

WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PREFERRED OPTIONS RESPONSES.

1. Summary of Responses

The consultation of the Waste Development Plan Document Preferred Options took place from 17 August 2005 to 28 September 2006. The Preferred Options responses are taken into account into the preparation of the Submission Draft document. Below are the responses to the consultation. A total of 655 responses were received. Out of these responses, 620 filled in a survey form via:

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

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

- 1. Preferred Guiding Vision for the Plan;
- 2. Preferred Strategic Option;
- 3. Sustainable Waste Management;
- 4. Working with neighbours/partners;
- 5. Development Control Criteria;
- 6. Environmental Objectives;
- 7. Transport;
- 8. Restoration;
- 9. Sustainable design, construction and resource recovery;
- 12. Other waste facilities.

The highest objection to questions (1-9 and 12) was to preferred option 2 with just 5.2 % objecting or strongly objecting.

In terms of the Strategic Waste Management Site for a waste management facility for final treatment, the preferred site at Old Wolverton was:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| • strongly supported and supported | 75.6% |
| • objected or strongly objected | 5.7% |

Eleven responses were received from residents in Wolverton:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| • strongly supported/supported | 7 |
| • strongly objected | 4 |

Eleven responses were received from residents in Old Wolverton:

- strongly supported 1
- objected and strongly objected 10

In terms of the reserve site at Wymbush, (if the Old Wolverton site does not come forward),

- strongly supported or supported 60.9%
- objected or strongly objected 8.6%

Nineteen responses were received from residents in Two Mile Ash (closest residents to the site). Out of these:

- support 4
- strongly objected or objected 13

In terms of safeguarding existing strategic sites, the support for safeguarding Bletchley Landfill Site for future disposal of residual waste and the statement, 'the site's life should not be dramatically reduced by imports from outside Milton Keynes, leaving Milton Keynes looking for an alternative facility sooner than 2022', was as follows:

- strongly support/support 85.2%
- strongly objected/objected 4%

There were 94 responses received from residents in Bletchley:

- strongly support/support 80
- strongly objected 6

In terms of the support for safeguarding the existing Materials Recycling Facility at Old Wolverton and the statement, 'the current facility should be retained unless it is provided for elsewhere or it becomes obsolete as a result of a new long-term waste management use elsewhere. There is potential for the site to accommodate new waste management uses, such as composting' was as follows:

- strongly support/support 88.5%
- 4 residents in Old Wolverton strongly objected

2. Main comments raised and response

The main comments from the surveys, emails, letters and from exhibitions and presentations are listed below. The Council's response is in italics.

<p>Treatment Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to evaluate options without knowing treatment option.
<p><i>The Municipal Waste Strategy assesses different treatment facilities including addressing the Issues and Options survey responses regarding considerations for treatment facilities. This will be considered further when the Council considers its waste contract. We now need to consider where such facilities could be located. An appendix of the Submission Draft includes Treatment Technologies Descriptions.</i></p>
<p>Further information on waste arisings, capacities and waste streams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More figs/info are required for different waste streams. • Impacts of surplus spoil from new developments needs to be addressed (comments from developers/agents) • Include waste water/sewage • Include hazardous waste treatment and remediation • Welcome policy approach to achieving regional and sub regional self-sufficiency. Policy should be strengthened to state requirements for MK for waste arisings and requiring management within MK, and declining amount of London's waste and commitment to meeting these.
<p><i>Further information is included which shows waste arisings, capacities of existing facilities and future requirements for different waste streams. Polices in the Core Strategy reflect these requirements.</i></p>
<p>The use of rail and water to transport waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of rail and water borne transport and appropriate provision should be encouraged particularly for large facilities. • Difficult to achieve transport of waste by anything other than road. • Should include emphasis on the use of a wider transport assessment. • The possible use of canal should be investigated. • Rail not realistic.
<p><i>Policy WDC3 addresses Transport Assessment and that planning applications must demonstrate that alternative methods to road transport have been considered.</i></p>
<p>Importing Waste and Partnership working</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns / support regarding partnership working with neighbours in terms of importation of waste. • Working with other local authorities would be beneficial in terms of economies of scale and developing optimum environmental solutions. • The suggestion that waste imports from outside Milton Keynes should be restricted to husband void space needs to be considered in the light of emerging regional policy.
<p><i>Milton Keynes is a relatively small area, and to obtain economies and efficiencies of scale, it may be necessary to combine waste activities with</i></p>

neighbouring local authorities. The Council support working with others to ensure appropriate waste management solutions are joined up. This includes working and joining up facilities to provide the best economies of scale and all waste sectors working together, commercial and municipal. A balance is required to deal with waste from neighbouring areas and retaining the landfill for residual waste for Milton Keynes. This is in accordance with regional policy.

