

**Joint Waste Core Strategy Consultation Responses draft Pre-Submission Document (publication version)**  
**4<sup>th</sup> January to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010.**

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
112	F22		South Stoke Parish Council	<p>Policy 5 considered unsound.</p> <p>1.The Fullers Earth Works site fails the competency test on Policy 11, allocation of this site in the JWCS is inconsistent with policy and unsound.</p> <p>2. 14. Should be specified as a RIG site, AONB, World Heritage.</p> <p>3. The site is currently operating unlawfully.</p>	<p>The Joint Waste Core Strategy Evidence Base supports the inclusion of the site as a suitable opportunity. The constraints (Bats) highlighted have been recognised in the Key Development Criteria at Figure 10 pg 1 of the JWCS. Development would be limited to the existing buildings and their curtilages.</p> <p>Noted in the Key Development Criteria.</p> <p>The JWCS allocates the site for inclusion for future development not the current operation. The area identified provides the opportunity for design led solutions and landscaping to be included in any proposals.</p>	<p><b>No change made addressed in: Evidence Base Key Development Criteria</b></p> <p><b>No change made addressed in: Key Development Criteria</b></p> <p><b>No change made.</b></p>
122	F25a	Laura Weston	Gloucestershire County Council	<p>Paras 6.10 &amp; 6.11</p> <p>Landfill- It is not clear as to whether this is a clear policy approach/'area of search' for landfill. Provision seems to hang on upon Policy 8 which is effectively a criteria based policy. Gloucestershire County Council contend that the policy for landfill provision is not clear and not particularly proactive. It has not been clearly made that landfill provision should be made. Therefore unsustainable practices of exporting waste for disposal could continue as recognised in para 6.11.1</p>	<p>Para 6.11.1 recognises that the reliance on exporting landfill is not sustainable throughout the plan period. Criteria based Policy (8) identifies areas where there would appear to be opportunities for landfill capacity. Industry have supported this criteria based approach and indicated there are opportunities they wish to pursue but have not indicated where these are. Policy 8 has been edited for clarification.</p>	<p><b>Policy 8</b></p>
122	F25b	Laura Weston	Gloucestershire County Council	<p>Paras 6.13.1</p> <p>The submission document is lacking a policy on hazardous waste. The text at Para 6.4.6 refers to Draft RSS text that has been deleted in the latest</p>	<p>That the Region is broadly self sufficient in hazardous waste remains in the Proposed Changes to the RSS. The JWCS makes provision for both hazardous and non</p>	<p><b>Para 6.10.11</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				RSS Proposed Changes (July 2008). The reference would not be in accordance with the emerging RSS Proposed Changes, Policy W3, which now states that Waste Planning Authorities should make provision for hazardous waste transfer, treatment and disposal facilities.	hazardous waste under policy 8 and 9 as set out at para 6.10.11.	
146	F29a	Hayley Townsend	Yate Town Council	<p>1. Waste Treatment sites 6.8.9 –The policy as drafted is too wide, effectively removing any ability for the local planning authority to control where a waste treatment site goes within Yate.</p> <p>2. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has not provided site specific analysis of the Preferred Option in each case, and does not evaluate alternatives.</p>	<p>The Strategic Area at Yate has an identified boundary in the JWCS that clarifies the existing industrial area considered suitable for development. Sites within this area display characteristics necessary for waste management development. This area has been identified for several stages of consultation and we have received no objections from landowners.</p> <p>The Strategic Area A at Yate has been considered in the SA at Table D13.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
146	F29b	Hayley Townsend	Yate Town Council	1. Policy is drafted too wide, enabling any industrial or warehousing site to be released, even one adjoining residential property. The use is not equivalent to all B Class uses, and should be limited to sites in the heavy industry category. Policy 12 doesn't give enough protection.	It is not clear which is referred to here as being drafted too wide. The JWCS should be read as a whole and Development Management Policies 12 and 11 provide the balance to the Spatial Strategy as set out at para 6.15.1 and 6.15.2.	<b>No change made</b>
153	E146	Nicky Milton	Cleeve Parish Council	Cleeve Parish Council considered the JWCS at its meeting in February but had no comments or additions to make.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32a	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	<p>Para 3.2.2 DPD considered sound &amp; legally compliant.</p> <p>The Agency acknowledges that in the short term the exportation of waste may occur, but welcomes the long term objective of the sub region to deal with waste within its own administrative boundaries as this will reduce the need to transport waste to areas outside of the sub-region.</p>	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
173	F32b	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 3.3.1 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency is encouraged by the recognition of the environmental impact of transporting waste. However, the Agency feels that included among the stated goals should be a reference to using more sustainable travel modes for transporting waste, such as rail or boat.	Development Management Policy 12 at bullet 14 seeks proposals that consider the opportunities for transportation of waste by rail or water.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32c	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 5.6.12. DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency is encouraged that reference has been made to the Joint Local Transport Plan and integration with its requirement to locate development where there would be minimal impact on the SRN. The agency strongly supports integration with the JLTP policy that encourages waste to be managed as close to the point of origin as possible.	The Agency's support is noted. Paras 6.8.5 to 6.8.6 sets out the rationale for the Spatial Strategy which seeks to ensure adequate distribution of waste infrastructure across the sub-region to meet the sub-regions needs. In particular the distribution at figure 6.1 considered waste arising, impacts on the SRN, and the RSS expectation that new waste management facilities be located within 16km of SSCTs.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32d	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.1.3 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency agrees that advantage should be taken within such schemes to introduce new technologies and facilities that can serve the local populations and recreate more sustainable patterns of development which reduce the requirement to transport waste to wider locations. The Agency recognises that such schemes will need to be sensitively planned due to their bad neighbour nature and should therefore be considered within the earliest stage of consultation and master planning exercise. The Agency would like to be consulted upon the location of such facilities during the embryonic stages of potential urban extension schemes.	The Agency's support is noted.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32e	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.11.1 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency supports the aspiration that the West	The Agency's support is noted.	<b>No change made.</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				of England should be self sufficient in the disposal and after treatment of non-hazardous landfill. Furthermore...we support the principle of using inert-waste in restoration of quarries and its use in the engineering projects within the region in order to reduce the distance it travels. The Agency would like to be consulted at an early stage regarding the suitability of potential sites identified for landfill operations in the West of England.		
173	F32f	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.11.1 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency would like to see hazardous waste that is exported out of the region transported by train to reduce the impact on the SRN.	Noted.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32g	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.2.1. DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency supports the aspiration to reduce the amount of waste that is generated in the region by waste prevention techniques. Helping reduce the amount of waste would ultimately help reduce demand for the transportation of waste.	The Agency's support is noted.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32h	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.2.6 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency supports the aspiration to design new developments in a way that will help reduce waste and increase recycling.	The Agency's support is noted.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32i	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.5.2 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency would like to see waste transfer facilities located in proximity to rail freight terminals to increase the potential for waste transfer by methods other than freight.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32j	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.8.5 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency is encouraged that the SRN, and transport impacts, are given bespoke mention as a key consideration as part of the Spatial Strategy	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				for residual waste facilities, as requested by the Agency during previous consultation stages.		
173	F32k	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 7.1.3 DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Highways Agency would like to see reference to 'other key stakeholders, including the Highways Agency' within this paragraph	The Environment Agency and the Development Industry are included as they will always be relevant stakeholders in the context of permitting and implementation. However, if the Planning Inspector feels appropriate, the Highways Agency could be added.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32l	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency is very concerned by the lack of reference to the reduction in waste miles as a strategic objective. The strategic objectives should also include reference to the use of freight rail as a preferred mechanism in achieving more sustainable patterns of waste transfer. In addition the Agency would welcome the inclusion of further text relating to the need for proposals to assist in securing sustainable patterns of development that do not increase the need to travel within or outside of the sub region.	Specific reference to reduction in waste miles has been removed because it doesn't account for the potential to use rail and doesn't consider overall benefit or burdens of any one proposal. To consider the sustainability of any one proposal requires the consideration of wider environmental issues.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32m	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency expects to see reference to the need for proposals for new waste facilities to be able to demonstrate they do not have an adverse impact on the function and capacity of the SRN. This is entirely consistent with the aims of PPS10 para 21. However, the agency appreciates that Policy 12 General considerations includes criteria that will require consideration on the impact of facilities on the SRN as applications come forward.	Impacts upon SRN have been considered in the SA, and the impact of transport on the SRN is included in Development Management Policy 12.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32n	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency is very disappointed to see reference to reduction in waste miles removed from the Vision. The Agency supported this in the Preferred Options consultation and on this basis the agency would strongly recommend that	Specific reference to reduction in waste miles has been removed because it doesn't account for the potential to use rail and doesn't consider overall benefit or burdens of any one proposal. To consider the sustainability of any one proposal requires	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				reference to the reduction in waste miles generated by waste facilities is re-introduced into the vision.	the consideration of wider environmental issues.	
173	F32o	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	DPD considered sound & legally compliant. The Agency strongly supports the provision of Policy 12, particularly of criterion 13. The Agency would suggest reference to the DfT's Guidance on Transport Assessment (GTA) to provide applicants with clearer guidance for the requirements of transport assessments	To ensure that the Joint Waste Core Strategy has longevity as a document this specific reference has not been included to future proof the document. This is a document that would be expected to be considered in the preparation of any development proposal.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32p	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Policy 1. DPD considered sound & legally compliant The Agency supports the requirements for waste audits for major development proposals, particularly criterion (e). However, the agency considers that the policy does not go far enough and recommends insertion of text into policy requiring assessment of impact on road network, including proposed routing of HGV for trips associated with waste disposal from development. This could be made a requirement of a construction management plan.	Noted. Policy 12 seeks proposals to consider the impacts of traffic generation and congestion, including access to and from the motorway and primary route network.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32q	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Policy 2. DPD considered sound & legally compliant The Agency would wish to see the insertion of supporting text setting out a requirement for applicants to demonstrate that new development will not impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.	Noted. Policy 12 seeks proposals to consider the impacts of traffic generation and congestion, including access to and from the motorway and primary route network.	<b>No change made.</b>
173	F32r	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Policy 3. DPD considered sound & legally compliant Whilst the Agency supports policy for recycling and composting they would still need to be satisfied that there would be no adverse impact on the SRN particularly for proposals in rural locations. The Agency reserves the right to comment on site specific proposals at this stage	Noted.	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
173	F32s	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Policy 4. DPD considered sound & legally compliant The Agency supports in principle, the co-location of waste treatment works at mineral extraction sites as this should reduce the need to transfer waste.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32t	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Policy 7. DPD considered sound & legally compliant The Agency reserves the right to comment on speculative applications on non –allocated sites as they come forward. In addition the Agency considers that this policy does not currently provide clarity over the assessment of proposals on non-allocated sites. Therefore the policy should make clear reference to which development management policies re applicable.	Noted. The JWCS should be read as a whole and Development Management Policies 12 and 11 provide the balance to the Spatial Strategy as set out at para 6.15.1 and 6.15.2.	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32u	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Policy 5. DPD considered sound & legally compliant The Agency does not have any overarching objections to the location of these sites; the Agency does however reserve the right to comment on site specific proposals during the application and pre application stage where detailed Transport Assessment (TA) would be required to identify the potential impact of development on the safe ad efficient operation of the SRN.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
173	F32v	Jacqui Ashman	Highways Agency	Para 6.8.11 DPD considered sound & legally compliant The Agency re-iterates previous comments that they would expect the location of such facilities to be identified during the comprehensive masterplanning stages and they would seek to be consulted at an early stage of this process.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
