



**Joint Consultation
On
Municipal Waste Strategy
and
Waste Development Plan Document
(Issues and Options)**

15th August to 30th September 2005

**Consultation Report
and
Methods of Public Engagement**

**Authors:
Gill King, Waste Strategy Manager
Rebecca Trowse, Senior Planning
Officer**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND	7
METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT	9
RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION	17
CAGOW - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	19
RESPONSES TO THE SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	23
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS:.....	27
RESPONSES TO THE TECHNICAL QUESTIONNAIRE	37
SUMMARIES OF THE PUBLIC DEBATES.....	67
RESPONSES BY LETTER	85
KEY THEMES FROM 3 COUNTIES RADIO DEBATE	93
APPENDICES	94
APPENDIX 1 - CAGOW REPORT –	95
APPENDIX 2 - TEXT OF SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	96
APPENDIX 3 - LIST OF CONSULTEES RECEIVING CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS/ CD ROM	103

SUMMARY

The 2005 Waste Consultation on the Municipal Waste Strategy (MWS) and the Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD) used a wide variety of means of engaging the public including:

- A Citizens Advisory Group on Waste (CAGOW)
- A short questionnaire available as a “wrapper” on a local paper, online and sent to a wide range of consultees, from which 3,468 responses were received
- A technical questionnaire, of which 13 were received
- Public debates, attended by around 50 people

The consultation covered the following areas:

- Waste Management Policies
- Targets
- Options for future waste management:
- Collection Options
- Treatment/Disposal Options
- Sites for Waste Management
- Design and layout of new development
- Waste Development Plan Principles
- Imports and Exports of Waste

Consultation CD ROMs containing all the consultation documents were sent to many organisations including:

- Government Agencies
- Town and Parish Councils
- Parish Meetings
- Neighbouring Local Authorities
- Political Parties
- Council members and officers
- Transport and Utilities organisations
- Business Interest organisations
- Local Strategic Partnership
- Waste Companies and Consultants
- Environment, Countryside and other Interest groups.

Taking all the responses from different methods of consultation together, results are summarised as follows:

Waste Management Policies

There is widespread support for the “Zero Waste” Policy as an aspiration. However, the practical difficulties of setting targets of “zero waste” are acknowledged.

(Supported by CAGOW, the short questionnaire survey and the technical questionnaire)

- Support for the current “no-incineration” policy is mixed.
 - Areas of confusion surround what is meant by the term “incineration”,
 - There is a lack of knowledge about the safety of incineration, and a lack of trust in new processes.
 - CAGOW, believe that “modern thermal waste treatment plant is safer and more efficient and should be considered as part of a wider deliberation of new technology options”.
 - The responses to the short survey indicate strong support for the “no incineration” policy with 69.1% of respondents agreeing or agreeing strongly with the policy; however the majority of these (42%) were “not sure” whether incineration was safe.
 - Residents of Bletchley were more likely to believe that incineration is unsafe (60.7%), and this was also witnessed at the public debates.
 - The strength of distrust in Bletchley is probably related to past events surrounding the landfill site there, (including a planning application for an incinerator) and apprehension that the landfill is the most likely site for any new development.

- Other policies were not included in the short questionnaire but were examined by the CAGOW, in public debates and by those responding to the technical questionnaire. These were:
 - Reduction in the hazardousness of waste – there was general support for this; the CAGOW felt that there did not seem to be evidence for much action
 - New Milton Keynes Waste Hierarchy – this was not a topic in the short questionnaire; it was generally supported by respondents to the technical questionnaire and by CAGOW. However, there was little discussion of the way in which this differentiated from the traditional hierarchy, except by one respondent who felt that the general term “recover value” would be better than “energy recovery”. CAGOW thought that it should be better enforced
 - Overall good environmental Practice and Sustainability – there was general support for this and no change was thought

- necessary; CAGOW thought that thermal treatments should not be excluded from evaluation of options.
- Local Self-Sufficiency – there was general support for this though the CAGOW felt that this should not preclude exploring opportunities for co-operation with neighbouring local authorities.
- An integrated waste management policy- again general support for this approach
- Best value – there was general support for this
- Flexibility and annual review – there was general support for this though some highlighted the difficulty in being flexible if long term contracts especially for new facilities, were to be entered into; one waste company considered that short term contracts are unlikely to justify the necessary investment needed to secure the development of waste management facilities.
- Co-operation and partnerships – there was support for this, particularly from CAGOW who would like to see more partnerships with other organisations.
- Educating and influencing – there was particularly strong support for more education and promotional work. Many respondents felt that too little was being done in this area, particularly in the areas of increasing participation in recycling schemes and educating local residents regarding various technologies.

Many respondents, across all the means of public engagement used, took the opportunity to comment that Milton Keynes Council is not doing enough to encourage businesses to reduce and recycle their waste. In particular they felt that that businesses should be doing more to reduce the amount of packaging they produce.

It was also felt that the Government should be doing more to reduce the amount of waste produced.

Targets and Allowances

It is widely felt that the Council should meet its landfill allowances.

However, the allowances are thought to be unfair because they do not take account of the growth of Milton Keynes, and many opportunities were taken to comment on this. Many respondents thought that the Council should lobby or make other representations to Government on this point.

Few respondents took the opportunity to make comments on the recycling or composting targets. The Council proposes to adopt those of the region. The CAGOW thought that these were ambitious; others thought that they were not high enough. Some thought the Council would need to accord with regional policy and national guidance.

Options for Collection

Most respondents to the short survey were supportive of the existing methods of containment of dry recyclables (sacks), garden waste (wheeled bin), and glass (box).

Regarding food waste, 73.1% of respondents in the short survey claim that they would be prepared to separate out food waste into an enclosed container, collected weekly. There was support (55.5%) for the use of a small, enclosed bucket for this – one of the methods currently being used in the food waste collection trials.

The preference for type of container for residual refuse shows support for the current method of sack collection (53.5%) over the wheeled bin (34.7%). This was also shown in a similar 1999 survey when support for plastic sacks was 60.4% versus 32.5% for wheeled bins. Thus there is a little more support for wheeled bins than previously, and from the comments it would appear that there is a vocal minority that support wheeled bins; in addition CAGOW (who questioned other local authorities about containers) thought that they might be a more popular option.

Support for sacks over wheeled bins varies across property type with a stronger preference for sacks in terraced housing and bungalows. Particular comments were made regarding the difficulty of using wheeled bins in terraced properties in Wolverton.

There is also a strong difference by age, with those over 56 and particularly those over 66 showing a greater preference for sacks rather than wheeled bins. This may be related to the perceived difficulties of handling wheeled bins.

Those completing the technical questionnaire (13 respondents) examined the various collection options more closely. Amongst this group, the strongest preference was for option “3a” followed by option “3”. Both of these options collect the widest range of recyclable materials – paper, glass, cans, plastics, food waste and garden waste. In option 3a the residual waste is collected on an alternate week basis; in option 3 it is collected weekly. There was least support for option 2b, which collected paper, glass and food waste on a weekly basis and garden waste on the current chargeable fortnightly system.

The issue of alternate week collection was not examined in depth. However, the CAGOW felt that weekly collections should be maintained to reduce confusion. In particular weekly collections of recyclables should be maintained to increase participation.

There was also support in comments from the short survey and by CAGOW for the investigation of compulsory recycling (e.g. that currently being used by the London Borough of Barnet)

Options for Treatment/Disposal

CAGOW were of the strong opinion that if long term targets (allowances) were to be achieved, then some form of thermal waste treatment will be unavoidable. Certainly the work done by Babbie to inform the strategy process showed that thermal treatments gave the most secure LATS position.

Those responding to the technical questionnaires favoured option “1e” – mechanical biological treatment which stabilised the output prior to landfill, i.e. a non-thermal option, with 6 of the respondents favouring it, and none rejecting it. The second most popular option was option “4” – energy from waste – which, although supported by 5 of the respondents also had 4 respondents rejecting it outright.

From the short surveys it can be seen that reducing pollution and rubbish for landfill are the top two priorities for waste treatment plants. There is then a “second tier” of priorities – generating electricity from rubbish and reducing climate change. This also indicates confusion in public perception regarding incineration, since generating electricity is most commonly associated with this technology.

From the public debates and other work it is clear that some sectors of the population, especially those near Bletchley landfill believe incineration to be a polluting technology.

GOSE are of the opinion that all options should be examined, with a “blank-sheet” approach, in which a no-incineration policy is not appropriate; a waste company also drew attention to the inconsistencies between the no-incineration policy and the health review by the leader of the Council’s Environmental Protection team.

Sites for Future Waste Management

The short questionnaire indicated that landfill sites or existing waste management sites and contaminated or derelict land are preferred options

Comments in the short questionnaire were often related to the need for waste management sites to be away from residential or built up areas or at least unobtrusive.

Development of the existing landfill site at Bletchley is supported by the site operators (WRG). However, those living nearest the local landfill site in Bletchley are likely to oppose to future development on the site – as witnessed at the public debates.

There is support in the short survey for CA sites (Community Recycling Centres) to be close to where people live, for their convenience.

A recurring theme was that waste management facilities should be found in expansion areas

Principles of the Waste Development Plan Document

The technical questionnaire showed general support for the WDPD's principles including the waste hierarchy, the proximity principle and self sufficiency. The short survey also showed some support for the self-sufficiency principle in that 32% of respondents chose as important the consideration that facilities should be "of a size to treat rubbish only from Milton Keynes" versus 15.3% saying that facilities "should be of a size as necessary to get economies of scale".

As has been seen above, there was also support for minimising the effects on nearby residents and minimising effects on the environment. The issue of providing sites in "the right location" is difficult since there is opposition to the use of the only landfill site in the borough by those living close by.

Imports and Exports

The technical questionnaire also included questions on imports and exports. All agreed that waste for landfilling from London and other places should have been subject to recycling and other recovery processes.

Layout and Design

New development needs to make sufficient provision for waste management and promote designs and layouts that secure the integration of waste management facilities. Some suggestions as to how to do this were made as part of the technical questionnaire, particularly ensuring that new developments have adequate space for the storage of recyclables.

Inert Waste

Milton Keynes is identified as a growth area and will be expecting much development. Much of the expansion is on Greenfield sites. One increasing issue is the amount of soil arising from development sites. Increasingly planning applications are being received for land raise, soil mounds (bunds) at golf courses and for noise attenuation.

Respondents to the technical questionnaire were mostly not sure (7 of the 13) as to whether the existing policy against landraising should be relaxed.

BACKGROUND

Milton Keynes Council is updating its Municipal Waste Strategy (MWS) for the third time. It is also preparing a Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD). The WDPD will replace the Waste Local Plan.

In line with current guidance, the two documents are being developed together, though the timescale for the WDPD is longer than that for the MWS. The MWS will guide new waste management contracts due to begin in October 2007. It is estimated that the WDPD will be adopted in 2008.

A consultation period on the update of the MWS and the first stage of the WDPD – the “Issues and Options” took place from 15th August 2005 to 30th September 2005.

This report documents the methods of public engagement undertaken and gives the results of the consultation.

METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The Nature of the Consultation

A number of complex waste management and planning issues were explored in this consultation, including the evaluation of the many different methods of collection and disposal, the location of sites, the layout and design of new developments, and principles and targets.

Some of the issues (for instance the advantages and disadvantages of different residual waste treatments) are quite complex. In order to reach as many people as possible with the consultation, it was considered that a variety of engagement measures and approaches were required.

Approaches taken

(i) The Milton Keynes Waste Forum

The Waste Forum comprises a stakeholders group involving waste contractors Cory Environmental and WRG, pressure groups Milton Keynes Friends of the Earth and PALS, a parish representative, the Environment Agency, a local representative from the Open University, Waste Management and Planning Officers, and Councillors representing the three main parties.

It has been running since April 2004 and has been involved in strategy development. The Forum carried out a "BPEO" weighting exercise in December 2004/January 2005. It also advised and help shape the questionnaire design for the consultation and advised on other aspects of the strategy.

(ii) Citizens Advisory Group on Waste (CAGOW)

The Council maintains a Citizens Panel. In May 2005 this comprised a group of 1,500 residents who had stated that they were prepared to take part in consultations. A letter was sent to all the Citizens Panel asking if they were prepared to take part in a waste consultation.

From the respondents, 24 were selected, chosen to be reasonably representative of the population in Milton Keynes demographically.

This "Citizens Advisory Group on Waste" were provided with independent facilitators Mo Shapiro and Mark Yoxon from Inform Training and Communication.

The CAGOW were asked to make recommendations to the Council on the following areas:

- Municipal Waste Strategy Policies and Principles

- Targets for Recycling/Composting
- Options for future Waste Collection and Disposal
- The Council's Approach to Designating Sites for Future Waste Management.

They were also provided with a background to waste and the major issues facing Milton Keynes by Council Officers, and a technical "teach-in" on waste technologies by DEFRA. After this point, Council officers and members had no further contact with the "CAGOW" unless specifically requested by them.

The CAGOW began work in June 2005 and reported their findings in October 2005. The full report of the CAGOW is in Appendix 1. An executive summary of their findings is given in the next chapter.

(iii) Unifying branding

In order to unify the consultation methods and to emphasise the seriousness of the consultation, a slogan "Your Waste, Your Cash, Your Choice" was developed and used on all publicity, together with the same images and styles of layout, incorporating images of a landfill site.

(iv) Consultation Documents

Consultation documents comprised the two main documents:

Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD) Issues and Options Paper and ***Milton Keynes Municipal Waste Strategy*** (MWS) Issues and Options – Consultation Draft.

The latter document was also available as a summary.

The MWS document included a number of technical appendices:

- Studies by Jacobs Babtie consultants of different waste residual waste collection and disposal options and their effect on recycling/composting targets and landfill allowances.
- BPEO (Best Practicable Environmental Option) studies by Entec Consultants of different waste residual waste collection and disposal options.
- A Review of the Health Impacts of Waste Management by the Environmental Protection Team of Milton Keynes Council.

(v) Development of Different Response Documents

Due to the complexity of the subject area, and the need for the public to have a considerable amount of information to be able make informed decisions, it was decided to develop two questionnaires – a short questionnaire and a technical questionnaire.