Development Control Policy

- Operator's past experience should be taken into account

This has been included in the Development Control Policy WDC1.

Number of treatment facilities

- There should be various sites to reduce vehicle distance congestion and impact on individuals
- Sites should be in all sides of Milton Keynes

In considering where such facilities should be located, six strategic options, which could potentially guide development were considered and appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal. The option, which performed best against 20 sustainability objectives, was a dispersed location of pre treatment and one site for final treatment.

Location of Sites

- Strategic site should be in new expansion areas – purpose built infrastructure and away from housing
- 5 miles outside of towns
- Away from houses
- Located to NE of Milton Keynes because of prevailing wind
- Near to M1
- Return journey of 5 miles is maximum acceptable distance for waste recycling sites
- Sites require good on site traffic management flows

Construction of the eastern and western expansion areas will commence shortly. The area of future growth beyond this period is unknown. Five miles outside towns will mean that it will be further away from the source of the waste and this would also be close to other settlements or even towns. We have considered Government and Environment Agency guidance that treatment facilities should be 250 metres away from sensitive receptors. No sites have come forward close to the M1. On site traffic management is considered in Development Control Policies and in the Key Development Criteria for the Reserve Site at Wymbush. The policy is for dispersed locations for recycling sites.

Growth

- Limit growth to reduce need for additional waste
- Growth will add to waste problem
- We have enough of our waste, growth will mean importing more waste
- The impact on growth area should be shown on the Core Strategy Plan

The Submission Draft addresses growth issues and allows for this in its assessment of future requirements and safeguarding of sites. This is highlighted on the Core Strategy Plan (Key Diagram).

Sustainable design and construction

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

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

Wolverton Strategic Waste Site

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

The scoring change does not affect the site as the preferred site. It is important to allow flexibility to provide the best option for the treatment solution. An assessment has been carried to consider an appropriate size

footprint for a facility. PPS10 Companion Guide states, DPD, 'will not generally prescribe the waste management techniques or technologies', and, 'should normally avoid any detailed prescription of waste management technique or technology that would stifle innovation in line with the waste hierarchy'. It is considered that the vehicle movements will be minimal, as the waste collection vehicles take the recycling to the MRF, adjacent to the site. This will mean that instead of travelling across the city to deliver the residual waste to Bletchley Landfill Site (current process), the residual waste will be taken to this site. The majority of responses to the survey supported the option. Any planning application would include a Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement. The site would be regulated by Environment Agency, Environmental Health and Planning. It is considered that these could be controlled or mitigated against.

Wymbush Reserve Strategic Waste Site

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

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

Sites put forward/suggested:

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

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

Safeguarding

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

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

Other sites assessed in Site Assessment in Annex

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

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

A number of responses addressed recycling, packaging and collection issues. These have been forwarded to the Waste Strategy team to consider in their policy development and activities. A number of responses addressed ‘Incineration’, which received a mixed response. These issues are not considered to be part of the Waste Development Plan Development. However, they will feedback to current Council policy

The Citizens Advice Group on Waste attended a workshop in September 2006 to discuss the survey. They generally supported the policies and some members of the group raised the following comments (the Council’s response is in italics):

- Rail should be used for the Old Wolverton site (*This would be addressed in the Transport Assessment with any submitted planning application*)
- Supported safeguarding the Materials Recycling Facility, especially when linked to the strategic site.
- Wymbush site needs direct access from the A5 (*This would be addressed in the Transport Assessment with any submitted planning application*)
- Sites at Denbigh West could be joined together for a suitable site (*The sites are close to sensitive receptors*).

There were 30 responses, which were received after the consultation period had closed. The majority of the survey responses were in support of the preferred policy directions. The comments that no other respondent had

raised were: locate the strategic site at the Cotton Valley Sewage Works; and developer contributions are required to fund habitat enhancement and creation with the restoration of sites. The Cotton Valley Sewage Works is safeguarded for future expansion of waste water and sewage. The supporting text to the restoration policy in Development Control Policies considers that restoration must provide a positive enhancement to wildlife habitats.

