

Bath & North East  
Somerset Council



North  
Somerset  
Council

South Gloucestershire  
Council

---

# The West of England Partnership

---

## The West of England Partnership – Joint Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options Document consultation

15 January to 12 March 2009

### **Summary Report of the consultation**

Produced with support from Dialogue By Design and Environmental Resources  
Management (ERM) Ltd.

June 2009

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Stakeholder Workshop</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Drop in sessions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Public consultation</b>	<b>6-9</b>
4.1 Consulting process	
4.2 Overview of Responses	

## Appendices:

<b>Appendix 1: Workshop Report</b>	<b>10-13</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Drop-in session Reports</b>	<b>14-25</b>
2.1 Hartcliffe Drop-In reporting sheet	
2.2 Long Ashton Drop-in reporting sheet	
2.3 Chipping Sodbury Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.4 Keynsham Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.5 Filton Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.6 Weston-super-Mare Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.7 Midsomer Norton Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.8 Easter Compton Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.9 Fishponds Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.10 Bath Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.11 Avonmouth Drop- in reporting sheet	
2.12 Knowle Drop- in reporting sheet	
<b>Appendix 3: Bristol City Council additional info</b>	<b>26-32</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Screenshot of Consultation website</b>	<b>33-34</b>

# 1. Introduction

1.1 Councils in the West of England (Bath & North East Somerset, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire, and Bristol) are working together to produce a Joint Waste Core Strategy that will set out policies to help planners make decisions about where waste facilities could be located.

1.2 From January to March 2009, The West of England Partnership consulted on a Preferred Options document. As well as outlining the general principles and approaches that will be developed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy, the Preferred Options document also identifies possible sites for larger-scale waste facilities.

1.3 The consultation process complied with the individual local authorities Statement of Community Involvement requirements, and consisted of several strands:

- Public consultation in the period of 15 January to 12 March 2009
- A stakeholder workshop on 6 February 2009
- A series of 12 local drop-in sessions held between 2 February and 4 March 2009.
- A Waste Core Strategy Stakeholder Event organised by Bristol City Council on 11 February 2009
- Attendance of Bristol City Council officers at three Neighbourhood Partnership meetings.
- Presentations by Bath and North East Somerset Officers to; Keynsham Town Council, the Parish Liaison and Chew Valley Area Partnership.
- Further correspondence with individuals and organisations.

1.4 This report contains

- A short summary of the stakeholder workshop on 6 February 2009 (section 2)
- A short summary of the drop in sessions (section 3)
- An overview of the results of the public consultation (section 4).
- Appendices of Workshops, drop in sessions and additional consultation undertaken by Local Authorities.

Schedules of representations made to the Preferred Options Document consultation are available separately at <http://www.westofengland.org/waste/planning>

## 2. Stakeholder workshop

- 2.1 The Stakeholder workshop, held in parallel with the formal consultation process, brought together stakeholders with in depth, specialist and technical knowledge of the issues pertaining to the Joint Waste Core Strategy, in order to:
- Provide participants with an opportunity to hear more technical detail about how the three options were developed and how the preferred option came to be preferred.
  - Provide participants with an opportunity to question, challenge and explore any issues arising from the draft preferred consultation document.
  - Increase mutual understanding between stakeholders with different knowledge and interests by listening to each others' perspectives.
  - Stimulate creative, innovative thinking in relation to the problems highlighted in the document.
- 2.2 The workshop was held on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2009 (10am to 1pm) in Bristol. Due to adverse weather conditions, more than half of registered people could not come to the venue and only 11 delegates attended. However, the small number did not affect the quality of the discussions. A team including WEPO and Bristol officers and ERM consultants was available to answer questions from participants. The workshop was facilitated by two Dialogue by Design facilitators.
- 2.3 After a presentation about the background of the options and issues paper, the participants identified 5 areas for further possible in depth discussion. There were only enough participants and time to run two of these:
- How the core strategy will deal with site allocations e.g. planning policy implications
  - Exploring the robustness of the process of getting to the final strategy e.g. one that won't be legally challenged. How can the process be made more robust?
- 2.4 The workshop report is attached in appendix 1 and is available for download at <http://www.westofengland.org/waste>.

### 3. Drop in sessions

3.1 During the consultation period a series of 12 drop-in sessions were held around the region to compliment the formal consultation process. It was intended that these events would provide an alternative, more informal opportunity for the public to engage with the West of England team, to find out more about the proposals and also encourage people to take part in the formal consultation. Generally they were held in town/village halls and community halls/centres located close to the potential sites identified in the consultation document. A full list of the sessions can be found below.

3.2 These sessions ran on weekday afternoons from 3 – 7pm, with the exception of the event at the Guildhall in Bath which ran 12 – 4pm. This time was chosen in order to provide members of the public some flexibility to fit their attendance around commitments such as employment.

2 <sup>nd</sup> February	The Gatehouse Centre	Hartcliffe, Bristol
6 <sup>th</sup> February	Village Hall	Long Ashton
9 <sup>th</sup> February	Town Hall	Chipping Sodbury
10 <sup>th</sup> February	Masonic Hall	Keynsham
11 <sup>th</sup> February	BAWA	Filton, Bristol
13 <sup>th</sup> February	The Campus	Weston-super-Mere
17 <sup>th</sup> February	Hollies Council Chamber	Midsomer Norton
19 <sup>th</sup> February	Village Hall	Easter Compton
20 <sup>th</sup> February	The Vassell Centre	Fishponds, Bristol
23 <sup>rd</sup> February	Guildhall	Bath
26 <sup>th</sup> February	Community Centre	Avonmouth, Bristol
4 <sup>th</sup> March	Methodist Church Hall	Knowle

3.3 At each drop-in session there were a number of displays outlining background information on waste, the key challenges facing the West of England Partnership and the different solutions that were proposed in the consultation. There were copies of the consultation documents and the paper consultation questionnaire available for attendees to take away. Staff from the West of England Partnership, and planning and waste officers from the constituent local authorities were also on hand to talk to members of the public and answer any questions that they had.



