

WIRRAL COUNCIL

CABINET – 10 DECEMBER 2008

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES

JOINT MERSEYSIDE WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – SPATIAL STRATEGY AND SITES REPORT – WIRRAL RESPONSE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Council is a partner in the preparation of a Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document with the Councils for Liverpool, Knowsley, Sefton, St Helens and Halton. A Spatial Strategy and Sites Report has been published for public consultation. Comments must be submitted by 9 January 2009.

This report considers the Council's formal response to the emerging strategy, to the ten sites in Wirral which are being suggested as suitable for new waste management facilities and to the six sites that are identified as part of a list of sites to be investigated for their potential to accommodate landfill or landraising.

This report recommends that the suggested answers to the consultation questions, shown marked by a box and numbered under Recommendations 1 to 13, are endorsed as the Council's formal response to the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report.

1 Background

- 1.1 Cabinet on 30 June 2005 agreed to the preparation of a Merseyside Waste Joint Local Development Document in partnership with the Councils for Liverpool, St Helens, Knowsley and Sefton (Minute 80 refers). Cabinet on 19 October 2006 agreed for the partnership to be extended to include Halton Council (Minute 126 refers).
- 1.2 The preparation of the joint Waste DPD is managed on behalf of the six districts by a specialist unit within the Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS), the Council's retained environmental advisors. The reason for producing a Waste DPD on a joint basis is to provide a consistent approach for dealing with waste-related planning applications across the six local authorities to achieve economies in the use of specialist staff and reduce the length and number of formal Examinations of the final document.
- 1.3 Public consultation on an Issues and Options Report for the joint Waste DPD was approved by Cabinet on 14 December 2006 (Minute 185 refers) and was undertaken during March and April 2007. The Council's response to the Issues and Options Report was considered by Cabinet on 28 March 2007 (Minute 316 refers).
- 1.4 The next stage in the preparation of the joint Waste DPD is consultation on a Spatial Strategy and Sites Report. Consultation on the Spatial Strategy and Sites

Report was approved by Cabinet on 16 October 2008 subject to the following resolution (Minute 236 refers):

(1) That Cabinet agrees to the commencement of an eight-week public consultation process on the Waste DPD Spatial Strategy and Sites Report in order to meet project deadlines and those set by the Secretary of State for the completion of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

(2) That Cabinet's agreement to the commencement of public consultation should not be taken as an endorsement of the sites or strategy set out in the consultation report and that the Council's formal comments on these will be the subject of a further report and decision during the consultation period. The Council's Investment Strategy requires that the most effective use is made of key development sites to provide for uses in accordance with the vision and aspirations of the Investment Strategy.

1.5 This report has been prepared to address the second recommendation.

1.6 A copy of the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report (the SSS Report) can be viewed at <http://merseysideeas-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. The closing date for comments is 9 January 2009.

2 Spatial Strategy and Sites Report

2.1 Previous consultation on the Waste DPD Issues and Options Report sought to obtain views on matters related to waste minimisation; self-sufficiency; the method for identifying potential sites; the distribution of waste facilities; treatment and disposal options; hazardous wastes; transport; the layout and design of facilities; and the need for criteria based policies for development control (SSS Report, paragraph 6.1, page 26). A review of these issues is provided at Appendix A (SSS Report, page 136).

2.2 The SSS Report now seeks to further develop the vision, objectives and overall strategy for the emerging Waste DPD and concentrates on the spatial pattern of future facilities; the need to respond to climate change and energy security; the assessment of potential sites for new collection and treatment facilities and for landfill; and the need to safeguard suitable sites to protect them from being lost or compromised by other uses. The SSS Report also seeks to respond to the findings of the sustainability appraisal of the emerging Waste DPD.

2.3 The emerging DPD is based on an extensive evidence base including a sustainability appraisal (SSS Report, Section 5, page 25 refers). Copies of the relevant documents can be viewed at http://merseysideeas-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/public_sss/public_sss

3 Context

3.1 The SSS Report begins by providing an overview of the main waste management issues facing the Merseyside and Halton sub-region.

3.2 The policy context for the emerging DPD is set by EC Directives, national policy set out in PPS10 and the Waste Strategy 2007, the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy prepared by the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority.

- 3.3 The national Waste Strategy sets targets for diverting waste from landfill by 2010, which increase further by 2020 (SSS Report, Table 4.1 refers). There are severe financial penalties for authorities that exceed them. National policy also expects communities to take more responsibility for their own waste and to direct it to the nearest appropriate facilities (PPS10, paragraph 3, Key Planning Objectives).
- 3.4 The requirements of the new Regional Spatial Strategy were considered by Cabinet on 6 November 2008 (Minute 257 refers). Principles established by RSS should not be re-opened in a Local Development Document (PPS10, paragraph 13).
- 3.5 The Merseyside sub-region is the third largest producer of waste in the North West behind Lancashire and Greater Manchester, generating up to 7 million tonnes of waste each year. A large proportion is exported outside the area. Despite increased levels of recycling, there is still a high dependency on landfill, which is now considered to be the waste management option of last resort. This is financially and environmentally unsustainable.
- 3.6 The SSS Report states that there is an urgent need for alternative treatment facilities. There is a lack of capacity for sorting and separation, recycling and reprocessing and of facilities for both primary and secondary treatment. There is also a shortage of landfill capacity across the North West and North Wales. The Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority has specific facility requirements. An appropriate response to these issues will require a step change in facility provision.
- 3.7 The SSS Report is the first time that individual sites have been identified for public consultation as part of the emerging Waste DPD.
- 3.8 The requirement to openly identify and evaluate a long-list of candidate sites, alongside the comments of the public and other stakeholders, at an early stage of the plan making process, is an essential component of the new development plans system introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Authorities are now required to demonstrate that every possible opportunity has been identified and robustly evaluated before concluding that no alternative reasonable options are available.

4 Proposed Vision

- 4.1 The Council, in responding to the previous Issues and Options Report, supported the stated aims of the Waste DPD (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 1, paragraph 4.5 refers). These aims have now been re-cast to provide a vision statement.
- 4.2 The proposed vision for the Waste DPD seeks to set out where the Merseyside and Halton sub-region wants to be by the end of the plan period in 2025 (SSS Report Statement 7.1, page 33 refers):

By 2025, the Waste DPD will have facilitated the development of a network of sustainable and modern waste management facilities which serve the needs of the local communities of Merseyside and Halton, enabling them to be as sustainable and self sufficient as possible in terms of waste management. The communities of Merseyside and Halton will have taken responsibility for their waste and through

effective resource management create economic prosperity by transforming waste into a resource and moving waste up the waste hierarchy. This network of facilities will be sited to minimise negative impact on health and the natural environment, with site allocations being appropriate to the scale and type of waste management facility, and where possible enabling waste management in Merseyside to support mitigation and adaption to climate change.

- 4.3 References to climate change and to the national waste hierarchy which seeks to shift the balance in the way waste is managed (SSS Report, Figure 7.1, page 30 refers) have been added in response to the findings of the sustainability appraisal (SSS Report, Statement 7.2, page 32).

Recommendation 1

Question 7.1 – Do you agree with the proposed vision we have outlined? If not, how can it be amended?

Answer – The vision is acceptable but the reference to site allocations being appropriate should be extended to ensure that they are also appropriate in terms of the character of the surrounding area. The text should be amended to read “...appropriate to the scale and type of waste management facility and to the character and setting of the location...” The reference to Merseyside in the last line should read “Merseyside and Halton” for the avoidance of doubt.

5 Proposed Strategic Objectives

- 5.1 The proposed objectives included in the original Issues and Options Report received wide support, gaining the agreement of 89% of respondents (SSS Report, Statement 7.4, page 33). A number of minor changes have, however, been proposed.
- 5.2 The proposed objectives have been re-titled “Strategic Objectives”. Objective 1 has been amended to better reflect regional waste issues. Objective 4 has been amended to include social gain and Objective 6 to include protecting human health to reflect the findings of the sustainability appraisal. A new Objective (8) has been added to reflect the contribution of improved waste management to climate change.
- 5.3 The Strategic Objectives are now (with additions underlined):

SO1 *To plan for sufficient waste management facilities to meet Merseyside and Halton’s identified waste management needs and to accommodate the sub-regional apportionment of waste arisings as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.*

SO2 *To promote waste minimisation and optimise re-use and recycling of waste materials for both waste specific and non-waste planning applications.*

SO3 *To encourage waste management facilities which increase re-use, recycling and value/energy recovery of all waste type, including through the use of new waste management technologies where appropriate, and minimise final*

disposal, in order to meet national, regional and Merseyside and Halton's waste targets.

- SO4 *For Merseyside and Halton, as one of the North West's City Regions, to be a leader in promoting transformation of waste to resource to encourage social, economic, environmental and employment gain from sustainable waste management.*
- SO5 *To raise awareness in sustainable waste management amongst the people and business communities of Merseyside and Halton to reduce waste arisings and increase recycling rates, in particular given the low starting point for the sub-region in terms of recycling.*
- SO6 *To minimise the adverse effects of waste management development (including transportation) on human health, local amenity and the natural and urban environment of Merseyside and Halton.*
- SO7 *To promote high quality development for waste management facilities, particularly given the urban nature of the sub-region.*
- SO8 *For all new waste management facilities on Merseyside and Halton to take account of and contribute to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate the effects of climate change.*

5.4 The Council supported the initial spatial planning objectives set out in the Issues and Options Report (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 2, paragraph 4.7). The nature of the changes now proposed would not alter this support.