179	F27	Tricia Golinski	Saltford Parish	Policy. DPD Policy considered unsound. Para 5.6.12.		

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
			Council	<p>1.No evidence of reference to the JTLP in the Pre-submission document. What analysis has been carried out to ensure that the sites identified within the strategy have minimal impact on the SRN. The sites are clearly not close to the point of origin as possible.</p> <p>2. Should make provision to urban extension.</p> <p>3.Concerns re: Broadmead Lane access, flood risk and contamination Appendix 1 Fig F9.</p> <p>4. Concerns re: no costings involved in implementation.</p>	<p>1. The Joint Local Transport Plan has been considered as set out in para 5.6.12, the SA and HRA have considered other plans including the JLTP, as appropriate at the plan making level. Specific development proposals will need to demonstrate through the normal application process that there are no adverse impacts on the SRN, by providing a transport assessment where required.</p> <p>2.Paras 6.8.11 to 6.8.14 acknowledges the potential role of adopted urban extensions. Policy 5 bullet 2 refers to the potential of urban extensions</p> <p>3. Access and flood risk are listed as issues to be considered by any proposals in the 'Key Development Criteria', and the former use is in the Site Assessment report which is part of the supporting evidence base. For clarification purposes the former use is included in the KDC to reflect the history of site.</p> <p>4. The costs for implementation will generally fall to the Development Industry. The main exception to this is in relation to delivery of municipal waste management infrastructure, which will have been subject to separate cost considerations through contractual negotiations. The JWCS provides a policy framework that conforms to National Policy, is sustainable, and deliverable.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>To be addressed in: Key Development Criteria</b></p>
181	F34	Jonathan Manning	Wiltshire	We have no objections to the document	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
183	F28	David Ogbourne	Wessex Water	1. Consider sound.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
183	F38	Gillian Sanders on behalf of David Ogbourne	Wessex Water	<p>Do not consider the DPD is sound or legally compliant, reason not effective.</p> <p>1. This is a resubmission and supercedes our response dated 10/02/2010. We regret that this revised response is necessary at such a late stage following extensive consultation procedures, however we have recently been liaising with Bristol City Council on the city wide local plan revision and now consider it important that the following issues are covered in the Joint Waste Core Strategy to give strategic support.</p> <p>2. We consider the DPD is unsound in that the Plan document does not specifically identify the need for land around our Avonmouth sewage treatment works to be safeguarded for future expansion to meet growth and potential future tightening of environmental standards.</p> <p>3. We fully support Policy 13 regarding the safeguarding of operational and allocated sites for waste management facilities.</p> <p>4. We believe it important that specific sites,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The evidence base did not specify a need to allocate sites for waste water treatment facilities so a criteria based policy approach has been used. Policy 10 provides a positive policy framework for proposals for waste water treatment to come forward. The JWCS does not seek to allocate new sites for waste water treatment, but Policy 13 does safeguard existing sites for Waste Water treatment.</p> <p>The land allocations in the current Bristol Local Plan makes some provision for expansion of the Avonmouth Sewage works. Any further requirements should be discussed with Bristol City Council to inform the site allocations DPD.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The JWCS does not seek to allocate sites</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>similar to those listed within Policy 5, should be identified to cover potential future expansion at our Avonmouth sewage treatment works.</p> <p>5. We have no immediate plans to carry out major extensions in the medium term but this site is the only realistic option for catering for growth in the large Bristol catchment in the longer term. It is vital the works does not become boxed in as we see the site being required to cater for growth for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>6. Another factor which may drive the need for upgrading over shorter time horizon is the pressure for tighter environmental standards. These may be driven by the emerging Waste Framework Directive, EU sludge directives or the Severn Barrage.</p> <p>7. We attach a plan showing our proposed requirements for the area. We are conscious that the land at the western end of the site within our current ownership is zoned within existing approved plan as a nature reserve. However, this would be ideally placed for some future extensions whereas the land to the east of the works does have some service restrictions, it may well be that some land swap could be achieved following more detailed review to facilitate best use of resources.</p> <p>8. In the south east corner of the land outside our ownership, we note the current allocation in the</p>	<p>but policy 13 does safeguard sites for Waste Water treatment. Policy 10 provides a positive policy framework for proposals for waste water treatment to come forward.</p> <p>Noted. Comments have been forwarded to Bristol City Council colleagues for consideration in the preparation of any site allocations DPD and to help assess development proposals.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Any proposal for land swaps to enable an extension to the site is a matter to be considered by Bristol City Council.</p> <p>The allocation of this site for a gypsy and traveller site is not a matter for the JWCS to</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Clarification provided in the Key Development</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				approved Bristol City Local Plan is for travellers accommodation. We do not feel this is an ideal site bearing in mind the 'bad neighbour' aspect of sewage treatment.	address. Bristol City Council's intent is to find an alternative provision for Gypsies and Travellers, the site remains a longer term opportunity for locating residual waste treatment facilities in the JWCS. These comments have been forwarded to Bristol City Council colleagues to consider.	<b>Criteria of site DS14 Gypsy &amp; Traveller site to acknowledge medium-longer term opportunity in the JWCS.</b>
194	E141	Laura Welti	Bristol Disability Forum	1. Requested information in a summary format.	Noted and a summary provided.	<b>No change made</b>
204	F21 L21	Simon Steele Perkins	Strategic Land Partnerships  Note 2 hard docs received.	<p>Do not consider the DPD is sound, reason not justified, effective or consistent with national policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 3.3.1 – must make reference to reducing the need to travel. This requirement underpins much of Government policy and must be enshrined in this policy. The current transportation of wastes long distances out of the plan area is a major contributor to the generation of harmful greenhouse gases.</li> <li>2. Para 4.3.1- strategic objectives. There needs to be stronger commitment in bullet 4 to deliver the infrastructure within the West of England. Without such a commitment history suggests that these facilities will not be delivered.</li> <li>3. Para 4.4.4 Landfill - The requirements for landfill capacity are not a fall back position to be provided only if waste cannot be managed in another way. The requirements are in fact a</li> </ol>	<p>The proximity principle has been reformulated by PPS10. A simplistic view of the burdens of waste transport doesn't pick up on the potential to transport waste by rail or recognise the value that may be recovered from waste. The JWCS focuses on recovery of value from waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy and includes consideration of transport impacts.</p> <p>Additional text has been provided at section 4.4 to clarify the policy framework. However, it is clear that the policy framework applies to WofE and that the sub-region is committed to making provision to deal with its own waste arisings.</p> <p>The waste hierarchy requires landfill as last resort and the JWCS underpins that. A criteria based approach is provided to bring forward appropriate landfill capacity as</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Clarification at section 4.4</b></p> <p><b>Policy 8 amended for clarification.</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>very conservative estimate of the quantities of residual waste which will require to be disposed of to landfill. Any requirement to demonstrate that waste to be disposed of to landfill/landraise is “residual” must be removed. The point is that capacity needs to be delivered.</p> <p>4. Para 5.3 is silent on the key elements of PPS10 which refers to the ‘delivery’ of the necessary infrastructure. The other bullet points of PPS10 para 3 should also be brought into the local policy base.</p> <p>5. Table 5.1- identifies significant but reducing need for landfill to 2020; in addition some will be required to 2026. The requirements included are therefore on the low side and should be treated as a minimum.</p> <p>6. Para 5.6.12. – refers to ensuring facilities have a minimum impact on strategic road network; this should go on to say that the JWCS has addressed this by requiring facilities to be provided close to the source of arisings and by reducing the need to travel.</p> <p>7. Para 6.10.3 fails to acknowledge the important role that landraise on undisturbed land will</p>	<p>required.</p> <p>It is not intended or appropriate to repeat policy (national or regional), clearly the JWCS must be in conformity with PPS10, but there is no not need to repeat this in the JWCS. The JWCS has been prepared to present a positive policy framework within which to deliver the required sustainable waste management infrastructure.</p> <p>The landfill requirement is the apportionment taken from the emerging RSS. These are figures the authorities are satisfied to work with and have sought to find opportunities to deliver</p> <p>Section 5 provides the policy context for the JWCS and para 5.6.12 provides the policy context of the JLTP. The JWCS is clear that the WofE is committed to dealing with its own waste arisings. Para 6.8.5 sets out that the spatial strategy was derived following a detailed assessment of alternatives that considered: population distribution; waste arisings; the Strategic Road Network; transport impacts and deliverability.</p> <p>Revisions made to policy 8 for clarification.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>The review of the evidence base has been documented in the ‘WEP Landfill Review’ and is reflected in para 6.11.2</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Policy 8</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>need to make, having regard to the evidence base and statistics, in providing the required capacity for the plan area, where the need is to being otherwise met within the plan area. The EA has directed that none of the limestone mineral voids are suitable for non hazardous waste disposal. Certainly to fail to provide a policy framework which does not allow this cannot be considered to provide a flexible and deliverable policy basis. There are no brownfield sites identified which are large enough or suitable which have been identified and so flexibility must be incorporated to allow for such facilities to be brought forward in the right places.</p> <p>8. As drafted the supporting text does not acknowledge this and Policy 8 would not allow a landraise scheme on a greenfield site even if that was shown to be the most appropriate or only available option for provision of such landfill void space. In para 21 of PPS10 it is stated that preference should be given to brownfield land. There is no restriction or limitation on the use of greenfield sites if needed to fulfil the requirements of the Plan.</p> <p>9. Para 6.11.1 contains the reference to future non-reliance on out of plan area landfill which is welcomed.</p> <p>10. Para 6.11.2 should refer to meeting the need identified in the Core Strategy as should Policy 8.</p> <p>11. As drafted the JWCS is not deliverable and is not flexible. It does not contain adequate clear</p>	<p>Revisions made to policy 8 for clarification.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Revisions made to policy 8 for clarification.</p> <p>Revisions made to policy 8, section 4.4 and para 6.8.12. for clarification.</p>	<p><b>Policy 8</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Policy 8</b></p> <p><b>Section 4.4, Para 6.8.12 and Policy 8.</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				objectives and it is not clear how these objectives will be met.		
206	F26	Brett Spiller	NES	<p>Do not consider the DPD is sound, reason policy not justified or effective.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New Earth Solutions (NESG) has specific concerns relating to the transparency of the decision making process and the consideration given to the evidence base. As a result, NESG consider that certain elements of the emerging Waste Core Strategy are unsound, but are capable of being remedied.</li> <li>2. It is evident that the WoE Partnership took a comprehensive approach to community engagement at the Issues &amp; Options and the Preferred options stage, something which NESG has previously commended.</li> <li>3. NESG welcomed the objectivity brought to bear by the WoE Partnership's consultants ERM, and their work on consolidating the evidence base. It is considered that the Revised Detailed Site Assessment serves to address some of the early concerns on the evidence base raised during the Industry and stakeholder Workshops.</li> <li>4. NESG support the Spatial Vision and Objectives. NESG is concerned however, that the delivery of the spatial strategy could be</li> </ol>	<p>The JWCS has been routinely reported at public meetings of the Partnership Board, Planning, Housing &amp; Communities Board, Joint Scrutiny and the decision making process has been undertaken by Full Councils, Cabinets as required. All of the reports to these meetings and the minutes are available on the Authorities and Partnerships websites respectively. All changes or decisions for Members to consider have been highlighted in the reports, which have also been accompanied by the evidence base.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy 5 makes provision for the allocation of a site within Bristol in Zone D-Site BR05 Hartcliffe Way, Bristol. In addition to this</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>fundamentally undermined by the lack of an allocated site within central Bristol – Zone D as demarked on the key diagram Figure 6.1.</p> <p>5. The Allmead Recycling depot did not feature in the Preferred Options document. NESG promoted this site as an omission site in its representation to the Preferred Options. The WoE Partnership ‘noted’ the representation.</p> <p>6. The Allmead Recycling Depot was not affected by flood risk issues and ERM recommended that the Allmead Recycling depot be allocated. NESG supported this view. The WoE Partnership again ‘noted the representation.</p> <p>7. The consultation responses, together with a draft Pre-submission document, were put before the Partnership Board on 11<sup>th</sup> September and subsequently the four Unitary Councils and Cabinets for ratification. The officer response to NESG’s representations on Allmead recycling depot were seemingly ambiguous, with no published material (other than that set out above) being in the public domain until 8<sup>th</sup> January 2010. NESG has been led to understand that the West of England’s Partnership report to Councils and Cabinets was accompanied by a confidential briefing paper, although no reference is made to this in any of the published papers. NESG is concerned that the statutory 6 week period of public consultation on the pre-submission document commenced in the absence of a</p>	<p>flexibility and deliverability of the JWCS is ensured through Policy 6 which also makes provision for suitable non allocated sites to come forward for proposals for residual waste management treatment facilities. All sites identified at any of the consultation stages were ‘noted’ by the Authorities, and then subjected to the site assessment process carried out by independent consultants ERM. This Site Assessment, together with other aspects of the evidence base and the representations to consultation informed the Authorities’ decision on which sites to allocate in the JWCS. The Environment Agency supported the exclusion of the Allmead Recycling Depot in the JWCS in their representation, on flooding grounds.</p> <p>All of the Evidence Base has been published including a document that sets out why sites were not included contrary to the independent technical advice from ERM in their revised detailed Site Assessment. The consultation opened on 4<sup>th</sup> January. There was a four day delay but information on why Allmead Recycling Depot was not allocated in the JWCS was in the public domain on 8<sup>th</sup> January when it was made available on the website and sent to all Stakeholders and Consultees. The consultation closed on 1st March, this still gave a 7 week consultation period, longer than the statutory 6 week requirement.</p> <p>The Partnership provided a cover report to each Authority to ensure consistent</p>	

