



# The Planning Inspectorate Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

**The Planning Act 2008**

**Application by Whitemoss Landfill Limited**

**The construction of a new landfill void for the disposal of hazardous wastes and continuation of filling at the existing Whitemoss Landfill**

**Examining Authority's Report of Findings and Conclusions**

**and**

**Recommendation to the  
Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

---

**Wendy Burden  
Philip Asquith  
Robert Macey**

**Examining Authority**

**21 February 2015**

This page intentionally left blank



**ERRATA SHEET – Whitemoss Landfill- Ref. WS010003**

**Examining Authority’s Report of Findings and Conclusions and  
Recommendation to the Secretary of State for Communities and  
Local Government**

**Corrections agreed by the Examining Authority prior to a decision  
being made**

**Main Report**

<b>Paragraph</b>	<b>Correction</b>
4.35	On the seventh line, for ‘met’ substitute ‘meet’.
4.182	For ‘Requirement 19(1)’ substitute ‘Requirement 19’.
6.17	In the first line of the quotation, omit the word ‘for’.
7.11	In the second bullet point, for ‘(r13)’ substitute ‘(r32)’.
7.14	In the penultimate line, for ‘r32(b)(ii)’ substitute ‘r32(2)(b)’
7.18	In the seventh line, for ‘AS-056’ substitute ‘APP-S106-03’.

**Appendix**

<b>Paragraph/ line</b>	<b>Correction</b>
Appendix 1 RR0687	‘Daniel hunt’ should read ‘Daniel Hunt’
Appendix 1 RR0700	‘Daniel wood’ should read ‘Daniel Wood’
Appendix 1 RR3237	‘west lancashire poultry ltd’ should read ‘West Lancashire Poultry Ltd’

**Examining Authority's findings and conclusions and recommendation in respect of the construction of a new landfill void and continuation of filling at the existing landfill at Whitemoss Landfill, White Moss Lane South, Skelmersdale**

**File Ref WS010003**

The application, dated 20 December 2013, was made under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 and was received in full by The Planning Inspectorate on 20 December 2013.

The Applicant is Whitemoss Landfill Limited.

The application was accepted for examination on 17 January 2014.

On the 17 March 2014, Wendy Burden was appointed to be the Examining Authority (ExA) for the examination of this application. The application was made by Whitemoss<sup>1</sup> Landfill Limited for the extension and continuation of landfill with hazardous waste at Whitemoss Landfill.

The examination of the application began on 21 May 2014 and was completed on 21 November 2014.

On the 8 July 2014, Philip Asquith and Robert Macey were appointed as two further members of a panel of three led by Wendy Burden under s68 of the Planning Act 2008. The panel became the ExA for the examination of the application from that date onwards under s62.

The development proposed comprises:

- (a) The construction of a new western landfill void for the disposal of the same range of hazardous wastes as at the existing Whitemoss Landfill site at an input rate of up to 150,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) supported by the existing site infrastructure.
- (b) The continuation of filling at the existing Whitemoss Landfill site with hazardous waste.
- (c) As part of the creation of the western landfill void, the extraction and stockpiling of clay and mudstones for use in the construction of the engineered containment system at the site and for exportation.
- (d) As part of the creation of the western landfill void, the extraction, stockpiling and exportation of general fill materials for use in the construction industry.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Applicant company and the existing landfill site are called Whitemoss Landfill, whereas the place name as given on sign posts within the locality and shown on OS maps is White Moss. We therefore refer to White Moss except where we are referring to the Applicant company and existing landfill site.

- (e) As part of the creation of the western landfill void, the extraction and exportation of coal.

**Summary of Recommendation:**

The Examining Authority recommends that subject to the measures which we identify at 8.12(i) and (ii), the Secretary of State should make the Order in the form attached.

## **Section Contents**

1	INTRODUCTION .....	6
2	MAIN FEATURES OF THE PROPOSAL AND SITE.....	9
3	LEGAL AND POLICY CONTEXT .....	15
4	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN RELATION TO POLICY AND FACTUAL ISSUES .....	18
5	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN RELATION TO HABITATS REGULATIONS .....	88
6	COMPULSORY ACQUISITION.....	89
7	RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO) .....	101
8	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	107

## **Appendices Contents**

1	EXAMINATION LIBRARY
2	EVENTS IN THE EXAMINATION
3	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
4	RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The proposed development is a landfill facility for the disposal of hazardous waste in England with a capacity in excess of 100,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) and therefore is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) as defined by s14(1)(p) and s30 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008).
- 1.2 Sections 14 and 30 of the PA2008 provide a clear legal definition of a NSIP, which is dependent upon the capacity of the proposed development. The proposal is for a development with a capacity in excess of 100,000 tpa, and it has been accepted by the SoS as falling within the definition contained in the PA2008.
- 1.3 We addressed the issue of whether the application should be considered as an NSIP in the Notice of Procedural Decisions published on the 30 May 2014 under Rule 8 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) [DEC-G-05].
- 1.4 A number of submissions argued that the likely input rates of hazardous waste would be below 100,000 tpa. [EV-PM-009 and others] This submission was contested by the Applicant [eg REP-1Q-11]. We consider the implications of potentially lower rates of hazardous waste deposits upon the impacts of the proposal as one of the main issues in the examination in Section 4 [4.129]
- 1.5 The main events of the examination and procedural decisions taken during the examination are listed in detail in Appendix 2. We visited the environs of the site and other locations referred to in representations, such as Beacon Country Park, on a number of occasions throughout the examination on an unaccompanied basis. We carried out an accompanied site inspection on the 15 October 2014 [EV-PM-025].
- 1.6 References in the report to Articles or Requirements mean the Articles in the recommended Development Consent Order (DCO) or the Requirements in Schedule 2 (Appendix 4). Any reference in the text to former numbered Articles means the Article as numbered in the application draft DCO [APP-DCO-01].
- 1.7 The DCO application was accompanied by a draft agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) [APP-s106-01]. The agreement was subject to discussion and amendment during the examination and was submitted as a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) [APP-s106-03] before the close of the examination. We consider the provisions of the UU in Section 4.
- 1.8 Some 3,280 relevant representations were received within the statutory period. Of these, the overwhelming majority were opposed to the project, with submissions on environmental harm and harm to health being most frequent.

- 1.9 Representations were made to the examination that the application was not properly made, submitting that the Applicant had not (in relation to the proposed application that became the application) complied with Section 2 of Part 5 of the PA2008 and particularly the duty to consult landowners as set out in s42(1)(d) [EV-PM-024, AS-008, and others]. This submission was contested by the Applicant [EV-PM-026 and others].
- 1.10 This matter was addressed in the Notice of Procedural Decisions under Rule 8 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) published on the 30 May 2014 [DEC-G-05]. The Secretary of State accepted the application for examination on 17 January 2014, having reached the conclusion that the Applicant had complied with Section 2 of Part 5 of the PA2008. We have no remit to review that decision.
- 1.11 We deal with notifications of persons required under s56(2)(d) including the matter of persons within Category 3 of s57 of the PA2008 within Section 6 on Compulsory Acquisition.
- 1.12 We carefully considered the submissions on this and all the other matters that were made to us, as they were made, and particularly noting the other consultation and notification activities that took place throughout the process.
- 1.13 To ensure that all interested parties in the project had every opportunity to participate in the examination, we exercised discretion and accepted late submissions throughout the examination until it closed on 21 November 2014.
- 1.14 In addition, we exercised the fullest discretion available to us to accept both written and oral submissions from parties who were not interested parties, at all stages of the examination.
- 1.15 In order to assemble further information on matters raised in submissions for the deadline of the 26 June, a change was made to the examination timetable under Rule 8 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) by letter dated 9 July 2014[DEC-G-06]. The dates for the accompanied site inspection and issue specific hearings were amended to follow the receipt of responses to the ExA's second round of questions.
- 1.16 The Applicant has agreed Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) with West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC) [PD-L-05, PD-L-09], Lancashire County Council (LCC) [PD-L-05, PD-L-08, PD-L-11], the Coal Authority [PD-L-03], the Environment Agency (EA) [PD-L-04 , PD-L-13], and Natural England (NE) [PD-L-06, PD-L-12]. We also note the correspondence sent by Public Health England to the Applicant, dated 10 July 2014, on areas of common ground between them [PD-L-07].



- 1.17 In addition to consent required under the PA2008 (the subject of this report and recommendation), the proposed development will require other consents and permits for its construction and operation. These include:
- A variation of the Environmental Permit (EP) for the operation of the existing Whitemoss Landfill [DP3639LM issued 18 September 2008], to include the new western extension.
  - A Surface Mining Operating Licence for the extraction of coal reserves which exist within the land proposed to be excavated to form the western extension.
- 1.18 An application for a variation to the EP, with reference EPR/DP3639LM/V005, has been received by the EA. It was confirmed as duly made by the EA on 23 September 2014 [PD-L-13]; and a period of public consultation was undertaken which began on 5 November 2014 and which closed on 2 January 2015. The application had not been determined at the close of the examination.
- 1.19 This report sets out in accordance with s74(2)(b)(i) of the PA2008 our findings and conclusions in respect of the application and our recommendation to the SoS under s74(2)(b)(ii) of the PA2008.

## **2 MAIN FEATURES OF THE PROPOSAL AND SITE**

### **The application site**

- 2.1 The application relates to an area of just under 25ha [APP-REP-03 3.2] at White Moss Road South, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TH within the borough of West Lancashire and the county of Lancashire. It includes the current Whitemoss Landfill which is centred approximately on national grid reference SD 47046 05064 [APP-ES-02 para 2.1 and Figures ES 1 and ES 2].
- 2.2 Located within an area of largely agricultural, open land the site lies to the south of the M58 Motorway between Junctions 3 and 4. The M58 runs parallel to the northern boundary of the site from east to west in this location, with White Moss Road South between the M58 and the northern boundary of the site. The town of Skelmersdale lies immediately to the north of the M58. The market town of Ormskirk lies to the north-west of the site, and within closer proximity, the village of Bickerstaffe lies to the west of the site, with Rainford Junction and the village of Rainford to the south [APP-ES-02 Figure ES 1]. The site lies approximately 12km directly west of Wigan.
- 2.3 The current hazardous waste landfill site (including a waste interceptor facility and other associated infrastructure) is located within the eastern section of the application site. This covers an area of approximately 8.5ha including a landfilling area of 6ha. The existing planning permission [08/11/0716] under which Whitemoss Landfill operates requires the use to cease in 2018 and the land to be restored by 2019.
- 2.4 In addition to the existing landfill site, the application site includes a large area of surrounding land to the west and north-west which is referred to in submissions as the western extension. The land comprises marsh/marshy grassland and semi improved grassland. The western extension has an area of approximately 16.5ha, and would provide an additional landfill area of about 12ha.
- 2.5 Within the area of the western extension there is a colliery spoil heap, and a residential property, The Cottage, which is located near the spoil heap. The dwelling is included within the landfill site and is proposed to be demolished. Peel Farm with its agricultural outbuildings is owned by Whitemoss Landfill Ltd and is located next to the northern boundary of the western landfill area between the site and White Moss Road South.
- 2.6 There are three further residential properties which lie to the south of White Moss Road South (nos 64, 66, and 68a). These properties directly adjoin the application site, along its northern boundary. There are a number of large industrial units immediately north of the M58 on the Gillibrands Industrial Estate. To the west of these, and immediately north of the proposed

extension to the existing landfill site, lies a primarily residential area of Skelmersdale, within which the nearest residential properties are about 110m north of the northern boundary of the site [APP-ES-02 19.3.1].