Recommendation 2

Question 7.2 – Do you agree with the amended Strategic Objectives to minimise waste, recycle and reuse while minimising adverse effects and greenhouse gas releases? If not, how can they be amended to reflect your concerns?

Answer – The revised Strategic Objectives are supported.

6 Proposed Strategic Approach

- 6.1 The Waste DPD team have concluded that the need to increase the amount of waste diverted from landfill, mitigate climate change, provide for energy security and address the severe lack of operational landfill capacity means that the only realistic strategic option for the long term for Merseyside and Halton is a resource recovery-led strategy (SSS Report, Section 8, page 36).
- 6.2 A resource recovery-led strategy will have the following objectives (SSS Report, Statement 8.1, page 37):
- *To seek to minimise waste arisings in the first place*
 - *To maximise recycling, resource recovery and re-processing*

- *To ensure that secondary waste is minimised and processed in a way to provide feedstock for heat and power generation thereby:*
- *Minimising export of residual wastes for landfill disposal*
- *Minimising the need for new landfill/landraise and reserving capacity for the greatest disposal needs*
- *Balancing any export of landfill tonnages with import of equivalent material for secondary treatment to ensure that Merseyside and Halton are net self-sufficient in waste management capacity.*

6.3 This would support the strategy being promoted by the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority (SSS Report, paragraph 8.8, page 37).

6.4 The Council, at Issues and Options stage, supported the objectives of waste minimisation across all sectors (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 3, Issue 1, paragraph 4.14) and sub-regional self sufficiency, other than for wastes requiring more specialised facilities such as hazardous or low-level radioactive wastes (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 4, Issue 2, paragraphs 4.20 and 4.21). The endorsement of a resource recovery-led approach would be consistent within these earlier resolutions.

Recommendation 3

Question 8.1 – Do you agree with the proposed strategy to meet Merseyside and Halton’s waste management needs? If not, please indicate what else Merseyside and Halton can do to address its waste management needs.

Answer – The promotion of a resource recovery-led strategy is supported.

7 Proposed Spatial Strategy

7.1 A spatial strategy is needed to address the priorities identified by the strategic objectives and by a resource recovery-led approach. The key criteria so far identified include (SSS Report, paragraph 9.14, page 41):

- **sources of main waste arisings** – to reflect the distribution of residential areas, industrial parks and town centres
- **current waste movements** – to strive to be sub-regionally self-sufficient to ensure that communities take more responsibility for their own waste
- **minimising transport impacts** – to reduce the number of lorry journeys by road and promote alternative transport options
- **the location of existing facilities** – to reflect the pattern of strategic centralised facilities which are already mainly located within existing industrial areas or within the port estates

- **climate change and energy security** – to reduce the environmental impact of landfill and identify alternative fuel sources
- **the site selection methodology** – to identify the most suitable locations close to the main sources of arisings

7.2 The resolution of Cabinet on 16 October 2008 (Minute 236 refers) refers to the need to secure the most effective use of key development sites in accordance with the vision and aspirations of the Council’s Investment Strategy.

7.3 National policy states that waste management should be considered alongside other spatial planning concerns (PPS10, paragraph 4). The Companion Guide to PPS10 states that waste should not be considered in isolation from other planning concerns, even when addressed through a thematic Local Development Document, like a Waste DPD (Companion Guide, paragraph 7.3). These wider concerns are not currently reflected in the list of key criteria.

Recommendation 4

Question 9.1 – Do you agree with the key criteria used for defining the spatial strategy? If not, what alternative or additional criteria should we consider?

Answer – An additional criterion should be included to refer to the need to reflect and support identified regeneration priorities and to ensure that any new facilities are designed and located to contribute positively to urban regeneration and renaissance in line with the wider requirement of PPS10 to consider waste management alongside other spatial planning concerns (PPS10, paragraph 4 refers) including the impact on the well-being of the local community (PPS10, paragraph 21(i)). An additional criterion should also be included to refer to the need to minimise the impact on residential areas, including from transport.

8 Spatial Strategy Options

8.1 Three Options are presented:

Option 1 – Sub-Regional Site Approach

8.2 This Option would take account of sub-regional needs by identifying an appropriate number of major sites suitable for sub-regionally significant facilities, based around existing clusters of activity. Sites would also be identified for smaller scale local needs. The clusters would be defined as Areas of Opportunity. Sub-regionally significant sites may also be identified outside Areas of Opportunity where they can be shown to be sustainable and in single ownership.

8.3 The “Pros and Cons” of Option 1 are set out in Table 9.3 (SSS Report, page 48). Option 1 offers the greatest flexibility and best reflects the earlier responses to the Issues and Options Report by allowing sites to be identified at the appropriate spatial level. It provides an objective approach but could lead to cumulative impacts. The illustrative map shows a series of sites clustered around Areas of Opportunity in the east of the Borough, in and around Tranmere and the Wirral docklands at Birkenhead (SSS Report, Figure 9.2, page 49).

- 8.4 The sustainability appraisal concludes that Option 1 is the most sustainable option because it is both robust and flexible (Statement 9.2, page 48). The Waste DPD Team believes that this is the most suitable option in terms of delivering the vision, strategic objectives and a resource recovery-led strategy (SSS Report, paragraph 9.49, page 57).

Option 2 – Waste Arisings Approach

- 8.5 This Option would be based on apportioning the volume of waste arising from each district and then identifying enough sites to treat it within each district's boundaries. This Option is likely to lead to a more dispersed pattern of provision across Merseyside and Halton, with a larger number of smaller facilities of all types being provided within each district.
- 8.6 The "Pros and Cons" of Option 2 are set out in Table 9.4 (SSS Report, page 51). While Option 2 is equitable and would meet the national objective of communities taking responsibility for their own waste, it is less likely to make the most efficient use of the best sites in the sub-region. More sites would be needed in each district, which may not comply with the site selection criteria. It may also be more difficult to finance and operate. The illustrative map shows that similar types of facility would need to be provided within each district (SSS Report, Figure 9.3, page 53).
- 8.7 The sustainability appraisal concludes that Option 2 would not be sustainable. The provision of facilities in each district in isolation is likely to lead to more movements of waste and conflict with climate change objectives. The fragmentation of capacity could reduce the ability to exploit economies of scale and could deter industry investment in the necessary facilities (Statement 9.3, page 52).

Option 3 – Resource Recovery Park Approach

- 8.8 Option 3 focuses on the co-location of facilities on larger sites or groups of smaller nearby sites. Small local sites would not be allocated but could be determined by a criteria based policy or included with other co-located facilities.
- 8.9 The "Pros and Cons" of Option 3 are set out in Table 9.5 (SSS Report, page 55). Clustering could maximise reprocessing synergies. This could limit the wider impact of waste across the sub-region but could also lead to over-concentration and place more pressure on local infrastructure. It would be less flexible for industry, could be more difficult to deliver and could increase the risk of speculative applications on non-identified sites. There may not be enough acceptable large sites to fully accommodate this Option. The illustrative map shows a fewer number of larger sites in the east of the Borough, in and around Tranmere and the Wirral docklands in Birkenhead (SSS Report, Figure 9.4, page 56).
- 8.10 The sustainability appraisal concludes that Option 3 could be too focussed on the delivery of large scale facilities which is more likely to lead to cumulative effects. It does not reflect the need to provide smaller sites and may, therefore, be less effective in facilitating a range of sites of different sizes (Statement 9.4, page 55).
- 8.11 The Council, at Issues and Options stage, supported a combination of diffuse, centralised and clustered facilities, as deemed appropriate (Cabinet, 28 March

2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 6, Issue 4, Question 14 refers). Support for Option 1 would be most consistent with this resolution. Option 2 would only provide for centralised facilities in a Borough wide context.

Recommendation 5

Question 9.2 – Do you agree with the preferred spatial strategy? If not, please tell us if you consider one of the alternative options described is preferable. If there is some other spatial approach (not described in the SSS Report) that you think would address Merseyside and Halton’s waste management requirements better, please tell us what it is.

Answer – The three options presented for the spatial strategy provide a comprehensive summary of the reasonable alternatives available to the Authorities for the future pattern of waste management facilities.

Option 1 – The Sub-Regional Sites Approach is supported as this option appears to provide the most flexible approach, is likely to be most viable in terms of the provision of new facilities and will ensure that the most suitable sites within the sub-region are used to best advantage.

The impact of the limited connections between Wirral and the rest of the sub-region, at the road tunnels across the Mersey and the potential impacts on the surrounding transport networks may, however, also need to be considered in terms of the most optimal future patterns of movement of waste into and out of Wirral, which may indicate that elements of Option 2 may also have some relevance for Wirral.

9 Climate Change and Energy Security

9.1 Climate change is a key driver behind many recent Government initiatives. Moving waste away from landfill will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The treatment of waste can also provide renewable energy, contributing to energy security as the cost of oil and gas continues to rise.

