Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Date: 26 MAR 2007

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13712	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11764	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12598	TACR CONSULTANCY	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12446	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 Emphasis on domestic and industrial recycling and reuse of non bio-degradeable materials and liquids. This would lead to fewer landfill sites. Fines in place for those not recycling and payment for waste disposal by weight, as this too will encourage recycling and re-use.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12017	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12206	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12298	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	1.1 Yes 1.2 As outlined
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11822	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	1.1 Yes 1.2 Issue W1 includes sensible elements and objectives however the derived interim Spatial Vision needs more careful phrasing. A spatial vision needs a geographic component, which is currently lacking. This component should be brought in to cover the environmental and effects on local communities as in the Minerals Core Strategy interim vision (Minerals and Waste Newsletter No.5). Therefore my recommendation is that a change is made to the interim WCS Spatial Vision wording as follows: A sustainable and educational waste management system for Gloucestershire that reduces waste produced from businesses and households as a priority so that waste is diverted from landfill; the environment is conserved and enhanced; and local communities are protected.
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	13616	DAUNCEY, , MRS	1.1 No response 1.2 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11957	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	1.1 No response 1.2 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12659	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	1.1 No response 1.2 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12506	EGERTON, JO,	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 Greater "greener" waste management, in conjunction with effective cleanliness.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12689	GERRY, RITA,	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 Resolve 2 obvious oddities from your figures namely a) reduce the 35% of material taken to HRCs then landfilled and b)dramatically improve the 90% of C & I waste landfilled. As a long term vision encourage increased recycling by door step collections of additional recycleable materials. Make collections simple and consistent. Give something back to the public as a means of encouraging increased particpation.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12145	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.2 Along lines of government guidance
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	13584	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		1.2 As suggested but should include 'management of greenhouse gas emissions'.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12112	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		1.2 The Core Strategy should have a clear vision, but one that is couched in spatial terms that gives a sense of what Gloucestershire will be like by 2026. The currrent Issues and Options document only suggests two possible visions - the existing 'old style' vision and a revised version - which doesn't read like a vision. It may be better to use phrases along the lines of 'by 2026 Gloucestershire's waste production will be reduced by X and the remaining waste will be managed by X facilities located at..' and 'working in close partnership with', 'reduce the need for long distances especially between Gloucestershire, West Midlands', etc.
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12050	GVA GRIMLEY	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.2 The view is taken that a vision is required for the WCS. No comments are made with respect to the "interim spatial vision" set out in the Paper, although it is considered necessary to amend two of the proposed "Objectives" as set out below.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12231	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11794	JONES, CERI, CLLR	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	13773	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	13743	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11701	NATURAL ENGLAND	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		In general supports the interim spatial vision and most of the objectives.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
			1.2 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11893	NETWORK RAIL	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11568	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12567	NOTT, DARREN,	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 compulsory recycling of wood/card/paper/ glass/ plastics/ cans for all householders and businesses, coupled with refusal to accept waste generated out of area
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11987	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12536	QUEST, DAWN,	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 Within reasonable costs, to make Gloucestershire a place where reducing and recycling waste becomes second nature through the use of edcuation, especially concentrating on young people
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12082	RADWAY, T, MR	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13615	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	1.1 No response 1.2 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11832	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	1.1 Yes 1.2 The Agency supports the draft Spatial Vision which seeks to reduce waste produced from businesses and households as a priority and diverts waste from landfill. However the Agency believes that reference should also be made to the requirement for the majority of new waste management facilities to be located within the strategically significant towns and cities such as Cheltenham and Gloucester, as identified within the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Agency would wish to reserve the opportunity to comment on site specific proposals at a later stage.
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12628	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	1.1 Yes 1.2 No response
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	13680	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	1.1 No response 1.2 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11607	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	1.1 Yes 1.2 Needs to be spatial
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12720	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	1.1 Yes 1.2 Our long term vision for sustainable waste management in Gloucestershire is the objective of zero waste. Such an idea is likely to gain local support and could be achieved through various initiatives, particularly waste reduction and also by maximising re-use and recycling. The phasing-out of disposal by landfill of any waste that can be reused, recycled or composted is absolutely vital. Waste is a resource, and current strategy relies far too heavily upon disposal. As a society we over-consume, and waste produced by this consumption is an inefficient use of resources. Encouraging households and business to do more with fewer resources will help the whole community, the local economy and will create jobs in the local waste reduction sector. Initiatives from around the world have shown that people can be encouraged to recycle at levels of close to 100%. National legislation on things such as packaging would help but more must be done locally too. The widest possible ra nge of materials should be collected door-to-door. Incineration as a solution to waste in GCC should not be considered, even as an `energy from waste¿ process, because of the production of greenhouse and acid gas emissions, carcinogenic dioxins and toxic ash residues that threaten the health of the local population and the environment. Landfill produces greenhouse gases, including 25% of CH4 emissions in the country as well as CO2. Volatile organic compounds in landfill gas act as a precursor to photochemical smog, and furthermore the escape of waste leachate with its associated hazards may not be completely prevented. When we add the other obvious disadvantages of increased traffic and additional impacts discussed in Q7.1, it is absolutely clear that such methods of waste management cannot be considered sustainable. We also consider it imperative that in the planning of waste management sites, adequate importance is placed upon the protection of green field sites and the conservation of environmentally sensitive and valuable land.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12750	SWARD	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.2 We believe that this Waste Core Strategy should go further. We believe that waste avoidance needs to be pursued more vigorously to prevent waste arising in the first place. The ultimate success of the Strategy and other policies will be "zero waste". This may seem fancifully idealistic at this stage but other authorities around the world are pursuing it. It should stimulate innovation and concentrate minds to reach as closely as possible to the eventual elimination of landfill. Incineration is not an option as it produces air pollution control residues which themselves have to be landfilled. Whilst the County has to provide for reducing landfill requirements in order to escape paying large fines for failure to do so, the only realistic way is to proceed along the lines of zero waste. It will be hard to reach, but 30% failure to achieve zero waste by 2020 is better than successful achievement of the current 50% target. At the Stakeholders meeting in March a nu mber of local authority officials said that a 50% recycling rate was perfectly achievable in the next few years, let alone by 2020. If this is so then it seems to us that this County must press ahead to achieve much higher rates than set by central Government. However, it also seems to us that local authorities do not have sufficient powers to control the generation of waste in their areas. The Waste Minimisation Act, 1998, Annex C seems specifically to prohibit local authorities taking any action to require businesses to reduce the waste which they expect the local authorities to deal with. It seems invidious for local authorities to have to deal with anything thrown at them upon pain of penalty. Therefore any strategy should lead to gaining such powers. Simple examples are the plastic bags for inserts in the weekend newspapers. They should be paper which can be recycled. Only Epson printer ink cartridges cannot be recycled. With many alternatives available local authorities should have the power to prohibit sale of Epson printers until the cartridges are available. If Marks and Spencer can sell their sandwiches in compostable card and corn starch window packets, the local authorities should have power to require other retailers to do likewise. Local authorities should have power to prohibit the building industry using plastic one-use film to wrap building materials, and require the development of other means. The current inquiry by Sir Michael Lyons into local government organisation and funding will hopefully recommend more power for local decision making. Since local authorities are charged with giving planning permission for waste facilities, they should have the power to require innovation to ensure that landfill and incineration are not even considered for the vast majority of products. Any such powers will, of course, have to be exercised with reasonable notice to ensure orderly transition. The Regional Waste Strategy talked about zero waste, but this concept does not seem to have gone forward into the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. This is worrying because the hazardous waste site at Bishop¿s Cleeve seems to be allocated as the national dustbin for hazardous waste. This is not acceptable and not necessary.
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13514	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11668	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		1.2 The interim Spatial Vision is acceptable however the existing vision statement for the Waste Local Plan is more comprehensive in that it refers to how reducing waste can increase financial resource and how recycling can provide additional resources. This is in accordance with the guidance in PPS10.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	12475	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.2 70%
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11862	THAMES WATER PLC	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11731	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.2 We understand the waste hierarchy and also that current government policy is to reduce the use of landfill (landfill diversion). This implies that the top priority for councils is to find an alternative to the use of landfill, which you are yet to do. We therefore find the Spatial Vision strange in that you are aiming at the highest level of the waste hierarchy first - that of reducing the overall amount of waste.
Issue Ref:	1.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13017	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	1.1 a - Yes
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		Yes there would be a need for a vision or set of goals Not sure if the vision reflects your core business. Quite high level and almost reflects the principles that have been set e.g. waste hierarchy. If the vision is meant to be high level, the JMWMS and the WCS should probably agree on a single high level vision.Not sure the insertion of `educational' adds anything to the vision. Education is a tool and should not sit in the vision statement.
Issue Ref:	1.1		
			1.2 Not sure, we can¿t decide one for waste at the moment. Shall we have a workshop session????
Ref No:	11923	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	1.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		1.2 No response
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	11638	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	1.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.2 One that promotes maximum recovery, re-use and recycling of waste. Preferably as near to the point of production as possible, minimises landfill and safely disposes of hazardous waste
Issue Ref:	1.1		
Ref No:	13713	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11765	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12599	TACR CONSULTANCY	1.3 Don't know
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12447	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	1.3 Don't know
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12018	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12207	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12301	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11823	COUNTY ECOLOGIST	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	2207	**Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	
Respdt Type:	INTL		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	13617	DAUNCEY, , MRS	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11958	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12660	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12507	EGERTON, JO,	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12690	GERRY, RITA,	1.3 No
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 Your objectives are not the easiest things to understand. I do think you are on the right lines but would refer you to my vision above and include these objectives. Increase door step recycling collection to include cardboard and plastic bottles. Include small business in this recycling effort - only charge small businesses for non-recycleable collections. Use green waste and cardboard in composting and sell back the compost to the public a) to raise money but b) to include the public in the whole cycle and give them some benefits. Minimise transportation of all waste by all possible means - including the publics transporation of materials to collection areas and dumps.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12146	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	1.3 Don't know
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13585	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	1.3 Don't know
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		1.4 You need to reference greenhouse gas emissions.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12113	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	1.3 No reponse
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		1.4
Issue Ref:	1.2		2 - The SA states that Vision 'Option 2' will meet a number of objectives but doesn't explain why or how - for example, protecting the environment, preventing development in the flood plain etc.

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12051 **Respdt No:** 3805 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 1.2	GVA GRIMLEY	1.3 No response 1.4 9 should be further qualified with additional text as outlined below: "To make the best use of land by re-using previously developed sites in preference to undesignated greenfield locations where this is proven to be the most sustainable option." The above amendment is considered necessary because although national policy gives priority to the re-use/redevelopment of previously-developed land ahead of greenfield sites, this is only relevant where it represents the most sustainable option. This is reflected in paragraph 27(viii) of Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005) which states that planning authorities should "promote...the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings..." (emphasis added). For example, it may be more sustainable in terms of transport movements to develop a waste management facility on a grrenfield site on the edge of an urban area rather than redeveloping a previously developed site in a remote area of the countryside. 12 Amended to read as follows: "To safeguard existing waste management facilities and sites allocated for waste management facilities from other proposed development where there is a demonstrable need for such sites to be retained for waste management purposes". The above revisions are considered necessary for the following two reasons: i) Only existing waste management facilities and sites specifically allocated for waste usage should be safeguarded. Simply stating 'sites suitable' is considered to be too vague and far-reaching as this could potentially be applied to unallocated sites; and ii) Sites should only be safeguarded where it can be demonstrated that there is a need to retain them for waste purposes e.g. where there is a clear shortfall in land available to meet targets for the development of waste management facilities. Without this caveat there is a risk that land will be safguarded even though it may no longer be required for waste purposes or where there is no realistic prospect of a waste development taking place. As such, it will be contrary to paragraphs 2.32 and 2.33 of Planning Policy Statement 12 (2004) as it could result in the sterilisation/blight of land.

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12232	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 I would like to see clean plastic packaging amongst the items collected from the green recycling boxes. At present it is rejected.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11795	JONES, CERI, CLLR	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		1.4 Particularly important objectives are 7, 8 and 10.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	13774	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	13744	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11702	NATURAL ENGLAND	1.3 No
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		1.4 Objective 9 states that previously developed sites will be used in preference to undesignated greenfield locations. It should be noted that some brownfield sites have significant biodiversity and geological interest. PPS9 recommends that local planning authorities should aim to retain this interst or incorporate it into the development of the site. Objective 9, as currently phrased runs the risk of encouraging development on sites of wildlife value.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11894	NETWORK RAIL	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11569	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12568	NOTT, DARREN,	1.3 No
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 not a question of altering objectives, just do not believe it will ever happen, things never do in Gloucestershire
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11988	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.4 The 12 key issues that need to be addressed by the WCS are all very pertinent and relevant to our community. The major problem with waste disposal is one of education and responsibility (both to the local community and to the environment). It is very easy to have a 'quick fix' by a waste management contractor who is, by definition only interested in increasing waste so that their gate fee is maxmised.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12537	QUEST, DAWN,	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12083	RADWAY, T, MR	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	13646	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11833	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		1.4 The Agency supports the 14 objectives which have been devised to help deliver the Vision, in particular objective nos. 7, 10 and 11, which include reference to transportation of waste.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12629	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	1.3 No
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.4 Basically support all the objectives but favour nos 3,4,5 & 9
Issue Ref:	1.2		Objective 10: our nearest waste disposal site is not in our District. Either Shurdington should be able to use the Cheltenham site, or Tewkesbury Borough needs a facility south of Cheltenham. Objective 11: We are concerned that a disproportionate amount of waste is being transported from the SE of England to Gloucestershire.
Ref No:	13681	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11608	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	1.3 Yes
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12721	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	1.3 No
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 1-2. The strategy appears correct to us but the targets defined by the EU could be improved upon. 3. The approach is good but the objectives are not attainable with incineration or continued use of landfill, landfill in the medium to long term is simply unsustainable. 7. Again we feel the approach is right, but the objectives are not attainable with incineration or continued use of landfill. 8. This objective sounds reasonable here but its aims are not substantiated in Policies 23 and 26. 10-11. These objectives raise complicated points, and we believe the consideration of conservation areas should be taken further into account. Waste must be diverted from landfill. Having made a study of the district to identify the key resources used, where they originate from and where they end up, GCC should work towards a zero waste strategy with a view to eliminating any landfill waste in the district by 2018. This strategy would involve widespread consultation with all the significant producers and handlers of waste. High local recycling and composting targets of 50% by 2010 and 75% by 2015 should be set. We believe these issues should be treated with greater urgency in the light of their huge importance.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12751	SWARD	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	13515	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	1.3 Don't know
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11670	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	1.3 Yes, if all objectives are met
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		1.4 We agree with the objectives, they do not appear 'SMART' in that they appear to be more statements of the vision rather than objectives. The objectives do however refer to minimising waste as a priority and using waste as a resource.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
			We suggest that the objectives are ordered in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy (Reduce - Re-use - Recycle - Recovery - Disposal) e.g. move objective 4 up (waste minimisation) up the list to objective 2, then objective 2 (re-use) becomes objective 3 and so on.

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12476	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	1.3 Don't know
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11863	THAMES WATER PLC	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	11732	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	1.3 No
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		1.4 We think the first priority should be to address the landfill diversion problem. We think your first priority should be to address the landfill alternative, with perhaps the second being to progress through the waste hierarchy with respect to more recycling (to which we will return) and waste reduction.
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	13018	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	1.3 a - Yes
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		If your objectives don¿t achieve sustainable waste management then no-one¿s will. Very detailed and covering everything I can think of.Your objectives are still very complicated. Maybe some need splitting down further. This may mean you have more but they will be simpler! Some objectives could be perceived as decision-making principles rather than objectives. The JMWMS and the WCS should be complimentary but will inevitably be different as we have different roles.The question is: do the objectives allow planning applications to be delivered in an economically viable way?
Issue Ref:	1.2		1.4 No response
Ref No:	11924	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	1.3 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		1.4 No response
Issue Ref:	1.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11639	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	1.3 Yes 1.4 2 More specifically consider waste/heat and power (Sect 5.30) transfer/generating stations for local power in Glos. 4 Consider extension of subsidised home composting kits for domestic use (as exisiting for Stroud Town/District Councils)
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	1.2		
Ref No:	12114	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	It may be beneficial for the objectives to include the desire to co-locate on mixed use sites and the desire to reduce the amount of cross boundary exporting and importing wherever possible.
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	1.4		
Ref No:	11925	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	We support the objectives identified in Issue W1.
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	1.4		
Ref No:	13714	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	2.1 No response 2.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11766	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	2.1 2018 The challenge of educating people regarding attitudes to recycling and future advances in technology mean a review in approximately 10 years is appropriate. 2.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12600	TACR CONSULTANCY	2.1 Other - As soon as possible say 2010 2.2 No
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	2.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12448	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12019	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11566	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	2.1 Section W2 The Boards preference would be for the Core Strategy to have the same timescale as the South West Regional Spatial Strategy.
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	2.1		2.2 No response
Ref No:	12302	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11824	COUNTY ECOLOGIST	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	2207	**Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	
Respdt Type:	INTL		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	13618	DAUNCEY, , MRS	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11959	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12661	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12508	EGERTON, JO,	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12691	GERRY, RITA,	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12147	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	2.1 2026
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	13586	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	2.1 2020
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		2.2 Don't know
Issue Ref:	2.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12115	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12052	GVA GRIMLEY	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12234	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11796	JONES, CERI, CLLR	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	13775	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	13745	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11703	NATURAL ENGLAND	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11895	NETWORK RAIL	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11572	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		2.2 No
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12569	NOTT, DARREN,	2.1 Other
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		something needs to be done now, or the problem will only get worse. It can be done in 2-3 years if the will is there, otherwise it will just get stalled, changed, watered down , quietly dropped and in a few years reannounced as another new initiative
Issue Ref:	2.1		
			2.2 Yes
Ref No:	11989	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12538	QUEST, DAWN,	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12084 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 2.1	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	2.1 Other - As early as possible 2.2 No response
Ref No: 13647 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 2.1	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	2.1 No response 2.2 No response
Ref No: 11834 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 2.1	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	2.1 No response 2.2 No response
Ref No: 12630 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 2.1	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	2.1 Other To meet environmental targets already in place we suggest 2012 as an appropriate time frame to work towards. The WCS should look in detail to 2012 and more generally to 2020. 2.2 No
Ref No: 13682 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 2.1	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	2.1 No response 2.2 No response
Ref No: 11609 **Respdt No:** 2725 **Respdt Type:** DC **Issue Ref:** 2.1	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	2.1 2018 and 2026 2.2 Yes

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12722	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12752	SWARD	2.1 2026
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	13516	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11671	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	2.1 2020
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		The plan should look ahead as along as possible. PPS10 recommends that a WCS should look forward at least 10 years from adoption and look ahead to any longer term timescale that may be set by the RSS, in this instance that is 2026.
Issue Ref:	2.1		2.2 We recognise that there are uncertainties with long time-scales therefore as national landfill targets will be in for 2020 it may be more appropriate to look in detail until then rather than 2018.
Ref No:	12477	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11864	THAMES WATER PLC	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11733	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	2.1 2018
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	13019	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	2.1 b - 2020
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		Appropriate timeframe- 2020. If the strategy is too long there may not be opportunity to bring forward new sites and gaining planning if not identified would be more difficult. 2020 would be a good time as this coincides with the BMW landfill diversion targets and the length of the JMWMS
Issue Ref:	2.1		
			2.2 b - No
			Most important for LATS is delivery of facilities by 2013/14
Ref No:	11926	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	2.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		2.2 No response
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	11640	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	2.1 2026
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		2.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	2.1		
Ref No:	12116	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	Given that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets the framework for all spatial plans, it would seem logical for the Core Strategy to look to 2026. We appreciate that flexibility within the Plan is important, but the overarching strategy of where future development will take place will be set out to 2026 in the RSS. It is not clear from the explanation in your SA on this subject as to why the 2026 date is uncertain in respect of a number of objectives - on what evidence of advice are these uncertainties based on? Are there any possible mitigation measures that could overcome them?
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	2.3		It would also clarify the existing policy framework if your next Issues and Options document were to refer to RPG10 which is currently part of the Development Plan.