- 2.7 A field drain (the Rainford Drain) crosses the site from south to north and enters the M58 drainage system. The Trans-Pennine Ethylene Pipeline, operated by SABIC<sup>2</sup>, runs along the south-western boundary of the site [APP-ES-02 Figure ES 4] and, further south, there is an overhead power line.
- 2.8 To the east of the site lies a Highways Agency maintenance compound (the Glenburn Compound). East of this the White Moss Business Park is located adjacent to and south of the junction between White Moss Road South and Moss Lane. There are several residential properties to the east of the Business Park beyond which are further dwellings in White Moss. Several individual residential properties are located to the south of the site, the closest of which are Higherend Farm, Moss Side Cottages and Gorsoy Bank, about 600m to the south of the site boundary [APP-ES-02 Figure ES.2].
- 2.9 The land to the south and the west of the application site is currently in use for agricultural purposes. A public footpath (FP44/FP45) runs in a north-westerly to south-easterly direction from White Moss Road South adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. FP66 runs along part of White Moss Road South some 40m to the west of the western boundary.
- 2.10 Access to the new landfill site would continue to be gained from the existing access from White Moss Road South. The length of White Moss Road South from the site access eastwards to the T junction, between White Moss Road South and Moss Lane has been widened by Whitemoss Landfill Ltd under a Highways Agreement [APP-Rep-03 3.6] to provide for vehicles accessing the landfill site. There are no residential properties between the site access and Moss Lane.
- 2.11 The Civil Aviation Authority considers that as there would be limited above-ground-level development, the project would be unlikely to constitute an aviation en-route obstruction [RR-00563]. The Ministry of Defence and National Air Traffic Services (NATS) confirmed that they have no safeguarding objections to the proposed development [APP-ES-2, para 2.9].
- 2.12 The location of sites with statutory (and non-statutory) ecological designations relative to the application site is shown in plan APP-Plan-09, the closest being the Nipe Lane and Ferny Knoll Bog. These Biological Heritage Sites are approximately 800m to the

---

<sup>2</sup> A global petrochemical manufacturer

south-east, beyond the White Moss Business Park and White Moss Lane Farm [Refs 8 and 9 within APP-Plan-09].

- 2.13 The Martin Mere RAMSAR<sup>3</sup> and Special Protection Area (SPA) site is approximately 10km to the north-west, and the Ravenhead Brickworks Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is approximately 3.6km to the east, on the opposing side of Skelmersdale [Refs 1 and 2 within APP-PLAN-09].
- 2.14 The location of identified heritage assets relative to the application site is shown on plan APP-Plan-08. There are three Grade II listed buildings within 2.5km of the site to the north and north-east, within Skelmersdale.
- 2.15 The Bickerstaffe Hall Scheduled Monument to the south-west and the Spa Roughs Wood Scheduled Monument to the north are the closest designated monuments, at approximately 2.5km and 3km away from the site respectively.

### **Planning history**

- 2.16 The existing Whitemoss Landfill consists of two separately consented and permitted uses which comprise a hazardous waste landfill site and a waste interceptor treatment facility.
- 2.17 The site has a long history of peat working with subsequent backfilling of the void and raising of levels using imported wastes. In 1987 planning permission was granted by Lancashire County Council (LCC) as the waste planning authority to landfill waste other than inert material into the site (ref 8/85/0527). Since that decision there have been successive extensions to the operational period of the landfill [PD-L-01, s4]. Planning permission for the completion of backfilling with inert, domestic, industrial and hazardous wastes was granted in 1992 which required infilling to be completed by August 1997 (ref 8/92/622).
- 2.18 An extension to the site which was permitted in 1997 required landfilling to cease by 30 June 2004, with restoration within a period of a further 12 months (ref 8/96/0993). Condition 1 of that permission was modified by a subsequent permission which allowed operations to continue to June 2007 (ref 8/96/0993); and a further two years for restoration was permitted in 2003 (ref 8/02/1218).
- 2.19 A further variation to condition 1 was permitted in 2006 to allow operations to continue until June 2013 (ref 8/06/0918). The waste interceptor treatment facility was granted permission in 2009 (ref 8/09/717), and the time period for the retention of the plant was extended in 2011.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Ramsar Convention is an international treaty for the conservation and sustainable utilization of wetlands

2.20 Whitemoss Landfill currently operates under planning permissions reference 08/11/0716 in respect of the landfill site and 08/11/0715 in respect of the waste interceptor treatment facility, granted in October 2011. These permissions require the operation of the site to cease by 31 December 2018, and that restoration must be completed by 31 December 2019.

**The present application**

2.21 The authorised project, comprising the authorised development together with associated development and ancillary works, is set out in Schedule 1 of the recommended DCO. Part 1 to Schedule 1 describes the authorised development. In summary, the main elements comprise:

- The construction of a new hazardous waste landfill facility for the disposal at a direct input rate of up to 150,000 tonnes per annum (tpa), of the same range of hazardous waste as in the current landfill operation.
- The retention of the environmental management infrastructure including leachate collection, treatment and lagoon system, and the gas flare until no longer necessary.
- As part of the creation of the western landfill void, the extraction, stockpiling and exportation of clay, mudstones, coal and other suitable materials including general fill materials and all other associated engineering works to construct the landfill phases.

Part 2 identifies authorised works that are associated with or ancillary to those works and includes:

- The continuation of the filling with hazardous waste of the existing landfill as described in the application.
- An extension to the operational life to 2035 of the interceptor waste treatment facility for the treatment of waste with the current hazardous waste input of 20,000 tpa.

2.22 Much of the Part 2 works would constitute the retention of existing infrastructure such as wheel cleaning facilities, weighbridge, offices and car parking associated with the existing Whitemoss Landfill.

2.23 The proposal is for the western landfill area to be excavated in four phases. The extent and phasing of the proposed works are shown on the works plan [APP-Plan-02]. It is proposed that existing structures in the western area would be demolished, and the Rainford Drain would be diverted.

2.24 The construction and operation of the proposed landfill would require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment

Agency (EA), which would specify construction techniques, along with environmental controls, monitoring and management activities throughout and beyond the operational life of the scheme. Much of the precise detail of the proposed engineering operations would therefore be governed by the requirements of the EP.

- 2.25 Excavated material is proposed to be stored on site, either for beneficial use on-site (such as clay for use as a lining material) or until exported for beneficial use elsewhere (such as mudstone for use in brickmaking).
- 2.26 Given geological conditions, as each phase is excavated and subsequently during landfilling operations, there is likely to be groundwater ingress into the created void. The application therefore anticipates dewatering activities during the operation of the scheme. Water is proposed to be discharged from the site through an extended surface water management system [APP-ES-06]. The extent to which controls would be exercised through the DCO during the excavation of minerals and coal is reported in Section 4 [4.98; 4.115; 4.127]. The treatment and management of the discharged water would also be subject to environmental controls which are the responsibility of the EA. We deal with the controls exercised by the EA and those which would be exercised through the DCO if made, in Section 4.
- 2.27 There are known to be two abandoned mineshafts in Phase B of the application site. It is a requirement of the recommended DCO that these be subject to treatment and capping prior to any excavation below 65m AOD of adjacent areas (App 4 r12).
- 2.28 The proposal would accommodate an input rate of 150,000 tpa. Importation of waste would be by road, using goods vehicles accessing the site via the current Whitemoss Landfill access on White Moss Road South. In accordance with current operating practice, and as required by the DCO, the access would be via junction 4 of the M58 onto Moss Lane, approaching the site from the east, and not from the west.
- 2.29 The DCO as recommended would require that landfilling and the operation of the interceptor facility cease by 2035, and that restoration of the site be complete by 2036. The DCO as recommended would allow for (and require in accordance with r32) revisions to the phasing of the works to ensure that the restoration of the site is delivered by that date [App 4].
- 2.30 The application site would then be restored in line with the submitted restoration plan, which was amended in agreement with NE [APP-Plan-03; PD-L-06; PD-L-12 ]. This includes a mixture of species-rich grassland/meadow, scrub pockets and broadleaf woodland, with peripheral marshland/moss habitats including ponds, scrapes and ditches using soils available at the site. The

restored landfill site would be subject to on-going management activities as required by the EP. These would include leachate management, water and air quality monitoring. Post-restoration management and monitoring would continue until such time as the EA considered that the White Moss site was no longer a potential source of pollution.

### **3 LEGAL AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 3.1 The legal and policy context for the application is set out in the Applicant's Planning Statement [APP-REF-03] and in the Environmental Statement [APP-ES-02].

#### **Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) and National Policy Statements**

- 3.2 The application is for a Development Consent Order under the PA2008, and falls within the definition of a nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP) in accordance with s14(1)(p) and s30 of the Act. The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Hazardous Waste of June 2013 applies as the designated NPS and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government must decide the application in accordance with the NPS under s104 of the Act.

#### **European Requirements and Related UK Regulations**

##### ***Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC)***

- 3.3 The Habitats Directive together with the Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds (Wild Birds Directive) forms the cornerstone of Europe's nature conservation policy. It is built around two pillars: the Natura 2000 network of protected sites and the strict system of species protection. The Directive protects over 1000 animals and plant species and over 200 habitat types (for example: special types of forests, meadows, wetlands, etc.), which are of European importance.
- 3.4 A Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment [APP-REP-02] was carried out for the application and we deal with the matter of whether a Habitats Regulation Assessment is required in Section 5, and all other matters relating to ecology, later in the report [4.248 et seq].

##### ***Landfill Directive***

- 3.5 The Waste Framework Directive (European Parliament and Council 2008/98/EC), also known as the revised Landfill Directive (LD), applies to all proposals for the disposal of waste by landfill. This requires that in the management of waste, more is sent for reuse, recycling and recovery with landfill being used only as the last resort. The NPS has taken into account the requirements of the LD [NPS 2.3.2-2.3.7], and relevant sections of the Directive are implemented through the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 (as amended).

##### ***Water Framework Directive***

- 3.6 On 23 October 2000, the Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the



Community action in the field of water policy or in short, the EU Water Framework Directive (the WFD), was adopted.

- 3.7 A hydrogeological risk assessment is being reviewed by the EA as part of its consideration of the application for an Environmental Permit (EP). The EA confirms that as part of its consideration of the EP, it will only issue an EP if it considers that the application complies with relevant sections of the LD and of the WFD as implemented through the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 [PD-L-13 3.2]. Water quality monitoring would be subject to the requirements of the EP.

### **Other Legal and Policy Provisions**

- 3.8 Our assessment of the main issues in Section 4 of the report gives consideration to other statutory requirements, as set out below, where appropriate.

### ***National policy and legislation***

- 3.9 Other national policy statements which are important and relevant in this case include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the recently published National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW).
- 3.10 In addition, the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, and the Waste Strategy for England 2007, are relevant to the application project.

### ***The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)***

- 3.11 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 is the primary legislation which protects animals, plants, and certain habitats in the UK. The Act provides for the notification and confirmation of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). These sites are identified for their flora, fauna, geological or physiographical features by the countryside conservation bodies, in this case Natural England (NE). The Act also contains measures for the protection and management of SSSIs.
- 3.12 The Act is divided into four parts: Part I relating to the protection of wildlife, Part II relating to the designation of SSSIs and other designations, Part III on public rights of way and Part IV on miscellaneous provisions. If a species protected under Part I is likely to be affected by development, a protected species licence will be required from NE.
- 3.13 The Act has relevance to consideration of impacts on SSSIs and on protected species and habitats.

### ***Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006***

- 3.14 The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) made provision for bodies concerned with the natural environment and rural communities in connection with wildlife sites, SSSIs, National Parks and the Broads. It includes a duty that every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard so far as is consistent with the proper exercising of those functions to the purpose of biodiversity. In complying with this, regard must be given to the United Nations Environment Programme Convention on Biological Diversity of 1992.
- 3.15 This is of relevance to biodiversity, biological environment and ecology and landscape matters in the proposed development.

### **Local Impact Reports (LIRs)**

- 3.16 There is a requirement under s60(2) of the PA2008 to give notice in writing to each local authority falling under s56A inviting them to submit LIRs. This notice was given on 22 April 2014 [DEC-G-03].
- 3.17 LIRs have been submitted by Lancashire County Council (LCC) and West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC) [PD-L-01 and PD-L-02]. The principal matters raised in the LIRs are set out in Section 4 of our report. The Secretary of State must have regard to these in his decision.

