

## **Waste Options Consultation Report**

### **Introduction**

Last year the Isle of Wight Council carried out a consultation exercise on the Island Plan "*Waste Sites Summary Report*" (August 2009). This report was in effect a summary of a more detailed report that was also available for comments being, "*Assessment of Options for Waste Sites and Other Alternatives to Landfill on the Island, Site Options Report*" (Entec UK Ltd September 2009). The purpose of the consultation exercise was to ask for public feedback on the evolving evidence base for potential site options for waste processing facilities and landfill sites on the Island.

The consultation specifically asked for feedback on the potential sites that have been identified and assessed. Three key questions with regards to the assessment methodology and results were asked, being;

1. Are the criteria that we have used for assessment appropriate? If not why?
2. Are there any sites that should not have been discounted from consideration?  
If so why?
3. Has the Council considered all reasonable alternatives for potential sites?

### **What is this?**

This report considers the responses received from all respondents and how the Council intends to progress identifying suitable sites for a variety of waste management facilities, taking the responses into account.

The Council have received a total of 96 comments from 31 organisations/individuals. Of these 90.63% were submitted electronically, which is an exceptionally high rate.

### **Why?**

It is important that the Council develops a robust evidence base for its Island Plan (Local Development Framework) documents, and as part of its evidence base, the Council has sought the views of both Island residents and key stakeholders. The Council must be able to demonstrate it has a credible evidence base and has considered all potential options (dependent on viability and supporting evidence) when deciding on future sites for waste management.

For further details on the Island Plan please see;

[http://www.iwight.com/living\\_here/planning/Planning\\_Policy/Island\\_Plan/](http://www.iwight.com/living_here/planning/Planning_Policy/Island_Plan/)

### **When?**

The consultation period ran for 5 weeks from 25<sup>th</sup> August 2009 to 29<sup>th</sup> September 2009. This consultation period was not a formal exercise under the Planning Regulations, in that there was no statutory obligation either to consult on this information at this stage, or to consult for any set period of time. However, the Council recognises the importance and potential sensitivity of the issue with regards to the future location of waste facilities on the Island and felt it was proper to consult widely early on in the plan process.

### **Who?**

The consultation exercise and this report have been carried out by the Planning Policy Team of the Council's Planning Services. This team is responsible for producing the Island Plan that will replace the Unitary Development Plan and will inform both the allocation of sites on the Island for certain uses and planning policies, that will both influence and determine planning applications.

The full detailed report, “*Assessment of Options for Waste Sites and Other Alternatives to Landfill on the Island, Site Options Report*” was carried out by consultants Entec UK Ltd on behalf of the Council.

A full list of all those who responded to the consultation exercise is available to view upon request.

### **What next?**

The Council will now **not** be producing a dedicated Minerals & Waste DPD; instead it will include policies on these matters within the Core Strategy and, where relevant, other DPDs.

The Council is now preparing the latest version of the Core Strategy. It is not expected that the general approach will change greatly from previous versions of the Core Strategy, but there is the opportunity to refine, update and improve the content of the Core Strategy.

The timetable for the publication of the Core Strategy is:

- Proposed Submission consultation to take place for six weeks in September/October 2010
- Submission consultation to take place for six weeks in January/February 2011
- Pre-Hearing Meeting May 2011
- Receipt of the Inspector’s binding report November 2011
- Adoption and publication December 2011

Due to the strategic importance of the provision of a landfill site on the Island and the current predicted date for the existing landfill facility at Standen Heath to reach its full capacity in 2015, the next phase of work looks to progress consideration of the landfill options, taking into account all relevant comments from this consultation.

This next phase of work, the Landfill Options Assessment work, is currently underway with an end date of late Spring 2010. In summary this work will produce the evidence to identify and justify a preferred site for landfill on the Island and include;

- feasibility study to assess the 2 shortlisted non-hazardous options coming out of the Waste Options work, being;
  - o Extension to Standen Heath
  - o Use of Lynn Plantation
- a report containing;
  - o results of work detailed above
  - o commentary on the feasibility of the options
  - o recommendations (in terms of options)
  - o recommendations for amendments to Core Strategy waste policy including the potential to control the phasing of any future landfill to deal with uncertainty and ensure waste is treated as far up the waste hierarchy as possible, including an analysis of how other waste authorities have provided phasing control in their policies

## **Waste Options Consultation Report – The Responses**

From the 96 responses it was possible to identify 7 themes against which each response has been categorised (with the possibility of any one response being labelled in more than one theme). The seven themes from the consultation responses are;

- General
- Alternatives
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Site specific
- Site threshold
- Sieving process
- Other environmental designations

In order to provide a succinct summary of the responses the below details the recurring Council replies for each theme. These responses should generally answer most of the queries raised by the responses to the consultation. In addition to the summary table of responses, a second table is available that has the full text with regards to both consultation responses and the Council's reply to each of these.