9.2 The majority of respondents to the Issues and Options Report indicated that other industries were likely to be interested in some form of energy from waste (SSS Report, Statement 10.1, page 59). The production of a refuse derived fuel could form part of the Merseyside Waste Partnership PFI (SSS Report, paragraph 10.8, page 60).

9.3 Two Options are suggested:

Option 1 would **encourage energy from waste as part of all new major developments** including housing development – this option would ensure that waste played a key role in the overall sustainability of all new developments (SSS Report, paragraph 10.14, page 61).

Option 2 would **only encourage energy from waste as part of non-residential developments** – this option would still implement key principles but would not maximise the contribution to energy security (SSS Report, paragraph 10.15, page 61).

- 9.4 The sustainability appraisal was quite critical of the approach presented by these Options but the Waste DPD Team have retained them to allow more general responses to be received before further work is completed.
- 9.5 The sustainability appraisal, for example, found that the Options did not take into account the scale, type and location of development and did not present a full range of options on how waste can be managed to mitigate against or adapt to climate change. The appraisal also suggested that a robust assessment of sub-regional potential for zero or low-carbon energy sources was needed and that energy security may best be delivered through individual authority Local Development Frameworks (SSS Report, Statement 10.2, page 62).
- 9.6 The Waste DPD would be technology neutral (SSS Report, paragraph 10.10, page 60) to respond to the national requirement to avoid stifling innovation (PPS10, paragraph 18).
- 9.7 The next generation of new major development schemes, such as Wirral Waters, are increasingly likely to consider these types of facility as part of their wider proposals. Consultants have already been appointed by the promoters of Wirral Waters to ensure the area wide sustainability of the project, including the consideration of energy, waste and water. Detailed proposals are not yet available. The acceptability of individual schemes will, however, be highly dependent on local conditions and will need to be subject to the preservation of residential amenity.

Recommendation 6

Question 10.1 – Do you agree with encouraging energy from waste in all major new developments? Is there an alternative option that we have not considered? If so please tell us about it with a justification.

Answer – While the principle of sustainable waste management should be considered as part of every major new development proposal, the Council would not wish to see a blanket requirement imposed which may not be suitable in every case. The practicality of delivery will highly depend on detailed site conditions and on the design and layout of new development proposed. Environmental impacts and the impact on local residential amenity would need to take precedence. The definition of major would be crucial. Acceptance would need to be subject to an agreed set of local site-based criteria which may be best promoted as part of Local Development Frameworks.

Question 10.2 – Do you agree with encouraging energy from waste in non-residential developments only? Is there an alternative option that we have not considered? If so please tell us about it with a justification.

Answer – There may be more scope to provide acceptable schemes as part of the wider setting of industrial or commercial based schemes. The Council would not wish to see a blanket requirement imposed which may not be suitable in every case. The practicality of delivery will highly depend on detailed site conditions and on the design and layout of new development proposed. The scale and setting of the proposal would be crucial considerations. Environmental impacts and the impact on local residential amenity would need to take precedence. Acceptance would need to be subject to an agreed set of local

site-based criteria which may be best promoted as part of Local Development Frameworks.

10 Site Selection Methodology

- 10.1 The site selection methodology was the subject of earlier consultation as part of the Issues and Options Report. The background to the methodology, which ensures that a broad range of site characteristics is taken into account, is presented in section 11 (page 63) and in Appendix B (page 143) of the SSS Report.
- 10.2 The Council supported the need for a robust evidence-based method for identifying sites for waste management facilities at the previous Issues and Options stage (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Additional Recommendation 4a, Question 7 refers).
- 10.3 The Council commented on minimum buffer distances from a wide range of sensitive receptors, such residential areas, schools, hospitals, food processing plants and nature conservation sites &c. (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 5, Issue 3, Question 11 refers) and indicated that the most critical environmental constraints included air quality, flood plains and the vulnerability of groundwater and controlled waters such as rivers streams and lakes; followed by Green Belts, nature conservation interests, the adequacy of the highway network and the sterilisation of mineral deposits (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 5, Issue 3, Question 12).
- 10.4 Rather than establish a rigid minimum buffer distance for each of the 40 separate criteria, the methodology now provides for a range of scores for a range of distances from each receptor. Thirteen of the criteria, such as proximity to railways, canals, docks and strategic highway, provide positive scores. The remaining twenty-seven, such as proximity to residential areas, schools and hospitals, provide negative scores (SSS Report, Table 11.1, page 65).
- 10.5 Appendix B explains why it would not be feasible to apply an absolute rule for the separation of waste uses from residential areas (SSS Report, Figure B.1 and paragraph B.5 and following, page 144).

Recommendation 7

Question 11.1 – Do you agree with the approach we have taken to site selection? If not, tell us how you would change the methodology and why your proposed changes would give better results.

Answer – The site selection methodology does not reflect wider policy priorities such as existing and emerging strategies for regeneration and renaissance, including housing market renewal. The Waste DPD also needs to make clear that some types of facility are more suitable than others, even on top-scoring sites, given the proximity of other more sensitive land uses.

11 Potential Areas of Opportunity

- 11.1 The majority of respondents to the earlier Issues and Options Report believed that a combined approach to the identification of potential sites should be considered, with specific sites being selected alongside generic areas of opportunity (SSR Report, Statement 9.1, page 41). The Council also supported a flexible approach to the identification of sites and areas of opportunity, dependent on the characteristics of the facilities and the findings of a full sustainability appraisal (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Additional Recommendation 4b, Question 8 refers).
- 11.2 The assessment of individual sites, using the site selection criteria considered in section 10 above, has identified a number of distinct clusters of highly scoring potential sites, which have now been identified as Areas of Opportunity. These mixed industrial areas are close to strategic transport networks, contain a number of existing waste management facilities and would provide jobs close to areas of greatest need. They are identified in the SSS Report as Areas of Opportunity on the basis that other sites that may become available within them are also likely to obtain a similarly high score (SSS Report, paragraph 12.2, page 68).
- 11.3 Two potential Areas of Opportunity have been identified in Wirral: in Tranmere, between the coast and the A41, in the area associated with the former Cammell Lairds shipyard; and in the Birkenhead and Wallasey Docks hinterland, between Seacombe and the former Bidston Dock, including Bidston Moss (SSS Report, Figure 12.2, page 76). The former falls within an area which is still being considered as a potential deep water berth. The latter area falls within the area now associated with Wirral Waters and the proposed Mersey Heartlands Growth Point.
- 11.4 The operational dock estates throughout Merseyside and Halton are also considered to be further areas of opportunity (SSS Report, paragraph 12.6, page 68).

Recommendation 8

Question 12.1 – Do you agree with the Areas of Opportunity which we have defined? If there are other areas that should be considered, where are they and what are their characteristics which make them suitable for waste developments?

Answer – The formal inclusion of Areas of Opportunity in the Waste DPD should be considered alongside other matters of strategic planning importance such as the need for economic regeneration and housing growth at the heart of the urban area, where there is also a limited supply of viable alternatives.

The Areas of Opportunity appear to have been assessed on the basis of current conditions and do not take account of emerging commitments. Both of the Areas of Opportunity in Wirral coincide with conflicting proposals at an advanced stage of preparation.

The Area of Opportunity between Seacombe and Bidston Dock is subject to the Wirral Waters proposals. The delivery of Wirral Waters is a key objective of the Council's Investment Strategy. While sustainable waste management will be considered as part of the wider sustainability of the Wirral Waters/Mersey Heartlands Growth Point proposals, it would not be appropriate to identify, allocate and safeguard sites within this area for waste

management uses that were not a fully integrated part of the proposals for a large scale, mixed use development, with the aim of promoting urban renaissance, economic revitalisation and housing growth at the heart of the urban area.

The Area of Opportunity at Tranmere is subject to wider proposals for the future use of the former Cammell Lairds shipyard, which has been identified as a potential deep water berth and inter-modal freight terminal and may also be needed to accommodate the re-location of uses to facilitate Wirral Waters.

The Area of Opportunity at Tranmere is also subject to major transport concerns, related to the capacity of the highway network, both within the immediate area and along surrounding routes, the impact on local air quality and the impact on other regeneration proposals within the surrounding area.

The identification of Areas of Opportunity in these locations would not be consistent with the Council's wider aspirations for the future use and development of these prominent waterfront areas at the heart of the urban area.