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>clear explanation of the decision to exclude Allmead recycling depot taken by the Partnership Board and individual Unitary Councils.</p> <p>8. It is not clear how the West of England Partnership's Board influenced the consideration by Councils and Cabinets. What is clear is that the Pre-submission draft considered by the individual Unitary Councils and Cabinets did not include Allmead Recycling depot. NESG consider that the Allmead recycling depot is worthy of allocation.</p> <p>9. In addressing the particular concerns set out in the 8<sup>th</sup> January statement NESG would like to emphasise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is already an established waste management use. Planning permission for the 'Demolition of existing structure; Waste recycling and transfer facility, storage and sale of building aggregates and soils was granted consent on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2000.</li> <li>• In March 2007 planning permission was</li> </ul>	<p>information was considered by each Council Cabinet. The final reports that went to each Cabinet are in the public domain. The JWCS Pre Submission Draft accompanied the Partnership report to Council Cabinets. The full evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal, Consultation Statement, consultation responses, Detailed Site Assessment Report, Flood Risk Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment were also made available for consideration.</p> <p>Reports considered at public meetings of the Partnership Board and Planning Homes and Communities Board in September listed the sites that were being considered suitable for allocation in the JWCS pre-submission document for consideration by Council Cabinets. All reports and minutes of these meetings are available on the Partnership website.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>granted for 'the change of use from recycling to general industrial (Use Class B2) and storage and distribution (Use Class B8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be noted that fuelled by the newspaper article as set out in Appendix C the perception was the site would be developed for a 400,000tpa mass burn incinerator. As a result many of the comments within the four representations objecting to the proposal are misguided</li> <li>• In the absence of any other allocation and noting Bristol City Council's aspiration to intensify commercial and residential uses in the City Centre and St Philips area, NESG question how the Partnership intend to deliver 60,000tpa of additional capacity within Zone D.</li> <li>• The Highways Agency had no over-riding objection to the identification of the Allmead recycling depot, but simply sought clarification.</li> <li>• Bristol City Councils view that 'it is highly unlikely that the site would be granted planning permission and therefore the site is not considered deliverable', is considered wrong and premature, particularly given the wide variation presented by a technology neutral allocation under Policy 5 of the Waste Core Strategy.</li> </ul> <p>10.The delay in publishing the Partnership's reasons for excluding the Allmead Recycling</p>	<p>The newspaper article was misleading. However, it should be noted that representations were lodged opposing the possible allocation of the site for residual waste treatment facilities some 10 months earlier - at the stage of Preferred Options consultation.</p> <p>Policy 5 makes provision for the allocation of a site within Bristol in Zone D-Site BR05 Hartcliffe Way, Bristol. In addition to this flexibility and deliverability of the JWCS is ensured through Policy 6 which also makes provision for suitable non allocated sites to come forward for proposals for residual waste management treatment facilities.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>As set out in their statement, Bristol City Council's decision to remove the site was informed by the evidence base and representations to the JWCS pre submission document, including that from the Environment Agency which supported removal of the site: also by earlier representations made in response to preferred options consultation.</p> <p>All of the Evidence Base has been published including a document that sets out why sites</p>	

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>depot in the Pre-submission document, contrary to ERM's advice, sits uncomfortably with the guidance on participation set out in paragraphs 4.19-4.20 of PPS12. In this instance it is evident that not all of the necessary information was provided at the start of the Pre-submission consultation.</p> <p>11. With respect to the Partnership's public statement published 8<sup>th</sup> January, NESG object to the apparent imbalance given to two elements of the evidence base, the statement asserts that 'a significant number of representations opposing the inclusion of the site' in numerical terms 4 is not significant. It should also be noted that fuelled by the newspaper article the perception was the site could be developed for a 400,000tpa mass burn incinerator.</p> <p>12. NESG is concerned that the Partnership has pre-judged the allocation without having the depth of information that would accompany a planning application. This would appear to contradict not only the advice of their consultants, but also their own responses to the objections posed by TRESA.</p> <p>13. NESG respectfully suggest that, for the reasons set out above, the –submission document is neither justified nor effective. As</p>	<p>were not included contrary to the independent technical advice from ERM in their revised detailed Site Assessment. The consultation opened on 4<sup>th</sup> January. There was a four day delay but information on why Allmead Recycling Depot was not allocated in the JWCS was in the public domain on 8<sup>th</sup> January when it was made available on the website and sent to all Stakeholders and Consultees. The consultation closed on 1st March, this still gave a 7 week consultation period, longer than the statutory 6 week requirement.</p> <p>The 8<sup>th</sup> January 2010 public statement by Bristol City Council was based on representations made:          -to Councillors and the Chief Executive of the West of the England Partnership at a community meeting in St Phillips/Totterdown.          -to neighbourhood partnerships.          -in response to Joint Waste Core Strategy Progress Updates.</p> <p>Policy is generally drafted without the level of information provided within a planning application. The decision to not allocate the Allmead Recycling Depot has been made on the evidence base.</p> <p>Noted</p>	

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				such, NESG consider the submission document unsound. The effective remedy would be to incorporate and allocate the Allmead Recycling Depot site under policy 5 of the emerging Waste Core Strategy. It is respectfully suggested that such a change would be an appropriate issue for consideration at the examination and fall to the discretion of an independent Inspector.		
213	F42	Robert Craig	SERA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obfuscatory consultation process by the WEP</li> <li>2. Non-specific regarding (1) location within proposed areas, (2) method of waste processing.</li> <li>3. SERA preferences are MBT Mechanical Biological Thermal.</li> <li>4. these objections /representations relate to Yate (Strategic Area A) and to Weston-super-Mare (Strategic Area B).</li> </ol>	<p>The consultation process was undertaken in accordance with the authorities Statement of Community Involvement. This included press adverts in the local press, direct mailing to stakeholders &amp; consultees on the consultation database (including SERA) and; publication of all documentation on the West of England Partnership website.</p> <p>The JWCS is technology neutral. The JWCS is a strategic planning document that allocates land suitable for residual waste treatment facilities and provides the policy framework to deliver the waste management infrastructure to meet the sub-regions needs.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraphs 6.8.9and 6.8.10 of the JWCS sets out the approach to allocating Strategic sites and acknowledges that both Yate and Weston may have future regeneration plans. As such it is more appropriate for the general area to be allocated and for sites within each respective area to come forward as part of wider proposals than to allocate specific sites on known industrial areas which have a high turn over rate.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
214	L31	Alasdair Brown	SW RDA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Agency's response is informed by the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) and it is within this context that our response should be considered.</li> <li>2. THE SWRDA welcomes recognition that the area of Avonmouth/Severnside is considered significant to regional economic success.</li> <li>3. The SWRDA is eager to work with the Partnership to overcome barriers to what may be seen as a developing low carbon cluster in the area. In this respect we would like to see a commitment to achieving a more coordinated approach to delivering development across the wider Avonmouth/Severnside area and that links are forged between existing and proposed facilities.</li> <li>4. The proposals within and around the Avonmouth/Severnside area is of potential regional, if not national significance and the consultation document fails to provide evidence of the impact of the proposed WoE development on the region's wider waste infrastructure requirements.</li> <li>5. In addition clarity is required on the spatial distribution of facilities in the WoE area as the allocation of sites in the consultation document does not seem to align with policy 5, which suggest the majority of identified sites are concentrated in Zone A. Clarity should be provided on whether Zone A is being positioned as a regionally strategic zone as appears to be the case in practice.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Para 6.8.8 sets out that the authorities are 'committed to a plan, monitor manage approach and will review both planned ad operational capacity when considering applications. Section 7.3 sets out the monitoring framework.</p> <p>The evidence base has tested growth scenarios and broadly supports the apportionments for waste infrastructure in the WofE, as set out in the emerging South West Regional Spatial Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal supports the spatial strategy as the best performing option.</p> <p>The indicative capacities set out in the Spatial Strategy at Figure 6.1 illustrate the distribution of residual waste treatment facilities across the sub-region.</p> <p>Clarification has been provided in a new paragraph of supportive text at 6.8.12. which states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provision will be made through the spatial strategy to meet the sub-</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 6.8.12</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				6. Policy 12.5 in the consultation document states that 'for waste facilities recovering energy, a feasibility study for combined heat and power should be undertaken.' However, given the scale of the emerging proposal, this appears to be insufficient and the distribution of power and heat must be considered from the onset.	<p>regions needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- where there is market potential for more capacity than indicated in Figure 6.1, a judgement will considering the benefits of the spatial strategy as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the potential for in-combination effects, affecting the sites of European Nature conservation.</li> </ul> <p>The JWCS at paragraph 6.9.3 supports National Policy support of generating heat and electricity through waste management processes. At paragraph 6.8.12 the JWCS encourages exploring the scope for any potential integration of waste management infrastructure and electricity or heat generation where practicable.</p>	<b>No change made</b>
247	L27a	Amanda Grundy	Natural England	<p>1. There is much to admire within this document; it appears to be thorough, evidenced based (where available), clearly presented and in accordance with relevant international, national and regional policies.</p> <p>2. It is particularly good to see references to monitoring and the recognition that this will be a critical tool to understand capacity provision and therefore future capacity requirement...Furthermore we note that the figures for commercial and industrial waste are based on estimates and that these have been used to forecast future capacity requirements. As acknowledged in the strategy, more accurate baseline data needs to be established to enable meaningful monitoring to take place.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The issue of robust baseline data for commercial and industrial waste is not unique to the West of England. The authorities are committed to a robust monitoring framework to ensure adequate provision is being planned for.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>3. We are satisfied the key issues challenges have been identified.</p> <p>4. However we note the use of the term 'balance' (page 10 para 3.5.2) and suggest it should not be a question of balance but ensuring that development takes place within environmental limits in accordance with Government sustainable development principles.</p> <p>5. We support the overall Vision.</p> <p>6. We are satisfied with the proposed strategic objectives, especially the emphasis on the waste hierarchy, ensuring facilities do not harm the environment, and seeking positive benefits where possible.</p> <p>7. However, we have some concerns about how well the proposed development management policy will work as decisions on proposals will be split between four individual UAs, and suggest further guidance is required to ensure development management decisions are made within the context of the sub-region.</p> <p>8. We are pleased to note the intention for the JWCS to deliver the waste management</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The strategic objectives of the JWCS include ensuring that waste management facilities do not harm the environment. Paragraph 6.16.1 sets out the aim of development management policy 11 which has been informed by the sustainability appraisal, and is principally concerned with protecting international, national and local planning designations in the West of England.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Para 6.5.12 acknowledges that the development management policies in the JWCS should not be seen in isolation. They will be used along with individual authorities development management polices. Setting out development management policies in the JWCS provides a consistent guide to both applicants and determining authorities when considering whether an application is acceptable. Regular monitoring of the JWCS will also help to ensure that decisions are made in the context of the sub-region.</p> <p>There is no policy cap or limit on residual waste treatment facilities as ultimately the</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>capacity apportioned to the sub-region within the draft RSS. However we suggest the core strategy needs to make more explicit the capacity required to better guide the number of individual waste facilities required in each broad location. As you are aware the waste industry is already bringing sites forward for planning consent within the Avonmouth/Severnside area that if granted would exceed the requirements of Zone A, undermine the ability of the strategy to ensure a geographical spread to minimise waste miles and put pressure on both the natural environment and transport infrastructure. We therefore recommend the West of England Partnership consider whether there is a mechanism for issuing interim guidance to ensure development management decisions taken prior to publication do not provide for more than local needs and thereby undermine the strategy.</p> <p>9. We are delighted to note that waste prevention is policy 1. However while the requirement of a waste audit is welcome, its success will depend upon the evaluation criteria used. Furthermore we suggest the 0.5 ha threshold may be too high given a significant number of development proposals under 0.5 ha are likely to come forward.</p> <p>10. Policy 3 –open windrow composting. We are broadly in agreement with the considerations contained within this policy, however, we suggest the distance of the proposed facility from waste arisings should also be taken into</p>	<p>aspiration is to divert waste from landfill and recovery of waste contributes to this higher objective. The indicative capacities set out in the Spatial Strategy at Figure 6.1 illustrate the distribution of residual waste treatment facilities across the sub-region.