



**YOUR WASTE  YOUR CASH  YOUR CHOICE**

# Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document

## **Consultation Statement**

January 2007





# **CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>BUILDING THE EVIDENCE BASE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>ISSUES AND OPTIONS (REGULATION 25)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>FURTHER WORK</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>PREFERRED OPTIONS (REGULATIONS 26 AND 27)</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>SUBMISSION</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>LIST OF CONSULTEES</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>	<b>METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT – ISSUES &amp; OPTIONS</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3</b>	<b>METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT – PREFERRED OPTIONS</b>	<b>45</b>



# 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD) is a statutory Development Plan Document. It is required to undergo a series of consultations, in accordance with Regulations 25, 26 and 28 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. The WDPD is now at the stage of submission to the First Secretary of State followed by a statutory consultation, in accordance with Regulation 28 of the above Regulations.
- 1.2 Under Regulation 28 planning authorities are also required to prepare and submit a Consultation Statement, setting out among other things the consultation and public involvement work to date and how it has influenced the development of the submission document.
- 1.3 This Consultation Statement includes the following 3 submitted Development Plan Documents (DPD):
1. The Waste Core Strategy;
  2. Waste Allocations; and
  3. Waste Development Control Policies.
- 1.4 And it includes
- Who has been consulted.
  - How they were consulted.
  - A summary of the main issues raised in those consultations.
  - How these main issues have been addressed.

## TIMETABLE AND STAGES

- 1.5 Below are the stages for the Waste Development Plan Document. There have been two consultation stages to draft the final plan to the Submission stage.

<b>Issues and Options</b>	<b>August/September 2005</b>
Identified the issues which the development plan document needs to address and the options which are available to deal with those issues.	
<b>Preferred Options</b>	<b>August/September 2006</b>
Statutory 6-week consultation. Set out the preferred options, together with alternatives that were considered.	
<b>Submission to Secretary of State</b>	<b>January 2007</b>
Submit Development Plan Document for independent examination to Secretary of State. Statutory 6-week consultation of the document. Representations sent to the Secretary of State.	

<b><i>Pre-examination meeting</i></b>	<b><i>July 2007</i></b>
To discuss the procedures and process of the examination. Independent Inspector runs the meeting.	
<b><i>Examination</i></b>	<b><i>September 2007</i></b>
The purpose of independent examination is to consider if the development plan document is sound. Inspector's report will be binding.	
<b><i>Estimated Adoption</i></b>	<b><i>February 2008</i></b>

- 1.6 The Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document will be formally submitted to the Secretary of State and will then be available for public consultation for a six-week period.

## **2 BUILDING THE EVIDENCE BASE**

- 2.1 The current Waste Local Plan was adopted in 1997 by Buckinghamshire County Council, the Waste Planning Authority at that time. This Plan provided the basis for waste planning decisions made by Milton Keynes Council. Since becoming a unitary authority in 1997, Milton Keynes is now the Waste Planning Authority for its area.. The Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document now replaces the existing Waste Local Plan (adopted in March 1997).
- 2.2 The process involved a number of measures of consultation and community engagement. The Waste Forum (a stakeholders group) carried out a Best Practicable Environmental Option weighting exercise in December 2004/January 2005 (BPEO Assessment report, July 2005). The Waste Forum also advised and help shape the questionnaire design for the consultation of the issues and options stage and advised on other aspects of the strategy.
- 2.3 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 chosen to be representative of the population in Milton Keynes. This 'Citizens Advisory Group on Waste' (known as 'CAGoW') was provided with independent facilitators and 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.
- 2.4 CAGoW was also provided with a background to waste and the major issues facing Milton Keynes by Council Officers. In addition they had a technical 'teach-in' on waste technologies by DEFRA. After this point, Council officers and members had no further contact unless specifically requested by CAGoW. The group began work in June 2005 and reported their findings in October 2005.

### **3 ISSUES AND OPTIONS (REGULATION 25)**

#### **Methods of Consultation and Engagement**

- 3.1 A consultation period on the update of the Municipal Waste Strategy and the first stage of the Waste Development Plan Document, the 'Issues and Options', took place from 15 August 2005 to 30 September 2005. In order to unify the consultation methods and to emphasise the serious nature of the consultation, a slogan 'Your Waste, Your Cash, Your Choice' was developed and used on all publicity.
- 3.2 Two survey questionnaires were developed, a short questionnaire, 'Your Survey' and a technical questionnaire. The need for two questionnaires was due to the complexity with the issues surrounding waste and consequently to enable to engage with all levels of the community. Other responses came from letters, telephone calls and emails.
- 3.3 The measures to publicise the consultation on waste included: 'Your Survey' as a wrap around the outer cover of the Milton Keynes Citizen; a number of presentations; posters, including bill boards on bus shelters; the use of websites; direct letter to interest groups, consultation bodies and stakeholders; copies of the documents and surveys in key locations; articles in newsletters; a press release; and a message on the Environment Services Helpline.
- 3.4 Other methods of public engagement included two public debates; a radio debate as part Environment Policy Development Committee (EPDC); and other means including distribution by parish councils to local residents, schools to pupils and the use of the survey in an adult literacy class.
- 3.5 A total of:
- 3,468 responses were received from the short questionnaire, 'Your Survey';
  - 13 responses were received from the technical questionnaire;
  - 20 letters were received
  - 60 people took part in debates
- 3.6 The Environment Policy Development Committee (EPDC) set up a Waste Review Group (WRG). The WRG carried out research on future waste management in Milton Keynes, including land use. The report (November 2005) has been considered in the development of the Municipal Waste Strategy and Waste Development Plan Document.
- 3.7 For the full results, please refer to the, 'Consultation Report and Method of Public Engagement' (2005), which can be downloaded from [www.milton-](http://www.milton-)



[keynes.gov.uk/planning-policy](http://keynes.gov.uk/planning-policy) - click on the Waste Development Plan Document, then issues and options. For details of who was consulted, see Appendix 1 and for a more detailed list of the method of consultation and engagement, see Appendix 2.