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11927	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	We would support a timeframe that is consistent with local development documents for housing and employment areas.
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	2.3		
Ref No:	13715	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11767	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12601	TACR CONSULTANCY	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12449	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12020	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12208	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12304	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11825	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13619	DAUNCEY, , MRS	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11960	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12662	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12509	EGERTON, JO,	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12692	GERRY, RITA,	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12148	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13587	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12117	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12053	GVA GRIMLEY	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12235	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11797	JONES, CERI, CLLR	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13776	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13746	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11704	NATURAL ENGLAND	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11896	NETWORK RAIL	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	3.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11577 **Respdt No:** 998 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 3.1	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Ref No: 12571 **Respdt No:** 3840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.1	NOTT, DARREN,	3.1 Yes
Ref No: 11990 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 3.1	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.1 No response
Ref No: 12539 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.1	QUEST, DAWN,	3.1 Yes
Ref No: 12085 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 3.1	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	3.1 Yes
Ref No: 13648 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.1	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.1 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11835	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12631	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13683	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11610	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12723	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12753	SWARD	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13517	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11672	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	12478	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11865	THAMES WATER PLC	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11734	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13020	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	3.1 a - Yes Excellent approach, particularly when dealing with proposals for new developments (householders etc). WCS needs to reflect waste min.activities in the provision of land.The Waste minimisation SPD should be saved and kept as the document addressing waste minimisation. The JMWMS should lead on the waste minimisation activities and policies for municipal waste but these should be aligned. How do this policies get enforced to ensure that permissions adhere to policy??.
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11928	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	3.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	11641	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	3.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.1		
Ref No:	13716	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	11768	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	3.2 A combination of a and b
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 A combination of both of the above
Ref No:	12602	TACR CONSULTANCY	3.2 b) Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 Allocating part of the site for suitable waste facilities

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12450 **Respdt No:** 3836 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.2	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	3.2 b) Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement. 3.3 Yes 3.4 Allocating part of the site for suitable waste facilities
Ref No: 12021 **Respdt No:** 2840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.2	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Ref No: 12209 **Respdt No:** 3400 **Respdt Type:** AONB **Issue Ref:** 3.2	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Ref No: 12305 **Respdt No:** 3827 **Respdt Type:** ENV **Issue Ref:** 3.2	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	3.2 a 3.3 Yes 3.4 Other - Developers only responsible for the building site waste they create
Ref No: 11826 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 3.2	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13620	DAUNCEY, , MRS	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	11961	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	12663	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	12510	EGERTON, JO,	3.2 c) combination of a & b
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 Making monetary contributions towards the development of waste management infrastructure elsewhere
Ref No:	12693	GERRY, RITA,	3.2 b) Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 A combination of both of the above

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12149	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	3.2 Rely on the saved WLP Policy 36 and roll it forward broadly in its current state into the WCS 3.3 Yes 3.4 Other - Build in facilities for some waste management. But contributions constitute a tax. Has to be specific to site development.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	13588	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	3.2 b - Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning application to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement. 3.3 Yes 3.4 c - a combination of both of the above
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	12118	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	3.2 Whilst it is appropriate to use existing local plan policies as a starting point, we do not consider that rolling Policy 36 forward will necessarily achieve the desired outcomes of a truly spatial plan. It is not clear from the documents submitted whether current evidence, recent national and regional planning policies and the SA process have found the existing policy still fit for purpose. In light of PPS22, we think it would be appropriate for the WCS to include a specific policy on energy from waste and would suggest you consider the various types of waste treatment and technology options contained in PPS22's Companion Guide. However, you should be aware that DEFRA have publicly expressed the view that there is a need for more energy from waste plants/incinerators to meet biodegradable waste diversion from landfill targets. 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	12054	GVA GRIMLEY	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12236	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 Allocating part of the site for suitable waste facilities
Ref No:	11798	JONES, CERI, CLLR	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	13777	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	13747	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	11705	NATURAL ENGLAND	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11897	NETWORK RAIL	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	11578	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	3.2 Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement.
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 A combination of both of the above
Ref No:	12572	NOTT, DARREN,	3.2 c) A combination of a & b
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 A combination of both of the above
Ref No:	11991	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		3.3 No response
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 No response
Ref No:	12540	QUEST, DAWN,	3.2 No response
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	3.2		
			3.4 A combination of both of the above

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12086 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 3.2	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Ref No: 13649 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.2	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Ref No: 11836 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.2	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Ref No: 12633 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 3.2	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.2 b) Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement 3.3 Yes 3.4 Allocating part of the site for suitable waste facilities. Policies should be put in place which avoid over-ordering of materials.
Ref No: 13684 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.2	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11611	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.2 Revise WLP Policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste mnimisation statement 3.3 Yes 3.4 A combination of both of the above
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	12724	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	3.2 c) A combination of a & b 3.3 Yes 3.4 A combination of both of the above
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	12754	SWARD	3.2 c) A combination of a & b A programme for advancing towards zero waste. There should be no threshold. Even the householder building a DIY conservatory should submit a waste minimisation plan to show how he will deal with surplus material and packaging waste 3.3 Yes 3.4 A combination of both of the above Applicants should be responsible financially for disposing of all the waste from their operations
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	13518	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.2 b - Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning application to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement. 3.3 Yes 3.4 c - A combination of both of the above;
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11673	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.2 Combination of a and b above 3.3 Yes 3.4 A combination of both of the above
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	12479	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	3.2 b) Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning applications to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement 3.3 Yes 3.4 C - A combination of both of the above
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	11866	THAMES WATER PLC	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	11735	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	3.2 D - another format. We do not believe that you can plan on the basis on an incremental decrease in waste over the coming years; keeping it to current levels, with population increase, will be an achievement in itself. We therefore feel that whatever you decide with more waste than at present to maximise on value for money in infrastructure costs. 3.3 No - With your aim to reduce waste, we were surprised with some of your suggestions to make this happen. For example, your reference to asking developers to pay for waste services for new housing developments, shops etc. If this was the priority for 'planning gain' then it may be possible to obtain some upfront funding as part of the 'negotiations' to obtain planning permission. But we do not see that ongoing charges are either workable or reasonable. New developments require infrastructure of every kind to support them - waste is relatively low down the priority list to have to be dealt with in this way, Developers will pass on the waste 'charges' to the new property owners, who will then end up paking twice for their waste services as they will also have council tax to pay (which includes monies for waste). 3.4 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13021	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	3.2 b - Revise WLP policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning application to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement Again, how do this policies get enforced to ensure that permissions/statements are adhered to??.E.g. how do you ensure that a developer actually plumbs in the water butts and doesn¿t just provide one? 3.3 a - Yes 3.4 c - A combination of both of the above Should be recognised when applications are submitted to address sustainability of the development and future impact once the facility/housing is built and operational
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	11929	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	3.2 No response 3.3 No response 3.4 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	11642	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	3.2 Revise WLP Policy 36 to take account of new issues, such as threshold sizes of planning application to determine whether applicants need to submit a waste minimisation statement 3.3 Yes 3.4 A combination of both of the above
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.2		
Ref No:	13717	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11769	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12603	TACR CONSULTANCY	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12451	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12022	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12210	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12309	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	3.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11827	COUNTY ECOLOGIST	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	2207	**Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	13621	DAUNCEY, , MRS	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11962	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12664	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12511	EGERTON, JO,	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12694	GERRY, RITA,	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		Composting is essential and beneficial to everyone. This muct include making the completed compost available back to the public. Recycling must be increased to include additional materials including cardboard and plastic bottles etc. Recycling must include small businesses - they should only pay for removal of non-recyclyeable materials.

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12150	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	13589	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12119	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12055	GVA GRIMLEY	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12237	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11800	JONES, CERI, CLLR	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	3.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13778	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	13748	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11706	NATURAL ENGLAND	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11898	NETWORK RAIL	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11579	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12570	NOTT, DARREN,	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11992 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 3.3	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.5 No response
Ref No: 12541 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.3	QUEST, DAWN,	3.5 Yes
Ref No: 12087 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 3.3	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	3.5 Yes
Ref No: 13650 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.3	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.5 No response
Ref No: 11837 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.3	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	3.5 No response
Ref No: 12634 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 3.3	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.5 No The first option should be re-use

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13685	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11612	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.5 Yes - where appropriate
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12725	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	12755	SWARD	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	13519	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11674	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12481	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11867	THAMES WATER PLC	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11736	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	3.5 No - Only some waste is appropriate for composting, and outlets cannot be found for all recyclables. A method should be chosen that is the best balance of financial and environmental factors.
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	13022	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	3.5 a - Yes
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11930	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	3.5 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.3		
Ref No:	11643	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	3.5 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13718	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11770	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		3.7 Key points:- Only finite areas of appropriate places to locate all category waste landfill sites. Rising energy costs and finite supplies of fossil fuels suggests that energy recovery from waste should be examined as part of long term solution
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12604	TACR CONSULTANCY	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		3.7 The Government and the LPA MUST be pro-active in finding market outlets for re-cycled waste. It is no good recycling it if you cannot dispose of the end product economically
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12452	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.7 Charges for the cost of disposal which could be put towards environmental improvements such as tree planting and funding alternative forms of energy (i.e. grants for industry and homeowners)- anything to balance the environmental damage caused by landfill and carbon emissions.
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12023	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12211	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12310	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	3.6 Yes 3.7 1) Define 'value' 2) Must be material specific 3) Must define process and site
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11828	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13622	DAUNCEY, , MRS	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11963	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12665	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12512	EGERTON, JO,	3.6 Don't know 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12695	GERRY, RITA,	3.6 Don't know
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12151	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	3.6 Don't know
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13590	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		3.7 Energy recovery needs to be addressed in an open honest manner.
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12121	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3127	TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE	
Respdt Type:	NGOV	FOR THE SOUTH WEST	3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12056	GVA GRIMLEY	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12238	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11801	JONES, CERI, CLLR	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13779	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13749	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11707	NATURAL ENGLAND	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11899	NETWORK RAIL	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11580	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		3.7 Re-use of metals Alternative uses for building residue
Issue Ref:	3.4		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12574 **Respdt No:** 3840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.4	NOTT, DARREN,	3.6 Don't know 3.7 No response
Ref No: 11993 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 3.4	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Ref No: 12542 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.4	QUEST, DAWN,	3.6 Yes 3.7 No response
Ref No: 12088 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 3.4	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	3.6 Yes 3.7 No response
Ref No: 13651 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.4	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Ref No: 11838 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.4	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	3.6 No response 3.7 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12635	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.6 Yes 3.7 Technology to extract metals and other valuable waste residues should be installed. Manual sorting of waste should take place at all depots.
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13686	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.6 No response 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11613	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.6 Yes 3.7 Should refer to weight relative or time taken to decompose or space used.
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12726	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	3.6 Yes 3.7 We agree with the proposal in the question but it is important that the policy is sufficiently detailed.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12756	SWARD	3.6 Yes 3.7 A policy to regard recovery value as a temporary situation only, with a time limit to allow for a zero waste solution.
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13520	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.6 Don't know 3.7 No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11675	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	12482	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	3.6 No
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		3.7 Question not understood. Consultation documents should be phrased in simple, every day English, not 'jargonese'.
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11868	THAMES WATER PLC	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11737	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	3.6 Yes
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		3.7 1 - required under EU and UK policy 2 - waste should be treated as a resource
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13023	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	3.6 a - Yes
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		3.7 Refer to the JMWMS wording¿.residual waste objective. Objective 5: ¿Residual Waste as a Resource¿To maximise recovery of recyclables and gain further value from residual waste before disposal. We will provide residual waste treatment capacity to divert waste from landfill, and find/or develop markets for recovered materials¿We intend to manage any residual waste (often referred to as `black bag¿ waste) that remains as a potential resource.¿Can your wording reflect this objective?
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	11931	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	3.6 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		3.7 No response
Issue Ref:	3.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11644	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	3.6 Yes 3.7 1 - Consider combined heat/power facilities 2 - Agree regional strategy (RSS) for disposal of hazardous waste
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.4		
Ref No:	13719	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11771	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12605	TACR CONSULTANCY	3.8 Marketing and GCC changing its Specification for Roads as an example where recycled aggregates are preferred to prime material
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12453	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12024	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12212	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12313	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	3.8 An essential part of the community structure: 'Need' a requirement of necessity.
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11829	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13623	DAUNCEY, , MRS	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11964	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12666	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12513	EGERTON, JO,	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12696	GERRY, RITA,	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12152	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	3.8 Competition is required to keep costs of management down. "Need" should not therefore be a mandatory issue.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13591	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	3.8 Communities where possible should take responsibility for their own arisings.
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12122	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12057	GVA GRIMLEY	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12239	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11802	JONES, CERI, CLLR	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13780	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13750	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11708	NATURAL ENGLAND	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11900	NETWORK RAIL	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11581	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	3.8 Examine efficiency of alternative methods i.e. anaerobic combustion. Take advantage of experience on other countries in the E.E.C
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12575	NOTT, DARREN,	3.8 more local recycling facilities / large skip areas needed to promote use as not everyone able / willing to get to one of the few large areasa in county, eg. hempstead / bishops cleeve
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11994	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12543	QUEST, DAWN,	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12089	RADWAY, T, MR	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13652	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11839	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12636	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.8 The financial cost as well as the environmental consequences of squandering the planet's resources needs to emphasised at all times.
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13687	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11614	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.8 On a spatial level
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12727	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	3.8 This seems a badly worded question, the exact meaning is unclear to us. We are not sure why the word `need¿ is highlighted in this way.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12757	SWARD	3.8 Communities should come to ¿own¿ their waste and not regard the local authority as responsible for ¿magicking¿ it away. Businesses will then begin to provide goods and packaging which will enable communities to reduce their waste dramatically.
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13521	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.8 The WCS should include reference to the likely number and type of waste management facilities needed within the time scale.
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11676	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.8 The WCS must deal with the 'need' for facilities. If facilities are built into developments the awareness is already there.
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	12483	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	3.8 See comment in 3.7: Question not understood. Consultation documents should be phrased in simple, every day English, not 'jargonese'.
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11869	THAMES WATER PLC	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11738	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	3.8 Essential - We accept that landfill diversion means waste plants will need to be built to take the waste that currently goes to landfill. We would hope that these plants will be capable of producing some value (electricity for example). we understand that larger plants offer better value for money (for use of council taxes) than smaller plants, and would therefore support a smaller number of these. As far as location is concerned, use of existing industrial sites close to large centres of population seems sensible, since this reduces overall vehicle movements. Fewer, larger plants also mean that fewer neighbouring communities are impacted by waste facilities.
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13024	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	3.8 Industry and Local authorities should be responsible for deciding what facilities are required for the different waste streams. The WCS should consider the need for facilities based on the waste produced (waste data provided) and reflect the land requirements/sites needed based on this.
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11932	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	3.8 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	11645	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	3.8 Has to be seen as part of the strategy for overall housing/industrial/service development across region as well as County
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.5		
Ref No:	13720	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11772	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12606	TACR CONSULTANCY	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12454	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12025	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12213	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12315	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	3.9 Not at present
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11830	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13624	DAUNCEY, , MRS	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11965	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12667	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12514	EGERTON, JO,	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12697	GERRY, RITA,	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12153	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13592	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12120	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12058	GVA GRIMLEY	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12240	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11803	JONES, CERI, CLLR	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13781	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13751	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11709	NATURAL ENGLAND	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11901	NETWORK RAIL	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11582	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	3.9 No
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12576	NOTT, DARREN,	3.9 stop accepting waste from out of area, eg. Bristol. Force areas / people to recycle / dispose of waste ithin area it is generated
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11995	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.9 We need to stand back and re-look at the problem; indeed Central Government needs to take a pivotal role. The emphasis has to be for the individual to look at what they are throwing away and what could be reused within their home (this would include home composting of garden and food refuse). Indeed it is obvious that waste companies are fuelling the increase in domestic waste as it is in their own interests to see an expansion of waste and therefore an increase in their turnover. By education, by charging for every extra bag, by fining for waste that could be recovered, by controlled supermarkets and making them responsible for the waste that they produce we can reduce the volume of waste collected at the curbside. With waste reduced so is transport and therefore carbon and methane emissions. There must be more emphasis on home composting, more local recycling facilities and less transportation of waste. The County can assist by lobbying Central Government for legislation to contol the food industry, by creating and education programme which each Parish could implement and by increasing the number of products that can be accepted into the counties waste stream (cardboard). For the individuals it surely must be more beneficial to have a national standard for recycling so that each area is following the same path. The problem is too large for each individual county to organise on a local basis. National Government has to have a greater detailed involvement. We have to look at the complete waste hierarchy and concentrate on the main issue " waste prevention and reduction" instead of always just starting with recycling.
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12544	QUEST, DAWN,	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12090	RADWAY, T, MR	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13653	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11840	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12637	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	3.9 Re-usable waste, suitable for private or commercial enterprises, should be accessible for removal at all public facilities. It is essential to provide staff to facilitate this re-use. Manufacturers should be made more responsible for dealing with the waste that they generate. Materials used should be returnable, re-usable to recyclable. Food retailers should facilitate re-use by issuing points as a reward and seek to reduce packaging generally.
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13688	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11615	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12728 **Respdt No:** 3842 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.6	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	3.9 In the drive towards zero waste, reduction and prevention are the most important steps, but further measures can be taken in achieving the lower tier objectives as well. With regard to MSW, public education campaigns should be started and supported, especially via households and schools, to reduce resource consumption and increase the re-use and recycling of waste. The widest possible range of materials including plastics, paper, cardboard, glass, tin, clothing, books, toys and biodegradable waste should be collected door-to-door. But the limitations and drawbacks of recycling must also be acknowledged. We would like to see a range of new waste technologies being developed, such as the development of hydrogen fuel cell technology as well as continuing support for initiatives like mechanical biological treatment and anaerobic digestion. We agree that much more needs to be done to divert C&D waste away from landfill and the recycling possibilities further explored and de veloped. We believe also that easy access facilities must be developed for the recycling of hazardous chemicals, engine oil and oil filters, including selling back recycled oil. Communities should be encouraged to share and re-use waste building and DIY materials such as wood, piping and paint through the use of community sheds as collection and distribution points. Civic amenity sites could be converted so that they can also perform a function as local re-use and recycle centres. We would hope to see the increase in community composting schemes in co-operation with local allotment associations being encouraged and co-ordinated where necessary. Cost-price compost bins should be provided to local residents in order to recycle organic materials, sourcing them wherever possible from local re-used waste materials. Local authorities can encourage and, where appropriate, subsidise new business ventures that re-use waste materials as well as enforcing existing anti-litter laws, improving street cleaning and introducing on-street recycling skips. However, while recycling is of immense value it is also important to remember that it requires energy, usually provided by fossil fuels, and in many ways recycling is far from being an environmental success. Crushing, pulping and smelti ng materials is hugely energy intensive and damaging to our environment. Therefore more emphasis should be placed upon reclaiming and re-using materials rather than destroying and then reproducing them. The simple fact of using fewer resources is not only more desirable but less expensive, particularly after the introduction of landfill tax which reflects scarcity of land. Local businesses should be encouraged to do more with fewer resources, thereby benefiting the economy of the County. In addition, many sorting and processing jobs will be created in waste reduction industries. The ideas of second-hand shops, furniture recycling and second-hand Sundays (as in other European countries) should be considered. The issue of supermarkets is very important, and there is no discussion here of how they could be encouraged or made to reduce their packaging. Elsewhere in the WCS, waste is measured in tonnes, yet landfill capacity is measured in cubic metres (of compacted waste). So in a sense the use of weight is convenient, but not what finally matters. How different would the recycling rates be if expressed in compacted waste volume?

