

---

**MINUTES OF THE NORTH WALES REGIONAL TECHNICAL GROUP (RTG) AND THE REGIONAL MEMBERS GROUP (RMG) MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 13<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2003 AT THE CONWY BUSINESS CENTRE, LLANDUDNO JUNCTION AT 1.00PM**

---

**PRESENT FOR:**

***Anglesey County Council***

Councillor R G Parry, Councillor Robert Llewelyn Jones, Steffan Owen

***Conwy County Borough Council***

Councillor Brian Cossey, Councillor Mrs Linda Thorp, Barry Bond, Ceri Thomas

***Cylch***

Katie Trent

***Denbighshire County Council***

Councillor Mike German (Chairman), Councillor F D Jones, Graham Boase, Gareth Jones, Avril Hughes

***Environment Agency***

Brian Booth

***Flintshire County Council***

Gary Nancarrow, Andy MacBeth, Councillor Jim Jones, Councillor R Kevin Jones, Councillor Meirion Matthews

***Gwynedd County Council***

Councillor Linda Wyn Jones, Jeremy Gibbins, Peter Evans

***Powys County Council***

Councillor Gus Fergusson, Andy Bull, Jan Jonker

***SLR Consulting Limited***

Alban Forster

***Snowdonia National Park Authority***

Councillor Leslie Jones, Councillor T Islwyn Morris, Peter Ogden

***Wales Environment Trust***

Richard Carter

***WESA***

Colin Priestley

***Welsh Assembly Government***

Sue Martin (Planning Division)  
Cathy O'Brien (Waste Strategy Unit)

***Wrexham County Council***

Councillor A.C.Bailey, Councillor H Moysen, John Ellis, Geoff Clegg

1. **LUNCH AND REFRESHMENTS (1.00pm – 1.30PM)**

2 **APOLOGIES –**

2.1 Apologies received from Councillor Max Eames–Hughes, (Conwy Borough Council) Julie Masters (WDA) Gareth Lloyd (Snowdonia National Park), J. Williams (Anglesey County Council), Cllr Dafydd Iwan (Gwynedd County Council), Mr Bob Sheffield (Wrexham County Council)

3 **MINUTES OF RTG MEETING 3 JUNE 2003 AND RMG MEETING 24 JUNE 2003**

**Accuracy**

3.1 **Minutes of RTG meeting**

– 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2003 - received as a true record.

**Minutes of RMG meeting**

3.2 – 24<sup>th</sup> June 2003 – received as a true record.

3.3 **Matters arising - None**

4 **CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT PLAN**

4.1 Gareth Jones (GJ) advised members of current position and advised that:

- (i) Consultation posters, a consultation booklet with pre-paid postage questionnaire and a consultation flier are in the process of being produced
- (ii) As agreed in previous meetings, DCC will only consult the RTG regarding the contents of the questionnaire which forms part of the consultation booklet and any feedback from Members of the RMG will be welcomed
- (iii) Distribution of the draft questionnaire for comments will be undertaken as soon as possible
- (iv) The same company would be used to produce the literature, i.e. Design and Print
- (v) DCC will distribute the consultation booklets and posters to the RTG in September and the numbers to be distributed will be as previously agreed
- (vi) Each Authority on the RTG have the responsibility of distributing the consultation material within their area and other organizations on the RTG also have a responsibility to distribute this material in accordance with the agreed requirements
- (vii) The consultation flyers for the industry and pressure groups will be distributed by DCC
- (viii) Any Authority requiring additional supplies of consultation material to contact DCC

5 **DRAFT REGIONAL WASTE PLAN**

i) **Introduction by DCC**

5.1 Graham Boase (GB) advised that the Draft Plan had been previously circulated to Members of RMG and RTG for internal consultation and a reasonable amount of time given to provide comments. It was advised that the Draft Plan had been prepared by GJ and GB and that every effort had been made to keep the document as user friendly as possible.

5.2 GB apologized for the omission of the photographs within the document and stated that these would be included in the final document which would go out to consultation.

5.3 GB thanked the group as a whole for the representations which had been received with regards to the Draft Plan. Cllr Michael German invited Members from each Authority and

from each of the other organizations on the RTG to provide a brief presentation summarizing their comments.

**ii) Summary by each RTG organization of their responses**

**5.4 Wrexham County Council (Presentation by John Ellis)**

Wrexham's Executive Board had met to discuss the Draft Plan and all agreed that the document was well written and covered the main points very well. It was felt that the document could be published subject to some minor alterations:-

- Further explanation regarding options in Part V of the Plan and what these would mean for the Authorities in the Region in terms of the provision of new waste management facilities.
- Indication of the possible monetary cost to the public in respect of each option.
- Queried whether the timetable could be readjusted to ensure that sufficient time was available towards the end of consultation period so that the RTG would have an opportunity to assess the responses.