## **MAIN ISSUES RAISED**

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

### **Waste Management Policies**

- 3.9 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.

3.10 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.

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

### **Targets and Allowances**

3.12 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.

- 3.13 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**

- 3.14 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).
- 3.15 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.
- 3.16 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.
- 3.17 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.
- 3.18 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.
- 3.19 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.

- 3.20 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.
- 3.21 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**

- 3.22 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.
- 3.23 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.
- 3.24 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.
- 3.25 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.
- 3.26 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**

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

- 3.28 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.
- 3.29 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.
- 3.30 There is support in the short survey for CA sites (Community Recycling Centres) to be close to where people live, for their convenience.
- 3.31 A recurring theme was that waste management facilities should be found in expansion areas

### **Principles of the Waste Development Plan Document**

- 3.32 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”.
- 3.33 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**

- 3.34 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**

- 3.35 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**

- 3.36 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.
- 3.37 Respondents to the technical questionnaire were mostly not sure ( 7 of the 13) as to whether the existing policy against landraising should be relaxed.

## **4. FURTHER WORK**

- 4.1 The Waste Development Plan Document Issues and Options consultation in August/September 2005 asked several questions about suitable locations for waste sites. However, there was a very limited response. We therefore wrote to waste operators/consultants/agents and to land owners in February 2006 to request that any proposals for waste management facilities within Milton Keynes be submitted to the Council to be considered. A variety of sites were put forward for smaller facilities such as waste transfer, vehicle depots, composting and recycling sites. It is now considered that these sites will be considered under Policy W7 Waste Development to offer flexibility throughout the life of the Plan. Sites for larger treatment facilities were put forward from a Landowner, waste operators and the Waste Department of the Council. A further site was identified by the Waste Planning Authority in the Western Expansion Area to meet the views expressed from the consultation of the issues and the options stage that a site should be found before housing is developed around it.
- 4.2 A number of evaluation criteria using environmental, social and economic indicators were initially identified. These 19 draft criteria were analysed and discussed at a Workshop held on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2006, which included officers from Waste, Planning, Environmental Health, Countryside and Landscape, Archaeology and Conservation and Highways Development Control. Three draft criteria were discarded and two additional ones added
- 4.3 The larger sites were then assessed using the site suitability criteria and also looking at the size of the sites required. This is listed in full in the annex of the Preferred Options Stage, with the method of determination criteria. The full results with site plans can also be seen in this annex.
- 4.4 Thirteen sites (see Preferred Options Consultation) were assessed with the site suitability criteria. Work was also carried out to identify the size of existing waste management facilities for final treatment in the UK and also to take into account the guidelines for the size of different types of waste management facilities. It has been identified that Milton Keynes requires a site of approx 4.00 hectares (9.88 acres). This footprint has been identified by considering what the maximum area is required for a facility to take Milton Keynes to 2032 (estimated life of the Council's future waste contract). Planned and existing facilities (Within Derbyshire, London, Gwynedd, Eastcroft, East Midlands and Leicester) site sizes were considered. These represent a number of different types of facility, as the type of facility has not been decided. The maximum site area for an advanced thermal treatment plant was approximately 2.3 hectares, with the maximum land take for a Mechanical Biological Treatment facility being 3.6 hectares and the maximum land take for an Energy to Waste plant was 3 hectares. Therefore the greatest land take is 3.6 hectares. Then allowing for a buffer area, gives the maximum land take area required to 4 hectares.

- 4.5 A site in Old Wolverton had the highest score from the site assessment criteria and also met the footprint required. It was therefore identified as the Strategic Site. A site at Wymbush had the second highest score and also met the required footprint. It was identified as the Reserve Site, if the Old Wolverton site could not come forward.



## 5. PREFERRED OPTIONS (REGULATIONS 26 AND 27)

### Methods of Consultation and Engagement

- 5.1 The statutory 6-week period was between 17 August – 28 September.
- 5.2 The slogan ‘Your Waste, Your Cash, Your Choice’ on all publicity was repeated from the Issues and Option Stage in order to show a connection to the first stage.
- 5.3 A survey ‘Your Survey’ was developed, which contained all the preferred options and a space for further comments or proposed changes. The survey was developed so that individuals/organisations did not need to read the whole preferred options document. However, reference to the full information was given which included a glossary for further research if required.
- 5.4 The measures to publicise the consultation included: ‘Your Survey’ as a wrap around the outer cover of the Milton Keynes News; a number of presentations; posters, including bill boards on bus shelters; the use of websites; direct letter to interest groups, consultation bodies and stakeholders; copies of the documents and surveys in key locations; articles in newsletters; a press release; and a message on the Environment Services Helpline.
- 5.5 Other methods of public engagement included a number of articles recording an article for Sound News (talking newspaper); and setting up displays at events linked to the MK2026 growth consultation.
- 5.6 The CAGOW was re-established and a workshop was held to examine the preferred options.
- 5.7 For the full results can be downloaded from [www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-policy](http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-policy) - click on the Waste Development Plan Document, then Preferred Options. For details of who was consulted, see Appendix 1 and for a more detailed list of the method of consultation and engagement, see Appendix 3.