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12758	SWARD	3.9 Campaigns to raise awareness are good, but there may be need to apply pressure where it is perfectly possible to improve the position in the hierarchy.
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13522	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11677	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.9 The Council must 'practice what it preaches' by ensuring its own developments have in built facilities and push contractors to work to higher standards - 'Lead by example'.
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	12484	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	3.9 Reducing the amount of packaging will help achieve waste prevention and reduction.
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11870	THAMES WATER PLC	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11739	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	3.9 Villagers in Uley are keen to recycle and expect that their efforts will result in the production of recycled goods. However, there have been a number of television documentaries which have revealed that much of the waste destined for recycling is actually sent to landfill (or in some cases sent abroad to be dumped in another country!). If you propose to ask people to do more recycling, then we need to know that it will genuinely be recycled, not merely 'sent for recycling' to meet your targets. So you need to ensure that this happens and provide re-assurance on this point to encourage more recycling (perhaps e.g. providing examples of recycled things produced directly from Gloucestershire's waste).
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13025	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	3.9 The policies are sufficient to ensure that the waste hierarchy is implemented. Care must be taken to ensure that the solutions at the bottom of the waste hierarchy solutions can be successfully implemented alongside the recycling/composting treatment solutions. The Waste hierarchy needs to be implemented as a `package¿. Again, landfill is an essential part of the package and always will be.The waste hierarchy to date has been difficult to implement based on the policies in WLP. Several attempts by industry have failed to gain planning consent for composting facilities. P¿haps we need to learn from experience???? Why have these failed? Policy or Political? Sites not in the WLP?We need to have a greater understanding of the waste stream, particularly business/commercial waste as this would assist the implementation of the waste hierarchy.
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11933	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	3.9 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	11646	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	3.9 Council tax concessions for businesses/organisations/households implementing local recycling schemes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	3.6		
Ref No:	13678	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	3.7 Waste Strategy 2000 recognises that to develop more sustainable waste strategies, the UK has to move from an over-reliance on landfill, to more integrated strategies including energy, recovery, recycling and composting. The Landfill Directive requires a substantial diversion of the biodegradable fraction of MSW from landfill and this is reflected in challenging targets for recycling and composting in WS2000. The net result is expected to be an order of magnitude increase in the amounts of MSW composted. WS2000, as it applies in Wales, is currently under review. Targets for Wales will be produced in the waste strategy for Wales during 2001-2002.
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	3.7		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 13689 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 3.7	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	Municipal Waste Management Paragraphs 4.11 to 4.38 deal exclusively with Municipal Solid Waste (MSW). We accept that the county through its role as a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) has access to detailed information on the management of this waste stream. We feel the analysis in this section is the best available and inline with those which we have seen in our role as a statutory consultee on other plans and strategies in the region. We offer no further comments on the analysis on MSW in the county. Paragraphs 4.39 to 4.48 address the management of Commercial and industrial wastes managed in the county. We support the separation of metal wastes from the overall management of this waste stream for the reasons stated by the county in paragraph 4.40. Drawing municipal waste disposal figures from your Table 9 and subtracting this from our grossed figure for disposal of all types of non-inert wastes presented in our Table 1. We would agree and support the figure of around 360,000 tonnes for the disposal of commercial and industrial wastes in Gloucestershire¿s landfills. Our information on the management of metal wastes through sites specifically licensed for this waste stream would broadly agree with your analysis presented in your table 12 and paragraph 4.41. We would support the analysis and assumption in paragraph 4.44. Our data on the disposal of all types of non-inert wastes from 2000 to 2004/05 in table 1 above shows considerable variability with a mean of 565,000 tonnes per annum. This would give an estimated average of around 330,000 tonnes of just commercial type wastes if your estimate (230,000 tonnes) of municipal waste disposal is accounted for within the total. Since the publication of Defra¿s Waste Data Strategy the Environment Agency as a key partner has worked hard to improve the quality of its waste monitoring data. We have recently completed our quality assurance of the annual data for 2005 and present in table 2 and 3 further information on waste disposal statistics for your reference. C&I Waste Management Capacity The Environment Agency, on behalf of the SW Regional Technical Advisory Board (SW RTAB) and WPA partners have been engaged in a comprehensive assessment of licensed waste management capacity. We will be submitting a final report to the SWRTAB early in the New Year. Having completed the majority of the work for the SWRTAB we would broadly support the approach and analysis summarised in Table 14 and would draw the same general conclusions. There is potentially a significant shortfall in capacity to divert non-inert commercial type wastes from landfill in future years. The demand for such capacity is hard to predict and will clearly be driven by central government policy.

Response	Respondent	Representations
		C&D Waste management It should be recognised that over the last five years there have been significant changes in the way information was collected, classified and collated on waste managed through licensed facilities. There are clearly some discrepancies between the information presented in our Table 1 and your Table 15. We do not consider these significant and the broad picture for C&D waste management remains the same. We agree with the county¿s analysis and conclusions in paragraph 4.52. Landfill Capacity We agree with the analysis of landfill void and would support the assumptions used in forecasting future demand. We would like to draw the county¿s attention to our Table 2 which shows the sub regional significance of disposal sites located in the county.
Ref No: 13803 **Respdt No:** 3842 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 3.7	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	We are fundamentally opposed to any likely increases in incineration anywhere because of the many environmental and health risks associated with this method of waste disposal. However, the pros and cons of pyrolysis followed by very high temperature combustion need to be researched. While we are not explicitly endorsing this method at the moment, we are supportive of further research (see reference to Page 27, W12 (i) of the WCS, below). In addition to the health hazards, incinerators are unsightly, inefficient in energy production, expensive and require additional large vehicle traffic. Incinerators also undermine efforts to reduce, re-use and recycle waste because it has to be seen to be necessary to justify the investment in them. We should look at what is already achieved elsewhere in the EU. Our aim in Gloucestershire should be to stay ahead of and better the NWS rates and be the national leader. We should have a long term aim of "zero waste to tip". The means for this were outlined in a national conference on Zero Waste attended by local councillors and officers on 17th October 2002. P11. We note that the major waste streams (C & I and Agricultural) are not under any form of enforceable control. P14. Long term aim must be "zero waste to tip" if this policy is to be called sustainable. Hence a long-term vision should be included which does not include landfill.
Ref No: 13721 **Respdt No:** 3172 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 4.1	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	4.1 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11773	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12607	TACR CONSULTANCY	4.1 Don't know
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12455	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	4.1 Don't know
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12026	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12214	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12316	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	4.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11831 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 4.1	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	4.1 No response
Ref No: 13625 **Respdt No:** 3784 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.1	DAUNCEY, , MRS	4.1 No response
Ref No: 11966 **Respdt No:** 2747 **Respdt Type:** AA **Issue Ref:** 4.1	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	4.1 No response
Ref No: 12668 **Respdt No:** 536 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 4.1	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	4.1 No response
Ref No: 12515 **Respdt No:** 3838 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.1	EGERTON, JO,	4.1 Yes
Ref No: 12698 **Respdt No:** 3841 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.1	GERRY, RITA,	4.1 Don't know

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12154	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	13593	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	4.1 Yes But, there should not be such an one provision of strategic sites should be allocated. Small scale should be subject to criteria based policies.
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12123	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	4.1 As with question 3, the overarching strategy should be based on your evidence, the latest policy frameworks and the findings of your SA.
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12059	GVA GRIMLEY	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12241	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11804	JONES, CERI, CLLR	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	4.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13782	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	13752	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11710	NATURAL ENGLAND	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11902	NETWORK RAIL	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11583	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12577	NOTT, DARREN,	4.1 No will never hapen on timescale given. Needs to be accelerated and compressed
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11996 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 4.1	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.1 No response
Ref No: 12545 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.1	QUEST, DAWN,	4.1 Yes
Ref No: 12091 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 4.1	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	4.1 Yes
Ref No: 13654 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 4.1	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.1 No response
Ref No: 11841 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 4.1	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	4.1 No response
Ref No: 12638 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 4.1	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.1 Don't know

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13690	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11616	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.1 No - needs updating
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12729	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	12759	SWARD	4.1 Yes Developers should be required to specify the estimated quantities of waste which will be generated by the development (i.e. when in use, fifty houses will produce x amount of waste), and specify how it is expected it will be disposed of (i.e. to which recycling, composting, landfill facilities)
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	13523	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11678	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12485	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11871	THAMES WATER PLC	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11740	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	13026	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	4.1 a - Yes - except less constraints¿..a lot of policies or possibly pitfalls!!!
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11934	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	4.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.1		
Ref No:	11647	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	4.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13722	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11774	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12608	TACR CONSULTANCY	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12456	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	4.2 No
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12027	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12215	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12318	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	4.2 No
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12177	COUNTY ECOLOGIST	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	2207	**Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	
Respdt Type:	INTL		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13626	DAUNCEY, , MRS	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11967	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12669	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12516	EGERTON, JO,	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12699	GERRY, RITA,	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12155	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.3 Yes - some allocation
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13594	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	4.2 No
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12124	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	4.2 The number of sites allocated should be based on up to date evidence and need and should be closely monitored throughout the Plan period. Perhaps you could include phasing provision to allow a certain amount of flexibility. However, you should ensure that at least a 10 year supply is met.
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		4.3 We currently operate a plan-led system to provide certainty to all involved in the planning process. Whilst application should be determined on their own merits the Planning Act requires LPAs to have regard to the Development Plan in the first instance. Therefore determining recycling etc on case-by-case basis without any policy framework in place would be contrary to planning legislation.
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12060	GVA GRIMLEY	4.2 No
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12242	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11805	JONES, CERI, CLLR	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13783	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13753	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11711	NATURAL ENGLAND	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11903	NETWORK RAIL	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11584	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	4.2 No
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12578	NOTT, DARREN,	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11997	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12546	QUEST, DAWN,	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12092	RADWAY, T, MR	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13655	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11842	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12639	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13691	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11617	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.2 No
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12730	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12760	SWARD	4.2 No
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13524	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.2 No
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11679	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.3 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	12486	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	4.2 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11872	THAMES WATER PLC	4.2 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		4.3 No response
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11741	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	4.2 No - Villagers are also keen to keep traffic to a minimum (another issue in our Parish Plan) and to ensure that environmental gain from recycling is not outweighed by environmental burdens associated with vehicles driving to recycling centres.
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.3 No
Issue Ref:	4.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13027	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	4.2 a - Yes Need to provide flexibility but important to identify some sites as planning is a huge risk. It is recognised that sites in the WLP have been through due process and are perceived as having less risk than a site that has not been identified and adopted in the WLP. The irony is that the sites in the WLP 2004 are more important to our current strategy as the WCS will not provide any future allocations until after GCC has to commit to a strategic site.If Policy 6 remains, this needs to be a realistic policy and sites brought forward must be assessed on an equal footing to sites within the WLP/WCS. If a reasonable site is brought forward that has been overlooked during the WCS review it must not be penalised for this. Also, 50,000 is not that large ¿ can you get rid of other and strategic sites and just state potential capacity of sites?? 4.3 Need a combination but if you can bring sites forward these must not be criticised if not in the WLP as the site(s) might be better than selected WLP sites. Also if not in the WLP, the planning process may be slowed down and become an issue.
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11935	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	4.2 No response 4.3 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	11648	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	4.2 Yes 4.3 No
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.2		
Ref No:	13723	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11775	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12609	TACR CONSULTANCY	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12457	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12028	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12216	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12319	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12178	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13627	DAUNCEY, , MRS	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11968	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12670	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12517	EGERTON, JO,	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12700	GERRY, RITA,	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12156	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	4.4 Don't know
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13595	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12125	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	4.4 Area Action Plans for large urban extensions or areas of significant change, such as those being proposed for Cheltenham and Gloucester, and the Gloucester Docks regeneration plans offer a good opportunity to integrate uses.
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12061	GVA GRIMLEY	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12243	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11806	JONES, CERI, CLLR	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	13785	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13754	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11712	NATURAL ENGLAND	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11904	NETWORK RAIL	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11585	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12579	NOTT, DARREN,	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11998	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12547	QUEST, DAWN,	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12093	RADWAY, T, MR	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	13656	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11843	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12640	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	13692	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11619	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12731	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12761	SWARD	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	13525	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11681	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	12487	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11873	THAMES WATER PLC	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11743	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	13028	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11936	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	4.4 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	11649	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	4.4 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.3		
Ref No:	13724	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11776	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12610	TACR CONSULTANCY	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.6 No threshold should be used at all. Throughput on existing stations is wildly underestimated and it will only increase if there is a bigger drive to recyle
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12458	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	4.5 No
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.6 No 5-yearly reduction plan, reducing waste in stages by appropriate amounts, i.e. 2,000 tonnes per year
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12029	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12217	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12322	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		4.6 a + c
Issue Ref:	4.4		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12179 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 4.4	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	4.5 No response 4.6 No response
Ref No: 13628 **Respdt No:** 3784 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.4	DAUNCEY, , MRS	4.5 No response 4.6 No response 4.7 No response
Ref No: 11969 **Respdt No:** 2747 **Respdt Type:** AA **Issue Ref:** 4.4	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	4.5 No response 4.6 No response
Ref No: 12671 **Respdt No:** 536 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 4.4	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	4.5 No response 4.6 No response
Ref No: 12518 **Respdt No:** 3838 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.4	EGERTON, JO,	4.5 Yes 4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled
Ref No: 12701 **Respdt No:** 3841 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.4	GERRY, RITA,	4.5 Yes 4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12157	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	4.5 Don't know
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13596	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		4.6 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12126	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	4.5 Strategically important sites of any type of facility would probably benefit from being identified in the Core Strategy - at least their general location should be specified (in both text and on the proposals maps). All other possible sites could be identified as part of the Issues and Options stage of your Site Specific Allocations DPD (in conjunction with the development of district authorities' sites allocations DPDs)
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	4.4		4.6 In terms of the appropriate threshold for strategic sites, it may be advantageous to have different thesholds which reflect difference in key influencing factors as evidenced by capacity, environmental impact etc. Page 16 of the summary document mentions your intention to continue with 2003/4 tonnages for C&D waste. It would be helpful to explain how recent significant new builds (Cheltenham GCHQ for instance) and planned future builds (such as Waterwells Park) have or will impact on this tonnage figure.
Ref No:	12062	GVA GRIMLEY	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12244	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11807	JONES, CERI, CLLR	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13784	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13755	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11713	NATURAL ENGLAND	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11905	NETWORK RAIL	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11586	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled
Issue Ref:	4.4		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12580 **Respdt No:** 3840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.4	NOTT, DARREN,	4.5 Yes 4.6 Yes
Ref No: 11999 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 4.4	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.5 No response 4.6 No response
Ref No: 12548 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.4	QUEST, DAWN,	4.5 Yes 4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled
Ref No: 12094 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 4.4	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	4.5 No 4.6 D - No threshold should be used at all
Ref No: 13657 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 4.4	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.6 No response
Ref No: 11844 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 4.4	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	4.5 No response 4.6 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12641	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13693	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11620	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		4.6 Difficult to quantify. Different thresholds would be better but would be confusing
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12732	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.6 We don¿t believe there should be any allocation for strategic sites.
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12762	SWARD	4.5 No
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13526	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		4.6 Yes
Issue Ref:	4.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11682	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled.
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	12488	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.6 There should be different thresholds depending on the types of waste being handled
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11874	THAMES WATER PLC	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11744	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	4.5 Yes
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		4.6 No
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13029	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	4.5 b - No
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		4.6 d - No threshold should be used at all
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	11937	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	4.5 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		4.6 No response
Issue Ref:	4.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11650	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	4.5 Yes 4.6 No 200,000 Figures in table 21 suggest that even allowing for recycling, recovery, re-use/treatment, throughput of waste may well exceed currently permitted limits
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.4		
Ref No:	13725	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11777	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	4.7 Composting green waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Composting kitchen waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Recover/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Disposal sites (landfill) - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Other facility - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12611	TACR CONSULTANCY	4.7 Composting Green Waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12459	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	4.7 Composting green waste - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Composting kitchen waste (mixed organic content) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Recovery/treatement facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Other - No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12030	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12218	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12324	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	4.7 Composting green waste - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Composting kitchen waste - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Recover/treatment facility (MBT, EfW) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Other facility - Special hazardous - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12180	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11970	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12672	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12519	EGERTON, JO,	4.7 Composting Green Waste - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12702	GERRY, RITA,	4.7 Composting Green Waste - Identify only smaller sites in a DPD Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Identify only smaller sites in a DPD Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12158	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	4.7 Composting green waste - Only identify broad aras of search in a DPD - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Composting kitchen waste - Only identify broad aras of search in a DPD - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad aras of search in a DPD - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Inert re-use, recyclng, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad aras of search in a DPD - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Disposal sites (Landfill) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD 'Other' - Exclude hazardous - only a few national sites for some of these.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	13597	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	4.7 Composting green waste - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Composting kitchen waste - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Biiodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Recovery/treatment facility - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Other - No response
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12127	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12063	GVA GRIMLEY	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12245	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	4.7 Composting green waste - No response Composting kitchen waste - No response Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - No response Inert re-use, reycling, transfer/bulking-up - No response Recovery/treatment facility (e..g. MBT, EfW) - No response Disposal sites (landfill) - No response Other - No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11808	JONES, CERI, CLLR	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	13786	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	13756	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11714	NATURAL ENGLAND	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11906	NETWORK RAIL	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11587	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	4.7 Composting green waste - identify only smaller sites in a DPD Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic contect) - identify only smaller sites in a DPD Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - identify lnly strategic sites in a DPD Inert re-use , recycling, transfer/bulking-up - identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Recovery/treatment facility (E.g. MBT, EfW) - only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Disposal sites (landfill) - identify all preferred sites in a DPD 'Other' facility type - no response
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12581	NOTT, DARREN,	4.7 Composting Green Waste - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Other' facility - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12000 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 4.5	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.7 No response
Ref No: 12549 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 4.5	QUEST, DAWN,	4.7 Composting Green Waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD 'Other' facility - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
Ref No: 12095 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 4.5	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	4.7 Composting green waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Composting kitchen waste - Identify only smaller sites in a DPD Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Disposal sites (Landfill) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Other facility - No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13658	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11846	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12642	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	4.7 Composting Green Waste - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Other' facility - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD. Disposal of hazardous waste.
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	13694	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11621	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.7 Composting green waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Composting kitchen waste - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12733	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12763	SWARD	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	13527	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	4.7 Composting green waste - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy; Composting kitchen waste - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy; Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy; Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy; Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy; Disposal sites (landfill) - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy; 'Other' facility - Idenitify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11683	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	4.7 Composting green waste - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Composting kitchen waste - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Only identify broad areas of search in a DPD Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	12489	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	4.7 Composting green waste - Identify only smaller sites in a DPD Composting kitchen waste - Identify only smaller sites in a DPD Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Identify no sites in a DPD and rely on a criteria based policy 'Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11875	THAMES WATER PLC	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11745	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	4.7
Respdt No:	1562		Composting green waste - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
Respdt Type:	PC		Composting kitchen waste (mixed organic content) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
Issue Ref:	4.5		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
			Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
			Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
			Other facility - No response
Ref No:	13030	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	4.7
Respdt No:	3847		Composting green waste - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
Respdt Type:	INTL		Composting kitchen waste - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
Issue Ref:	4.5		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
			Recovery/treatment facility - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
			Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify all preferred sites in a DPD
			'Other' - No response
Ref No:	11938	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	4.7 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	4.5		
Ref No:	11651	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	4.7
Respdt No:	1345		Composting green waste - Identify only smaller sites in a DPD
Respdt Type:	PC		Composting kitchen waste - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
Issue Ref:	4.5		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify only strategic sites in a DPD
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Identify all referred sites in a DPD
			Recovert/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Identify all referred sites in a DPD
			Disposal sites (landfill) - Identify all referred sites in a DPD
			Other facility - No response

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12181 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 4.6	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	Issue W4 (making provision for facilities) is a crucial one in having potential for impacts on desingated sites, habitats and species of biodiversity importance. There is most certainty of likely impacts with Option 1 (business as usual) and less with Option 2 (strategy of identifying new/revised sites). Option 2 does however provide an opportunity to improve allocations and make them more environmentally acceptable (if this is possible). Option 3 (having a criteria based policy only) is attractive but is neither proactive nor efficient; it is likely to cause confusion plus increased work and delays when considering or drawing up waste planning applications. Option 3 is not spatially focussed whic is probably at odds with the new Development Framework approach. Option 4 has implications somewhere between Options 2 & 3.

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12175 **Respdt No:** 3830 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 4.6	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	Section 4 and 5 - Making provision for waste - Locational issues PPS 10 identified the need to include unallocated sites in waste management strategy. Practical considerations support this. However, it seems that the trend is towards allocated sites in spatial planning frameworks, although experience in the County indicates that most sites come forward as unallocated ones. From my limited experience in Gloucestershire, there are the following: a) Vetspeed - Clinical Waste Transfer Station at Tewkesbury on an industrial site - 2002? Plays important role in collecting dead animals from local and regional vets, work for Council Environmental Health Depts - eg. road kills, and many other community service functions in dental, medical and other areas. b) Green Waste composting (household green waste, moving up waste hierarchy) - Dymock 2004 - unallocated site on farmland. Product to farmland to improve cropping. c) Green waste composting (househol green waste) - Sunhill, Cirencester - 2005 - Product to farmland, or re-use in specialist agricultural compost. d) In-vessel composting - re-use of existing plant - 2004 not approved but the site in principle (relative location) was acceptable to planning inspector. Over-reliance on spatial allocation of sites over a wide spectrum of 'waste management' will lead to delay and non-optimum provision for the following reasons: 1) Allocated sites have to be subject to environmental/sustainability evaluation, public consultation, the process of plan making under the new Act, which means that in effect, they will not be approved for many years. 2) Lean-in time for investment, planning approval etc, will add to this time 3) Identifying sites immediately leads to an add-on land value which will increase with scarcity: limited allocated sites, or sites that will not be released, will therefore cause waste management to be more expensive than it need be. 4) Allocated sites may not become available; or they may develop into 'ransom' situations - impact on local government finances and business costs is important 5) Reliance on allocated sites will increase road miles particularly in relation to some wastes, which could otherwise be dealt with on a more local and ad hoc network. 6) Most potential sites have characteristics which make them less than suitable for some of teh broad range of waste management activities - blanket allocation ignores this.

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12064 **Respdt No:** 3805 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 4.6	GVA GRIMLEY	The Inspector's Report into the adopted Waste Local Plan indicates that more sites for waste management facilities were allocated than were actually required. However, Explanatory Paper B acknowledges at paragraph 5.41 that the great majority (86%) of waste proposals submitted in 2004/05 related to sites whic were not allocated in the adopted Waste Local Plan. It is therefore evident that it is unnecessary to over-allocate land and it will be more appropriate to allocate fewer sites and introduce criteria-based policies to deal with waste proposals on non-allocated sites. This would provid sufficient flexibility to identify waste management facilities over the life of the Core Strategy. If GCC are to take a different view and seek to achieve flexibility through the over-allocation of land, it is critical that sites are assessed in detail (through the application of criteria) to ensure that they are realistic. Furthermore, it will be important to incorporate a policy which permits any surplus allocations to be developed for altervaitve purposes if it can be proven that they are no longer required for waste management purposes (refer to the suggested revised safeguarding policy in paragraphy 5.2 below). Without such a policy, there is a risk that certain sites will be blighted/sterilised and this will be contrary to PPS12 (refer to paragraph 2.5 above).