12 Top-Scoring Sites

- 12.1 The needs assessment underpinning the emerging Waste DPD suggests that sites to accommodate up to 27 new facilities may be required across the sub-region to 2025, assuming that a recovery-led strategy is adopted (SSS Report, Table 9.1). The baseline position, for meeting diversion targets but continuing to rely on landfill for residual disposal, would suggest that 29 new facilities would be required (SSS Report, Table 9.1, page 38).
- 12.2 Both these assessments are based on estimates of future waste arisings, the capacity of existing facilities and estimates of the typical sizes of the different types of facility required for each waste stream. While the number of sites needed could be reduced if individual facilities could be co-located, a larger site would be required to accommodate them (SSS Report, paragraph 9.3, page 39). The construction of alternative facilities in the period before the Waste DPD was submitted for public examination could also reduce the number of sites that the DPD would need to identify.
- 12.3 A list of 45 potential sites across Merseyside and Halton has been identified for public consultation. These represent the sites which score best against the site selection criteria considered in section 10 above. A greater number of sites have been identified at this stage to allow flexibility and choice and to provide an element of contingency for sites that may yet still prove to be unsuitable or undeliverable.
- 12.4 The 45 sites have been identified from an original long-list of over 800 individually scored sites (SSS Report, paragraph 11.11, page 64). The full list of the sites considered and their relative scores can be viewed at http://merseysideeas-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/public_sss/public_sss (SSS Report, paragraph 12.13, page 72). A site specific sustainability appraisal has been undertaken for each of the short-listed sites identified.
- 12.5 The sites have been classified under two categories, based on their size:

(i) Sites Identified as Suitable for Sub-Regional Scale Facilities

- 12.6 Large sites above 4.5 hectares have been identified for single, larger capacity facilities which could handle a significant proportion of the waste streams generated from Merseyside and Halton (excluding landfill and/or land-raising, which is dealt with in section 14 below). The relative shortage of high-scoring large sites means that only three of the ten identified are within the top 10% of site scores. Two of the three large sites identified in Wirral fall within the top 10% of site scores (SSS Report, Table 12.3, page 170).
- 12.7 The reference case for the procurement process for the management and treatment of municipal waste, being considered by the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority, includes two sites of at least 8 hectares in size to enable the co-location of a mechanical biological treatment plant with an energy recovery facility (SSS Report, paragraph 12.16, page 73).
- 12.8 Comments on the background evaluation of each of the large sites identified within Wirral are set out below. The suggested formal response on each of the large sites is set out in Table 1, under Recommendation 9 below:
- Former Graving Docks, Beaufort Road (W0808) – Bidston and St James Ward – 11.0 ha*
- 12.9 This site is part of a collection of four sites (three are small sites) identified in North Birkenhead, two of which are existing waste management facilities.
- 12.10 The site comprises vacant dockside facilities, including former graving docks backfilled with waste by the former Docks and Harbour Company. The site lies between the ship repair yard operated by North Western Ship Repairers and the port transit facilities at Cavendish Wharf. Parts of the site have been subject to previous consents for waste transfer and the mechanical processing of scrap metal.
- 12.11 The site was previously shown as part of the Dock Estate subject to UDP Policy EM10, which permitted business, industrial and storage uses. Policy EM10 is no longer in force, following a Direction by the Secretary of State in September 2007. The site is now identified as part of Wirral Waters.
- 12.12 The masterplanning for Wirral Waters shows the Corporation Road/Beaufort Road corridor as a City Boulevard, a greatly enhanced high quality transport corridor with intensive landscaping, to improve local environmental conditions, introduce green infrastructure and provide improved east-west accessibility with further links through to north and west Wirral as part of the wider regeneration of the area. A major waste project on this site would, therefore, harm aspirations for the wider regeneration and environmental improvement of this area.
- 12.13 The site is also being assessed as part of proposals to reinstate the docks rail freight link as part of continued operation of the port and for the relocation of existing port uses from East Float to West Float to facilitate the development of Wirral Waters.

12.14 Major waste facilities are already provided within the vicinity of the site at Wallasey Bridge Road. The site is owned by Peel Holdings.

12.15 This site does not appear to have been subject to a site-specific sustainability appraisal.

Former Southern Car Park, Cammell Lairds (W0360) – Rock Ferry Ward – 4.7 ha

12.16 This is the highest scoring site appearing in the published short-list of large sites within the sub-region.

12.17 This is one of two large sites (and two small sites) associated with the former Cammell Laird shipyard. The site is a prominent riverside site at the heart of the urban area, which comprises part of the wider area allocated as an Employment Development Site at Cammell Lairds, identified in the UDP as one of two centrally located special development opportunity sites in Birkenhead. Together with site W0343 below, it is one of a limited number of sites with potential to meet the regional need for deep water berths as identified by the North West Development Agency in its October 2005 Ports Study. The site may also be required to accommodate uses relocated from Wirral Waters. The site is owned by Peel Holdings.

12.18 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored three positives, one uncertain positive, four negatives and two uncertain negatives.

Old Workshops, Cammell Lairds (W0343) – Rock Ferry Ward – 9.1 ha

12.19 This is the only short-listed larger site falling outside the top 10% of site scores.

12.20 This is one of two large sites (and two small sites) associated with the former Cammell Laird shipyard. The site is a prominent riverside site at the heart of the urban area, which comprises part of the wider area allocated as an Employment Development Site at Cammell Lairds, identified in the UDP as one of two centrally located special development opportunity sites in Birkenhead. Together with site W0360 above, it is one of a limited number of sites with potential to meet the regional need for deep water berths. The site may also be required to accommodate uses relocated from Wirral Waters. The site is owned by Peel Holdings.

12.21 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored one double positive, four positives, two uncertain positives and four uncertain negatives.

(ii) Sites Identified as Suitable for District Scale Facilities

12.22 A series of smaller sites have also been identified that would be suitable for a wide range of more local scale facilities (again, excluding landfill and/or landraising, which is dealt with in section 14 below). All of the smaller sites identified in Wirral, with the exception of the site at Old Gorse Lane, Seacombe (Site W0240), fall within the top 10% of site scores (SSS Report, Table 12.4, page 70).

12.23 Comments on the background evaluation of each of the smaller sites identified within Wirral are set out below. The suggested formal response on each of the smaller sites is set out in Table 2, under Recommendation 9 below:

Mersey Waste Holdings, Wallasey Bridge Road (W2215) – Bidston & St James Ward

12.24 This site is part of a collection of three small sites (and one large site) identified in North Birkenhead, two of which are existing waste management facilities.

12.25 The site contains an existing, recently constructed waste management facility operated by the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority. The site currently contains an integrated waste management centre, including a household waste reception centre, a materials recycling facility and an in-vessel composting facility. The site also has permission for a compost maturation building which has not yet been constructed. The site currently accepts waste from four Merseyside districts and may offer additional capacity if similar replacement facilities are provided elsewhere within the sub-region (SSS Report, paragraph 4.50, page 21).

12.26 The site is shown as part of a Waste Disposal Site for illustrative purposes on the UDP and as part of an Area Requiring Landscape Renewal. The site would be adjacent to the Wirral Waters proposals at the former Bidston Dock and is acceptable as an existing, modern waste management facility.

12.27 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored five positives, one uncertain positive and two negatives.

George Major, Wallasey Bridge Road (W0180) – Bidston & St James Ward

12.28 This site is part of a collection of three small sites (and one large site) identified in North Birkenhead, two of which are existing waste management facilities.

12.29 The site is an existing waste management facility, operated by a private contractor since the late 1990s. The site has consent for the recycling of non-hazardous waste, the external storage of reclaimed building/excavation material and a building for enclosed screening and sorting. Planning permission was granted for industrial units on a small part of the site in December 2006. The site was identified as an Employment Development Site falling within an Area Requiring Landscape Renewal in the UDP and now forms part of the wider hinterland to Wirral Waters. The site is acceptable as an existing waste management facility.

12.30 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored one double positive, four positives, two uncertain positives, one negative and two uncertain negatives.

Cleared site, Tees Street, Beaufort Road (W0191) – Bidston and St James Ward

12.31 This site is part of a collection of three small sites (and one large site) identified in North Birkenhead, two of which are existing waste management facilities.

- 12.32 The site forms the western part of the site of the former River Streets housing estate which was cleared during the late 1990s, to the south of the former Mobil Oil works and the dockland facilities to the north of Beaufort Road. The land to the immediate east is being considered for a new Police Command Centre.
- 12.33 The site is shown as part of a Primarily Residential Area in the UDP but was put forward for consideration as an Employment Development Site in the Employment Land and Premises Study, which is still to report. The site was shown for industrial uses on the initial master plan prepared for the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.
- 12.34 The masterplanning for Wirral Waters shows the Corporation Road/Beaufort Road corridor as a City Boulevard, a greatly enhanced high quality transport corridor with intensive landscaping, to improve local environmental conditions, introduce green infrastructure and provide improved east-west accessibility with further links through to north and west Wirral as part of the wider regeneration of the area. A major waste project on this site would, therefore, harm aspirations for the wider regeneration and environmental improvement of this area.
- 12.35 Major waste facilities are already provided within the vicinity of the site at Wallasey Bridge Road. The majority of the site, together with land to the east towards Lincoln Street, is Council owned.
- 12.36 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored six positives, one uncertain positive and two uncertain negatives.

Old Joiners Shop, Cammell Lairds (W0339) – Rock Ferry Ward

- 12.37 This is one of two small sites (and two large sites) associated with the former Cammell Laird shipyard. The site comprises part of the wider area allocated as an Employment Development Site at Cammell Lairds, identified in the UDP as one of two centrally located special development opportunity sites in Birkenhead. The site comprises a large brick built building on Campbeltown Road to the west of the construction hall and basin.
- 12.38 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored one double positive, four positives, two uncertain positives, one negative and two uncertain negatives.

Global Environmental Recycling, Campbeltown Road (W0322) – Rock Ferry Ward

- 12.39 This is one of two small sites (and two large sites) previously associated with the former Cammell Laird shipyard. The site comprises an existing unit in the Maritime Business Park off Campbeltown Road, which is already used for the treatment and recycling of electrical equipment. The site is shown as part of the Primarily Industrial Area adjoining the A41 frontage to the wider Cammell Lairds complex. The site is privately owned and operated.
- 12.40 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored one double positive, four positives, one uncertain positive, one negative and two uncertain negatives.