3. Results of the Survey

Number of responses

	Number of respondents	Percent
MK News Wrap around	287	43.8
Online		
Submitted online	221	33.7
Submitted by post	13	2.0
E-mail	18	2.7
Letter	22	3.4
Your Survey:		
Council Offices	16	2.4
Housing Office	3	0.5
Library	37	5.6
The Centre MK	7	1.1
Midsummer Place	6	0.9
MK News	2	0.3
Other	20	3.1
Question not answered	3	0.5
Total	655	100.0

Letters and Emails received from individuals and from:

Government Agencies: Government Office for the South East; Environment Agency; East Midlands Regional Assembly; Milton Keynes Partnership; South East England Regional Assembly;

Parish Councils/Residents Associations/Action groups: Sherington Parish Council; Shenley Brook End & Tattenhoe Council; Emberton Parish Council; Lathbury Parish Meeting; Gayhurst Parish Council; Old Wolverton Residents Association; PALS.

Other Local Authorities: Northamptonshire County Council; Bedford Borough Council; Aylesbury Vale District Council;

Developers/Agents/Waste companies: Turley Associates (Britel Fund Trustees Limited and Prudential Assurance Company Limited); David Lock Associates (Hallam Land Management, William Davis Limited, TGR Williams & Son); Waste Recycling Group; Dreh Resources Ltd; Gill Pawson Planning (Shanks Waste Services); JM Farms; John Drake & Company; Robinson & Hall; New Earth Solutions; GCS Ltd.

Councillors: Cllrs Holroyd, Irons and Seymour

Business organisations: Chamber of Commerce and Newport Pagnell Business Association;

Local Organisations: Age Concern; Woburn Safari Park; TH& AAY Jones; Radix Micro Devices; Selby Consulting

Age group of respondents

Age Group, years	Number of respondents	Percent
Under 18	1	0.2
18-24	15	2.4
25-34	67	10.8
35-44	114	18.4
45-54	123	19.8
55-64	120	19.4
65+	137	22.1
Question not answered	43	6.9
Total	620	100.0

Ethnicity of respondents

Ethnicity	Number of respondents	Percent
White	519	83.71
Black / Black British	5	0.81
Asian / Asian British	9	1.45
Chinese / SE Asian	6	0.97
Mixed	3	0.48
Other	24	3.87
Question not answered	54	8.71
Total	620	100.0

Property Type of respondents

Property Type	Number of respondents	Percent
Flat	29	4.7
Semi detached	171	27.6
Detached	230	37.1
Terraced	102	16.5
Bungalow	45	7.3
Other	2	0.3
Question not answered	41	6.6
Total	620	100.0

Length of time in MK of respondents

Length of time in MK, years	Number of respondents	Percent
Less than 1yr	7	1.1
1-3	81	13.1
4-6	137	22.1
7-10	45	7.3
11+	337	54.4
Don't live in MK	3	0.5
Question not answered	10	1.6
Total	620	100.0

No of adults in the household of respondents

No of adults in household	Number of respondents	Percent
1	136	21.9
2	345	55.6
3	59	9.5
4	18	2.9
5	2	0.3
20	1	0.2
Question not answered	59	9.5
Total	620	100.0

Address of respondents

Postcode	Number of respondents	Percent
MK1	3	0.5
MK2	29	4.7
MK3	59	9.5
MK4	44	7.1
MK5	33	5.3
MK6	42	6.8
MK7	38	6.1
MK8	30	4.8
MK9	2	0.3
MK10	20	3.2
MK11	27	4.4
MK12	32	5.2
MK13	43	6.9
MK14	43	6.9
MK15	26	4.2
MK16	39	6.3
MK17	6	1
MK19	14	2.3
MK43	0	0
MK44	1	0.2
MK46	8	1.3
Total with MK postcode	539	86.9
Non MK / not answered	81	13.1
Total	620	100

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Q1 Preferred Guiding Vision for the Plan

A vision for: a reduction in landfill; meeting growth needs; meeting Government, Regional and Local targets; Everyone playing a role to deliver sustainable waste management, providing a social, environmental, economic approach to waste management.

All respondents

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	421	67.9
Support	154	24.8
Neither support nor object	19	3.1
Object	6	1.0
Strongly object	4	0.6
Not answered	16	2.6
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	14	73.7
Support	4	21.0
Neither support nor object	1	5.3
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	9	81.8
Support	2	18.2
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	3	27.3
Support	8	72.7
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Q2 Preferred Strategic Option

Pre-treatment Waste Management facilities, such as Community Recycling Centres, and composting sites should be located all around Milton Keynes. Final treatment, is the treatment of the rubbish left (residual waste) after recycling, should be located at one site in Milton Keynes.