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11876 **Respdt No:** 3165 **Respdt Type:** UTL **Issue Ref:** 4.6	THAMES WATER PLC	We support in principle Policy 18 of the existing Waste Local Plan and consider that this should strengthened and carried forward into the new Waste Development Framework to address the development of waste water treatment works and facilities to process sewage sludge. A key sustainability objective for the preparation of LDDs should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 4.9 of the new PPS12, 2004 states: "LPAs should ensure that delivery of housing & other strategic and regional requirements is not compromised by unrealisitic expectations about the future availability of infrastructure, transportation and resources. Annex B sets out further guidance on resources, utilities and infrastructure provision". Paragraphs B3 to B8 of PPS12 placce specific emphasis on the need to take account of infrastructure such as sewerage in preparing Local Development Documents. Paragraph B3 in particular states: "The provision of infrastructure is important in all major new developments. The capacity of existing infrastructure and the need for additional facilities should be taken into account in the preparation of all local development documents. Infrastructure here includes water supply and sewers, waste facilities..." Section 7.3.12-7.3.14 of the Draft South West RSS, June 2006 relates to Sustainable Water Resources and Water Quality Management. Policy RE6 lists a number of water and waste/water sewerage infrastructure issues which local authorities should take into account in preparing Local Development Documents. In December 2005 The Planning Inspectorate published 'A Guide to the Process of Assessing Soundness of Development Plan Documents'. Test iv (a) on page 16 states: "It is a spatial plan which has regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies" Paragraph A key question under this Test states: "Has adequate account been taken of the relationship between the proposals in the DPD and other requirements, such as those of utility companies and agencies providing services in the area including their future plans or strategy and any requirements for land and premises. which should be prepared in parallel?" The evidence base for this states: "Of particular significance, will be representations from bodies that consider that the plan does not have sufficient regard to other relevant strategies for which they are responsible." If the Waste LDDs are to meet the "soundness" test, then it is considered essential that there is a policy in the Waste LDDs to address the development of waste water treatment facilities. Thames Water consider that specific sites for waste water treatment works and sewage sludge treatement facilities should also be identified in the Waste Development Framework in addition to a criteria based Policy 18 of the existing Waste Local Plan. Paragraphs B3 to B8 of PPS12 place specific emphasis on the need to take account of infrastructure such as sewerage in

Response	Respondent	Representations

preparing Local Development Documents. Paragraph B3 in particular states: "The provision of infrastructure is important in all major new developments. The capacity of existing infrastructure and the need for additional facilities should be taken into account in the preparation of all local development documents. Infrastructure here includes water supply and sewers, waste facilities...."

Water companies' investment and price setting are regulated by the Office of Water Services (Ofwat) through the 5 yearly Asset Management Plan (AMP). as a result we base our investment programmes on development plan allocations which form the clearest picture of the shape of the community (as mentioned in PPS12 paragraph B6). We require a three to five year lead in time for provision of the extra capacity. Where a complete new water or sewage treatment works is required the lead in time can be between five to ten years.

However, as our investment is based on a 5 yearly cycle and because we cannot always predict the land use impacts of new European and UK requirements relating to waste water treatment, we cannot plan for all operational development which may be needed over the plan period. Therefore there is also a clear need for the general Criteria Based Policy as well as idenitifying any specific proposals for waste treatment facilities in the Waste LDDs.

We also have the following comments on the Waste Development Framework:

The Water Industry receives and treats waste waters from a range of domestic and commercial customers. We have a statutory obligation to provide sewerage and sewage treatment.

As development takes place and the population increases so does the amount of th waste water generated. Waste water catchments do not match up with Borough and County boundaries and therefore there needs to be a recognition that waste may need to be transported either in sewers or by lorries in the case of sewage sludge across the boundaries.

Sewage sludge (biosolids) is applied to a range of agricultural and other lands acring not only as a fertiliser, but also as a soil improver. The recycling of biosolids to land is an excellent way to return nutrients to soils. It avoids the use of landfill, is sustainable and the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) in most cases.

The national policy framework for sewage sludge disposal is outlined in the Waste Strategy 2000 for England and Wales - Part two" (DETR, May 2000) which states at paragraphy 8.152 that: " Sewage sludge production is expected to rise to 1.5 million tonnes per year by 2005 as a greater proportion of sewage is treated and higher treatment standards are applied under the phased implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive. This Directive also prohibited the dumping of sewage sludge at sea by the end of 1998, which had previously been the means of disposal of around 30% of total arisings. The Directive also requires that sludge should be re-used whenever appropriate and those disposal routes should minimise the adverse effects on the environment".

Response	Respondent	Representations
		Paragraph 8.154 states: "The Government and National assembly consider that recovering value from sludge through spreading on agricultural land is the best practicable environmental option for sludge in most circumstances. Agricultural use of the sludge brings savings of several million pounds in fertiliser costs and the organic matter improves soil structure, its workability and its water holding capacity". However, if a situation arose where this recycling route was lost or became unsustainable then more sewage sludge would need to be disposed by other means such as incineration and this should be recognised in the Waste Development Framework.
Ref No: 13726 **Respdt No:** 3172 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 5.1	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	5.1 No response
Ref No: 11778 **Respdt No:** 3164 **Respdt Type:** UTL **Issue Ref:** 5.1	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	5.1 Composting green waste - Edge of town Composting kitchen waste - Edge of town Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - No response Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - No response Recovery/treatment facility (MBT, EfW) - Edge of town Disposal sites (landfill) - Rural Other facility - Not sure (varies)
Ref No: 12612 **Respdt No:** 3315 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 5.1	TACR CONSULTANCY	5.1 Composting Green Waste - Rural Composting Kitchen Waste - Edge of Towns Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Rural Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Rural Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Edge of Towns Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Rural 'Other' facility - No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12460	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	5.1 Composting green waste - Edge of towns Composting kitchen waste - Town Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of towns Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of towns Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Edge of towns Disposal sites (landfill) - Edge of towns Other - No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12031	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12219	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12332	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	5.1 Composting green waste - Edge of town Composting kitchen waste - Edge of town Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - No response Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of town Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Rural (Not green belt or AONB) Disposal sites (landfill) - Rural (Not green belt or AONB) Other - Special: Hazardous - Rural
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12182	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13630	DAUNCEY, , MRS	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11971	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12673	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12520	EGERTON, JO,	5.1 Composting Green Waste - Rural Composting Kitchen Waste - Edge of Towns Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Edge of Towns Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Edge of Towns Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Not sure 'Other' facility - Not sure
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12703	GERRY, RITA,	5.1 Composting Green Waste - Edge of Towns Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Edge of Towns Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Edge of Towns Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Edge of Towns Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Edge of Towns Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Rural Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12159	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	5.1 Too prescriptive. Site and locational criteria compliance more relevant.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	13598	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	5.1 Composting green waste - Edge of town Composting kitchen waste - Edge of town Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of town Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of town Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Edge of town Disposal sites (landfill) - Rural Other - No response
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12128	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12065	GVA GRIMLEY	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12246	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	5.1 Composting green waste - edge of towns Composting kitchen waste - edge of towns Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of towns Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of towns Rrecovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Edge of towns Disposal sites - Not sure Other - Not sure
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11809	JONES, CERI, CLLR	5.1 I would say the most important factors when determining a framework for identifying sites are: - an appropriate distance from any extensive housing developments (at least 500m) - the suitability of local roads - prevention of environmental pollution and disamenity (especially in light of the first factor listed above) - using sustainable modes of transport
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	13787	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	13757	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11715	NATURAL ENGLAND	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11907	NETWORK RAIL	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11588	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	5.1 Composting green waste - rural Composting kitchen waste - rural Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking - edge of towns Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - edge of towns Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - not sure Disposal sites (landfill) - edge of towns Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12582	NOTT, DARREN,	5.1 Composting Green Waste - Edge of Towns Composting Kitchen Waste - Edge of Towns Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Edge of Towns Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Edge of Towns Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Edge of Towns Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Not sure 'Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12001	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12550	QUEST, DAWN,	5.1
Respdt No:	3839		Composting Green Waste - Edge of Towns
Respdt Type:	IND		Composting Kitchen Waste - Edge of Towns
Issue Ref:	5.1		Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Edge of Towns
			Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Rural
			Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Rural
			Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Rural
			'Other' facility - No response
Ref No:	12096	RADWAY, T, MR	5.1
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	Composting green waste - Edge of town
Respdt Type:	WOP		Composting kitchen waste - Town
Issue Ref:	5.1		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer-bulking-up - Edge of town
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Rural
			Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Rural
			Disposal sites (Landfill) - Rural
			Other facility - Rural (WfE)
Ref No:	13659	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11847	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12643	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.1 Composting Green Waste - Edge of Towns Composting Kitchen Waste - Edge of Towns Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Edge of Towns Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Edge of Towns Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Rural 'Other' facility - Not sure
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	13695	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11622	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.1 Composting green waste - Edge of town Composting kitchen waste - Edge of town Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of town Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Rural Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Rural Disposal sites (Landfill) - Rural Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	12734	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12764	SWARD	5.1
Respdt No:	3843		Composting Green Waste - Town
Respdt Type:	IND		Composting Kitchen Waste - Town
Issue Ref:	5.1		Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Edge of Towns
			Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Edge of Towns
			Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure
			Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Not sure
			'Other' facility - Not sure
			MBT and landfill must only be temporary. EfW should not be considered
Ref No:	13528	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH	5.1
Respdt No:	3858	COUNCIL	Composting green waste - Edge of town
Respdt Type:	DC		Composting kitchen waste - Edge of town
Issue Ref:	5.1		Biodegradable - Town
			Inert - Town
			Recovery/treatment - Town
			Disposal - Rural
			Other - No response
Ref No:	11684	TEWKESBURY OFFICE	5.1 Development should seek to ensure the right facility is in the right place at the right time and this cannot be achieved
Respdt No:	3133	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	if a pre-determined criteria have established a preference between urban and rural.
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12490	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	5.1 Composting Green Waste - Edge of Towns Composting Kitchen Waste - Edge of Towns Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Rural Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Rural Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Rural Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Rural 'Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11877	THAMES WATER PLC	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11747	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	5.1 Composting green waste - Edge of towns Composting kitchen waste - Edge of towns Biodegraddable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of towns Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of towns Recover/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Town (To maximise opportunities for CHP Disposal sites (landfill) - Rural Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13031	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	5.1
Respdt No:	3847		Composting green waste - Edge of towns and rural
Respdt Type:	INTL		Composting kitchen waste - Edge of towns and rural
Issue Ref:	5.1		Biodegradable - Town and edge of towns
			Inert re-use - Edge of towns
			Recovery/treatment faiclity - Edge of towns
			Disposal sites - Edge of towns and rural
			'Other' - No response
Ref No:	11939	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	5.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.1		
Ref No:	11652	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	5.1
Respdt No:	1345		Composting green waste - Town Rural
Respdt Type:	PC		Composting kitchen waste - Town Rural
Issue Ref:	5.1		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of town
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Edge of town
			Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Rural
			Disposal sites (Landfill) - Rural
			Other facility - No response
Ref No:	13727	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11779	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	5.2
Respdt No:	3164		Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Respdt Type:	UTL		Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Not sure
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Not sure
			Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure
			Disposal sites (landfill) - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			Other facility - Combination of centralised and dispersed
Ref No:	12613	TACR CONSULTANCY	5.2
Respdt No:	3315		Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Respdt Type:	BUS		Composting Kitchen Waste - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham)
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
			Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
			Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
			Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
			'Other' facility - No response
Ref No:	12461	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	5.2
Respdt No:	3836		Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities
Respdt Type:	IND		Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking - Dispersed facilities
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Centralised facilities
			Recovery/treatement facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities
			Disposal sites (landfill) - Dispersed facilities
			Other - No response
Ref No:	12033	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12220	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12336	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	5.2 Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) and combination of centralised and dispersed. Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham) Disposal sites (Landfill) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham) Other - Special hazardous - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham)
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12183	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	13631	DAUNCEY, , MRS	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11972	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12674	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12521	EGERTON, JO,	5.2 Composting Green Waste - Combination of centralised and dispersed Composting Kitchen Waste - Combination of centralised and dispersed Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Not sure Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Not sure Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Not sure Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12704	GERRY, RITA,	5.2 Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Composting Kitchen Waste (mixed organic content) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12160	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	5.2
Respdt No:	3830		Composting green wastse - Combination of centralised and dispersed
Respdt Type:	BUS		Composting kitchen waste - Combination of centralsed and dispersed
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			Inert re-use, recycling transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham)
			Disposal sites (Landfill) - Combination of centralised and dispersed.
Ref No:	13599	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	5.2
Respdt No:	3867		Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities
Respdt Type:	DC		Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities
			Recovery/treatment facility (MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities
			Disposal sites (landfill) - Not sure
			Other - No response
Ref No:	12129	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12066	GVA GRIMLEY	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12247	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	5.2 Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Composting kitchen waste - dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking up - dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham) Disposal sites (landfill) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham) Other facility - Not sure
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11810	JONES, CERI, CLLR	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	13788	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	13758	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11716	NATURAL ENGLAND	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11908	NETWORK RAIL	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11589	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	5.2
Respdt No:	998		Composting green waste - combination of centralised and dispersed
Respdt Type:	PC		Composting kitchen waste - combination of centralised and dispersed
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking - centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham)
			Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/buling-up - centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham)
			Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - not sure
			Disposal sites (landfill) - dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district)
			Other facility - No response
Ref No:	12583	NOTT, DARREN,	5.2
Respdt No:	3840		Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Respdt Type:	IND		Composting Kitchen Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham)
			Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham)
			Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester or Cheltenham)
			'Other' facility - Not sure
Ref No:	12002	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12551	QUEST, DAWN,	5.2
Respdt No:	3839		Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Respdt Type:	IND		Composting Kitchen Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
Issue Ref:	5.2		Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District)
			Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Combination of centralised and dispersed
			'Other' facility - No response

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12097 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 5.2	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	5.2 Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Disposal sites (Landfill) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Other facility - No response
Ref No: 13660 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.2	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.2 No response
Ref No: 11848 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.2	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	5.2 No response
Ref No: 12644 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 5.2	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.2 Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Composting Kitchen Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Combination of centralised and dispersed Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) 'Other' facility - Not sure
Ref No: 13696 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.2	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.2 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11623	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.2 Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Recovery treatment facility (MBT, EfW) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Disposal sites (Landfill) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12735	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12765	SWARD	5.2 Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Composting Kitchen Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Not sure Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Not sure 'Other' facility - Not sure MBT and landfill nust only be temporary. EfW should not be considered
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	13529	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.2 Composting green waste - Dispersed facilities Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilities Biodegradable reuse, recycling, transter/bulking-up - Centralised facilities Inert reuse, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Centralised facilities Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT. EfW) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Disposal sites (Landfill) - Centralised 'Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11685	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	12491	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	5.2 Composting Green Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Composting Kitchen Waste - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) Inert Re-use, Recycling, Transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Recovery/Treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Disposal Sites (Landfill) - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each District) 'Other' facility - No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11878	THAMES WATER PLC	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11748	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	5.2 Composting green waste - Combination of centralised and dispersed Composting kitchen waste - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester and Cheltenham) Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Recover/treament facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester and Cheltenham) Disposal sites (landfill) - Combination of centralised and dispersed Other facility - No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13032	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	5.2 Composting green waste - Combination of centralised and dispersed Composting kitchen waste - Combination of centralised and dispersed Biodegradable - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Inert reuse, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Dispersed facilities (local facilities in each district) Recovery/treatment facility - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham) Disposal sites - Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham) 'Other' - No response
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11940	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	5.2 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	11653	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	5.2 Composting green waste - Dispersed facilites (local facilities in each District) Composting kitchen waste - Dispersed facilites (local facilities in each District) Biodegradable re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Inert re-use, recycling, transfer/bulking-up - Combination of centralised and dispersed Recovery/treatment facility (e.g. MBT, EfW) Centralised facilities (in or near Gloucester/Cheltenham) Disposal sites (Landfill) - Conbination of centralised and dispersed
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.2		
Ref No:	13728	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11780	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	5.3 Planning to full capacity
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12614	TACR CONSULTANCY	5.3 Not making any specific provision
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12462	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	5.3 b - Making limited provision
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12034	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12221	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12345	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	5.3 b
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12184	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13632	DAUNCEY, , MRS	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11973	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12675	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12522	EGERTON, JO,	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12705	GERRY, RITA,	5.3 Making limited provision
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12161	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	5.3 a - Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13600	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	5.3 c - not making any specific provision
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12130	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12067	GVA GRIMLEY	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12248	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11811	JONES, CERI, CLLR	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	13789	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13759	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11717	NATURAL ENGLAND	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11909	NETWORK RAIL	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11590	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12584	NOTT, DARREN,	5.3 b - Making limited provision
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12003	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12552 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 5.3	QUEST, DAWN,	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Ref No: 12098 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 5.3	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	5.3 Not making any specific provision
Ref No: 13661 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.3	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.3 No response
Ref No: 11849 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.3	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	5.3 No response
Ref No: 12645 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 5.3	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Ref No: 13697 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.3	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.3 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11624	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.3 Making limited provision
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12736	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	5.3 Not making any specific provision.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12766	SWARD	5.3 Making limited provision
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	13530	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.3 b- making limited provision
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11686	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	12492	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11879	THAMES WATER PLC	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11749	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	5.3 Put in waste plants!
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	13033	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	5.3 a - Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11941	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	5.3 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	11654	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	5.3 Planning for full expected capacity
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.3		
Ref No:	13729	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11781	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	5.4 - Consultation with EA regarding suitability of site - Discuss with waste industry on ability to 'deliver' site within planned period
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12615	TACR CONSULTANCY	5.4 residual waste sites for material that cannot be recycled MUST be allowed NEAR where the waste is derived. It is NOT SUSTAINABLE to take tailings to South Cerney for example
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12463	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12035	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12222	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12346	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	5.4 (i) Avoid areas of population (ii) Rural - Not in green belt or AONB (iii) No health hazard (iv) Ground geology silcurk (v) No water courses (vi) Well landscaped
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12185	COUNTY ECOLOGIST	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	2207	**Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	13633	DAUNCEY, , MRS	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11974	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12676	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12523	EGERTON, JO,	5.4 a reasonable distance away from residential areas.
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12706	GERRY, RITA,	5.4 Aim to minimise transport costs. Enable good access to new sites.
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12162	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	5.4 Normal criteria on traffic/environmental impact AND value added assessment (financial, environmental)
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	13601	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	5.4 Visual amenity considerations, transport, proximity to arisings, need for landscape restoration/enhancement.
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12131	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12068	GVA GRIMLEY	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12249	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11812	JONES, CERI, CLLR	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13790	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	13760	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11718	NATURAL ENGLAND	5.4 Safeguarding of sites with nature conservation interests
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11910	NETWORK RAIL	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11591	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	5.4 a Attention of Environmental Impact i.e. water courses, visual amenities, land contamination b Impact on nearby properties
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12585	NOTT, DARREN,	5.4 brownfield sites, eg old quarries, that can be 'lined ' etc to prevent leakage into water table etc
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12004 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 5.4	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.4 No response
Ref No: 12553 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 5.4	QUEST, DAWN,	5.4 No response
Ref No: 12099 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 5.4	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	5.4 Sustainability means land fill near the source of materials - i.e. in the Severn Vale
Ref No: 13662 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.4	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.4 No response
Ref No: 11850 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.4	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	5.4 No response
Ref No: 12646 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 5.4	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.4 Where possible on ex industrial sites. Where there is no danger of leaking pollution. Where access is safely away from residential and environmentally sensitive areas.

