	
	Hannah Philip/Claire McIntosh Vincent and Goring Ltd Sterling Court	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Norton Road Stevenage HERTS SG1 2JY	
	Stewart Ross DevPlan UK 8 Westville Avenue ILKLEY LS29 9AH	
	Kate Anderson/Nichola Sewell Indigo Planning Ltd 36 Park Row LEEDS LS1 5JL	
	Chris Smith Indigo Planning Lowry House 17 Marble Street MANCHESTER M2 3AW	
	Beverley Butler Leith Planning Ltd 13 South Clifton Street Lytham St Annes Lancashire FY8 5HN	
	The Abbeyfield Society Abbeyfield House 53 Victoria Street St Albans Herts AL1 3UW	
	Colin Burnett Burnett Planning & Development Golden Cross House 8 Duncannon Street London WC2N 4JF	
	Rachel Pierce Sanderson & Weatherall 25 Wellington Street LEEDS	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	LS1 4WG	
	Jamie Pyper Land & Development Practice 1 Horsfair Weatherby LEEDS LS22 6JG	
	Chris Thomas Chris Thomas Ltd Outdoor Advertising Consultants Collingwood 2 Bell Barn Road Stoke Bishop BRISTOL BS9 2DA	
	Jason Tait Planning Prospects Ltd 1 Broomhall Business centre Broomhall Lane WORCESTER WR5 2NT	
	Trevor Sayle Goldfinch Estates Ltd Elston West Road Weaverham CHESHIRE CW8 3HH	
	Mr S MacPherson Ben Rhydding Action Group/Save Us Pub 33 Wheatley Lane Ben Rhydding ILKLEY LS29 8BW	
	Val Summerscales Bradford District Chamber of Trade Gleave House C/o 91a Victoria Road Eccleshill BRADFORD	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	BD2 2DQ	
	John Goodwin/Kate Broadbank Carter Jonas Regent House 13 – 15 Albert Street HARROGATE HG1 1JX	
	Faye Wilders RPS 1 st Floor West Cottons centre Cottons Lane LONDON SE1 2QG	
	Conar Vallely How Planning 40 Peter Street MANCHESTER M2 5GP	
	Mrs B Smith 42 Allerton Upper Green BRADFORD BD15 8AE	
	Jemma Benson Future Energy Yorkshire The Green Sand Foundry 99 Water Lane LEEDS LS11 5QN	
	Mr T Bendrien Greenfield 62 Long Lane Queensbury BRADFORD BD13 2LR	
	Charles Patchett Patchett Homes Ltd 180 Highgate Road Queensbury BRADFORD BD13 1DS	
	Mr J P Lloyd Nook Cottage	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Brierley Lane Eaves Woodplumpton PRESTON Lancashire PR4 0BJ	
	Martin Spiers 37 Bowland Avenue Baildon BRADFORD BD17 5SA	
	Felicity Wye Planning Research Manager Tribal MJP 70 High Street Chislehurst KENT BR7 5AQ	
	Duncan Hartley Hartley Planning Consultants 10 Margerison Road Ilkley LS29 8QU	
	Tom Jones Moorhurst Langley Lane BINGLEY BD16 4ET	
	Christopher Whitmore Andrew Martin Associates Innovate Office Lake View Drive Sherwood Park NOTTINGHAM NG15 0DT	
	F M Lister & Son 6 Manor Square OTLEY LS21 1QR	
	Dr A Tupholme Yorkshire Gardens Trust 1 Heather View ELDWICK	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Bingley BD16 3HH	
	Tamsin Cowley Dunlop Haywards Planning Abbey House 32 Booth Street MANCHESTER M4 4QP	
	Steve Hughes Hurstwood Group Link 665 Business Centre A65 Rosendale Lancashire BB4 5HU	
	Mr Kurt Kunz Gazeby Hall Farm Back Lane Wilsden Bradford BD15 0LE	kunzkurt@aol.com;
	James Woffendin David Wilson Homes Northern Barfield House Britannia Road Morley LEEDS LS27 0DT	
	Edward Uwechue DPP Apsley House 78 Wellington Street LEEDS LS1 2EQ	
	Emma Knott Purearth PLC Balderton Hall Fernwood Newark NG24 3JR	