### **1. General**

- Wherever possible the Council will use plain English. However, there are some instances where the use of technical terminology is unavoidable and in such instances we will ensure a comprehensive glossary is provided.
- The Council will continue to investigate the viability of commercial waste recycling through the Waste Management Strategy. The requirement for sites as a result of the options being developed through the Waste Management Strategy will inform the provision of such sites in the Island Plan through the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD.
- The management of waste by the Council will follow the waste hierarchy, therefore after reducing waste, all feasible options for re-use will be considered.
- The Council will seek wherever possible to treat waste as high up the waste hierarchy as possible. However, the Waste Needs Assessment report concluded that the Council should plan for future residual waste disposal needs such as landfill.
- The detailed decisions on specific waste treatment technologies will be made as part of the Waste Management Strategy and not through the Island Plan LDF that at its most basic form is seeking to allocate appropriate sites for such treatment types.

### **2. Alternatives**

No recurring Council response can be identified under this theme.

### **3. Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**

No recurring Council response can be identified under this theme.

### **4. Site specific**

- The purpose of this consultation is to identify the most suitable options available and thus a range of sites have been considered and assessed.
- Comments on specific sites in relation to either options for waste management or landfill will be taken into account when progressing each

of these waste treatments in terms of suitable site options (for example further work on viable site options for future landfill etc).

- Comments made on specific waste management methods and technologies will be considered by the Council's Waste Contracts Management Team during development of the new Waste Management Strategy.
- As a result of the assessment of sites identified as possible options for landfill only 2, LF12 Standen Heath and LF13 Lynn Plantation Landfill are identified as potentially suitable for non-hazardous landfill (please refer to Section 5.2 Summary of Assessment of Shortlisted Sites for Landfill, and the supporting Technical Note 'Isle of Wight – Future Landfill Options' both in the full Site Options Report, Assessment of Options for Waste Sites and Other Alternatives to Landfill on the Island, September 2009.
- The justification for the identification of site options LF12 & LF 13 is that in relative terms they have been assessed as the least constrained and most suitable sites for non-hazardous landfill (which is different from inert).
- Assessment of landfill and other waste management solutions will continue to be assessed separately, but will be linked in terms of a total waste management approach both through waste policies in the Island Plan (LDF) and the Council's Waste Management Strategy.

## **5. Site threshold**

- Size thresholds for landfill and built facilities:-
  - Landfill - source of guidance for the size of a site is ODPM Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study (2004) which states between 5 and 50 ha would be typical.
  - Built facilities - three sources of guidance for the size of a small scale recycling facility stated 50,000 tonnes would require 1 to 2 ha (ODPM Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study (2004)); 60,000 tonnes would require 1 to 2 ha (Environment Agency Waste Technology Data Centre; and 80,000 tonnes would require at least 1 to 2 ha (Waste Strategy Unit, Welsh Assembly).
- All the details about the size threshold are in the main report at pages 15 and 16.

## **6. Sieving process**

- National guidance seeks to treat waste as close to source as possible and where it is advantageous to do so to co-locate facilities.
- While sites for waste management treatment, other than landfill, will not be specific in the treatment method/technology to be used (so as not to stifle innovation) policies will be in place to ensure technologies and methods used are appropriate to a specific site.
- The nature of the search methodology employed by the Council's consultants (ie applying different layers of positive, exclusionary and discretionary criteria) meant that the search was as broad as possible in considering suitable sites Island-wide. One of the purposes of the consultation was to alert the Council to any potential sites that had not been considered and provide a reasonable option for the purpose of waste management.
- The sieving process has been applied in a consistent and uniform manner. If one site can be viewed as being more constrained than another when considering the 3 different sieves applied this is a relatively objective exercise, once sieves have been decided upon.

## **7. Other environmental designations**

- In assessing the sites, environmental considerations such as the European Sites have been identified as exclusionary criteria to screen out any sites within these designated boundaries. Any sites which are within close proximity to such sites will be appraised in accordance with the Habitat Regulations.