**Conwy Borough Council (Presentation by Ceri Thomas)**

**5.5** CBC thanked DCC for producing an informative document which was easy to read and understand. However, it was felt that the following additional information should be provided in the document:-

- Additional clarification regarding the implications of the different Options for the Region.
- No real explanation within the document regarding sharing and apportionment of facilities between authorities.
- Should be an explanation of the differences in demand for waste management facilities between the Authorities in the Region.
- Format should be amended so that the questions regarding how the Region should deal with its waste are at the front of the plan.
- It was felt that hazardous waste was not adequately addressed in the plan.

**Gwynedd County Council (Presentation by Peter Evans and Jeremy Gibbins)**

**5.6** GCC stated that the document was well written and user friendly. However, it was felt that the document required some additional information as follows:-

- More clarification regarding the implications of each Options for the Region.
- More emphasis regarding treatment of waste over the plan period.
- Emphasise more that something positive has to be done and there is no getting away from the need to plan for new waste management facilities.
- DCC should look at rephrasing the statement in the plan regarding landfill capacity being exceeded by 2006 as this was not accurate.

### **Powys County Council ( Presentations by Andy Bull and Jan Jonker)**

- 5.7 PCC complimented DCC on the work they had done on the Plan.
- 5.8 PCC made the point that the document was more of a consultation on options rather than a Draft Plan and the following additional points were made:
- The document should mention inter-regional co-operation.
  - Only part of Powys falls in the North Wales Region and they may experience more problems than other Authorities in the formulation of their Unitary Development Plan policies on waste.
  - The Plan should highlight the concerns that targets will not be met and that there is a reliance on the public to do their bit.
  - More detailed explanation on how different options compare would be useful.
  - Can the Plan achieve what is required by TAN 21?
- 5.9 Finally, PCC expressed some concern that Option 6 would mean recycling 90% of household waste and this is unlikely to be achieved without full co-operation from the public. It was felt that this document should begin with the proviso that we only achieve our target with the public's co-operation.

### **Environment Agency (Presentation by Brian Booth)**

- 5.10 DCC were congratulated on producing an excellent document.
- Felt that more information should be included in Part V on each of the options.
  - More coverage in the document on Hazardous Waste.

### **Welsh Assembly Government (Sue Martin and Cathy O'Brien)**

- 5.11 Felt that the document was a well written document covering land use planning issues:
- Explain in more depth about whose targets are being met. (Target set by Europe and the Welsh Assembly Government)
  - More information on the annual growth rates of waste in the Region.
  - More detailed explanation on the waste hierarchy.
  - Felt that more information is required on hazardous waste taking into account provision within the Region.
  - Clearer definition on different types of waste treatment.
  - Make it clearer in the document what the main issues are for public and industry

- (Do we plan for the number of new recycling and composting facilities required to meet the targets or the numbers of facilities required to exceed these targets? What do we do with the waste which is not or cannot be recycled or composted?)
- Queried whether any information was available regarding the capacity or the actual arisings going to the 518 exempt waste facilities.
- Also queried landfill capacity reached by 2006 – queried whether this information was based on current growth.
- Eco Parks – Other regions – are all regions happy about eco parks within their authority.
- Useful to have appendices stating no of facilities that each option will provide.

#### **Ynys Môn (Presentation by Steffan Owen)**

5.12 Ynys Môn were generally happy with the document. However, they felt that the document would benefit from the following information.

- Rephrase the statement in the Plan referring to the fact that there will be no landfill capacity left after 2006 as this appeared inaccurate.
- Questioned whether Eco Parks were feasible for each authority?
- Clarification within the document as to how the review of the plan will happen.
- The document should mention costs for providing new facilities. Felt that the paragraph 4.1 on page 24 is misleading as it states “No direct cost to the public”. Suggested re-writing of this paragraph.

#### **Snowdonia National Park (Presentation by Peter Ogden)**

5.13 Felt that Snowdonia National Park should be treated differently from other Authorities and that the Plan should relate more to the function of the Park as well as the cross border relationships between other Authorities, i.e. (importation and exportation of waste). The following points were made:

- Stated that some difficulty might be experienced due to the fact that each Authority is at a different point in the preparation of their Unitary Development Plan.
- More information on Options and what this would mean in terms of the number, types and suitable locations for new waste management facilities, and in respect of the Park a recognition that any new facility needed to be “fit for place and purpose” and therefore acknowledging the differences between the Authorities in the Region.
- How does the plan relate to the Wales Spatial Plan?
- What is the scope for the use and or expansion of the existing waste facilities in the Region?
- The general policy statements need clarification as these appear to be a mixture of general principles as well as general policies.

### **Welsh Environment Trust (Presentation by Richard Carter)**

- 5.14 WET expressed their support for the document and reminded everyone that one of the main functions of WET is to support schemes which derive economic value from waste. The following comments were made:
- Higher profile needed to be given in the document with regards to what can be done to waste which is not recycled or composted. Treating the waste to produce energy derived fuel needs to be highlighted as a realistic option particularly given the uncertainty regarding Mechanical Biological Treatment.
  - Need to highlight the possible employment benefits that can be introduced through the provision of new waste management facilities.
  - Supported the concept of the eco park which was felt could be adapted for industrial parks generally where complimentary uses are located close together.