### MAIN ISSUES RAISED

- 5.8 The Preferred Options responses have been taken into account in the preparation of the Submission document. A total of 655 responses were received. Out of these responses, 620 filled in a survey form via:

• MKNews Wrap around	287
• Submitted online	221
• Online form downloaded and submitted by post	13
• Submitted by post	94

5.9 Some responses were received by email (18) and letter (22). Some of these also included a survey form. The majority (over 80%) of survey responses either strongly supported or supported preferred options 1 – 9 and 12:

- **1. Preferred Guiding Vision for the Plan**  
*A vision for: a reduction in landfill; meeting growth needs; meeting Government, Regional and Local targets; Everyone playing a role to deliver sustainable waste management, providing a social, environmental, economic approach to waste management.*
- **2. Preferred Strategic Option**  
*Pre-treatment Waste Management facilities, such as Community Recycling Centres, and composting sites should be located all around Milton Keynes. Final treatment, is the treatment of the rubbish left (residual waste) after recycling, should be located at one site in Milton Keynes.*
- **3. Preferred Policy 1 Sustainable Waste Management**  
*A policy which follows best practice to provide sustainable, self-sufficient waste management, close to source of the waste and in accordance with the waste hierarchy (waste reduction > re-use> recycle> energy recovery > landfill as the last option).*
- **4. Preferred Policy 2 Working with neighbours/partners**  
*A policy that sets out working with others to ensure appropriate waste management solutions are joined up. This includes working and joining up facilities to provide the best economies of scale and all waste sectors working together, commercial and municipal.*
- **5. Preferred Policy 3 Development Control Criteria**  
*A policy that sets out development control criteria for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities, such as noise and dust.*
- **6. Preferred Policy 4 Environmental Objectives**  
*A policy that sets out environmental objectives for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities including considering climate change and the impact on natural resources.*
- **7. Preferred Policy 5 Transport**  
*A policy that considers the vehicle movements in and out of a waste management facility. The policy will consider reducing the reliance on road transport and require a Transport Assessment is carried out.*
- **8. Preferred Policy 6 Restoration**  
*A policy that sets out key principle aims and objectives for restoration of waste management sites.*
- **9. Preferred Policy 7 Sustainable design, construction and resource recovery**  
*Policies that will set out objectives for sustainable design, construction including encouraging recycling, waste minimisation and resource recovery. The large-scale development proposed in Milton Keynes presents a major opportunity to put into practice and demonstrate best practice in waste minimisation and integration of recycling into development.*

- **12. Preferred Site Other waste facilities.**  
*A criteria based policy will assess other waste management facilities such as for: windrow composting; invessel composting, recovery facilities; inert processing facilities; vehicle depot; waste transfer and bulking up facilities; household recycling facilities; and waste water facilities; inert landfill and landraise. It will look at locational requirements as well as showing a need and being in accordance with the other policies in the Development Plan Document.*

- 5.10 The highest objection to the questions (1-9 and 12) was to preferred option 2 with just 5.2 % objecting or strongly objecting.
- 5.11 A Strategic Site at Old Wolverton was identified as a site for a waste management facility for final treatment. This site could also have other waste facilities, such as recycling. The majority of the responses supported this option (75.6%). Eleven responses were received from residents in Old Wolverton: 1 person strongly supported the option and 10 people objected or strongly objected. Eleven responses were received from residents in Wolverton: 7 strongly supported or supported the option and 4 people strongly objected.
- 5.12 A reserve site was identified to be safeguarded for a waste management facility if the strategic site at Old Wolverton did not come forward. The majority of responses strongly supported or supported this option (60.9%) and 8.6% objected or strongly objected. Nineteen residents in Two Mile Ash (closest residential area to the site) responded to the survey. Out of these 4 supported it and 13 strongly objected or objected.
- 5.13 One preferred option was to safeguard existing strategic waste sites, in particular Bletchley Landfill Site for future disposal of residual waste. The site's life should not be dramatically reduced by imports from outside Milton Keynes, leaving Milton Keynes looking for an alternative facility sooner than 2022. The Majority of responses strongly supported or supported this option (85.2%). There were 94 responses received from residents in Bletchley and 80 of these supported this option.
- 5.14 In terms of the support for safeguarding the existing Materials Recycling Facility at Old Wolverton and the statement, 'the current facility should be retained unless it is provided for elsewhere or it becomes obsolete as a result of a new long-term waste management use elsewhere. There is potential for the site to accommodate new waste management uses, such as composting' was as follows:
- strongly support/support 88.5%
  - 4 residents in Old Wolverton strongly objected

- 5.15 A number of responses addressed recycling, packaging and collection issues. These have been forwarded to the Waste Strategy team to consider in their policy development and activities. A number of responses addressed ‘Incineration’, which received a mixed response. These issues are not considered to be part of the Waste Development Plan Development. However, they will be fed back to inform current Council policy.
- 5.16 The Citizens Advice Group on Waste attended a workshop in September 2006 to discuss the survey. They generally supported the policies and some members of the group raised the following comments (the Council’s response is in *italics*):
- Rail should be used for the Old Wolverton site (*This would be addressed in the Transport Assessment with any submitted planning application*)
  - Supported safeguarding the Materials Recycling Facility, especially when linked to the strategic site.
  - Wymbush site needs direct access from the A5 (*This would be addressed in the Transport Assessment with any submitted planning application*)
  - Sites at Denbigh West could be joined together for a suitable site (*The sites are close to sensitive receptors*).
- 5.17 There were 30 responses, which were received after the consultation period had closed. The majority of the survey responses were in support of the preferred policy directions. The comments that no other respondent had raised were: locate the strategic site at the Cotton Valley Sewage Works; and developer contributions are required to fund habitat enhancement and creation with the restoration of sites. The Cotton Valley Sewage Works is safeguarded for future expansion of waste water and sewage. The supporting text to the restoration policy in Development Control Policies considers that restoration must provide a positive enhancement to wildlife habitats.
- 5.18 The main comments from the surveys, emails, letters and from exhibitions and presentations are listed below. The Council’s response is in italics. The survey asked, if you have any further comments or wish to tell us why you do or do not support any of the preferred options, or to suggest viable alternatives, or is there something you think we need to include them.