The short questionnaire "Your Survey" required the respondent to have little technical knowledge of waste management beyond a familiarisation

of the issues, and could be filled in quite quickly. This was used for an on-line survey, distributed in libraries and other outlets and also used for a survey on the cover of the “Citizen” newspaper. The short questionnaire is in Appendix 2.

In order to encourage response, a number of organisations were approached to donate prizes for those participating in the short survey. Prizes were donated by the following organisations

- Xscape – tobogganning
- Cineworld – film tickets
- Milton Keynes Theatre – theatre tickets
- MK Dons – football tickets
- The Centre MK – shopping vouchers

The other document, the “technical questionnaire” required the respondent to either be involved in waste management, or to have read most of the consultation document. In particular it required the respondent to have familiarised themselves with different waste management technologies.

(vi) Use of Websites

All the consultation documents and the questionnaires were loaded onto the website www.mkweb.co.uk/waste along with links to DEFRA background documents on new technologies.

Links to this web page were also made from other council pages – the home page, consultations page, schools page, MK Observatory, and the planning page.

News of the consultation was also run as a headline on MKWEB (Milton Keynes Web – a local network of information about Milton Keynes), on the Council homepage, and on the Council’s intranet.

The short questionnaire was developed into an online survey and placed on the main website. This was a popular form filled in by 862 respondents during the consultation period. The results are analysed in the next section together with the short questionnaire results from other respondents.

The survey was live between 15th August and 30th September. After this period, it was closed, but the consultation documents have remained on the website.

(vii) Distribution of Consultation Documents by CD

The Consultation Documents were distributed to all statutory consultees as required for the Waste Development Plan Document Issues and

Options paper. In addition a wide range of non-statutory consultees were sent the documents. Since a considerable number of documents were involved, the distribution was achieved by placing all the consultation documents on a CD, including both the short and technical questionnaires. The consultees were also sent a hardcopy of the short questionnaire. Respondents could choose which questionnaire to fill in.

The interest groups, consultation bodies and stakeholders sent the documents included the following:

- Waste Consultants
- Waste Operators
- Waste related companies
- Parishes
- Members
- Government Agencies
- Neighbouring Local Authorities
- Political parties
- Environmental/countryside organisations
- Transport organisations
- Utilities organisations
- Business Interest organisations
- Action/ Interest groups
- Tenant farmers
- Landowners
- CAGOW
- Members of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)
- Internal officers and all Councillors and Aldermen

A full list of all those to whom the consultation CD was sent is given in Appendix 4.

(viii) Distribution of Consultation Documents in Hardcopy.

Hardcopies of the two main documents, together with CD roms and short questionnaires were placed in the following locations:

- All Milton Keynes libraries,
- Milton Keynes Council Civic Offices
- Political Party Group rooms in the Civic Offices

(ix) Notification of the Consultation

All neighbouring parishes and all Waste Planning Authorities in the South East were notified of the Consultation by letter and advised where the consultation documents could be found; and could receive a free CD rom on request.

(x) Newsletters/Articles

Articles about the consultation were run in the following publications:

- Milton Keynes Council Housing newsletter
- Milton Keynes Council Schools newsletter
- Milton Keynes Council Parish Newsletter May/July 2005
(Some of the Parishes subsequently ran their own articles – it is known that articles appeared in Parish newsletters and/or on websites in Woburn Sands, Bletchley and Wavendon)
- Milton Keynes Council Internal magazine – [MK@work](#) July and Sept 2005
- Milton Keynes Council residents magazine – “Live MK” distributed with the Citizen newspaper on 30th August 2005
- Milton Keynes Council Members Weekly News – 19 August
- “Catch-up” magazine distributed to 900 community groups in Milton Keynes.
- Two Milton Keynes Council internal “Tuesday Bulletin” circular emails providing employees with current Council news were sent out during this period about the waste consultation.

(xi) “Wrap around” on the Citizen newspaper– 6 September 2005

The outer cover of the local “Citizen” newspaper was purchased for Tuesday, 6th September. The short questionnaire was re-designed to fit the cover, and an explanatory article accompanied the survey.

The Tuesday Citizen claims to have a distribution of 90,768 properties in Milton Keynes, reaching most parts of the Borough, including the main rural areas.

The response to the Citizen wrapper survey was very good, with 1,977 respondents sending back the survey

The results of this survey, together with the online survey are given in the next section

(xii) Public Debates

The public were invited to attend two public debates, one from 11am-1pm on Saturday 17th September, and one on Wednesday 21st September from 7.30-9.30pm

The debates were held at the City Discovery Centre in Bradwell Abbey. They were chaired by Dr Michael Synnott, Director of the City Discovery Centre and incorporated “breakout” sessions, which were managed by Inform Training and Communication.

Each presentation followed the same format:

Introduction and Welcome by Dr Michael Synnott

- Presentation on Current Waste Issues in Milton Keynes by Andy Hudson, Chief Waste management Engineer
- Presentation on Waste Management Technologies by Tony Voong of Fichtner Consulting Engineers Ltd
- “Breakout groups” to determine the 3 most important questions or comments that each group would like to make, facilitated by Milton Keynes Council staff.
- Each group presented the questions or comments in turn to a panel, comprising Andy Hudson and Tony Voong together with Rebecca Trowse from the Council’s Waste Planning division, Dr Steven Moorhouse from the Council’s Environmental Protection Team. and either Paul Wright (Saturday) or Emma Smith (Wednesday) from the Environment Agency.

The debates were recorded and are summarised in the next section

(xiii) Other Publicity

a) Presentations

Members of the waste management and waste planning team gave presentations on the main issues in the consultation to:

- The Local Strategic Partnership (31st August)
- MK Labour Group (5th September)
- The Parish Assembly (8th September)
- The “Grow MK” information forum for Milton Keynes Council staff and others on the future development of Milton Keynes (8th September)
- The Environmental Policy Development Committee (10th August)
- MK Conservative Group (26th September)

b) Displays

A display accompanied by short questionnaires were present –

- Throughout the consultation period at two locations in the shopping centre – Middleton Hall and Midsummer Place
- At Milton Keynes Council Managers Assembly on 14th September
- At the Milton Keynes Garden Show in the Shopping Centre on 10th September

c) Other survey distributions

Short questionnaires were distributed:

- by some Parish Councils to local residents
- by Cory Environmental to members of their workforce
- by teachers at Sir Frank Markham School and Milton Keynes College to 6th Form students
- by ACE , forming an exercise in an adult literacy class
- at Housing Offices
- at Saxon Court

d) *Radio debate*

BBC Three Counties Radio held a debate on consultation issues (summarised in the next section)

e) *Posters*

A4 or A3 Posters advertising the consultation were placed in the following locations:

- Libraries
- Civic Office
- Saxon Court
- Middleton Hall
- Midsummer Place
- Sent to all Parishes for noticeboards etc

f) *Bus Shelters*

30 large “6-sheet” posters were placed on bus shelters during the consultation period. These were moved regularly to have wide coverage around Milton Keynes.

g) *Press Release*

Press releases were used to launch the consultation, and also to announce the start of a food waste trial, which occurred during the consultation period.

Public notices were placed in the MK Citizen on 11th and 18th August 2005.

h) *Environment General Helpline*

The general environment helpline ran a message publicising the consultation while customers were on hold during the consultation period.

i) *Dedicated helpline and email address*

A dedicated helpline number 01908 254663 was set up during the consultation period to handle queries, together with an email address specifically for the consultation: yourwaste@milton-keynes.gov.uk

(xiv) Member Involvement

Presentations were given to both the Labour and Conservative Groups. All members received a CD with a hardcopy of the questionnaire. An article was included in the members weekly news. Hardcopies were put in group rooms. The 3 Counties radio debate was part of the scrutiny process. The Environment Policy Development Committee (who have the scrutiny role) have set up a Waste Review Group.

RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION

CAGOW - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Report of the Citizens' Advisory Group on Waste - CAGoW

Introduction

The following report represents CAGoW's comments, conclusions and recommendations. It represents over 750 formal hours of facilitated consultation and deliberation, and most likely the same amount again informally.

As for all other UK local authorities, waste management represents a significant challenge in the years to come. A systematic and strategic approach is essential if the challenge is to be met in ways which satisfy diverse driving forces, including those set by the European Union, the UK Government and local needs. It must do this and seek to devise a waste strategy that improves the local and regional environment. If any approach is to succeed it must engage creatively with the local community. The CAGoW process, instigated by Milton Keynes Council (MKC), provided an innovative and proactive mechanism to take account of citizen's views and opinions.

It is intended that the guidance in this report will be used by MKC as it formulates its new waste strategy.

The comments, conclusions and recommendations are set out fully in section four and are summarised here:

Zero Waste

As an aspiration it is commendable and needs to be backed up by considered actions at local and national level. All waste treatment options result in disposal needs. More infrastructure, education and incentives will be needed if more progress is to be made.

No Incineration Policy

It is unfortunate that the recent rejected application for an incinerator in Bletchley was influenced by a relatively small number of people. Modern thermal waste treatment plant is safer and more efficient and should be considered as part of a wider deliberation of new technology options. Cost benefit analysis, relating treatment options to likely fines and potential council tax increases should be carried out. This needs to be supported by a wider public education programme.

Waste hierarchy

The MK waste hierarchy seems effective and is well linked to EU and Government directives. It needs to take account of any technology or other changes at national and EU level. MKC should continue to be

active lobbyists at national level, for example to deal with the increased environmental pressure of the South East house building programme. The hierarchy needs to be enforced to ensure local residents take account of it.

Reduction in the Hazardousness of Waste

CAGoW is not convinced that this is happening. The public should be more effectively informed of what is and is not hazardous. The report sets out five questions to illuminate the issues around hazardous waste issues in Milton Keynes.

Overall good environmental practice and sustainability
The four aims set out by MKC are considered important aspirations. Thermal waste treatment should not be omitted from BPEO considerations, and regular review of associated transport options is needed to ensure good environmental practice.

Local Self-Sufficiency

With the exception of hazardous waste and some recyclables, Milton Keynes is achieving its goal of self sufficiency. The effect of planned growth must be reviewed, and opportunities for co-operation with nearby local authorities explored.

An integrated waste management policy
CAGoW believe the principles to be excellent as far as they go. Opportunities for recycling kitchen waste and excluded plastics and other varieties of waste should be investigated. More work is needed to examine modern technologies and seek guidance from other local authorities who have direct experience of such options. An inter-authority thermal waste policy should be considered.

Best value

MKC should continue to make best use of Government grants and research the market for waste plant and operator companies. There is a need to persistently lobby Government for a national policy based on European and global best practice in waste management.

Flexibility and Annual Review

CAGoW considered the existing review period to be effective. A balance between essential long (>20 year) contracts to encourage investment, and maintaining flexibility is difficult in practise but should be striven for.

Co-operation and Partnerships

Working together in partnership with other councils and, where appropriate, a diverse range of stakeholders such as environmental

pressure groups, schools and businesses is essential to foster best practice. The generic outcomes of such work should be used in the process of lobbying Government.

Educating and Influencing

The excellent work with schools and the local community should continue. Key messages should be strengthened to displace outdated public perceptions. These include “More waste = higher local taxes” and consideration of advanced technologies and their safety. Information provision should mirror these key messages with audience focus and content of promotional material reviewed regularly. Lobbying at Government level on these issues as well as the special issues surrounding local expansion by engaging the waste industry and other councils should be extended.

“New resident starter packs” should be provided routinely and include generic MK waste management information, locations of CA sites and how to recycle.

Councillors should visit CA sites from time to time to “wave the flag”.

Provision of composting facilities for council run care homes and sheltered housing should be considered.

Current targets

Despite up to 67% of MSW being recyclable, the regional target of 40% (2010) & 60% (2025) are felt to be very ambitious and have significant cost implications. In CAGoW’s opinion it is unlikely that they will be achieved without access to larger and more advanced treatment facilities.

Targets will need to be continuously assessed to take account of the expected population growth, alongside vigorous lobbying of Government. This will also mean taking into account “start-up” issues for new households, which is likely to generate more waste.

Once again, significant and effective progress is predicated on public acceptance and public participation. MKC should maintain and extend its awareness and education campaigns.

Options for dealing with waste in the future

The number of different categories of materials diverted from the waste stream should be increased to include food waste and compostables.

CAGoW considers it essential to maintain weekly collections to ensure participation rates. Sacks should be more robust and bio-degradable. Reinstatement of community skips should be investigated.

MKC should consider compulsory recycling and realistic limitations on how much waste each household may produce. This needs to be implemented with sensitivity.

Partnerships with retailers should be investigated, for example local bring sites (bottle banks, etc.) and encouraging food retailers to address packaging waste issues.

All available treatment options, including thermal and those which have potential to generate power, must be considered.

CAGoW believes that some form of thermal treatment is essential if long term targets are to be met.

Selection of Future Waste Management Sites

The long term planning for the growth of MK represents significant opportunities to ensure longer consultation, focus on MK residents needs where possible and strategic location of waste management sites in or near areas designated for expansion.

Consideration of a new facility and associated planning issues is an *urgent* priority given the finite life of the only local landfill site.

RESPONSES TO THE SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE

3,468 respondents completed the short questionnaire.

Of these, most responses were from the Citizen or the Online surveys:

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Citizen	1,977	57.0
Online	862	24.9
Short Surveys from Other outlets:		
Exhibition	50	1.4
Library	41	1.2
Council Offices	34	1.0
City Discovery Centre	24	0.7
Not specified	480	13.8
Total	3,468	100.0

2,137 respondents (61.6%) of those filling in the short questionnaire gave a postcode that was in Milton Keynes. Although there is a good spread of response amongst the Milton Keynes postcodes, there is a particularly strong response from the Bletchley area (postcodes MK2 & MK3) which together account for 18.9% of Milton Keynes residents who gave postcodes.