</p> <p>Clarification has been provided in a new paragraph of supportive text at 6.8.12. which states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provision will be made through the spatial strategy to meet the sub-regions needs.</li> <li>- where there is market potential for more capacity than indicated in Figure 6.1, a judgement will considering the benefits of the spatial strategy as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the potential for in-combination effects, affecting the sites of European Nature conservation.</li> </ul> <p>0.5 ha has been selected in line with the threshold identified in PPS3, and to ensure the requirement is not burdensome of authorities or developers.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>account when assessing windrow site proposals.</p> <p>11. Policy 4- We are satisfied this policy recognises and explains the potential advantages of co-locating waste associated with construction. However wherever possible it would be more sustainable , and more likely to reflect local geology and therefore reduce risk of contamination, to use waste from the quarry itself for restoration.</p> <p>12. Policy 5- We are satisfied that high level site investigations have identified strategically suitable sites, and acknowledge there is a need for limited capacity to be provided in environmentally sensitive areas. We are broadly satisfied that suggested mitigation at Appendix F is likely to be sufficient to ensure no likely significant effects on the interest of protected sites and species, but only so far as development of such sites can be strictly limited to the capacity within each zone. Without such a policy how can plan, monitor, manage be meaningfully applied? Our main concern relates to Zone A which includes Avonmouth/Severnside. Currently there is a risk of more than one thermal waste facility being granted consent, which could impact on the interest of a protected area and associated species, exceed required capacity, and potentially result in the importation of waste from outside the sub-region.</p> <p>13. We recommend the West of England Partnership considers amending policy 5 to more precisely align with the findings of the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There is no policy cap or limit on residual waste treatment facilities as ultimately the aspiration is to divert waste from landfill and recovery of waste contributes to this higher objective.</p> <p>However, paragraph 6.8.8. acknowledges that Policy 5 lists more sites than may be required. This is to ensure flexibility and deliverability of the Spatial Strategy. The authorities will review both planned and operational capacity when considering applications.</p> <p>The Key Development Criteria for each allocated site in Policy 5, specify the relevant findings from the evidence base</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p> <p><b>Key Development Criteria of allocated sites at policy 5.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>Habitats Regulation Assessment, with respect to specifying the nature and scale or recovery facilities that could be accommodated without risking adverse effects to a European site.</p> <p>14. Policy 6- We are happy that this policy is both reasonable and clear.</p> <p>15. Policy 7- this policy appears reasonable subject to demonstration of capacity requirements and compliance with the Habitat Regulations.</p> <p>16. Policy 8- We are satisfied this policy should help to ensure opportunities for such residual waste cannot be recycled recovered or processed. Careful consideration will be needed to ensure proposals really are 'essential' to ensure waste disposal option is only used as a final option.</p> <p>17. We are satisfied that this policy seeks to maximise opportunities for landfill gas recovery and result in positive aftercare of sites, however since landfill is at the bottom of the waste hierarchy this may be another area in</p>	<p>that must be addressed including those identified in the Habitats Regulation Assessment. Development management policy 11 provides the balance to the positive policy framework and is concerned with protecting land in the WofE covered by International, national and local planning designations.</p> <p>The JWCS is clear in that the authorities are committed to the provision of waste infrastructure to meet the sub-regions needs.</p> <p>Clarification has been provided in a new paragraph of supportive text at 6.8.12. which states that where there is market potential for more capacity than indicated in Figure 6.1, a judgement will considering the benefits of the spatial strategy as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the potential for in-combination effects, affecting the sites of European Nature conservation.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>which the West of England Partnership should consider setting limits on capacity provided for.</p> <p>18. Policy 10-We recommend the insertion of 'closer to the source of waste arisings' after 'the need cannot practicably be met at another site', which would accord more closely with the proximity principle.</p> <p>19. Policy 11-We are pleased to note the list of designations and sites including flood zones.</p> <p>20. We are pleased that this policy has been included in the JWCS. However we are disappointed the policy refers only to 'appropriate mitigation 'but makes no reference to enhancement.</p> <p>21. Sustainability Appraisal- we are satisfied the SA has been undertaken in accordance with the legislation and consider the recommendations made are reasonable and would contribute positively to the sustainability of the strategy.</p> <p>22. We would seek clarification on the following points; whilst we can find no specific reference, we are reasonably satisfied that the intention of the joint Waste Core Strategy is to provide capacity for management of Waste arising in the sub-region only. The SA makes reference to the overall options based on a total treatment capacity of 800,000 tpa, we suggest this also needs to be made explicit in the strategy, the SA explains that no data was available for C&amp;I arisings, this needs t be compiled as a matter of urgency; We are</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Further clarification in changes made to section 4.4 and Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12.</b></p> <p><b>Further clarification in changes made to section 4.4 and Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12.</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>pleased to note cumulative impacts have been considered from other plans and programme but would welcome the assessment of cumulative impacts arising from all potential development within the JWCS itself.</p>	<p>Clarification is provided at section 4.4 and para 6.8.11-6.8.12. that the JWCS seeks to meet the sub-regions need for waste management infrastructure.</p> <p>Clarification has been made to para 6.8.11-6.8.12 to ensure that the benefits of the Spatial Strategy as assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal are realised.</p> <p>The lack of C&amp;I data is not unique to the West of England sub-region, and is an issue for all authorities. The Wof E authorities will work together to improve the information collected through regular monitoring.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to further consider in-combination effects</b></p>
247	L27b	Amanda Grundy	Natural England	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I write further to our previous letter. We have recently been made aware of concerns raised by B&amp;NES regarding the JWCS and accompanying HRA. In light of this we would like to make the additional comments.</li> <li>2. There is a lack of consistency and therefore clarity between Policy 5 of the JWCS and the HRA with respect to BA12 Former Fullers Earth Works. Policy 5 suggests that planning permission will be granted subject to development management policies. This appears inconsistent with the findings of the HRA which states the site is suitable for any facility other than thermal treatment. Para 8.6.1 of the HRA then goes on to suggest the findings do not preclude development of</li> </ol>	<p>Concerns have been raised by B&amp;NES following issues were raised by a landowner in their representation to the B&amp;NES Core Strategy Options document which was recently published for consultation.</p> <p>Policy 5 states that permission will be granted subject to development management policy and the Key Development Criteria (KDC) for each allocated site listed.</p> <p>In the instance of Fullers Earth Works the KDC sets out that the constraints highlighted in the HRA should be addressed. The KDC will be made more explicit to include reference to the findings that the site may</p>	<p><b>Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to further consider in-combination effects</b></p> <p><b>Key Development Criteria for site BA12 Former Fuller's Earth Works, Fosseway, Bath</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>thermal treatment facilities on sites listed in table 8,.1 of the HRA which further compounds the confusion. We suggest that Policy 5 wording is amended to clarify which of the sites listed are suitable for thermal treatment technologies, and which are unsuitable or require further assessment.</p> <p>3. The JWCS HRA does not consider the draft RSS area of search to the South/ South West of Bath, the emerging B&amp;NES core strategy or the Joint LTP as part of cumulative impact assessment or in-combination effects. We suggest this is addressed prior to the publication of the strategy, and that these additional strategies are added to Table D1, Site BA12 and in the Site Specific Constraints and opportunities paper.</p> <p>4. We have been advised that a horseshoe bat roost has been identified on the Fullers Earth Works site. Ideally we recommend that the presence of and function of the reported roost is established prior to the final publication of the JWCS, however, if this does not prove possible it will be important the presence of the roost and its protected status s made clearing within the HRA and that a detailed site assessment and strict adherence to bat mitigation guidelines will be necessary.</p>	<p>not be suitable for thermal treatment. The JWCS is technology neutral and does not seek to specify what type of technology a site would be suitable for so as not to prejudice applications. KDC will be amended to provide more clarity where the HRA has identified a site may not be suitable for thermal treatment.</p> <p>The JWCS has considered the emerging RSS and the Joint Local Transport Plan. The JWCS HRA has been reviewed to look at any potential in-combination effects of development at this area.</p> <p>The HRA highlights the presence of Bats and seeks an ecological survey prior to application to demonstrate no adverse effects.</p>	<p><b>Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to further consider in-combination effects</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
252	L25	Peter Brown	SW Councils	1. Only respond if further issues of conformity.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
252	L28	Henning Totz	SW Councils	1. We support the efforts undertaken by the WoE to increase self sufficiency and to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill in neighbouring	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>authorities. Meeting the fourth strategic objective will hence be absolutely critical.</p> <p>2. We are pleased to see that criteria based policy will guide the development of non-residual waste treatment.</p> <p>3. We also support the identification of strategic sites for waste management facilities, In this respect it will be critical to monitor progress against the targets set in the RSS and Core Strategy, and that the four West of England authorities continue to cooperate in order to ensure the necessary steps are being taken to support delivery.</p> <p>4. Regarding provision of landfill void, it will be more important to seek agreement with neighbouring authorities in case it becomes clear that there will be shortfalls beyond 2014.</p> <p>5. We find that the West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy is in general conformity with the current and emerging RSS for the south West.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. The Wof E has a commitment to dealing with the sub-region's own waste arisings.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p>
253	F40	Tessa Foxall on behalf of Steve Grainger	Avon Wildlife Trust	<p>1. The Trust is concerned about the loss of any valuable wildlife sites and Policy 11 will have to be adhered to.</p> <p>2. Clarification is needed with regard to the refusal of applications when given Zones in Figure 6.1, have reached their stated capacity. It is evident that within Zone A there is a capacity of 390,000tpa, bearing in mind that there are eight proposed site within the area, it is predicted that the capacity can be reached without the necessity to develop all of the highlighted sites. Clarity is needed with regard to the capping of development once the</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>There is no policy cap or limit on residual waste treatment facilities as ultimately the aspiration is to divert waste from landfill and recovery of waste contributes to this higher objective. However, paragraph 6.8.8. acknowledges that Policy 5 lists more sites than may be required. This is to ensure flexibility and deliverability of the Spatial Strategy. The authorities will review both planned and</p>	<p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>capacity has been reached.</p> <p>3. The Trust feels that capping development will decrease the likelihood of waste being sourced from outside the West of England in order to meet the increased capacity levels.</p> <p>4. It is noted that within Zone A two applications have already been granted on two of the sites which are proposed in the JWCS, also within Zone A there are two applications submitted currently. If the applications are granted or indeed if one of them is granted, it is evident that that there will be the need for waste to be imported in form other regions as Zone A will be over capacity.</p> <p>5. It is noted there are excess sites mentioned to meet the capacity required for Zone A allowing for flexibility for deciding which sites are most appropriate. Therefore the Trust recommends that the JWCS clearly states guidance for applications submitted utilising sites which is most appropriate for development, allowing the better sites in terms of biodiversity to be preserved once the capacity is reached.</p>	<p>operational capacity when considering applications.</p> <p>Development Management Policy 12 requires the applicant to state the source of waste arisings to be managed at any facility. The authorities are committed to meeting the sub-regions need for waste management infrastructure.</p> <p>The authorities will review both planned and operational capacity when considering applications. The authorities are committed to meeting the sub-regions need for waste management infrastructure, this is further clarified in additional text at paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12.</p> <p>The Key Development Criteria for each allocated site in Policy 5, specify the relevant findings from the evidence base that must be addressed including those identified in the Habitats Regulation Assessment. Development management policy 11 provides the balance to the positive policy framework and is concerned with protecting land in the WofE covered by International, national and local planning designations.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
256	E140	David Pring	Environment Agency	1.As previously advised, additional work should be undertaken in respect of hazardous waste treatment capacity	That the Region is broadly self sufficient in hazardous waste remains in the Proposed Changes to the RSS. The JWCS makes	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>2. The Agency is of the opinion that landfill capacity has been overestimated.</p> <p>3. Care should be exercised in respect of the assumption that the transfer station will provide extra recycling capacity. It is important to appreciate not all permitted sites operate to their full capacity.</p> <p>4. Whilst it is understood the strategy is technology neutral, additional work could be undertaken to explore the potential for using CHP. This could be used in conjunction with the members' respective Core Strategies.</p> <p>5. With regard to Flood risk issues the Agency welcomes reference to the respective SFRAs as part of the evidence base and the related text of Policy 11, excluding allocations within Flood Zone 3b.</p> <p>6. The Agency supports the removal of sites IS 4 and IS9</p>	<p>provision for hazardous waste at para 6.1.4. of the JWCS "all waste streams are provided for in JWCs".</p> <p>The landfill capacity figure provided by a site owner has been reviewed and does appear to have been overestimated. The evidence base review is presented within a supplementary document, the 'Landfill Review Paper'. The future capacity required has been revised at Para 6.11.2 which states a requirement of 5.9-6.5 million cubic metres of non-hazardous landfill void. This additional information was subject to further consultation in May/June 2010.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The JWCS refers to areas where there is definite policy lead of new regeneration areas, and indicates at Policy 12 point 5 that development proposals must explore opportunities.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p><b>Paragraph 6.11.2 and 'Landfill Review Paper'</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