Fig 1. The style of the drop-in sessions (as seen at The Vassall Centre, Fishponds)

## 4. Public consultation

### 4.1 Consultation process

#### Consultation-related documents

- 4.1.1 The main document 'Preferred Options-a development plan being prepared by the West of England Unitary Authorities to deal with strategic waste planning issues' was available for download from the consultation website; hardcopies were sent out on request.
- 4.1.2 A number of additional documents were available for download on the consultation website:
- Information leaflet: Preferred Options - 'Planning For Waste Treatment Facilities'
  - Sustainability Appraisal
  - Spatial Options Appraisal
  - Non-Hazardous Landfill Briefing Paper
  - Site Identification and Assessment Summary Report
  - Entec Sub-Regional Study of Waste
  - Waste Capacity Report
- 4.1.3 Additional documents (e.g. Report of Preferred Options Stakeholder Workshop on 6 February 2009), were provided as they became available.

#### Marketing

- 4.1.4 A written invitation to participate in the consultation was sent by post or email to more than 2,400 individuals and organisations. The postal invitation included the information leaflet 'Planning for waste treatment facilities' and pointed to the consultation website but also mentioned the option to request a paper version.
- 4.1.5 In addition, the public consultation was advertised in local newspapers, in local radio interviews and a number of press releases were issued.

#### Consultation website

- 4.1.6 A dedicated consultation website was set up: <http://wepo.dialoguebydesign.net> (accessed via [www.westofengland.org/waste](http://www.westofengland.org/waste)). The consultation website hosted relevant information and documents, and allowed participants to register and respond to the consultation questions online.
- 4.1.7 The consultation website allowed participants to log in and amend their responses at any time during the consultation period.
- 4.1.8 Participants could contact Dialogue by Design by telephone or email to obtain support for using the website.

#### Alternative ways of responding

- 4.1.9 While participants were encourage to participate online where possible, alternative ways of responding were offered:
- By post – a response form could be downloaded from the consultation website, and a freepost address was provided so people could respond without having to postage.
  - By email – by emailing the dedicated email address [wepo@dialoguebydesign.com](mailto:wepo@dialoguebydesign.com)

## **Public access to view all submissions**

4.1.10 The responses received will be displayed back on the West of England Partnership website during a review phase, which is scheduled to start in June 2009.

## **Participation statistics**

4.1.11 Dialogue by Design has processed some 210 consultation responses received until close of business 16 March 2009 (the website closed on 12 March 2009, but a number of postal and email responses were received after 12 March). The West of England Partnership will continue to accept responses after this date, and they will be considered separately.

4.1.12 As with any form of open consultation process, it is important to remember, when seeking to interpret the results, that this is a qualitative consultation, not an objective survey of public opinion. Its primary purpose is to collect ideas, arguments and views on the Preferred Options document, which will help inform the further development of the Joint Waste Core Strategy.

## **4.2 Overview of responses**

4.2.1 The purpose of this overview is to identify some common themes emerging from the range of ideas and opinions contained in all the responses. For a more in-depth understanding it is recommended to read the full responses which are available on the West of England Partnership website. A summarised list categorising responses has been produced by Dialogue by Design and is also available on the Website.

### **Spatial Options**

4.2.2 The representations to the Preferred Options consultation were consistent with the Issues and Options consultation with significant opposition to Spatial Option A, on the basis of concerns over large facilities, which offered no flexibility and a lack of local facilities to assist in reducing waste miles.

4.2.3 There was support for both spatial options B and C, common themes identified were the ability to deliver flexibility and to encourage local responsibility to deal with waste arisings.

4.2.4 There were also objections to both options B and C. Opposition to Option C were in most cases in relation to the interpretation of the larger facility being a particular technology.

4.2.5 The representations opposing option B were in most cases on the basis of deliverability, and the risk involved in delivering and the impacts of 8 sites to deliver the spatial option, as opposed to 4 in option C. A particular concern from the industry with Option B was the commercial viability of several smaller facilities.

## **A Summary of the emerging themes raised in the Consultation on the Preferred Options Document of the Joint Waste Core Strategy.**

### **1.Type of Waste Management Technology**

Several representations indicated that it is difficult to comment on specific sites or general areas without knowing about the technologies to be used. The representations indicated that a more informed view could be taken if the type of waste management facility proposed for each site was known. Some perceived that the indicative capacity (tonnes per annum) figures for sites/general areas implied an assumption towards a particular technology.

### **2. Waste Management- Private Finance Initiative (PFI)**

Some representations queried the relationship between the Joint Waste Core Strategy and the Private Finance Initiative funding and reference business case. In particular, respondents questioned whether the recent decision taken by Bristol City Council to withdraw support to the Business Case would affect the Joint Waste Core Strategy spatial option. Clarification was also sought on the B&NES decision not to support incineration as a technology for waste management.

### **3. Scope of the Joint Waste Core Strategy**

Some representations indicated that the Preferred Options document is unclear about the size of sites and facilities required to address the identified capacity needs, in particular that the Preferred Options document does not provide clear guidance on the strategy for delivering smaller, non-allocated sites, and the way in which such sites could help deliver identified waste management capacity. Queries were also raised regarding the timing and phasing of provision of waste management facilities.

### **4. Evidence base**

Some representations required more information including, evidence on capacity, flood risk, site identification process and the main arising/waste handling characteristics of the area in spatial terms.