The following table contains a summary of the results of the consultation exercise with regards to comments made and the Council's response and follows on from this section of the report;

1. Waste Sites Summary Document for Consultation Responses – Summary of Comments and the Council's Response

For further information either on the work being carried out on waste options as part of the Island Plan, or the Core Strategy please contact the Planning Policy Team at;

Planning Services  
Isle of Wight Council  
Seaclose Offices  
Fairlee Road  
Newport  
Isle of Wight PO30 2QS

Tel: (01983) 821000

Email: [planning.policy@iow.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@iow.gov.uk)

**Waste consultation responses – summary of comments and Council’s response**

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
	Avice	Mariner	Brightstone Parish Council	32	Disagree	Plain English and not technical terms	<b>General</b>	A glossary is available
	David	Sims	Southern Water	51	No Opinion	No comments to make at this time	<b>General</b>	Comment noted
	Rose	Freeman	The Theatres Trust	41	No Opinion	no comments to make	<b>General</b>	Comment noted
	Irene	Curran	RSPB	34	Strongly Agree	Welcome the constraints based approach	<b>General</b>	Comments noted
	Christine Mary	Bentley		73	No Opinion	The Glossary does not explain 'non hazardous landfill' or 'inert landfill'	<b>General</b>	Update glossary
	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	77	Agree	Subject to detailed consideration, the 11 short listed sites would appear suitable for waste development.	<b>General</b>	Comment noted
	Doreen	Armstrong	Labour Party - Sandown and Shanklin Branch	70	No Opinion	Unable for formulate any comments.	<b>General</b>	Comment noted
2	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	74	No Opinion	Inert Landfills clarify what sites these are with estimated void space for each.	<b>General</b>	Entec to respond to arising queries
4	Roger	Hendey	Cowes Town Council	31	No Opinion	Inappropriate to comment at this stage	<b>General</b>	Comment noted
Question 1	Rachael	Bust	The Coal Authority	5	No Opinion	No specific comments to make at this stage.	<b>General</b>	Comment noted
Question 21	David	Ogilvy	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association	1	No Opinion	Landfill sites are well-known sources of bird strikes.	<b>General</b>	Comment noted. This is assessed as an exclusionary criterion to ensure that any sites are outside of the safeguarding zones.
Question 21	Sue	Janota	South East England Partnership Board	2	No Opinion	No sites to put forward.	<b>General</b>	Comment noted

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
Question 21	Maurice	Richards		4	No Opinion	Using inert material as a means to help prevent coastal erosion.	General	Comment noted.
Question 21	Ed	Lockett	Sport England - South East Region	3	No Opinion	Any future sites considered should not contain playing fields or built sports facilities	General	Comment noted
Question 21	Keith	Adlam		6	No Opinion	Alternative option.	General	Comment noted
Question 21	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council	60	Disagree	Inert material to landfill lacks imagination	General	The Council seek wherever possible to treat waste as high up the waste hierarchy as possible.
				42	Disagree	Utilisation of recycling, composting and solid waste biomass treatment	General/ Alternatives	Comment noted.
	Brian	Brake		96	Disagree	Emphasis upon recycling, incineration and transfer to the mainland for disposal.	General/ AONB/ Alternatives	Comments noted.
4	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council	100	No Opinion	Use of inaccurate maps	General/ Site specific	Entec to respond
Map 4.13	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council	99	No Opinion	Use of inaccurate maps	General/ Site specific	Entec to respond
Question 7	Gregory	Dowden	Indigo Planning	72	Disagree	IOW6 do not agree that the correct assessment has been made	General/ site specific	Entec to respond
Question 1	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	10	No Opinion	No less than 1ha would set a sensible threshold	Site threshold	Comment noted
Question 1	Mary	Tappenden	Biffa Waste Services	66	Agree	1ha is the minimum size necessary	Site threshold	Comment noted
3	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	75	No Opinion	1ha threshold may be appropriate.	Site threshold	Comment noted
3	Mary-Jane	O'Neill	Renaissance	97	No	Ensure that the most appropriate locations	Sieving	Comments noted

