

Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy Preferred Options and Proposals
Workshop
Manor Hall, Saturday 7th October 2006 10:00 – 12:30

Attendees:

Keith Kondakor	Friends of the Earth
Richard Hammersley	Planning Aid
Ian Davison	Warwick and Leamington Green Party

Introduction to Waste Development Framework: Pam Neal

Issues about how to improve the consultation process to reach more people were discussed. It was suggested that we could actually knock on peoples doors and tell them about the consultation. However, this brings up issues of boundaries – where would we start and stop.

A presentation was then given by Derek Greedy giving an overview of the Preferred Options consultation and the policy principals. It was decided the best way to conduct the meeting with such a small group was to discuss the issues as Derek gave his presentation.

The following issues were discussed by the group.

Key Issue 1

Remove ‘economic’ from “sustainable economic prosperity”
Add high quality of life as the social factor is missing. It was noted that quality of life does not only come from a good economy but also from a good physical environment. The proximity principal was flagged up as still being important.

Key Issue 2

Limit this to a quantitative approach concern (trend base) – be more positive/proactive. RTAB provision needs to be mentioned.
Take out ‘whereby’ and reword to suggest the planning system can promote change and follow the waste hierarchy.

Key Issue 3

It was suggested “Disposal” should replace “land fill”.
Encourage recycling opportunities and encourage industry to reduce, reuse, and recycle. The point should aim to reduce disposal and encourage commercial activities to reuse and recycle.

Key Issue 4

Happy with this issue.

Key Issue 5

It was pointed out that hazardous waste is not the main waste issue in Warwickshire. We need to consider how to mention nuclear and radioactive waste and check the process.
Use of planning conditions to instil confidence in the public (real time info etc).
There should be a policy to encourage working with other agencies/industries.

Key issue 6

Reduction: link to provision of facilities – slightly under provide.
Provision of reuse shop. For example in any new CA site.
Balance of objectives need to be mentioned.
Need to put in to context – market/economy

Recovery

Technologies do not fit in just one category – spectrum of all.
On the diagram we need to show some things cover more than one activity. There could be an extra column in the diagram showing the percentage that each type applies to each category.
Small scale could help.

Disposal

Incineration with electric (power) only (20/80 split)
Organic waste was suggested to be recovery not disposal as it is a valuable resource.

Key Issue 7

Key Issue 8

Sorting – dispersed/Treatment – centralised } change sentence around.
Centralised? Take out/clarify what we mean – scale NOT geography. Also needs to reflect proximity and self-sufficiency.
Economic viability – needs to be reflected.
Length of contracts.
Need to put in number of facilities BUT reflect uncertainty.

There was a consensus that one large plant was not wanted and perhaps a network of local facilities, supported by specialist centralised facilities on a local scale (no bigger than 60-75,000 tonnes of municipal waste) was a better option.

Local is a key word – consider sequential approach.

Key Issue 9

“Policy to focus...” – suggested wording to begin the point.
Design. Policy needed to minimise impact on locality.

Key Issue 11

Add “and existing transport infrastructure”.

Key Issue 12

Include “do not allow subsequent development to jeopardise restoration”.

Monitoring

Real time monitoring data to be included in policy requirements for design –and management of process will lead to greater public confidence.
Local liaison groups.

The meeting then closed.