<p><b>Treatment Options</b></p>
---------------------------------

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to evaluate options without knowing treatment option.</li> </ul> |
|---|

<p><i>The Municipal Waste Strategy assesses different treatment facilities including addressing the Issues and Options survey responses regarding considerations for treatment facilities. This will be considered further when the Council considers its waste contract. We now need to consider where such facilities could be located. An appendix of the Submission Draft includes Treatment Technologies Descriptions.</i></p>
---

<p><b>Further information on waste arisings, capacities and waste streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More figs/info are required for different waste streams.</li> <li>• Impacts of surplus spoil from new developments needs to be addressed (comments from developers/agents)</li> <li>• Include waste water/sewage</li> <li>• Include hazardous waste treatment and remediation</li> <li>• Welcome policy approach to achieving regional and sub regional self-sufficiency. Policy should be strengthened to state requirements for MK for waste arisings and requiring management within MK, and declining amount of London's waste and commitment to meeting these.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Further information is included which shows waste arisings, capacities of existing facilities and future requirements for different waste streams. Polices in the Core Strategy reflect these requirements.</i></p>
<p><b>The use of rail and water to transport waste</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of rail and water borne transport and appropriate provision should be encouraged particularly for large facilities.</li> <li>• Difficult to achieve transport of waste by anything other than road.</li> <li>• Should include emphasis on the use of a wider transport assessment.</li> <li>• The possible use of canal should be investigated.</li> <li>• Rail not realistic.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Policy WDC3 addresses Transport Assessment and that planning applications must demonstrate that alternative methods to road transport have been considered.</i></p>
<p><b>Importing Waste and Partnership working</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns / support regarding partnership working with neighbours in terms of importation of waste.</li> <li>• Working with other local authorities would be beneficial in terms of economies of scale and developing optimum environmental solutions.</li> <li>• The suggestion that waste imports from outside Milton Keynes should be restricted to husband void space needs to be considered in the light of emerging regional policy.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Milton Keynes is a relatively small area, and to obtain economies and efficiencies of scale, it may be necessary to combine waste activities with neighbouring local authorities. The Council support working with others to ensure appropriate waste management solutions are joined up. This includes working and joining up facilities to provide the best economies of scale and all waste sectors working together, commercial and municipal. A balance is required to deal with waste from neighbouring areas and retaining the landfill for residual waste for Milton Keynes. This is in accordance with regional policy.</i></p>
<p><b>Development Control Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operator's past experience should be taken into account</li> </ul>
<p><i>This has been included in the Development Control Policy WDC1.</i></p>

<p><b>Number of treatment facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be various sites to reduce vehicle distance congestion and impact on individuals</li> <li>• Sites should be in all sides of Milton Keynes</li> </ul>
<p><i>In considering where such facilities should be located, six strategic options, which could potentially guide development were considered and appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal. The option, which performed best against 20 sustainability objectives, was a dispersed location of pre treatment and one site for final treatment.</i></p>
<p><b>Location of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic site should be in new expansion areas – purpose built infrastructure and away from housing</li> <li>• 5 miles outside of towns</li> <li>• Away from houses</li> <li>• Located to NE of Milton Keynes because of prevailing wind</li> <li>• Near to M1</li> <li>• Return journey of 5 miles is maximum acceptable distance for waste recycling sites</li> <li>• Sites require good on site traffic management flows</li> </ul>
<p><i>Construction of the eastern and western expansion areas will commence shortly. The area of future growth beyond this period is unknown. Five miles outside towns will mean that it will be further away from the source of the waste and this would also be close to other settlements or even towns. We have considered Government and Environment Agency guidance that treatment facilities should be 250 metres away from sensitive receptors. No sites have come forward close to the M1. On site traffic management is considered in Development Control Policies and in the Key Development Criteria for the Reserve Site at Wymbush. The policy is for dispersed locations for recycling sites.</i></p>
<p><b>Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit growth to reduce need for additional waste</li> <li>• Growth will add to waste problem</li> <li>• We have enough of our waste, growth will mean importing more waste</li> <li>• The impact on growth area should be shown on the Core Strategy Plan</li> </ul>
<p><i>The Submission Draft addresses growth issues and allows for this in its assessment of future requirements and safeguarding of sites. This is highlighted on the Core Strategy Plan (Key Diagram).</i></p>

**Sustainable design and construction**

- Should be realistic in terms cost and practicability
- Should consider combined heat and power
- Object for large scale developments

*Combined heat and power is considered under biomass in the Core Strategy.*

**Wolverton Strategic Waste Site**

- Scoring - hydrogeology and groundwater risk scoring should be changed from 4 to 3.
- Right site and solution
  - Close to existing MRF
  - Could be an extension to MRF
  - Reduce vehicle movements across the city (as many lorries will have to travel from Wolverton to Bletchley as they do at present)
  - Accepted land use
  - Lorries already go here with the pink sacks
  - Good access to rail and canal for the transportation of waste
- Unknown technology
  - against incineration
  - timing of WDPD and waste procurement not lined up – what treatment will be used
- Distance from housing
  - Too close
  - Odour
  - Hours of working
  - Noise
  - Other amenity impacts
  - Fire risk (two previous fires)
  - Favourably located for prevailing winds
- Additional lorry movements
- Lorry movements not be compared to current position – as the city doubles, waste will double
- Already have additional vehicle movements with existing new developments and sand and gravel extraction will increase vehicle movements
- Road not up to standard for vehicle movements or has the capacity
- Increased vehicle movements on Newport Road, New Bradwell
- Road on Colts Holm Road used as overnight lorry park
- Vehicles must come from V6 if goes forward

*The scoring change does not affect the site as the preferred site. It is important to allow flexibility to provide the best option for the treatment solution. An assessment has been carried to consider an appropriate size footprint for a facility. PPS10 Companion Guide states, DPD, 'will not generally prescribe the waste management techniques or technologies', and, 'should normally avoid any detailed prescription of waste management technique or technology that*

would stifle innovation in line with the waste hierarchy'. It is considered that the vehicle movements will be minimal, as the waste collection vehicles take the recycling to the MRF, adjacent to the site. This will mean that instead of travelling across the city to deliver the residual waste to Bletchley Landfill Site (current process), the residual waste will be taken to this site. The majority of responses to the survey supported the option. Any planning application would include a Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement. The site would be regulated by Environment Agency, Environmental Health and Planning. It is considered that these could be controlled or mitigated against.