271	L29	David Crook	GOSW	1. Overall we consider that the document takes a	Noted.	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>flexible and strategic approach to waste planning in the sub-region and can largely be considered sound.</p> <p>2. My main concern regarding the soundness of the document relates to the Strategy's approach to landfill. The approach being taken is not unsound. I think the concern can be addressed by articulating a more explicit approach to landfill in your Spatial Strategy, minor changes to the wording of the Policy's supportive text and by the use of information contained in your evidence base.</p> <p>3. In addition the strategy lacks an explicit statement explaining what the approach is to the spatial distribution of strategic sites, how the strategy will meet requirements of the RSS and the approach taken towards specific technologies for waste treatment. Section 4.4 has begun to develop these themes but some additional overarching text would help to explain this further.</p> <p>4. Finally I assume Appendix 2 is the documents Key Diagram. If it is it should be labelled as such. The Appendix could be more diagrammatic, show linkages to other authorities and illustrate the indicative capacities in figure 6.1. Possibly you may wish to reconsider this in terms of the revised articulation of the spatial strategy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Further clarification has been provided at section 4.4 of the JWCS.</p> <p>Policy 8 has been revised to include areas not appropriate for landfill as informed by the evidence base.</p> <p>Noted. Further clarification has been provided at section 4.4.</p> <p>Noted. Appendix 2 has been relabelled Key Diagram and is more diagrammatic.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Section 4.4</b></p> <p><b>Policy 8</b></p> <p><b>Section 4.4</b></p> <p><b>Appendix 2 'Key Diagram'</b></p>
274	F39a	Lisa Bishop on behalf of Paul Davis	Persimmon Homes	<p>1. Policy 1 should apply to all residential development. Para 6.2.6 sets out the alternative of on site provision, or a contribution of off site facilities and a Contributions Policy could apply to all</p>	<p>Policy 1 applies to all residential development of 0.5 ha or more and all other development of 1ha or more this is classed as major development as defined in PPS3. This threshold for waste audits has been</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>development. This would avoid putting an unfair burden on larger developments and ensure occupiers of all development contribute equally to recycling.</p> <p>2. The supporting paragraphs should explain what how the Policy will be monitored to ensure the maximum diversion of waste.</p> <p>3. The supporting paragraphs should define what is meant by 'once the development is operational'.</p>	<p>used to recognise the need for waste audits balanced against a realistic requirement that is not too burdensome on authorities or the development industry to implement.</p> <p>The monitoring section at 7.3 lists the relevant indicators to monitor each policy.</p> <p>This is to distinguish between the construction phase and the operational phase –i.e. when a development has been completed and is being used for the purpose it was built be it residential development or an operational waste management facility.</p>	<p><b>Section 7.3 'Monitoring'</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
274	F39b	Lisa Bishop on behalf of Paul Davis	Persimmon Homes	<p>1. Policy 2- There is no justification for identifying the total area of adopted urban extensions for the location of non-residual waste treatment facilities.</p> <p>2. The Policy is unclear because it relies on unspecified Development Management Polices, rather than specific guidance in the Policy.</p> <p>3. Persimmon Homes own Weston Airfield and the Policy may prejudice future proposals for</p>	<p>Policy 2 is a criteria based policy that seeks to provides a positive policy framework for non-residual waste treatment facilities to come forward, but does not allocate sites. Policy 2 is seeking to ensure that any new development is sustainable and contributes to providing appropriate waste management infrastructure to meet the sub-region's needs. Identifying the whole of the urban extension area does not allocate it all for waste management uses, but reflects the expectation that suitable facilities will be provided as part of the delivering sustainable development</p> <p>The development management policies do not need to be specified as they would be those that are contained within the relevant development plan, including the JWCS.</p> <p>There is a national policy expectation that new residential development will deliver</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				this area.	<p>sustainable communities, which includes the provision of waste management and renewable/low carbon energy supplies.</p> <p>Paras 6.8.11-6.8.13 of the JWCS pre-submission document highlights that development proposals for new urban extensions or re-development areas should consider making provision for dealing with waste arisings, and exploring the potential for CHP in accordance with National Policy</p>	
274	F39c	Lisa Bishop on behalf of Paul Davis	Persimmon Homes	<p>1. Policy 5 - The Policy needs to differentiate between specific sites and identification of areas of search and needs to be clearer about site requirements within the urban extensions. It is important to set out how many and what sized site would be required, so as not to impact on the whole area and to enable sufficient sites to be identified through emerging plans and specific detailed proposals.</p> <p>2. It is not clear why the only urban extension in emerging RSS which has been identified in Policy 5 is at Weston-super-Mare.</p> <p>3. An additional specific consideration that should be added to Fig 13 in Appendix 1 is that proposals</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy as illustrated in Figure 6.1 and listed in Policy 5 clearly sets out the indicative capacity requirements within each broad area. Policy 5 lists specific sites or General Areas allocated as suitable locations for residual waste treatment facilities.</p> <p>Identifying the whole of the urban extension area does not allocate it all for waste management uses, but reflects the expectation that suitable facilities will be provided as part of the delivering sustainable development</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8.10 JWCS pre-submission document the findings of the Site Assessment which concluded that there are locations within the Weston Regeneration area suitable for residual waste treatment facilities. Policy 5 refers to all urban extension areas as they are defined through approved Core Strategies.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8.10 of the JWCS pre-submission document acknowledges that</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Section 4.4</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>should be in accordance with the emerging North Somerset Core Strategy and emerging Master Plans for the Weston Urban extension.</p> <p>4. Add a reference to compliance with the North Somerset Core Strategy in Fig 13.</p>	<p>the policy framework to deliver the planned urban extension to Weston-super-Mare is still being developed and that in order not to frustrate broader development objectives a broad strategic area has been identified.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.6.4 states that the JWCS should be read alongside other plans and strategies in the West of England. Clarification added to section 4.4 to re-iterate that the JWCS should be read as a whole and alongside other relevant plans and policies most notably the emerging Core Strategies of the four authorities.</p>	
274	F39d	Lisa Bishop on behalf of Paul Davis	Persimmon Homes	<p>1. Paragraph 6.8.26 and Policy 7 should also require proposals to be consistent with the policies of the other DPDs.</p> <p>2. Policy 7 does not provide clear guidance for proposals in other locations and should set out specific criteria within the Policy</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.6.4 acknowledges this. Further clarification added at section 4.4</p> <p>Policy 7 is a criteria based policy that makes clear proposals will be considered that are in accordance with the spatial strategy at Policy 5, and the other JWCS policies.</p>	<p><b>Section 4.4</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
274	F39e	Lisa Bishop on behalf of Paul Davis	Persimmon Homes	1. Policy 11-Part 19 should refer to 'exceptional circumstance' rather than 'special circumstance' to accord with PPG2.	The test to pass in PPG 2 is very special circumstances, the wording used in Policy 11(19).	<b>No change made</b>
274	F39f	Lisa Bishop on behalf of Paul Davis	Persimmon Homes	1. Policy 12- We consider the Policy is too flexible in seeking mitigation 'where necessary'. Mitigation should always be required where the need has been identified in an assessment and it should not be in effect an additional proviso.	Noted. The Policy states:... and where necessary, appropriate mitigation should be identified'. Policy 12 provides the balance to the positive policy framework provided elsewhere within the JWCS. We agree that appropriate mitigation will be provided as a matter of course and therefore should not be considered as an additional proviso or burden to the development industry.	<b>No change made</b>
290	F24a	David Berry	Coal Authority	Policy 5 & Appendix 1 (Residual Waste Treatment Facilities – Locations) Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				supports the inclusion of text within Appendix 1 relating to the need to consider coal mining legacy issues, and the potential sterilisation of coal resources, as part of the development of Strategic Area A (Yate). This is particularly important given the presence of surface coal resources and former coal mining activities within this area.		
290	F24b	David Berry	Coal Authority	Policy 12- <b>Support</b> – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports the inclusion of a criterion relating to the potential risk of ground instability among the range of issues that proposals for waste related development will need to consider and address. <b>Reason</b> – This policy criterion draws attention to the need to consider this important locally distinctive issue in accordance with the guidance in PP14 (Development on Unstable Land).	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
298	F20	Alex Wilson	Western Power Distribution	Western Power Distribution asks that the relevant LA consults with them on detailed proposals to ensure principally: 1. Health & Safety is maintained once site is established. 2. Ensure safety during construction Western Power Distribution will require access to maintain pylons and there will be restrictions as how close to the pylons buildings/structures can be established.	These concerns are project specific and would be most appropriately considered as part of the planning application process.	<b>No change made</b>
307	L32	Caroline Power	English Heritage	1. We would like to make the following comments where we believe slight modifications need to be undertaken to the document in order to align it with current emerging government guidance in the form of PPS15, thus ensuring the DPD meets the test of soundness in PPS12.  2. 3.5 Protecting the environment- we would recommend that this is changed to the 'historic environment' as this is much broader definition	Noted  Noted. Development Management Policy 12 at bullets 10 and 17 are concerned with protection of townscape, archaeological	<b>No change made</b>  <b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>than 'built'. The same point is relevant to Development management where in 6.15.1 'built environment should be replaced with 'historic environment'.</p> <p>3. BA12-Former Fuller's Earth Works. We have reservations about how authorities intend to assess (and weight) the impact that strategic waste management facilities might have upon historic assets lying at some distance from the site of the proposed waste management facility. Particular concern in relation to the scheduled monument known as Wansdyke as well as it being near to a Roman Road. The impact of any waste facility in this location will therefore have to be considered carefully against these heritage assets and mitigation measures put forward. It would be appropriate to assess this site against the Wold Heritage Management Plan and also to be mindful of the proposed urban extension in this area.</p> <p>4. With minor changes requested above incorporated into the DPD or put in place for the submission document, we would consider that this document will meet the grounds of 'soundness' or 'legal compliance'.</p>	<p>resources, or historic assets.</p> <p>As noted above Development Management policy 12 is concerned with the protection of the historic environment, and provides the balance to policy 5. Policy 5 also requires any development proposals to address the issues identified in the Key Development Criteria for each allocated site. The KDC for site BA12 has highlighted issues including Site Design and Visual impact in relation to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<b>No change made</b>
320	F30	Matthew Macan	Hignett Family Trust	<p>1. These representations address:</p> <p>1. Policy 5 of the DPD and more specifically the relationship between the allocation at BA12 Fuller's Earth Works and proposed New Neighbourhood at Option SWB2 in the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy Spatial Options document.</p> <p>2. The Joint Waste Core Strategy Habitat Regulations Assessment , Policy 5 and 'in-combination' effects.</p>	Noted	<b>Clarification provided at para 6.8.12 on the need to consider in-combination effects.</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>2. Policy 5 of the Joint Waste Core Strategy makes site specific allocations for residual waste treatment at a time when other published LDF documents are proposing significant policy changes. This is an on-going situation that will change over time. It is therefore important that we be allowed to bring to an oral part of the examination, up to date information, to avoid prejudicing the outcome of the LDF process. The 'in-combination' effects of two plans are complex and have ramifications for the HRA. It is therefore in the public interest that these matters be properly addressed.</p> <p>Information submitted:            -Response to Joint Waste Core Strategy : Hignett Family Trust-Feb 2010*            -Kestrel Wildlife Consultants: Response to the Interim HRA for the B&amp;NES Core Strategy Spatial Options-Feb 2010*            -Kestrel Wildlife Consultants : Addendum-Feb 2010*            -Response to the Bath and North East -Somerset Core Strategy Spatial Options :Part 1&amp;2 (+Appendices 1-9) Hignett Family Trust-Feb 2010**            -Other relevant Documents:            -Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy Spatial Options***            -Bath and North East Somerset Interim Habitat Regulations Assessment****</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All supplementary information noted.</p>	
320	L26a (linked to F30)	Matthew Macan	Hignett Family Trust	<p>1. The Hignett Family Trust gives general support to the Joint Waste Core Strategy and to the proposed allocation through Policy 5 of a residual waste treatment facility as the Fuller's Earth Works site BA12, south of Bath. We wish to make the following observations, which are supported</p>	Noted	

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