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
			Planning (SEEDA)		Opinion	are chosen for such uses.	process	
Question 2	Ruth	Waller	Isle Of Wight Council	30	Disagree	Should have contacted the Historic Environment Record (HER) database	Sieving process	This was done
Question 2	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council	56	Agree	the criteria are appropriate but the application of the criteria does not appear to be consistent	Sieving process	Entec to respond
Question 2	Nick	Dunn	Land & Mineral Management Ltd	48	Disagree Strongly	The sieving process is insufficient as it has failed to include key existing and proposed waste sites.	Sieving process	Entec to respond
Question 2	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	76	Agree	The sieving process would appear to be in line appropriate policy and guidance.	Sieving process	Comment noted
Question 2	Mary	Tappenden	Biffa Waste Services	67	Agree	Analysis does not appear to have been applied consistently	Sieving process	Entec to respond
Question 3	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council	57	Agree	Inert material to landfill lacks imagination	Sieving process	The Council seek wherever possible to treat waste as high up the waste hierarchy as possible
Question 3	Mary	Tappenden	Biffa Waste Services	68	No Opinion	Consider that Downend should be analysed again	Sieving process	Comments noted.
Question 18	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning Officer	25	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 15	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning Officer	22	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/ AONB/ site specific	Comments noted.
Question 16	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning Officer	23	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/ AONB/ Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 17	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning	24	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/	Comments noted.



Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
			Officer				site specific/ AONB	
Question 19	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning Officer	26	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 20	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning Officer	27	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 20	Mark	Bucket	AONB Planning Officer	28	Disagree	Expansion of existing facilities to be more appropriate than the creation of new ones	Sieving process/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 4	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	79	No Opinion	Contamination, surface water drainage	Site Specific	Comments noted.
Question 5	NOEL	TOOGOOD		54	Strongly Agree	Could provide employment	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 5	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	80	No Opinion	Contamination, surface water drainage	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 6	Rusty	Adams	Gurnard Parish Council	9	No Opinion	Considers the Stag Lane site to be the best option	Site specific	Comment is noted.
Question 6	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	81	No Opinion	Landfill gas, pollution and surface water drainage	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 6	Mary-Jane	O'Neill	Renaissance Planning (SEEDA)	98	Disagree	Holding objection to the principle of the selection of the sites, including the Stag Lane Depot site (SZ501917, site IOW3) and land adjacent to Cowes Power Station (SZ504943, site IOW7) reserve detailed comment on the selection of the sites until further information	Site specific	Comments noted.

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
						is available.		
Question 7	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	18	Disagree	Having a build waste facility in this location, when more appropriate sites may be easily identified in the undertaking of a sequential test, would be inappropriate.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 7	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	82	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 8	Les	Morris	National Grid	29	Disagree Strongly	IOW7 is removed from the shortlist of potential waste. Safeguard land surrounding Cowes substation for essential utility development	Site specific	Entec to respond
Question 8	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	83	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 8	Matthew	Trigg	RWE npower	71	Disagree	Do not consider that it is appropriate to designate Site IOW 7 for waste uses	Site specific	Comments noted
Question 9	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	84	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 10	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	19	Disagree	The separation of built and landfill facilities may be considered logical.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 10	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	85	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 11	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	86	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 12	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	87	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 13	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashley Parish Council	58	Agree	The extension of an existing site with infrastructure already in place as appropriate.	Site specific	Comment noted
Question 13	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	88	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 14	James	Hewitt	Cheverton Aggregates	64	Disagree Strongly	Too small and visually intrusive	Site specific	Comments noted.

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
Question 14	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	89	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 15	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	90	No Opinion	Pollution and surface water drainage.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 16	Catherine	Lewis	Havenstreet & Ashy Parish Council	59	Disagree Strongly	Size, use, uncertainty, access, AONB, airfield safeguarding and local watercourses.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 16	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	91	No Opinion	Pollution and the hydrological regime.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 16	James	Hewitt	Cheverton Aggregates	65	Disagree Strongly	Too small and high visibility	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 17	Alan R	Phillips		8	Agree	Haul route, AONB and located on an aquifer of immediate vulnerability.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 17	Nick	Dunn	Land & Mineral Management Ltd	49	Disagree Strongly	Assumptions made are incorrect. Need to recognise the existing and proposed waste operations at the Cheverton Chalk Quarries and the consented and proposed void space at the Cheverton Gravel Pit.	Site specific	Entec to respond
Question 17	James	Hewitt	Cheverton Aggregates	62	Disagree Strongly	Overlook the fact that the area highlighted is an already existing and filled inert landfill site	Site specific	Entec to respond
Question 17	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	92	No Opinion	Pollution and the hydrological regime.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 18	Avice	Mariner	Brightstone Parish Council	33	Disagree	Contamination, traffic impacts, AONB.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 18	Nick	Dunn	Land & Mineral Management Ltd	50	Disagree Strongly	Support the use of this site for landfill. Fails to recognise the existing waste operations	Site specific	Entec to respond
Question 18	James	Hewitt	Cheverton Aggregates	63	Disagree Strongly	Size of the quarry has been understated and does not take into account the new extension area, existing transfer station. Further facilities could easily be accommodated.	Site specific	Entec to respond
Question 18	James	Attrill	Christopher Scott Chartered	102	Agree	The site can fulfil the Council aspirations to reduce, reuse and recycle waste.	Site specific	Comments noted.