**Wymbush Reserve Strategic Waste Site**

- Too close to city centre
- Wrong side of A5 – cannot access rail spur
- Noise and dust for Bradwell Common
- Too central and too sensitive
- Poor alternative to Wolverton
- Too close to Lodge Lake
- Parking problems on estate
- A5 junction busy
- Busy road
- Proximity to parkland
- Lead to pollution over Milton Keynes (prevailing wind)

The site is considered to be the second most preferred site after carrying out a site assessment. The majority of responses to the survey supported the option. Any planning application would include a Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement. The site would be regulated by Environment Agency, Environmental Health and Planning. It is considered that these could be controlled or mitigated against.

**Sites put forward/suggested:**

1. Materials Recycling Facility for Commercial and Industrial waste, Bleak Hall
2. Pharmaceutical/clinical waste treatment, Granby
3. Primary waste treatment facility or a local recycling centre, Bletchley Landfill Site
4. In vessel composting, Broughton
5. Expansion of existing Materials Recycling Facility, Site G (Preferred Options) Trio Buildings, Old Wolverton

1,2,3,5 can be considered under the Core Strategy (Provision for Waste Management Capacity) and Development Control Policies. The Preferred Site has been identified at Old Wolverton. Bletchley Landfill Site is safeguarded for landfill.



**Safeguarding**

- Bletchley Landfill Site – comments included: rate should be increased; working hours should be reduced; should build an incinerator; against any incineration at this site; agree with text; only used for waste generated by local people; use should not be increased; vital to protect site. The site operators have stated that ‘significant importation is needed to fill Bletchley by 2022. Company has invested to make it a regional facility in accordance with the planning permission in 2002. Maintaining facility until 2022 needs to be done through agreement between Council and WRG’.
- Safeguarded could be strengthened by including policy or reference that ensures waste infrastructure (transfer/bulking facilities) are safeguarded in the submission draft.

*It is considered that the landfill capacity is a valuable resource. This site should be safeguarded for future disposal of residual waste. Safeguarding policy (WA2) in Allocations has been strengthened to include waste management facilities including sites for waste transfer and bulking facilities that are essential for sustainable transport of waste materials.*

**Other sites assessed in Site Assessment in Annex**

- Additional sites assessed - Site M (WEA) - do not select as one of the preferred sites. Existing site raises numerous complaints due to odour problems.
- Numerous Objection sites at Lathbury and Sherington.

*Sites have been assessed and are not considered as the preferred sites.*

## 6 SUBMISSION

- 6.1 The Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD) includes the Core Strategy, Allocations and Development Control Policies.

**Core Strategy** - sets out the long-term spatial vision for Milton Keynes and the strategic policies required to deliver the vision. This is the Strategy part of the Waste Development Plan Document – where are we now and where do we need to be.

**Allocations** – allocations of sites for waste management facilities. This is the Spatial part of the Waste Development Plan Document – where the waste management facilities required to be located.

**Development Control Policies** – policies related to the delivery of site specific allocations and other planning applications which may come forward. This is the Management part of the Waste Development plan Document – how are sites to be considered and controlled.

- 6.2 The comments received from the Preferred Options consultation have been considered and the final document has incorporated these comments where appropriate.

- 6.3 The format of the document has been changed from the Preferred Option stage to show a final form of the plan and to respond to comments from Government Office for the South East:

- To split the document into sections so there is clear separation between the Core Strategy, Allocations and Development Control Policies sections.
- To be in accordance with regional policy, the emerging SE Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy).
- To give a clear demonstration of how anticipated volumes of waste are to be managed, including figures on waste arisings, existing capacity and required capacity and also a waste trajectory showing the impact of delivering housing growth on waste volumes.
- The Plan period to cover the period, in accordance with the SE Plan to 2026.

**APPENDIX 1 LIST OF CONSULTEES**

## LIST OF CONSULTEES

*Organisations in bold text were also consulted in the preferred options stage.*

ISSUES & OPTIONS	PREFERRED OPTIONS
<p><u>Government Agencies</u></p>	
<p><b>Department of Environment Fisheries and Rural Affairs</b>  <b>Office of the Deputy Prime Minister</b>  <b>East of England Development Agency</b>  <b>East of England Regional Assembly</b>  <b>East Midlands Development Agency</b>  <b>East Midlands Regional Assembly</b>  <b>English Heritage</b>  <b>English Nature</b>  <b>English Partnerships</b>  <b>Environment Agency</b>  <b>Government Office for the East Midlands</b>  <b>Government Office For The South East</b>          Government for the East of England  <b>Health &amp; Safety Executive</b>  <b>Milton Keynes Partnership</b>  <b>Ministry of Defence</b>  <b>South East England Regional Assembly</b>  <b>South East England Development Agency</b></p>	<p>Commission for Racial Equality</p> <p>Home Office</p> <p>East Midlands Regional Local Government Association</p> <p>Commission for Rural Communities</p>
<p><u>Town and Parish Councils</u></p>	
<p><b>Astwood and Hardmead</b>  <b>Bletchley and Fenny Stratford</b>  <b>Town Council</b>  <b>Bow Brickhill</b>  <b>Bradwell</b>  <b>Bradwell Abbey</b>  <b>Broughton &amp; Milton Keynes</b>  <b>Campbell Park</b>  <b>Castlethorpe</b></p>	

