

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
1. Waste Data	<p>The group felt that the availability of data on waste is a real problem, especially for the construction and demolition waste streams. There was an acknowledgement that this is not a problem unique to Greater Manchester. A technical issue is that there is no central database of waste data, and waste data is often not at an appropriate level (sub-regional). One member of the group summarised the problem by saying '<i>you have got to measure waste in order to manage waste</i>'. Often waste is dealt with internally within construction sites, so never gets recorded accurately.</p> <p>The group felt that hazardous waste is often overlooked in data terms and agricultural waste is not classified in its own right. The group accepted that municipal waste data has reached quite a good level but the other waste streams need to catch up.</p>	<p>One option for solving this problem is the forthcoming Government waste data system, although this would arrive too late to benefit this Greater Manchester Development Plan Document process.</p> <p>This issue of data needs to be considered holistically and understanding of Greater Manchester's waste data needs to improve significantly.</p> <p>Cllr Swannick felt that the greatest issue is waste growth and figures for anticipated growth in the future. This has a knock on for facility provision</p>
2. Waste Targets	<p>The group consensus was that there should be major disincentives for not meeting targets, and that many targets are simply a statement of desire with no 'teeth'. What incentives are there for meeting targets?</p> <p>The group identified a shortcoming of the current RSS draft – no sub regional apportionment figures are provided, which demonstrates the gap in data.</p> <p>In order to set appropriate targets, the group suggested that there needs to be a better understanding of existing capacity at waste facilities.</p> <p>In addition, the issue of imports and exports is an important consideration – how much waste is coming in to / going out of Greater Manchester? This will affect future targets.</p>	<p>The group felt that targets are only as good as the data upon which they are based.</p>



Association of
Greater Manchester Authorities

Planning for Waste in Greater Manchester

Workshop 1 Stakeholder Event 1

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
3. Waste Technologies	<p>The group discussed the merits of using waste to create more sustainable fuels. Whilst it should be noted that not all delegates were strongly in favour of Energy from Waste (EfW) / Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) options, there was general consensus that we should be committing to moving waste up the hierarchy, and this would be one option for achieving that.</p> <p>There was some concern that by implementing such waste technologies, you are effectively perpetuating waste production – without waste these technologies would be null and void. We should really be focusing on minimising waste.</p> <p>Landfill should be the last resort for residual waste, but still needs to be planned for.</p>	<p>One option would be to promote and enhance these types of waste management solutions through the Development Plan Documents' policies. It should be noted that there was broad but not complete consensus on this point.</p>
4. Availability of Sites	<p>The group felt there is an inevitable trade-off between areas. There simply isn't enough landfill in Greater Manchester due to policy constraints, urban areas, flood risk areas, aquifers. This leads to a need to export residual waste.</p> <p>The group also felt that 'Nimbyism' should be tackled through involvement and information.</p>	<p>The only way the trade off can be appropriately managed is through joint-working.</p> <p>There is a danger that sites could become concentrated in poorer / less desirable areas, and the group highlighted this as a concern. However, as a method of managing site selection, some members of the group felt that a form of planning gain could be implemented (for example offering community facilities in return for that community housing a waste facility which is perceived to be undesirable).</p>

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
5. Transport	<p>Over-reliance on road transport is currently seen as a problem. Sites are not currently located within easy access of rail / water transport.</p> <p>Consultation with local people is a key issue.</p>	<p>The group felt that one option would be to utilise the canal system to transport waste.</p> <p>Rail heads should be built into new waste management schemes where possible (longer term economies of scale and sustainability)</p>
6. Meeting Objectives National Regional Local	<p>The group felt that the sub-regional objectives for waste management must be informed by, and conform with, regional and national planning policy frameworks. As described before, the absence of the targets in the draft RSS is a significant problem.</p>	