### **The Development Plan**

- 3.18 The Local Development Framework documents comprise the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework Core Strategy, the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Allocation and Development Management Policies, and the West Lancashire Borough Local Plan 2012-2027. The relevant policies are set out in LIRs submitted by LCC [PD-L-01] and WLBC [PD-L-02]. We consider relevant development plan policies in Section 4.
- 3.19 Section 104(3) of the PA2008 requires that the SoS must decide an application for hazardous waste infrastructure in accordance with the relevant NPS [NPS 1.1.2]. Therefore, in the event of any conflict between the policies of the development plan and the NPS, the NPS takes priority.

## **4 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN RELATION TO POLICY AND FACTUAL ISSUES**

4.1 An initial assessment of the principal issues was published with the Notice of the Preliminary Meeting on the 22 April 2014 [DEC-G-03 Annex C]. The issues are those arising from the consideration by the Examining Authority (ExA) of the application documents and the relevant representations received in response to the notification of the accepted application carried out by the Applicant in accordance with s56 of the 2008 Act.

4.2 As the examination progressed, the issues became more clearly defined and other issues raised at the Preliminary Meeting and through written submissions and hearings were considered where relevant.

### **Issues arising from written submissions**

4.3 From the written submissions, issues of importance<sup>4</sup> to interested parties include:

- (i) Whether National Policy should be interpreted as stating that the need for nationally significant hazardous waste landfill sites has been demonstrated.
- (ii) Whether there is certainty that the proposed landfill would be completed within 20 years in accordance with the proposed DCO and its requirements, and the implications if it were not.
- (iii) The impacts of the proposed development on the health and well-being of the local community.
- (iv) Whether the proposed scheme would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- (v) If the scheme does constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations, such as to constitute the very special circumstances required for development consent to be granted.
- (vi) The extent to which environmental issues relating to the landfill operation, including impacts on ground and surface water resources, are matters to be dealt with in the DCO or to be determined through the environmental permitting regime.
- (vii) Whether the hydrogeological setting of the application site is appropriate for a hazardous waste landfill site.
- (viii) The impact of the proposed development on:
  - Agricultural land, including the potential impact on the quality and saleability of crops raised on adjoining land.
  - Residential amenity.
  - Recreational activities.
  - The local economy and tourism.

---

<sup>4</sup> The list of issues is not set out in any order of priority.

- Landscape and visual amenity.
- Wildlife and habitats.
- Highway considerations.

4.4 The above list of issues informed the questions that we asked in the first and second round questions (FRQ and SRQ). They were also matters that were examined at the Issue Specific Hearings (ISH) on Policy and Need, Environment, and DCO and at the Open Floor Hearings (OFH).

### **Issues arising in Local Impact Reports (LIRs)**

4.5 LIRs were submitted by Lancashire County Council (LCC) [PD-L-01] and West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC)[PD-L-02]. The issues set out in the LIRs by the Councils include:

- That the site does not have the ability to attract the volumes of waste necessary to meet the threshold of capacity set out in s30 of the PA2008 for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), and therefore it should not be accepted as an NSIP.
- Any shortfall in deposits would have implications for the restoration of the landfill site by 2036 as required by the proposed DCO.
- LCC considers that any loss of openness to the Green Belt would be limited in duration and of minimal impact and therefore the development would not be inappropriate. WLBC does not agree and considers the development would harm the openness of the Green Belt both during operation and following restoration. It would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- Suitability of the geological setting and impacts on water resources.
- Landscape and visual impact, having regard to the character of the landscape in which the site is located and the proximity of residential properties and public footpaths.
- Impact on best and most versatile agricultural land.
- Impacts on health with associated noise, air quality and odour concerns, having regard to the proximity of nearby residential properties.
- Socio-economic impacts, in particular the image of Skelmersdale and the impact on the White Moss Business Park.

4.6 Among the issues raised in the LIR, LCC concluded that an adequate depth of mineral extraction would take place to avoid unacceptable sterilisation of mineral reserves. The Council is satisfied that there would be limited impacts on ecological interests, the local highway network, the historic environment and water resources provided that issues are addressed satisfactorily. LCC also considered that impacts on landscape and the Green Belt would be acceptable.

- 4.7 WLBC is satisfied that the development would not affect the setting of any listed building or the character of any conservation area. It is also satisfied that archaeological interests would be addressed through a requirement in the DCO, which is included as Requirement (r)11(App 4).

### **Issues addressed in the Report**

- 4.8 We took into account all the matters raised by the local authorities, interested parties and other submissions. In this Section we report on those matters under the following headings:

- Conformity with NPSs and other key policy statements.
- Conformity with other relevant policies.
- Environmental Statement (ES).
- The relationship between planning and environmental permitting.
- Geological setting and impact on water resources.
- The completion and restoration of the application site within the timescale of the DCO.
- Health.
- Socio-economic impacts.
- Design.
- Landscape and visual impact.
- Wildlife, habitats and agricultural Land.
- General and residential amenity.
- Traffic and transport.
- Other matters.
- Appropriateness and necessity of any planning obligations with LPAs.
- Conclusions on the main issues and whether very special circumstances exist.

### **Conformity with NPSs and other key policy statements**

- 4.9 In accordance with s104(3) of the PA2008, the application falls to be considered against the National Policy Statement for Hazardous Waste June 2013(NPS). The NPS states [NPS para 1.2.1] that it provides the policy for nationally significant hazardous waste infrastructure as set out in s30 of the PA2008.
- 4.10 There was some debate at the ISH on Policy and Need as to whether the NPS was the most up-to-date and relevant policy statement against which the determination of the application should be made [REP-17 Nov 07 and others]. However, s104(3) of the 2008 Act states that the Secretary of State (SoS) must decide the application in accordance with the relevant NPS subject to the exceptions set out in subsections (4) - (8).
- 4.11 Subsections (4)-(8) of the PA2008 include:
- Where such a determination would lead to the United Kingdom (UK) being in breach of its international obligations.

- Where such a determination would lead the SoS to be in breach of any duty imposed on the SoS by or under any enactment.
  - Where the SoS is satisfied that the adverse impact of the proposed development would outweigh its benefits.
  - Where the SoS is satisfied that any condition prescribed for deciding an application otherwise than in accordance with a NPS is met.
- 4.12 The NPS is the primary basis for decision-making on hazardous waste NSIPs [NPS para 1.1.1]; it has been subject to an Appraisal of Sustainability [NPS para 1.4.1]; and it has taken account of policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the former Planning Policy Statement 10<sup>5</sup>. The NPS states at para 4.1.5 that "in the event of a conflict between these or any other documents and this NPS, the NPS prevails for purposes of decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure".
- 4.13 At the Preliminary Meeting and during the examination, LCC, WLBC, ARROW<sup>6</sup>, CPRE and a number of interested parties [REP-2QC-09; EV-G-06] questioned the need for the application scheme. As they argue, the existing Whitemoss Landfill facility has an Environmental Permit (EP) to deposit 150,000 tpa of hazardous waste. However, for the period since 2006 when waste deposited at the site was first restricted to hazardous waste, less than 100,000 tpa of waste has been taken for disposal. The Applicant argued at the ISH on Policy and Need that the application should be considered anew, and that the past performance of the existing facility is not relevant. Nevertheless, we address the implications of the past history of the site, and the consequences of not achieving deposits of 150,000 tpa, later in this Section [4.129 et seq].
- 4.14 The issue of need is addressed in the NPS and summarised in s3.1. The need for hazardous waste management infrastructure is stated to be essential for public health and a clean environment. There remain significant hazardous waste arisings in spite of the measures taken to prevent and minimize the production of hazardous waste, and new facilities are required to deal with them.
- 4.15 The NPS states that the production of hazardous waste has not declined significantly during the economic downturn. Some 3.3m tonnes of hazardous waste were consigned in 2010 and arisings are expected to increase as the economy improves. There remain products for which there is no alternative but to use a hazardous component, and future increases are expected "*due to increasing use of producer responsibility schemes, changes to the list of*

---

<sup>5</sup> This has now been replaced by the National Planning Policy for Waste October 2014

<sup>6</sup> Action to Reduce and Recycle Our Waste

*hazardous properties in the revised Waste Framework Directive and forthcoming changes to the European Waste List" (NPS para 3.2.2).*

- 4.16 It is stated in NPS s3.1 that the SoS *"will assess applications for infrastructure covered by this NPS on the basis that need has been demonstrated"*. Need is therefore to be taken as established for the application project regardless of the past history of the existing landfill site.
- 4.17 The availability of hazardous waste infrastructure is required to support a wide range of activities including households, businesses of all types, and public services such as the health service and schools. Large quantities are produced by the chemical and oil industries and by construction and demolition work (NPS para 3.2.1). To comply with principles of self-sufficiency and proximity in Article 18 of European Council Directive 2008/98/EC on Waste, known as the revised Waste Framework Directive, NPS para 3.3.3 states that *"sufficient disposal facilities must be provided in England to match expected arisings of all hazardous wastes"*.
- 4.18 In view of the importance of hazardous waste infrastructure to support economic activities and public services, and the requirement for England to be self-sufficient in disposal facilities, we give considerable weight to the need for the application project.
- 4.19 Submissions by ARROW [REP-W-04] argue that the SoS would potentially be in breach of the revised Waste Framework Directive if the White Moss Landfill DCO is made. The NPS recognises that the Government must meet its obligations under European legislation, and NPS para 2.3.1 refers to the *"stringent legislative controls"* which are in place to control the management of waste with hazardous properties. Those controls are exercised by the EA through the issue of EPs which set conditions for the operation of the facility, including the types and treatment of the waste, and the specific emission limits and conditions relating to any need to keep activities away from sensitive receptors.
- 4.20 ARROW argues that potential environmental impacts of the landfill operation are matters for the DCO to control [REP-1Q-01]. However, NPS para 4.7.3 states that the decision maker should *"focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and on the impacts of that use, rather than the control of processes, emissions or discharges themselves."* Furthermore, the decision maker *"should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. It should act as a complement but not seek to duplicate it."* We consider the arguments put forward by ARROW and the extent to which matters of concern should be dealt with through the DCO later in this Section [4.95 – 4.128].

- 4.21 The implementation of the "Waste Hierarchy" identified in the revised Waste Framework Directive is included within the Government's policy objectives for hazardous waste (NPS para 2.3.2-3). The landfill of hazardous waste is intended by the NPS to be adopted only when all other means of disposal have been ruled out as not possible. Of the disposal options available, landfilling of hazardous waste should only be used as a last resort. ARROW argues that the provision of new landfill facilities will increase the amount of hazardous waste which is disposed of to landfill rather than encourage its disposal through other options higher up the waste hierarchy [REP-2QC-09; EV-G-06]
- 4.22 LCC [PD-L-01 para 5.6], ARROW and others [REP-2QC-09; EV-IS3-05] do not consider that the Applicant has adequately addressed the waste hierarchy question. It is a Principle of the Strategy for Hazardous Waste Management in England to reduce reliance on landfill, with landfill only being used where, overall, there is no better recovery or disposal option (NPS para 3.4.13). NPS para 4.20.1 states that new hazardous waste landfill facilities should only be proposed for waste which cannot be managed in an alternative way higher up the waste hierarchy before making an application for development consent.
- 4.23 However, the NPS does not seek to identify the number, type or location of facilities to be provided. It is the Government's strategy<sup>7</sup>, as confirmed in NPS para 2.4.2, to look to the market to bring forward the necessary infrastructure to meet the need for the management of hazardous waste. The NPS establishes the need for new facilities.
- 4.24 Compliance with the waste hierarchy is achieved through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011<sup>8</sup>. The Regulations require waste producers to confirm that they have applied the waste management hierarchy when consigning their wastes for disposal. As evidence of this, a declaration is included on waste transfer and consignment notes, which is a legal undertaking to confirm that the principles of the waste hierarchy have been met. Wastes would only be accepted at the application site where these procedures have been followed [APP-REP-03].
- 4.25 A further objective of the revised Waste Framework Directive which was raised by ARROW and others [REP-1Q-01; REP-1RC-01] relates to the proximity principle, as summarised in NPS 2.3.5-2.3.7. The revised Waste Framework Directive envisaged a network of installations to enable waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies. Such an approach is necessary to avoid EU Member States from having to transport

---

<sup>7</sup> As expressed in the Waste Strategy for England, 2007 and a Strategy for Hazardous Waste Management in England March 2010

<sup>8</sup> SI 2011 No 988



hazardous waste for disposal over longer distances. It is bound up with another main objective of Government policy on hazardous waste, which is to minimise greenhouse gas emissions (for example, by reducing so-called 'waste miles').