<p> <b>Central Milton Keynes</b>  <b>Clifton Reynes &amp; Newton</b>  <b>Blossomville</b>  <b>Cold Brayfield</b>  <b>Emberton</b>  <b>Gayhurst</b>  <b>Great Linford</b>  <b>Hanslope</b>  <b>Haversham cum Little Linford</b>  <b>Kents Hill &amp; Monkston</b>  <b>Lavendon</b>  <b>Little Brickhill</b>  <b>Loughton</b>  <b>Moulsoe</b>  <b>New Bradwell</b>  <b>Newport Pagnell</b>  <b>North Crawley</b>  <b>Olney</b>  <b>Ravenstone</b>  <b>Shenley Brook End</b>  <b>Shenley Church End</b>  <b>Sherington</b>  <b>Simpson</b>  <b>Stantonbury</b>  <b>Stoke Goldington</b>  <b>Stony Stratford</b>  <b>Walton</b>  <b>Wavendon</b>  <b>West Bletchley</b>  <b>Weston Underwood</b>  <b>Woburn Sands</b>  <b>Wolverton &amp; Greenleys</b>  <b>Woughton</b>  <b>MK Assoc. of Local Councils</b>  <b>MK Assoc. of Urban Councils</b> </p> <p><u>Parish Meetings</u></p> <p> <b>Calverton</b>  <b>Chicheley</b>  <b>Filgrave and Tyringham</b>  <b>Lathbury</b>  <b>Warrington</b> </p>	
--	--

<p><u>Neighbouring Local Authorities</u></p> <p><b>Association of Councils of the Thames Valley Area</b>  <b>Aylesbury Vale District Council</b>  <b>Bedfordshire County Council</b>  <b>Borough Of Wellyingborough</b>  <b>Buckinghamshire County Council</b>  <b>Mid Beds District Council</b>  <b>Northamptonshire County Council</b>  <b>South Beds District Council</b>  <b>South Northants District Council</b></p> <p><u>Political</u></p> <p><b>All MKC Members And Alderman</b>  <b>The Conservative Party</b>  <b>The Green Party</b>  <b>The Labour Party</b>  <b>The Liberal Democrat Party</b>  <b>Conservative Party MEP Office</b>  <b>Green Party MEP Office</b>  <b>Labour Party MEP Office</b>  <b>Liberal Democratic Party MEP Office</b>  <b>UK Independence Party MEP Office</b>  <b>Mr Mark Lancaster MP</b>  <b>Dr Phyllis Starkey MP</b></p> <p><u>Environmental/Countryside</u></p> <p><b>Berks, Bucks &amp; Oxon Wildlife Trust</b>  <b>Council For The Protection Of Rural England</b>  <b>Countryside Agency</b>  <b>Country Land And Business Association</b>  <b>Country Landowners Association</b>  <b>English Nature</b>  <b>Forestry Authority</b>  <b>Forestry Commission</b>  <b>Friends Of The Earth</b>  <b>Gose- Maff And Rural Team</b>  <b>Mk Energy Agency</b>  <b>Milton Keynes Natural History Society</b>  <b>National Farmers Union</b></p>	<p>Bedford Borough Council  Luton Borough Council  South Bucks District Council</p> <p>Young Persons MP</p> <p>J. Walfson, B &amp; MK Water Partnership Board</p>
--	---

<p>Nature Conservation in Buckinghamshire  <b>RSPB Central England Wolverton &amp; District Archaeological &amp; Historical Society</b></p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>British Rail Property Board  <b>British Waterways Highways Agency Mk Tag</b>  MK Transport 2000  <b>Network Rail Railtrack Property</b>  Strategic Rail Authority</p> <p><u>Utilities</u></p> <p><b>Anglian Water Services Ltd Buckingham &amp; 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</b></p> <p><u>Business Interest</u></p> <p><b>MK Economic Partnership MK &amp; 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</b></p>	<p>Three Valleys Water PLC  National Grid  Southern Gas Networks  Bedford Group of Drainage Board  Mobile Operators Association  O2  Orange PCS  T Mobile  The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain  Vodafone</p> <p>Woburn Sands Business &amp; Community Association  Stony Stratford Partnership</p>
--	---

<p><u>Local Strategic Partnership</u></p> <p><b>Members of the LSP</b></p> <p><u>Waste Companies/Waste and Planning Consultants/ Landowners</u></p> <p>Abitibi Consolidated Recycling Europe <b>Accord Environmental Services</b> <b>Age Concern</b> <b>Aggregates Industries UK Ltd</b> <b>Amey Ventures</b> <b>Amphill Metals</b> <b>Bedminster</b> <b>Biffa</b> <b>Chartered Institute for Waste Management</b> <b>Cory Environmental</b> Cotton Fresh Cumfy Bumfy Cutts Brothers <b>DK Symes Associates</b> Environmental Services Association <b>F &amp; R Cawley Ltd</b> <b>Fosca</b> <b>Frosts Garden Centre</b> <b>GP Pawson Planning</b> Green Composting Services Limited <b>Hanson Aggregates</b> <b>Hartigan Trading Ltd</b> <b>Ian Smith Construction</b> <b>John Drake &amp; Co</b> <b>Kilvington Associates</b> <b>Kirby and Diamond</b> <b>Lafarge Aggregates</b> <b>Land Network (Boxon) Ltd</b> Lollipop <b>Material Change Ltd</b> <b>Matthews &amp; Son</b> <b>O &amp; H Properties Ltd</b> <b>Oakdene Hollins Ltd</b> <b>Oaktech Environmental Ltd</b> <b>Onyx Environmental Group Plc</b> <b>Pearce Recycling Company Ltd</b></p>	<p>Active Compost Ltd. Agrivert Alfred McAlpine Private Investment A Day A&amp;R Stacey New Earth Solutions Bridgewater Paper Mill Amec Group Biopower Britcare Ltd. Chichley Farms Ltd Chiltern Env Ltd Clarke Energy Cleanway Compact Power Edmund Nuttal Ltd Energos Entsorga Enteco EQ Waste Management Firbank Recycling Ltd. Global Renewables Greenfinch Central Networks Lawn Lodge Babtie Group J W Cook &amp; Sons Grundon Waste Management Ltd. Herhof Environmental Ltd. Hot Rot IET Energy ISKA GmbH Leeds and Bradford Boiler Company Ltd Linde KCA Dresden GmbH Goss &amp; Sons Materials Recovery May Gurney Limited Mitsuiababcock</p>
---	---