Former Tip, Oakdale Road (W0270) – Seacombe Ward

- 12.41 This site lies within the Primarily Industrial Area to the north of the Wallasey docks and is part of the wider hinterland to Wirral Waters.
- 12.42 The north of the site, adjacent to the Kingsway Tunnel Approach Road, includes the site of the former British Leather tannery landfill. This part of the site was acquired by the Council in the early 1990s for treatment with landscaping as open space. The site has been capped with a membrane which cannot be pierced or built upon. This part of the site is overlooked by residential development along the opposite site of Oakdale Road.
- 12.43 The south of the site, to the rear of the New Way Business Centre, outside the boundary of the former landfill site, is allocated as an Employment Development Site. This area of the site is privately owned and is currently being considered for a grant aided industrial development by a local developer. Permission for a motorcycle showroom was granted in December 2005 but not implemented. The development of industrial units would be appropriate in the context of recent nearby development.
- 12.44 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored two uncertain double positives, two positives, three uncertain positives, one uncertain double negative and two uncertain negatives.

Land North West of Old Gorse Lane (W0240) – Seacombe Ward

- 12.45 This is the only short-listed smaller site in Wirral to fall outside the top 10% of site scores. The site is part of the Primarily Industrial Area to the north of the Wallasey docklands on the UDP and is part of the wider hinterland to Wirral Waters. The land to the south accommodates a number of existing waste management facilities.
- 12.46 The site itself is a long-vacant, backland area of cleared hardstanding left over from the demolition of the previous town gas works. The site lies adjacent to the Wallasey gas holders and contains the vent for the mid-Wirral high pressure gas main, both of which are major hazards. It is unlikely that the site would even be appropriate for waste management uses. The land is privately owned.
- 12.47 Out of the thirty-one sustainability objectives identified in the site-specific sustainability appraisal this site scored two uncertain double positives, two positives, three uncertain positives and three uncertain negatives.

Comments of the Directors of Regeneration and Technical Services

- 12.48 The Director of Regeneration is unable to comment on the suitability or otherwise of the large or small sites proposed without knowing the exact nature of the operations proposed. The site at Oakdale Road (W0270) has the greatest potential to cause harm, given the proximity of existing residential properties.
- 12.49 The Director of Technical Services notes that all the potential large and small sites are located in proximity to the strategic highway network.

12.50 Proposals located on the collection of sites in and around Cammell Lairds would cause concern and would require very careful consideration for the following reasons:

- (1) a significant increase in emissions from heavy vehicle activity in the vicinity of the A41 could have a serious impact on air quality, which could require additional constraints on vehicle movements to be imposed;
- (2) a significant increase in large vehicles using the A41 from the south, through Bromborough and Eastham, would be detrimental to flows currently operating at about capacity along this corridor;
- (3) access to the west from the M53 may need to be limited. Woodchurch Road is identified as a congestion corridor in the Local Transport Plan, where traffic flows need to be managed to reduce journey times along the section east of the M53 as part of the Council's Local Area Agreement;
- (4) access from the north, from the M53 through Woodside, could have implications for other major regeneration projects, along dockland routes and the Kingsway Tunnel.

12.51 The site at Tees Street (W0191) may be needed to accommodate a potential park and ride development, as part of the transport strategy to support Wirral Waters.

12.52 The large dockland site at Beaufort Road (W0808) may be needed to provide the terminus for a re-opened rail freight line from Bidston, as part of the relocated dockland facilities associated with the Wirral Waters proposals.

Recommendation 9

Question 12.2 – Do you agree with the shortlist of top-scoring sites shown in Tables 12.3 and 12.4? Are there in your opinion any overriding reasons why any of the sites listed in Tables 12.3 and 12.4 are unsuitable for waste management uses? Are there other sites you would prefer to see used for development of waste management facilities – where are they and why would they be more suitable than the sites listed in Tables 12.3 and 12.4?

Answer – Comments on the suitability of each individual site are set out in Table 1 (large sites) and Table 2 (small sites) below.

There are no other sites that the Council would currently wish to see used for the development of waste management facilities, beyond those where planning permission has already been granted.

The accompanying site-specific sustainability appraisal does not appear to have taken into account the potential implications on air quality for developments proposed at the four sites in and around the A41 at Tranmere (Sites W0322, W0339, W0343 and W360), which are close to trigger levels for the designation of an Air Quality Management Area.

The evaluation of proximity to a railway line does not appear to take into account whether the rail line concerned is capable of carrying freight or is only used to provide passenger services.

Site W0808 – Graving Dock, Wirral, does not appear to have been subject to a site-specific sustainability appraisal.

The sustainability appraisal for Site W0240 – Old Gorse Lane, Wallasey appears to be based on the incorrect assumption that the site is between 250 to 500 metres away from residential property, when there is a substantial area of housing within 250 metres of the boundary to the site.

The sustainability appraisal for Site W0322 – Unit D, Maritime Business Park, appears to be based on the incorrect assumption that there is no residential property within 250 metres of the site, when there is a substantial area of housing within 250 metres of the boundary to the site.

Table 1 – Large Sites (above 4.5 hectares)

Site Reference	Suitability	Reasons
W0808 - Graving Docks	Not suitable	<p>The development of this site for high intensity waste management would be contrary to the Council's wider aspirations for the regeneration and renaissance of the area.</p> <p>This site is owned by a port operator and is being reserved to assist the relocation of port activities to facilitate the delivery of Wirral Waters and the Mersey Heartlands Growth Point.</p> <p>The site is also being assessed as part of proposals to reinstate the docks rail freight link as part of Wirral Waters.</p> <p>The masterplanning for Wirral Waters shows the Corporation Road/Beaufort Road corridor as a new City Boulevard, a greatly enhanced high quality transport corridor with intensive landscaping, to improve local environmental conditions, introduce green infrastructure and provide improved east-west accessibility.</p> <p>Major waste facilities are already provided within the vicinity.</p>

Site Reference	Suitability	Reasons
W0360 - Cammell Lairds (Southern Car Park)	Not suitable	<p>The site is part of a special development opportunity at the heart of Birkenhead, which is identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as a priority for renewal and economic revitalisation.</p> <p>The site has recently been purchased by a port operator. There is a regional need for additional deep water port facilities. The area has been identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as an area of search for an inter-modal freight facility.</p> <p>The site includes made ground towards the coast and lies adjacent to the Tranmere Oil Terminal (a major hazard).</p> <p>The development of this site for high intensity waste management could have significant transport impacts in terms of air quality, congestion and highway capacity in the immediate vicinity and on routes to and from the M53 to from the north, south and west.</p> <p>The proposal could harm prospects for economic regeneration and urban renaissance within the surrounding areas and would be contrary to the Council's wider aspirations for the area.</p>
W0343 - Cammell Lairds (Old Workshops)	Not suitable	<p>The site is part of a special development opportunity at the heart of Birkenhead, which is identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as a priority for renewal and economic revitalisation.</p> <p>The site has recently been purchased by a port operator. There is a regional need for additional deep water port facilities. The area has been identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as an area of search for an inter-modal freight facility.</p> <p>The development of this site for high intensity waste management could have significant transport impacts in terms of air quality, congestion and highway capacity in the immediate vicinity and on routes to and from the M53 to from the north, south and west.</p> <p>The Council would oppose the use of this site for secondary treatment.</p> <p>The proposal could harm prospects for economic regeneration and urban renaissance within the surrounding areas and would be contrary to the Council's wider aspirations for the area.</p>

Table 2 – Small Sites (below 4.5 hectares)

Site Reference	Suitability	Reasons
W2215 – Mersey Waste Holdings, Wallasey Bridge Road	Suitable	The site is suitable as an existing waste management facility for materials recycling, household waste reception and in-vessel composting.
W0180 – George Major, Wallasey Bridge Road	Suitable	The site is suitable as an existing waste management facility for the recycling of non-hazardous materials including covered sorting and the storage of reclaimed building materials.
W0191 – Former Tees Street	Not Suitable	<p>The site is Council owned. The development of this site for waste management would be contrary to the Council's wider aspirations for the regeneration and renaissance of the area.</p> <p>The masterplanning for Wirral Waters shows the Corporation Road/Beaufort Road corridor as a new City Boulevard, a greatly enhanced high quality transport corridor with intensive landscaping, to improve local environmental conditions, introduce green infrastructure and provide improved east-west accessibility.</p> <p>Major waste facilities are already provided within the vicinity.</p>
W0339 - Cammell Lairds (Joiners Shop)	Not suitable	<p>The site is part of a special development opportunity at the heart of Birkenhead, which is identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as a priority for renewal and economic revitalisation.</p> <p>Any proposal on this site would need to be considered in the context of the wider proposals for economic regeneration and urban renaissance on the adjacent sites within the surrounding area. It would not be appropriate to allocate the site for waste management uses in isolation from these wider proposals.</p>
W0322 - Cammell Lairds (Global Recycling)	Suitable	The site is suitable as an existing waste management facility for the recycling of electrical equipment.
W0270 - Oakdale Road	Not suitable.	<p>The majority of the site adjacent to the tunnel approach road was a former tannery landfill. The site was acquired by the Council for treatment and has been secured by the installation of a membrane. Any building or reuse that could damage the underlying membrane would not be permitted. The site is overlooked by residential property.</p> <p>The part of the site to rear of the New Way Business Centre is privately owned and is being promoted for the development of industrial units, which would be consistent with the character of the surrounding area..</p>
W0240 – Old Gorsey Lane	Not suitable	The site contains the vent to the mid-Wirral high pressure gas main and lies adjacent to gas holders (both major hazards) and is unlikely to be suitable for an alternative use. The site is not in the top 20% of site scores.