- 4.26 As the Applicant points out [APP-REP-03 s8; REP-1Q-11 para 7.22-3], the North West region is a national hub for treating and processing hazardous waste, and thereby generates residues [NPS para 3.3.5] that can only be disposed of to landfill. In addition, with its industrial legacy and the presence of the Liverpool/Merseyside and Manchester conurbations which are undergoing significant regeneration, the North West is itself a major generator of hazardous waste. The existing provision for hazardous waste landfill in the region includes Minosus in Cheshire, the Ineos Chlor Randle Island Landfill in Runcorn, and the current Whitemoss Landfill site.
- 4.27 There are limitations as to the types of waste which can be deposited at Minosus, and evidence was submitted to the effect that the Ineos site had no remaining constructed void space available [REP-R17-1-20; EV-G-05 A27; EV-G-18 1.3]. In these circumstances, there is a realistic prospect that the application project would provide for regionally-generated hazardous waste arisings.
- 4.28 In any event, the Applicant argues [REP-1Q-11 para 7.31] that the proximity principle is intended to operate at the national rather than the regional or local level, and cites the decision of the SoS in relation to the East Northants Resource Management Facility DCO at Kings Cliffe [DCLG ref WS010001]. We find no reason to reach any contrary conclusion in respect of the application project.
- 4.29 The NPS has taken account of, and adopted the principles of, the revised Waste Framework Directive, and of the Waste Strategy for England. The relevant sections of the Directive are implemented through the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 (as amended). Annex 2 to the Waste Strategy states that existing hazardous waste landfill is sufficient for current need. However, the NPS states that there will remain some waste streams for which landfill is the best overall environmental outcome [NPS para 3.4.13]. It also states [para 4.1.5] that the NPS prevails in the event of any conflict with any other document.
- 4.30 The application site falls within a designated Green Belt (GB). The NPS at para 5.10.2 states that the most important attribute of the GB is its openness, and refers to the NPPF for advice on the purposes of the GB. NPS para 5.10.8 refers to the general presumption against inappropriate development within the GB, and states that such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It then states at para 5.10.9 that infilling or redevelopment of major developed sites in the GB, if

identified as such by the local planning authority, may be suitable for hazardous waste infrastructure.

- 4.31 The existing Whitemoss Landfill operation is included within the application site and is nearing completion. The remainder of the application site is an area of open and largely undeveloped land. The application site does not therefore fall within the category of a major developed site. In terms of GB policy, the application project falls to be assessed against the criteria set out in the NPPF at paras 79-92 (NPS para 5.10.9). We carry out our assessment against the NPPF in this respect later in this Section of the report [4.42et seq].
- 4.32 NPS para 4.1.3 requires the decision-maker to take into account any cumulative adverse impacts of the proposed development. The Applicant has considered cumulative impacts in respect of each of the issues examined in the ES. The Applicant argues that the current operations are undertaken in accordance with the conditions of the EPs and there is no evidence that day to day activities at the site currently give rise to significant effects. Since the application project represents a continuation of current operations over an extended period in accordance with any conditions of the EPs, significant cumulative impacts are not anticipated [APP-ES-02]. We find no reason to disagree with this proposition in respect of each of the issues assessed in the applicant's ES.
- 4.33 The requirement under EU Directives that the precautionary principle should be taken into account in planning decisions is a matter raised in representations [eg REP-W-08]. The NPS sets out the matters to which the decision-maker should have regard in the assessment of an application for a hazardous waste development. These include the effect on landscape and visual impact; the impact on agricultural land; geological conditions and the effect on groundwater; impact on air quality; residential amenity; the impact on tourism and leisure; impact on health; and socio-economic impacts. All these matters are assessed through the examination of the DCO application.
- 4.34 In this case the proposed development is the subject of close scrutiny both through the examination of the DCO and the determination of the EP. The European Commission has indicated that the scope of the precautionary principle is specifically "*where preliminary objective scientific evaluation, indicates that there are reasonable grounds for concern that the potentially dangerous effects on the environment, human, animal or plant health may be inconsistent with the high level of protection chosen for the Community*<sup>9</sup>". As a result of the control which would be

---

<sup>9</sup> European Commission on the Precautionary Principle: Brussels 02 02 2000 COM(2000) 1

established through the DCO and the EP, we conclude that there are no grounds for the exercise of the precautionary principle.

## **Conformity with other relevant policies**

### ***The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)***

#### *Sustainable development*

- 4.35 The NPPF sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPS on Hazardous Waste has been the subject of an Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) (NPS s1.4). As stated in the NPS, it is for the project applicant to set out in detail how they will meet the policy and requirements set out in the NPS. Where a project is shown to meet the policy and requirements of the NPS, including with appropriate mitigation, it would meet the criteria for sustainable development considered in the AoS and would therefore attract the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF.

#### *Mineral and coal extraction*

- 4.36 Section 13 of the NPPF deals with mineral extraction and is concerned with facilitating the sustainable use of minerals. NPPF para 144 states that great weight should be given to "*the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy*", and then lists the matters to be taken into account when determining applications for mineral extraction. These include not granting permission for peat extraction from new or extended sites; and not normally permitting other development proposals in mineral safeguarding areas where they might constrain future use for such purposes. We deal with other environmental impacts of the mineral extraction phase of the development later in the report.
- 4.37 In terms of the management of the peat at the site, peat will be stored for re-use in the restoration of the site [APP-REP-03 para 9.25], and a soils management plan has been agreed with Natural England (NE) [PD-L-06 and PD-L-12]. With regard to the safeguarding of the minerals at the site, glacial clay would be extracted and stored for use in the formation of the low permeability containment-engineered barriers for the existing landfill and the western extension. Incidental excess clay and other suitable general fill materials would be excavated and exported from the site for sale and use. It is also proposed that the mudstones would be excavated and exported for use at a nearby brickworks (which has confirmed its interest in taking them), with coal also being excavated and exported from the site for use in electricity generation [APP-REP-03 9.18]. LCC has indicated that it is satisfied that sterilisation of the mineral resource would be minimised such that the development would be acceptable [PD-L-01 6.5.5].

- 4.38 The excavation of the voids for the new landfill would also involve the removal of coal from the site. NPPF para 149 states that permission should not be given for the removal of coal unless the proposal is environmentally acceptable or can be made so by planning conditions or obligations; or if not, that it provides national, local or community benefits which clearly outweigh the likely impacts to justify the grant of permission.
- 4.39 A licence would be required under the Coal Industry Act 1994 for the extraction of coal. The Coal Authority has reviewed the Applicant's Environmental Statement and is satisfied that the Applicant has given due consideration to all coal mining related issues and set out appropriate mitigation measures [RR-003122]. Furthermore, a SoCG has been agreed with the Coal Authority [PD-L-03], and this confirms at para 5.3 that in principle the extraction of coal would be acceptable on the site.
- 4.40 A licence for the extraction of the coal was submitted on 30 May 2014. In the SoCG the Coal Authority states that it would be "*premature to categorically state that there would be no impediment to the issuing of a licence*". It should be noted that no coal extraction could take place until a licence has been issued.
- 4.41 The main benefit from the "incidental extraction" [RR-003122] of the low quantities of coal proposed in the application would be to enable the development of a nationally significant hazardous waste landfill site. In addition it would provide a national and local economic benefit in the form of electricity generation. In the event that the SoS determines that the White Moss Landfill DCO should be made, we consider that the extraction of coal would comply with NPPF para 149.

*Green Belt (GB)*

- 4.42 The application site is located within the GB, and the application project falls to be assessed against para 5.10.15 of the NPS. That states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the GB and there is a presumption against inappropriate development except in very special circumstances. The NPS (para 5.10.9) directs the Applicant to the relevant criteria in paras 79-92 of the NPPF (Section 9). It is against the criteria in the NPPF that we assess whether or not the application project would be inappropriate development.
- 4.43 In the High Court judgement in *Timmins and Anor v Gedling Borough Council* 2014 [EV-G-05 App H], the judge found that, properly interpreted, section 9 of the NPPF means that *any* development in the Green Belt is treated as *prima facie* "inappropriate".
- 4.44 NPPF paras 89-90 identify forms of development which may not be inappropriate in the GB. The application project is not the

construction of a new building, and does not fall within any of the definitions set out in NPPF para 89. NPPF para 90 sets out other forms of development which are also not inappropriate in the GB provided they preserve the openness of the GB and do not conflict with the five purposes of including land in the GB set out in NPPF para 80. The list under para 90 includes mineral extraction, engineering operations, and the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.

- 4.45 The Applicant puts forward the proposition that the mineral extraction and the engineering operations required to restore the site would not be inappropriate development [APP-REP-03 paras 11.2-11.3]. If the Applicant is correct, the reuse of the buildings within the existing landfill site would also not be inappropriate development. However, the mineral extraction would only take place in order to create the void for the deposit of waste, and the restoration of the site is the consequence of the completion of the landfill operations. Likewise, the reuse of buildings is only required if the additional landfill operations sought through this application are consented. If landfill at the site was to cease in accordance with the current permission, the buildings would be demolished.
- 4.46 The judgement in *Timmins and Anor v Gedling Borough Council* 2014 [EV-G-05 App H] makes it clear that if a development includes elements which on their own would not be inappropriate development, that does not mean that the whole of the development is not inappropriate. It is the principal form of the development and not its constituent parts, which falls to be considered against Section 9 of the NPPF. In this case the development to be considered is a landfill site for the deposit of hazardous waste.
- 4.47 NPPF paras 89- 90 do not include a landfill facility for any form of waste disposal as development which may not be inappropriate in the GB. The Applicant argues that the project is not inappropriate in the GB but, if it is, there are very special circumstances which would justify the grant of consent for the development [APP-REP-03 section 11]. LCC [PD-L-01 section 6.3] takes the view that the creation of a landfill facility constitutes an engineering operation; that the project would not harm the openness of the Green Belt; and therefore it would not be inappropriate development. WLBC also assumes that the project would fall within the definition of an engineering operation, but considers that it would have a harmful effect on openness. According to WLBC this would occur both during the 20-year operational phase and on a permanent basis following restoration [PD-L-02 para 6.3.16-6.3.19].
- 4.48 We agree that activities to create and operate the landfill facility, including the formation of the voids, the movement and compaction of the waste within the site and the application of layers of soil and the capping of the waste would be works which require engineering skills. On the basis of case law, we give

"engineering operations" the meaning of operations which are "of the kind usually undertaken by engineers, i.e., operations calling for the skills of an engineer"<sup>10</sup>. As a result we find that the creation and operation of the landfill facility would constitute an engineering operation. The application project may therefore not be inappropriate development provided that it preserves the openness of the GB and does not conflict with the five purposes of including land in the GB set out in NPPF para 80.