### **5. Deliverability issues**

It was suggested by some representations that assessing the deliverability of sites should not just consider 'suitability' but also its availability and whether it is achievable in terms of both planning and commercial considerations. Linked to this it was indicated that the Preferred Option document does not outline proposed solutions if the strategy fails to deliver the required sites.

### **6. Sites-suggested additional sites for consideration.**

Some representations suggested additional sites for consideration. The industry suggested that the Joint Waste Core Strategy should allow for new non-allocated sites to come forward within the overall framework.

### **7. Site Specific Concerns**

Several representations objected to specific sites on grounds of deliverability, environmental impacts, flooding, health impacts, transport impacts or existing highway congestion issues.

### **8. Local Amenity Impacts**

Some representations expressed concern that the local amenity impacts of a recovery facility (in particular incineration) had not been considered when identifying sites or general areas. This theme was closely linked to respondents who had concerns about sites near residential areas in terms of potential noise and pollution.

## **9. Transport Impacts**

Representations queried the transport impacts of locating a waste recovery facility at some sites or general areas.

## **10. Support for Energy generation and Combined Heat and Power (CHP)**

Several representations expressed a preference for Combined Heat and Power (CHP) technology to be used, and that they would like to see the Joint Waste Core Strategy make a stronger case for CHP facilities in new developments.

# Appendix 1: Workshop Report

dialoguebydesign  
making consultation work

Report – Stakeholder Workshop 6 February 2009 1

## JOINT WASTE CORE STRATEGY FOR THE WEST OF ENGLAND

### Preferred Options Stakeholder Workshop

Novotel Bristol Centre  
Victoria Street, Bristol, BS1 6HY

Friday 6 February 2009, 10.00am – 1.00pm

### Workshop Report

This workshop, held in parallel with the formal consultation process, brought together stakeholders with in depth, specialist and technical knowledge of the issues pertaining to the Joint Waste Core Strategy, in order

to:

- Provide participants with an opportunity to hear more technical detail about how the three options were developed and how the preferred option came to be preferred.
- Provide participants with an opportunity to question, challenge and explore any issues arising from the draft preferred consultation document.
- Increase mutual understanding between stakeholders with different knowledge and interests by listening to each others' perspectives.
- Stimulate creative, innovative thinking in relation to the problems highlighted in the document.

#### PROGRAMME

10am Welcome

Background to the options

Break

Identify discussion areas

Discussions

1pm Finish

## Comments made by participants

These come from questions asked by participants

- There is no map or information showing commercial and industrial waste arisings by area – this could be useful
- The maps don't show projected / predicted housing developments – this could be useful to see
- The spatial options identified should be able to cope with the projected housing developments – the working assumptions took these developments into account
- Delivery of option A, B or C would be phased over a period of time, not all sites at once
- 180,000 tonnes of Municipal Solid Waste, the rest is Commercial & Industrial waste i.e. 640,000 tonnes
- Jacobs are the technical advisors to the waste disposal authority on Private Finance Initiative (PFI)
- There is a discrepancy between the figures in the Regional Spatial Strategy and what's presented in the current consultation documents
- The ability to secure finance for the options was not considered as part of the deliverability criteria
- Significant Flood Risk Assessments are close to completion; this information is likely to have an impact on identified sites. It is true that if this impact is so significant that these options are no longer deliverable, this consultation and the process of developing the core strategy may need to be re-run
- In relation to this Core Strategy, Short term means up to 5 years, medium term means 6 to 15 years, long term means over 15 years
- The core strategy will need to be more defined policies on locations and sites compared to this draft
- Current PFI plans / timescales are expected to remain
- The current timetable will mean the core strategy will be adopted before the planning application goes in for PFI projects
- It would be good to clarify the size / scale of the identified sites
- The core waste strategy considers all waste streams
- Projected capacities for the PFI project (not the JWCS) are based on waste reduction and recycling taking place at a predicted rate of 70% for MSW – if this rate is increased some sites / facilities may not be needed for residual waste treatment
- All existing waste treatment sites were put into the "mix" in the draft consideration
- This strategy is phase 2 – i.e. residual wastes (after e.g. reduction)
- Recycling and composting facilities of over 30,000 tonnes are in this strategy, anything under this tonnage is left to individual LAs through the LDF
- ERM is carrying out a critical review of the evidence base used in the strategy; reporting February 09 onwards.
- The industry is likely to find a facility that is over 150,000 tonnes to be more efficient / viable

## QUESTIONS

These are outstanding questions that were posed by the participants at the workshop, and require further consideration by the Partnership.

- What are the implications for option C if one site is not deliverable e.g. it costs too much for a private operator for it to be worth their while?
- Where does the 540,000 tonnes of inert waste figure come from? (ref: paragraph 6.57)
- Where does the inert waste currently go?
- The current description of inert waste going to landfill is questionable, this needs to be checked

## **POSSIBLE IN DEPTH DISCUSSION AREAS**

These were identified by the participants as areas for further in depth discussion. There were only enough participants and time to run two of these.

- How the core strategy will deal with site allocations e.g. planning policy implications
- Can Local Authorities deliver the strategy? Has enough been done to ensure this and if not what contingencies are there?
- Exploring the robustness of the process of getting to the final strategy e.g. one that won't be legally challenged. How can the process be made more robust?
- The approach to the hazardous waste element being taken.
- The role this strategy has in delivering smaller scale sites through the LDF

## **GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON CHOSEN TOPICS**

### **Group 1 – A robust process of strategy development**

- The Preferred Options Document is one stage in the process, not the final, detailed strategy.
- If a site is not listed in draft at the moment, the policy should allow for it to be considered
- Deliverability is more important than the timetable to get the strategy completed; if more time is needed to improve robustness – take it.
- Policy on “general areas” needs to be strengthened in relation to all waste streams and how they are dealt with in this document
- Look more closely at the links between this document and other documents e.g. climate change policies and LDFs

### **Group 2 – Dealing with Site Allocations**

- How sites in this document will be handled compared to another site that may come forward which is suitable, but not identified in the strategy document – a policy is needed to deal with this.
- What level of geographical detail will the sites be identified by / with?
- Not clear if one or several facilities will deliver the capacity on one site
- Need more clarification on sites on urban extensions that are not currently in the draft documents at the moment (because they would be in green belt, which is not currently included within potential areas for sites).