			Hignett Family Trust-Feb 2010*	<p>by separate evidence forwarded to the authority. This has led us to propose alterations to the wording of Policy 5 and to supporting text/appendices in the Joint Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>2. We think that the Habitats Regulation Assessment is a sound piece of work however, we have included observations and recommendations.</p> <p>3. The Site BA12 sits immediately alongside a proposed New neighbourhood allocation, as set out in the B&amp;NES Core strategy Spatial options document. The allocation is known as Odd Down Plateau Option SWB2. Arguably, the Fuller's Earth Works site BA12 forms part of the proposed urban extension at Odd Down, although at present the Council have drawn the boundary around the outside of the BA12 site in the Core Strategy Spatial Options document.</p> <p>4. Whilst we see no particular conflict between the proposals in either plan, indeed we state elsewhere that there is potential for significant sustainability benefits to be gained by combining these proposals, it is nevertheless important to ensure that proper regard is had to the emerging plan for B&amp;NES and vice versa.</p> <p>5. B&amp;NES have published an interim Habitats Regulation assessment. It confirms the presence of significant bat foraging and light lines. These features lie within the 4km roost sustenance zone of the Bath and Bradford-on-Avon SAC. As such they are potentially significant in terms of maintaining the integrity of the European site.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>In the instance of Fullers Earth Works the KDC sets out that the constraints highlighted in the HRA should be addressed The HRA highlights the presence of Bats and seeks an ecological survey prior to application to demonstrate no adverse effects.</p>	<p><b>Clarification provided at para 6.8.12 on the need to consider in-combination effects</b></p> <p><b>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed</b></p> <p><b>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>6. The emission modeling that formed part of the appropriate Assessment of a thermal waste treatment option, focused solely on the impact on SCA, 2.1 km to the north east. This is an omission albeit an understandable one. Any future AA at BA12 should take into account both the potential impact on the habitats nearby that are significant to the SAC as well as the SAC itself. We propose amending Policy 5 to reflect this outcome.</p> <p>7. Any future AA at BA12 should take into account the proposed mitigation strategy (set out in the report by Kestrel Wildlife consultants).</p> <p>8. Policy 5 proposes a presumption in favour of residual waste treatment at adopted urban extensions. Whilst this may appear broadly sensible, it is not accompanied by an AA or other screening in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Habitats Regulations. This raises the likelihood of potential risks to European sites, especially in the case of thermal treatment of residual waste,. As significant risk form residual waste treatment on European sites arises form thermal treatment we propose to remove the presumption in favour of this type of treatment only form adopted urban extensions. Suggest at bullet 2,3 and 4 of Policy 5 following text is added: “other than for thermal treatment of residual waste.”</p> <p>9. Suggested wording for inclusion in the Key Development Criteria for Site BA12; “More specifically, to date it has not been possible</p>	<p>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The JWCS is technology neutral and does not seek to specify what type of technology a site would be suitable for so as not to prejudice applications. KDC will be amended to provide more clarity where the HRA has identified a site may not be suitable for thermal treatment.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed</p>	<p><b>The Habitats Regulation Assessment has been reviewed to ensure cumulative impacts have been adequately addressed</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>Clarification provided at para 6.8.12 on the need to consider in-combination effects Key Development Criteria for site BA12 Former Fuller’s Earth Works, Fosseyway, Bath</b></p> <p><b>Clarification provided at para 6.8.12 on the need to consider in-</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				to conclude that there would be 'no likely significant effect on European sites', form any proposals involving thermal treatment. Therefore any such proposals will have to clearly demonstrate at the planning application stage the potential effect upon both the European site itself and upon bat foraging and flight times nearer to BA12, that support the European site will not adversely affect the integrity of the European site. Any assessment will need to take into account of 'in-combination effects' from any other Development plans and in particular the potential arrangements for mitigation associated with the urban extension proposals at Ddd Down."		<b>combination effects</b>  <b>Key Development Criteria for site BA12 Former Fuller's Earth Works, Fosseway, Bath</b>
320	L26b (linked to F30)	Matthew Macan	Hignett Family Trust	Kestrel Wildlife Consultants: Response to the Interim HRA for the B&NES Core Strategy	Noted alongside other supplementary documentation provided	<b>No change made</b>
320	L26c (linked to F30)	Matthew Macan	Hignett Family Trust	Kestrel Wildlife Consultants : Addendum-Feb 2010*	Noted alongside other supplementary documentation provided	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31a	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1. Para 6.5.4 identifies a preference for the location of waste treatment facilities within the urban fabric and provides a list of industrial estates within the evidence base 'General Areas Report'. However, it may be equally sustainable to expand existing treatment facilities which lie just beyond existing urban areas or which fall within the Urban Extension Areas of Search (defined in the RSS Secretary of State's Proposed Changes). For example, in the case of the former Fullers Earth Works site.  2. Paragraph 6.5.4 should recognise equal	Para 6.5.4 acknowledges that non-residual waste treatment facilities can be located in a range of locations and sets out a preference for the location of these facilities within the urban fabric. The preference reflects the need for convenient provision of recycling and processing facilities for household and commercial customers.  The Former Fuller's Earth Works Site is allocated in Policy 5 as a location suitable for residual waste treatment facilities.  Para 6.5.4 reference to within the urban	<b>No change made</b>  <b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>benefits of using existing recycling and processing sites and encourage their upgrading alongside building new facilities in urban areas.</p> <p>3. Gazelle Properties Ltd owns the former Fullers Earth Works site, which is listed in Policy 5. Changes to the Waste Core Strategy will have a material impact upon its future operation.</p>	<p>fabric could apply to new or upgrading of existing facilities.</p> <p>Noted. The Former Fuller’s Earth Works Site is allocated in Policy 5 as a location suitable for residual waste treatment facilities. Para 6.5.6 acknowledges that these sites may also be suitable for non-residual waste related facilities but not at the expense of delivering residual waste treatment capacity and provided the development meets the identified Key Development Criteria at Appendix 1.</p>	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31b	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>1. Policy 2 identifies 3 criteria for granting planning permission for non-residual waste treatment facilities. The criteria are however, restrictive and potentially prevent the most sustainable options being pursued. As currently written, the policy requires all 3 criterion to be adhered to; an almost impossible task.</p> <p>2. In addition, criterion 3 does not allow for any expansion of existing non-residual waste management sites beyond their designated boundaries.</p>	<p>Policy 2 does not require all criteria to be met.</p> <p>Criteria 3 does accommodate this and any additional text would provide no added value.</p>	<p><b>Policy 2, bullet 2 removed “and”</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
321	F31c	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>1. Paragraph 6.8.8 confirms that Policy 5 lists suitable sites for managing residual waste, including land at the former Fullers Earth site, Bath (Site BA12). It also states that Policy 5 identifies more sites than may be required, allowing some flexibility on their delivery. Concern is expressed about reference to ‘plan, monitor, manage’ (in paragraph 6.8.8) as a means of managing this ‘flexibility’. This would appear to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy 5 and paragraph 6.8.8 refers to residual waste treatment facilities. The capacities in the Spatial Strategy at Figure 6.1 and outlined in Policy 5 are indicative. There is no cap on residual waste, but the West of England are committed to meeting the sub-regions need. Therefore in</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>promote an upper limit to recycling. For example, if the 'plan monitor, manage' process identifies that more than 35% of residual waste is being treated, would it result in a moratorium being placed upon new site being brought forward either through Policy 5 or Policy 2? As 15% or more untreated waste may still be going into landfill; this is clearly an unsuitable and unsustainable option.</p> <p>2. The sites listed in Policy 5 should be recognised as the minimum level of provision.</p> <p>3. In addition to this, the evidence base does not appear to make any connection between the amount of waste recycling necessary to meet minimum national requirements and the amount of land/ throughput of facilities identified in Policy 5. It is therefore difficult to see how the West of England Partnership can be so certain that the amount of sites identified will allow flexibility in the choice of sites.</p>	<p>accordance with the approach that CLG expects LAs to take in their plan preparation and implementation, the authorities will review both planned and operational capacity when assessing proposals for residual waste treatment.</p> <p>There is no cap on recycling or recovery, a plan monitor, manage approach will ensure the sub-region continues to make provision of waste management infrastructure to meet the sub-regions need.</p> <p>Sites and areas listed at Policy 5 provide the opportunities to deliver the indicative residual waste capacities that have ultimately been apportioned from RSS. There is no rigid cap on waste management capacity more recovery capacity can be provided. The policy is not prescriptive about the capacity to be delivered at each site.</p> <p>Policy 5 shows that we have several sites to deliver the residual waste treatment facilities required by the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Policy 2 makes provision for non-residual waste treatment facilities (excluding open windrow composting) to come forward over the plan period.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
321	F31d	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties	<p>1. Policy 5 is broadly supported, particularly the inclusion of land at the former Fullers Earth site, Bath (Site BA12).</p> <p>2. However, the underlying evidence base to Policy 5 is incorrect with regard to the former</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has considered the site in the same way as all</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
			Ltd	<p>Fullers Earth site. Table D.1 of the Annex to the Sustainability Assessment identifies the former Fullers Earth site as land in industrial use. The Sustainability Assessment fails however, to recognise that the site is used for recycling purposes by Waste Recycling@Bath.</p> <p>3. The implications of this are threefold:          -The Sustainability Assessment should be re-examined and amended accordingly.</p> <p>- The existing throughput from Waste Recycling@ Bath needs to be taken into account within the WEP Needs Assessment and additional land identified to meet any shortfall that may result.</p> <p>-Consideration should be given to the site's expansion through Policy 5 to provide a greater concentration and range of residual and non-residual treatment facilities.</p> <p>4.Concern is also expressed with regard to the continued use of indicative required capacities within the 5 identified zones. The Regional Spatial Strategy does not make such distinctions and facilities within Zone C for example, should not be restricted to achieving a limit of 150,000 tpa of residual waste treatment. In connection with Gazelle Properties' earlier representation regarding Paragraph 6.8.8 of the draft Core Strategy, this approach would not be suitable or</p>	<p>the other sites allocated in Policy 5 have been considered. Table D1 refers to site specific constraints and the SA recognises the industrial nature of the site.</p> <p>The SA reflects the known status of the site</p> <p>The evidence base has considered the site and reflects the allocation of the site for residual waste treatment.</p> <p>As paragraph 6.5.6 states sites identified within Policy 5 may also be appropriate for non-residual waste related facilities, but not at the expense of delivering residual waste treatment capacity. In this context co-location of residual and non-residual uses is provided for in the JWCS Policy framework. Policy 2 makes provision for non-residual waste facilities to come forward.</p> <p>Noted. It is recognised that the RSS doesn't break down the sub-regional apportionment but to illustrate the spatial strategy the proportionate spread of residual capacity across the plan area is indicated by the spatial strategy at figure 6.1. The capacities are indicative and the policy 5 is not prescriptive about the capacity to be delivered at each site. The indicated spatial distributed was concluded to be the best</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>sustainable.</p> <p>Policy 5 should continue to include site BA12 (former Fullers Earth Site) but should also consider the need for its expansion.</p> <p>Plan SK1 (rep f31o) shows the full extent of the former Fullers Earth Site. Inclusion of the additional land would not have any material impact upon the Joint Waste Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment or the Sustainability Assessment already undertaken.</p> <p>Policy 5 should not break down the Sub-region into 5 zones for monitoring purposes, unless the policy makes it clear that they are in no way to be perceived as upper limits to residual waste treatment</p>	<p>performing option in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The capacities are indicative and the policy 5 is not prescriptive about the capacity to be delivered at each site. The site boundary as defined against existing buildings and their curtilages has been assessed in the HRA and SA. There are no firm proposals on which to consider expanding the boundary of the site. This is a matter to be addressed when site specific proposals are submitted as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Policy 5 contains indicative capacities.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
321	F31e	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>Paragraph 6.8.14 is not consistent with national policy. Whilst all planning applications will need to be judged against the prevailing Development Plan, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 also makes reference to other material considerations. The emerging Joint Waste Core Strategy is one such material consideration that must be taken into account when considering any planning applications, even in advance of its adoption as a Development Plan document.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8.14 should be removed and the method of considering planning applications should be consistent with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. There is no need to repeat this within the Joint Waste Core Strategy</p>	<p>This paragraph recognises that there are development proposals at some of the sites in Policy 5. For transparency this paragraph provides clarity that the inclusion of these sites within the policy does not prejudice the determination of proposals by the LPA.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
321	F31f	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>1. There are no national or regional planning requirements to justify a policy which seeks applicants to demonstrate market demand for a particular use prior to granting planning permission. The introduction of such an expectation will only serve to add another layer of complexity and delay in delivering sites which in the WEP Needs Assessment are clearly under provided for at the present time. Policy 6 should be removed from the Joint Waste Core Strategy</p> <p>2. Furthermore, Paragraph 6.9.1 makes it clear that that not all mechanical or biological processes will recover materials and energy</p>	<p>Policy 6 is included in the JWCS to understand the overall benefit of a proposal and to understand the real achievement of diverting waste from landfill. As Paragraph 6.9.4 sets out the policy seeks to assist the developer and authority in determining that a proposed facility is for energy recovery and not for waste disposal.</p> <p>Para 6.9.1 also refers to recover of energy</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
321	F31g	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>1. Policy 7 only serves to reiterate the purpose of the Joint Waste Core Strategy. Applicants seeking to develop residual waste treatment sites outside of the locations identified in Policy 5 will be aware of the other policies set out in document and the Development Plan as a whole. Policy 7 should be removed from the Joint Waste Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Policy 7 has been included in the JWCS because clarity was sought on how non – allocated sites that may come forward over the plan period.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p>