- 4.49 The existing landfill is in active use. In addition to the physical presence of the buildings, its operation provides visual and physical evidence of the impact which the larger landfill facility proposed at White Moss would have. On our visits to the site and the surrounding area we saw waste being tipped and disposed of. At the time, tipping and disposal was being carried out above ground level, and in our view the activities involved do intrude into the openness of the GB.
- 4.50 We accept that the visibility of the tipping operations would fluctuate as each void is filled. However, visibility in itself is not the test for impact on openness. In our view the presence of machinery in active use, together with raised tipping areas and soil storage stockpiles, and the movement of lorries and other vehicles to and from the site, would signal the physical presence of a man-made and intrusive operation in an otherwise undeveloped location.
- 4.51 An existing cottage in the GB would be demolished, and its removal would contribute to openness. However, the retention of buildings, fencing and access within the existing landfill site, which would be removed if the DCO is not made, would add to the impact on openness. Furthermore, the existing mounding on the eastern section of the site would be extended around the new area of operations in the proposed project to form a substantial man-made structure. The mounding together with the new security fencing would be disruptive to the openness of the area.
- 4.52 We conclude that the construction and operation of the proposed landfill project would fail to preserve the openness of the GB. Furthermore since the extended operation would intrude into an area which lies outside any settlement boundary and is currently mostly open undeveloped land, it would conflict with one of the five purposes of the GB, which is the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment. During its construction and its operational phase the project would therefore be inappropriate development in the GB.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Fayrewood Fish Farms Ltd v SoS for the Environment and Hampshire* [1984] JPL 267

- 4.53 The DCO as recommended would require the completion of landfilling in 2035, with the completion of the restoration of the site by 2036 (App 4, r5).
- 4.54 For the restoration of the site the buildings within the site and the mounding around its perimeter would be removed. The voids would be capped, a large area of mounded earth would be engineered, and landscaping and soil restoration would be carried out. The Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat Management and Aftercare Scheme has been agreed with NE [PD-L-12]. The scheme would provide an equivalent area of land as Grade 2 agricultural land to that which is currently within the site. It would also create a mixture of species rich grassland/meadow, scrub pockets and broadleaf woodland with peripheral marshland/moss habitats to include ponds, scrapes and ditches as appropriate to the character of the landscape in this area. The value of the site in terms of biodiversity and planting would therefore be improved.
- 4.55 We consider the restoration proposals in terms of the landscape and visual impact of the scheme later in this Section. In terms of the effect on the GB, we consider that the construction of an area of raised ground, which would be in excess of 10ha in area and up to 10m in height [PD-L-12] above surrounding land levels, would fail to preserve the openness of what is currently a generally flat and open undeveloped area.
- 4.56 LCC considers that the mounding would not be intrusive to openness because the final landform would be similar to other former colliery spoil mounds in the area [PD-L-01 6.3.17]. However, the presence of other man-made mounding does not negate the physical impact which would result from the increase in ground level as proposed for the application site. Not only would the proposed new mound affect a significantly larger area of land than any existing mounds, but the application site is currently part of an extensive area of generally open and relatively low-lying countryside south of the motorway. By raising the ground level of a significant area of this land there would be an intrusion into the openness of the wider countryside which in our view would interfere with and have an impact on the openness of the GB.
- 4.57 We therefore agree with the views of the WLBC that there would be an impact on the openness of the GB [PD-L-02; REP-1Q-10; EV-G-15] as a result of the creation of the engineered mound, which in itself would therefore be inappropriate development. Nevertheless, we consider that the intended after uses of the site as set out in the Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat Management and Aftercare Scheme [PD-L-06; PD-L-12] would be compatible with its rural location in the GB. As a result, there would no longer be conflict with the purpose of safeguarding from encroachment, and the overall impact on openness in the long term would be mitigated to some degree through the proposals for the restoration of the site.

- 4.58 NPPF para 87 states that "*inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.*" NPPF para 88 goes on to state that "*very special circumstances*" will not exist "*unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations*". The mitigation which would be provided in the restoration phase of the scheme is one of the "*other considerations*" to be weighed in the balance when considering whether there are such very special circumstances in this case.
- 4.59 We consider whether very special circumstances exist, after we have reported on the other relevant issues raised in the examination. This enables us to identify "*any other harm*", to be weighed in the balance against "*other considerations*".

***National Planning Policy for Waste October 2014 (NPPW)***

- 4.60 During the examination, the National Planning Policy for Waste October 2014 (NPPW) was published. Linda Webster and other interested parties (IPs) argued at the ISH on Policy and Need[ EV-IS2-01-08] that as a more recently published statement of Government policy, it should take precedence over the NPS, in particular in terms of the way in which need for the facility should be assessed. However, the NPPW states in para 1 that "*All local planning authorities should have regard to its policies...*". The policies are therefore set out to guide local planning authorities in discharging their responsibilities.
- 4.61 These include the preparation of Local Plans [NPPW para 2] and the making of decisions on planning applications for waste facilities which come before them [NPPW para 7]. The reference in NPPW para 3 to the identification of need for waste management facilities falls within the context of development plan-making. The reference to assessing need in NPPW para 7 falls within the context of the determination of a planning application under the 1990 Planning Act by a local planning authority. Neither reference to need is stated to relate to the determination of an NSIP under the PA2008.
- 4.62 It is stated at NPS para 1.14 that the NPS "*will remain in its entirety unless withdrawn or suspended in whole or in part*" by the SoS. There is no statement by the SoS that the NPPW withdraws or suspends the NPS on Hazardous Waste. Having regard to the requirement of s104(3) of the 2008 Act, and the statement in NPS para 4.1.5, even if there were any conflict between the advice set out in NPPW and the policy of the NPS, the NPS continues to prevail for the purpose of decision-making on an application which falls within the definition of an NSIP in s30 of the 2008 Act.
- 4.63 Nevertheless, NPS para 1.1.1 states that the SoS must also have regard to any local impact report (LIR), any matters prescribed



that are relevant to the application and any other matters which it considers are both important and relevant to a decision.

- 4.64 There are matters identified in NPPW para 7 which are important and relevant considerations in the determination of the White Moss Landfill DCO. The first two bullet points relate primarily to need, on which the NPS must prevail. The matters in bullet points 3-6 are also raised by the NPS. These include the impact on the local environment; design; the need to assume that the pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced; and the need to secure high environmental standards in the restoration of a landfill site. These are important and relevant matters which we take into account in our report to the SoS.

### ***Development Plan Policies***

- 4.65 The Development Plan for the application site comprises the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework Core Strategy, (MWCS) the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (MWLP), and the West Lancashire Borough Local Plan 2012-2027 (WLLP). The relevant policies are set out in the LIRs submitted by LCC [PD-L-01] and WLBC [PD-L-02].

#### *Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework Core Strategy (MWCS), and Local Plan Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (MWLP)*

- 4.66 Taking first the MWCS, this recognises the continued requirement for landfill facilities to deal with the disposal of hazardous wastes which do not have any resource value for recycling, or for the disposal of residues from the treatment of all wastes where no further value can be recovered. Policy CS8 deals with the identification of capacity for the management of waste. It states that criteria will be developed for the consideration of proposals for waste management facilities, including landfill for hazardous wastes, to include the contribution of the proposal to self-sufficiency.
- 4.67 The policies of the MWCS are further developed in the MWLP. Policy LF3 of the submission document allocated land at the existing Whitemoss Landfill site in order to provide for the maintenance of capacity for the hazardous waste requirements noted in Policy CS8. The area of land allocated under this policy was to the west of the existing site but smaller in area than the DCO application site.
- 4.68 However, the policy was amended during the examination of the deposit plan to delete the site allocation. LCC considered at the time that there was no need for the allocation and that there were other alternative sites in the region, even though no alternative sites were put forward. This amendment was accepted by the

Inspector at the examination who considered that the revised criteria based policy would support permission for a new site or extension to an existing site where there was a demonstrable need. We also note that the Inspector considered there would be a continuing need for a location that would provide capacity for the landfilling of hazardous waste of up to 17,000 tpa generated from within the plan area only [PD-L-01 paras 5.11-12].

4.69 Policy LF3 as adopted states that development will be supported for the disposal to landfill of residues from the treatment of hazardous wastes that cannot be recycled or recovered or otherwise treated subject to the listed criteria.

4.70 LCC raises the issue of need, with regard to the policies of the MWCS and MWLP. However, the development plan pre-dates the NPS and the NPS takes priority in relation to a DCO application under the PA2008. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires a presumption in favour of the development plan, does not apply to NSIP applications. As stated earlier in this Section, the need for the application project is established in the NPS.

4.71 We address other matters which are relevant to policies in the MWCS and the MWLP later in this Section.

*West Lancashire Local Plan (WLLP) 2012 - 2017*

4.72 There are a number of WLLP policies cited by WLBC in its LIR [PD-L-02 5.17-5.23]. These relate to the assessment of the environmental effects of all development, and many reflect policy at county and national level. In particular, the WLLP policies seek to preserve and enhance local landscape character through Policies GN3 and EN2. The application site lies within Landscape Character Area 3: Upland Type Mosses [PD-L-02 App 3].

4.73 The Council's Natural Areas and Areas of Historic Landscape History Importance Supplementary Planning Guidance (Landscape SPG) includes recommendations for minimising environmental impact in this landscape character area. A SoCG is submitted between the Applicant and WLBC on Landscape and Visual Impact Matters, which narrows the matters on which WLBC maintains objections [PD-L-09]. There is potential for conflict with Policies GN3 and EN2 of the WLLP, and we return to consider in more detail the impact on the landscape of the operational and restored site later in this Section [4.221 et seq].

4.74 These policies are also concerned with visual impact, on which the views of WLBC are set out in the LIR [PD-L-02] and the SoCG [PD-L-09]. In terms of visual impact, we also consider that there would be potential for conflict with Policies GN3 and EN2 of the WLLP. We consider visual impact of the operational and restored site in more detail later in this Section [4.238 et seq].

4.75 Policy EC1 of the WLLP deals with the economy and employment land. White Moss Business Park is a Strategic Employment Area and permission is only given to class B1, C1, and D1<sup>11</sup> land-uses in an attempt to ensure that the character of a high quality business park is maintained. Other policies of the WLLP aim to improve Skelmersdale as a place in which to live and work. In particular, WLBC is seeking to ensure that the town benefits from the regeneration of the Port of Liverpool, since it is just 30 minutes by road from the Port. We consider the socio-economic effects of the application project later in this Section [4.198 et seq].

*Conclusions on development plan policy*

4.76 The point is made above that the NPS takes priority over the development plan in the determination of this application. As a result there is no requirement for the Applicant to demonstrate a specific local or regional need for the proposal. The development plan does include a number of policies against which it is appropriate and relevant to assess the project, and many of the matters covered are also raised in the NPS.

4.77 It is relevant to note that whilst there is the potential for conflict between environmental policies of the development plan and the application project, the site is one which has been identified in an early iteration of the MWLP as suitable for hazardous waste landfill. Furthermore, the need identified in the MWLP for additional capacity has not been fulfilled in the development of any other site. The application project would clearly meet the need identified in the MWLP. It would provide well in excess of the capacity identified in the MWLP, but it is not the intention of the NPS to limit provision to that which would meet locally-generated demand.

4.78 Overall, we consider that the application project would contribute to self-sufficiency as required by the MWCS, and fulfil the need identified in the MWLP. There may be some areas of conflict with other development plan policies, but we find they are not so significant as to weigh heavily against the application project.

**Environmental Statement (ES)**

4.79 As stated in NPS section 4.2, all proposals for projects which are subject to the European Environmental Impact Assessment Directive<sup>12</sup> must be accompanied by an Environmental Statement describing the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the project.

4.80 The ES submitted in support of the DCO application [APP-ES-02] includes an assessment of the effects of the excavation, landfilling

---

<sup>11</sup> Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)

<sup>12</sup> Council Directive 92/2011

and restoration of the application site on human beings, fauna and flora, soil, water, air, climate, the landscape, material assets and cultural heritage, and the interaction between them, as required by the Directive. The mitigation measures proposed as part of the design and operation of the application scheme together with their regulatory control mechanisms are summarised in Table ES1. The measures which would be subject to control through the EP are not addressed in detail in the ES.