13 Site Maps and Profiles

- 13.1 A site profile for each of the short-listed potential sites, showing the site boundary and describing the surrounding context, is provided in section 12 of the SSS Report. Site profiles for the large sites in Wirral can be found on pages 85 to 87 and for the small sites on pages 122 to 128.
- 13.2 Part of each profile refers to the broad type of waste management uses likely to be suggested for each site, taking account of the likely impacts of different types of uses (Appendix B, table following paragraph B.23, page 150), the size and shape of the site, proximity to housing and other environmental constraints, transport links, potential synergies with other adjacent sites and other policy constraints (SSS Report, Appendix B, paragraph B.24, page 151). Each site specific recommendation is technology neutral, leaving the choice of technology to the site developer and operator (SSS Report, Statement B.6, page 151) in line with national policy (PPS10, paragraph 18).
- 13.3 The nature of the types of use being suggested for each site is summarised in Table 12.5 (SSS Report, page 74). Only one of the short-listed potential sites in Wirral, at Cammell Lairds, has been identified within the SSS Report as suitable for secondary treatment, such as energy from waste or combined heat and power (W0343, page 87). The collection of four sites at Cammell Lairds (W0322, page 123; W0339, page 122; W0343, page 87; and W0360, page 85) has also been identified, alongside the sites at Wallasey Bridge Road (W0180, page 125; W0191, page 127; and W2215, page 124) and at Beaufort Road (W0808, page 86), as suitable for a resource recovery park, where the co-location of a number of different uses could maximise the potential for re-processing and treatment.
- 13.4 The Council, at Issues and Options stage, indicated that the most appropriate locations for waste treatment facilities would include business parks and light industrial areas; industrial areas containing heavy or specialised uses; contaminated land, brownfield land including derelict land, redundant sites and existing sites or buildings; and sites previously occupied by other types of waste management facilities. While household waste reception centres were also considered acceptable within urban areas in general, waste to energy developments were only considered acceptable in industrial areas containing heavy or specialised uses. The Council also indicated that any decision, on any site, for any type of facility, should be subject to a full sustainability appraisal (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 5, Issue 3, Question 10, (i)-(iii) refer).

Recommendation 10

Question 12.3(a) – Do you agree with the sites and the waste management uses which we have described in the site profiles? If you disagree with specific sites, please tell us which sites you object to. If you believe there are inaccuracies in the profiles, please tell us where you think these are.

Answer – The Council’s response to the suitability of individual sites is set out in the response to Question 12.2 (Recommendation 9 above).

The Council does not accept that site W0343 – Old Workshops, former Shipyard, Campbeltown Road, would be suitable for secondary treatment, given its location at the heart of the urban area, which is a priority for economic revitalisation and urban renaissance and where potential air quality management issues have already been identified.

14 Landfill or Landraise Sites

- 14.1 There will always be a need to landfill residual wastes that cannot be disposed of in any other way and more landfill sites will be needed to accommodate the sub-region's residual waste, even if Government targets to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill are met (SSS Report, paragraph 12.31, page 129).
- 14.2 A list of existing authorised sites is provided (SSS Report, Table 12.6, page 129). The only site on Merseyside still accepting waste will close before the Waste DPD is adopted (SSS Report, paragraph 12.32, page 129).
- 14.3 The needs assessment suggests a potential need for up to eleven new landfill sites over the plan period to 2025 to accommodate the sub-region's residual waste (SSS Report, Table 9.1, page 38) or six new sites, if a recovery-led strategy is adopted (SSS Report, Table 9.2, page 39). The final capacity required will, however, depend on the success of waste minimisation initiatives and on the amount of waste that can be dealt with by alternative recycling, reprocessing and treatment facilities.
- 14.4 The SSS Report recognises that the options for landfill of Merseyside's residual waste are severely limited (SSS Report, paragraph 12.35, page 130).
- 14.5 A list of thirty-one potential sites within the sub-region has been identified for public consultation (SSS Report, Appendix D, Table D.1, page 157) from an initial long-list of 104 existing or historic landfill and mineral sites (SSS Report, paragraph 12.43, page 131). These sites represent the top 30% best-scoring sites. All the sites identified score negatively. A full list of the sites considered and their relative scores can be viewed at http://merseysideeas-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/public_sss/public_sss
- 14.6 Unlike the previous "short-list" of sites the list of thirty-one potential landfill sites is still to go through a technical assessment process including detailed discussions with the Environment Agency, and no site profiles or site boundaries have been provided (SSS Report, paragraph 12.44, page 131). A site-specific sustainability appraisal has also not yet been carried out on any of these sites.
- 14.7 The SSS Report list identifies six sites in Wirral. The two sites at Moreton (referenced MIN027 and EAS0018) and one at Prenton (referenced MIN030) fall within the upper half of scores. The sites at Irby (referenced MIN031) and Bromborough Dock (EAS0020) score worst (Appendix D, Table D.1, page 157).
- 14.8 At Issues and Options stage, the Council indicated as a general principle across Merseyside and Halton that landfill would be acceptable at working quarries and borrow pits and at existing and former landfill sites and that countryside and Green Belt areas should only be used by exception. Former mineral sites were specifically

excluded (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Recommendation 5, Issue 3, Question 10 (iv) refers).

- 14.9 Comments on the background evaluation of each site are set out below. The suggested formal response on each of these sites is set out in Table 3, under Recommendation 11 below:

Bromborough Dock North Landfill, Dock Road South (EAS0020) - Bromborough Ward

- 14.10 Bromborough Dock was the last active landfill site in Wirral, located to the north of the former port estate at Bromborough but close to the residential areas to the east of New Ferry Bypass. The site was shown as a Waste Disposal Site for illustrative purposes in the UDP. The adjoining coastal areas are now recognised as having international value for nature conservation. The site has finished receiving waste and is undergoing an agreed programme of restoration. The site has already been subject to significant landraising.

Irby Quarry, Irby Mill (MIN031) – Greasby Frankby and Irby Ward

- 14.11 This site is a small, long-disused, former quarry for local sandstone. The site is owned by the Council and maintained as part of Royden Country Park for countryside recreation and rock climbing. The site is in the Green Belt, in an Area of Special Landscape Value. It is also designated as a Countryside Recreation Site, a Site of Biological Importance and a Site of Local Importance for Earth Science in the UDP.

North Wirral Brickworks, Carr Lane, Moreton (MIN027) – Hoylake and Meols Ward

- 14.12 This site forms part of a mineral working with permission for clay extraction. The site is in the Green Belt and is shown for illustrative purposes as a Mineral Reserve in the UDP. There is a Site of Special Scientific Interest adjacent to the north east corner of the site. The site also lies within the flat, low-lying North Wirral coastal plain and is identified as part of an Area Requiring Landscape Renewal on the UDP.

- 14.13 New conditions for the mineral site were approved in 2002. The restoration conditions do not allow the use of any imported controlled waste. An application for the extension of clay extraction, landfilling and restoration to agriculture, installation of boreholes and landfill gas extraction system and associated plant including flare stack was dismissed at appeal in 1991.

- 14.14 There is a history of enforcement action including action against the illegal tipping of waste above adjoining land levels. An enforcement notice requiring its removal remains extant. The tipped area is now vested in the Crown. Housing is in close proximity, particularly along the eastern boundary.

Moreton Landfill, Old Brickworks, Tarran Way, Moreton (EAS0018) – Moreton West & Saughall Massie Ward

- 14.15 This site forms part of a former mineral site for clay extraction which has been backfilled with inert material and is undergoing the final phases of restoration. The site has consent for a golf course. Earlier phases of restoration now form part of the

Moreton Hills Golf Centre. Permission to extend the period allowed for the crushing and screening of imported inert material on the later phases of restoration was refused in 2008.

- 14.16 The site lies in the Green Belt to the north of the railway line with access from Tarran Industrial Estate and is shown as a Waste Disposal Site for illustrative purposes on the UDP. The site also lies within the flat, low-lying North Wirral coastal plain and is identified as part of an Area Requiring Landscape Renewal. An area of washland adjoins the site to the north west. The site is in close proximity to housing along the southern boundary.

Prenton Quarry, Prenton Dell (MIN030) – Prenton Ward

- 14.17 This site is a former mineral works for clay extraction in the Green Belt, located to the south of Prenton Dell Road, between the electricity substation and Prenton Golf Course.

- 14.18 An application for the determination of new conditions for the mineral site was approved in July 2000. The site was not shown as a Mineral Reserve in the UDP. Access would involve the use of local residential roads. A vehicle weight restriction order was placed on Melford Drive in 2005. The site is in close proximity to housing along the north western boundary. The potential for designation as a Site of Biological Importance has been confirmed by the Wirral Local Wildlife Sites Partnership.