	Mr C Narrainen 39 Keats Road WILLENHALL WV12 5HY	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	John Wilkinson Trench Wood Barn Higher Coach Road Baildon BD17 5SJ	
	National Offender Management Service c/o Lambert Smith Hampton Atkins Global Bank Chambers Faulkner Street MANCHESTER M1 4EH	
	Joanne Besford and Tony Zacharczuk 108 Westfield Lane Idle BRADFORD BD10 8UQ	
	Mr & Mrs Filligan Hollyhocks 37A Tong Lane Tong Village Bradford BD4 0RT	
	Vicki Richardson Walton & Co 2 Queen Street LEEDS LS1 2TW	vicki.richardson@walton-co.co.uk ;
	Jay Everett Director CB Richard Ellis Ltd Bank House 27 King Street Leeds LS1 2HL	jay.everett@cbre.com ;
	Kate Matthews Assistant Planner Firstplan 25 Floral Street LONDON WC2E 9DS	kmatthews@firstplan.co.uk ;
	Andrew E Brown	andrew.brown@brookhousegroup.co.uk ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Land and Planning Manager Brookhouse Group Prospect House 168 – 170 Washway Road Sale Cheshire M33 6RH	
	Laura Haworth 28 The Mistral Bradford BD10 8WQ	lhaw@aol.com ;
	Rachael Probert Taylor Young Vanilla Factory 39 Fleet Street LIVERPOOL L1 4AR	rachael.probert@tayloryoung.co.uk;
	Gemma Brickwood Planning Potential Palace House 3 Cathedral Street LONDON SE1 9DE	gemma@planningpotential.co.uk ;
	Annette Elliott Retail Planning Liaison Manager Property Division – Planning The Co-operative Group Ltd 5th Floor, Old Bank Building Hanover Street Manchester M60 0AB	annette_e@coop.co.uk;
	Mr G E Tattersall 51 Idle Road Undercliffe BRADFORD BD2 4QA	getattersall@hotmail.co.uk ;
	Jonathan O'Connor Eddisons Caspian House 61 East Parade Little Germany BRADFORD BD1 5EP	jonathan.oconnor@eddisons.com;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Wendy Sockett Planning & Development 15 – 16 Park Row LEEDS LS1 5HD	wendy.sockett@collierscre.co.uk ;
	Matthew Sheppard Turley Associates 33 Park Place LEEDS LS1 2RY	msheppard@turleyassociates.co.uk;
	Vicki Ingleby Turley Associates 33 Park Place Leeds LS1 2RY	vingleby@turleyassociates.co.uk;
	Alistair Flatman Scott Wilson West 1 Wellington Street Leeds LS1 1BA	alistair.flatman@scottwilson.com;
	Claire Norris Planning department Lambert Smith Hampton 79 Mosley Street Manchester M2 3LQ	cnorris@lsh.co.uk;
	Louise Moody Turley Associates 33 Park Place Leeds LS1 2RY	lmoody@turleyassociates.co.uk ;
	Michael Brooke Brooke Properties 450 Haworth Road Bradford BD15 9LL	m.r.brooke@hotmail.co.uk;
	The St John's Centre 68 Fagley Road Bradford BD2 3LT	admin@stjohnsfagley.org;
	Tim Sharpe Development Director Magellan Properties Ltd	tim.sharpe@magellanproperties.co.uk;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Merchants Quay Ashley Lane ShIPLEY BD17 7DB	
	Jason Taylor 25 Staveley Way Keighley BD22 7ED	majesticstates@blueyonder.co.uk;
	Ian Moore Honorary Secretary Inland Waterways Association West Riding Branch 2 Eric Street Bramley LEEDS LS13 1ET	westriding@waterways.org.uk;
	Bruce Barnes 37 Wilmer Road Heaton Bradford BD9 4RX	bruce.poetbradford@blueyonder.co.uk ;
	Chris Darley Apsley House 78 Wellington Street Leeds LS1 2EQ	Chris.darley@dppllp.com ;
	Abby Mann BIC Angel Way Bradford BD7 1BX	AMann@blackmarble.co.uk ;
	Heidi Sobers 4 Festival Square BRADFORD BD1 5BD	heidi.sobers@bradford.gov.uk ;
	John & Judith Bolland 127 Apperley Road Idle BRADFORD BD10 0AX	j.bolland@challenge.ngfl.ac.uk ;