321	F31h	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>1. Policy 12 is complex and confusing; it also cuts across the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations and other aspects of the Development Plan. It acts more as an informative piece of text than a Development Plan policy and reiterates much of national policy set out in PPS1 and PPS10. Its effectiveness as a development control policy tool is questioned? Policy 12 should be deleted and the text replaced in an appendix to the DPD which provides details of information required as part of any waste related planning applications.</p>	<p>Policy 12 along with 11 provides the balance to those policies that promote development. It provides a clear framework of information expected to be delivered with waste management applications.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p>
321	F31i	Mr Colin	Landplan	<p>1. Figure 10 identifies the former Fullers Earth</p>	<p>The text in the Key Development criteria is</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
		Danks	Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	<p>Works (Site BA12) and is generally supported. However, concern is expressed about the enduring nature of the bullet points listed as Key Development Criteria; in particular, reference to Green Belt. The West of England Partnership will be aware that the site falls within an Urban Extension Area of Search, identified within the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. The Partnership will also be aware that this will involve a review of Green Belt boundaries, including that around the former Fullers Earth Works site, which may result in its removal from the designation. The second to last bullet point should, for consistency with other emerging Development Plan Documents, recognise the potential change.</p> <p>2. Figure 10 should be amended to include all of the land associated with the former Fullers Earth Works, shown on the attached Plan SK1 (rep F31o).</p>	<p>correct and reflects the current position. It is not appropriate to word as suggested upon prospective changes.</p> <p>The site boundary in Figure 10 outlines the industrial nature of the site and provides flexibility for a design led solution including landscaping.</p>	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31j	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1. Cover Letter sent with representation	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31k	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1.Paragraph 3.5.1 identifies the need to protect the natural and built environment. It should also recognise that the relocation of existing waste facilities may be more environmentally harmful than expansion or redevelopment; this is an important factor in determining the most suitable locations for waste facilities. For example, it may prove less environmentally harmful to expand existing waste recycling sites, like the former Fullers Earth Site, than develop new ones	Paragraph 3.5.2 is part of setting the context for the JWCS.	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				elsewhere. Paragraph 3.5.1 should recognise there is a balance to be struck in the context of environmental protection, between identifying new sites and expanding/ redeveloping existing ones		
321	F311	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1. Concern is expressed about the clarity of the WEP Needs Assessment and its relationship with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. Paragraph 5.4.4 should only identify levels of need if the WEP Needs Assessment is based upon housing and economic growth set out in the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes RSS document	The need identified in the WEP needs assessment used a range of economic growth scenarios, and housing growth scenarios in accordance with the Draft RSS. The waste apportionments in the Draft RSS did not change in the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft RSS. It is recognised that the apportionments in the Draft RSS were at the upper level to begin with and did not fully take account of the increasing amount of waste being diverted from landfill.	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31m	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1. Concern is expressed with regards to the usefulness of Table 6.1 and its implications for each of the constituent local authority areas, leading to a fragmented approach to delivering waste recycling sites. The purpose of the Joint Waste Core Strategy is to create a strategic, cross boundary framework that promotes sustainable patterns of waste movement and recycling. Table 6.1 should be removed from the Joint Waste Core Strategy.	Table 6.1 is provided for information only and as noted in para 6.4.3 there is not a ceiling for recycling and composting capacity.	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31n	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1. It is not clear whether the WEP Needs Assessment is based upon growth figures from the Draft RSS or the RSS Secretary of State's Proposed Changes; as such the assumptions in Table 6.2 may prove to under estimate landfill capacity requirements. This will have the effect of changing recycling and composting targets in line with the Waste Strategy for England 2007.	In respect of Landfill capacity the WEP Needs Assessment has been updated with the Landfill Review Paper. This additional part of the evidence base outlines the current Landfill capacity and future needs. The WofE has a requirement for 5.9-6.5 million cubic metres of landfill capacity and paragraph 6.11.2 of the JWCS has been revised to reflect this.	<b>Evidence base updated with Landfill Review Paper.</b>  <b>Paragraph 6.11.2</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				2. Furthermore, the Waste Core Strategy should treat the National targets as minimums rather than maximums.	Noted. The authorities are committed to meeting the sub-regions needs.	<b>No change made</b>
321	F31o	Mr Colin Danks	Landplan Consulting Ltd on behalf of Gazelle Properties Ltd	1. Map – Fuller's Earth Works and B&NES Core Strategy Spatial Options consultation Option SWB2. (Plan SK1 referred to above in rep F31i)	Noted.	<b>No change made</b>
322	E144	Rose Freeman	Theatres	Thank you for this consultation, however, due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and this consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust's work. We therefore have no comments to make that may be useful or pertinent to this topic but look forward to being consulted on further planning policy documents in due course.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
323	E145	Diane Bailey	Pucklechurch Parish Council	Thank you for your email regarding the consultation I confirm the Parish Councils reply was 'they do not feel qualified to comment on this stage of the consultation'.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
334	L30	Bernard Benchell	CABE	Thank you for consulting the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). Unfortunately, due to limited resources, we are unable to comment on this document.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
				Standard general advice on spatial plans attached	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
335	F33	Dr Hugh Annett	Public Health Bristol	NHS Bristol welcomes the inclusion of health impact as one of the criteria under Policy 12 (General Considerations). This is in line with Policy HE2 (promoting health) of the draft revised South West Regional Spatial Strategy (July 2008)	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				and should be used to look at both the positive impacts to promote health and well-being as well as protecting health from any adverse impacts of a development.		
336	F35	Cllr Deborah Brooks	Backwell Parish Council	I am in support of the DPD policies because I feel the outlining policies have been thoroughly investigated, planned and well documented. This is a huge, long term project which encompasses a large area/s and many households and business communities. The dramatic reduction of hazardous and non-hazardous landfill sites is being clearly addressed in the JWCS. The policies are clear, easily understandable and workable!	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
337	F36a	Chris Herbert	SLR Consulting on behalf of Viridor Waste Management Ltd	<p>1. Section 6.8 on Recovery should recognise that government policy does not place a cap on the development of waste management capacity and that therefore the 800,000tpa capacity requirement should be seen as a minimum and not as a ceiling. The section also needs stronger links with section 5.5 on renewable energy to confirm the benefits of recovering energy from waste and how this will contribute towards achieving the regional targets on renewable energy.</p> <p>2. Suggested wording for paragraph 6.8.3a. "However government policy does not place a cap on the development of waste management capacity and the 800,000tpa capacity requirement identified above should not be seen as a ceiling. The provision of additional recovery capacity would have the benefits of providing a greater capacity for generating renewable energy which will assist in delivering the regional targets identified in section 5.5. The additional capacity would also reduce the need for new landfill</p>	<p>There is no policy cap or limit on residual waste treatment facilities as ultimately the aspiration is to divert waste from landfill and recovery of waste contributes to this higher objective. The indicative capacities set out in the Spatial Strategy at Figure 6.1 illustrate the distribution of residual waste treatment facilities across the sub-region.</p> <p>Clarification has been provided in a new paragraph of supportive text at 6.8.12. which states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provision will be made through the spatial strategy to meet the sub-regions needs.</li> </ul> <p>where there is market potential for more capacity than indicated in Figure 6.1, a judgement will considering the benefits of the spatial strategy as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the potential for</p>	<p><b>Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p> <p><b>Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				capacity that is identified in paragraph 6.11.2.”	in-combination effects, affecting the sites of European Nature conservation.	
337	F36b	Chris Herbert	SLR Consulting on behalf of Viridor Waste Management Ltd	<p>1. Section 6.8 should acknowledge that the market will only bring forward capacity that there is a commercial demand to supply and that this is for the market to determine.</p> <p>2. Suggested wording for paragraph 6.8.4a.: “The granting of planning permission is no guarantee that the required residual waste treatment infrastructure will be built and that this capacity will be delivered on the ground, planning authorities should not therefore seek to restrict the granting of planning permission for waste treatment schemes on the basis of concerns of overprovision. Paragraph 6.8.3a. above confirms that government policy does not place a cap on the development of waste management capacity and identifies the benefits this additional capacity can deliver. It is further recognised that the market will only bring forward capacity that there is a commercial demand to supply and, as such, there is a practical cap on the amount of capacity that the industry will actually deliver operationally.”</p>	<p>Clarification has been provided in a new paragraph of supportive text at 6.8.12.</p> <p>Clarification has been provided in a new paragraph of supportive text at 6.8.12.</p> <p>The monitoring framework explicitly seeks to monitor both planned and operational capacity.</p>	<p><b>Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p> <p><b>Paragraphs 6.8.11-6.8.12</b></p>
337	F36c	Chris Herbert	SLR Consulting on behalf of Viridor Waste Management Ltd	Section 7.2 sets out how the spatial strategy will be implemented with capacity be delivered within Zone A early in the plan period. As there are already sites under the control of the waste management industry within zone A the proposed phasing of the strategy set out in section 7.2 is supported.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
337	F36d	Chris Herbert	SLR Consulting on behalf of Viridor Waste Management	Policy 5 provides a clear spatial framework for the delivery of waste management capacity within the West of England. The allocation of site DS07 Selvaco Plant (northern part) is supported and the deliverability of this site can be confirmed as it is under the control of the waste management	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
			t Ltd	industry.		
337	F36e	Chris Herbert	SLR Consulting on behalf of Viridor Waste Management Ltd	Policy 11 treats international, national and local designations on the same manner. The correct approach for considering development proposals which may impact on these designations is already set out in legislation for the international designations, national policy for the national designations and other development plan documents for the local designations. Policy 11 is therefore unnecessary and should be deleted.	Policy 11 provides the balance to the overall positive policy framework of the JWCS, and sets out environmental considerations.  Policy 11 after bullet 19, acknowledges that: 2 “In assessing each development proposals due regard will be paid to prevailing national policy.....”	<b>No change made</b>  <b>No change made</b>
337	F36f	Chris Herbert	SLR Consulting on behalf of Viridor Waste Management Ltd	The information sought by policy 6 does not accord with government policy on waste management and renewable energy. Paragraph 22 of PPS10 advises that where proposals are consistent with an up to date development plan, waste planning authorities should not require applications for new or enhanced waste management facilities to demonstrate a quantitative or market need for their proposals. The later reference to presenting a market for any energy to be produced should also be deleted because at paragraph 20 of Planning and Climate Change, supplement to PPS1 government policy advises that applicants should not be required to demonstrate the overall need for renewable energy or its distribution. Policy 6 should be deleted.	Policy 6 is about demonstrating the need for recovery before disposal and the wider objectives to meet carbon reduction targets within the plan area. This policy will help to understand the contribution to electricity and or heat output as a result of residual treatment and this is an indicator included in the monitoring framework.  The policy asks “For both materials and energy recovery that the market is <i>presented</i> ” not demonstrated. The information is sought in order to monitor how these broader objectives are being met.	<b>No change made</b>  <b>No change made</b>
338	L33a	Debera Harrison on behalf of Chris Rose	CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd	1. Matrix Movements is concerned about the justification and effectiveness of the Pre Submission Document, particularly the initial assessment of an omission site known as Stowey Quarry, the assessment of the need for hazardous waste management capacity in the sub-region and the provision of new stable non-reactive hazardous waste landfill facilities.	The site was rejected at an early stage as it is remote with very poor, narrow access (off A37) leading past residential properties  The site is located over a groundwaterprotection zone and so is unlikely to receive no objection from the Environment Agency in respect on non hazardous or non reactive hazardous landfill.	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>2. It is understood that the site was dismissed by ERM owing to perceived access constraints. Matrix Movements takes exception to this view and consider the site to have been dismissed prematurely. Stowey Quarry enjoys excellent transportation links via the A37 and already benefits from consent for inert aggregates recovery. The principle of HGV movements to and from the site has therefore already been established. The credibility of the evidence base is therefore called into question.</p> <p>3. Two other sites within Zone C feature in the Pre-submission Document, namely the former Fuller Earth Works site at Fosseyway and land at Broadmead Lane in Keynesham, to meet the treatment capacity of 150,000tpa (assigned to Zone C). The Fullers Earth Works site is located within the Green Belt and lies adjacent to the Cotswold AONB. The Broadmead Lane site is not without constraints, as highlighted in ERM's Revised Detailed Site Assessment. In contrast, Stowey Quarry is relatively free of constraints being located outside of the designated Green Belt, AONB and flood risk zones 2 and 3. We would question therefore whether the two sites in Zone C represent most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>4. Matrix Movements respectfully suggest that Stowey Quarry should be allocated under Policy 5 of the Pre-submission document. This would provide flexibility and ensure the deliverability of the Waste Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The Stowey Quarry site has permission for waste management, when implemented the site would be safeguarded under policy 13. Permitted proposals are currently for inert waste. Any other proposals for the site could be brought forward under policy 7 of the JWCS.</p> <p>The allocated sites listed at Policy 5 have all been subjected to a detailed site assessment. They are allocated as they represent deliverable opportunities through which to deliver the spatial strategy.</p> <p>Flexibility is provided for in the JWCS. Development proposals on sites not allocated in the JWCS could come forward under Policy 7 for consideration by the Local Planning Authority.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>5. Matrix Movements would also like to put down a marker as to the potential for Stowey Quarry to be used for stable non-reactive hazardous landfill.</p> <p>6. Matrix Movements is concerned, however, at the statement in paragraph 6.13.1, that '<i>... there is no identified need for new hazardous waste landfill capacity within the plan area</i>'. This unqualified statement appears to contradict the preceding commentary and appears at odds with the intent of policies W1 and W3 of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>	<p>Policy 8 is for both hazardous and non-hazardous landfill. This site could come forward as meeting requirement as set out in policy 8 bullet 2a. However, the site is located over a groundwater protection zone and so is unlikely to receive no objection from the Environment Agency in respect on non hazardous or non reactive hazardous landfill.</p> <p>The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy states that hazardous waste landfill capacity is a regional matter. Policy 8 of the JWCS is a policy framework for both hazardous and non-hazardous waste proposals to come forward.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>