## Appendix –Participants

### Delegates

First name Last Name Job title Organisation  
Andrew Beard CSJ Planning  
Charles Gerrish Executive Member Waste & Planning Bath & North East Somerset  
Amanda Grundy Advisor Natural England  
Philip Hale Director of Planning WP2  
Barbara Lewis Joint Scrutiny Chair Bristol City Council  
Kevin Phillips Minerals and Waste Manager Gloucestershire County Council  
Gareth Phillips Property and Planning Manager SITA  
Nicholas Pollock Technical Director RPS Planning and Development Ltd  
Brett Spiller Planning Manager New Earth Solutions  
Lauren Taljaard Associate - Development Plans Bakers Associates  
Andy Towens Towens Group

### Presenters

First name Last Name Organisation  
Natalie Maletras ERM consultants  
Hilary Livesey ERM consultants  
Kirsten Berry ERM consultants

### Officers

First name Last Name Job title Organisation  
Steve Allen Waste Management Officer Bristol  
Laura Grady Senior Planning Officer WEPO  
Steve Moore Waste Management Officer Bristol  
Dick Sage Waste Planning Officer Bristol  
James White Transport Officer WEPO/ERM

### Facilitators

First name Last Name Organisation  
Lynn Wetenhall Dialogue by Design  
Rob Angell Dialogue by Design

## Appendix 2: Drop In Sessions Reports

### Appendix 2.1: Hartcliffe Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Jim Welch

Wepo staff Kay Hobday; UA: Dick Sage, Dawn Griffiths

Date: 2 February 2009

#### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1 3-4pm	One journalist (Bristol Evening Post) One local person
Hour 2 4-5pm	One (former Bristol councillor)
Hour 3 5-6pm	
Hour 4 6-7pm	
Drop-in Total	3

#### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	1
Consultation leaflet	2
Paper response form	
List of the possible sites	
Other	

#### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
  - 2 young/middle-aged ladies, one young man...
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly:
  - "How can people choose when they don't know what technical solutions are proposed?"
  - "Will anybody take any notice of our comments/suggestions? Giving comments is not a dialogue! I don't want my responses to go into a black hole!"
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
  - A suggestion to consider an additional site (Hengrove site known about by Bristol City Council but not on the list of potential sites)
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins
  - It would be useful to have available reference copies of the Joint Waste Strategy document (These were provided for the next events)
  - It would be helpful if a 'technical' person were present in the team for those who have a detailed technical interest/questions

## Appendix 2.2: Long Ashton Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Jim Welch

Wepo/UA staff Mike Reep (NS Head of Planning)

Date: 6 February 2009

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1 3-4pm	Nil
Hour 2 4-5pm	Nil
Hour 3 5-6pm	Nil
Hour 4	After due consideration of weather conditions (deteriorating, roads freezing forecast etc) and in consultation with Mike Reep, the Session was closed early at 6pm
Drop-in Total	Nil

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	0
Consultation leaflet	0
Paper response form	0
List of the possible sites	0
Other	0

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

## Appendix 2.3: Chipping Sodbury Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Rob Angell  
 Kay Hobday, Bruce Kent, Simon Ford, Liz Alison

Wepo staff

Date: 9 February 2009

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	7
Hour 2	8
Hour 3	6
Hour 4	10
Drop-in Total	31

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	4
Consultation leaflet	20
Paper response form	1
List of the possible sites	6
Other	

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

### Observations / Notes

- local journalist turned up and chatted, along with her photographer
- all attendees were over 50, except 4
- fairly even split of genders
- 2 local town / parish councillors attended

### Key points made by one participant in particular

It's not possible to comment as there is not enough information about the likely / projected impact of a particular type of activity on any site.  
 For example, will more transport movements be generated at the sites, will there be an increase in emissions.

## Appendix 2.4: Keynsham Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Hamish Wills  
 Wepo staff: Kay Hobday (WEPO), Kate Hobson (B&NES Waste Management), David Davies (B&NES Planning Consultant), Charles Gerrish (Cabinet Member and Local Councillor)  
 Date: 10.02.09

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	16
Hour 2	2
Hour 3	7
Hour 4	3
Drop-in Total	26

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	0
Consultation leaflet	20
Paper response form	1
List of the possible sites	20
Other	0

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.  
*Middle aged and retired, even gender balance apart from 1 group of 5 men anxious about future of their businesses (see below), 1 reporter (male), several councillors (female) and the District Councillor Marie Longstaff*
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- *Since we don't know what the final decision about Keynsham will be, we don't know what will happen to our businesses stationed on the site, we need more information to make an informed decision, accept the need for waste disposal but prefer alternative to incineration, general concern it's going to be an incinerator, quite a few waste technology related questions answered by B&NES waste officer, why do we have to take Bath's rubbish? questions about flood risk, access, additional traffic feeding onto the A4 and congestion, and waste miles*
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention  
*Keynsham with particular concerns on deliverability, access and flooding, though there were also references to the lack of a site in Bath.  
Two alternative sites put forward; Fullers Earth /works and Queen Charlton Quarry.*
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.  
*General feeling of anxiety, but also an acceptance of the need to deal with the waste problem, and after discussion and a look at the information a less antagonistic approach towards it*

### Anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

- having a knowledgeable waste officer and planning officer present was really important

## Appendix 2.5: Filton Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Jim Welch  
 Kay Hobday; Bruce Kent;  
 Wepo/UA staff Barbara Maksymiw; Liz Alison; Simon Ford  
 Date: 11 February 2009

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1: 3-4 pm	Men: 3; Women: 4. Including one Bristol councillor, one parish councillor and one aspiring candidate for councillor
Hour 2 4-5 pm	Nil extra. Some of the above stayed well into this period.
Hour 3 5-6 pm	Nil.
Hour 4 6-7 pm	Men: 2; Women: 2.
Drop-in Total	11

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	2
Consultation leaflet	9
Paper response form	2
List of the possible sites	3
Other (Joint Waste Strategy leaflet)	1

### Observations

- Age range late 20s to 60s; mostly probably 40s or 50s
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly: some individual quotes:
- “We should be doing more to tackle the sources of waste, especially supermarkets and their packaging (and the many and various forms of plastic in particular)”;  
 “[These facilities] could be a good thing especially for local employment (provided they are clean and quiet for local residents)”;  
 Reference was made to the example of a “model facility” in London Borough of Redbridge.
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- Several broadly supportive of the principles involved. Some would rather talk about further measures towards waste reduction – or even the state of the local buses...

Note: at least one couple said they had just read the article in today’s Evening Post and came immediately, not wanting to miss the chance. They were reassured to hear that they have the chance to study details and make comments on line.

## Appendix 2.6: Weston-super-Mere Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Rob Angell  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Wepo staff Michael Reep  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: 13 February 2009  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	3
Hour 2	2
Hour 3	3
Hour 4	1
Drop-in Total	9

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	7
Consultation leaflet	6
Paper response form	0
List of the possible sites	2
Other	Maps 2

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

### Observations / Notes

- 2 parish councillors; Ralph Newey and Les Mason from Locking PC attended. They said they had not received any notification about the consultation or about this drop in. I said we would follow up to see what had happened. Information had been sent to other contacts at the Parish Council. The contacts list will be updated with the information provided.

Attendees seemed to think that option C made sense – but didn't rule out A or B either  
 They were unsure if they could really comment on the sites without knowing what was actually proposed for them

They didn't really draw any difference between the two sites as they are at two ends of the same old airfield so to them it is one "area"

I'd say they were all supportive of the notion of dealing with waste where or close to where it arises

The only repeated theme was about Avonmouth and how suited it was to having waste facilities (not to the exclusion of Weston though)

## Appendix 2.7: Midsomer Norton Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Rob Angell  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Wepo staff: Kate Hobson, Kaoru Jacques  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: 17 February 2009  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	1
Hour 2	2
Hour 3	1
Hour 4	1
Drop-in Total	5

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	2
Consultation leaflet	2
Paper response form	0
List of the possible sites	0
Other	

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- *It is difficult to comment on the options without knowing exactly what will be proposed on each site. Some expressed their preference on Option B as they perceived this meant a more localised option i.e. shorter distance to travel, however also acknowledged that careful consideration for the local residents who live nearby must be given.*
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

### Observations / Notes

Wendy Walker, Somerset Guardian attended.  
 1 B&NES councillor  
 1 planning consultant

## Appendix 2.8: Easter Compton Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Rob Angell  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Liz Allison  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Wepo staff  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: 19 February 2009  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	2
Hour 2	2
Hour 3	0
Hour 4	0
Drop-in Total	4

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	2
Consultation leaflet	2
Paper response form	0
List of the possible sites	
Other	

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

### Observations / Notes

1 was the local ward councillor  
 1 was the photographer from "The Gazette"  
 1 was the reporter from "The Gazette"  
 1 was the representative from CPRE

## Appendix 2.9: Fishponds Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Rob Angell  
 Kay Hobday, Dick Sage

Wepo staff  
 20 February 2009

Date:

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	22
Hour 2	6
Hour 3	6
Hour 4	8
Drop-in Total	42

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	8
Consultation leaflet	20
Paper response form	3
List of the possible sites	0
Other	

### Observations / Notes

- good range of age groups and gender
- general view was that the Fishponds site was not suitable, too close to housing and schools, poor transport access
- many comments in favour of putting any facility in Avonmouth
- Everyone seemed well informed about the site and its potential use(s)
- 1 local ward councillor attended

### Key points made by participants

It would have been useful to have made it clear(er) that the consultation was about influencing the site(s) and that it was an opportunity to oppose or agree sites and not about the technologies

Many would have liked to have seen potential impacts listed (for each technology, for each technology's transport impact etc) to make it more meaningful

Some comments / complaints that the event had not been publicised enough and that it was half term and that it was a Friday afternoon / evening – all leading to a feeling that it had been an attempt to “hide” it. Would have liked to have seen posters in the library, Pos and supermarket windows.

## Appendix 2.10: Bath Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff:	Hamish Wills
Wepo staff	Kay Hobson, David Davies, Carol Tunnard, Kay Hobday.
Date:	23.2.09

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	3
Hour 2	0
Hour 3	5
Hour 4	3
Drop-in Total	11

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	5
Consultation leaflet	25
Paper response form	0
List of the possible sites	15
Other	0

### Observations

Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.

- *Mostly younger to older working age, fairly equal gender balance, quite a few representing interest groups, eg Friends of Bath, Transition Bath, one or two worked in waste industry but came as local citizens*

particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly

- *nearly all wanted clarification about the proposals or the nature of the consultation*

general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.