	Number of Respondents	Percent of those giving postcodes who live in Milton Keynes	Percent of population in Milton Keynes
MK 1	8	0.4	0.3
MK2	114	5.3	6.5
MK3	290	13.6	9.6
MK4	167	7.8	7.2
MK5	141	6.6	6.1
MK6	185	8.7	11.6
MK 7	168	7.9	6.0
MK8	114	5.3	4.6
MK9	13	0.6	0.9
MK10	70	3.3	2.9
MK11	96	4.5	3.4
MK12	83	3.9	5.1
MK13	184	8.6	8.3
MK14	147	6.9	8.6
MK15	82	3.8	8.3
MK16	131	6.1	3.0
MK17	61	2.9	1.8
MK19	9	0.4	1.9
MK43	1	0.0	0.1
MK46	71	3.3	3.9
Total answering question with MK postcode	2135	100	100
Non MK or not answered	1333		
Total	3468		

The demographics of the respondents were as follows:

Age Group, years	Number of respondents	Percent
Under 18	39	1.1
18-25	123	3.5
26-35	504	14.5
36-45	619	17.8
46-55	619	17.8
56-65	486	14.0
66+	449	12.9
Not answered	629	18.1
Total	3,468	100.0

Comparing these groups to those given in the latest Population Bulletin, it would appear that the respondents to this survey were slightly older than the adult Milton Keynes population as a whole, and the sample was especially stronger in the 46+ age group.

Age group	Number of respondents giving age	Sample %	Population %
15-17	39	1.4	5.0
18-25	123	4.3	11.0
26-35	504	17.8	19.3
36-45	619	21.8	21.0
46-55	619	21.8	17.4
56-65	486	17.1	13.1
66+	449	15.8	13.3
Total	2,839	100.0	100

It should be noted that efforts had been made to contact a younger age group by going to 6th form groups, writing to schools, consulting the YMCA and Youth Forum Development workers.

Perhaps reflecting the older ages responding to the questionnaire, respondents were also more likely to have been living longer in Milton Keynes than those in the population as a whole:

Length of time living in Milton Keynes, yrs	Number of respondents	Percent	Percent of those answering, and living in MK	Percent in MK population
Less than 1yr	59	1.7	2	5
1-3yrs	261	7.5	9	11
4-6yrs	277	8.0	10	11
7-10yrs	309	8.9	11	10
11+yrs	1,906	55.0	68	63
Don't Live in MK	32	0.9		
Question not answered	624	18.0		
Total	3,468	100.0	100	100

Type of property lived in	Number of respondents	Percent
Flat	107	3.1
Semi-Detached	812	23.4
Detached	1,115	32.2
Terrace	563	16.2
Bungalow	221	6.4
Other	41	1.2
Question not answered	609	17.6
Total	3,468	100.0

Number of adults in the household	Number of Respondents	Percent
0	3	0.1
1	625	18.0
2	1,737	50.1
3	274	7.9
4	127	3.7
5	21	0.6
6	7	0.2
7	1	0.0
8	1	0.0
10	1	0.0
22	1	0.0
Question not answered	670	19.3
Total	3,468	100.0

Number of Children in the Household	Number of respondents	Percent
0	983	28.3
1	359	10.4
2	391	11.3
3	95	2.7
4	22	0.6
5	2	0.1
8	1	0.0
Question not answered	1,615	46.6
Total	3,468	100.0

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS:

Q1 How Strongly do You Agree with the Zero Waste Strategy?

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Agree	2,471	71.3
Agree	696	20.1
Neither Agree or Disagree	98	2.8
Disagree	51	1.5
Strongly Disagree	30	0.9
Not answered	122	3.5
Total	3,468	100.0

It can be seen that 91.4% of respondents agree or strongly agree with the zero waste strategy.

Q2 Would you be prepared to separate out all your food waste for composting by putting it out for weekly collection in an enclosed bin?

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Yes	2,536	73.1
No	391	11.3
Not Sure	346	10.0
Not answered	195	5.6
Total	3,468	100.0

It appears that respondents are prepared to consider separation of food waste, though actual separation will be found when the current food waste trial has been running for longer.

Q3 What types of containers would you like to store your rubbish and recyclables?

Recyclable Materials – paper, cans and plastics

Type of Container	Number of respondents	Percent
Box	757	21.8
Plastic Sack	1,702	49.1
Wheeled Bin	748	21.6
Other	35	1.0
Not answered	226	6.5
Total	3,468	100.0

There is support for the current method of collecting paper, cans and plastics, and also glass:

Glass

Type of Container	Number of respondents	Percent
Box	2,572	74.2
Small Enclosed Bucket	317	9.1
Wheeled Bin	344	9.9
Other	34	1.0
Not answered	201	5.8
Total	3,468	100.0

Garden Waste

Type of Container	Number of respondents	Percent
Plastic Sack	452	13.0
Wheeled Bin	2,612	75.3
Other	102	2.9
Not answered	302	8.7
Total	3,468	100.0

The current method of collecting garden waste is popular:

Food Waste

Type of Container	Number of respondents	Percent
Plastic Sack	409	11.8
Small Enclosed Bucket	1,926	55.5
Wheeled Bin	640	18.5
Other	122	3.5
Not answered	371	10.7
Total	3,468	100.0

It is notable that the small, enclosed bucket would appear to be a popular choice for food waste collection, rather than a wheeled bin. However, at this stage, residents did not have a lot of information about either method of collection, currently the subject of the food waste trial.

Rubbish left after recycling

Type of Container	Number of respondents	Percent
Plastic Sack	1,855	53.5
Small Enclosed Bucket	119	3.4
Wheeled Bin	1,204	34.7
Other	45	1.3
Not answered	245	7.1
Total	3,468	100.0

The preference for type of container for residual refuse shows support for the current method of sack collection (53.5%) over the wheeled bin (34.7%). This was also shown in a similar 1999 survey when support for plastic sacks was 60.4% versus 32.5% for wheeled bins. Thus there is a little more support for wheeled bins than previously, and from the comments seen later in Question 9, it would appear that there is a vocal minority that support wheeled bins.

Support for sacks over wheeled bins varies across property type with a stronger preference for sacks in terraced housing and bungalows. There is also a strong difference by age, with those over 56 and particularly those over 66 showing a greater preference for sacks rather than wheeled bins. This may be related to the perceived difficulties of handling wheeled bins by those in the older age groups.

	Property		Total					
	Flat	Semi-Detached	Detached	Terrace	Bungalow	Other	Unknown	
Plastic sack	53.1%	55.6%	56.8%	60.3%	63.9%	62.5%	57.0%	57.6%
Small Enclosed Bucket	3.1%	3.1%	3.4%	4.1%	6.5%	5.0%	3.6%	3.7%
Wheeled Bin	43.9%	40.2%	38.5%	34.3%	27.8%	32.5%	37.0%	37.4%
Other	0.0%	1.0%	1.3%	1.3%	1.9%	0.0%	2.4%	1.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Age								Total
	Under 18	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-64	66+	Unknown	
Plastic Sack	36.1%	48.6%	46.4%	48.8%	58.0%	68.9%	74.8%	56.5%	57.6%
Small Enclosed Bucket	8.3%	5.4%	3.5%	3.1%	3.9%	2.3%	5.0%	3.8%	3.7%
Wheeled Bin	52.8%	45.0%	48.9%	47.1%	36.7%	27.3%	19.5%	37.2%	37.4%
Other	2.8%	0.9%	1.2%	1.0%	1.4%	1.5%	0.7%	2.5%	1.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q4 Incineration Policy

4a How strongly do you agree with this policy?

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Agree	1,653	47.7
Agree	741	21.4
Neither Agree or Disagree	523	15.1
Disagree	245	7.1
Strongly Disagree	195	5.6
Not answered	111	3.2
Total	3,468	100.0

4b Do you think that the incineration of household and commercial waste is safe?

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Yes	661	19.1
No	1,210	34.9
Not Sure	1,458	42.0
Total	3,329	96.0
Not answered	139	4.0
Total	3,468	100.0

The short questionnaire responses showed that 69.1% of respondents agreed or agreed strongly with the no-incineration policy. Bletchley residents (MK2&3) were particularly supportive (79.1%)

However, only just over a third of respondents (34.9%) thought it was actually unsafe. Most (42.0%) were not sure. Bletchley (MK2&3) residents, however, were much more emphatic that incineration was not safe (60.7%) with only 25.1% saying that they were “not sure”.

This perhaps this reflects a past application for an incinerator in Bletchley.

Q5 Priorities for considering treatment facilities

Please look at the list of possible considerations below and mark with a cross the 5 which are the most important to you

That the treatment facility:

Consideration	Number of Respondents	Percent
Reduces pollution as much as possible	2,454	70.8
Reduces rubbish for landfilling	2,252	64.9
Generates electricity from rubbish	1,689	48.7
Reduces climate change as much as possible	1,454	41.9
Includes extra recycling	1,249	36.0
Is of a size to treat rubbish only from MK	1,110	32.0
Can cope with future changes in rubbish legislation	1,065	30.7
Is as unobtrusive as possible	913	26.3
Uses as little energy as possible	859	24.8
Has technology that is well established	816	23.5
Costs a little as possible	712	20.5
Has as few traffic movements as possible	710	20.5
Is of a size as necessary to get economies of scale	531	15.3
Can meet all targets as soon as possible	456	13.1
Creates jobs	382	11.0
Is close to where rubbish is collected	215	6.2
Other	58	1.7

It can be seen that reducing pollution and rubbish for landfill are the top two priorities. There is then a “second tier” of priorities – generating

electricity from rubbish and reducing climate change. This also indicates confusion in public perception regarding incineration, since generating electricity is most commonly associated with incineration.

As may be expected, Bletchley (MK2 &3) residents, having stronger associations with the issue of incineration, have a different ranking. However, they still think that generating electricity is quite important and are particularly concerned that the size of the plant is such as to treat only waste from Milton Keynes.

Ranking of Q5 by in MK2 & MK3 postcodes	%
Reduces pollution as much as possible	72.9
Reduces rubbish for landfilling	62.1
Is of a size to treat rubbish only from MK	58.4
Includes Extra Recycling	43.6
Reduces climate change as much as possible	42.4
Is as unobstructive as possible	37.4
Generates Electricity from Rubbish	36.7
Has as few traffic movements as possible	34.7
Can cope with future changes in rubbish legislation	25.4
Has technology that is well established	24.6
Costs a little as possible	18.2
Uses as little energy as possible	14.5
Can meet all targets as soon as possible	12.3
Is of a size as necessary to get economies of scale	10.3
Creates Jobs	8.6
Is close to where rubbish is collected	5.7
Other	1.7

It is also significant that, to all residents, the cost of the facility is relatively unimportant, with only 20.5% thinking it is one of the top five considerations.

Q6 Sites for Waste Facilities

Where do you think sites should be?

Rank your choice in order of preference with 1 being most preferred and 7 being least preferred

	Existing Landfill %	Existing Waste Management Land Use %	Previous or existing industrial land use %	Contaminated or Derelict Land %	Agricultural and Surrounding Yards %	On or Adjoining Sewage Works %	Open Countryside %
Ranked 1	47.5	17.0	2.8	22.8	0.8	6.3	2.3
Ranked 2	18.8	39.9	7.2	13.9	1.4	9.3	0.7
Ranked 3	9.7	18.7	17.4	28.8	2.2	13.6	0.8
Ranked 4	5.7	9.1	27.4	18.5	4.1	24.5	1.2
Ranked 5	3.7	3.9	32.0	6.7	14.6	28.1	1.6
Ranked 6	2.2	2.8	3.5	1.5	63.1	8.6	4.0
Ranked 7	4.8	0.6	1.0	0.8	4.4	1.2	79.9
Not answered	7.6	8.0	8.7	7.0	9.5	8.5	9.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
average rank	2.0	2.3	3.7	2.6	5.1	3.6	6.0

As can be seen, existing landfill, existing waste management use, and contaminated or derelict land are the preferred choices., with agricultural land and the open countryside least preferred.

In MK2 and MK3, there is a difference in ranking which possibly reflects leafleting in that area by the local pressure group PALS (People Against Landfill Sites) – contaminated/derelict land is preferred, pushing waste management use and existing landfill sites into 2nd and 3rd place respectively.

	Existing Landfill %	Existing Waste Management Land Use %	Previous or existing industrial land use %	Contaminated or Derelict Land %	Agricultural and Surrounding Yards %	On or Adjoining Sewage Works %	Open Countryside %
average rank	3.4	3.1	3.9	2.4	5.3	3.6	6.1

Q7 Have you any further comments or suggestions for locations for waste management facilities?

Comments	Number of Respondents	%
Not near residential/schools/hospitals/businesses	151	4.4
Should investigate or use incineration	67	1.9
Should have good traffic access/close to main roads/no night traffic	52	1.5
Sites should be screened/unobtrusive	46	1.3
Consider wind direction	37	1.1
No incinerator	36	1.0
CA sites should be near homes	36	1.0
CA sites should have better layout	36	1.0
Should not treat waste from London/no imports/MK waste only	34	1.0
Not in Bletchley/Newton Longville	30	0.9
Should be on industrial land	29	0.8
Should be near railway/use railway	21	0.6
New/more CA sites required	19	0.5
Should not be on green/agricultural	17	0.5
Use old mines or mineral works	17	0.5
Sites should be integrated/all on one site/existing sites/ as few sites as possible	13	0.4
Better/more recycling facilities needed	11	0.3
CA sites should be east, west or south east	7	0.2
Should be in the north or at Wolverton	6	0.2
Away from nature reserves/parks	6	0.2
Should not export waste	5	0.1
New building/development should be energy efficient	4	0.1
Next to sewage works	3	0.1
CA sites should be accessible by car	3	0.1
Other comments in relation to locations	62	1.8

Q8 Should Community Recycling Centres be located close to where people live for their convenience?

	Number responding	Percent
Yes	2,096	60.4
No	722	20.8
Not Sure	485	14.0
Not answered	165	4.8
Total	3,468	100.0

Q9 Do you have any other comments?