- 4.81 Although ARROW and others [REP-1Q-01] argue that this was a deficiency in the ES, it is for the EA to determine whether mitigation through the EP will be adequate. We deal with the division between the impacts to be controlled through the DCO and through the EP later in this Section. In our report to the SoS, we concentrate on those impacts which fall to be controlled through the DCO. NPS 4.7.3 states that the ExA and the SoS must work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. On this basis it is appropriate for the ExA to accept conclusions reached in the ES that there would be no likely significant effects in relation to those impacts which would be subject to control through the EP.
- 4.82 A Habitats Regulations Screening Assessment has been submitted in accordance with NPS para 4.3.1-2. We consider whether or not the proposals may have any likely significant impact on a European protected site in Section 5.
- 4.83 The ES for a project should include an outline of the main alternatives studied by the Applicant and an indication of the main reasons for the Applicant's choice (NPS para 4.4.3). In this case the application would extend the life of the existing Whitemoss Landfill by extending operations to the west onto land which is already partly in the ownership of the Applicant. The alternative considered in the ES is to "do nothing", whereby the current landfill area would be filled by the end of 2015, and no further landfill facility would be available at White Moss. The benefits of extending the existing hazardous waste landfill are set out in the ES [APP-ES-02 paras 4.3.2-5].
- 4.84 Whitemoss Landfill was included as a specific allocation for hazardous waste in the submission version of the MWLP. Although it was decided not to include any specific allocations, no alternative sites were put forward for Lancashire. In the Inspector's report on the Plan, he agreed a criteria-based policy and recognised that there was a continuing need for a facility for hazardous waste residue disposal. The closure of the existing site would mean that this continuing need would not be met.
- 4.85 There has been a relatively recent review of potential hazardous waste sites through the Development Plan process, where no alternatives to Whitemoss Landfill were identified. In addition, no alternative site was put forward as a result of the consultation

process on the ES. We therefore consider that the Applicant's approach to alternatives is adequate in this case.

- 4.86 In accordance with NPS para 4.6.6 an allowance is made for climate change in the surface water management plan [APP-ES-06] which is subject to approval and regulation through the EP. It also takes into account changes in rainfall which might arise as a result of climate change. The management plan would control surface water and the level of abstracted groundwater discharges from the site. It would also ensure that there is unlikely to be any danger of flooding as a result of increased water run-off from the site following restoration.
- 4.87 The Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat Management and Aftercare Scheme [APP-ES-04] was the subject of discussion between the Applicant, NE and LCC. It was subject to amendments and the final scheme dated September 2014 is appended to the second SoCG with NE [PD-L-12 App A].
- 4.88 The Soil Handling and Management Scheme was also the subject of discussion and amendment through the examination, and appears as Appendix B to the second SoCG with NE [ibid App B] dated September 2014.
- 4.89 Table ES 1 of the ES was also amended [EV-G-05 App G]. This sets out the proposed mitigation measures and residual impacts of the application project. It then identifies the relevant means of regulatory control, whether through the requirements of the DCO or through the EA. The impacts for which mitigation measures are identified include: human health; atmospheric quality; ecology; landscape and visibility; transport network and traffic; noise; water resources; flood risk; land contamination; archaeology and cultural heritage; soil resources and agriculture; and general amenity.
- 4.90 Of the mitigation measures, impacts on ecology; landscape and visibility; transport network and traffic; noise; water resources in terms of the management of the mine shafts and during site excavation; land contamination; archaeology and cultural heritage; and soil resources and agriculture would be subject to control through the requirements of the DCO. The remaining impacts would be controlled through the EP.
- 4.91 The EP for the landfill operations would set out the details of the permitted operations; the waste that can be handled at the site; the landfill engineering design and construction; the operation and management systems and the schemes for the monitoring and reporting of the waste management activities. Landfill management and engineering controls which are specified in the EP would continue at the site following the cessation of waste acceptance and restoration of the landfill.

- 4.92 ARROW and others [EV-IS3-05] cite the Landfill Directive (LD) and the need to secure pollution control for the whole life cycle of the landfill site. They are concerned about the long term risks to water, soil, air, greenhouse effects and health. These are primarily issues for the EA and the EP. The EP would remain in place until the EA is satisfied that the site no longer represents a potential risk to the environment. Furthermore, it would be a condition of the EP that the operator makes financial provision in a form that is available to the EA to cover their obligations under the permit, in the event that the company went out of business whilst controls were required to be implemented [EV-G-05 paras B46-49].
- 4.93 Since the long-term management of pollution control for the restored site is a matter for the EP, and the decision maker is entitled to rely on this control, we do not consider that the ES is deficient in this respect.
- 4.94 We are satisfied that the ES, together with the other information submitted by the Applicant during the examination, is adequate and that it meets the requirements under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 as amended (EIA Regulations 2009)<sup>13</sup>. The Panel has taken full account of the environmental information in the assessment of the application and in making its recommendation to the SoS.

### **The Relationship between Planning and Environmental Permitting**

- 4.95 Many IPs have raised concerns about discharges or emissions from the proposed project, primarily in relation to concerns about the impacts on human health of discharges to air, water or land.
- 4.96 The NPS (s4.7) notes the separate but complementary nature of the planning and pollution control systems, and records that the ExA, and SoS as decision-maker, should focus on whether the development is an acceptable use of the land, and on the impacts of that use, rather than the control of processes, emissions or discharges. The presumption is that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced (NPS para 4.7.3), and in deciding an application for a DCO the SoS should seek to complement rather than duplicate the appropriate environmental permitting regimes. The issue of appropriate use of land is considered in relevant sections below primarily in relation to health and water.
- 4.97 The prime responsibility for controlling discharges in relation to the proposed project rests with the EA. It has confirmed in a SoCG that the relevant EP will only be issued if it is "*satisfied that the operations will be operated in a manner which will not result in an*

---

<sup>13</sup> Statutory Instrument 2009 No. 2263

*unacceptable risk to the environment and human health” [PD-L-13].*

- 4.98 The Applicant’s ES includes a summary analysis [APP-ES-02, Table ES 1] setting out the range of identified impacts of the proposed development together with an assessment of whether these would be controlled by the DCO or the EA’s environmental permit (EP). Consideration of this issue developed significantly during the examination, particularly in relation to the controls over water-related issues, and in the closing stages, and in response to a request, the Applicant provided an updated Table ES 1 [EV-G-05 App G].
- 4.99 This revised table reflects discussions with (primarily) the relevant statutory bodies and consideration during the examination, and we concur with the assessment of which issues are regulated under the EP and which under the DCO. The main changes in this table relate to the control of potential emissions to water; this is discussed more fully within the section on the Geological Setting and Impact on Water Resources below.
- 4.100 While ARROW has raised concerns in relation to a number of issues that it believes should be considered within the DCO, primarily in relation to hydrogeological issues, discussed in a separate section below, it has not substantively challenged the Applicant’s assessment in the revised table.
- 4.101 IPs, particularly ARROW, have raised on a number of occasions [REP-W-04; REP-1Q-01] concerns that there are locational issues relating to the LD that should be considered within the consideration of planning issues, citing in particular paragraph 1 of Annex 1 of the LD which identifies a need to consider issues including proximity to residential areas and amenity sites, proximity to water or nature protection zones, geological or hydrogeological conditions, risks of flooding and other natural disasters, and protection of natural and cultural heritage.
- 4.102 These requirements of the LD have been assessed in the ES and a summary table identifying the relevant analyses was provided in a representation following the first OFHs [REP-R17-1-20, Annex B.6]. These are considered where necessary below, most notably in relation to health in relation to proximity to residential areas and amenity sites and also in considering geology and water impacts.
- 4.103 NPS para 4.7.10 notes that consent to the DCO should not be refused on the basis of regulated impacts unless there is good reason to believe that the necessary consents will not be forthcoming. Having considered the evidence presented on environmental impacts, the EA’s views that the Whitemoss Landfill Limited “*are competent operators who manage Whitemoss Landfill in compliance with their Environmental Permits*” [PD-L-04, 2.2]

and its identification of the operator as “a good performer” (para 4.165 below) we have no reason to believe the necessary consents will not be forthcoming.

### **Geological Setting and Impact on Water Resources**

- 4.104 The geological nature of the site, the impact of the proposed development on water quality and quantity, and clarification of the respective roles and responsibilities of statutory bodies in relation to water-related issues have each been significant issues during the examination. There has been considerable engagement between IPs; we issued a Rule 17 letter seeking responses to concerns raised by ARROW [DEC-G-08 Annex C]; and there was detailed consideration at the ISH on the environment and further consideration at the ISH on the DCO.

#### ***Nature of the site***

- 4.105 Section 14 of the ES considers the nature of the site and the potential impact on water resources [APP-ES-02]. It has been supplemented by a preliminary hydrogeological risk assessment (HgRA) [APP-ES-12] with a slightly amended HgRA submitted to the EA as part of the application for the EP [REP-W-094]. This update included provision for a high density polyethylene geomembrane liner as a consequence of additional modelling, and has formed part of the environmental information against which we have assessed the application. The update led to no changes to the conclusions of the preliminary HgRA submitted in support of the DCO application [REP-R17-1C-02, 1.2 1.3].
- 4.106 The site is located within 2 aquifer units. The upper aquifer consists of the Peat and Shirley Hill Sand Formation, into which rainfall percolates with a low permeability glacial till forming a shallow upper aquifer. A lower aquifer consists of the Coal Measures Strata in which groundwater is present and is confined under the low permeability glacial till. Borehole tests show that the low permeability glacial till separates the 2 aquifers [REP-R17-1C-02, s2].
- 4.107 As part of the excavation of the site to no more than 48m AOD (App 4, r12) the Applicant plans to extract coal and has submitted an application for a conditional licence to the Coal Authority. The ES records that the coal measures strata “are highly variable across the western landfill area” and that “it is not possible... to draw conclusions regarding the detail of the structural geology of the coal measures strata” from the boreholes drilled and given the varying character and thickness of the strata [APP-ES-02, 14.3.11]. The SoCG with the Coal Authority records that while “in principle the extraction of coal would be acceptable on this site, it would be premature to categorically state that there would be no impediment to the issuing of a licence” [PD-L-03 para 5.3], noting the need for a financial appraisal, confirmation of rights and



planning consents. No good reasons have been advanced during the examination as to why a licence is unlikely to be forthcoming.

- 4.108 The Coal Measures are fractured and fissured providing pathways for groundwater movement across the site, particularly in the south and west of the site. The Coal Authority has reported that coal seams beneath the Western Landfill Area were last worked in 1934 and that *“any ground movement from these coal workings should have stopped by now”* [PD-L-03]. Two abandoned mineshafts are known to exist within the site, located within phase B of the proposed development but with their precise location as yet undetermined. The Applicant plans to investigate and treat these, and any other unrecorded mine workings that might be identified as part of the development [APP-ES-02, ch 14; EV-G-18]. The SoCG with the Coal Authority notes that given the potential existence of unrecorded historic coal mining activity the proposal *“could be beneficial in removing any potential land instability problems on this site”* [PD-L-03 ].
- 4.109 Following discussions with the EA a mine shaft hazard assessment has been prepared by the Applicant providing additional detail and identifying potential options for treating the mineshafts. The EP application includes a stability risk assessment which further considers the proposed engineering design and treatment of the mineshafts, with detailed design to be approved prior to each phase of development; in relation to phase B this will be based on the results of the investigation of the mineshafts and a specification for their treatment [EV-G-18, 2.11].
- 4.110 The broad design principles of the proposed development in relation to water management incorporate a groundwater abstraction system with abstracted water pumped out of the site; this is similar to the management of the existing site, with pumping to be undertaken for as long as is required by the EA [EV-G-05, App B, ix]. The details of this are for the EA to address in considering the EP application, though there is a role for LCC as discussed below. The approach has been agreed with the EA and Coal Authority [EV-G-18, 2.11].
- 4.111 The LIR submitted by LCC [PD-L-01, s6.6] notes that the main controls on the operation of the site will fall to the EA to regulate, but that it is a relevant consideration at the planning stage to ensure that *“the development is situated in a location that is acceptable in principle and which does not present unacceptable risks to ground or surface water resources”* [PD-L-01, 6.6.4]. It notes issues that have been assessed in the ES and that, from a broad land use planning perspective the site:
- Is not located in an area with particularly sensitive groundwater characteristics.
  - Groundwater resources that would be intercepted are not used for public water supply.

- Has no direct relationship with surface water courses in the near vicinity of the site. (We discuss the Rainford Drain below.)
- Will have a system of lining and attenuation akin to that of the existing site which appears to be effective<sup>14</sup>.

4.112 LCC did identify the potential risks given the mining history and the existence of two abandoned mine shafts, which it saw at the time as the responsibility primarily of the EA, with the EA having the responsibility for ensuring that the risks can be managed acceptably. The understanding of roles and responsibilities of the relevant statutory bodies in this area has evolved significantly through the examination, and is discussed below.