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	319	52.3
Support	194	31.3
Neither support nor object	53	8.5
Object	18	2.9
Strongly object	13	2.3
Not answered	23	2.7
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	12	63.2
Support	5	26.3
Neither support nor object	1	5.25
Object	1	5.25
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	8	72.7
Support	2	18.2
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	1	9.1
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	1	9.0
Support	2	18.2
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	3	27.3
Strongly object	4	36.3
Not answered	1	9.1
Total	11	100

Q3 Preferred Policy 1 Sustainable Waste Management

A policy which follows best practice to provide sustainable, self-sufficient waste management, close to source of the waste and in accordance with the waste hierarchy (waste reduction > re-use> recycle> energy recovery > landfill as the last option).

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	382	61.6
Support	162	26.1
Neither support nor object	42	6.8
Object	7	1.1
Strongly object	9	1.5
Not answered	18	2.9
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	14	73.7
Support	4	21.0
Neither support nor object	1	5.3
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	9	81.8
Support	2	18.2
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	2	18.2
Support	7	63.6
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	2	18.2
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Q4 Preferred Policy 2 Working with Neighbours/Partners

A policy that sets out working with others to ensure appropriate waste management solutions are joined up. This includes working and joining up facilities to provide the best economies of scale and all waste sectors working together, commercial and municipal.

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	338		54.5
Support	174		28.1
Neither support nor object	66		10.6
Object	13		2.1
Strongly object	12		1.9
Not answered	17		2.7
Total	620		100

Two Mile Ash

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	14		73.7
Support	5		26.3
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	19		100

Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	9		81.8
Support	1		9.1
Neither support nor object	1		9.1
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Old Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	3		27.3
Support	4		36.4
Neither support nor object	2		18.15
Object	0		0
Strongly object	2		18.15
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Q5 Preferred Policy 3 Development Control Criteria

A policy that sets out development control criteria for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities, such as noise and dust.

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	321		51.8
Support	200		32.3
Neither support nor object	65		10.5
Object	9		1.5
Strongly object	8		1.3
Not answered	17		2.7
Total	620		100

Two Mile Ash

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	12		63.2
Support	6		31.6
Neither support nor object	1		5.2
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	19		100

Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	7		63.6
Support	3		27.3
Neither support nor object	1		9.1
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Old Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	4		36.4
Support	6		54.5
Neither support nor object	1		9.1
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Q6 Preferred Policy 4 Environmental Objectives

A policy that sets out environmental objectives for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities including considering climate change and the impact on natural resources.

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	368	59.4
Support	174	28.1
Neither support nor object	42	6.8
Object	8	1.3
Strongly object	10	1.6
Not answered	18	2.9
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	15	78.9
Support	4	21.1
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	10	90.9
Support	1	9.1
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	4	36.4
Support	7	63.6
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Q7 Preferred Policy 5 Transport

A policy that considers the vehicle movements in and out of a waste management facility. The policy will consider reducing the reliance on road transport and require a Transport Assessment is carried out.

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	346	55.8
Support	150	24.2
Neither support nor object	73	11.8
Object	21	3.4
Strongly object	12	1.9
Not answered	18	2.9
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	16	84.2
Support	2	10.5
Neither support nor object	1	5.3
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	9	81.8
Support	2	18.2
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	6	54.5
Support	5	45.5
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Q8 Preferred Policy 6 Restoration

A policy that sets out key principle aims and objectives for restoration of waste management sites.

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	287		46.3
Support	216		34.8
Neither support nor object	78		12.6
Object	5		0.8
Strongly object	5		0.8
Not answered	29		4.7
Total	620		100

Two Mile Ash

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	16		84.2
Support	3		15.8
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	19		100

Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	9		81.8
Support	1		9.1
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	1		9.1
Total	11		100

Old Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	4		36.4
Support	7		63.6
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Q9 Preferred Policy 7 Sustainable design, construction and resource recovery

Policies that will set out objectives for sustainable design, construction including encouraging recycling, waste minimisation and resource recovery. The large-scale development proposed in Milton Keynes presents a major opportunity to put into practice and demonstrate best practice in waste minimisation and integration of recycling into development.