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13698	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11625	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.4 Proximity to urban areas. Mitigation requirements needed.
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12737	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	5.4 Should WDAs import and export waste? Surely the polluter should deal with their own pollution as locally as possible. Waste is all place value. P23. W3. "and working towards the long term goal of "zero waste to tip" as landfill volume is a very finite resource and hence unsustainable in any long term view".
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	12767	SWARD	5.4 With a zero waste approach this question should not arise. Existing void space would be filled more slowly to the point where it would be many decades before any further provision even need be considered.
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	13531	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.4 - Close ot source of waste; - On primary road network; - Sites of least landscape impact;
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11687	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.4 Consideration should be given to landfill mining and reclamation with re-engineered containment to higher standards. Achieve a commitment that any proposed operation commits to 'beyond compliance' for regulations e.g. goes over and above what is required by regulations.
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12493	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	5.4 The Council possesses insufficient technical knowledge to answer this question.
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11880	THAMES WATER PLC	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11750	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	5.4 Should only be done for secondary waste after treatment/resource recovery
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	13034	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	5.4 Groundwater Appropriate land use Arisings - the need case Location (near arisings/good road links?) It is important to identify sites in the emerging WCS using a range of environmental criteria.
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11942	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	5.4 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.4		
Ref No:	11655	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	5.4 - Residual brownfield/dispoiled land, mineral extraction sites - Location sustainable (water/rail) access - Not in green belt land
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13730	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11782	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration and land stability 2 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 3 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses 4 - Safeguarding nature conservation issues 5 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12616	TACR CONSULTANCY	5.5 1 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising 2 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities 3 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 4 - The visual impact of the facility 5 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability)
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12464	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution 2 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests 3 - Using sustainable modes of transport 4 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising 5 - Protecting the historic environment
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12036	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12223	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12348	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	5.5 Protecting green-field land - (Green belt/AONB) - 1 The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access - 2 Safeguarding nature conservation interests - 3 Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising - 4 Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration and land instability) - 5
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12186	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13634	DAUNCEY, , MRS	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11975	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12677	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12524	EGERTON, JO,	5.5
Respdt No:	3838		1 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
Respdt Type:	IND		2 - The visual impact of the facility
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
			4 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests (e.g. impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc)
			5 - Protecting the historic environment and built heritage (e.g. listed buildings, conservation areas)
Ref No:	12708	GERRY, RITA,	5.5
Respdt No:	3841		1 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access
Respdt Type:	IND		2 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability)
			4 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
			5 - Protecting green-field land
Ref No:	12163	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	5.5 See para 5.46 and take into consideration also, characteristics of different activities.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13602	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	5.5
Respdt No:	3867		1 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses
Respdt Type:	DC		2 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising;
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - The visual impact of the facility;
			4 - Using sustainable modes of transport
			5 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12132	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12069	GVA GRIMLEY	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12250	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	5.5 Safeguarding nature conservation interests (e.g. impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc) - 1 Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability) - 2 Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water rather than by road) - 3 Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising - 4 Protecting green-field land - 5
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11813	JONES, CERI, CLLR	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13791	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13761	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11719	NATURAL ENGLAND	5.5
Respdt No:	3141		1 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.5		English Nature strongly supports the inclusion of a criterion that safeguards nature conservation interests
Ref No:	11911	NETWORK RAIL	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11593	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	5.5
Respdt No:	998		1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration and land instability)
Respdt Type:	PC		2 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
			4 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests (e.g. impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc)
			5 - Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water rather than by road)
Ref No:	12586	NOTT, DARREN,	5.5
Respdt No:	3840		1 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
Respdt Type:	IND		2 - Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water rather than by road)
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability)
			4 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities
			5 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access
Ref No:	12005	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12554	QUEST, DAWN,	5.5 1 - Protecting green-field land 2 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 3 - Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water rather than by road) 4 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability) 5 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12100	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	5.5 1 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
Respdt No:	225		
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13663	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11851	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	5.5 The Agency acknowledges the issues raised at the Waste Forum (as listed on page 24) which need to be balanced against each other in the identification of sites for waste management operations. In particular, the Agency supports: - The need for facilities to be located close to the source of waste arising - The principle of locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities - Using sustainable modes of transport such as rail or water We note the criteria relating to the suitability of local roads to handle traffic and site access, however, the Agency requests the addition of further criteria, which requires proposals which will potentially attract higher trip rates to fully consider their impact on the trunk road network and provide mitigation measures where appropriate.
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12647	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability) 2 - Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water rather than by road) 3 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising 4 - Protecting green-field land 5 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13699	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11626	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.5 1 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising 2 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration and land stability) 3 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 4 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary exisiting activities 5 - Protecting the historic environment and built heritage (e.g. listed buildings, conservation areas)
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	12738	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12768	SWARD	5.5
Respdt No:	3843		1 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access
Respdt Type:	IND		1 - Protecting green-field land
Issue Ref:	5.5		1 - Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water rather than by road)
			1 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
			1 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests (e.g. impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc)
			1 - Protecting the historic environment and built heritage (e.g. listed buildings, conservation areas)
			1 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
			1 - The visual impact of the facility
			1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability)
			2 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities
Ref No:	13532	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	5.5
Respdt No:	3858		1 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising;
Respdt Type:	DC		2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses;
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests;
			4 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access;
			5 - The visual impact of the facility
Ref No:	11688	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.5
Respdt No:	3133		1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration and land instability)
Respdt Type:	AGEN		2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
Issue Ref:	5.5		3 - Using sustainable modes of transport
			4 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities
			5 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests (e.g. impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12494	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration & land instability) 2 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising 3 - Safeguarding nature conservation interests (e.g. impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc) 4 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 5 - Protecting the historic environment and built heritage (e.g. listed buildings, conservation areas)
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11881	THAMES WATER PLC	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11751	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odours, vibration and land instability) 2 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising 3 - Locating new waste facilities with complementary existing activities 4 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 5 - Protecting the historic environment and built heritage (e.g. listed buildings,, conservation areas)
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	13035	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution 2 - The suitability of local roads 3 - Safeguarding nature conservation 4 - Protecting the historic environment 5 - Visual impact
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11943	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	5.5 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	5.5		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11656	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	5.5 1 - Preventing environmental pollution (i.e. protection of water resources, noise, dust, air emissions, litter, vermin, birds, odour, vibration and land instability 2 - Protecting green-field land 3 - Using sustainable modes of transport (e.g. by rail or water, rather than by road 4 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 5 - Locating facilities near to the source of waste arising
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	5.5		
Ref No:	11567	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	Section W5 The Board agrees with the criteria against which any particular proposal will be judged. In the Statement sent to you in December 2005, the Board made reference to the harmful impact of vehicles serving waste sites in rural areas, which is a particular point made in the AONB Management Plan.
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	5.6		
Ref No:	12187	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	Issue W5 is related to W4 above and as is pointed out in the consultation document waste sies should be identified where it is possible to safeguard (or enhance) biodiversity. In terms of impact Option 1 (Town Centres) would probably be the lowest. Apart from Option 6 (business as usual - a combination of locations) for all other options the impact on biodiversity would be very uncertain until sites became identified (or were scoped). Option 4 (centralised facilities) increases the potential for large gains for biodiversity via developer contributions but on the other side such a strategy has the greatest potential for harm especially if poorly located.
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	5.6		
Ref No:	12133	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	5.6 As a spatial plan, the location of sites should reflect the future development patterns emerging from the draft RSS. It would also help inform locational choices if the Issues and Options paper were to identify the names of key settlements and establish what existing facilities are available and what future facilities are likely to be required within the plan period. The Plan may benefit ftom the provision of additional landfill capacity, but the policy will need to reflect the choices made about which types of residual waste treatment technology will be developed during the plan period as these will dictate the level of landfill voidspace required. In providing additional landfill, the impacts on water quality and transport issues will need to be given particular consideration.
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	5.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12070	GVA GRIMLEY	Slough Estates do not wish to respond to any of the speccific questions relating to Issue 5. However, it does wish to highlight an additional and vitally important non-spatial criterion which needs to be taken into account whenn identifying sites - ownership constraints. Paragraph 18 of PPS10 states that Waste Planning Authorities should "avoid unrealistic assumptions on the prospects, for the development of waste management facilities, or of particular sites or areas, having regard in particular to any ownership constraint which cannot be readily freed, other than through the use of compulsory purchase powers". The Companion Guide to PPS10 (2006) adds that "Ownership constraints are identified in particular because of the concern that sites may not n reality come forward for waste management without willing landowners, or the use by the WPA of compulsory purchase powers" (Paragraph 7.223). It is therefore a requirement to inclue ownership constraints as a criterion when identifying waste management sites and we would recommend the following text to be added to any list of site-selection criteria: - Ownership Constraints (e.g. sites where the landowner(s) is opposed to waste management uses) which cannot be readily freed other than through the use of compulsory purchase powers.
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	5.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13677	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	5.6 There will be a presumption against permitting (and to object to any planning application) of any new composting process (or any modification to an existing process) where the boundary of the facility is within 250 metres of a workplace or the boundary of a dwelling, unless the application is accompanied by a site-specific risk assessment, based on clear, independant scientific evidence which shows that the bioaerosol levels are and can be maintained at appropriate levels at the dwelling or workplace. The agency will continue to work with DEFRA and others to identify appropriate control measures that may allow operations to take place within 250 metres of the boundary or a dwelling/workplace. The agency will in the future identify and review the licences/registrations of all exisitng sites that may potentially be affected by this position and assess the scale of impact. The timing of this work will depend on HSE research into dispersal monitoring and health effects and the peer review of existing research. Once of the scale of this impact has been assessed an action place will be prepared and prioritised against existing agency business planning priorities. No action should be taken by staff in relation to these sites until the HSE research is carried out and further guidance issued. DETR and agency research "Health effects of composting" and "Monitoring the Environmental impact of composting plants" shows that composting has the potential to harm the health of humans situated for long periods within 250 metres of composition operations. This position covers only aerobic recovery processes for biodegradable waste and therefore its scope is limited to the composting of separated fractions of municipal sold waste and to other facilities composting industrial or commercial biodegradable wastes which fail to be regulated by way of waste managment licence or waste exemption. It does not therefore cover treatment of whole/unsegregated waste or mechanically separated waste, such as MBT, though where such waste is being composted similar standards will apply as appropriate. In this position statement , reference to composting means an aerobic, biological degardation process that produces a material suitable for recovery by spreading on land, used as cover at landfills or incorporating into growing media. All permit applications or modifications should be accompanied by a site-specific risk assessment. Where an operation is proposed within 250 metres of a sensitive receptor, there will be a presumption against permitting or exempting unless the site specific risk assessment based on sound, independent, scientific evidence which demonstrates that appropriate levels can be achieved and maintained at any working or dwelling place whose boundary lies within 250 metres of a boundary of the site for which th permit has been applied. In making the above references it is assumed that the operator and their staff are not included as receptors in the risk assessment.
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	5.6		

Response		Respondent	Representations
			Modifications to existing sites will be primarily of concern where it is proposed that physical alterations or extensions to the site boundary will take the operations closer to a sensitive receptor. Modifications to the tonnage, or removal of containment (e.g. building) will only be of concern if these had specifically been introduced as mitigating factors for the justification of locating a proposal closer than 250m to a sensitive receptor. For the purposes of the position independant simply means a recognised establishment, educational institute or appropriately qualified person who is third party to the proposal. Reference to appropriate levels means effectively background levels specific to that locality. This may be judged to be de-minimus or the location may present particular circumstances that warrant undertaking background monitoring to establish a pre-composting base level, for instance where significant alternative sources of bui-aerosols are already present such as near a landfill.
Ref No: 13700 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 5.6		SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	The information in table 2 shows the origins by region and where we think relevant Waste Planning Authority. On these most recent statistics it can be seen that significant quantities, around 131,000 tonnes or 25% of all non-inert wastes disposed in the county arise from adjoining areas. In this respect the county¿s disposal capacity should be considered of sub regional significance. Further analysis of waste disposed, where the origin was recorded as being from Gloucestershire or its constituent districts, presented in Table 3 below shows no significant flows of waste out of the county.
Ref No: 13804 **Respdt No:** 3842 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 5.6		STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	5.6 W5. We favour small-scale, local facilities. Volume reduction of waste should take place as locally as possible to minimise transport costs and the social con sequences of lorry movements. Where appropriate, sites next to existing or newly reopening waterways should be considered as barge traffic is more benign and sustainable than road vehicles. (See also comments for the Part B P56 below). Volume reduction of waste should take place as locally as possible to minimise transport costs and the social consequences of lorry movements. Conventional mass-burn incineration would require a very large, tall, visually intrusive plant; the site of Sharpness for a regio nal facility, favoured during the initial stages of the WLP process, would spread its exhaust plume over the Stroud District under the prevailing wind direction. Such a facility would be wholly unacceptable to the people of Gloucestershire.

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11944 **Respdt No:** 3167 **Respdt Type:** UTL **Issue Ref:** 5.6	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	5.6 With reference to waste water treatment it is not always possible to comply with the issues outlined in Issue W5. Consideration should be given to a degree of compliance with the identified issues. With regard to locating facilities near the source of waste arising the 'need' for any treatment facilities will be primarily defined by the extent of new domestic and employment development within the plan area. However, there may also be a requirement to transfer waste water between plan areas. Whilst our waste water treatment plants generally service the local town or catchment, by products such as sewage sludge are transferred to a smaller number of sludge treatment centres across the Wessex Water region. This is in order to provide efficient and effective treatment centres, prevent the proliferation of sludge treatment sites, and to reduce the costs of treatment. Locations of these centres are not defined by the waste arising in the individual plan area. With regard to sludge treatment our current primary method of disposal is to treat to an appropriate standard and dispose to agricultural land. At present we do not anticipate any change in this disposal route. However, it could be possible during the life of the Waste LDD that changes to environmental legislation increase sludge production or that our ability to dispose to land is reduced. In these instances we will have to review our sludge policy and may require further treatment facilities such as incineration.
Ref No: 13731 **Respdt No:** 3172 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 6.1	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	6.1 No response
Ref No: 11783 **Respdt No:** 3164 **Respdt Type:** UTL **Issue Ref:** 6.1	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	6.1 No response
Ref No: 12617 **Respdt No:** 3315 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 6.1	TACR CONSULTANCY	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12465	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	6.1 b - By using criteria based policy
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12037	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12224	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12379	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	6.1 b - By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12188	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13635	DAUNCEY, , MRS	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11976	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12678	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12525	EGERTON, JO,	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12709	GERRY, RITA,	6.1 Don' know
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12164	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	6.1 c - not either/or but both. Objectives must be: 1) Practical in short time frame 2) Flexibility 3) Avoidance of 'ransom' sites 4) Acknowledgement of fast-changing land use
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13603	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	6.1 c - Other - a combination of both sites allocations for the larger more controversial uses, criteria based for the smaller more benign uses.
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13271	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12071	GVA GRIMLEY	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12252	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	6.1 Don't know
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11814	JONES, CERI, CLLR	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13792	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13762	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11720	NATURAL ENGLAND	6.1 Implementing the joint municipal waste strategy
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11912	NETWORK RAIL	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11594	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12587	NOTT, DARREN,	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12006	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12555	QUEST, DAWN,	6.1 Don't know
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12101 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 6.1	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Ref No: 13664 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 6.1	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	6.1 No response
Ref No: 11852 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 6.1	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	6.1 No response
Ref No: 12648 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 6.1	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	6.1 Don't know
Ref No: 13701 **Respdt No:** 3136 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 6.1	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	6.1 No response
Ref No: 11627 **Respdt No:** 2725 **Respdt Type:** DC **Issue Ref:** 6.1	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	6.1 By allocating site specific sites

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12739	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12769	SWARD	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13533	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	6.1 b - By using criteria based policy
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11689	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste management options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	12495	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11882	THAMES WATER PLC	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	6.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11752	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	6.1 By allocating specific sites
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13036	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	6.1 Awaiting further detail
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11945	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	6.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	11657	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	6.1 By using criteria based policy (particularly for waste managment options at the top of the waste hierarchy)
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	6.1		
Ref No:	13732	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11784	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	7.1 - Traffic movements - Landscaping/visual impact
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12618	TACR CONSULTANCY	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12466	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12038	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12225	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12380	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	7.1 (i) Health hazard: Impact of noise and smell; (ii) Influence on local transport/roads etc... (iii) Environmental management - Lanscape; - Flora and fauna; - Water courses; - Outlook; - Farming; (iv) Effectiveness of communication iwth local water management companies; (v) Faith in Environment Agency/permit conditions; (vi) Involvement of hazardous waste or not;
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12189	COUNTY ECOLOGIST	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	2207	**Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13636	DAUNCEY, , MRS	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11977	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12679	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12526	EGERTON, JO,	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12710	GERRY, RITA,	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12165	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	7.1 Traffic impact, noise, smell, dust
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13604	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	7.1 Vehicle movements, emissions of pollutants, noise, visual impact
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12134	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12072	GVA GRIMLEY	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12253	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11815	JONES, CERI, CLLR	7.1 In connection with this aspect of assessing the cumulative impact on local communities, could I urge that you kindly take into account the findings of the Wingmoor Farm Task Group, which was set up under the auspices of the Health OSC and which is currently researching this very subject. Furthermore, a Health Impact Assessment is due to be undertaken in the near future with a report anticipated in April or May 2007 (recent update attached). Could I request that this is also considered, as it will involve a wide range both of professionals and of members of the local community. It is clear that this whole issue is of critical importance and I hope that in addition to the many health, environmental and disamenity problems, the strategy will take account of the undesirability of the very close proximity of such facilities to extensive family housing. The convenience of the many should not be at the expense of the sacrifice of the few.
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13793	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13763	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11721	NATURAL ENGLAND	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11913	NETWORK RAIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11595	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	7.1 Health/noise/appearance
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12588	NOTT, DARREN,	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12007	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12557	QUEST, DAWN,	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12102	RADWAY, T, MR	7.1 Smell and lorries
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13666	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11853	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	7.1 The consideration of the cumulative impact of waste operations on the well-being of local communities is supported by the Agency. However, as well as consideration of environmental quality, social cohesion and includsion, and economic potential elements, the Agency requests that additional reference is made to acknowledge the importance of accessibility and sustainable transportation elements.
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12649	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13702	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11628	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12740	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12770	SWARD	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13534	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	7.1 - Traffic generated; - Light, noise and air pollution; - Visual impact;
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11690	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.1 A criterion for assessment could be the effects of traffic generated by waste
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	12496	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11883	THAMES WATER PLC	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11753	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13037	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	7.1 Not just waste but other industrial facilities within that community. Criteria could include:· Transport, Noise, Dust, Vermin, Air emissions, Odours, Vibration Should assess short, medium and long-term effects .
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11946	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	7.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	11658	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	7.1 1 - Effect of noise, smell, pollution of WMF on local environment especially adjacent residential, educational, health, leisure facilities. 2 - Impact of vehicle movements on area around site 3 - Effect on local wildlife, water/courses/drainage and agricultural environment
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.1		
Ref No:	13733	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11785	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12619	TACR CONSULTANCY	7.2 Don't know
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12804	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	7.2 c - Don't know
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12039	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12226	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12381	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	7.2 a - By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12190	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13637	DAUNCEY, , MRS	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11978	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12680	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12527	EGERTON, JO,	7.2 Don't know
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12711	GERRY, RITA,	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12166	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	7.2 a - by using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13605	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	7.2 b - An issue that needs very sensitive treatment. Key regeneration projects should not be fettered by waste allocations.
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12135	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12073	GVA GRIMLEY	7.2 It is recognised that some form of policy will be required in the WCS to safeguard both existing and allocated waste management sites from incompatible (and often higher value) uses. However, there will be circumstances where alternative forms of development must be allowed. For example, there will be instances where an allocated waste management site is no longer required or considered suitable for this purpose. If a safeguarding policy was insufficiently flexible to deal with such a circumstance the land would be blighted as it could not be put to a reasonably beneficial alternative use (again contrary to PPS12 - refer to paragraph 2.5 above). Although the draft policy outlined at Paragraph 5.74 of Explanatory Paper B includes the word "normally" this is still considered to be unclear and inflexible. In light of the above, it is considered that the safeguarding policy should be revised as outlined below: The Waste Planning Authority will normally oppose proposals for development within or in proximity to existing and allocated sites for waste management use where it would prejudice the site being developed or used for appropriate waste management operations. Proposals for incompatible or alternative uses will only be permitted where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable, or required, for waste management purposes.
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12254	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	7.2 Don't know
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11816	JONES, CERI, CLLR	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13794	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	13764	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11722	NATURAL ENGLAND	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11914	NETWORK RAIL	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11596	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12589	NOTT, DARREN,	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12008 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 7.2	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	7.2 No response
Ref No: 12558 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 7.2	QUEST, DAWN,	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Ref No: 12103 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 7.2	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	7.2 A - By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Ref No: 13667 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 7.2	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.2 No response
Ref No: 13273 **Respdt No:** 3142 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 7.2	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	7.2 No response
Ref No: 12650 **Respdt No:** 847 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 7.2	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	7.2 Don't know

