

Greater Manchester Waste DPD

Note of Procedural Meeting

Fred Perry House, Stockport
10.30am 21 April 2011

1.1 The Inspector introduced himself as Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRPTI MIQ who has been appointed to carry out the examination into the soundness of the Greater Manchester Waste Development Plan Document (DPD) submitted to the Secretary of State.

1.2 The Programme Officer (PO) is Mrs Natalie Blackston who will act as an impartial officer of the Examination under the Inspector's direction. Her contact details will be in covering correspondence. The POs main tasks are to liaise with all parties to ensure the smooth running of the Hearings and other parts of the Examination, to organise the Hearing programme, to ensure that all written and electronic material received both before and during the Hearings is recorded and distributed and to oversee the Examination library of Core Documents and Statements. All questions on procedure should be directed in the first instance to the PO.

1.3 The representatives of the Greater Manchester Councils who would participate in the Hearings were then introduced by Mr Malcolm Philips, the lead spokesman. Other participants at the forthcoming Hearings and who were at the meeting were identified.

2.1 The purpose of the meeting was to discuss matters of process and procedure relating to the examination into the DPD. It is not an inquiry into objections but an examination of the soundness of the submitted Plan and whether it complies with legislation. The Inspector will have regard to the representations made, but the report at the conclusion of the Examination process, which began with submission of the Plan, will only deal with broad issues.

2.2 The tests for "soundness" are set out in PPS12. To be sound a Plan should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Justified means that the Plan must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base and have the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. Effective means that the DPD must be deliverable, flexible and able to be monitored.

2.3 The starting point by the Inspector is that the Councils have submitted what they consider to be a sound Plan. So the assumption is that the Plan is sound unless proved otherwise.

2.4 The report will be binding on the Councils, although a Council may choose not to adopt a Plan. Further guidance relating to examinations, and the test of soundness, can be found in the Guidance Note to the Examination which is circulated together with this note.

2.5 Only those who have made objections to the Plan, and were seeking changes, have a right to be heard.

3.1 The Councils commented that one late representation received from Mr Farrar had been accepted as duly made and one other from Shell was the subject of discussion.

3.2 The Councils also confirmed that the legal requirement as set out in PPS12 para 4.50 have been met.

3.3 The Councils indicated that they have the delegated authority to deal with minor changes which might arise out of the Examination process, but not any more significant changes which might affect soundness.

4.1 The Hearings will begin at 10.00am on Tuesday 28 June 2011 in Fred Perry House, Stockport. A detailed programme will be drawn up when it is confirmed who will be attending. Hearings into the selected Matters will still take place, even if no person or organisation wished to speak other than representatives of the Councils.

4.2 The Examination Programme documents will be sent out in early May, setting out details of the Hearing sessions, details of those attending, and inviting those parties to submit any additional information, as necessary, by Tuesday 14th June (*7th June was mentioned by the Inspector at the procedural meeting: 14th June would be more appropriate; any objections to this, please contact the PO*). The Inspector agreed to set out in more detail the objectives of the Hearing sessions and any questions to be answered. Participants at the Hearings, including the Joint Councils, may submit further statements (3,000 word max.) if they wish. Statements of Common Ground should be prepared where appropriate.

4.3 A comprehensive list of changes would be required as an attachment to the Inspector's final report, including minor amendments.

5.1 A draft list of Matters for Examination had been circulated. The Inspector discussed this list expanding on why he felt the matters should be included. Not all of the Matters need to be the subject of a Hearing session, but where a representor wishes to be heard and has objected on that matter, it will be dealt with at the Hearing.

5.2 The draft list of Matters comprised the following together with additional comments made by the Inspector at the meeting:

1. Legal compliance - especially consultation and publicity.

Whether the correct procedures have been followed with particular reference to Rochdale

2. The degree to which spatial alternatives have been considered.

An impression is gained that the allocations within the plan may have been predetermined by planning permissions already granted.

If that is the case, was there any scope for considering reasonable alternatives?

In addition, how were the locations chosen?

3. The relationships with neighbouring waste planning authorities: (imports - exports).

The extent to which (various types of) waste is exported to other waste planning authorities and whether they are content with this arrangement?

4. The likelihood and consequences of a Scenario which results in even greater recycling.

Scenario 2 aims at the maximisation of recycling. What would be the consequences of greater recycling? Would this be revealed by annual monitoring?

5. The relationship of Policy 4 (Sites) to Policy 5 (Areas),

How Sites were preferred to Areas and the justification for the numbers of each?

Including the issues of: (a) BL9 Watersmeeting South C Triangle;
(b) RD6 Mandale Park, Rochdale;
(c) SL2 Clifton Industrial Estate, Salford;
(d) Green Lane, Salford.

6. Policy 6: Inert waste.

How should inert waste be managed? Is there a surplus of the material?

7. Policy 7: Future needs, including the issues of Whitehead.

5.3 Following a question by Entec about whether there would be a session on Need, the Inspector commented that, because the company confirmed that it had submitted a relevant objection and wished to be heard, there would be one.

5.4 Updated information could be included in the Plan, as necessary, provided that it did not significantly change it.

5.5 The Inspector stated that he would be visiting contentious sites unaccompanied prior to the Hearing.