338	L33b	Debera Harrison on behalf of Chris Rose	CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd	Representation form with respondents details. Indicates representation is in relation to Policy, considered unsound because not justified or effective.	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
338	L33c	Debera Harrison on behalf of Chris Rose	CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd	Map of Stowey Quarry	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
338	L33d	Debera Harrison on behalf of Chris Rose	CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd	Notification of Decision Application No 07/02326/MINW	Noted	<b>No change made</b>
339	L34	Jane Hennell	British Waterways	1. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft document. Having viewed the potential site locations we feel that there is little impact on British Waterways and we feel that if other sites are subsequently chosen	Noted	<b>No change made</b>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>then the list of General considerations and planning designations adequately covers any possible concerns.</p> <p>2. We are therefore content that we need raise no issues relating to the soundness of the document and wish you well with its adoption</p>	Noted	No change made
340	L35	Peter Duppa-Miller	Coombe Hay Parish Council	<p>1. Combe Hay Parish Council strongly supports:</p> <p>a. Pages 9 and 10 – Section 3.3 - the linkage with Climate Change policies (see also Section 5.5 on page 16).</p> <p>b. Page 11 – the JWCS Vision.</p> <p>c. Page 12 – the Strategic Objectives of the JWCS.</p> <p>d. Pages 17 and 18 – paragraphs 5.6.8 and 5.6.9 - the linkage with the relevant Sustainable Community Strategy and the relevant Core Strategy.</p> <p>e. Page 19 – paragraph 6.1.1 – the Waste Hierarchy approach (as depicted in Figure 1 on page 14).</p> <p>f. Pages 21 and 22 – Policy 1 (Waste Prevention).</p> <p>g. Page 31 – Policy 5 (Residual Waste Treatment Facilities – Locations).</p> <p>h. Pages 37 and 38 – Policy 11 (Planning Designations) – many of which relate to Site BA12, for example the Green Belt, the</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>adjoining City of Bath World Heritage Site and the adjoining Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>i. Pages 39 and 40 – Policy 12 (General Considerations) – many of which relate to Site BA12, for example the imperative to consider the potential contamination and/or flooding of properties and grazing fields below the down on which the site is located.</p> <p>j. Page 40 – Policy 13 (Safeguarding Sites).</p> <p>k. Page 42 – Section 7.3 – the Plan, Monitor, Manage approach.</p> <p>l. Pages 60 and 61 – the Key Development Criteria relating to Site BA12.</p> <p>2. With regard to item l. above, Combe Hay Parish Council contends that, in addition, there must be taken into account:</p> <p>a. The fact that part of Site BA12 and its surrounding area is a designated Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).</p> <p>b. The fact that part of Site BA12 and its surrounding area is a Regionally-Important Geological Site (RIGS).</p> <p>c. The fact that Site BA12 lies above a Major Acquirer.</p> <p>3. Combe Hay Parish Council would wish to draw the West of England Partnership’s attention to the current (and very long-running) planning,</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The allocation of Site BA12 is for its future use as a residual waste treatment facility. Allocation of the site will give a better</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>planning enforcement and environmental issues relating to Site BA12 and its surrounding area. Such issues MUST be resolved before Site BA12 is considered as a site for a potential Residual Waste Treatment Facility.</p> <p>4. Combe Hay Parish Council would wish to participate in the oral part of the eventual examination, because Site BA12 is in Combe Hay Parish and its potential use as a Residual Waste Treatment Facility site is of direct and most significant importance to the residents and electors of Combe Hay Parish</p>	<p>operational and planning outcome.</p> <p>Noted. The Panning Inspector will consider who will be invited to participate at the examination.</p>	<b>No change made</b>
341	L36	Brian Huggett	Englishcombe Parish Council	<p>1. We found the document, in our opinion, fundamentally sound in terms of its legal requirement in all respects. Of equal importance from our point of view was the understandability of the document and clarity with which the issues were documented; for which Englishcombe Parish Council is grateful and on which the authors are to be complemented.</p> <p>2. Section 6 Joint Waste Core Strategy Policy: Englishcombe Parish Council would wish to see a more robust policy adopted in respect of quantities of non-recycled waste produced domestically and by commercial activity –note non-recycled as opposed to non-recyclable. There is still a high degree of laxity and complacency on behalf of households and business in identifying recyclable materials. Councils on the other hand need to concentrate on user –friendly receptacles and convenient and reliable collection policies.</p> <p>3. Englishcombe Parish Council finds itself in sympathy with the views expressed at length in South Stoke Parish Council's letter of 21<sup>st</sup></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Policy 1 on waste minimisation provides the policy framework for the ways in which waste prevention will be promoted. The authorities have made significant progress an in accordance with Sustainable Community Strategies and the Joint Municipal Waste Strategy this good work will continue.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>February in respect of activity in the Green Belt, the ecology of the site, its proximity to the Cotswold's AONB and its prominence on a main route into the City of Bath World Heritage Site</p> <p>4. Englishcombe Parish Council takes a more pragmatic approach. Whilst having the site returned to open grassland would in our opinion be most appropriate, we have serious reservations that this will happen, given the long running and highly unsuccessful efforts by B&amp;NES to restore the site to legal and more aesthetically pleasing use. The site as it is at present is and appalling mess and a Blot on an otherwise attractive landscape.</p> <p>5. If the site were adopted it is anticipated that within any Planning Application for the whole 3.32Ha there would be a detailed proposal for extensive landscaping and concealment of the proposed waste treatment activities.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The site boundary for BA12 Former Fuller's Earth Works in Figure 10 of the JWCS outlines the industrial nature of the site and provides flexibility for a design led solution including landscaping.</p>	<p>No change made</p> <p>No change made</p>
342	F41	Tim Gent on behalf of Mr Charles Crossland (Goodman)	GVA Grimley Re: Merebank site	Representation form with respondents details. Indicates representation is in relation to Policy 5(d), Policy 13 and the proposals map. Considers unsound because not justified or effective.	Noted-see response to user 342 L37	No change made
342	L37	Tim Gent on behalf of Mr Charles Crossland (Goodman)	GVA Grimley Re: Merebank site	In summary we broadly support the strategy set out within the pre-submission version of the JWCS. We also welcome the recognition within the document of the potential of the Merebank site to accommodate a Waste Treatment facility during the plan period. However to ensure that this positive policy does not prevent other forms of development coming forward, and to reflect the planning position at Merebank, we recommend that Merebank is either (and preferably) removed from the list of sites allocated in Policy 5, or that	Para 6.8.8 recognises some areas have more sites than may be required to ensure flexibility and deliverability of JWCS. Should the resource park not come to fruition and should it be demonstrated that the necessary waste management infrastructure has been provided in the Avonmouth Zone, the safeguarding would carry little weight and alternative uses may be permitted given that it won't jeopardise the JWCS delivery.	No change made

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				changes are made to Policy 13 which indicate a more flexible approach at Merebank which responds to the sites planning history and potential.		
343	F23	Miss Nicola Vines on behalf of Shaun Davis	Alder King on behalf of Shaun Davis	<p>1. There is a firm policy emphasis to increase waste recycling facilities within the South West and we fully support this. We also support the aim to prevent, minimise and ensure the sustainable management of waste, reducing reliance on land fill and that this should include reduction, re-use, recycling and composting of waste.</p> <p>2. A flexible approach should be taken towards proposals for waste related developments, especially in terms of the location of such facilities and when applying the sequential approach. Policy should be made more flexible to allow sites that may not be as sequentially preferable to come forward in order to meet the requirement for waste management facilities as set out in the emerging South West Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>3. Given the extent of the Green belt, sites proposed for waste management facilities within it should take into account these wider considerations and should not be automatically rejected due to their location within it where the proposal would not affect the openness of the green belt or undermine its function for being included within the green belt.</p> <p>4. As such policy should be worded so that on land in the green belt, planning permission for waste management facilities will be granted only in very special circumstances, unless they maintain openness and do not conflict with the purpose of including land in the green belt.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The JWCS identifies opportunities and criteria based policy for sites to come forward outside of those identified.</p> <p>National Policy on Green Belt prevails but is not repeated in the JWCS.</p> <p>National Policy on Green Belt prevails but is not repeated in the JWCS.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
344	E142	Keith Hallet	Individual	Email received outlining general concerns regarding development of Long Ashton	Noted but outside of the remit of the JWCS. The representation has been sent on to Officers in N.Som and Bristol for their information.	<b>No change made</b>
345	F43 late response	Mr Mohammed Saddiq	Wessex Water through subsidiary GENeco Ltd	<p>1. Wessex Water, through its subsidiary GENeco, is considering anaerobic digestion of organic waste material such as food waste, in addition to sewage sludge. However, we are concerned at the omission from the Joint Waste Core Strategy of any mention, let alone discussion, of the role of anaerobic digestion. We consider the document to be a) out of step with government strategy and b) unclear on how the joint waste core strategy will itself assist carbon reduction more broadly.</p> <p>2. The following references to renewable energy and carbon reduction in the Joint Core Waste Strategy.... These statements suggest that technologies which have a strong carbon reduction role should play a part. However, the JWCS gives little sense of how it would encourage renewable energy generation.</p> <p>3. It can be inferred from the JWCS that non-residual organic waste, such as source segregated food waste, would be directed preferentially to composting; if this was the case, the potential for producing biogas for renewable electricity and heat production would be lost. Furthermore the nitrous oxide emissions from the composting process and the compost produced means that this option has an unfavourable overall impact on greenhouse gas emissions. Unfortunately, this important consideration was omitted by ERM's sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>The JWCS is technology neutral. The JWCS is a strategic planning document that allocates land suitable for residual waste treatment facilities and provides the policy framework to deliver the waste management infrastructure to meet the sub-regions needs. This would include anaerobic digestion.</p> <p>By providing a positive policy framework that will deliver the infrastructure necessary to divert waste from landfill, the JWCS will enable carbon reduction generally. JWCS policy 1 focuses on waste minimisation, which will assist in carbon reduction. Policy 12 (4) requires applicants to demonstrate the amount of GHG produced and how these will be minimised.</p> <p>Policy 6 establishes the expectations that value (whether material or energy) will be recovered from the residual waste management facilities. This policy will help to understand the contribution to electricity and or heat output as a result of residual treatment and this is an indicator included in the monitoring framework.</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
				<p>4. We would welcome clarification of the following:</p> <p>-How will the current proposals contribute to renewable energy generation and carbon reductions if organic waste – non-residual and residual alike – is to be composted?</p> <p>-Could anaerobic digestion of separated food waste be seen as a form of biological <i>non-residual</i> waste treatment, on a par with composting?</p> <p>-If anaerobic digestion is classed as residual waste treatment, can food waste be considered a legitimate waste-stream for processing in digesters?</p> <p>5. We believe the West of England Partnership should articulate how it sees anaerobic digestion fitting into the JWCS and how the strategy will contribute to national and regional policy for carbon reduction.</p>	<p>The JWCS is technology neutral and seeks to implement the waste hierarchy. The waste hierarchy favours recycling/composting over energy recovery. The JWCS does not prevent AD or other biological energy recovery proposals being brought forward.</p> <p>It is perhaps unlikely (not least as a result of the Animal By Products Regulations) that food waste would be put through a simple composting process in any event. It is much more likely to be required to go through some sort AD procedure, which should be able to satisfy Policy 6.</p> <p>The JWCS does not require organic waste to be composted.</p> <p>The point of this question is unclear. Strictly speaking, the waste could be non- residual if it hasn't been through some sort of former recycling/composting process – but it would be perverse to not recover energy from the process because the operator was trying to put it on the same level as composting, which would only recover materials.</p> <p>The waste stream to go through any type of waste management facility is the choice of the developer.</p> <p>The JWCS is technology neutral. The JWCS is a strategic planning document</p>	<p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p> <p><b>No change made</b></p>

User ID	Ref	Name	Organisation	Key Issues raised in the representation* Copies of the full representations made are available on our website: <a href="http://www.westofengland.org/waste">www.westofengland.org/waste</a>	Response	Where this issue has been addressed in the Joint Waste Core Strategy Submission Document (DPD)
					that allocates land suitable for residual waste treatment facilities and provides the policy framework to deliver the waste management infrastructure to meet the sub-regions needs. This would include anaerobic digestion.	

S:\WEP\WEP meetings\4. Planning Housing & Communities Board\2010\4. 13 July 10\Item 7 Appendix A.doc