

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
1. Waste Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group considered one of the main issues is that not all waste data is up to date. Data on commercial and industrial and construction and demolition waste is not currently available below regional level. It was noted that two studies are being undertaken in respect of C&I and C&D waste at sub-regional level and that this information would be available next year. The validity of the data at publication was also questioned as construction waste can fluctuate significantly. No information is available on commercial waste from transfer stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of improving the collection of data on commercial waste, the Group considered it would be appropriate to contact trade organisations such as the Chartered Institute of Waste Management and Environmental Services Association. It was also suggested that the developer collect and supplies the necessary information as part of their Environmental Management System – policy could encourage this practice The Building Research Establishment would be a good source of information on construction and demolition waste LATS is a good information source in respect of MSW
2. Waste Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are currently no targets for commercial and industrial or construction and demolition waste. Businesses are being incentivised by financial penalties such as the landfill tax. These are starting to have an impact – WTS are recovering as much waste as possible. There are national targets for MSW set by the Landfill Directive with financial penalties if these are not met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education was identified as the key to achieving targets. Provision of waste management facilities to facilitate recycling and recovery was also considered crucial to achieving targets It was felt the local authorities should help small businesses by separating trade waste from MSW as currently trade waste is included in the Landfill Allowance The Group also felt that the procurement process could help achieve targets through compliance with ISO standards or a kite mark There should also be incentives to adopt Environmental Management Systems

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
3. Waste Technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group considered that the benefits of many new technologies still needed to be proven. Pyrolysis requires high energy input and if the net carbon effect is neutral then there is no point in using such a technology. They specifically discussed the use of incinerators and noted that authorities with incinerators tended to have low recycling rates. It was felt that there could be a problem in achieving the high calorific value required for the incinerator if waste is diverted for recycling or composting. They concluded however that the need to recycle as much as possible should not preclude incineration in principle; it may dictate how many EfW plants are appropriate for dealing with residual waste. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste technologies should follow the principle of the waste hierarchy i.e. waste should not be incinerated that could be recycled. The Group felt that the Plan should be flexible to take into account new technologies and that specific technologies should not be precluded but should take into account the waste hierarchy. It was felt that the UK should develop technologies for recycling so that waste is not exported great distances. There is also a need to develop local markets for recyclables. The Group also felt that the co-location of waste facilities on a Waste Park was appropriate, as it would provide the flexibility to respond to changes in the market.
4. Availability of Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group felt that waste facilities should be located close enough to centres of population to make best economic use of a site but far enough away such that environmental impact is minimised. The perception issue of what a waste management facility actually is needs to be overcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group identified the following locational principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to source (proximity principle) Transport infrastructure (utilising railways and canals wherever possible) Co-located with industry Availability of previously-developed land It was considered that environmental issues would be addressed by the PPC permit.

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
5. Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group felt that the key issue in terms of transportation was the need to transport materials in the most efficient and sustainable way possible i.e. to minimise distances and maximise efficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More waste should be transported using canals and railway. There is no time constraints associated with transporting waste and this should be taken into account in the decision making process. The potential for 'linked trips' was also discussed e.g. 'bring sites' should be located with supermarkets to make it as easy and convenient as possible to recycle waste and to eliminate unnecessary journeys.
6. Meeting Objectives National Regional Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Group considered that education was the key to meeting objectives at all levels and concluded that the emphasis should be on Central Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education Financial incentives with a direct link to increases in Council Tax if targets are not met. Fines for exceeding the landfill allowance would ultimately get passed to the Council Tax payer. The Group did raise concerns that financial penalties could result in an increase in fly tipping.

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
7. Scale of Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In discussing the scale of facilities the Group felt that it was dependent on both the technology and waste stream. • Location was also identified as an issue that should be taken into account. • A balance needs to be struck between the need for a hub or cluster approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of facilities needs to be such that efficiency is maximised. • Co-location of facilities should be considered on a regional scale • Resource-recovery park served by multi-modal transportation • The Group concluded that there should be a number of localised first stage processing sites in connection with a central large scale hub site. • In essence the Plan needs to be flexible and most importantly must be deliverable.
8. Interface with Adjoining Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the main issues identified by the Group was the lack of communication and knowledge sharing between the authorities. • The interface with adjoining authorities is particularly important as Greater Manchester exports the majority of its MSW and imports hazardous waste. • It is also important in terms of the proximity principle; the nearest site maybe outside the administrative boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A standardised approach is needed across the Greater Manchester area • It is also important to plan on a regional basis as the need for and location of facilities is often more appropriately determined as the regional level. • Joint working was also identified as being important.

TOPIC	ISSUES	OPTIONS
<p>Key Locational Principles</p>	<p>The Group ranked the following issues as being most important:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of Sites 2. Scale of Facilities 3. Transport 	
<p>Blue Group Members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Waring Environment Agency • Maurice Belshaw Individual • Lawrence Wales Individual • Bill Brison Individual • Bridget Green Trafford Green Party • Peter Barsby Emerson Group • Keiran Tames Peel Environmental Holdings Ltd • Cllr Dave Hibbert Oldham MBC 	