<p><b>Peter Bennie Limited</b>  <b>Rmc (Cemex)</b>  <b>Robinson &amp; Hall</b>  <b>Samuel Rose</b>  <b>Shanks Waste Services Ltd</b>  <b>Sita Uk Limited</b>  <b>T Taylor</b>  <b>Terra Eco Systems</b>  <b>Tgr Williams &amp; Son</b>  <b>W Needham &amp; Sons</b>  <b>Wardell Armstrong</b>  <b>Waste Recycling Group</b>  <b>WRAP</b>  <b>Wyn Thomas Gordon Lewis (now White Young Green)</b></p>	<p>Neatworld  Norfolk Environmental Waste Services  Nuttall Hyens  Specialist Groundwork Services Construction Ltd  Sterecycle  TechTrade GmbH/Wastegen (UK) Ltd  The Composting Company  Thermsave Engineering (UK) Ltd  VCU Europa  Verdant Group Plc.  Viridor Waste Management Ltd.  VKW Anlagenbau Und Umwelttechnik GmbH  Warmingtons  Wellman Recycling  Wyver Waste  Terence O'Rourke Plc  David Lock Associates  Hutchinson 3 G  Indigo Planning  Nathaniel Lichfield  Chichley Estates</p>
<p><u>Other (local)</u></p> <p><b>Bucks Community Action</b>  <b>City Discovery Centre</b>  <b>CAGOW (Citizens Advice Group on Waste)</b>  <b>GEMK</b>  <b>Haversham and Linford Residents Association</b>  Land owners/tenant farmers  <b>MK Forum</b>  <b>Milton Keynes General Hospital</b>  <b>Milton Keynes Parks Trust</b>  Milton Keynes Play Association  Olney Development Partnership  <b>Open University Library</b></p>	<p>Wolverton Unlimited  Buckinghamshire Health Authority  Milton Keynes Christian Council  Milton Keynes East African Community Association  Milton Keynes Churches Council  Milton Keynes Community NHS Trust  Wolverton &amp; District Senior Citizens Trust  Dhosti Lunch Club  Milton Keynes Hindu Association  Milton Keynes Pensioners Society  MK Women's Aid  Travellers Forum  Youth Housing Network  Bangladeshi Workers Association  Hindu Forum  Milton Keynes Asian Women's</p>

<p><b>Open University</b>  <b>PALS</b>  Stony Stratford Community Association  Tenant farmers of MKC small holdings  <b>Waste Forum</b>  <b>Wolverton Partnership</b></p>	<p>Network  Help the Aged  Midsummer Housing Association  Buddhist Temple  Wolverton Society for Art and Heritage  Cyclist's Touring Club  Oxford Diocesan Board of Education</p> <p>Old Wolverton Residents Association  Beanhill Residents Association  Bletchley Residents Association  Bradville Residents Association  Campion Tenants Association  Conniburrow Community Association  Downs Barn Residents Association  Eaglestone Residents Association  Fenny Stratford Residents Association  Fishermead and Oldbrook Residents Association  Fishermead Residents Association  Fullers Slade Action Group  Hodge Lee Residents Association  Kilkenny House Residents Association  Leon Residents Association  Loughton Residents Association  Meads Close Residents Association,  Mellish Court Residents Association  Mill Road Residents Association  Netherfield Residents Association  The Castle Residents Association  The Lakes Residents Association  Tinkers Bridge Association  Warren Bank Resident Association  Water Eaton Resident Association  West Bletchley Community Association  Woburn Sands &amp; District Society</p>
---	--

<p><u>Other (National)</u></p> <p><b>British Library</b>  House Builders Federation  <b>Oxford Diocesan Board Of Finance</b>  <b>Royal Town Planning Institute</b>  <b>SEERAWP Chair</b></p> <p><u>Internal Officers</u></p> <p><b>Assistant Chief Executive  (Governance &amp; Finance)</b>  <b>Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy  &amp; Performance)</b>  <b>Business Support</b>  <b>Chief Building Control Surveyor</b>  <b>Chief Waste Management Engineer</b>  <b>Chief Environmental Health Officer</b>  <b>Chief Executive</b>  <b>Community and Economic  Development</b>  <b>Corporate Director Environment</b>  <b>Corporate Director Learning and  Development</b>  <b>Corporate Director Neighbourhood  Services</b>  <b>Countryside &amp; Rights of Way</b>  <b>Democratic Services</b>  <b>Development &amp; Design</b>  <b>Director of Public Health</b>  <b>Engineering &amp; Design (Highways  Development Control)</b>  <b>Environmental Co-Ordinator</b>  <b>Environmental Health</b>  <b>Estates, Legal &amp; Property Services</b>  <b>Head of Development &amp; Design</b>  <b>Head of Environmental Services</b>  <b>Head of Finance</b>  <b>Head of Planning And Transport</b>  <b>Highway Network Manager</b>  <b>Legal and Property Services</b>  <b>Parish &amp; Locality Services</b>  <b>Planning Officers</b>  <b>Policy and Communications</b></p>	<p>Racial Equality Council  Planning Aid (South)  British Horse Society</p>
--	---