- *Not hostile, understood that waste was a problem and had to be dealt with*
- *General support for option C*

## Appendix 2.11: Avonmouth Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Hamish Wills

---

Wepo staff: Kay Hobday, Dick Sage (BCC planning), Dave Allen (BCC Waste),  
Steve Gill (WEP Project Director)

---

Date: 26.2.09

---

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1	7
Hour 2	5
Hour 3	5
Hour 4	2
Drop-in Total	19

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	20
Consultation leaflet	20
Paper response form	3
List of the possible sites	10
Other	

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.  
*1 student, 2 young local employees, 1 young couple, rest middle aged/retired, some business people, more women than men, local community group represented and local environmental group*
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly
- *Some very strong expression about inadequate advertising for the event because nobody cares about Avonmouth, hope that whatever the facility at Avonmouth it will help rejuvenate the neighbourhood with new employment, hope that new plant will produce energy from waste, concern about traffic and pollution*
- particular sites that receive a lot of attention
- *Avonmouth*
- general receptiveness of the attendees to the proposed strategy.
- *None strongly negative, most wanted to find out, some hoped it would help bring prosperity to area*
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins

## Appendix 2.12: Knowle Drop-In Reporting Sheet

DbyD staff: Jim Welch

Wepo/UA staff Dick Sage, Chris Lawler

Date: Wednesday 4 March 2009

### Attendance Tally Chart

Hour 1: 3-4 pm	Nil Rain started about 3.45pm
Hour 2 4-5 pm	1 (man)
Hour 3 5-6 pm	2 (1 woman and 1 man)
Hour 4 6-7 pm	1 (woman) Chris Lawler left at 6.30 pm due to low attendance.
Drop-in Total	4

### Documents given out (estimated)

Consultation document (Long)	nil
Consultation leaflet	nil
Paper response form	nil
List of the possible sites	nil
Other (Joint Waste Strategy leaflet)	nil

### Observations

- Information such as the balance of age, gender etc.
  - mid 20s to early 50s. Gender as above.
- particular questions or comments that are heard repeatedly: some individual quotes:
  - one visitor favoured the smaller facilities of Option B as the local impacts would be less than the economically favoured bigger, concentrated sites proposed in Option C.
  - existing operations in St Philips mentioned by two visitors as problematic. This is due to apparently unregulated noise, smells and visual impact from the surrounding (elevated) areas. Visitors felt that the complaints apparently fall on deaf ears and that this undermines confidence that any new facility, particularly if privately run, will conform to appropriate environmental standards.
  - one visitor favoured any facilities to be away from residential areas due to the real problems experienced as outlined in the point above.
  - for the same reason, another visitor suggested enclosing facilities (e.g. roof over a former quarry)
- anything you think that could be improved or changed for future drop-ins
  - One visitor commented that he was disappointed that no one had alerted/contacted him about this consultation as he had been involved and registered for a previous phase. He had found out about it through reading the local paper.
  - Another was advised of the drop-in event via a leaflet from his local residents association.

## **Appendix 3: Bristol City Council Additional Consultation Information.**

- 1.1 Bristol City Council held a consultation event in Bristol aimed at a range of Stakeholders, mainly communities, but with some representation from commercial interests, public bodies, environment groups etc. A list of the minutes and attendees is attached. The main reason for holding this event was to be consistent with the approach to consultation taken on other emerging DPD documents produced by the City Council. They were aimed informing attendees, rather than asking for commitment to a particular view as part of the event.
- 1.2 Bristol City Council Officers also attended three meetings of Neighbourhood Partnerships; these are the urban equivalent of Parish Councils, but without any statutory recognition. The purpose of these was to raise awareness of forthcoming drop-in events, provide a basic understanding of the purpose of the consultation and to encourage communities to respond. The Neighbourhood Partnerships were chosen because they included potential waste development sites identified in the Preferred Options document. They covered the wards of Avonmouth/Kingsweston, Windmill Hill/Knowle/Filwood and FromeVale/Hillfields/Eastville. Following poor attendance at early drop in events posters were also put up in local shops and public buildings to raise awareness of the events at Avonmouth and at Filwood.
- 1.3 A consultation letter was sent to Gypsy and Traveller groups to address the fact that one of the possible waste development sites at Avonmouth, Bristol is currently operating as a Gypsy and Traveller transit site (ie short stay, rather than permanent residences) and might be selected for waste development, depending on further work and the outcome of consultation. A copy of this letter is attached.

# **Bristol City Council Waste Core Strategy Stakeholder Event**

**The Pavilion, Canons Marsh**

**17:30 – 22.00 11th February 2009**

Format:

- Introduction
- Presentation: the Preferred Option
- Questions and Answers
- Group Discussions
- Conclusion

Notes of the meeting

## ***Question and Answer Session***

- Q. Is the energy embodied in building, for example, 5 sites as in Option C compared to 2 sites in Option A taken into account while assessing the sustainability of the different options?
- A. Could not answer this directly as the consultants' findings had not yet been looked at in sufficient detail. However, 32 variables covering a broad range of impacts were taken into consideration in assessing the options, from which Option A emerged as essentially a non-starter, whereas Option C came out best and Option B slightly worse
- Q. Under Option C, would the same types of waste be handled at each of the 5x sites?
- A. National policy requires that we identify site locations for waste development capable of accommodating a broad range of technologies and types of waste. We are therefore not looking to allocate sites for specific types of waste. We are aware that large volumes of commercial waste will have to be dealt with and are fairly confident that the proposed sites in Option C would all be needed.
- Q. Are we locked into a particular proposal e.g. a large scale incinerator?
- A. No. We have to consider a range of technologies but, on the other hand, cannot rule any particular technology out.
- Q. Would the waste vehicles be based at each waste site, or at another depot 20 miles away?
- A. The municipal waste vehicles could be based at the site if it were large enough.
- Q. Could we have clean, low-emission waste vehicles?
- A. Bristol City Council is looking for a sustainable form of vehicle for use in transporting municipal waste. There is also EU legislation concerning engines.