Comment	Number responding	%
Should recycle more plastics/drinks cartons/food waste/other materials	218	6.3
Businesses should be encouraged to produce better product design/fined etc for bad product design/disposables	218	6.3
Should be more education/pr/recycling in schools/more information generally	168	4.8
Taxes/fines/penalties necessary to encourage recycling/minimisation/mandatory recycling	167	4.8
Should be more recycling/minimisation, generally	160	4.6
Do want wheeled bins/rigid containers/don't want sacks	155	4.5
Learn from other places/councils	108	3.1
Council tax refund/other reward for recycling/waste reduction	76	2.2
MK/waste management in MK is good/retain lead/be example/better than average	72	2.1
CA sites need improvements- layout/signs etc/too much queuing etc	71	2.0
Not enough pink or black sacks	62	1.8
More to be done to discourage flytipping/litter	63	1.8
Should generate electricity or investigate or use efw/incineration	60	1.7
Make recycling easier/simpler	54	1.6
More info on nappies/mention of nappy recycling plant in Holland/more should be done to reduce nappy problem	56	1.6
Businesses should recycle more of their waste	56	1.6
Should be safe/ not affect public health/not affect environment	56	1.6
Should be more/better recycling sites/banks	51	1.5
Garden waste bins/home composters should be free to all	52	1.5
Re-introduce bulk skips/skips/kangaroo/mobile facilities on estates etc	36	1.0
Should have biodegradable bags/plastic bags	31	0.9
Don't like pink sacks for recycling prefer box or wheeled bin	27	0.8
No incineration	29	0.8
More info on home composting/more home composting	21	0.6
Mixing refuse/recycling by crews or in vehicle	21	0.6
Don't want wheeled bins	21	0.6
Problems with recycling in flats	17	0.5
Concern about separate food waste collection/smell/maggots	18	0.5
Cut down on junk mail/citizen/free newspapers	14	0.4
Charge according to how much waste produced	14	0.4
Crews don't put boxes back	13	0.4
Difficulties in getting blue box	7	0.2
More info on safety of technology	6	0.2
Better facilities for disabled needed	8	0.2

Council should provide free recycling service for businesses	8	0.2
Other waste management comments	144	4.2
Other non waste management comments	23	0.7
Need to ask other questions/biased/need referendum/question value of survey etc	65	1.9

From question 7 it can be seen that ideally, and perhaps not surprisingly, residents do not want waste management facilities near them, and that traffic movements, screening and wind direction are issues that they would like taken into account. However, there is support for CA sites to be close to homes for convenience.

In this question 7 comments those saying that the Council should investigate or use incineration outweigh the “no incineration” response (Many questionnaires simply had “no incineration” written on them), though in question 9 this was reversed, again perhaps reflecting the difference of opinion on the subject.

The comments in question 9 reflect the key issues seen in other parts of the consultation – particularly the emphasis on better product design, education and incentives or taxes to encourage recycling, and the need to recycle more materials.

It would appear that although those wanting wheeled bins for refuse are still in the minority at just over a third (as seen in Question 3)

You can access all the questionnaire responses and perform your own analyses on the data collected through the waste website: www.mkweb.co.uk/waste

RESPONSES TO THE TECHNICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Thirteen technical questionnaires were returned.

The types of respondent sending back questionnaires were as follows:

Other local authority (outside Milton Keynes)	3
Resident in Milton Keynes	3
Waste Management or Minerals Companies	3
Research Organisation	1
Political Organisation	1
Community Association	1
Fire and Rescue Service	1

Most (7) of the respondents were sent the questionnaire directly;
Others downloaded it from the website or other publicly available sources.

The responses are presented in the questionnaire, as follows:

KEY ISSUE 1

Policies

Q Do you think the Council needs to change its current policies, and if so, how should they change?

Policy	Does this policy need to change? yes/no	If the policy needs to change, how should it change?
Zero Waste	Yes - 2 No - 8 Possibly - 1 NR - 2	Zero waste is not a reasonable target and fail to see how it can work in practice. The way in which the policy is presented needs to change – presenting zero waste to the public as maximising recycling can be misleading and without due regard to its environmental impact may not always be the most sustainable option. Although the aspirations of the Zero Waste are positive because it is a vision rather than practicably achievable it could lead to misunderstanding and a negative reaction from the public.
New Keynes Hierarchy	Yes - 2 No - 10 NR - 0	Not sure if it is practicable If a hierarchy is pursued, then we feel that recovery of value from waste is a more appropriate term to cover the range of waste treatment that may include MBT, AD and thermal recovery - all of which should then be evaluated under the overall good environmental practice
Reduction in the hazardousness of waste	Yes - 2 No - 9 NR - 2	Don't allow companies to make hazardous waste.

NR = No Response

Policy	Does this policy need to change? yes/no	If the policy needs to change, how should it change?
Overall Good Environmental Practice and Sustainability	Yes – 1 No – 11 NR - 1	Less waste through bad packaging and reduce the miles travelled by road to the disposal site.
Local self-sufficiency	Yes – 2 No – 10 NR - 1	More composting where possible and perhaps reuse of waste to power individual homes. Provide jointly with Beds, Bucks & Northants. Need to be self sufficient.
An Integrated Waste Management Policy	Yes – 2 No – 10 NR - 1	We need to be integrated to help the whole country Not properly integrated at present.
Best Value	Yes – 2 No – 10 NR - 1	Depends what value means. Best value should have a wider remit beyond the economic, efficient and effective to consider added environmental and social value.
Flexibility and annual review	Yes – 1 No – 10 NR – 1	To ensure the best and cheapest method is used. Achievement of this may be incompatible with the letting of long term 25 year contracts to one major company reliant on one large high capital cost waste treatment facility Always review in light of new information.
Co-operation and Partnerships	Yes – 2 No – 10 NR – 1	Trade with other local authorities who may have better methods of disposal of things like cars or white goods. It might make sense for a local authority to specialise in a method of disposal and trade with other authorities. If partners from industry are asked to make or share investment, appropriate length of contract is needed.

Policy	Does this policy need to change? yes/no	If the policy needs to change, how should it change?
		Always listen to what others have to offer.
Educating and Influencing	Yes - 2 No - 10 NR - 1	Educate children at school to they have a better understanding when they become homeowners. Also encourage discussions on local talk radio stations such as "Three Counties" and local BBC TV stations. They tend to get involved with local issues and so an ideal no cost vehicle. Major effort needed.

KEY ISSUE 2

Recycling /Composting and Recovery Targets

Q Should the Council adopt the South East Region's targets, as shown below?

	2010	2015	2020	2025
Municipal waste recovery target (includes energy recovery)	52%	74%	83%	84%
Municipal waste recycling & composting target	40%	50%	55%	60%

Yes :10

No: 3

If no, what targets do you think the Council should adopt?

The scale and rate of expansion should be inextricably linked to the council's ability to deal satisfactorily with waste that would be produced.

Targets should be based on reductions in waste to landfill on a per capita or per household basis. The govt wants MK to expand so it must make allowances for expansion when evaluating landfill allowances for future years

100% is the only target to aim for anything less is not trying and we should be mostly there by 2010, say 80%

KEY ISSUE 3-

Options for the Future

The Municipal Waste Draft Strategy has examined a range of options for handling municipal waste in the future. This is not an exhaustive list as the number of options for collection and disposal are very great.

Here are two lists of options— one of the Collection Options and one of the Treatment/Disposal Options - examined in the Waste Strategy. Please tick any options that you would definitely like to see in Milton Keynes, and cross any that you would definitely not like to see. Please add any comments by each one, and if there are other options that you would like to see, please add them to the list.

Collection options

Option Number	Recyclables collected weekly	Residuals Collection	Garden Waste Collection	Tick if definitely yes or cross if definitely no	Comments
1	Paper, cardboard, garden waste, food waste	Weekly	Weekly wheeled bin with food	Yes 4 No 5 NR 4	Insufficient width of source separation of materials for recycling by excluding glass and plastics.
2	Paper, glass, garden waste, food waste	Weekly	Weekly wheeled bin with food	Yes 5 No 4 NR 4	Insufficient width of source separation of materials for recycling by excluding glass and plastics. Glass, contaminants, composting
3	Paper, cardboard, glass, plastics, garden waste, food waste	Weekly	Weekly wheeled bin with food	Yes 6 No 4 NR 3	Weekly collection of residual waste will take the emphasis off the recycling effort. Needs the fullest possible width of recycling collectables to support it through. Glass, contaminants, composting People need encouraging to recycle and if it is collected every week that is more encouraging.

Option Number	Recyclables collected weekly	Residuals Collection	Garden Waste Collection	Tick if definitely yes or cross if definitely no	Comments
1a	Paper, cardboard, garden waste, food waste	Alternate weeks	Weekly wheeled bin with food	Yes 5 No 5 NR 2	Insufficient width of source separation of materials for recycling by excluding glass As people don't like living with their waste. Favour AWC for residuals but we consider limiting the range of recyclables collected detrimental to maintaining public participation in recycling
2a	Paper, glass, garden waste, food waste	Alternate weeks	Weekly wheeled bin with food	Yes 3 No 6 NR 4	Insufficient width of source separation of materials for recycling by excluding glass and plastics. Glass, contaminants, composting Favour AWC for residuals but we consider limiting the range of recyclables collected detrimental to maintaining public participation in recycling
3a	Paper, cardboard, glass, plastics, garden waste, food waste	Alternate weeks	Weekly wheeled bin with food	Yes 8 No 3 NR 2	Believe this to be the only option that puts sufficient emphasis on recycling. It also enables the community to participate fully in the aspiration to move to zero waste as far as possible and to support BPEO disposal options Glass, contaminants, composting Providing processing costs for combined food and garden waste are not too high
1b	Paper, cardboard, food waste	Weekly	Fortnightly, chargeable, separate from food	Yes 3 No 5 NR 5	Charging for garden waste won't give the source separation of a more complete range of compostables materials. We believe this will be needed in support of a sustainable waste management strategy going forward Favour chargeable green waste schemes as these appear to limit increases in arisings observed with free garden waste schemes as per 1a for dry recyclables
2b	Paper, glass, food waste	Weekly	Fortnightly, chargeable, separate from food	Yes 2 No 6 NR 5	Charging for garden waste won't give the source separation of a more complete range of compostables materials. We believe this will be needed in support of a sustainable waste management strategy going forward Glass, contaminants, composting Favour chargeable green waste schemes as these appear to limit increases

Option Number	Recyclables collected weekly	Residuals Collection	Garden Waste Collection	Tick if definitely yes or cross if definitely no	Comments
3b	Paper, cardboard, glass, plastics, garden waste, food waste	Weekly	Fortnightly, chargeable, separate food	Yes 4 No 5 NR 4	in arisings observed with free garden waste schemes as per 1a for dry recyclables Charging for garden waste won't give the source separation of a more complete range of compostables materials. We believe this will be needed in support of a sustainable waste management strategy going forward Glass, contaminates, composting But with AWC for residuals - to incentivise households to participate in weekly food waste collections as per 1b re garden waste

Other comments on collection options or other preferred options:

- Thought it was not possible to mix garden waste and compost due to foot and mouth. If it were not possible I think fortnightly collection of food waste would be unsanitary. Food waste should only really be left in wheelie bins as cats and wildlife tend to rip open sacks.
- Key issues: Easy to participate & accessible - through weekly doorstep collections and a wide range of recyclable materials covered by doorstep collections. Education - to secure the support of the community. Incentives - to encourage participation. Penalties/enforcement/fines for those who refuse to participate.
- Confusing error in Entec Exec summary ref 3b. We liked the apparent idea of charging for residual waste as an incentive to recycle
- Dry recyclables should be collected separately from organic/biodegradables to provide high quality compost output to PAS 100 standard for beneficial use (to ABPR standard for both green and kitchen waste i.e. utilising New Earth composting technology maximising recycling under BVP182B and LATS landfill diversion targets
- Favour 3b.
- Evidence from other schemes suggests that AWC have an important role to play in improving the weekly participation and capture of all recyclables
- No mention of metal collection. This should be included in 3

Tick your preferred choice of container for residual refuse collections:

	Wheeled bin	Refuse sack	Other, please state
If collected weekly	0	1	-
If collected alternate weeks	1	0	-
No preference	6	5	-
No response	6	7	-

- Comment: Would depend on where I lived, maybe wheeled bin for a house or refuse sack for a flat. Wheeled bins would seem better for the health and safety of waste collection staff but I would want to ask staff themselves.

Treatment/Disposal Options for residual wastes

Please tick your preferred options and cross options you definitely do not support. You can tick or cross as many as you like; all comments are welcome, and please add any other options that you would like to see

Option number	Technology	Tick if definitely prefer or cross if definitely do not support	Comments
1a	Mechanical Biological Treatment + Advanced Thermal Treatment of RDF + In-Vessel Composting of waste derived compost.	Yes 4 No 3 NR 6	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling. Post MBT compost may in any case have to be landfilled as only outlet. RDF very risky as no assured markets therefore MBT unsound. Unqualified to answer
1b	Mechanical Biological Treatment + Energy from Waste/ Fluidised Bed + In-Vessel Composting of waste derived compost.	Yes 4 No 3 NR 6	No preference Unqualified to answer Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling Post MBT compost may in any case have to be landfilled as only outlet. RDF very risky as no assured markets therefore MBT unsound. Energy from waste is incineration and low on hierarchy.
1c	Mechanical Biological Treatment + In-Vessel Composting of waste derived compost + Landfill	Yes 2 No 2 NR 9	No preference If option 1e precludes composting this is an option we would consider supporting. Have reservations due to the low grade compost that may result - would there be an outlet for it we wonder? Post MBT compost may in any case have to be landfilled as only outlet. What happens to residual waste from MBT We need to reuse more.
1d	Mechanical Biological Treatment +	Yes 2	No preference

	In-Vessel Composting of waste derived compost + RDF treated in a third party thermal facility	No 4 NR 7	Just gives someone else the problem of burning RDF. Post MBT compost may in any case have to be landfilled as only outlet. RDF very risky as no assured markets therefore MBT unsound.
1e	Mechanical Biological Treatment with residue stabilised and landfilled to comply with Landfill Directive requirements	Yes 6 No 0 NR 7	No preference This is the option we would most wish to see assuming that Front end recycling is part of the scheme. Let's have the BPEO for MK is our view. Landfill may be the only option for stabilised fraction. Needs to take place in an ABPR compliant facility to ensure no regulatory problems with disposal to landfill now or in the future. Therefore not MBT but BMT. Only UK plant that can do this on mixed MS is New Earth biological treatment facility eg Dorset
2a	Mechanical Treatment + Anaerobic Digestion of waste derived compost + Advanced Thermal Treatment of RDF + maturation of digested compost product	Yes 2 No 4 NR 7	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling Anaerobic digestion is not proven technology for mixed MSW. Compost product remains a waste according to Ea and cannot be applied to land therefore does not benefit recycling or LATS
2b	Mechanical Treatment + Anaerobic Digestion of waste derived compost and kerbside organics + Landfill	Yes 3 No 2 NR 8	No preference If option 1e precludes composting this is an option we would consider supporting. Have reservations due to the low grade compost that may result - would there be an outlet for it we wonder? No logic in mixing segregated and post – MBT organics. Why contaminate kerbside organics with other inputs
2c	Mechanical Treatment + Anaerobic Digestion of waste derived compost and kerbside organics + RDF treated in a third party thermal facility	Yes 3 No 4 NR 6	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling No logic in mixing segregated and post – MBT organic Unsound system if depends on a third party accepting RDF Ransom situation. Led to Herhoff MBT going bust as no outlet for their RDF pellets.
3a	Advanced Thermal Treatment	Yes 2 No 4 NR 7	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling At odds with waste hierarchy and not proven.
3b	Advanced Thermal Treatment (Modules at multiple sites)	Yes 1 No 4 NR 8	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling At odds with waste hierarchy and not proven.