	Sally Fletcher Januarys York House	sfletcher@januarys.co.uk;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	7 Dukes Court 54-62 Newmarket Road Cambridge CB5 8DZ	
	Frances Horne 2 Apperley Gardens Bradford BD10 0ND	franceshorne@hotmail.com;
	Stephen Grimster GVA Grimley 81 Fountain street Manchester M2 2EE	steven.grimster@gvagrimley.co.uk ;
	Simon Turner Fox Land & Property Gladman House Alexandria Way Congleton CW12 1LB	s.turner@foxlp.co.uk ;
	Greg Dickson Turley Associates 33 Park Place Leeds LS1 2RY	gdickson@turleyassociates.co.uk ;
	Jennifer Winyard Turley Associates 33 Park Place Leeds LS1 2RY	jwinyard@turleyassociates.co.uk ;
	Alastair Sim Newstead Ben Rhydding Drive Ilkley West Yorkshire LS29 8BQ	alastair.c.sim@gmail.com ;
	Aneesa Jain Turley Associates The Chancery 58 Spring Gardens Manchester M2 1EW	ajain@turleyassociates.co.uk
	Ben R Coles Strategic Land & Planning Manager	Benjamin.Coles@taylorwimpey.com;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited Sandpiper House Peel Avenue Wakefield WF2 7UA	
	Dr Henrie Lidiard Saltaire Village Society 49 Titus Street Saltaire Bradford BD18 4LS	henrielidiard@mac.com ;
	Anthony Greaves Hallam Land Management Limited Banner Cross Hall Sheffield S11 9PD	AGREAVES@henryboot.co.uk ;
	James Sheppard Consultant Development and Asset Strategy Jones Lang LaSalle 82 King Street Manchester M2 4WQ	James.Sheppard@eu.jll.com ;
	Anthony Barnett Robinson Architects 1 - 2 Merchant's Quay Ashley Lane ShIPLEY BD17 7DB	anthony.barnett@robinsongroup.co.uk ;
	Ali-Marie Ladwa 38 Rush Croft Thackley BD10 8WN	amladwa@googlemail.com ;
	Luke Plimmer Martineau No 1. Colmore Square Birmingham B4 6AA	Luke.plimmer@martineau-uk.com ;
	Mark Fisher Facility Development Manager The Lawn Tennis	Jarmanm@aol.com ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Association The National Tennis Centre 100 Priory Lane Roehampton London SW15 5JQ	
	Land & Development Manager Land & Development (B1) National Grid House Warwick Technology Park Gallows Hill Warwick CV34 6TG	
	Andy Rollinson Rollinson Planning Consultancy 80 Main St Menston Ilkley LS29 6HS	andy@rollinsonplanningconsultancy.co.uk ;
	Andrew Roberts Strategic Land manager George Wimpey West Yorkshire Ltd Taylor Wimpey Sandpiper House Peel Avenue Wakefield WF2 7UA	Andy.Roberts@taylorwimpey.com ;
	Nadine Illingworth Faxfleet Residents Association 68 Rathmell Street Bradford BD5 9QJ	n.illingworth@fsmail.net ;
	Mrs Samantha Maddocks 3rd Queensbury Guides c/o 38 Ashlar Grove Queensbury Bradford BD13 2SP	samantha.claire@sky.com ;
	David J Rhodes Oakenshaw Residents'	padama6@tiscali.co.uk ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Association Dale House Illingworth Road Oakenshaw BRADFORD BD12 7AJ	
	Brian Pearson Woodlands Cricket Club - Oakenshaw C/o 567 Bradford Road Cleckheaton BD19 6BU	brian@bpearson6@fsnet.co.uk ;
	Mrs Patricia Hollings New Horizons 1 Greenacre way Wyke Bradford BD12 9DJ	
	Mrs Virginia Robinson Dracup Lodge Day Nursery 19 Dracup Street Great Horton Bradford BD7 4HA	dracuplodge@btconnet.com ;
	Mr Richard Humpreys Buttershaw Business and Enterprise College Reevey Road West Bradford BD6 3PX	rbh@bbc.bradford.sch.uk ;