- Q. Who will pay for these waste developments – will it be the West of England authorities, or will it be by private finance? To what extent will the running of the sites be determined by private financiers?
- A. They will have to be provided privately, for the most part. Municipal facilities will be procured through the market.
- Q. Presumably there will be preferred choices in the private contractor market?
- A. It will be open to us, in our tender specifications for municipal waste facilities, to choose, but we will have to be mindful of which offers are sound and deliverable and will get the job done.

## **Workshop Session**

### **Workshop Discussions: Group 1**

The group recorded the following questions / issues:

#### **General**

- Depends on how sustainability is measured.
- Would the sites do different things?
  - It was noted that they would do the same things at different scales.
  - Various technologies available.
  - Role of new / unknown technologies.
- Has the proposed new development for the area been factored in, along with increasing recycling?
- Market considerations.
  - It was noted that there is a market for waste treatment.
- Have links to hospitals been considered?
  - It was noted that limited waste is generated.
- Is land reclamation an option?
  - Pollution.
  - Tidal impacts.
  - Severn Barrage impacts.
- Could we use train lines?
  - An Avonmouth facility would have good links to where waste is generated.
- Could planning control the types of waste handled?
- Use Council land holdings.

#### **Option A**

- Some support as increased containment
- More traffic impacts

#### **Option B**

- Viability concerns regarding smaller sites

#### **Option C**

- How big would the sites be?
- Still focuses on some large sites

## **Urban Extensions**

- Could they be waste neutral?

## **Workshop Discussions: Group 2**

The group recorded the following questions / issues:

### **General**

- Would the same activities take place on each site?
- Maximise opportunities for waste recovery.
- Rail transport potential should be used.
- Need to be site specific to understand the impact on the natural environment, but a dispersed model was generally preferred.
- Fewer places result in greater impact through journeys.
- Recognise the role of local as well as strategic sites. Could there be localised opportunities for Combined Heat & Power (CHP)?
- Tendering – would all five sites have the same operator?

### **Options**

- Options B and C were favoured, but the group felt the need for more detail of site activities. There was no consensus between the two, but overall there was a preference for a larger number of sites.

## **Urban Extensions**

- Urban extensions should handle their own waste via CHP.
- Waste infrastructure should be built in first.
- With the urban extensions the dispersal shown in Option C would be inadequate – unless the urban extensions included their own local facilities.

## **Workshop Discussions: Group 3**

The group recorded the following questions / issues:

### **Option A**

- Have the transport impacts been considered?
- Could end up becoming even more regional with rationalisation, including South Wales.
  - Loss of competition.

### **Option B**

- Should be pursued, but not at the expense of disadvantaged areas.
- Identify as many sites as possible to meet future needs.

### **Option C**

- Some strengths.
- Possible loss of sites over time through buyouts and future site rationalisation. As with Option A, could end up with a single dominant provider at Avonmouth.
- Unless all sites were able to take all kinds of waste, the distance travelled by waste could increase over Option A.

## **Urban Extensions**

- Should be considered for waste development if they come forward. Avoid missing opportunities.
- CHP facilities are a sensible approach to pursue.

## **Workshop Discussions: Group 4**

Group 4 participants were reallocated to the other four groups.

## **Workshop Discussions: Group 5**

The group recorded the following questions / issues:

### **General**

- Rail is not mentioned in the preferred option document and should be used where it would be a cost-effective solution. Infrastructure could be shared with passenger services.
- River access by barge could also be considered.
- The impact on nature conservation would depend on the location, design and containment of the facilities.
- How the sites would be operated should be key to which option is chosen. How much public liability / control would there be over a private operator?
- Consider developing larger sites as “clusters”, so as to have the option of shutting down redundant capacity and to provide for contingencies.
- Could we do more on reduction / reuse?

### **Option A**

- Why not ship waste by rail to one larger depot at Avonmouth. Could this be cost-effective?
- Keynsham is also served by rail.

### **Option B**

- All of the sites would be the same size, but it had already been noted that Avonmouth generates a large quantity of commercial waste.
- Rail transport to those sites served by rail would be less feasible due to economies of scale.
- Would this option result in higher construction costs?
- However, smaller units would have less local impact and would be closer to the source of the waste.

### **Option C**

- Although all five locations are served by rail, rail may still be less feasible due to economies of scale.
- However, as with Option B, smaller units would have less local impact and would be closer to the source of waste.
- This option would reduce the pressure on Avonmouth compared to Option A and provide for a contingency plan if the Avonmouth facility broke down.

## **Urban Extensions**

- Waste management should be planned into the urban extensions. With modern technology it should be possible to provide sites within the new development. Also consider building sites into existing areas when they are reconfigured.

National Romani Rights Association  
c/o Basil Burton  
10 Dugdell Close  
Ferndown  
Dorset  
BH 8BH

**Reply to** Dick Sage  
**Telephone** 0117 9036721  
**Minicom**  
**Fax** 0117 9036681  
**Email** dick.sage@bristol.gov.uk  
**Our Ref**  
**Your Ref**  
**Date** 26th January 2009

Dear Sir or Madam,

## Public Consultation on Waste Plan for the West of England

The four Councils in the West of England (Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire) are working together to produce a Plan containing policies which will help planners make decisions about where major waste facilities should be located. The Councils have issued a "Preferred Options" Document and a summary leaflet to explain what is proposed and are inviting comments on emerging policies. The Councils have previously carried out an "Issues and Options" consultation in early 2007 and there will be a further chance to comment at a later stage in late 2009.

We would like to obtain your organisation's views on the Preferred Options document as part of a wider public consultation with individuals, groups and other interests. In particular, you may want to comment on the possible use of an existing Gypsy and Traveller transit site at Avonmouth for waste purposes – one of eighteen possible sites under consideration. This site will be the subject of further consultation if it emerges as a good prospect for waste use.