### ***Flooding***

4.113 A flood risk assessment of the site has been carried out, taking account of climate change, and the SoCG with the EA records that the drainage system has adequate capacity to cope with run-off from a 1 in 100 year storm event without flooding [PD-L-04 para 3.6]. A similar conclusion is presented in the SoCG with LCC and WLBC [PD-L-05 para 4.12]. (Issues raised by ARROW in relation to the proposed works are discussed separately below.)

4.114 The Rainford Drain runs through the western landfill area and it will be necessary to divert the Drain around the perimeter of the site, with the proposed location shown on the works plan. Concerns have been expressed by local land interests about the lack of specific detail in relation to the diversion and the risks to surface and groundwater [EV-OF2-27; REP 17 Nov 08]. The pipeline would be diverted in accordance with a scheme to be approved by LCC and constructed to a standard suitable for effective water management, with these secured by r15. Surface water monitoring is secured in part by r13, but also by the EP where the EA has confirmed it will require a surface water management plan as part of the EP.

### ***Statutory roles and responsibilities***

4.115 The separate but complementary nature of the planning and pollution control regimes has been discussed above. The ES [APP-ES-02, s14 and Table 1] and the first draft DCO [APP-DCO-01] was predicated on the assumption that relevant potential pollution would be adequately controlled by the EP and included no requirements relating to the management or monitoring of water, other than indirectly via the then r12 relating to mining shafts. The EA's powers for pollution control are broad in relation to waste disposal. However, apart from the discharge of water from the site

---

<sup>14</sup> The SoCG with the Environment Agency notes that performance reports dating back to 2009 "record no exceedances of compliance limits and demonstrate compliance with the Environmental Permits" [PD-L-04, 2.2]

which would require a licence from the EA, dewatering activities or mineral extraction which precede the engineering of the waste containment facility are not subject to the EP [PD-L-04, App B]. This has been agreed by the Applicant, EA and LCC and not challenged by other parties, and is a judgement we share. It is therefore necessary to seek to control the impacts of dewatering and mineral extraction via the DCO.

### ***The Examination and DCO requirements***

- 4.116 The two main related considerations are, firstly, the treatment of mine shafts and works in proximity to them and, secondly, the need for requirements to address issues relating to water management and monitoring which cannot be adequately addressed by the EP.
- 4.117 In relation to mine shafts there have been concerns relating to excavation and dewatering, including concerns that the planned works might facilitate the transmission of water from mined voids beneath the level of the landfill void. To mitigate this it is proposed to seal the mine shafts below 48m AOD, the maximum depth of the landfill void, and to preclude excavation or dewatering activities below this level, save for works approved by the planning authority to create a basal sub grade. In addition no excavation or dewatering will take place below 65m AOD unless the relevant mine shafts have been adequately sealed, in accordance with details approved by the planning authority in consultation with the EA and Coal Authority [r12].
- 4.118 The prevention of abstraction and excavation below 65m AOD prior to treatment of the shafts is a further measure to minimise the risks that water from the shafts will enter the excavation [PD-U-05]. In response to a written question, the EA noted it was "*satisfied that an engineering solution exists that will ensure there is no hydraulic continuity between the landfill void and any groundwater within the mine shafts*" [REP-2Q-05, Annex 1 para 1.8]. However this engineering solution has not yet been determined and it is necessary to include requirements to ensure that no works take place that may affect the integrity of, or water level in, the mine shafts until appropriate sealing works have been undertaken.
- 4.119 These issues are addressed in r12 in the DCO at App 4; the draft in the recommended DCO in relation to this requirement is identical to that in the ExA draft we circulated for consultation [PD-U-09], with that draft having been subject to further drafting amendment throughout the examination with input from LCC as well as the EA, and reflecting one of ARROW's concerns (discussed below). No comments were received on this drafting reflecting the substantial level of engagement and agreement between the Applicant and the relevant statutory bodies throughout the examination.

- 4.120 The more general concerns that the EP could not provide appropriate control over dewatering or mineral extraction have been addressed by including a requirement (r13) that development may not commence until a scheme for water management and monitoring has been approved by the county planning authority in consultation with the EA. The requirement sets out various issues the scheme must address in relation to attenuation lagoons, discharge rates and monitoring.
- 4.121 Our consultation draft DCO did not include the detail of the monitoring requirements now included at r13(1)(c) of our recommended DCO (App 4). We did however consult on this proposal by LCC [PD-U-08]. The Applicant is content with the suggested addition; we note that r13(1) is concerned with a scheme for management and monitoring and that neither r13(1)(a) nor r13(1)(b) relate to monitoring. We therefore recommend that the addition proposed by LCC at r13(3) be included.
- 4.122 No other comments were received in relation to this requirement, aside arguably from a concern from ARROW about the duration of leachate management discussed separately below.

### ***Community concerns***

- 4.123 Community concerns on the technical issues relating to geological conditions and risks to water quality and quantity have primarily been led by ARROW. It has raised a number of concerns in relation to hydrogeological issues, raising environmental issues and alleging failures to meet various statutory requirements, primarily relating to the LD. These concerns were most fully set out in a written submission forwarding a report from H Fraser Consulting Ltd [REP-1RC-01].
- 4.124 We issued a Rule 17 letter seeking responses to ARROW's concerns [DEC-G-08, Annex C] to which the Applicant provided a response [REP-17-1-20], with the issues subject to substantial consideration at the ISH on the Environment and more limited consideration at the ISH on the DCO. There has been no evidence of significant engagement between ARROW and the Applicant on these issues outside the formal examination process of written evidence and participation at hearings.
- 4.125 Following the ISHs the Applicant provided further written evidence [EV-G-05 App B], with ARROW continuing to raise a number of concerns. Many of these relate to the EP which the EA is considering and include:
- The absence of **assessment of the Peat and Shirley Hill Sand Formation aquifer** [REP-1RC-01] and concerns about the assessment of impacts of dewatering in the vicinity of Brookdale Farm [ES-IS3-04]. The Applicant has disputed this

[EV-G-05, B50 et seq; EV-G-18, p14] identifying the assessment in the ES, citing British Geological Society evidence on geological conditions, evidence from pumping trials and evidence of the absence of impact in relation to the current landfill. We find this persuasive, noting that neither the EA nor the planning authority has expressed concerns. We further note that r13 which requires a water management and monitoring scheme to be approved by the relevant planning authority provides a safeguard should there be unexpected issues, with the planning authority required to consult with the EA.

- The need for an additional requirement relating to the **density of void space and basal heave**, citing the LD and NPPF in support [EV-IS3-05], and the absence of a quantitative assessment of basal heave [ES-IS3-04]. The Applicant has noted that basal heave is an EP issue and a Stability Risk Assessment, including a quantitative assessment of basal heave, has been submitted in support of the EP application which is consistent with the LD and NPPF. To address this via the DCO would duplicate an issue which is properly the subject of an EP process; we concur with the Applicant and note that ARROW's representation did not address why this issue is appropriate for the DCO rather than the EP.
- The need for an **assessment of groundwater inflows** from the untreated mineshafts to be agreed with the EA, and for a buffer zone around mine shafts, within which no water abstraction or excavation can take place prior to the shafts being sealed, to be greater than the (then) proposed 25m [EV-IS3-05]. The recommended DCO (r12(2)) has been modified to remove the 25m limit to the buffer zone but to require that a horizontal distance is agreed by the county planning authority, in consultation with the EA and Coal Authority.
- The **addition of precipitation and site discharge** to be included within the parameters of the scheme in r13(1) and the need for the water management and monitoring scheme (r13) to be informed by a quantified water balance [EV-IS3-05]. We consider the drafting suggestion to be unnecessary as the scheme must include water levels and site drainage, and it will be open to the planning authority to require a quantified water balance should that be necessary.
- A concern from ARROW [REP-1RC-01; REP-17 Nov-02] that **leachate management will be required for thousands of years**, with a related concern that there is inadequate financial provision for the management of the site in the EP application submitted to the EA. The Applicant has disputed the likelihood of this and noted that leachate management will continue as long as required by the EA. It is the responsibility of the EA to ensure financial provision is in place to discharge the obligations of the EP [EV-G-05 para B46]. No compelling reason has been offered as to why this

issue cannot properly be left for determination by the EA in considering whether an EP should be agreed and with what conditions, and the EA has expressed no concerns on the likelihood of this not being deliverable.

- The **inadequacy of the lining proposals** and their alleged incompatibility with the requirements of the LD [EV-OF2-03; ES-IS3-04]. This has been disputed by the Applicant, identifying relevant provisions in the Directive and confirming the adequacy of protection to groundwater as demonstrated in its hydrogeological risk assessment [EV-G-18]. Regardless of this, we can see no reason why this issue is not properly for the EA to determine in considering the EP application rather than the DCO.
- A concern of ARROW that the plan to place **a landfill site over abandoned mine shafts** was novel, if not unique [EV-G-07; REP-17 Nov 02], with this challenged by the Applicant [EV-G-05 App B]. While the facts remain unclear, with the issue arising late in the examination, we consider that r12 which deals with the investigation and treatment of the mine shafts is sufficiently widely drawn to ensure that any unforeseen risks that arise can be adequately addressed, with the expertise of the Coal Authority and EA informing the approval role of LCC.

### **Conclusion**

- 4.126 We find that neither geological nor water management issues provide grounds for concluding that the proposal represents an unacceptable use of the land.
- 4.127 In relation to mitigating potential impacts, we have given significant consideration to those which would not be included within the EA's permitting responsibilities. The brevity of r12 and r13 do not do full justice to the extent of consideration and engagement that underlies these enhanced requirements, following significant engagement between the Applicant and the relevant statutory bodies – LCC, Coal Authority and EA – and directly within the examination involving other IPs and us as ExA. In broad terms r12 and r13 ensure that the formal responsibility for approving assessments undertaken by the Applicant and for planned works rests with LCC as the planning authority in those areas where the EA does not have the statutory role under the EP regime. But the requirements have been drafted so as to ensure that the expertise and interests of the EA and Coal Authority properly inform the decisions to be taken before works can proceed.
- 4.128 We conclude that r12 and r13 are necessary and sufficient to address the relevant concerns both in relation to potential impacts and statutory responsibilities.

### **The completion and restoration of the application site within the timescale of the DCO**

- 4.129 An issue of concern to LCC, WLBC and others [PD-L-0; PD-L-02; REP-1Q-02] is that the landfill would not be completed by 2035 as proposed in the DCO, and that the restoration could not therefore take place by 2036. The environmental impact assessment of the development is based on the completion of landfill in 2035, with restoration in 2036. Any delay in the filling of voids as a result of a rate of hazardous waste deposit below 150,000 tpa could prejudice the implementation of the proposed restoration scheme. This would have environmental impacts which have not been assessed in the ES.
- 4.130 Furthermore, we identify in our report the benefits which would arise from the restoration of the site. The benefits fall to be weighed in the balance against the impacts from the construction and operation of the site for a period of 20 years. If there was any risk to the implementation of the restoration scheme in 2036, there would be consequences for the judgement to be made on whether or not the benefits of the development would outweigh the impacts.
- 4.131 During the examination, we sought evidence from the Applicant on the levels of waste which have been deposited at the site, and those that would be available for deposit in the future, in order to assess whether or not there was any risk that the capacity of the site would not be fully taken up by 2035. We also sought submissions on strategies which might be used to secure completion of landfill by 2035 in the event that deposits of 150,000 tpa were not achieved [DEC-G-08 Annex B].
- 4.132 Meaningful figures on levels of deposits to the existing site can only be shown from 2006 following the ban on co-disposal of hazardous with other wastes in July 2005. Since that date, the Applicant's figures indicate that the highest level of deposits has been just over 76,000 tpa in 2013, with inputs as low as 22,654 tpa in 2011 [REP-2Q-14 3.3; Table 2].
- 4.133 The Applicant argues that past rates of infill should not be regarded as determinative of the future [EV-G-05 para A28]; that arisings are in any event expected to increase as the economy improves; and examples are provided of future sources of hazardous wastes for deposit [REP-2Q-14; EV-G-05 paras A29-A30]. Furthermore, the Applicant has been managing the rate of deposit at the existing landfill site to extend its operation and secure continuity of service in the event that the DCO is made [REP-R17-1-20 Schedule 2 1.2].
- 4.134 Policy DM3 of the MWLP requires a s106 obligation to secure the time-limiting of a development and its full restoration by a fixed date. However, the project could not, within the terms of the

DCO, continue past the completion date in 2035. Nevertheless, as LCC states, it is not always possible to complete landfill sites at lower levels due to engineering/pollution control considerations which might have an impact on the effectiveness of those controls [PD-L-01]. Furthermore, we are concerned that unfilled voids could remain at 2035 which could inhibit the proposed restoration scheme, on the benefits of which we place significant weight.