	Cannon Gordon Dey Holmewood Community Council Tong Vicarage 74 Holme Wood Road Bradford BD4 9EJ	thedeyteam@blueyonder.co.uk ;
	Pastor Warren Evans Bierley Community Association & Bethel Community Church Shetcliffe Lane Bierley Bradford	whl.evans@gmail.com ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	BD4 6DF	
	Mr Rob Martin Saltaire Village Society 61 Albert Road Shipley West Yorkshire BD18 4NS	robmartin@phonecoop.coop ;
	Revd Cannon Tony Parry New Testament Church of God 34 Necropolis Road Lidget Green Bradford BD7 2PU	pastor@ntcbradford.org.uk ;
	Mrs Betty Waterhouse Sutton Community Association Sutton Community Centre 51 Kyffin Place BD4 8NB	eawaterhouse@yahoo.co.uk ;
	Mrs Carol Woodley Bolton Woods Community Centre Livingstone Road Bolton Woods Bradford BD2 1BD	cazyw@yahoo.co.uk ;
	Mr Stan Burston Wyke Christian Fellowship 10 Wyke Lane Wyke Bradford BD12 9BX	hsie6@blueyonder.co.uk ;
	Mr William Barraclough Wyke Armature Rugby League Club 9 railway Terrace Low Moor Bradford BD12 0LT	
	Mr David Reynolds South Bradford Community Network	sbcn@talk21.com ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	37 Smith Avenue Odsal Bradford BD6 1HH	
	Mr Geoff Twentyman Low Moor Local History Group 13 St Abbs Fold Odsal Bradford BD6 1EL	geoff@twentyman.org.uk ;
	Mrs Caroline Heward The Salvation Army St Margarets Avenue Bradford BD4 9BD	Caroline.heward@salvationarmy.org.uk ;
	Jean Sopyla Bradford South & West Live at Home Scheme Salvation Army Buildings Holroyd Hill Wibsey BD6 1PQ	jean@liveathomescheme.co.uk ;
	Jeannette Cummings-Smith Sunningdale & Manor Park NHW 2 Manor Park Fairweather Green BD8 0LY	Jeannette.cummings-smith@bradfordhospitals.nhs.uk ;
	Andrew Thorby 36 Woodside Avenue Cottingley Bingley West Yorkshire BD16 1RB	thorbya@yahoo.co.uk ;
	Rev. David Kennedy C of E St Johns St Johns Vicarage 22 Bierley Lane Bierley BD4 6AA	therevdavid@hotmail.com ;
	David Barry Clark Lidget Green Community Partnership	

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	3 Church Court Lidget Green Bradford BD7 2LL	
	Mr Frank Kirk 3 Herschel Road Bradford BD8 0QS	Frank.kirk1@btopenworld.com ;
	Mr Brian Rhodes 133 Allerton Road Bradford BD8 0AA	Bkr133@yahoo.co.uk ;
	Mr Jim Smith Incommunities Trust House 5 New Augustus Street Bradford BD1 5LL	Jim.smith@incommunities.co.uk ;
	Mrs Rose Carol McKenny St John's Luncheon Club 8 Cresswell Place Horton Bank Top Bradford BD7 4PB	
	Mrs Berna White 11 Adelaide House Crosley Wood Road Bingley West Yorkshire BD16 4QF	
	Mrs June Stenson Aldersgate Parent / Toddler Group 33 Larch Hill Crescent Odsal Bradford BD6 1DR	
	Mrs Jeanette Alderman 15 Rosedale Avenue Allerton Bradford BD15 9JD	ginny@alderman.worldonline.co.uk ;
	Mrs Sharon Rushworth Highfield Healthy Lifestyle	sharon.rushworth2@bradford.nhs.uk ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	1 South View Grove Gomersal Cleckheaton BD19 4JE	
	Mr Richard Hackford ShIPLEY Constituency Area Panel Advisory Group (SCAPAG) 94 Thackley Old Road ShIPLEY BD18 1DS	
	Mr Arnold Butterfield Sedbergh Youth & Community Centre Huddersfield Road Odsal Bradford BD6 1DJ	arniebutterfield@yahoo.co.uk ;
	Mr David Wilford Holme Christian Community Madison Avenue Bradford BD4 0JE	david@hccbradford.org.uk ;