4	Energy from Waste recovery	Yes 5 No 4 NR 4	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling At odds with the waste hierarchy
5a	Autoclave + Advanced Treatment	Yes 1 No 4 NR 8	No preference Opposed to thermal treatment options. Not recycling At odds with waste hierarchy and not proven.
5b	Autoclave + Landfill	Yes 1 No 3 NR 9	No preference Unconvinced that autoclave of residual waste would yield usable outputs. Fails recycling and LATs diversion

Other treatment/disposal option that you would like to see:

Alt 1) Biological mechanical treatment of mixed MSW to maximise bio-stabilisation and recover metals and plastics using new earth technology. Produces high LATS diversion and high recycling with low collection costs. Alt 2) Composting of source segregated green and kitchen waste (meat included). A New Earth plant can start on mixed MSW alt1 and switch capacity incrementally to segregated as council resources and need to perform on LATS dictate. Therefore maximum flexibility. Short term contract period 5 years available. Gate fee not dissimilar for landfill. A just in time solution as 12 month lead in period. Modular plants 25, 000 tonnes upwards to fulfil proximity principle. Of being close to where waste is produced. Low key buildings (agric shed appearance) fully contained with bio filters, turned and aerated housed windrows. No environmental emissions.

The complex interactions and evaluations of the treatment processes included above make tick and cross judgements not appropriate. We don't feel that any can be immediately ruled out with no preferred option. The options consultation provides some assessment of the combinations in terms of criteria and should provide a comparative evaluation. However we feel that there are assumptions within the evaluation that we would question and others that aren't explicit or transparent. (for eg see actual questionnaire). We question some of the ranking conclusions in the appraisal and feel they need to be further examined.

KEY ISSUE 4

Waste Development Plan Document principle aims

- To deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy.
- To implement and be consistent with the national waste strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the Milton Keynes Municipal Waste Strategy.
- To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the Proximity Principle and net self-sufficiency.
- To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place for the right time.
- To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents, avoiding risks to human health.
- To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development.
- To ensure the layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management.

Do you consider that these are the right principle aims? Should any of them be deleted? Are there any other aspects, which should be included?

Yes 10

No 2

Not Sure

No Response

Comments

- Would suggest the addition of the following statement of intent: That the selected waste management solution(s) will realise the BPEO for MK and surrounding area. Clear risk management policies, procedures and accountabilities will be put in place and made clear to the public regarding: Prevention, containment, clean up and aftercare for any members of the community who may have their health and well being compromised, by any incidents or accidents that may occur at any of MK's waste management facilities.
- Education to reduce waste in first place. Radical suggestion: Ban plastic carrier bags from all shops in MK and make them use a reusable hemp bag with the city logo on and advertising MK's green image
- More emphasis should be given to reducing the amount of waste that has to be disposed. More emphasis on producer responsibility
- The council could set an example by 1) managing own waste properly 2) reducing waste at source through purchasing power on suppliers

KEY ISSUE 5

Imports and Exports

Q Do you think

- That the imports and exports into/out of Milton Keynes should be in balance before 2016? 2
- That they should be in balance by 2016? 0
- That they should be in balance later than 2016? 3
- Waste should be dealt with close to where it was disposed of? 2

No response 6

Comments from respondents:

- Given the small geographical area of MK we do not feel that import/export balance should be an overriding factor in WM policy; other issues related to sustainability are more important.

Q Do you think that only waste for landfilling should be accepted from London & other local authorities?

Yes 2

No 4

Not Sure 4

No response 3

If No/not sure – why is this?

Comments:

- Acceptance of other waste would need to be considered as part of a cost benefit analysis. Any additional waste accepted should have a clear benefit to the community, if accepted.
- Milton Keynes will be fined for over dumping. It will encourage London to look at their waste strategy as dumping it on us will be the easy option. It also causes more transportation by road, which is damaging to our environment.
- Why take waste from London and other authorities?
- These procedures should be carried out close to the source of the waste arisings; we are unclear as to why we, and others have to clean up after London. Why can't London deal with it's own waste? MK should also deal with it's own waste arisings.
- Waste facilities/treatment can be shared with neighbouring Beds, Bucks, Northants provided each takes a reasonable share.
- For a limited period.
- Landfill should be phased out.

- London has to deal with its own waste and cannot off load its problem to MK.
- No waste should be accepted from London and other LAs.
- If it is the best environmental option.
- We want a balance but not entirely an LA issue.

Q Do you think that the waste for landfilling from London and other places should have been subject to recycling and other recovery processes?

Yes 13

No 0

Not Sure 0

KEY ISSUE 6

Sites for Waste Management Facilities

Q Where do you think these sites should be? Rank your choice in order of preference with 1 being the most preferred and 7 the least preferred.

Existing landfill sites	1 st - 7 2 nd - 3 5 th - 2
Existing waste management land use	1 st - 4 2 nd - 6 3 rd - 1 4 th - 1
Previous or existing industrial land use	1 st - 1 2 nd - 2 3 rd - 3 4 th - 2 5 th - 4
Contaminated or derelict land	2 nd - 2 3 rd - 4 4 th - 6
Agricultural buildings or surrounding yards	4 th - 1 5 th - 2 6 th - 9
On or adjoining sewage works	3 rd - 3 4 th - 3 5 th - 3 6 th - 3
Open countryside	7 th - 12

Q Have you any further comments or suggestions for locations for waste management facilities?

- Facilities provided should be separated from any residential and other built facilities to ensure protection from fire and other environmental hazards;
- Have assumed sites would be chosen that would not be in unacceptable close proximity to residential or rural areas
- No response - this list is too simplistic and does not reflect the new guidance in PPS 10. With suitable technology that controls emissions and low environmental impact facilities in terms of scale and building a wide range of potential opportunities for locating facilities are opened up
- Everybody should compost. It is not difficult - don't use so much packaging. Mend things rather than throw them away
- Key issues: 1) be open minded to solutions 2) reduce waste at source 3) recycle-re-use bottles 4) generate electricity

KEY ISSUE 7

Inert Arisings

Q *Currently there is a policy against landraising - should this be relaxed?*

Yes 2

No 3

Not Sure 7

No response – 1

Comments:

- Impossible to say without understanding the wider environmental impact for MK & surrounding area of such a change in policy e.g. on land drainage, flooding, visual impact, loss of amenity etc and other key planning criteria.
- But only if new publicly usable land is created e.g. open space, playing fields

KEY ISSUE 8

Layout and Design of new development

Q In new residential developments, what should be provided to the householder to increase recycling?

- Information about recycling centres and correct use and guidance for household recycling containers.
- Compostable bin liners or sacks ideally free of charge to remove objections to green/kitchen recycling.
- Household composters separate recycling collection facilities.
- Compost bins Space in kitchens to store recycling boxes water butts in gardens to collect rain for watering plants/garden..
- Space for storage of different types of materials for recycling
- Recycling provision should be integrated into house design and build (storage space inside/outside).
- Individual or communal segregated recycling facilities with guaranteed weekly disposal.
- Well maintained neighbourhood recycling banks.

Q *How could building be better to make storage and collection of waste easy?*

- Providing outside storage cupboards for waste.
- Localised collection centres.
- All houses to be built with solar panels and wind generator. All design and construction should be carried out with demolition and recycling in mind
- Make it easy for residuals to get waste and recyclables from storage to kerbside for collection.
- Depends on collection system in use, but generally speaking greater priority should be given to separation and storage facilities in building design.
- Individual or communal segregated recycling facilities with guaranteed weekly disposal.
- Internal waste disposal and enclosures for recycling receptacles.

Any further comments?

- Operational impacts of plants such as operating hours and transport movements must be sympathetic to nearby residential areas. Good practice should be followed, e.g. the setting up of representative community boards, so that any community concerns can be raised, managed and resolved in a rational and socially responsible manner.
- Central govt need to legislate to make producers and outlets responsible for the full economic cost of disposing of the waste that they introduce into the cycle, especially if it is not recyclable or compostible e.g. disposable nappies; fast food outlets; supermarket packaging; electrical goods; automobile components. An endless list it would seem. improvements would stem from design efficiency in many cases.
- We feel that, despite MKC's efforts to date, sufficient people haven't really understood the cause and effect links that mean if you don't sort out your own waste you get something undesirable e.g a massive waste processing plant near you. Anything the council can do to make this better understood & secure people's cooperation to increasing the community's collective recycling effort would help. Perhaps some initiatives in schools, web based awareness and education packages that people could access from home or local libraries supported by publicity in local newspapers, so that people know it's there, would help; along with some worked examples of what will happen to council tax bills if we don't all get on board & wk together . Such an approach may be a good combination of carrot and stick
- Any solutions chosen that have risks of damage to human health as a result either from accidents or from waste management plant activities would need to be supported by clear statements that outline the accountabilities of the waste site operators and various accountable govt enforcement agencies. In our view these would need to cover as a minimum: *prevention, containment, clean up, after care*. The waste companies and the enforcement agencies have not fared well to date locally and nationally. The Byker, Newcastle incident for e.g. strongly enforces the public perception of risk, associated with incineration of waste, due to bad operational management no matter how relatively clever the technology does or does not become.

- Should visit the New Earth Composting technology in Poole, Dorset. It is presently being expanded to 50,000 tonnes/annum.
- Education. Education, education. Reduce waste at source tax companies that use plastic bags
- Meet govt target. The bio-fuel potential of MK is substantial, MKC should lead in developing bio-fuel enterprise. It needs political recognition and support.

SUMMARIES OF THE PUBLIC DEBATES

Public Debate on 17th September

Discussion Point	Response
<p>Green Group</p> <p>The targets that have been set for biodegradable municipal waste going to landfill in Milton Keynes are linked to the growth tonnages produced in 1995.</p> <p>The population of Milton Keynes is due to expand to double its current size and will therefore be hit twice as hard. This is considered to be doubly unfair and could result in additional taxation for the residents of MK.</p> <p>The targets need to be reconsidered.</p>	<p>Paul Wright</p> <p>In my 18 years experience, most change in thinking is driven by the imposition of targets.</p> <p>In support of the landfill targets since they have resulted in a change in thought which is being policy driven by MKC Sympathy for the point made.</p> <p>Large parts of the East of England are affected by enormous growth plans over the next 10 – 15 years, which should be given consideration in regards to the targets. MKC have been campaigning for this along with other Councils.</p> <p>Environment Agency administrators the system but the targets are set by Central Government.</p>
	<p>Andy Hudson</p> <p>MKC have lobbied the Government agency responsible for setting the targets, DEFRA (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs) on a number of occasions and in conjunction with neighbouring authorities (for which a 50% growth in waste is forecast).</p> <p>To date this has been unsuccessful. There is no time to wait for a change of mind by the Government. Action must be taken quickly to avoid fines. There is light at the end of the tunnel but we need to plan for the worst-case scenario.</p>
<p>Red Group</p> <p>We should be concentrating on the source of the waste problem as opposed options of dealing with it.</p> <p>There is no good method of</p>	<p>Andy Hudson</p> <p>Why are we focusing on residual waste technology? It was emphasised in the presentation that even if we could recycle/compost everything in our waste stream, which is not</p>

	<p>dealing with waste that cannot be recycled.</p> <p>Why is so much emphasis and time given to dealing with the waste once it has arisen rather than concentrating on minimising waste by legislation or education.</p> <p>Why aren't we looking more at demand management rather than supply management?</p>		<p>possible, we would still fail to meet our allowances. Therefore we would have to treat the waste.</p> <p>There is a rule that you can apply to waste. 80% of waste is recyclable / compostable. If 80% of the material which can be recycled/composted is collected from 80% of residents, 80% of the time, it results in a 40% combined recycling and composting rate.</p> <p>Therefore, you do not achieve enough to avoid the need for some form of waste treatment.</p> <p>It is for this reason that we are looking at how over the next few years we can avoid the very severe penalties, which will be imposed if we fail to meet our targets.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Yellow Group</p>	<p>What are MKC doing to put pressure on package producers (big firms such as Currys) to reduce the amount of packaging they are using or to recover the package they are using? We heard examples of supermarkets in Europe. Here customers are able to remove packaging as they leave and the supermarket will collect it. The ASDA development at Denbigh should have this concept built in. MKC should also be making appropriate representations to large hypermarkets to introduce this concept so that we don't take packaging away or have somewhere to take it.</p>	<p>Andy Hudson</p>	<p>It is important to continue to look at waste minimisation / prevention / avoidance. MKC has identified this as something that Milton Keynes needs to do better on. There are a number of programmes currently underway, including home composting & Nappy Development Officer (lot of waste nappies are biodegradable). We do need to do more on waste minimisation. However, the reality of an increase in waste due to an increase in population is that even if we could achieve a 2-3% reduction per year through minimisation, waste would still increase. Therefore, we need to focus on what waste Milton Keynes has produced and how we are going to manage it against our allowances. MKC have modelled waste on current trends of waste growing at 2% – 3% per year but assumed that this increase will not continue and eventually there will be no increase in waste per annum per head of population. There will be an increase in the total amount of waste though. MKC are trying to persuade the Government and packaging industries so that there is less waste produced in the first place. This is very important.</p>
---------------------	--	--------------------	---