Consultation began on 15<sup>th</sup> January and closes on the 12<sup>th</sup> March 2009. The consultation documents can be downloaded from the West of England Partnership's website at: [www.westofengland.org/waste](http://www.westofengland.org/waste), However, for your convenience I enclose copies of both the full "Preferred Options" Document and the summary leaflet. Further copies of the summary leaflet can also be obtained from public libraries in Bristol or from the Council's offices at Brunel House, St. George's Road, in central Bristol.

Can you let us have your comments either by:

- completing a comments form on the website at [www.westofengland.org/waste](http://www.westofengland.org/waste), or
- e-mailing us at [wepo@dialoguebydesign.com](mailto:wepo@dialoguebydesign.com), or
- returning the enclosed form, or writing to us with your comments (no stamp required) to :

The West of England Partnership  
Freepost SEA 12430  
Thornton Heath  
CR7 7XT

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or wish to discuss any issues raised by this letter or the consultation documents.

Yours faithfully,

Dick Sage  
Project Manager, Strategic Policy

Copies sent to:

Friends, Families and Travellers  
Community Base  
113 Queens Rd  
Brighton  
East Sussex  
BN1 3XG

Gypsy Council  
European and UK Office  
8 Hall Road  
Aveley  
Essex  
RM15 4HD

Irish Travellers Movement in Britain  
The Resource Centre  
356 Holloway Road  
London  
N7 6PA

Avon Consortium Traveller Education Service  
Charborough Road  
Filton  
Bristol  
BS34 7RA

# Appendix 4 – Screenshots from consultation website

## Screenshot 1. Home page

The screenshot shows the home page of the West of England Partnership website. At the top, there are logos for Bath & North East Somerset Council, North Somerset, and South Gloucestershire Council. Below the logos is the title 'The West of England Partnership'. A navigation bar contains links for Home, Background, Registration, Contact us, and Links. The main content area features a heading 'The West of England Partnership - Joint Waste Core Strategy consultation' and several paragraphs of text explaining the consultation process. A map of the West of England region is visible in the background. At the bottom, there is a footer with links for Top, Legal issues, Contact us, Access keys, Home, and a copyright notice for Dialogue by Design.

**The West of England Partnership - Joint Waste Core Strategy consultation**

Councils in the West of England (Bath & North East Somerset, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire, and Bristol) are working together to produce a Joint Waste Core Strategy that will set out policies to help planners make decisions about where waste facilities could be located.

This consultation website hosts the consultation documents and supporting information, and allows you to respond to a series of consultation questions online. The proposed plan deals with policies on waste minimisation, recycling and composting, recovery and landfill; it includes the identification of potential locations for treating waste.

If you already have a user name and password, please proceed directly to the [Login](#) page.

To register and participate in this process please go to the [Registration](#) page.

If responding via the Internet is not suitable for you or if you prefer to respond by paper or email for another reason, please use see the section '[Alternative ways of responding](#)'.

This process is provided by Dialogue by Design on behalf of The West of England Partnership.

## Screenshot 2. Registration page

The screenshot shows the registration page of the West of England Partnership website. It features the same header and navigation bar as the home page. The main content area is titled 'Registration' and contains instructions for users. Below the text are several form sections: 'Your personal details' with fields for Title, First name, and Last name; 'Your Organisation' with fields for Organisation and Job title; 'Your address' with fields for Address line 1, 2, 3, 4, and Post code; and 'Your telephone number' with a field for Tel No. A map of the West of England region is visible in the background.

**Registration**

By completing the registration form below you will be able to access the consultation pages, and we will notify you of your user name and confirm your password by email.

Before registering, you may wish to read the section '[Legal issues](#)'.

If you have already registered for this consultation, click on the 'Login' link above.

**The 'Submit' button is at the bottom of the page. Fields marked \* are mandatory.**

**Your personal details**

Title\*

First name\*

Last name\*

**Your Organisation**

Please fill in only if you are responding on behalf of this organisation.

Organisation

Job title

**Your address**

We would like to collect address information so we can map where responses have come from within our region. To do this it would be helpful if you could provide the first line of your address and postcode.

Address line 1

Address line 2

Address line 3

Address line 4

Post code

**Your telephone number**

Tel No.

### Screenshot 3. Page with consultation question, document reference and brief summary (example)

Bath & North East Somerset Council         

# The West of England Partnership

Home   Background   Objectives   Links   Log off

Profile   Participants

## Joint Waste Core Strategy consultation

Expand content list  
Close content list

- Introduction
- Waste minimisation**
- Waste Audits
- Recycling and composting
- Recovery
- Landfill

### Waste minimisation - Waste Audits

 [Waste minimisation \(extract from chapter 6 of the consultation document\)](#)

A clear view expressed to the Issues and Options Consultation was that waste minimisation has a vital role to play in the way we approach the management of waste and that more should be done to promote it. Waste minimisation is at the top of the Waste Hierarchy, which recognises the importance of "Reduce, Reuse and Recycle". However, waste growth is a difficult issue to tackle because the underlying reasons and drivers to its promotion are associated with issues of lifestyle and culture.

The draft Regional Spatial Strategy promotes the use of Waste Audits for new development. Waste audit is a means of establishing the types and amounts of waste that come from new developments.

Our proposed policies are:

- to promote the use of Waste Audits for development
- to identify the types of developments for which waste audits would be applicable.

Please type your response in the text box below, then click the 'submit' button to save your entry. For a more detailed explanation of the use of this page please click on [Instructions \(link opens in a new window\)](#)

**2. Do you have any comments on the policy to promote the use of waste audits?**

2000 Characters left