**Safer Communities Unit  
Social Inclusion Project Officer  
Strategy & Growth Team  
Support Services (Environmental  
Services Helpline)  
Traffic and Transport  
Waste & Energy (Operations  
Manager, Waste Strategy Manager)**

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  
Wootton  
Yardley Hastings  
Yardley Gobion**

All Waste Planning Authorities in the

<p><u>South East excluding neighbouring Buckinghamshire</u></p> <p><b>Berkshire Unitaries</b> <b>East Sussex</b> <b>Hampshire</b> <b>Isle of Wight</b> <b>Kent</b> <b>Medway Council</b> <b>Oxfordshire</b> <b>Surrey</b> <b>West Sussex</b> <b>East of England RTAB</b> <b>London RTAB</b></p>	
---	--

**APPENDIX 2    METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT – ISSUES & OPTIONS**

## **METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

### **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](http://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 15<sup>th</sup> August and 30<sup>th</sup> 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 30<sup>th</sup> 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, 6<sup>th</sup> 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 17<sup>th</sup> September, and one on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> 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 10<sup>th</sup> 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 11<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto: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.

**APPENDIX 3    METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT – PREFERRED  
OPTIONS**

# METHODS OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT – PREFERRED OPTIONS

## Approaches Taken

### Slogon:

Your Waste Your Cash Your Choice (Repeated from issues and options)

### Documents:

Waste Development Plan Document Preferred Options  
 Sustainability Appraisal Report  
 Comments Form 'Your Survey'  
 CD containing WDPD PO, Comments Form (both word and pdf), SA, Translations, background documents (Defra guide, Municipal Waste Strategy including appendices – consultation report for issues and options stage and EPDC Report)  
 Translation sheet  
 A4 poster  
 A3 Poster  
 6 Sheet Posters

### Advanced activities before consultation commenced:

Wrap Around MK Citizen 10 June (advanced warning about the consultation)  
[MK@Work](#) June (internal emailed newsletter)  
 LiveMK (MKC magazine which goes out in the MK Citizen)  
 Environment Spokes briefing 19 June  
 Internet sign up for the consultation  
 LDF Advisory Panel June  
 Advanced letters to Parishes  
 Advanced letters to Members  
 Advanced letters to CAGOW (Citizens Advisory Group on Waste)

### Activities:

DATE	ACTIVITY
11 August 9am	Waste EPDC 3 Counties debate
19 August 10-12	Hand out surveys at MK2026 event Wolverton farmers Market
23 August 10-12	Hand out surveys at MK2026 event Bletchley Development Board
25 August 10-12	Hand out surveys at MK2026 event Stony Stratford Farmers Market
1 September 11-2	Hand out surveys at MK2026 event Kingston
1/2/3 September	Garden Show - surveys
4 September	Presentation to Labour Group
5 September 7.30pm	Public meeting to Old Wolverton residents regarding preferred site.
6 September 7.30pm	LDF Advisory Group



6 September	Wrap around MK News
11 September 5pm	Presentation LSP Planning Task group
13 September 6-9pm	Citizens Advice Group On Waste
14 September 8.15pm	Presentation Parish Assembly
20 September 7pm	Waste Forum
21 September 6.30pm	Display before Housing Forum
25 September	Presentation Conservative Group

**Other discussions of activities:**

Offered meeting to Parishes where Preferred Site and Reserve Site are.  
Offers of meeting/ articles for newsletters to voluntary groups, Parishes, Local Strategic Partnership  
Link up with MK2026 activities

**Online survey:**

Responses go straight into database.

**Websites:**

MKC Planning Policy  
MKweb front page (website on Milton Keynes)  
MKC Environment front page  
MKC Schools page - link  
MKC Housing – link  
MKC Waste and Energy  
MKC Intranet  
Milk n Beans (young persons website)  
MKC Consultation page  
Front page MKC

**Articles:**

MKC Housing newsletter  
MKC Parish Newsletter  
MKC LiveMK (MKC magazine goes out in the local paper)  
Catch up (Newsletter goes out to over 900 voluntary and community groups in Milton Keynes)  
Weekly Alert (Email sent out by MK Community Foundation)  
Tuesday Bulletin (Internal email newsletter)  
Sound News (Talking Newspaper)  
Weekly News (Members newsletter)  
Wrap Around MKNews

**Posters:**

30 billboard posters moved around MK throughout the consultation period.  
MKC Adult Continuing Education Office  
MKC Housing Offices  
Civic Offices

Libraries  
Middleton Hall (Shopping Centre display boards)  
Midsummer Place (Shopping Centre display boards)  
Saxon Court (MKC office)  
Sent to Parish Councils  
Sent to some community groups

**Surveys:**

MKC Adult Continuing Education Office  
MKC Housing Offices  
Civic Offices  
Libraries  
Middleton Hall (Shopping Centre display boards)  
Midsummer Place (Shopping Centre display boards)  
Saxon Court (MKC office)  
MKC Energiser bus (travels to community events)

**Public notice:**

MK Citizen 17 August

**Press Release:**

Appeared 10 August 2006

**Environmental Helpline:**

Recorded message while people are on hold.

**PUBLIC INFORMATION BOARD IN CIVIC OFFICES RECEPTION**

Information displayed

**CONSULTATION LETTERS:**

To statutory bodies  
To interested parties  
To all Members and Parish Councils  
To LSP to get their groups involved  
See Appendix 1 for full list.

**Notification letters:**

To all those signed up on the web site  
To all those who responded in the issues and options stage