Lower Farm, Roman Road/Prenton Dell Road, Prenton (EAS0282) – Prenton Ward

- 14.19 This site is a completed former landfill in the Green Belt to the rear of Prenton Dell Road and Roman Road. Access would involve the use of local residential roads. The site is in close proximity to housing along the northern and eastern boundaries.

Comments of the Directors of Regeneration and Technical Services

- 14.20 The Director of Regeneration has expressed concern with regard to the close proximity to residential premises of the areas identified for landfill and the potential for nuisance from noise, odours, flies and lighting, on the basis of experience from previous facilities within the Borough, particularly at the existing Bromborough Dock landfill site.

- 14.21 The Director of Technical Services considers that:

(1) access to the potential sites in Moreton would put further pressure on Moreton Cross, where the highway network is already over-stretched, causing further harm to the environment of the Key Town Centre. An increase in HGVs through Hoylake and Meols would also be unwelcome, given the Council's wider proposals for the regeneration of the coastal resorts.

(2) access to the potential sites in Prenton could only be provided from roads served by the A552, which is identified as a congestion corridor in the Local Transport Plan, where traffic flows need to be managed to reduce journey times along the section east of the M53 as part of the Council's Local Area Agreement.

(3) access to the potential site at Irby Quarry is very poor and would require heavy vehicles to penetrate local residential roads.

(4) access to Bromborough Dock could only be served from the A41 corridor which is already operating at or near capacity at peak times. Increased traffic would impact negatively on residents both in the vicinity of the site and along the transport corridor.

Recommendation 11

Question 12.4(a) – Do you agree with the list of sites to be assessed for potential as landfill/landraise? Are there any sites listed in Appendix D which you feel would be unsuitable for development as a landfill? If so, please tell us why.

Answer – None of the sites identified in Wirral are considered to be an acceptable location for future landfill or land raising operations for the reasons set out in Table 3 below.

Question 12.4(b) – Are you aware of any other sites which may be suitable for development of additional landfill or landraise capacity for Merseyside and Halton? If so please tell us.

Answer – The Council is not aware of any other site within the Borough that would be suitable for the development of additional landfill or landraise capacity.

Table 3 – Landfill Sites

Site Reference	Suitability	Reasons
EAS0020 – Bromborough Dock North	Not suitable	<p>This site is an existing former landfill which has already been subject to significant landraising, has now ceased receiving waste and is actively under going an agreed programme of restoration. The height of previous landraising and the proximity of new and proposed residential property makes this site unsuitable for further landfill or landraising operations, especially given the prolonged impact on local residents during the previous operation of site.</p> <p>The site could only be served from the A41 corridor which is already operating at or near capacity at peak times. Increased traffic would impact negatively on residents both in the vicinity of the site and along the transport corridor.</p>
MIN031 - Irby Quarry	Not suitable	<p>This site is a small, long extinct former quarry for local sandstone. The site is now owned by the Council and managed as public open space for countryside recreation as part of Royden Country Park. The site lies in an inaccessible location and would require heavy vehicles to penetrate local residential and rural roads. The proximity of residential property would also make this site unsuitable for any landfill operation.</p>

Site Reference	Suitability	Reasons
MIN027 - Carr Lane Brickworks	Not suitable	<p>The site is a mineral site in the Green Belt. Restoration conditions do not permit the use of imported controlled wastes. An application for the extension of clay extraction, landfilling and restoration to agriculture, installation of boreholes and landfill gas extraction system and associated plant including flare stack was dismissed at appeal in 1991.</p> <p>Landraising would be incompatible with the surrounding landscape of a flat, low lying coastal plain. Part of the site, which has been subject to illegal tipping above surrounding land levels, is subject to an extant enforcement notice requiring its removal.</p> <p>The import of materials would involve increased levels of heavy goods vehicles along residential roads. Access through Moreton Cross would have serious implications for congestion on the surrounding strategic highway network and would cause further harm to the environment of the Key Town Centre. Access from Hoylake and Meols would conflict with the Council's wider strategy for the regeneration of the coastal resorts for tourism and coastal recreation.</p> <p>The proximity of residential property would also make this site unsuitable for landfill or landraising operations and the addition of waste management operations would have an unacceptable cumulative impact on the well being of the local community.</p>
EAS0018 - Tarran Way Brickworks	Not suitable	<p>The site comprises the final phases of the restoration of a former clay extraction site in the Green Belt. The site is undergoing final restoration and has consent for a golf course. Previous phases are already in active use as a golf facility.</p> <p>Permission for additional imported material was refused in 2008. Landraising would be incompatible with the surrounding landscape of a flat, low lying coastal plain.</p> <p>Access through Moreton Cross would have serious implications for congestion on the surrounding strategic highway network and would cause further harm to the environment of the Key Town Centre.</p> <p>The proximity of existing residential property would also make this site unsuitable for landfill or landraising operations, particularly given the cumulative effect on the community of previous activities.</p>
MIN030 - Prenton Quarry	Not suitable	<p>The site is a former mineral site in the Green Belt. Access to the site is poor and would involve the use of local residential roads. Vehicle weight restrictions are in place along Melford Drive. Access would also have serious implications for congestion on the surrounding strategic highway network. Qualification for formal designation as a Site of Biological Importance has been confirmed by the Wirral Local Wildlife Sites Partnership. The proximity of residential property also makes this site unsuitable for landfill or landraising operations.</p>

Site Reference	Suitability	Reasons
EAS0282 - Roman Road, Prenton	Not suitable	The site is a long-closed landfill in the Green Belt, which has already been subject to landraising. Vehicular access would be required through local residential roads. Access would also have serious implications for congestion on the surrounding strategic highway network. The proximity of residential property would also make this site unsuitable for landfill or landraising operations.

15 Safeguarding Approach

- 15.1 The strategic importance and controversial nature of waste management facilities means that acceptable sites, once identified, may need to be safeguarded to ensure their continued availability for waste-related uses. This could also affect the use of adjacent sites. National policy suggests that proposals which could prejudice the implementation of the waste strategy should be refused (PPS10 paragraph 33).
- 15.2 The majority of respondents to the previous Issues and Options Report agreed that sites should be safeguarded to ensure their continued availability (SSS Report, Statement 12.1, page 132).
- 15.3 Three Options have been suggested:
- Option 1 – **Safeguard all the large sites**, with the potential for accommodating sub-regional facilities, with a periodic review after five years.
- Option 2 – **Safeguard all the identified sites**, large or small, with a periodic review after five years.
- Option 3 – **Safeguard all the identified large sites alongside a selection of smaller sites**, with a periodic review after five years.
- 15.4 The sustainability appraisal indicates that the difficulty in identifying sites suitable for waste management means that safeguarding should be applied to a range of sizes of site (SSS Report, Statement 12.2, page 133) and that safeguarding without any means of review would be too inflexible (SSS Report, Statement 12.3, page 134). The appraisal has, therefore, concluded that Option 3 would provide the most flexible approach (SSS Report, Statement 12.4, page 134).
- 15.5 The need for a formal review of allocations, at least every five years, is set out in national policy (PPS10, paragraph 19).
- 15.6 The Council supported the principle of safeguarding identified sites for new waste management facilities, at the Issues and Options stage, subject to a clear programme for the delivery of the facilities required (Cabinet, 28 March 2007, Minute 316, Additional Recommendation 4c, Question 9 refers). This caveat should be retained, to balance the need to provide additional waste facilities against the Council's wider aspirations for regeneration and renaissance and to prevent key sites from being needlessly sterilised from other beneficial uses.

Recommendation 12

Question 12.5 – Do you agree with Option 3 as the most flexible option for safeguarding sites? If not do you favour either Option 1 or Option 2 or is there a safeguarding option that we have not considered? If so please tell us what it is.

Answer – It is not clear how the “safeguarding” proposed would differ from the normal effect of allocating a site for a specific use in a Development Plan.

If additional safeguarding is to occur, the principle of safeguarding both large and small sites under Option 3 alongside a formal periodic review would be supported. The safeguarding of sites should, however, be clearly linked to an identified programme for the delivery of facilities to meet the essential needs of the sub-region.

Any safeguarding approach will need to differentiate both between essential and non-essential large sites as well as essential and non-essential small sites, non-essential sites having been identified to provide an element of choice and flexibility in line with wider Areas of Opportunity.

Option 3 appears to indicate that the safeguarding of small sites will be more selective than under Option 2 but does not indicate how those small sites will be selected. The criteria for selecting sites for safeguarding should be clearly set out.

The extent of safeguarding with respect to the future use of adjacent sites should be more clearly defined, as this is likely to have an impact on the acceptability or otherwise of some of the sites selected in terms of the impact on the delivery of wider strategies and objectives.

Overall Appraisal of the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report

15.7 A final consultation question allows respondents to submit any additional comments about the content of the SSS Report (page 135).

Recommendation 13

Question 12.6 - Finally, please tell us if you agree with the overall approach taken and conclusions reached in this report on the spatial strategy and sites for the Waste DPD. If not, please tell us what we should change.

Given the concerns of the Director of Regeneration about the proximity of waste management facilities to residential property, the criteria and scores for facilities that are likely to generate nuisance including noise, odours, flies and lighting, which have been experienced by residents living near existing waste management facilities, such as landfills, should be reconsidered.