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13703	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11629	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	7.2 Exclusion zone?
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12741	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	12772	SWARD	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	13535	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	7.2 a - Using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11691	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12497	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	7.2 a - By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11884	THAMES WATER PLC	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11754	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	7.2 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	13038	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	7.2 a - a. By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy; Bufferzone. Get districts and county to work together to allocate appropriate sites
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11947	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	7.2 B - We support the safeguarding of existing waste facilities from re-development by other uses or from encroachment from incompatible land uses. Please refer to our comments at the start of this response. Safeguarding must be retained within the Waste LDD. In the determination of policies the Council must recognise that waste treatment facilities can have adverse effects on the environment and quality of life enjoyed by individuals and communities. They must also recognise need for buffer zones between operations and the properties or settlements affected, in which no waste management operations should be permitted. Wessex Water support the identification of these zones, particularly when applied to odour from sewage treatment facilities. However, sites suitable for waste management facilities are scarce and can be difficult to find. Where they are permitted they have to comply with stringent tests of the planning system with regard to their emissions and impact on the local environment. Therefore such sites also need to be protected from encroachment of sensitive development which could derogate or prejudice their future use. Creating such a situation is against the advice given in Planning Policy Statement 23 which promotes the separation of potentially polluting and other land uses. Therefore it should also be the policy of the planning authority to safeguard importance waste facilities from sterilisation by other forms of development and ensure that sensitive development does not encroach into areas where it could be adversely affected by the operation of waste facilities. This policy should be implemented by opposing applications for development which would sterilise land identified for waste managements or would bring sensitive development into an area likely to be adversely affected by waste facilities. For the latter, allowance could be made where the applicant could sufficiently demonstrate due consideration of the problems and propose satisfactory engineering and mitigation measures which would alleviate any adverse effects.
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	7.2		
Ref No:	11659	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	7.2 By using the approach proposed in the safeguarding policy. Form of wording in WLP 7 as laid down in section 5.74 of WCS document supported.
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	7.2		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 13679 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 7.4	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	7.4 Under properly controlled conditions, including the location of the process relative to sensitive receptors, composting is an acceptable form of managing waste and provides a useful means of recovering biodegradable waste to produce a humus-like material. However, the biological degradation of waste, whether in a dustbin, landfill, compost process or anaerobic digestion plant utilises the action of natural micro-organisms and will produce odours, volatile organic compounds, and release bio-aerosols (air-borne mirco-organisms, including pathogenic bacteria and fungal spores). These bacteria and fungi are released, mainly into the air throughout the composting process but are particularly prevalent during operations such as screening, shredding and turning. Levels of bacteria and fungi released are significant and, in particular, one fungus, Aspergillus fumigatus, a Class 2 pathogen, can be present in sufficient concentrations to give rise to adverse health effects in humans. While such effects may be most manifest in the infirm and those with immune deficiency, a significant minority of the population can be affected by releases of these agents at any level significantly above background levels. Additionally, if non-sensitive population is exposed, they may become sensitised to low levels of bio-aerosols. Agency responsibility: The EA is required to ensure that waste is recovered or disposed of without endangering human health and without the use of processes or methods which could hamr the environment and in particular without: a) Risk to water, air, soil, plants or animals; b) Causing nuisance through noise or odours; c) Adversely affecting the countryside or places of special interest; As with any other waste managment process composting has the potential to adversely affect the environment and/or human health. In particular, research over the past five years has demonstrated that composting has the potential to produce significant environmental emissions in relation to noise, odours, dust and bio-aerosols (including bacteria and fungal spores). While noise can be adequately controlled though operational measures and dust us reported as unlikely to cause a nuisance to the public, both odour and bio-aerosols have the potential to impact on the public at some distance from the operations. Although they can be reudced they are an inevitable consequence of hte natural biodegradation process. The emissions from waste composting processes have the potential to contain sufficiently high concentrations of bio-aerosols to cause and/or exacerabate certain respiratory disease in some of the population. One cause for concern arises form the thermo-tolerant fungus known as Aspergillus fumigatus. Research carried out by DETR and the agency has shown that concentration levels of the spores of the fungus are likely to be reduced to background levels within a distance of 250 metres form the source. The research also shows that 250 metres is probably sufficient to deal with other releases from a properly operated composting facility such as noise, dust and odour. It is possible to take measures to reduce the adverse effects of composting. These include: - Controlling the airflow by carrying out all or part of the process in a sealed building or under negative pressure;

Response		Respondent	Representations
			- Operating in-vessel; - Treating gases and odours produced by the process; - Utilising a different turning regime with different equipmnt (although the pile must be thoroughly mixed, kept aerobic and maintained at the correct temperatures); - Keeping the compost piles suitabily damp;
Ref No:	13734	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11786	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12620	TACR CONSULTANCY	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12467	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12040	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12227	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12382	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12191	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13638	DAUNCEY, , MRS	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11979	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12681	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12528	EGERTON, JO,	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12712	GERRY, RITA,	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12167	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	8.1 Don't know
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13606	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12136	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12074	GVA GRIMLEY	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12256	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11817	JONES, CERI, CLLR	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13795	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13765	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11723	NATURAL ENGLAND	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11915	NETWORK RAIL	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11597	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12590	NOTT, DARREN,	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12009	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12559	QUEST, DAWN,	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12104	RADWAY, T, MR	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13668	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11854	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12651	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13704	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11630	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.1 No (Unless new)
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12742	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12771	SWARD	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13536	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11692	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	12498	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11885	THAMES WATER PLC	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11755	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13039	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	8.1 Is this a policy that this land use strategy should be dealing with?
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.1		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11948	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	8.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	11660	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	8.1 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.1		
Ref No:	13735	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11787	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12621	TACR CONSULTANCY	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12468	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12041 **Respdt No:** 2840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 8.2	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	8.2 No response
Ref No: 12228 **Respdt No:** 3400 **Respdt Type:** AONB **Issue Ref:** 8.2	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	8.2 No response
Ref No: 12383 **Respdt No:** 3827 **Respdt Type:** ENV **Issue Ref:** 8.2	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	8.2 Yes - Guarded yes Depends on: (i) Quality and quantity of hazardous waste (ii) Permit restrictions (iii) If you include medical waste???
Ref No: 12192 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 8.2	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	8.2 No response
Ref No: 13639 **Respdt No:** 3784 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 8.2	DAUNCEY, , MRS	8.2 No response
Ref No: 11980 **Respdt No:** 2747 **Respdt Type:** AA **Issue Ref:** 8.2	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	8.2 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12682	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12529	EGERTON, JO,	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12713	GERRY, RITA,	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12168	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	13607	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12137	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	8.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12075	GVA GRIMLEY	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12258	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	8.2 Don't know
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11818	JONES, CERI, CLLR	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	13797	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	13766	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11724	NATURAL ENGLAND	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11916	NETWORK RAIL	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11598	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12591	NOTT, DARREN,	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		much more of a specialist operation / harder to set up and maintain etc. Easier to control / develop if know they are safeguarded
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12010	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12560	QUEST, DAWN,	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12105	RADWAY, T, MR	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	8.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13669	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11855	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12652	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.2 No Concern about the term "environmental acceptability!. Who would be responsible for determining the acceptability and the extent of the hazard risks? Stringent controls would need to be monitored and frequently updated.
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	13705	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11631	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12743	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	8.2 No response Again the question is unclear. For a start, what is ¿environmentally acceptable¿ is subjective. If the question means that we should accept what is currently in place then there is an argument for saying ¿yes¿ if a favourable assessment can be made by Government or the CC.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12773	SWARD	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	13537	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11693	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	12499	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	8.2 Don't know
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11886	THAMES WATER PLC	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11756	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13040	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	8.2
Respdt No:	3847		Yes - See question 8.3 and link to JMWMS
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11949	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	8.2 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	11661	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	8.2 Yes
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.2		
Ref No:	13736	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11788	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12622	TACR CONSULTANCY	8.3 1 - The need for the facility 2 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activities 3 - The pollution control record of the facility 4 - The effect that the facility closing will have on the environment (e.g. derelict land issues, waste travelling to different facilities) 5 - The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12469	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	8.3 1 - The effect that th efacility closing will have on the environment 2 - The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc; 3 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activities; 4 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses 5 - The need for the facility
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12042	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12384	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	8.3 1 - The polluction control record of the facility; 2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents); 3 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access; 4 - The need for the facility; 5 - The visual impact of the facility; 6 - The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc: 7 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activitiesl 8 - The effect that the facility will have on the environment (e.g. derelict land issues, waste travelling to different facilities); 9 - The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings; 10 - The availability of sustainable modes of transport nearby; 11 - The compatibility of the facility with neighbouring land-uses; 12 - The impact of the facility on listed buildings, conservation areas and ancient monuments;
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12193	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13640	DAUNCEY, , MRS	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11981	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12683	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12530	EGERTON, JO,	8.3 1 - The impact on the facility on listed buildings, conservation areas and ancient monuments 2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 3 - The visual impact of the facility 4 - The need for the facility 5 - The pollution control record of the facility
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12714	GERRY, RITA,	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12169	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13608	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	8.3 1 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses 2 - Location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 3 - Suitability of local road networks. 4 - Visual impact of facility 5 - Availability of sustainable modes of transport
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12138	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12076	GVA GRIMLEY	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12259	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	8.3 The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc - 1 The pollution control record of the facility - 2 The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access - 3 The need for the facility - 4 The effect that the facility closing will have on the environment (e.g. derelict land issues, waste travelling to different facilities) - 5
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11819	JONES, CERI, CLLR	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13796	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	13767	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11725	NATURAL ENGLAND	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11917	NETWORK RAIL	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11599	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	8.3 1 - The pollution control record of the facility 2 - The effect of not having the facility on the environment (e.g. derelict land issues, waste travelling to different facilities) 3 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 4 - The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc 5 - The need for the facility
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12592	NOTT, DARREN,	8.3 1 - The need for the facility 2 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activities 3 - The pollution control record of the facility 4 - The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 5 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12011	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12561	QUEST, DAWN,	8.3 1 - The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 3 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 4 - The availability of sustainable modes of transport nearby (e.g. rail or water rather than road) 5 - The need for the facility
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12106	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	8.3 1 - The need for the facility
Respdt No:	225		
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	13670	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11856	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12653	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.3 1 - The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 2 - The availability of sustainable modes of transport nearby (e.g. rail or water rather than road) 3 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 4 - The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc 5 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	13706	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11632	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.3 1 - The location of the facility in relation to local,, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses 3 - The compatibility 4 - The effect that the facility closing will have on the environment (e.g. derelict land issues, waste travelling to different facilities) 5 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary existing activities
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12744	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12774	SWARD	8.3 1 - The pollution control record of the facility 2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 3 - The compatibility of the facility with neighbouring land uses 4 - The availability of sustainable modes of transport nearby (e.g. rail or water rather than road) 5 - The visual impact of the facility
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13538	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.3 1 - Availability of suitable local roads to handle traffic and the site access; 2 - Compatibility of the facility with neighbouring land-uses 3 - Location of the facility in relation to loca, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 4 - Pollution control record of the facility 5 - Need for the facility
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11695	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.3 1 - Effect of closure on environment 2 - Compatibility with neighbouring land uses 3 - Pollution control record of the facility 4 - Location in relation to local, regional and national hazardous waste arisings 5 - Complementary existing activities
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	12500	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11887	THAMES WATER PLC	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11757	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	8.3 1 - The pollution control record of the facility 2 - The need for the facility 3 - The compatibility of the facility with neighbouring land-uses 4 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary exisiting facilities 5 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents)
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13041	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	8.3 No response Environmental Acceptability of haz facilities should be based on a risk assessment approach. Each application may be completely different as hazardous waste is so diverse (could be a TV or flyash!). Therefore it is difficult to assess. It may be better to include a statement as part of the application addressing environmental impacts
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11950	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	8.3 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	11662	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	8.3 1 - The location of the facility in relation to local, regional or national hazardous waste arisings 2 - The impact on neighbouring land-uses (e.g. nearby businesses and residents) 3 - The suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 4 - Locating new hazardous waste facilities with complementary exisiting activities 5 - The impact on wildlife, biodiversity etc
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.3		
Ref No:	13737	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11789	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12623	TACR CONSULTANCY	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.4		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12043 **Respdt No:** 2840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 8.4	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	8.4 No response
Ref No: 12385 **Respdt No:** 3827 **Respdt Type:** ENV **Issue Ref:** 8.4	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	8.4 As above: (i) Quality and quantity of hazardous waste; (ii) Health impact on local community; (iii)Medical waste? (iv)Time-limited? (v) Above or below ground?
Ref No: 12195 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 8.4	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	8.4 On issue W8 I would agree with the SA report summary on page 28 that options 3 is preferable for the management of hazardous waste in Gloucestershire. Options 1 and 2 however are also likely to be needed. This issue can be a significant threat/concern to biodiversity conservation.
Ref No: 13641 **Respdt No:** 3784 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 8.4	DAUNCEY, , MRS	8.4 No response
Ref No: 11982 **Respdt No:** 2747 **Respdt Type:** AA **Issue Ref:** 8.4	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	8.4 As you are no doubt aware the hazardous waste landfill situated at Bishops Cleeve provides a strategic facility for the disposal of hazardous waste beyond the boundaries of Gloucestershire. We note from Section 5 of your consultation document that the site is subject to a time limited consent which is due to expire in 2009. We appreciate that you have no control as to whether the operator seeks to renew the planning permission or not but we would be concerned if such a strategic facility were lost as it currently provides an outlet for regional hazardous waste arisings for which suitable alternatives may not exist or could not be readily established to redress any shortfall in capacity.
Ref No: 12684 **Respdt No:** 536 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 8.4	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	8.4 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12531	EGERTON, JO,	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12715	GERRY, RITA,	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12170	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	8.4 Criteria have to be more or less important relative to the type of hazardous waste involved and its optimum/required disposal. This ranking is meaningless.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	13609	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12139	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12077	GVA GRIMLEY	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	8.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12260	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11820	JONES, CERI, CLLR	8.4 I have already mentioned that I believe that waste facilities should not be located within at least 500m of extensive housing. If that is true in the case of non-hazardous waste, it is imperative where hazardous waste is concerned. The health and well-being of the beleaguered community accepting such waste MUST is paramount. It is surely true that no new hazardous waste landfill facility would be countenanced within 1 or even 2 km of large family estates, so it is surely right to insist that no such existing sites should be developed further or have their life extended, especially of the Waste Planning Authority has never permitted it in the first place. I am personally dismayed at the prospect of such operations continuing on the Wingmoor Farm complex (which is specifically named in the consultation document) after its current permission expires in 2009.
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	13798	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	13768	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11726	NATURAL ENGLAND	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11918	NETWORK RAIL	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	8.4		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11600 **Respdt No:** 998 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 8.4	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	8.4 a Reduction of Production i.e. Minimising Necessity for Waste b Cross or on Border Agreements with Neighbouring authorities
Ref No: 12593 **Respdt No:** 3840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 8.4	NOTT, DARREN,	8.4 No response
Ref No: 12012 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 8.4	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	8.4 No response
Ref No: 12562 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 8.4	QUEST, DAWN,	8.4 No response
Ref No: 12107 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 8.4	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	8.4 No response
Ref No: 13671 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 8.4	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.4 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11857	ROUTE MANAGEMENT	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3142	HIGHWAYS AGENCY	
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12654	SHURDINGTON PARISH	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	847	COUNCIL	
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	13707	SOUTH WEST REGION	8.4
Respdt No:	3136	LIAISON ENVIRONMENT	Hazardous Waste Management
Respdt Type:	AGEN	AGENCY	We recognise the data presented in Tables 18 and 19 and would support the county¿s analysis in paragraphs 4.68 to 4.79.
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11633	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	2725	- CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12745	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3842	PARTY	
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12776	SWARD	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	8.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13539	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11696	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	12502	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11888	THAMES WATER PLC	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11758	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	13042	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	8.4 Producer responsibility including eco design (managing haz materials out of products) and promoting re-manufacturing and recycling
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	8.4		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11951	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	11663	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	8.4 No response
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	8.4		
Ref No:	13738	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	9.1No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11790	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	9.1 1 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities 2 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 3 - Good facility design 4 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 5 - Preventing the merging of nearby town areas 9.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12624	TACR CONSULTANCY	9.1 1 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 2 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 3 - Good facility design 4 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 5 - Economic and employment benefits 9.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	9.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12470	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	1 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities; 2 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings; 3 - Safeguarding the setting of historic towns; 4 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste had to travel; 5 - Maintaining the openness of the green belt; 9.2 No
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12045	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12229	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12386	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	9.1 Do not accept waste development in Green Belt 9.2 No
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12196	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	13642	DAUNCEY, , MRS	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	9.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11983	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12685	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12532	EGERTON, JO,	9.1 1 - Safeguarding the setting of historic towns 2 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt 3 - The planning history of the site 4 - Good facility design 5 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 9.2 No
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12716	GERRY, RITA,	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12171	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	9.1 1 - The planning history of the site 2 - Preventing the merging of nearby town areas 3 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 4 - Good facility design 5 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 9.2 Yes
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	9.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13610	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	9.1
Respdt No:	3867		1 - Proximity to arisings
Respdt Type:	DC		2 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings
Issue Ref:	9.1		3 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access
			4 - Safeguarding the setting of historic towns
			5 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities
			9.2 Yes
Ref No:	12140	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3127	TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE	
Respdt Type:	NGOV	FOR THE SOUTH WEST	9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12078	GVA GRIMLEY	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12268	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		9.2 No
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11821	JONES, CERI, CLLR	9.1 I do not believe that waste management facilities should encroach upon designated Green Belt land.
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	13799	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13769	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11727	NATURAL ENGLAND	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11919	NETWORK RAIL	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11601	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 2 - Safeguarding the setting of historic towns 3 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 4 - Good facility design 5 - Economic and employment benefits
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		9.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12594	NOTT, DARREN,	9.1 1 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt 2 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 3 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 4 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 5 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		9.2 Yes
Issue Ref:	9.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12013 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 9.1	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Ref No: 12563 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 9.1	QUEST, DAWN,	9.1 1 - Good facility design 2 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 3 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt 4 - The planning history of the site 5 - Preventing the merging of nearby town areas 9.2 Yes
Ref No: 12108 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 9.1	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	9.1 1 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 2 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 3 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities 4 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 9.2 No response
Ref No: 13672 **Respdt No:** 3869 **Respdt Type:** AGEN **Issue Ref:** 9.1	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	9.1 No response 9.2 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11858	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	9.1 In considering potential sites within the Gloucestershire Green Belt for waste management proposals, the Agency notes the advice contained within planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) which seeks to protect Green belts but recognises the particular locational needs of some waste management facilities. The Agency requests that in consisting the wider environmental and economic benefits of proposals, the full impact of a proposal on the trunk road network is also considered. 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12655	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 2 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 3 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt 4 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities 5 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 9.2 No
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	13708	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	9.1 No response 9.2 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11634	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Preventing the merging of nearby town areas 2 - Safeguarding the setting of historic towns 3 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 4 - Economic and employment benefits 5 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 9.2 Yes
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	9.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12746	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		9.2 No
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12775	SWARD	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		9.2 No
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	13540	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Proximity to arisings and reducing distance waste has to travel; 2 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt; 3 - Preventing the setting of historic towns; 4 - Re-using preivously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings; 5 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities;
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	9.1		9.2 No
Ref No:	11697	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	9.1 Electronic questionnaire
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		9.2 Green belt policy should make allowances within it for waste management facilities. Composting for example is a largely agricultural style operation that would have less impact upon the green belt.
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	12501	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings 2 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt 3 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities 4 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 5 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	9.1		9.2 No

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11889	THAMES WATER PLC	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11760	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Maintaining openess of the Green Belt 2 - The planning history of the site 3 - Proximity to arisings and reducing the distance waste has to travel 4 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 5 - Good facility design
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	9.1		9.2 Yes
Ref No:	13043	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		9.2 a - Yes
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11952	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	9.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		9.2 No response
Issue Ref:	9.1		
Ref No:	11664	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	9.1 1 - Maintaining the openness of the Green Belt 2 - Co-locating complementary or ancillary activities with existing activities 3 - The planning history of the site 4 - Suitability of local roads to handle traffic and the site access 5 - Re-using previously developed land or redundant agricultural buildings
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	9.1		9.2 No