		<p>Dr Moorhouse</p>	<p>There is a health aspect. The worst time to deal with toxic materials is when they get to the treatment stage. We need an emphasis on design and manufacture that minimises the toxic materials that go into things. This cannot happen instantly. It is essential that we all put pressure on those that have the power to introduce these changes. This is therefore a National issue and not really in the Local Authority remit.</p>
	<p>Paul Wright</p>	<p>There are two issues The amount of waste we generate. A continued increase in waste that we throw away is unsustainable. The difficulty is that this is a lifestyle issue. Education has an enormous role to play in people making better choices and include the amount of waste they will produce due to their choices. New legislation on 'producing responsibility'. For many years, packaging industries have had a responsibility for recycling a percentage of waste. This is starting to have some impacts. New legislation on the disposal of motor vehicles at end of life is being introduced which puts some responsibility on the car companies. Waste electronics and electrical manufactures (e.g. washing machines, dishwashers, radios etc) are also being required to start taking responsibility for recovering these materials.</p>	

Red Group	<p>If you design a scheme where you are hoping to recycle 80% of waste from 80% of the residents, 80% of the time, but results only in 40% recycling rates, the conclusion isn't necessarily that you will have a lot of residual waste.</p> <p>The conclusion might be that you are going to have to aim for 99% compliance for 99% of the time?</p>	Holly Mills	<p>WRAP (Waste Resources Action Programme) has just introduced the Coughard Agreement whereby 13 -14 of the major supermarkets have agreed to look at the design of packaging and make it more compostable. More information is available on the Recycle Now website.</p> <p>It is fine to aim for 99% efficiency and collection etc for recycling / composting but we have to accept that there are limits. While it is fine to hope for the best you must plan for the worst.</p>
Blue Group	<p>How up to date is our information about the risks and difficulties associated with different technologies? Are we taking a realistic view of the opportunities that are now available?</p> <p>Gasification- why Didn't Tony talk about Gasification as a potential option. Bristol are actively pursuing it for completion in 2006</p>	Tony Voong	<p>The information is current since MKC are working on projects at the moment and an on-going review is in place.</p> <p>There has been lots of talk about Gasification but nothing has been built as yet. Talk is not the same as actually getting something up and running.</p>

Green Group	<p>Issue: Incineration – Concern regarding the effects on global warming & the amount of flue gas produced by the heat processes.</p> <p>Alan Watson Independent Consultants report on Bletchley, Newton Longville Incineration Project (Shanks) said that the amount of gases produced would be equivalent to 107,000 additional cars doing a 30km commute per day, which is a huge impact on global warming and will increase.</p> <p>Power generation from incineration is very inefficient at about 20% compared to natural gas generation which is 60%.</p> <p>This feeds back onto the previous point made about recycling targets. MK is not meeting the targets that other areas/ countries are. For example, Daventry hit 50% recycling in 2 years and throughout the world the figure is between 50 – 60 %. If the targets are met then we will not need to resort to the same extent to these other alternatives and in particular incineration, where there is a global warming issue?</p>	Tony Voong	<p>The impact of incineration on global warming would take many days to discuss fully.</p> <p>Incineration (burn material) does produce CO², which contributes to global warming (as does NBT). However, need to balance that with incineration you recover energy, which can be used to offset the fossil fuel you would otherwise have to burn. Therefore, it is not a simple argument. It is agreed that the efficiency of incineration is less than you get with Natural Gas. However, you need to consider that :</p> <p>i) Incineration plants are smaller than power stations and so will be less efficient ; ii) The efficiency of a modern incinerator is nearer the 30% mark, depending on budget.</p>
-------------	--	------------	---

		<p>Andy Hudson</p>	<p>Whilst there are Local Authorities that are performing better than MKC and we should learn from them, we need to put things into perspective. MKC is in the upper quartile for performance, being in the top 10% of all Local Authorities in the UK so we are doing reasonably well. In terms of international experience e.g. Canberra stating 80% recycling and composting. The performance statistics are calculated differently to those for the UK so it is not comparing like with like. Accept that we need to do better and that is a given, but what we have done in the Options & Appraisal Work, included in the Waste Strategy document, is to assume that we manage a 45% recycling and composting rate from source separation. Even with that sort of level, which is state of the art, best practice in the UK currently, the top performers are at that level and so we have met them. However, we still need treatment facilities very quickly. Also, to get to a 45% recycling and composting rate will take some time. It is not something that could be achieved overnight. Unfortunately it will take a few years.</p>
--	--	--------------------	---

		Dr Moorhouse	<p>Global Warming issue. If you take the amount of CO² generated by treating solid municipal waste in this country as a whole it amounts to only 2.4% of our national emissions. If you look at methane, which is another greenhouse gas, the scenario is worse. Approximately 27% of methane emissions come from treating solid municipal waste. Almost all of that comes from landfill and is one reason for avoiding sending biodegradable material to landfill.</p> <p>Incinerators</p> <p>In recent mathematical research, Professor Mark McCarthy came to the conclusion that in terms of local air quality, the emissions from the extra traffic generated by incinerators would have a greater impact than those from the incinerator itself. Therefore we must take things in perspective.</p>
	<p>Concern about relative timescales of the issues being discussed in this debate and the Waste Development Plan, which it is understood has to be sorted out by 2008.</p> <p>It appears from the presentation that the process we are in now will have to identify sites in time for the waste contract to be re-negotiated possibly earlier than 2008.</p> <p>Concern that the consultation on where to put waste facilities will not be provided with sufficient consultation and discussion because of the</p>	Rebecca Trowse	<p>The WDPD document is currently out to consultation at the issues and options Issues and Options Stage, which involves getting people's views on where sites should go. This is recognised as an enormous problem looking at the expense of land in the city, and finding the right location.</p> <p>The next stage of the WDPD document moves onto the Preferred Options Stage which will go through consultation for a six week period. During this stage, MKC will be looking at the whole of the current consultation process and evaluating the</p>

	<p>pressure on signing the waste contract.</p> <p>An analogy is made with Wolverton. The Minerals Development Plan for Wolverton was not resolved until planning permission had already been granted for considerable mineral extraction in Wolverton since that was the way the development was panning out.</p> <p>Concerned that the same thing will happen again i.e. that there will be sites identified for this process, whether in Wolverton or elsewhere, through the planning process. Therefore, what is the point of the WDP? How are people to get the input that it is assumed they will have in the WDP i.e. how will they be consulted?</p> <p>In MK we have a unique opportunity- greenfield developments- get the waste facilities in early and we'll remove all of the problems with NIMBYism.</p>		<p>responses from the discussion in the debates. MKC will start to try to identify sites at this stage and go out to consultation again.</p> <p>When the WDPD moves onto the next stage this will involve formulation of the WDPD for submission to the Secretary of State with further consultation and a big public examination. The Inspector will be looking at the soundness of the plan. Such issues raised like the Minerals Plan will be important to the Inspector at that stage so we will need to make sure this process is done properly. The new system is about engaging the public to formulate the plan.</p>
--	---	--	--

FLIP CHART NOTES FROM THE BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Red Group

Three key comments or questions and discussion grouped together:

- (Targets) Education – schools + other means and waste reduction e.g. packaging as a starting point.
- Waste – source rather than problem.
- Avoid disposability – return to manufacturer.
- Minimise transport and distances
- Re- use of materials at home
- (Policies)
- Out to guarantee “outlets”.
- To require % use of recyclables.
- (Sites)
- Local facilities.
- Local as possible
- Processing for recycling
- Consider transport/access to sites.
- Some processes might be optimised on regional/cross-county basis – but issues of transport.
- Waste processes are industrial.

(Options) Preference – waste minimisation
Mechanical/bio-degradable.
Careful balance of environment impact.

Green Group:

Discussion

Policy

- Constraints on system which impacts on policy – e.g. population - and-growth.
- Fight expansion because it is “stupid” (policies – central government, EU) but we in MK have to work with the central government/EU impositions.
- Need for “proportionate” targets.
- “State & the art”
- Need to become a beacon of excellence with waste – whatever that may be but cutting edge may be unproven.
- Insufficient usage – finding uses for waste products (need to be aware of).
- Incineration produces huge CO2 emission – impact on global warming – if you bury it can be inert
- Incineration is relatively more inefficient.

- Long way to go on recycling.

Targets

- Meet “imposed” targets but also challenge them.
- 30% targets quite inadequate.
- Need to look at best practice – try and achieve high targets.
- Charging e.g. Germany?
- Transparent bags not black.
- Educating people.
- Different facilities for different sites e.g. HIMOs

Sites

- Incineration is not an option.
- Incineration is an option.
- Anaerobic digestion is friendly.
- Planning process & waste strategy & will stifle debate.
- Targets/policies
- Growth tonnages targets don't take into account population growth.
- Technical issues need e.g. testing CO2 emission & impact on global warming.

Yellow Group

Three key questions or comments:

How up to date is our information about the risks and difficulties associated with different technologies?

Is the Council joined up in its waste & planning responsibilities?

How was the Council intended to involve partners, e.g. the not for profit sector, in waste management?

Discussion

- Sites
- Agree we should be self-sufficient.
- Need to develop local markets.
- Need one big treatment centre.
- Lots of local sites with local estate ownership.
- Build into new developments.
- What happens to the stuff we collect? Where is the benefit?
- People are reluctant to separate at source.

Policies

- Carrot & stick – people need to see a benefit now not in 25 years time.
- Bins for specific purposes e.g. Bruges in streets.

- Door-to-door collection v collection centres.
- Need to expand the range of things we can recycle.
- Pressure on retailers to reduce packaging e.g. carrier offered for newspapers!
- Return waste packaging to shop
- “Unpackaging” options in supermarkets with bonus points.
- Refunds on bottles.
- Separate collection – litter, cans, paper etc. bins in street.
- Suppliers to be more responsible
- Recollect packaging
- Built into ASDA development
- Use less packaging

We need to make easy for people and give them immediate benefits.

Public Debate of 21st September 2005

Summary of the Debate

The “yellow” group’s questions about incinerators started off the debate.

A number of the audience declared that they were from the pressure group “PALS” which are opposed to incinerators, and are based in Bletchley. It was evident that there is a particular distrust of incinerators by this pressure group, who fear that such a treatment plant may be located on Bletchley landfill, and which may affect their health. It was stressed that no such decisions on locations had been taken.

Dr Steve Moorhouse (who lives in Milton Keynes) stated that the effects of the management of municipal solid waste upon public health are considered to be minimal. However, members of the audience stated that they distrusted such evidence as is available and feared that although there was little evidence now, harmful effects that are not known about could become evident in the future; an example of Corby Steelworks site was given.

Regarding the issue of the size of incinerators, Tony Voong explained that incinerators could be built to accommodate a range of throughputs, but that generally, the larger the throughput the less the cost per tonne.

Generally it was felt that it was best way to reduce the amount of waste was at source, and in particular to reduce hazardous materials that may enter the waste stream. The issue of packaging waste and the necessity of retailers and other producers to reduce the amount of packaging they produce was thought very important. More producer responsibility was thought to be essential.

There was discussion around sites and locations for waste management facilities and Emma Smith from the Environment Agency clarified how the Environment Agency took into account factors such as the type of soil (clay etc) involved.

A question was asked regarding which option had been evaluated as being the “BPEO” – “the best practicable environmental option” – a calculation taking into account social and environmental factors weighted by local stakeholders. Andy Hudson replied that the BPEO had been evaluated as being stabilised MBT. Regarding MBT, the question was raised of whether an MBT plant would work if work if the householder separates recyclables at the doorstep. Tony Voong replied that most MBT plants could handle materials which had been subject to a significant amount of front end recovery, as is assumed will happen in Milton Keynes.

A question was asked regarding whether the Council should oppose expansion without the necessary infrastructure. Since this is a political question, officers were reluctant to answer. However, John Moffoot clarified that the Council's policy at present is to welcome growth provided that the necessary infrastructure is provided.

Notes from the Breakout Sessions

Green Group

Three key questions or comments

Targets

- MK should have targets that are realistic and that reflect growth per head, not per household, or per town and based on 1995 figures as they are now.
- Options – we should emphasise reduction of waste that has to be treated as the residual MSW. Concentrate on reducing, reusing and recycling.
- We should lobby for reduction in packaging. Producers of packaging should be responsible for its disposal.

Discussion

Targets:

- MK should have targets that reflect to growth, should be per head, not per household – young pops have smaller household than average.
- Targets should be easily reachable.
- Growth means that we are treated unfairly.
- Targets must be compatible with zero waste policy. Reuse, recycling targets must be increased – target FRONT end of process.
- What is in black bag? Batteries, toxic materials.

Options:

- Compulsory recycling (USA, Germany) but poorer people recycle less and can't pay fines
- Collection facilities should be use-friendly.
- Charge per kilo? It may encourage fly tipping. Incentives would be better.
- Packaging should be reduced and recyclable.
- Producers of the packaging should be responsible for disposal. Not householders.
- We don't like any of the back and treatment.
- The main thing is to minimise what goes into black bags.

- Much front end depends on front packaging, maximising recyclables in production.
- Use real nappies can be 50% of bag.

Yellow

Three key questions or comments

- Need resources to support expansion
- Targets appropriate
- Reduce the amount of waste
- Education
- Increase recycling options
- Incinerator questions:
- Toxins in the residue?
- Does it need to take more than MK's waste to operate
- What might be the effect on people's health?

Discussion

Options:

- Problem is new 10,000 new houses without infrastructure – say no to expansion.
- Quite a lot of people will not be registered electoral elections.
- 30% affordable houses only 18,500 tariff – 10% high cost: proportionally more waste.
- Producer responsibility – are the manufacturers responsible?
- Need MK council to lead a culture change.
- Like the incineration put bark on the table.
- Would an incinerator need to have waste from outside MK to make it work?
- Education
- Increase in recycling is not good if the total amount of waste increasing.
- Must stop producing waste
- Penalty system for not recycling. Only hitting people in the pocket leads to change.
- Why can only certain materials be recycled?
- More options that were presented.
- Current landfill site is noisy and smelly.
- Deal with nappy waste as recyclable.
- Nappies are clinical wastes.
- Mixed view about incineration.

Blue Group

Three key questions or comments

- Which option provides lowest risk to public health
- Evidence?
- Perceived?
- Want more bins (not bags) make it easy. Every week collection.
- Retailer policies – enforce low packaging (zero targets).

Discussion

- Food waste collection – define?
- If asking public to do something – got to be simple.
- More recycling collections.
- Education (some care & recycle)
- MKC seen to act publicly (street bins for recycle)
- Which technological solution presents best environmentally practicable option? If so would it deliver on targets?
- What kinds of sites have in mind? (near, where for what?)
- Incinerator at least 500 m from residential developments.
- Support no incineration (mistakes)
- Support zero waste.
- Examples of incineration errors.
- Doesn't reflect modern technologies.