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
			Surveyors					
Question 18	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	93	No Opinion	Pollution, sensitivity of hydrological regime.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 19	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	78	Agree	LF12 in the best location/least constraints of the proposed sites for a non-hazardous landfill.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 19	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	94	No Opinion	Pollution, sensitivity of hydrological regime.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 19	Mary	Tappenden	Biffa Waste Services	69	Agree	Standen Heath site is preferable to release of new sites. Is the largest of the identified sites and has a long history of non hazardous landfill.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 20	Simon	Macfarlane	Environment Agency	95	No Opinion	Pollution, sensitivity of hydrological regime.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 21	Keith	Adlam		53	Disagree	Waste to energy (W2E) solution is the key and should be included as an active, cost-effective option/alternative.	Site specific	Comments noted.
Question 21	Tony	Flower	TF Property Solutions	101	Agree	Planning history, location, access, capacity and restoration.	Site specific	The factors are considered comparatively to other options.
Question 12	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	20	No Opinion	The separation of built and landfill facilities may be considered logical. The assemblage of landfill sites in this location could have benefits.	Site specific/AONB	Comments noted.
Question 13	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	21	Disagree	The separation of built and landfill facilities may be considered logical. The assemblage of landfill sites in this location could have benefits.	Site specific/AONB	Comments noted.
Question 21	Bruce	Denness		7	Disagree	Alternative site.	Site specific/AONB	Comments noted.
Question 15	David	Howarth	Ramblers Association	43	Disagree Strongly	Not in AONB.	AONB	Comments noted.
Question 16	David	Howarth	Ramblers Association	44	Disagree Strongly	Not in AONB.	AONB	Comments noted.

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
Question 17	David	Howarth	Ramblers Association	45	Disagree Strongly	Not in AONB.	AONB	Comments noted.
Question 21	David	Howarth	Ramblers Association	47	Disagree Strongly	Hierarchical approach to waste disposal. AONB should not be used for additional landfill sites.	AONB	Comments noted.
Question 18	David	Howarth	Ramblers Association	46	Disagree Strongly	Not in AONB.	AONB	Comments noted.
Question 6	Irene	Curran	RSPB	35	Disagree	Proximity to European nature conservation sites, further evaluated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and adoption of the precautionary principle.	Other environmental designations	Comment noted.
Question 7	Irene	Curran	RSPB	36	Disagree	Proximity to European nature conservation sites, further evaluated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and adoption of the precautionary principle.	Other environmental designations	Comment noted.
Question 8	Irene	Curran	RSPB	37	Disagree	Proximity to European nature conservation sites, further evaluated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and adoption of the precautionary principle.	Other environmental designations	Comment noted.
Question 11	Irene	Curran	RSPB	38	Disagree	Proximity to European nature conservation sites, further evaluated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and adoption of the precautionary principle.	Other environmental designations	Comment noted.
Question 14	Irene	Curran	RSPB	39	Disagree	Proximity to European nature conservation sites, further evaluated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and adoption of the precautionary principle.	Other environmental designations	Comment noted.
Question 20	Irene	Curran	RSPB	40	Disagree	Proximity to European nature conservation sites, further evaluated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment and adoption of the	Other environmental	Comment noted.

Question Number	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	ID	Your View	Summary of comment	Theme	Council Response
						precautionary principle.	designations	
	Bob	Blezzard	Yarmouth Town Council	52	No Opinion	Need for new landfill sites kept to a minimum. The mining of waste at existing landfill sites to fuel the Gasification Plant and a strategy to minimise the waste going to landfill, not least commercial waste.	Alternatives	Comments noted.
Question 4	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	11	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ Site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 5	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	12	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ Site Specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 6	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	13	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ Site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 8	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	14	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 9	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	15	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 11	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	16	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.
Question 14	Mark	Buckett	AONB Planning Officer	17	No Opinion	Sites shortlisted for built facilities, impact on an AONB.	Alternative s/ site specific/ AONB	Comments noted.