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12141	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	The Green Belt currently being reviewed as part of the RSS process and should the general extent be altered, this will offer the opportunity to locate facilities close to Gloucester and Cheltenham (probably through AAPs). It is not clear from any of the documents how much discussion has taken place with Tewkesbury, Cheltenham and Gloucester about such opportunities but we would urge you to do so as soon as possible to ensure a fully integrated approach to delivering mixed, sustainable communities is achieved.
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	9.2		
Ref No:	13740	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11791	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	10.1 Nature conservation - Yes Waste environment - Yes Landscape - No Archaeology - Yes 10.2 AONB covers a large area. Sewage treatment/pumping facilities are required close to development creating the waste due to hydraulic/network demand/capabilities. It may not always be feasible/sustainable to avoid development in the AONB for such types of waste facility. 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12625	TACR CONSULTANCY	10.1 Nature conservation - Don't know Water Environment - Don't know Landscape - Don't know Archaeology - Don't know 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12471	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	10.1 Nature conservation - Yes Water environment - Yes Landscape - Don't know Archaeology - Don't know 10.2 No response 10.3 The human population!
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12046	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11576	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	10.1 No response 10.2 No response It is suggested that the AONB policy is amended as follows. 10.3 Proposals for waste development within or affecting the setting of areas of outstanding natural beauty will only be permitted where: - There are no alternative sites not affecting the AONB to serve that market need; & -The impact on the special qualities of the AONB (including the landscape setting and recreational opportunities) can be successfully mitigated. The Board considers that the last paragraph simply paraphrases national policy set out in PPS 7.
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12387	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	10.1 Nature conservation - yes Water environment - yes Landscape - yes Archaeology - yes 10.2 No response 10.3 Impact on local communities - Health
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12197	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	13643	DAUNCEY, , MRS	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11984	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12686	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12533	EGERTON, JO,	10.1 Nature conservation - Don't know Water environment - Don't know Landscape - Don't know Archaeology - Don't know 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12717	GERRY, RITA,	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12172	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	10.1 Nature conservation - Don't know Landscape - No 10.2 This is not reconciled with a) Need for network of some facilities b) Para 3.33 - Policy SPP.6 (See 12 sheet) 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13611	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	10.1 Nature conservation - No Water environment - No 10.2 Include European designations pSAC, SAC, RAMSAR etc. AONB needs more flexibility to allow small scale facilities to meet local demand. 10.3 Setting of Severn Estuary see Structure Plan Policy MR.8.
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12142	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3127		
Respdt Type:	NGOV		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12079	GVA GRIMLEY	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	12271	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	10.1 a heck of a lot of gobbledy gook and jargon which means very little to the people who will be most affected. 10.2 No response 10.3 why is our garden rubbish, collected in special, paid-for green bags, immediately put amongst the general rubbish - obviously not composted.?
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12203	JONES, CERI, CLLR	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		10.2 No response
Issue Ref:	10.1		
			10.3 No response
Ref No:	13800	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		10.2 No response
Issue Ref:	10.1		
			10.3 No response
Ref No:	13770	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		10.2 No response
Issue Ref:	10.1		
			10.3 No response
Ref No:	11728	NATURAL ENGLAND	10.1 Nature conservation - No
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	10.1		10.2 To bring the wording of the nature conservation policy in line with PPS it should be amended to include the phrase '...clearly outweigh the impact it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on teh national network of SSSI's'.
			10.3 SSSI
Ref No:	11920	NETWORK RAIL	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		10.2 No response
Issue Ref:	10.1		
			10.3 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11602	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	10.1
Respdt No:	998		Nature conservation - Highlighted
Respdt Type:	PC		Water environment - Highlighted
Issue Ref:	10.1		Landscape - Highlighted
			Archaeology - Highlighted
			10.2 No response
			10.3 No response
Ref No:	12595	NOTT, DARREN,	10.1
Respdt No:	3840		Nature conservation - Yes
Respdt Type:	IND		Water environment - yes
Issue Ref:	10.1		Landscape - Yes
			Archaeology - Yes
			10.2 No response
			10.3 No response
Ref No:	12014	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		10.2 No response
Respdt Type:	PC		10.3 No response
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12564	QUEST, DAWN,	10.1
Respdt No:	3839		Nature conservation - Yes
Respdt Type:	IND		Water environment - Yes
Issue Ref:	10.1		Landscape - Yes
			Archaeology - Yes
			10.2 No response
			10.3 No response
Ref No:	12109	RADWAY, T, MR	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	10.2 No response
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	10.1		10.3 No response
Ref No:	13673	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	3869		10.2 No response
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	10.1		10.3 No response
Ref No:	11859	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	10.1 No response
Respdt No:	3142		10.2 No response
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	10.1		10.3 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12656	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	10.1 Nature conservation - Yes Water environment - yes Landscape - Yes Archaeology - Yes 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	13709	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11635	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	10.1 Nature conservation - No Water environment - Yes Landscape - No Archaeology - Yes 10.2 Nature conservation - Local sites of importance Landscape - Does not have an adverse impact. Criteria 1 has to be proven 10.3 Geoconservation should have a separate policy
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12747	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	10.1 Nature conservation - No Water environment - No response Landscape - No Archaeoloogy - Yes 10.2 "Nature Conservation We don¿t believe that Policy 23 is satisfactory or adequate in its present form, as its wording makes the implications of its content sound more innocuous than they really are. The concept of ¿exceptional circumstances¿ creates a dangerous policy as it appears widely open to abuse. Who is to have a say in what amounts to circumstances being ¿exceptional¿ and to what extent will financial considerations play a part in such decisions ? The potential damage to areas of huge environmental and ecological importance cannot be dismissed in this manner through the acceptance that ¿adequate mitigation¿ may make a harmful scheme desirable. The policy should place far greater importance on the absolutely vital task of preserving our unique ecological heritage, its biodiversity and its value for future generations. Water Environment We should adopt the ¿Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems¿, (National SUDS Working Group, July 2004). L andscape We broadly agree with the Cotswolds Conservation Board¿s enhancement of Policy 26, with minor alterations including the reinstatement of the final deleted paragraph : ¿Proposals for waste development within or affecting the setting of areas of outstanding natural beauty will only be permitted where: − There are no alternative sites outside of the AONB to serve that market need; & − The impact on the special qualities of the AONB (including the landscape setting and recreational opportunities) can be successfully mitigated. In the case of major development proposed in the AONB a proven national interest needs to be demonstrated. Approval will only be granted in exceptional circumstances following the most rigorous examination.¿" 10.3 Air quality P26. W10. it is unclear what "it is proposed to review policies" implies. The WLP is the current binding document until 2012. Its policies, such as Policy 26 on the Cotswolds AONB, were the result of much discussion and argument and must remain. The process over time has been to increase protection: in the past there has been major landfill in the AONB which would be wholly unacceptable nowadays. Hence the only review should be to increase protection, and certainly not water down the WLP policies.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12777	SWARD	10.1 Nature conservation - Yes Water environment - Yes Landscape - Yes Archaeology - Yes 10.2 All of them - in general "yes", but the problems will be few with zero waste 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	13541	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	10.1 Nature conservation - Yes Water environment - Yes Landscape - Yes Archaeology - Yes 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11698	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	10.1 Nature conservation - No Water environment - No response Landscape - No response Archaeology - No response 10.2 The planning system has moved away from 'demonstrable harm' to 'precautionary principle' therefore the nature conservation policy should be reworded to reflect this. 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12503	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	10.1 Nature conservation - Yes Water environment - Yes Landscape - Yes Archaeology - Yes 10.2 No response 10.3 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Sites of Special Scientific Interest
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11890	THAMES WATER PLC	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11761	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	13045	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	10.1 Don't know 10..2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11953	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	10.1 No response 10.2 No response 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	10.1		
Ref No:	11665	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	10.1 Nature conservation - No Water environment - Yes Landscape - Yes Archaeology - Yes 10.2 Nature conservation - It is essential to define what is meant by 'exceptional circumstances' as benefits/disadvantages issue could cause conflict if demand increases (even with recycling/re-use) and there is pressure on rural sites 10.3 No response
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	10.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12198 **Respdt No:** 2207 **Respdt Type:** INTL **Issue Ref:** 10.2	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	Issue W10 appropriately suggests a policy concerning nationally designated areas leaving international designations to be dealt with by the Regional Spatial Strategy and local sites by the subsequent Development Control DPD. The amended version of existing Policy 23 from the adopted Waste Local Plan (as appearing in bold text) should certainly be a policy in the WCS. Clear references to other relevant plans and strategies that concern national assets must be made, e.g. PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, Regional Spatial Strategy, River Basin Management Plans, Coastal Habitat Management Plans and AONB Management Plans. Nationally important areas should be shown in the WCS Key Diagram (as promoted in DFRA's 'Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: A Guide to Good Practice', paragraph 4.30). The general issue of conservation and enhancement of biodiversity needs to be covered (in accordance with the Key Principles in PPS9 and the new statutory duty for Local Authorities to conserve biodiversity (NERC Act 2006, Section 40)). The Core Strategy should contain a generic policy for biodiversity and geological conservation that can be applied throughout the county and is not location specific (this is produced in DEFRA's 'Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: A Guide to Good Practice', paragraph 4.31). Paragraph 5.129 of Part B of the Issues and Options document suggest an overarching nature conservation policy and it is recommended that the revised version of MR.5 (as quoted in italics) be adopted for this purpose. The revised version of MR.5 will help to address issues surrounding species of biodiversity importance (e.g. Biodiversity Species List for England (NERC Act Section 41), National Red Data Book Species and Gloucestershire BAP Species) wherever they occur. A separate policy to take account strategically of the Water Framework Directive is strongly supported. To summarise for Issue W10 Option 2 should be the preferred choice.

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12176 **Respdt No:** 3830 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 10.2	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Suggested policy under 5.135 The Cotswolds AONB is the largest AONB in the country and defended by many interested residents. The issue of integrated waste management facilities, serving perhaps more localised needs, is therefore one which needs attention, since local residents are very likely to resist any facility 'near them' and will use this policy to support their view. So policy para 5.135 will not serve here to produce local networks of facilities such as small recycling or waste transfer sites, composting sites, or even perfectly innocuous bulking up or processing sites in, say B2 allocated areas. Additionally, the policy does not appear to be compatible with the policy SRP6 to which the AONB Conservation Board have signed up on 23rd March 2006. (para 3.33) It is therefore necessary, if sustainability objectives indicate a network of facilities, and less lorry trips through and out of the AONB, to frame a policy which is positive in encouraging networks of waste management facilities within the AONB - subject to strict criteria about impact, landscaping and design. One problem already seen (not only in Gloucestershire, but in Oxfordshire) is that while a scheme might result in the 'redirecting' of lorry traffic within the AONB, to the benefit of lorry miles, it is resisted on the basis that in the terms of the application itself, in that additional lorry traffic is generated, apparently contrary to policy. But the arising already take place: they are already transported in a different section of the AONB, taking longer trips. With waste this is particularly significant, since the proposal will probably not imply an increase in a product - waste already arises. This contrasts with a new industrial building producing widgets, where this is an additional activity, with additional lorry trips. This situation supports the idea that a policy should have a positive approach, supporting the concept of waste collection/recycling/disposal being a community service, acceptable within the AONB if it services the community, and is carefully controlled as to impact. In theoretical terms, there is no reason why local (as opposed to major) provision for waste mangement is any less acceptable in the AONB, especially in terms of the objectives of the Conservation Board and the AONB Management Plan. The history of the AONB is one of industry in the landscape over the centuries, and industrial sites are still allocated there in the interests of the local economy. Waste mangement is equally justifiable, or more so if based on existing arisings. In additiona, PPS7 is quoted as the basis of the policy proposed: in fact, close reading of PPS7 indicates far more emphasis on Sustainability, than on landscape protection to the exclusion of all else. Great weight should be given to AONB status, but the important sentence is Para.21 - as well as reflecting these priorities, planning policies...should also support suitably located and designed development necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of these designated areas and their communities... it goes on to mention providing local needs housing, but it can hardly be

Response	Respondent	Representations

demied that the whole thrust of waste policy is to bring waste management/minimisation/recycling into focus as a community need.

STRATEGY
Perhaps it would be helpful to be more specific about the range of local and community waste management facilities which should be provided at community level. For example, recycling banks are the smallest community facilities, and there is a wide network, which support kerbside collection. But is it wide enough - shouldn't encouragement be given in the strategy to more? - for example in one village vandalism has discouraged such a site, which is no longer available. (This approach might be appropriate at County-wide scale as well as AONB).

HRCs are important, but the provision is not proximate to some areas of the County, especially in the AONB.

If it comes to wider needs of the community, proximate provision for construction and demolition arisings, from households and businesses, is required, due to the need to reduce lorry trips. The products of recycling, such as natural stone, soil, secondary aggregates, can be used locally in construction and maintenance work. However, in the AONB, additional local provision could not be made under the policy. Nor could a small waste transfer station for the bulking up of clinical waste, or other small hazardous wastes, be supported. This might come from local doctors, dentists, small hospitals, etc. and the materials must be sent on for long distances for specialist treatment. Additional regulation requires more items to be disposed of by specialist facilities, including agricultural arisings.

Another example of composting, which might be needed either for local municipal arisings, or agricultural production/processing such as the trimmings from vegetables, or by-products of agricultural activity. One product is soil washed off vegetables while being packed, which is bagged and sold as fine soil. Agricultural production can also provide ABPR compostable wastes which by using in-vessel faciltiies may be returned to the soil.

Since the definition of waste extends over anything which is 'discarded', there are many commercial materials which are defined as waste for which small local facilities for bulking up, or for processing, would not be harmful to the AONB.

All these needs serve the local economy, and may well not produce an adverse impact on the environment or the landscape. The approach needs to be positive to encourage sites to come forward, and to be aimed at producing a viable local network for a number of waste streams. Currently it is clear that longer journeys would be obliged to take place for sorting, processing or disposal. The policy should have strong criteria for design and landscaping, mitigation and if necessary, noise but in principle, if the WCS is to be consistent, it should support local provision, in the AONB, and give guidance as to how it can be acceptable.

Suggested policy

Response	Respondent	Representations
		5.135 The AONB policy is proposed to be amended to give due weight to the requirements of PPS7, which state that great weight is to be attached to the objectives of the designation in determining planning proposals. It follows that it is unlikely that greenfield sites would be favourably considered unless there were exceptional circumstances, and that small scale operations would be preferable. Sustainability objectives will inform the determination of proposals for waste management development within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, where a very important objective is to preserve and enhance the landscape. Permission may be granted where it can be shown that the proposal is in accordance with the following: - The proposed development forms part of a network of facilities for the sustainable treatment of locally arising wastes, appropriate in scale and activity; - It would cause no undue or unacceptable harm to the landscape or the environment, either through its location, or mitigation to a high standard. - It would offer defined benefits to the community in the AONB, the land and landscape (including through integrated farm diversification), or contribute to local sustainable acitivity. - It would not unacceptably increase traffic impact. In the case of major development proposed in the AONB a proven national interest needs to be demonstrated which can be evaluated as outweighing any impacts resulting from the development.
Ref No: 11954 **Respdt No:** 3167 **Respdt Type:** UTL **Issue Ref:** 10.2	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	Please refer to our comments on proximity of waste water treatment sites in our comments on W5.
Ref No: 13741 **Respdt No:** 3172 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 11.1	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	11.1 No response
Ref No: 11792 **Respdt No:** 3164 **Respdt Type:** UTL **Issue Ref:** 11.1	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	11.1 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12626	TACR CONSULTANCY	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12472	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12047	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12230	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12388	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	11.1 Would like to see any W.C.S satisfy national/local waste policies or CPRE. Whilst the W.C.S is inevitably 'time limited', CPRE must look to the environmental issue 'in perpetuim'.
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12199	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	11.1 Issue W11 (SA Report) - I direct you to a table I have compiled with David Ingleby entitled 'Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening of Gloucestershire County Council's Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options (Summer 2006)' which is relevant to Appendix 5 of the SA Report. I presume you are aware of this document already. Section 5 (Plan issues and options) is useful and I would not question the summarised commentary provided at 5.2, as it is a reasonable appraisal of the issues and options under consideration.
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	11.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13644	DAUNCEY, , MRS	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11985	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12687	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12534	EGERTON, JO,	11.1 I have lived in an area where green recycling bins were used, and black bins were only collected on a 2 weekly basis. This had a massive impact on the residential area, due to the lack of recycling to support the 2 week bin collection- to accompany a 2 week collection also needs food waste recycling, plastic collection (i.e milk cartons, plastic bottles etc..)also cardboard allowance in with garden rubbish.
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12718	GERRY, RITA,	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12173	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	11.1 Can't honestly feel the resources and work involved have added much to the main problem, or solving it.
Respdt No:	3830		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	11.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13612	GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3867		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 12144 **Respdt No:** 3127 **Respdt Type:** NGOV **Issue Ref:** 11.1	GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	11.1 Whilst we do not comment in detail on the Sustainability Appraisal we have made a couple of observations which you may wish to consider. As expressed in our response to Question 2 above, you may wish to revisit some of your explanations so that your SA better articulates your reasoning for marking in the way that you have. For example, page 50, W2, Options 2, 3 and 4, SA Objective 12, seems to suggest that if fuel technology results in less CO2 emissions then lorry movement will not need to be reduced, but surely CO2 emission are not the only adverse impact of lorry traffic on communities - what about safety, noise etc? You appear to have taken a slightly different approach to the same issue in W3 (page 53). We feel there are a number of such cases throughout the document which would benefit from clarification/justification. Tests of Soundness Test I It may be worth clarifying what level of partnership engagement there has been to date to inform this document, for example with district authorities, the business community, primary care trusts etc. Test IV PPS12 sets out the elements of provision that spatial plans should include. It refers to implementation, monitoring and phrasing provision which is currently lacking in your document and should therefore be addressed. The plan should also make clearer how the it has taken account of other service providers requirements eg agencies providing services in the area including their future plans and also how it relates to other strategies such as the LTP. For example, although waterways, this does not seem to be reflected in the Issues and Options stage Waste Core Strategy. Could Sharpness docks be utilised in the transportation of waste from Lydney for example? Will the proposed Gloucester Parkway Train Station offer options for waste transportation? Does Gloucester Docks have a role? Is the Lorry Management Strategy being discussed with the waste industry? Area Action Plans for large urban extensions or areas of significant change, such as those being proposed for Cheltenham and Gloucester, and the Gloucester Docks regeneration plans offer a good opportunity to integrate uses and should be fully explored as part of this document. Test VI In the issues affecting Gloucestershire your document mentions the level of exporting and importing of various wastes - is this a problem? Are you looking to reduce this cross-boundary traffic? How are you engaging with waste authorities/companies in other regions to address this? Test VIII As stated under Test IV, the document will need to refer much more to implementation, monitoring and phasing -

Response		Respondent	Representations
			particularly in light of the problems of delivery identified in Part B para 5.41
Ref No:	12080	GVA GRIMLEY	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3805		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	13048	HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3835		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12204	JONES, CERI, CLLR	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	13801	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	13771	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11729	NATURAL ENGLAND	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	11.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
Ref No: 11921 **Respdt No:** 3788 **Respdt Type:** TRAN **Issue Ref:** 11.1	NETWORK RAIL	11.1 No response
Ref No: 11605 **Respdt No:** 998 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 11.1	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Ref No: 12596 **Respdt No:** 3840 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 11.1	NOTT, DARREN,	11.1 No response
Ref No: 12015 **Respdt No:** 1213 **Respdt Type:** PC **Issue Ref:** 11.1	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Ref No: 12565 **Respdt No:** 3839 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 11.1	QUEST, DAWN,	11.1 No response
Ref No: 12110 **Respdt No:** 225 **Respdt Type:** WOP **Issue Ref:** 11.1	RADWAY, T, MR **Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	11.1 Sustainabiliy go hand-in-hand. 15% of sorted waste in a WTS HAS to go to landfill because it cannot be used elsewhere. The LPA MUST be flexible in finding/allowing land in the Severn Vale to be used for that purpose. It is not SUSTAINABLE to take the residue to the Water Park or beyond.