Options:

- Incineration
- Gasification/pyrolysis
- MBT (various) anaerobic digestion, autoclaving

Question: How up to date is the info/data used.

Red Group

Three key questions or comments

Does an MBT plant work if the householder separates recyclables at the doorstep?

Need to educate people better.

Need to make producers accountable.

Discussion

Sites

MRF composting facilities

Bletchley landfill.

Broughton Barn.

Caldecot Farm.
Passenham Quarry.
CRS Bleak Hall, N/P, N/B.
Cotton Valley.
Bletchley has 10 years life, 750 lorries per day.
Find the site now in new development areas before people move in.

Policies

- Council has no incineration policy “until the public thinks it is safe.
- Switzerland everything is incinerated.
- Need more info about health risk of incineration.
- Italy recycles 90% of its waste, how?
- Need to reduce packaging, shouldn't be consumers' problem, should be manufacturers'/retailers' problem,
- McDonalds should have 2 bins – 1 for recyclables,
- Australia everything (plastics) is numbered according to its recyclability.

Black Group

Three key questions or comments

- Whatever option is chosen work with other LA's/companies regionally and nationally to achieve economies of scale/ min negative impact.
- Need to know costs / benefits each of the options clearly (need to know main waste stream).
- Discounts/enforcement/ charging/ incentives/reward.

Discussion

- Need an incinerator
- Don't need an incinerator
- How does it (the incinerator) affect e.g. people health, local transport?
- Public doesn't feel they know enough about the costs/benefits of the incinerator (general consensus on this from group).
- Greater education about waste mgt/individual responsibility (especially adults!)
- Better enforcement (but may take time).
- Need to know more about other options (i.e. other than incineration).
- Could there be a combination or “mix” of options?
- Better management of landfill (e.g. noise pollution etc).
- Need to think regionally/nationally in terms of policy development/decisions (as it may impact on MK).
- Transport is key to effective waste mgt.

- Choice of site is key to making incineration consider using: industrial site, derelict site, contaminated site (not “reusable”). Minimise impact on the residents (as no one will want it in their backyard).
- Maximise recycling.
- Work with manufacturers to reduce waste esp. that which cannot be recycled.
- Call the Council/approach further supermarkets to give incentives for recycling and waste minimisation.
- Need to limit amount of waste generated.

RESPONSES BY LETTER

Twenty letters were received through the waste consultation process. Of these letters one was from a neighbouring authority; one from a landowner; four from a waste company/consultancy; 3 from government agencies; 3 from local residents; one from a community organisation; one from a MK organisation; one from a MK town council; one from a MK councillor; one from a neighbouring parish council; and two from transport agencies.

A few responses just expressed an interest in the process and wished to be kept informed.

Below summarises the responses into categories:

Municipal Waste Strategy Principles

Zero Waste

Zero waste was not flagged up as a key consideration in the Waste Development Plan Document issues and options document. (neighbouring local authority)

The use of the terminology can be confusing as commonly it would be taken to mean no waste. It is contradicted by statements made on page 40 of the MWS. (neighbouring local authority)

Zero waste is commendable as a target. Government policy recognises that, whatever waste management techniques are employed, there will still be residual waste arisings and that landfill will therefore continue to be a necessary element of waste management in the UK even after all targets have been met. In reality 'zero waste' is likely to be 'minimum waste'. (waste company)

Waste Hierarchy

Broadly supports the principles of the waste hierarchy. (landowner)
Self-Sufficiency

Broadly supports the principle of local self-sufficiency. (landowner)

The Council should consider all potential options for the management of municipal waste arisings within Milton Keynes before considering cross-border movement of waste. (landowner)

Strongly support the principle aims of the WDPD, particularly the need that waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the Proximity Principle and net self-sufficiency. (landowner)

Whilst this should be encouraged, Bletchley Landfill Site will attract waste from further a field in accordance with Waste Management Policy for the South East. (waste operator)

Failure to import waste would severely restrict the rate of filling and would thus prejudice the end date for operations at the site. (waste company)

The proximity principle is supported, but the constraints imposed by the objective of the net self-sufficiency in respect of commercial and industrial waste could lead to problems of finding suitable sites in the authority's area. (waste company)

Education

Need a general aim of transparency - this should include letting people know what happens to their waste. Suggest the use of transparent waste bags, which would make people realise the implications of waste and also might be greater encouragement to recycle. (Councillor)
Educate young people. (local resident)

Targets

There is no justification for adopting different targets to those of the South East. Anything more onerous would be unrealistic, whilst lesser targets would not accord with regional policy and national guidance. (waste company)

Contracts

Short-term contracts are unlikely to justify the investment necessary to secure the development of waste management facilities. (waste company)
Collection

Wheeled bins

Wheeled bins will not work in Wolverton (many of the houses are terraced) and will not encourage recycling. (Councillor)
Incentives/penalties

The Council should not introduce a charge for bulky items, as this will increase the likelihood of fly tipping. The Council should use more fixed penalty notices and prosecutions against fly tippers. (MK Parks Trust)

There should be incentives for recycling. (MK Parks Trust)

Householders should be charged for collection of black bags. (local resident)

Business Waste

Consideration should be made about encouraging businesses to recycle. (community organisation)

There should be more done to support businesses to recycle. (MK Parks Trust)

Waste Streams

Hazardous waste

The management of hazardous waste and clinical waste should be an important part of the Core Strategy as it is such a specialist issue. The text only mentions asbestos waste, which is exported long distances and is contrary to the policy to find sufficient sites and ensuring waste is disposed off as near as possible to its source. (neighbouring local authority)

Construction and demolition waste

The document highlights the growth within the sub-region, however it does not indicate how it intends to deal with construction and demolition waste arising from the growth. (neighbouring local authority)

Inert waste

Concern about the amount of inert material generated in Milton Keynes. It is considered that 1,000,000 – 1,250,000 million cubic metres could arise from Milton Keynes. Considers that doesn't appear to be any other source of disposal accept for land raise in the form of noise attenuation bunds and mounding of golf courses. The proposed bund in the eastern expansion area will be required to be built more quickly to facilitate development of the houses to shield and therefore, for that reason and its close proximity to the motorway will attract a lot of material from other areas. (waste consultant/company)

In the list of existing landfill sites, it should be noted that Broughton Barn is nearly full and will not provide capacity after May 2006. (waste company)

Some predictions should be made of the likely volumes that will need to be disposed of each year. Then an assessment should be made of where this waste can be disposed off. This analysis will help to answer the question posed about the policy on landraising. Inert waste disposal will be a major issue for the authority in the future, as landfill capacity reduces. (waste company)

Wood waste

Would like to see a market locally for woody arisings. Would be keen to explore options for establishing a site where we could store, dry and process our woody arisings, perhaps alongside a waste plant (energy

generation). V8 reservation at Fenny Lock is a possible site, there maybe others. (MK Parks Trust)

Treatment Options

Incineration

The exclusion of incineration may prejudice the zero waste philosophy in that it is probably the most effective way to secure maximum treatment of waste. (waste company)

Public perception is a planning consideration, but it is not a sound reason for refusal of an application unless it is well founded. The test should not be whether the public is convinced, but whether the Health Impact Assessment demonstrates an acceptable situation. The no incineration policy is inconsistent with the Health Impact Report prepared by the Council. (waste company)

A 'Review of Environmental and Health Effects of Waste Management' was published by DEFRA in May 2004 and gives no support for a 'no incineration' policy. (waste company)

Unless existing local markets can be found for the RDF, MBT must be combined with a thermal treatment process to recover energy from the RDF. (waste company)

What are the grounds and what is the evidence that guides your current Council policy that incineration is unsafe? (MK town council)
Strongly agree with no incineration policy and consider that it is not safe. (local resident)

Strongly oppose incineration and do not think it is safe. (local residents)

Alternatives to incineration

Waste Derived Fuel and pyrolysis. (local resident)

Landfill

There will remain a future need for the provision of suitable landfill facilities to dispose of residual waste. Therefore Bletchley Landfill Site is an extremely valuable resource that should be retained for the management of local residual municipal wastes produced by Milton Keynes. Although MK has a relatively large supply of landfill capacity compared to other areas, its capacity is rapidly diminishing. Given that other existing landfill sites in Bedfordshire are likely to close in the near future, and the role of MK as a major growth area, Bletchley landfill should be used to deal with local residue waste. The importance of protecting existing landfill resource is further reinforced by the limited number of sites that are potentially suitable for landfill, new acceptance criteria and the

strict environmental controls placed upon the development of new landfill sites. The continued use of the Bletchley Landfill facilities for the disposal of wastes from London and other parts of the region is not sustainable use of scarce landfill resources and will lead to a future requirement for waste to be transported over greater distances to other locations. (landowner)
General

The Council's five priorities when considering the treatment facilities for the rubbish left over should be: is of a size to treat rubbish only from MK; reduces pollution as much as possible; has as few traffic movements as possible; reduces rubbish for landfilling; and includes extra recycling. (local resident)

The Council's five priorities when considering the treatment facilities for the rubbish left over should be: extra recycling; unobtrusive as possible; reduces climate change; has as few traffic movements as possible; reduces rubbish for landfilling; and can cope with future changes in rubbish legislation. (local residents)

Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy

A clearer reference to the MKSMSRS will allow the reader a clearer understanding of the wider spatial impacts. There is no indication of how the MKSMSRS will be implemented. (local neighbouring authority)

Sites

Location of further waste management facilities within or adjacent to existing landfills would result in potential benefits both environmentally and financially. (waste company)

Bletchley Landfill Site with substantial new development planned on adjacent land makes it an ideal location to consider some form of thermal treatment with combined heat and power. (waste company)

A site should be found in the middle of the Atlantic, but certainly not anywhere near Bletchley. (local resident)

Bletchley Landfill Site should not be used for a future waste management facility. (local residents)

Layout and design should go further to allocate locations for new waste management facilities. (neighbouring local authority)

The Council should look to allocate and acquire land to provide for the wide range of waste developments that will be needed to serve the City. In addition, priority should be given in the short term to medium term to facilitate urgent development on a) landfill sites, which are not suitable for competing, higher value development and b) in association with existing commercial uses in the countryside, e.g. farms, small businesses, which

are far enough from the built up area that they will not be surrounded by new development in the next 10-20 years. (waste company)

Consider the options for the location of waste facilities do not offer a palette of options to be pursued. Some small scale local facilities and larger scale biomass facilities. (GOSE)

Detailed Site considerations

Regard should had to the DfT circular 4/2001, Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Agreements with Developers under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. This sets out the Government's advice on its policy on the control of development affecting trunk roads. The Agency would be concerned about any site that would adversely impact on the M1 and A5 in terms of additional traffic. (The Highways Agency)

It is necessary to consider the impacts of the waste site on the environment during construction, during the period of use and in the period when the site is no longer in use. When considering sensitive receptor sites it is necessary to think about the impacts of the following: leachate; emissions to the air, dust, noise and disturbance especially near sites supporting wintering birds. These factors can impact on the quality of surface water and ground water, hydrology and air quality. Both direct and indirect impacts on nature conservation should be considered. (English Nature)

Locations unsuitable for waste related development are statutory designated sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Ancient Woodland Sites and locally designated sites such as Buckinghamshire Country Wildlife Sites. (English Nature)

Site Restoration and Aftercare

When deciding what a site should be restored to it is important to consider what was there before and what the surrounding habitats and land-uses are. However when waste sites are restored they can be restored into good quality wildlife habitats even if the site did not previously have any wildlife value. By creating new wildlife sites, it fulfils some of the Habitat and Biodiversity Action Plan targets. And an opportunity to fulfil government, 'People and Wildlife' targets (benefits of accessible wild space on the quality of life and health of the population in the surrounding area). (English Nature)

Consider the issues and options for site restoration is a matter that we would suggest should have been part of this document. (GOSE)

General comments

It is acknowledged that the problems with waste are very real and people do need to take action now and every household and working unit should

play their part in every way there is to recycle as much as possible. Mid Bedfordshire District Council are working hard to reduce levels of waste throughout the area and the Parish Council is committed to do what it can to promote the message to recycle wherever possible. (neighbouring parish council)

General WDPD comments

The DPD should be in general conformity with the current Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG 9) and take account of the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the emerging Draft South East Plan. (SEERA) In the final document we would expect to see a more detailed discussion of the issues surrounding wildlife sites/protected species in relation to site identification for waste management facilities and reference to Planning Policy Statement 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. (English Nature)

Consider that future DPDs – issues and options, local planning authorities should focus on the identified key issues and the evaluation of all alternative options rather than trying to justify certain options, such as a no incineration policy. (GOSE)

Suggest that the waste issue should be looked at in broader terms and linkages should be identified with other issues, such as economic and housing growth. You may need to consider the linkages to producing renewable energy, the creation of new markets for recycled products and the use of the countryside. The issues facing Milton Keynes should have been set out. It is not clear whether the overall waste strategic issues are to be set out in the Council's Core Strategy. (GOSE)

Waste transport infrastructure should have been considered as part of the document. (GOSE)

Concern that MWS objectives are being used as plan objectives. This could have implications for the soundness of the Plan. For example, the no incineration policy may be something the Council currently pursues but the whole purpose of the issues and options stage is to consider all the options. (GOSE)

The Plan period should be considered. (GOSE)

Public Engagement

It is vital that consultation is held as early as possible with residents of Milton Keynes as to what sort of facility will possibly/probably be built in a particular place. There is no point in having a vague and generic consultation and then leaving it to the normal planning process to do the rest when applications come in. (Councillor)
Process

Concern raised regarding the process leading to the new waste contract and the Waste Development are not running hand in hand. Concern that sites will be granted permission before the WDPD is finalised and thereby short circuiting the consultation possibilities. (Councillor)

General Consultation Comments

Maps

The use of maps outlining key settlements and the existing waste facilities that are referred to would allow the reader a clearer understanding of the spatial relationships and catchment areas of new facilities. (neighbouring local authority)

Thursday Citizen

Excellent idea to use the Tuesday Citizen for the survey, however it is not delivered to every household, whereas the Thursday Citizen does have a wider circulation. (community organisation)

Your Survey

It would have been a good idea to distribute Your Survey to every household in the Milton Keynes area. (local resident)

KEY THEMES FROM 3 COUNTIES RADIO DEBATE

- Educating people about recycling
- Food waste trial and composting
- The problem of disposable nappies
- Reduction of waste in the first instance
- CO₂ emissions from incinerators
- 'Locking' CO₂ into buildings
- Needing leadership from Govt on recycling and reduction of waste
- Packaging in general
- Incentives/charges for those who do/don't recycle
- Free newspapers

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - CAGOW REPORT –

Please see the attached separate document.