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	387	62.4
Support	163	26.3
Neither support nor object	37	6
Object	4	0.6
Strongly object	9	1.5
Not answered	20	3.2
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	14	73.7
Support	5	26.3
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	10	90.9
Support	1	9.1
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	4	36.4
Support	5	45.5
Neither support nor object	2	18.1
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Q10 Preferred Strategic Site – Colts Holm Road, Old Wolverton

A Strategic Site is identified as a site for a waste management facility for final treatment. Such sites could also have other waste facilities, such as recycling.

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	291	46.9
Support	178	28.7
Neither support nor object	98	15.8
Object	9	1.5
Strongly object	26	4.2
Not answered	18	2.9
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	14	73.7
Support	5	26.3
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	3	27.3
Support	4	36.35
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	0	0
Strongly object	4	36.35
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	1	9.1
Support	0	0
Neither support nor object	0	0
Object	1	9.1
Strongly object	9	81.8
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Q11 Preferred Reserve Site – Garamonde Drive, Wymbush

A reserve site has been identified and will be safeguarded for a waste management facility if the Strategic Site does not come forward.

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	185		29.8
Support	193		31.1
Neither support nor object	166		26.8
Object	27		4.4
Strongly object	26		4.2
Not answered	23		3.7
Total	620		100

Two Mile Ash

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	0		0
Support	4		21.1
Neither support nor object	2		10.5
Object	7		36.8
Strongly object	6		31.6
Not answered	0		0
Total	19		100

Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	5		45.5
Support	3		27.25
Neither support nor object	3		27.25
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Old Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	3		27.3
Support	2		18.2
Neither support nor object	3		27.3
Object	2		18.2
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	1		9.0
Total	11		100

Q12 Preferred Site – Other Waste Facilities

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

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	231	37.3
Support	226	36.5
Neither support nor object	110	17.7
Object	11	1.8
Strongly object	9	1.5
Not answered	33	5.3
Total	620	100

Two Mile Ash

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	7	36.8
Support	9	47.4
Neither support nor object	2	10.5
Object	0	0
Strongly object	1	5.3
Not answered	0	0
Total	19	100

Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	5	45.4
Support	3	27.3
Neither support nor object	3	27.3
Object	0	0
Strongly object	0	0
Not answered	0	0
Total	11	100

Old Wolverton

	Number of respondents	Percent
Strongly Support	0	0
Support	4	36.4
Neither support nor object	2	18.2
Object	0	0
Strongly object	3	27.3
Not answered	2	18.2
Total	11	100

Q13 Preferred Site – Safeguarding Existing Strategic Sites

A. Bletchley Landfill Site

This site should be safeguarded for future disposal of residual waste. The site's life should not be dramatically reduced by imports from outside Milton Keynes, leaving Milton Keynes looking for an alternative facility sooner than 2022.

All respondents

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	396		63.9
Support	132		21.3
Neither support nor object	44		7.1
Object	4		0.6
Strongly object	21		3.4
Not answered	23		3.7
Total	620		100

Bletchley

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	65		69.1
Support	15		16.0
Neither support nor object	5		5.3
Object	0		0
Strongly object	6		6.4
Not answered	3		3.2
Total	94		100

Two Mile Ash

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	15		78.9
Support	2		10.5
Neither support nor object	1		5.3
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	1		5.3
Total	19		100

Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	8		72.7
Support	1		9.1
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	2		18.2
Total	11		100

Old Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	4		36.4
Support	3		27.3
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	2		18.15
Not answered	2		18.15
Total	11		100

B. Materials Recycling Facility, Old Wolverton

The current facility should be retained unless it is provided for elsewhere or it becomes obsolete as a result of a new long-term waste management use elsewhere. There is potential for the site to accommodate new waste management uses, such as composting.

All Respondents

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	402		64.8
Support	147		23.7
Neither support nor object	32		5.2
Object	2		0.3
Strongly object	13		2.1
Not answered	24		3.9
Total	620		100

Two Mile Ash

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	16		84.2
Support	3		15.8
Neither support nor object	0		0
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	19		100

Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	10		90.9
Support	0		0
Neither support nor object	1		9.1
Object	0		0
Strongly object	0		0
Not answered	0		0
Total	11		100

Old Wolverton

	Number respondents	of	Percent
Strongly Support	1		9.05
Support	2		18.2
Neither support nor object	3		27.3
Object	0		0
Strongly object	4		36.4
Not answered	1		9.05
Total	11		100