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13674	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11860	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12657	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	13710	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11636	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	2725		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12748	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	11.1 It is not emphasised nearly enough in the SA that landfill is a fundamentally unsustainable process in the medium to long term. Any process is by definition unsustainable if it piles up large quantities of material in sites that will admittedly be full within a few years. Regarding Issue W10 of WSC (page 28), it is not true that Option 2 is the most positive. The table on P105 shows no difference except a marginal one for flooding, which seems irrelevant in this case.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12778	SWARD	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	13542	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11699	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	11.1 We are generally satisfied with the SA assessment of the WCS
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	12504	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11891	THAMES WATER PLC	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11762	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13046	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	11.1 Very detailed and seems thorough
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11955	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	11.1 No response
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	11666	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	11.1 Generally support conclusions in the SA report but the adverse effects of environmental change (eg: flooding) due to global warming and any unanticipated economic downturn on employmen/housing/transport in the next 20 years, need to be given greater emphasis.
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	11.1		
Ref No:	13742	CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT	12.1 We have received a copy of the above draft for comment as part of your consultation process. CIWM would like to be in a position to respond to this and all similar documents, however resources do not allow us to do this for what would potentially be over 500 individual drafts. Unfortunately in this instance we are not able to respond. Please continue to send similar documents to CIWM, these are of interest to members and will be logged in the library accordingly.
Respdt No:	3172		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11793	SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD	12.1 Severn Trent Water Ltd (STWL) is a regulated business with statutory responsibility for the provision of water and sewerage services for over 8 million people, for an area with .... Gloucestershire. STWL has a rolling 5 years infrastructure development programme, which includes new and tightened environmental and quality obligations and investment to ensure existing water supply and sewerage networks and treatment facilities operate efficiently and effectively. A 5 year capital expenditure programme overseen by the regulator OFWAT also takes account of measures in demand for water and sewerage services. Gloucestershire has a mixture of urban development (residential/commercial) in and around Gloucester/Cheltenham, and more isolated communities (residential/small industrial) in rural locations. STWL is required to provide recovery, treatment and appropriate disposal of waste water arising from all of these types of communities. Therefore the policies of the WCS need to be sufficiently flexible to allow the expansion of existing waste water treatment facilities, to allow the need for increased treatment capacity due to new development, and also the need for new waste water treatment pumping stations, and new underground network infrastructure so rural communities not currently connected to the network can benefit from mains sewerage connections where appropriate or required.
Respdt No:	3164		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12627	TACR CONSULTANCY	12.1 1.Arisings after WTS processing must be taken to landfil (inert) near the point of production 2 Markets for recycled materials must be investgated 3 Composting MUST take place near the source of the material. Issues over landscape and Environmental Impact or even traffic movement will have to be put to one side if sites are to be found. In short no-one wants them near them but at the same time fell that we should be following a strategy. Something MUST GIVE and the development must go ahead.
Respdt No:	3315		
Respdt Type:	BUS		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12473	BATCHELOR, THERESA,	12.1 I believe that Gloucestershire has the potential to set the benchmark for creating an environmentally responsible waste management plan and that the consultation document should be more widely advertised and available and also simplified becasue there are some pretty complicated questions in the current version.
Respdt No:	3836		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12048	BILLINGS-FERRAND, J A, THE HON	12.1 Views as follows: 1) Put into force a hose pipe ban urgently! Councils also waste much needed water by regularly watering city parks and flower bed we dont all wish to enter the "Britain in Bloom" contest or our Council's Best garden contest. 2) These competitions should be cancelled by law during a water shortage like now! 3) Put a surcharge on large compnay's who waste water at any time of the year. 4) Force Severn Trent Water to repair all leaks quickly. 5) In respect of the environment request householders not to light bonfires before 8.30pm in summer months not at 6 pm as they do here.! 6) Give householders a garden incinerator so that they may waste safely and make compost from the ash which they can dig into their garden thereby make possible better garden produce for their own delight.
Respdt No:	2840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12202	COTSWOLDS CONSERVATION BOARD	12.1 On page 7 reference is made to the size of the Cotswolds AONB. Please note that the Cotswolds AONB is the largest in England and Wales, not 'one of the largest'. The board is disappointed to note that there is no reference to AONB Management Plans in Section 3 'Policy Context'. these are statutory plans, adopted by the County Council, and include policies relating to minerals in the AONB.
Respdt No:	3400		
Respdt Type:	AONB		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12389	COUNCIL FOR THE PROTECTION OF RURAL ENGLAND (GLOUCESTERSHIRE - WASTE)	12.1 1) More emphasis on addressing 'waste' entering the County from 'outside' source; 2) Influence or E.U. rulings; 3) Special conditions for medical waste; 4) More exploration of use of 'waste' for energy; 5) More exploration of use of 'waste' as a generator of industrial processes and a stimulant to industrial growth: - Reuse of metals; - Creation of plasterboard; - Creation of leisure surfaces; - Creation of aggregate etc.... - Creation of biofuels
Respdt No:	3827		
Respdt Type:	ENV		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12200	COUNTY ECOLOGIST **Agent:** ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE	12.1 Issue W12 - The Waste (& Minerals) Core Strategy should address information needs for the Development Framework. Using up to date information is the first Key Principle in PPS9 and this issue is a general one not just specific to biodiversity or geodiversity. Proposals for monitoring have been referred to in the SA Report (page 11).
Respdt No:	2207		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	13645	DAUNCEY, , MRS	12.1 Although we are committed recyclers and have reduced the contents of our weekly wheelie bin to a small swing bin liner, we have not felt able to answer the questionnaire. Interesting reading and good to know its all happening, but too full of complications and jargon to deal with. We do feel that in a rural area such as ours where big gardens are the norm, a weekly collection of the 'brown bin' would be helpful, with the normal household waste being collected fortnightly.
Respdt No:	3784		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11986	DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ECONOMIC STRATEGY - WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	2747		
Respdt Type:	AA		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12688	DURSLEY TOWN COUNCIL	12.1 #3 currently proactively minimising waste generation, could also focus on recycling and revcvoering value / energy from waste - first 2 options good, some uncertainty over 3rd. #5 Spatial strategy some concerns regarding rural sites due to the related proximity of sites to where majority of waste produced, current option most positive. In veiw of these comments, existing sites should be maintained especially Hosley which is well used and well located for the local area, thus providing a valuable resource and opprtunity to recycle / dispose of waste correctly. This would be less likely if residents had a 30 mile round trip. #9 Appropriateness of proposals for new waste management in the Green belt. We would be very concerned to see new facilities on green belt land and also object to the possible redefining of green belt as this is designated to prevent the unrestricted sprawl of built up area and to safeguard the surrounding countryside. It is also there to preseve the special character of historic town and to assist with urban regeneration, Any redefinition even for purposes such as waste core strategy could lead to further encroachment on green belt
Respdt No:	536		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12535	EGERTON, JO,	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3838		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12719	GERRY, RITA,	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3841		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12174	GILL PAWSON PLANNING	12.1
Respdt No:	3830		POINTS
Respdt Type:	BUS		1. Smaller local sites cannot be spatially identified and allocated on a network basis, it is impracticable unless supported by a specific policy in the same way as small housing sites are allocated in relation to 'settlement'. But the difference is that waste management is not generally compatible with 'settlements'. Nor are we starting with a clean slate. Over a County with mizxed land uses, and mixed assets, a criteria-based approach which is able to take into account the sustainable conversion/re-use/development of mainly existing assets is a more practical approach to many aspects of the integrated waste management network.
Issue Ref:	12.1		2. Existing assets, in terms of waste management, can include farm buildings and land, industrial and mining land, docks, sui generis uses such as building contractors. Waste management assets can also be built into new developments not allocated for waste management on the spatial plan such as retailing or mixed use sites.
			3. Technology in the waste industry is changing rapidly. Government policy warns against being too prescriptive, and states that flexibility should be retained.
			4. Because of the climate of public objection to waste proposals, it is a mistake to build into the planning process the tools for objectors to use against new proposals, by writing into the plan prescriptive policies/allocations, without alternative or positive approaches being written in (please see 6. below and statement on AONB below).
			5. Competition as to provision of services is also to be encouraged (PPS10).
			6. What is waste? Now that waste is so widely defined, and so many activities and land uses, including Agriculture, involve handling materials defined as waste, it is necessary for policies to take into account the workings of various businesses. Policy work has to be clearly focussed on specific types of waste, on a broader range than hitherto, and with a postive approach if objectives of sustainable waste management are to be achieved.
			Otherwise activities which involve 'waste', but which in fact are fairly normal activities, will be discriminated against when they are required to have a defined planning consent with regard to waste. The following are examples: a. Farmer imports green waste from local landscape gardeners to make compost in association with own waste materials to be spread onto his farm, or perhaps sold as farm diversification scheme/product. b. Farm chemicals, or farm plastics - now within 'waste' definition, are bulked up for onward transit to processor. This is a small waste transfer function which is reasonable in a rural area. c. Groundworks and landscape contractor with many years of operation has always imported soils, demolition rubble, bricks, stone, including natural stone and cut stone, and green waste, for sorting, processing to hardcore, mulch, wood

Response		Respondent	Representations
			chips, and then use on other sites. In fact, many landscape contractors (who generally do hard landscaping, retaining walls, drives - i.e. groundworks involved) must operate illegally in that they are sorting wastes and stockpiling soil, stone, etc for later use. They require planning permission for waste transfer. All the above are moving waste up the waste hierarchy, and contributing to the economy. They should be encouraged, and the planning policies should be in place to allow this. Unfortunately, because the term 'waste' generally arouses an adverse response, unless policies are clearly supportive, these activities will present unnecessary problems. While not concentrating on this point about normal activity involving waste, PPS10 is clear that unallocated sites should be regarded 'favourably', subject to compliance with criteria.
Ref No: 13613 **Respdt No:** 3867 **Respdt Type:** DC **Issue Ref:** 12.1		GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL	12.1 The energy from waste issue appears to have been side stepped a little, given the public concern over this issue this is perhaps an omission. Technology has moved on significantly since the WLP process, perhaps it is time to re-visit some of the earlier discussions on this subject.
Ref No: 12201 **Respdt No:** 3127 **Respdt Type:** NGOV **Issue Ref:** 12.1		GOSW - LOCAL PLANNING TEAM GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE SOUTH WEST	12.1 No response
Ref No: 12081 **Respdt No:** 3805 **Respdt Type:** BUS **Issue Ref:** 12.1		GVA GRIMLEY	12.1 No response
Ref No: 13049 **Respdt No:** 3835 **Respdt Type:** IND **Issue Ref:** 12.1		HOOKER, IRENE, MRS	12.1 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12205	JONES, CERI, CLLR	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	2071		
Respdt Type:	CCLLR		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	13802	LANDSCAPE OFFICER	12.1 My only landscape concern about the document is that it does not mention th Landscape Character Assessments that have been written for the county. We are hoping that these documents will be used to influence planning decsions such as the Waste Core Strategy.
Respdt No:	3831		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	13772	MCCURRY, PATRICIA, MS	12.1 While I don't feel qualified to respond to the questions raised in your issues and options summary, I do have some thoughts on issue W3 based on my experiences as a frequst user of the "recycling centres" at Horsley, Gloucestershire and in Ilfracombe, North Devon, where my mother lives. 1 At the Horsley centre, I see all sorts of items with a saleable value go into the (usually landfill) skip and an acitve polic enfored by the workmen not to allow any goods brought to the centre to be taken away by members of the public who might want them. The policy seems to be that once an item has been placed on the ground, it belongs to the centre and cannot be removed. It must go into the (usually landfill) skip. Whereas in Ilfracombe the centre sells all items of any valule to the public and is known as the place to go to find that extra chair, clay flower pot, odd roof tile or whatever, thus truly living up to it's name as a recycling centre. 2 Sometimes, when skips are full, waste that i have carefully separated all goes into the landfill skip. Thus I have been told to put both metal and wood skips have been full, which makes me wonder why I bother. This is especially so at weekends, which are obviously the busiest times because that's when Joe public has the time to load the car and go the 'tip'. 3 Most of my waste is garden waste, which I take to the recycling centre because I'm going past there once a week anyway and it saves me burning it and adding to CO2 emissions. I believe that some centres sell cheaply bags of composted material and it strikes me that this would provide an excellent incentive to encourage more people to recycle their green waste. These are just some observations and suggestions. I'm that with some imagination and creativity much could be done to make the recycling centres truly just that.
Respdt No:	3822		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11730	NATURAL ENGLAND	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3141		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11922	NETWORK RAIL	12.1 The comments relate specifically to Network Rail's role as the agency responsible for delivering a reliable and safe rail network and also to maintain, improve and upgrade every aspect of the railway infrastructure. Network Rail has a diverse and significant portfolio, and, where not required operationally, it is generally used to fund improvements to the rail network through maximising the commercial value of its estate by redevelopment or enhancement of the existing portfolio where ever possible. Network Rail would support the document in principle, and would like promote any initiatives to transport waste by rail.
Respdt No:	3788		
Respdt Type:	TRAN		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11606	NEWLAND PARISH COUNCIL	12.1 More education in schools and colleges and Press about the urgency of action and necessity to reduce waste. Explanation of cost to all of us in terms of money and environmental impact.
Respdt No:	998		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12597	NOTT, DARREN,	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3840		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12016	QUENINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	1213		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12566	QUEST, DAWN,	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3839		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12111	RADWAY, T, MR	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	225	**Agent:** SMITHS (GLOUCESTER) LTD	
Respdt Type:	WOP		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	13675	REGULATORY WASTE TEAM - ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	12.1 Exempt facilities: The Agency has submitted proposals to DETR to change the existing exemption for composting (Schedule 3, paragraph 12). The proposals reflect most, if not all of the controls and restrictions considered necessary by the agency and described in this position statement. In addition the agency has recommended that certain composting operations be allowed to take waste from outside sources and then sent on for use by outside users. A charging scheme for registering and inspecting composting activities has also been proposed. A Government consultation on the revision of Exempt Activities including revision to Paragraph 12 is expected soon. This position should be taken to over-arch, take precedence but not replace existing guidance such as the current Internal Guidance on Paragraph 12 Composting Activities issued in February 2001.
Respdt No:	3869		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11861	ROUTE MANAGEMENT HIGHWAYS AGENCY	12.1 The Agency generally welcomes the issues and options set out within the paper and broadly support the objectives. However, the Agency would welcome further reference to the need for proposals to maximise opportunities for transporting waste by rail or water. Furthermore, the Agency would recommend that proposals for waste management facilities should be assessed in terms of their impact on the trunk road network and whether they reflect sustainable transport objectives and the guidance contained within PPG13. Any planning applications for waste development should be accompanied by sufficient information, including a full transportation assessment, to enable their impact on our network to be properly assessed. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage on development sites that come forward.
Respdt No:	3142		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12658	SHURDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	847		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13711	SOUTH WEST REGION LIAISON ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	12.1 The Environment Agency has published comprehensive data on waste management at the Waste Planning Authority level in the form of Strategic Waste Management Assessments (SWMA) in 2000 and 2004. The SWMA principal data sets are: - The results of a statistical survey of business waste production and management and, - A summary of waste inputs to licensed waste management facilities in thousands of tonnes. We believe the SWMA information published to our website is the minimum required to deliver sound spatial planning policy. The Environment Agency South West Region is committed to working closely with its WPAs and the SWRTAB to ensure the best possible information on wastes managed is available. We have supplied further information from our monitoring database of waste inputs and outputs at the site level in personal communications to the WPAs in the South West for all years for which we have data. A summary of this information is presented here for reference in Table 1 below. The county and stakeholders should note that comparisons between recent years should be taken in the round. There have been significant changes to the way waste management data is collected. In particular the recent change in classification scheme from a UK based substance orientated system to the EU waste catalogue. Consequently to ensure the highest level of consistency we have had to collate data at a very high level as either inert, non-inert or hazardous/special wastes. From the summary information in Table 1 we would agree with the council statement that broadly the around 1.4 Mt of wastes are managed through licensed waste facilities in the county on an annual basis (paragraph 4.1) Agricultural Waste Management New regulations since May 2006 have classified all waste materials arising on agricultural premises as waste within the terms of Environmental Protection Act 1990. We recognise the data in Table 20 but feel the analysis to potentially erroneous. A recent judgement from the European Court of Justice (ECJ) has confirmed that manure¿s and slurries arising from agricultural activities and spread to land for agricultural benefit do not fall within the terms of the Waste Framework Directive and are therefore not to be considered waste. The amounts of actual wastes, essentially those non-natural materials arising through farming activities will be waste and require appropriate management and disposal. We do not believe the amounts of such arising at both a regional and sub regional level to be significant representing less than one percent of existing waste management tonnages. Conclusions Having assessed the waste management data used to establish the evidence base for issues and options appraisal we would support the County¿s general position and agree with the general conclusions drawn. We would hope that the county ensures the appropriate level of engagement with its adjoining Authorities and recognises it current role in
Respdt No:	3136		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response	Respondent	Representations
		providing potentially significant disposal capacity for non-inert and hazardous wastes at both the sub-regional and national level respectively.
Ref No: 11637 **Respdt No:** 2725 **Respdt Type:** DC **Issue Ref:** 12.1	STRATEGIC LAND USE TEAM - CHELT. BOROUGH COUNCIL	12.1 No response

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	12749	STROUD DISTRICT GREEN PARTY	12.1 We thought the questions often badly framed and limiting, as we simply weren't able to address all the issues. We should be entitled to comment on the whole of these document and not just be able to answer the questions the planners would like us to answer. WCS Issues and Options Part A: Summary Version. P6/7. 4 routes, not 3. Cotswold Way to be added. P15, 16, 17. Yes, but how can you "manage" C&I, C&D and Agricultural waste if there is no enforceable control and hence no sanctions on the producers? The phrase "more needs to be done" is empty if there is no control. P17. Note that straw is a good carbon neutral heating fuel. P27. W12. (i) We remain essentially opposed to incineration; however, careful consideration should be given to the option of pyrolysis followed by a very high and controlled flame temperature. None of the other combustion options, particular ly old fashioned mass burn incineration, can provide proper destruction of dioxins. Even then, inputs of heavy metals must be avoided. (ii) How do we gain effective regulation of C&I, C&D and Agricultural wastes such that there is defined continuous improvement of their recycling and recovery to defined timescales? (iii) This "Summary for Public Consultation" is stuffed with complex long-winded English; "Crystal Mark" it is not, regardless of the introduction on P4. WCS Issues and Options Part B Explanatory Paper P3. S3. Comments as above regarding control of C&I, C&D and Ag wastes. P10. 1.15. Add clause "be in line with other current local policy which is in force such as the WLP (2004)". P71. 5.135. The clause should be the same as the WLP policy 26, which are the words proposed, with some enhancement. It is not "one option"; it is the statutory policy requirement in place until 2012. PPS7 is a lot more woolly than WLP policy 26. P82. Appendix C. In the title, what does "policies proposed to be replaced" imply? With policy 26, we know that GCC officers would like more flexibility; the words were hard won at the WLP public enquiry, and were the choice of the Gloucestershire citizens organisations, fully backed by the Inspector, against the GCC officers. So the only acceptable change is to MORE rigorous protection of the AONB. This is a continuous improvement trend.
Respdt No:	3842		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12779	SWARD	12.1 Question 9. Although Government policy allows it, waste disposal is not appropriate in the Greenbelt. Effectively it is negating the purpose of the Greenbelt Redefining Greenbelt boundary undermines the purpose of it. No one will be able to place any reliance on a Greenbelt as offering any stablitiy.
Respdt No:	3843		
Respdt Type:	IND		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	13543	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3858		
Respdt Type:	DC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11700	TEWKESBURY OFFICE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	3133		
Respdt Type:	AGEN		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	12505	TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL	12.1 Gloucestershire should manage its own waste and not import waste from elsewhere. The County Council should press for a national policy on minimising packaging. The Council does not believe the questions relating to age, sex, ethnic origin have any relevance in relation to this consultation document. Indeed, they fly in the face of equal opportunities.
Respdt No:	1559		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11892	THAMES WATER PLC	12.1 Regarding the funding of water and sewerage infrastrucutre, it is our understanding that Section 106 Agreements cannot be used to secure water and waste water infrastructure upgrades. However, it is essential to ensure that such infrastructure is in place to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses plus water shortages with associated low pressure water supply problems. Water and sewerage undertakers also have limited powers under the water industry act to prevent connection ahead of infrastructure upgrades and therefore rely heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure is provided ahead of development either through phasing or the use of Grampian style conditions. It is essential that developers demonstrate the adequate capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.
Respdt No:	3165		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Schedule of Representations
Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy (Core Strategy Issues And Opts)

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11763	ULEY PARISH COUNCIL	12.1 No response
Respdt No:	1562		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	13047	WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT	12.1 Landfill capacity - given development delays this needs to be given a priority
Respdt No:	3847		
Respdt Type:	INTL		
Issue Ref:	12.1		

Response		Respondent	Representations
Ref No:	11956	WESSEX WATER SERVICES LTD	12.1 We would support the inclusion of a policy to address the development of waste water treatment facilities in the Waste LDDs. Planning for the provision of appropriate infrastructure to manage sewage wastes is not something that is, or should be, left to chance. Wherever possible we make provision for anticipated levels of development as identified within local and regional planning documents. This has to be integrated with our quinquennial asset management plans as approved by Ofwat. In addition wherever we are required to comply with new environmental regulations and discharge consents we also take account of anticipated future levels of growth. The emerging spatial strategies and development frameworks may make the process easier by their increased focus of development in existing towns and urban areas. However, it is often the windfall developments, particularly in small rural catchments, that cause difficulties in providing appropriate treatment. In such cases the provision of adequate treatment facilities must be resolved at the planning application stage for the new development. It must also be realised that in some instances this could affect the programme for development. Due to the continued potential for compliance with new environmental regulations and windfall developments it will not be appropriate to provide a list of specific waste water treatment sites affected by proposed levels of development. At the outset we will be unable to identify all of the necessary improvements and extensions for the duration of the development document. Whilst it may be possible to identify some sites to supplement and/or compliment the draft policy, these are only likely to cover the period of our asset management plans. Our current plan covers the period 2005 to 2010 after which it is inevitable that new environmental requirements will require additional treatment processes at some treatment facilities. The likely scenario of schemes beyond this date will not be identified until 2008/9 and will not be confirmed until 2010. In addition, the exact requirements, including the need for additional land, will only clarified when we undertake the detailed assessment of the works. We have a number of treatment facilities requiring improvements/extensions by 2010, and wherever possible we can indicate the need for additional land. A list of the facilities can be provided if required. However, I would appreciate some guidance to the level of information required from ourselves in order for Gloucestershire County Council to undertake an appraisal as part of the Waste LDD.
Respdt No:	3167		
Respdt Type:	UTL		
Issue Ref:	12.1		
Ref No:	11667	WOODCHESTER PARISH COUNCIL	12.1 - Generally a comprehensive and carefully thought through and presented document. - Some reference to existing successful recycling schemes as examples of 'the way forward' would have been helpful (e.g. Bisley community compost scheme, Stroud Town Councils composting bin initiatives) - One would have liked to see more reference to combined heat & power schemes using waste - particularly of use to urban areas & in view of expanded population in Cheltenham BC & Gloster City.
Respdt No:	1345		
Respdt Type:	PC		
Issue Ref:	12.1		