APPENDIX 2 - TEXT OF SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE

“Your Waste Your Cash Your Choice”

“Your Waste, Your Cash, Your Choice” a consultation document about the future of waste management in Milton Keynes (insert translations)

This questionnaire is to find out what you think about how the Council should handle your rubbish.

Each household is generating more rubbish every year. As the city grows and if we keep consuming more, the rubbish we generate could double by 2020.

Last year we dealt with over 124,000 tonnes of rubbish, enough to fill the Xscape Building. Each household produces over a tonne of rubbish every year and much of that could be recycled!

From 2005 the Council has been given limits for the amount of rubbish it can put into landfill.

If we go over these limits we will be fined £150 per tonne. If every person in Milton Keynes continues as they are today, our city could be fined up to £11m a year. This could mean an increase in Council Tax of over £100 for every house in Milton Keynes just for waste.

We all need to change. We all have to reduce the amount of waste we produce and recycle and compost more.

Fill this in and return to the Freepost address and you will be entered into a FREE PRIZE DRAW TO WIN: Theatre Tickets, 5 sets of Family tickets to Cineworld, A Family Ticket to any MK Dons home match, Shopping vouchers for the Centre:MK, and a family ticket for tobogganing at the Exscape.

Thank you to the above companies who generously donated these prizes. You have until 30 September 2005 to let us know your views

This survey can be sent by post to:

Your Waste Your Cash Your Choice, Milton Keynes Council, Freepost MK1466, PO Box 113, Milton Keynes, MK9 3YZ

or fill it in on line at www.mkweb.co.uk/waste

To see the whole picture and the events that are taking place during this period:

Log on to www.mkweb.co.uk/waste or

Email yourwaste@milton-keynes.gov.uk or

Telephone 01908 254663 or Fax 01908 252330 or

Write to “Your Waste Your Cash Your Choice”, Milton Keynes Council, Freepost MK1466, PO Box 113, Milton Keynes, MK9 3YZ

The Council can help you understand this document in your own language or by large print or Braille. Please complete and return the section below with your name, address and preferred language. Translations.

The questionnaire is a part of the process of the Municipal Waste Strategy and Waste Development Plan Document consultation. The Municipal Waste Strategy determines how your waste is managed. The Waste Development Plan Document guides where waste facilities should be located.

Your views are important to us. We need to know what you think.

Zero Waste

The Council currently has a ‘Zero Waste’ Strategy. This means maximising recycling and composting - all residents must separate their rubbish for recycling. Everyone must also reduce the overall amount of rubbish they produce.

How strongly do you agree with the Zero Waste Strategy? (please tick)

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Food waste

Food waste makes up 15% of household waste.

Would you be prepared to separate out all your food waste for composting by putting it out for weekly collection in an enclosed bin? (please tick)

Yes

No

Not sure

Rubbish Collection

What types of containers would you like to store your recyclables and rubbish? Please tick as applicable
(the areas greyed out show when the container would be unsuitable for the type of waste)

	Recyclable (Paper, cans, plastic)	Glass	Garden waste	Food waste	Rubbish left over from recycling.
Box					
Plastic sack					
Small enclosed bucket					
Wheeled bin					
Other, please state					

Incineration

It is current Council policy that, 'the council are currently opposed to the incineration of commercial and household waste anywhere within the Borough of Milton Keynes and will maintain this position unless or until such time as residents are convinced that it is safe'.

4a How strongly do you agree with this policy? (please tick)

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4b Do you think that incineration of household and commercial waste is safe? Tick as applicable

Yes
No
Not Sure

5 Priorities for considering treatment facilities

Due to new legislation, even if we recycled or composted as much as we can, the rubbish left over will still need to be treated before it can be landfilled.

When considering the treatment facilities for the rubbish left over, what should the council's priorities be?

Please look at the list of possible considerations below, and mark with a cross the 5 which are the most important to you

That the treatment facility

includes extra recycling	
generates electricity from the rubbish	
is of a size to treat rubbish only from Milton Keynes	
is of a size as necessary to get economies of scale	
reduces the rubbish for landfilling as much as possible	
costs as little as possible	
is as unobtrusive as possible	
reduces pollution as much as possible	
has as few traffic movements to and from the facility possible.	
reduces climate change as much as possible	
creates jobs	
uses as little energy as possible	
has technology that is well-established and understood	
can cope with future changes in rubbish, legislation etc	
is close to where the rubbish is collected	
can meet all targets as soon as possible	
Other, please state.....	

Sites for waste facilities

Due to the expansion of Milton Keynes and the need to treat waste in new ways, it is likely that more sites will be needed for waste management in Milton Keynes in the future.

6. ***Where do you think these sites should be? Rank your choice in order of preference with 1 being the most preferred and 7 the least preferred.***

Existing landfill sites	
Existing waste management land use	
Previous or existing industrial land use	
Contaminated or derelict land	
Agricultural buildings or surrounding yards	
On or adjoining sewage works	
Open countryside	

7. ***Have you any further comments or suggestions for locations for waste management facilities?***

8. ***In your opinion, should community recycling centres (tips) be located close to where people live for their convenience?***

Yes

No

Not Sure

9. ***Do you have any further comments?***

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. Your views are important to us.

Please help us with a few more details about yourself and we can enter you in to our prize draw.

Your name:

.....

Your address:

.....

.....

.....

Email:

Telephone:.....

Where did you pickup this leaflet from – please tick:

- Council offices/library/
- Exhibition/City
- Discovery Centre

Other – please name.....

How many adults live in your household – please state?

.....

How many children (under the age of 18) live in your household – please state:

.....

How old are you? Please tick.

- Under 18
- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66 and above

How long have you been living in Milton Keynes?

.....

What type of property do you live in? Please tick.

Flat

Semi detached/

Detached

Terrace

Bungalow

Other - please state:

APPENDIX 3 - LIST OF CONSULTEES RECEIVING CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS/ CD ROM

ORGANISATIONS WHO RECEIVED A CD OF THE CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS (ORGANISATIONS WHO RECEIVED A HARD COPY ALSO)*

Those in BOLD TEXT have responded

Government Agencies
Department of Environment Fisheries and Rural Affairs*
Office of the Deputy Prime Minister*
East of England Development Agency
East of England Regional Assembly
East Midlands Development Agency
East Midlands Regional Assembly
English Heritage*
English Nature*
English Partnerships*
Environment Agency*
Government Office for the East Midlands
Government for the South East*
Government for the East of England
Health & Safety Executive
Milton Keynes Partnership*
Ministry of Defence
South East England Regional Assembly*
South East England Development Agency

Town and Parish Councils

Astwood and Hardmead
Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council
Bow Brickhill
Bradwell
Bradwell Abbey
Broughton & Milton Keynes
Campbell Park
Castlethorpe
Central Milton Keynes
Clifton Reynes & Newton Blossomville
Cold Brayfield
Emberton
Gayhurst
Great Linford
Hanslope
Haversham cum Little Linford
Kents Hill & Monkston
Lavendon

Little Brickhill
Loughton
Moulsoe
New Bradwell
Newport Pagnell
North Crawley
Olney
Ravenstone
Shenley Brook End
Shenley Church End
Sherington
Simpson
Stantonbury
Stoke Goldington
Stony Stratford
Walton
Wavendon
West Bletchley
Weston Underwood
Woburn Sands
Wolverton & Greenleys
Woughton
MK Assoc. of Local Councils
MK Assoc. of Urban Councils

Parish Meetings

Calverton
Chicheley
Filgrave and Tyringham
Lathbury
Warrington

Neighbouring Local Authorities

Association of Councils of the Thames Valley Area
Aylesbury Vale District Council
Bedfordshire County Council
Borough of Wellingborough
Buckinghamshire County Council
Mid Beds District Council
Northamptonshire County Council
South Beds District Council
South Northants District Council
Stony Stratford Community Association

Political

All MKC Members and Alderman
The Conservative Party

The Green Party
The Labour Party
The Liberal Democrat Party
Conservative Party MEP Office
Green Party MEP Office
Labour Party MEP Office
Liberal Democratic Party MEP Office
UK Independence Party MEP Office
Mr Mark Lancaster MP
Dr Phyllis Starkey MP

Environmental/Countryside

BBONT
Council for the Protection of Rural England
Countryside Agency
Country Land and Business Association
Country Landowners Association
English Nature
Forestry Authority
Forestry Commission
Friends of the Earth
GOSE- MAFF and Rural Team
MK Energy Agency
Milton Keynes Natural History Society
National Farmers Union
Nature Conservation in Buckinghamshire
RSPB Central England
Wolverton & District Archaeological & Historical Society

Transport

British Rail Property Board
British Waterways
Highways Agency
MK TAG
MK Transport 2000
Network Rail
Strategic Rail Authority

Utilities

Anglian Water Services Ltd
Buckingham & River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board
British Gas Properties
British Gas Southern
British Pipeline Agency
British Telecommunications
East Midlands Electricity
MK Energy Agency

National Power
TRANSCO

Business Interest

MK Economic Partnership
MK & North Bucks Chamber of Commerce
Newport Pagnell Business Association
Newport Pagnell Partnership
Olney Chamber of Trade
Olney Development Partnership
Stony Stratford Business Association
Wolverton Business Association
Wolverton Partnership

Local Strategic Partnership

Mr Bruce Abbott, Community Representative
Mr David Ansell, Learning and Skills Council
Ms Navrita Atwal, Minority Ethnic Communities, MK Racial Equality Council
Mr Rob Badcock, Milton Keynes College
Ms Kate Bennet, Manager of Volunteer Connexions
Mr D Child, Lesbian & Gay Link
Mr Robert de Grey, CMK Partnership
Mr B Dugdale, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire and Rescue
Ms Jenny Henderson, Disabled People
Mr C Jones, Youth Forum Development Worker
Ms Barbara Kennedy, Joint Health & Social Care Board, Milton Keynes Primary Care Trust
Wendy Lehmann, Citizens Advice Bureau
Mr John Liversidge, Crime & Community Safety Partnership, Thames Valley Police
Sean McDermott, Youth Forum Development Worker
Ms Cheryl Montgomery, English Partnerships
Mr Stephen Norrish, (Interfaith MK Representatives), The Christian Foundation
Mr Ian Revell, YMCA
Mr David Rumens, Milton Keynes Association of Local Councils
Mr Andrew Peck, Business Leaders Association
Ms J Scott, Milton Keynes Theatre and Gallery Company
Julia Seal, MK Community Foundation
Mrs Ruth Stone, Milton Keynes Council of Voluntary Organisations

Waste Companies/Consultants

Abitibi Consolidated Recycling Europe
Accord Environmental Services
Age Concern
Aggregates Industries UK Ltd

Ampthill Metals
Biffa
Chartered Institute for Waste Management
Cory Environmental
Cotton Fresh
Cumfy Bumfy
Cutts Brothers
DK Symes Associates
Environmental Services Association
F & R Cawley Ltd
Fosca
Frosts Garden Centre
GP Pawson Planning
Green Composting Services Limited
Hanson Aggregates
Hartigan Trading Ltd
Ian Smith Construction
John Drake & Co
Kilvington Associates
Kirby and Diamond
Lafarge Aggregates
Land Network (Boxon) Ltd
Lollipop
Material Change Ltd
Matthews & Son
O & H Properties Ltd
Oakdene Hollins Ltd
Onyx Environmental Group plc
Pearce Recycling Company Ltd
Peter Bennie Limited
RMC (Cemex)
Robinson & Hall
Samuel Rose
Shanks Waste Services Ltd
SITA UK Limited
T Taylor
Terra Eco Systems
TGR Williams & Son
W Needham & Sons
Wardell Armstrong
Waste Recycling Group
WRAP
Wyn Thomas Gordon Lewis

Other (local)

Bucks Community Action
City Discovery Centre
CAGOW

GEMK
Haversham and Linford Residents Association
Land owners/tenant farmers
MK Forum
Milton Keynes General Hospital
Milton Keynes Parks Trust
Milton Keynes Play Association
Olney Development Partnership
Open University Library
Open University
PALS
Stony Stratford Community Association
Tenant farmers of MKC small holdings
Waste Forum
Wolverton Partnership

Other (National)

British library
House Builders Federation
Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance
Royal Town Planning Institute
SEERAWP Chair

Internal Officers

Assistant Chief Executive (Governance & Finance)
Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy & Performance)
Business Support
Chief Building Control Surveyor
Chief Environmental Health Officer
Chief Executive
Corporate Director Environment
Corporate Director Learning and Development
Corporate Director Neighbourhood Services
Countryside & Rights of Way
Democratic Services
Development & Design
Director of Public Health
Engineering & Design
Environmental Co-ordinator
Environmental Health
Estates, Legal & Property Services
Head of Development & Design
Head of Environmental Services
Head of Finance
Head of Planning and Transport
Highway Network Manager
Legal and Property Services
Parish & Locality Services

Planning Officers
Policy and Communications
Safer Communities Unit
Strategy & Growth Team
Support Services
Traffic and Transport
Waste & Energy

Organisations who were notified about the waste consultation

All Neighbouring Parish Councils
Aspley Guise
Aspley Heath
Beachampton
Bozeat Parish Council
Carlton & Chellington Parish Council
Cosgrove Parish Council
Cranfield
Deanshanger Parish
East Maudit
Grafton Regis Parish
Great Brickhill
Hackleton Parish Council
Harrold
Hartwell Parish Council
Heath and Reach
Hulcote and Salford
Kempston Rural
Newton Longville
Old Stratford Parish
Potsgrove Meeting
Soulbury
Stagsden
Stewartby
Stoke Hammond
Turvey
Whaddon
Woburn Parish
Wooton
Yardley Hastings
Yardley Gobion

All Waste Planning Authorities in the South East excluding neighbouring Buckinghamshire (sent a CD)

Berkshire Unitaries

East Sussex
Hampshire
Isle of Wight
Kent
Medway Council
Oxfordshire
Surrey
West Sussex
East of England RTAB
London RTAB