	Ms Liz Wooles Royds Advice Service Woodside Village Centre 86 Fenwick Drive Bradford BD6 2RZ	lizw@royds.org.uk ;
	Miss Hayley Marshall Southmere Primary School Ewart Street Great Horton Bradford BD7 3NR	Hayley.marshall@southmere.bradford.sch.uk ;
	Mrs Carole Southwell H.B.P Residents Association 23 Raikes Avenue Tong Bradford BD4 0QQ	carolesouthwell23@talktalk.net ;
	Mrs Shelia Philpott Forster Community College 1 Captain Street	ceo@forster.ac.uk ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Bradford BD1 4EL	
	Revd Mark Woodhouse Holme Church / Holme Christian Community 81 Denbrook Avenue Bradford BD4 0QN	mark@woodhouse44.eclipse.co.uk ;
	Mark Williams Miller Homes Limited – Yorkshire Lapwing House Peel Avenue Calder Park Wakefield WF2 7UA	tim.williams@miller.co.uk ;
	Mrs Mandy Miller Secretary Mossdale Residents Community Group c/o 5 Chilver Drive Tong BD4 0TS	info@mossdale.org ;
	Miss Karen Hodgson Scholemoor Beacon c/p 53 Scholemoor Avenue Bradford BD7 2RU	Karen.hodgson@incommunities.co.uk ;
	Mr Andrew Robertson Barnardo's Allergrange Community Service 91 Saffron Drive Allerton Bradford BD15 7NQ	Andy.robertson@barnardos.org.uk ;
	Yvonne Oliver Partnership Development Manager Community Centre 102 - 104 Bierley House Avenue Bradford West Yorkshire	yvonne.oliver@Q2regeneration.org.uk ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	BD4 6UB	
	Mr Ken Knight Micklethwaite Village Society 160 Micklethwaite Lane Bingley BD16 3JF	
	Mr Allan Mirfield Eldwick Memorial Hall Trust 43 Grange Road Eldwick Bingley West Yorkshire BD16 3DQ	anval@blueyonder.co.uk ;
	Trish Lambert 43 Beaconsfield Road Clayton Bradford BD14 6LQ	trish@tlctravelltd.co.uk ;
	Alan Black 37 Bracken Road Brighouse HD6 2HX	Alan.black@dtz.com ;
	Simon Artiss Planning Manager Bellway Homes North West Division 2 Alderman Road Liverpool L24 9LR	Simon.artiss@bellway.co.uk ;
	Mr Anthony Casson lyss Localities West The Arc Canterbury Youth and community Centre Arum Street Bradford BD5 9LE	
	Martin Walsh Martin Walsh Associates Firth Buildings 99-191 Leeds Road	m.walsh@martinwalshassociates.co.uk ;

CAP REF NO.	Name and Address	Email Address
	Dewsbury WF12 7BU	
	Steve Gibbs Principal Consultant The Arley Consulting Company Ltd Chorleian House 49-51, St Thomas's Rd Chorley Lancs PR7 1JE	Sgibbs@taccl.co.uk;
	Mrs Imogen Scotney Scott Wilson Royal Court Basil Close Chesterfield Derbyshire S41 4SL	Imogen.scotney@scottwilson.com ;

8.0 APPENDIX 3 – REPRESENTATIONS

8.1 This section contains the all the representations received on the Waste Management DPD: Issues Options as of 1st March 2010.

8.2 The 20 respondents are listed below:

1. Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
2. Martin Walsh Associates
3. Lancashire County Council
4. Earth Tech & Skenska
5. Highways Agency
6. West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service
7. P Casey
8. English Heritage
9. Theatres Trust
10. Steeton-with-Eastburn Parish Council
11. Aire Valley Environmental
12. Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber
13. Yorkshire Forward
14. Burley Parish Council
15. Environment Agency
16. Coal Authority
17. Minerals Planning Group
18. Bradford Wildlife Group
19. Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)
20. Environment and Waste Management Improvement Committee