With respect to the sites identified for potential landfill and landraising, the Council is concerned that sites with little realistic prospect of progressing have been presented in a public report without adequate prior assessment, causing needless concern to the public.

The Waste DPD should make more explicit reference to the capacity of existing facilities throughout the sub-region with consent to accommodate identified needs.

The Council does not agree that that the emerging plan proposals are unlikely to have a detrimental equality impact on individual residents or groups of residents within the plan area. The Equality Impact Assessment demonstrates a disproportionate impact on areas displaying the highest levels of deprivation within the sub-region, particularly in Wirral, and does not appear to consider the potential impact of waste facilities on the image and perception of these areas and on housing market renewal in particular, which is a strategic priority for east Wirral.

16 Next Steps

16.1 The next stage in the preparation of the joint Waste DPD, following the consideration of the comments received on the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report, will be the publication of Preferred Options, currently scheduled for June 2009. The publication of Preferred Options will require the approval of Full Council. The target date for adoption following submission to the Secretary of State and public examination is currently April 2011.

17 Financial Implications

17.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

17.2 The acquisition of sites is integral to the MWDA Private Finance Initiative (PFI) scheme. The Merseyside authorities will meet any costs through the annual MWDA levy. A report on the issues highlighted by the MWDA around the additional costs associated with delays in the acquisition of sites was presented to Cabinet on 4 September 2008. There are severe financial penalties for authorities that exceed targets for landfill diversion.

18 Staffing Implications

18.1 There are no staffing implications arising directly out of this report.

19 Equal Opportunities Implications

19.1 The Equality Impact Assessment accompanying the SSS Report concludes that the main impact on equal opportunities is likely to arise from the effectiveness of the consultation process for the SSS Report. Measures have been put in place to minimise these impacts.

20 Community Safety Implications

20.1 The identification of sites for waste management uses can have community safety implications. The Council's proposed responses under Recommendations 1 to 13 include the consideration of these matters, where it is possible to make an assessment.

20.2 The Health Impact Assessment accompanying the SSS Report concludes that there is no consensus on how to demonstrate the health impacts of waste facilities. Although studies have found some significant statistical differences in recorded and reported illness in populations close to waste facilities, there is no conclusive evidence of a direct causal link. Many of these studies do not reflect the changing

nature of waste streams and the move to residual waste management. The assessment concludes that all waste management facilities carry an element of risk to health which needs to be mitigated by applying good planning practice combined with effective regulation. Reliance on well-managed and regulated sites that demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements should ensure minimal risk. Available evidence suggests that the distance of any impact is unlikely to extend beyond 1km from a waste management facility and may be below 500 metres. For incineration, there is some consistency that distances above 5km can be considered as distant.

- 20.3 The Health Effects of Waste Management, September 2008 can be viewed at http://merseysideeas-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/public_sss/public_sss

21 Local Agenda 21 Implications

- 21.1 Increased vehicular traffic will contribute to additional emissions and air quality standards that are contrary to LA21, which promotes sustainable modes of transport. The provision of the facilities necessary to secure sustainable waste management is a key objective of the joint Waste DPD and national policy. The emerging joint Waste DPD has been subject to an ongoing statutory sustainability appraisal, which has been used to inform the content of the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report.

22 Planning Implications

- 22.1 The joint Waste DPD, when adopted in April 2011, will form part of the statutory Development Plan for the Borough. In the meantime, the evidence base for the emerging joint Waste DPD will be capable of being a material consideration in the determination of individual planning applications.

23 Anti-Poverty Implications

- 23.1 There are no anti-poverty implications arising from this report.

24 Human Rights Implications

- 24.1 There are no human rights implications arising from this report.

25 Social Inclusion Implications

- 25.1 The Equality Impact Assessment accompanying the SSS Report concludes that the system used for scoring sites results in a clustering of sites around areas which coincide largely with areas experiencing high levels of deprivation. While high-scoring sites are not found exclusively in the most deprived areas, more than half of them can be found in the 20% most deprived areas (Table 2.1, page 7). This is particularly apparent in Wirral, where the overall ranking for the areas falling within the identified Areas of Opportunity fall within the top 5% most deprived areas in England, the lowest average rank of any of the Areas of Opportunity identified across the sub-region (Table A6, page 14).
- 25.2 Table 2.2 (page 9) considers the likely impact on factors considered within the English Index of Multiple Deprivation. Positive impacts include additional jobs, new

facilities designed and operated to modern standards, general improvements in townscape and the regeneration and reuse of currently unattractive and derelict sites. The heavy industrial and port-related character of the two Areas of Opportunity in Wirral is also considered to be relevant. No impact is, however, recorded for housing, which appears to fail to consider the potential impact on the image and perception of the area and on housing market renewal in particular, which is a strategic priority for east Wirral.

- 25.3 The Assessment, nevertheless, concludes that that the emerging plan proposals are unlikely to have a detrimental equality impact on individual residents or groups of residents within the plan area (page 1) and that there is little likelihood that any elements which make up the Index of Multiple Deprivation will be negatively impacted (page 9).
- 25.4 The Equality Impact Assessment can be viewed at http://merseysideeas-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/public_sss/public_sss

26 Local Member Support Implications

- 26.1 The Spatial Strategy and Sites Report will be of interest to all Ward Members. The sites listed in the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report and considered elsewhere within this report fall within the following Wards:

Site Ref	Site Name	Ward
W0808	Former Graving Docks, Beaufort Road	Bidston & St James
W2215	Mersey Waste Holdings, Wallasey Bridge Road	Bidston & St James
W0180	George Major, Wallasey Bridge Road	Bidston & St James
W0191	Cleared site, Tees Street, Beaufort Road	Bidston & St James
EAS0020	Bromborough Dock North Landfill, Dock Road South	Bromborough
MIN031	Irby Quarry, Irby Mill	Greasby Frankby and Irby
MIN027	North Wirral Brickworks, Carr Lane, Moreton	Hoylake and Meols
EAS0018	Moreton Landfill, Old Brickworks, Tarran Way, Moreton	Moreton West & Saughall Massie
MIN030	Prenton Quarry, Prenton Dell	Prenton
EAS0282	Lower Farm, Roman Road/Prenton Dell Road, Prenton	Prenton
W0360	Former Southern Car Park, Cammell Lairds	Rock Ferry
W0343	Old Workshops, Cammell Lairds	Rock Ferry
W0339	Old Joiners Shop, Cammell Lairds	Rock Ferry

Site Ref	Site Name	Ward
W0322	Global Environmental Recycling, Maritime Business Park, Campbeltown Road	Rock Ferry
W0270	Former Tip, Oakdale Road	Seacombe
W0240	North West of Old Gorse Lane	Seacombe

27 Background Papers

- 27.1 Cabinet 28 March 2007 - Merseyside Joint Waste Development Plan Document – Issues and Options Report for Public Consultation – Wirral Response, can be viewed at http://www.wirral.gov.uk/minute/public/cabcs070328rep1_23553.pdf
- 27.2 Cabinet 16 October 2008 – Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document – Spatial Strategy and Sites Report – Approval of Public Consultation, can be viewed at [http://democracy.wirral.gov.uk/Published/C00000121/M00000350/AI00000890/\\$WasteDPDConsultRptCab16Oct08.docA.ps.pdf](http://democracy.wirral.gov.uk/Published/C00000121/M00000350/AI00000890/$WasteDPDConsultRptCab16Oct08.docA.ps.pdf)
- 27.3 Merseyside Joint Waste Development Plan Document – Spatial Strategy and Sites Report – can be viewed at <http://www.wasteplanningmerseyside.gov.uk/site.do>
- 27.4 Planning Policy Statement 10 - Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (ODPM, July 2005) can be viewed at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/147411.pdf>
- 27.5 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management - A Companion Guide to PPS10 (CLG, June 2006) can be viewed at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/150805.pdf>
- 27.6 The National Waste Strategy (2007) can be viewed at <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/strategy07/pdf/waste07-strategy.pdf>
- 27.7 The Regional Spatial Strategy – The North West of England Plan (September 2008) can be viewed at <http://www.gos.gov.uk/497468/docs/248821/476846/NorthWestEnglandRSS>
- 27.8 Cabinet 6 November 2008 - Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West – Implications for Wirral, can be viewed at [http://democracy.wirral.gov.uk/Published/C00000121/M00000351/AI00002030/\\$CABCS081106REP1.docA.ps.pdf](http://democracy.wirral.gov.uk/Published/C00000121/M00000351/AI00002030/$CABCS081106REP1.docA.ps.pdf)
- 27.9 The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Merseyside (June 2005) can be viewed at <http://www.merseysidewda.gov.uk/documents/MASTER%20COPY%20-%20STRATEGY%20version%202.pdf>
- 27.10 North West Ports – Economic Trends and Land Use Study (NWDA, October 2005) can be viewed at <http://www.nwda.co.uk/pdf/NorthWestPorts.pdf>

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Recommendations 1 to 13 be endorsed as the Council's formal response to the Spatial Strategy and Sites Report.

J. Wilkie
Deputy Chief Executive/Director of Corporate Services

This report has been prepared by the Forward Planning Section who can be contacted on 691 8218.