### **WESA (Presentation by Colin Priestley)**

- 5.15 WESA believed the document was well laid out. Agreed with the issues already raised by the other organizations on the RTG and made the following points:
- Issue of landfill still needs to be addressed and emphasised in the document that there will be a need for new landfill capacity as well as other types of waste management facilities. Concern that landfill will have run out before the provision of the new facilities.
  - More information about the cost and the deliverability of the Options.

### **Cylch (Presentation by Katie Trent)**

- 5.16 Believed that the document was well written and made the following points:
- Needed to be clearer on what we were consulting on, which could be achieved by expanding on the issues raised at the start of the document and asking specific questions.
  - Further clarification required on the options.
  - More reference should be made in the Plan to the role of the Community Sector in provision of waste related facilities and there should also be a policy to encourage a partnership approach to waste.

### **Flintshire**

- 5.17 General support for the content of document and the following points were made:
- Further information required on the implications of the 6 Options in terms of the provision of new facilities for the Region.
  - The Draft Plan offers 6 possible options at the consultation stage and should therefore perhaps give more of a steer on the preferred options.

- What will be done with the waste once processed into a recycle?
  - How will the preferred option be delivered and what are the financial cost implications.
- 5.18 The Chairman thanked each Authority for their summaries and invited DCC to respond.
- 5.19 GB advised that it was the intention of DCC to take on board the main issues which had been raised by the RTG and to include the main issues in the Draft Plan, which would go out to consultation. He also stated that it was hoped that the RMG and the RTG could agree to the Draft Plan subject to the amendments and allow DCC to undertake the required changes and then send the Draft Plan out to formal consultation. The formal consultation period would allow everyone on the RTG and RMG another opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan.
- 5.20 GJ handed out a graph and table which illustrated the options in respect of the regional requirements in more detail and to show an example of the changes that would be undertaken to the Plan. He also advised that similar tables would be produced for the individual Authorities in the Region (except Snowdonia which will be included in data for Conwy and Gwynedd) to illustrate the forecast capacities of waste facilities and the numbers of facilities required in respect of each option.
- 5.21 A general discussion followed and Members felt there was a need for some major publicity to get people on board, possibly a TV advert from the Welsh Assembly Government.
- 5.22 WAG responded stating that they were funding a campaign through Waste Awareness Wales and that the coordinator, B. Maine, had been involved in "Big Bin" road shows in Anglesey, Denbighshire and Gwynedd which involved representatives from the various Authorities and which were geared towards raising general awareness about waste issues. Similar road-shows had also taken place in the other Regions. It was also advised that B. Maine was working on a national media campaign which includes TV and Radio advertising. Funds have been designated from landfill tax credit scheme to pay for the national advertising.
- 5.23 WAG also stated the importance of the Regional Waste Plans and that it was a requirement that the waste policies of the Unitary Development Plans of the individual Authorities are updated in accordance with the requirements of the Regional Waste Plan.
- 5.24 Other issues discussed by the Group included the need to win over the Public as well as Industry and commerce and make them aware of their responsibilities as waste producers.
- 5.25 GB thanked all Authorities for their ongoing support and stated that North Wales are showing that they are responsible as a Region and are taking the Plan very seriously indeed, and that this had been illustrated by the excellent attendance at meetings as well as the input from both Groups.
- 5.26 Cllr M. German (Chair) proposed that the Plan be agreed subject to the amendments which would take account the issues summarized by RTG members so that it could then go out to consultation during the first week of September. An issue was raised that maybe the Draft Plan should favour or give a steer on which option the region should agree to. Following a further discussion it was advised that it had already been previously agreed to consult on all 6 options. However, it was also advised that it would be made clear in the Draft Plan the scoring for each option following the various assessments which would illustrate the highest and lowest scoring options.

5.27 The RTG and RMG members then voted unanimously to agree to the Draft Plan (subject to amendments) to go out to formal consultation and were happy for DCC to incorporate all the necessary changes.

5.28 It was also agreed that the next meeting would also be a joint meeting and DCC advised that this would be likely to be arranged for late November 2003 and the meeting would be similar to this meeting, with each Authority and organization on the RTG summarizing their comments on the final version of the Plan.

6. **Any other Business**

6.1 Cathy O'Brien advised that Hazardous Waste is a planning issue that is bigger than any individual region can address on its own and in this respect, Members were reminded that WAG are holding a Seminar on Hazardous Waste at the Maes Mawr Hotel on the 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2003. Invitations to go out shortly. There will be an opportunity to look at material recovery facility in Powys in the afternoon.

The meeting closed at 3.30pm

7. **ACTIONS**

ISSUE	ACTION DCC	ACTION OTHERS
Consultation Booklet and Consultation Posters	To consult RTG asap on questionnaire only. Booklet and Posters to be distributed to RTG in September 2003.	RTG to circulate posters and booklets in accordance with agreed consultation requirements.
Consultation Flyer	DCC to distribute flyers to industry and pressure groups on behalf of the Region.	RTG to provide DCC with details of pressure groups and industries asap.
Draft North Wales Regional Waste Plan.	DCC to incorporate changes and to send to RTG by end of September 2003.	Authorities on RTG to make available for public inspection at their planning offices and main libraries.