- 4.135 Whilst improvements in the economy might lead to increases in the level of hazardous waste deposits requiring landfill, there is no guarantee that there would not be further economic downturns over the lifetime of the project. We are conscious that both European and UK policy might also further limit disposal to landfill, and technical change can increase the opportunities for managing wastes further up the hierarchy. Given this, and in view of the history of extensions of time to complete the existing landfill facility, and the relatively low levels of waste which have been deposited at the site since 2006, we consider that there is a real prospect of the capacity of the site not being fully taken up within the timescale set in the DCO.
- 4.136 In a situation whereby there would remain significant areas of unfilled void within the site at 2035, the restoration scheme as proposed in the recommended DCO could not be implemented and there could be significant consequences for the environmental impact of the project. Given these potential consequences, we issued a Rule 17 letter setting out our concerns and identifying this as an issue for discussion at an ISH [DEC-G-08 Annex B]. In response to our request, the Applicant submitted more detailed information about the actions which could be taken to avoid the potential for any significant unfilled void to remain in 2035 in the event that deposits of 150,000 tpa were not achieved [REP-R17-1-20]. We and IPs considered these fully at the ISH.
- 4.137 The Applicant is confident that there are several options that could be pursued to ensure the completion of restoration in accordance with the timescale of the DCO if either mineral extraction operations or landfill operations take place at a slower rate than required to sustain deposits of 150,000 tpa. Three worked examples are provided [REP-R17-1-20 paras 2.6 - 2.8] and were described in detail at the ISH on Policy and Need [EV-IS1-02-04].
- 4.138 In example 1, the basal level of the site would be increased, to reduce the scale of the overall landfill void. The level of the basal elevation in some or all of Phases B, C and D could be increased following a review of waste input rates as required by r32 of the recommended DCO.
- 4.139 Example 2 is a scenario where the mineral extraction operations are complete and inert waste is imported to complete the restoration. The need to import inert waste would be determined



through the review of waste input rates as required by r32 of the recommended DCO.

- 4.140 In example 3, a phase or a partial phase of mineral extraction operations would not be implemented, and restoration materials would be imported to achieve the consented restoration profile and scheme. A reduction in mineral extraction would reduce the overall landfill void for hazardous waste hence the duration over which hazardous waste is imported to the site. The need to reduce the mineral extraction would be determined through the review of waste input rates as required by r32 of the recommended DCO.
- 4.141 From the detailed explanation of the three worked examples, we are satisfied that the three scenarios demonstrate that there are alternative work plans which could secure restoration of the site by 2036 in accordance with the requirements of the DCO. In all three cases, there would be no change to the overall restoration proposals. A summary of the potential environmental effects of each example is set out in Table 1[REP-R17-1-20] and there would be no adverse change in the environmental impact.
- 4.142 Provided that there are no significant unfilled voids at 2035 and the scheme for the restoration of the site can be implemented as proposed we are satisfied that there would be no significant adverse change in the environmental impact of the project.
- 4.143 In order to ensure that action would be taken and could if necessary be enforced to secure the completion and restoration required in the DCO, we recommend r32. We considered the use of the requirement imposed in respect of the East Northants Resource Management Facility<sup>15</sup>, but decided this would not be appropriate for White Moss. The requirement which we recommend would secure a review of the disposal capacity and consumption of the space available for waste before the start of excavation of the second, third and fourth phases of the project. In the event that there is a material shortfall in the quantities of waste that have been accepted, then a variation of the relevant plans and schemes<sup>16</sup> must be put forward by the Applicant and approved by LCC before the next phase of the project may commence. Work must then proceed in accordance with the approved variation.
- 4.144 CPRE raised concerns that the options identified to compensate for any shortfall in deposits would provide an incentive for the Applicant to work the mineral and coal deposits and then backfill with inert waste [EV-OF2-08]. Requirement 32 would prevent the excavation of a new phase of the application site before a review of deposits has taken place, accompanied by the submission and approval of an amended scheme and plans. It would therefore fall

---

<sup>15</sup> DCLG ref WS010001 SoS decision dated 11 July 2013

<sup>16</sup> As listed in subparas (5), (9) and (13) of r4

within the control of LCC to ensure that such an approach to excavation is not undertaken.

- 4.145 CPRE also raised a concern about the time span between reviews if r32 was implemented as recommended by the Panel. However, the timescale is agreed by LCC which is the body responsible for the implementation of the requirement. Since the development could not progress to the next phase until any shortfall in deposits has been addressed, we consider the link between the timing for a review and the progress of the project through each phase is appropriate.
- 4.146 Concerns were also raised at the OFH [CPRE and others EV-OF2-34] that in the event that the whole site was not put to use within the timescale of the application, it would still be necessary to construct the mounding across the whole site to comply with the restoration scheme. However the creation of the new mounding would be the long-term consequence of the implementation of the project whether or not deposits are achieved at the proposed rate. We consider that the benefit of providing a safeguard through r32 to ensure that there are not unfilled voids in 2035 outweigh these concerns.

### **Conclusion**

- 4.147 Requirement 32 is within the ExA draft DCO issued on the 12 November 2014 [PD-U-07], and has been agreed with LCC [REP-R17-2-01] and noted by the Applicant [REP-17 Nov10, Sch 1]. We are satisfied that the requirement would ensure that the project would be completed and that restoration would take place in accordance with the DCO. No further legal obligation as suggested by Policy DM3 of the MWLP would be required.

### **Health**

- 4.148 As noted in para 4.3 above, the impact of the proposed development on the health and well-being of the local community is an issue of importance to interested parties. Such impacts are similarly an issue considered within LIRs, as set out in para 4.5 above. A substantial number of the over 3,000 relevant representations cite such impacts as concerns. These have been further articulated in numerous written and oral representations during the examination. Principal concerns relate to potential for harm to health from the pollution of air or water, including the risk to soil and crops, and the fear and anxiety caused by the belief that this could occur. We examined these matters through both our first and second written questions and at the environment ISH [DEC-G-05; DEC-G0-7; EV-IS-04].
- 4.149 The NPS for Hazardous Waste states at para 4.10.2:

*"Modern, appropriately located, well-run and well-regulated, waste management facilities operated in line with current pollution*

*techniques and standards should pose little risk to human health. The detailed consideration of a waste management process and the implications, if any, for human health is the responsibility of the pollution control authorities. However, planning operates in the public interest to ensure that the location of proposed development is acceptable and health can be material to such decisions. Perceptions of the health risks associated with hazardous waste infrastructure may exceed any actual risks and could lead to anxiety and stress. The Secretary of State should take account of health concerns when setting conditions relating to a range of impacts including, for example, noise."*

- 4.150 The Applicant's ES includes an assessment of the potential impacts on health of those living and working in the area as a result of the proposed development [APP-ES-11; APP-ES-02]. This is in line with para 4.10.3 of the NPS which indicates that an ES should assess these effects for each element of the project, identifying any adverse health impacts, and identifying measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for these impacts as appropriate. The ES also assesses the potential impact on the mental and social well-being of residents as a result of the perception of health impacts associated with the site. It employed a source - pathway - receptor methodology<sup>17</sup> for assessing impacts.
- 4.151 The overall conclusion of the ES is that identified sources of contaminants and exposure pathways from the proposed development can be adequately controlled so that there would be no unacceptable impact on human health [APP-ES-11, section 10].
- 4.152 Public Health England (PHE) was involved in consultations relating to the preparation of the ES. Its objectives are:
- "to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of the population, and to reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing outcomes"* [REP-01-RC-03].
- 4.153 PHE has confirmed that its suggested general approach to the assessment of the potential impacts on health has been followed in the ES and that the areas specifically considered appear to be reasonable and proportionate [APP-ES-11, HS6]. Both LCC and WLBC also considered the source-pathway-receptor approach was an appropriate technique for the assessment of health impacts [REP-1Q-05; REP-1Q-10].
- 4.154 PHE's position relating to the potential impacts on health of landfill sites is that set out in the report 'Impact on health emissions from

---

<sup>17</sup> The three elements of this methodology comprise: a) a contaminant source which has the potential to cause harm to human health; b) a receptor (in general terms something that could be affected adversely by the contaminant) such as people, or a water body which will then be used by people; and c) a pathway or route by which a receptor can be exposed to and affected by the contaminant. Each of the elements can exist independently but an impact can occur only where the elements are linked together so that a contaminant can affect a receptor via a pathway [APP-ES-11, HS4].

landfill sites' of July 2011 by its predecessor Health Protection Agency (HPA):

*"... The disposal of waste materials to landfill can undoubtedly present a pollution risk and a potential health hazard. Improvements in landfill design and management, restrictions in the types of waste that can be handled, and environmental legislation designed to minimise pollution should all ensure that there is no significant risk to health of the local population ...a well-managed modern landfill site does not pose a significant risk to human health". [PD-L-07; APP-ES-11, para 10.3].*

- 4.155 PHE has not raised objections to the proposal on the grounds of risks to health. This is on the basis of necessary permit requirements and control by the regulator - in this case the EA[PD-L-07]. ARROW does not accept the view of PHE. Nor does it accept the findings of the HPA's July 2011 report; it considers this should be disregarded as: it did not undergo evaluation through peer-review publication; did not take into account the most recent papers on the subject; and evidence relied upon relates largely to municipal waste and not hazardous waste sites [REP-W-06].
- 4.156 ARROW has also criticised the Applicant's health impact assessment on several grounds: failure to cite references; the non-inclusion of site-specific health research on the Whitemoss site; and failure to provide evidence that no unacceptable impact would occur. It refers to evidence which it considers demonstrates that contaminants in landfill sites cannot be adequately controlled over the periods necessary to protect human health [REP-W-06].
- 4.157 The 2011 HPA review is an update to an earlier report of 2004 prepared on behalf of Defra<sup>18</sup>. The earlier report was reviewed by the Royal Society<sup>19</sup>. The 2011 report included a review of more recent research into suggested links between landfill site emissions and effect on health, as well as detailed monitoring results from EA-funded studies. As part of the preparation of the 2011 report, advice was sought from the Committee on Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment [EV-G-05, Schedule B]. The report does however consider it important that research continues in order to improve the assessment of risk of exposure from UK landfill sites.
- 4.158 ARROW refers to a more recent 2013 review by Mattiello et al<sup>20</sup>. This does not present new information and data but comprises a review of previous papers many of which refer to earlier epidemiological studies. It suggests that in relation to the health

---

<sup>18</sup> 'Review of Environmental and Health Effects of Waste Management: Municipal Solid Waste and Similar Wastes'

<sup>19</sup> The Royal Society is the national Academy of Science in the UK

<sup>20</sup> 'Health effects associated with the disposal of solid waste in landfills and incinerators in populations living in surrounding areas: a systematic review'. Int J Public Health (2013)

effects of landfill *"it is reasonable to conclude that the risk of congenital anomalies is likely to be real"* [REP-W-06]. However, this review does not refer to the 2011 HPA report and therefore ignores extensive emissions monitoring data collected by the EA and assessed in the 2011 report. At the same time it identifies the lack of available exposure measurements as a weakness in the assessment methodologies which it reviewed [EV-G-05].

- 4.159 Furthermore, the Mattiello review identifies the difficulty in differentiating between different waste types in landfill sites assessed in the papers reviewed. It makes no attempt to differentiate between papers reporting assessments of legally operated landfill sites and illegal dumps or land contaminated by uncontrolled deposition of wastes. Additionally, most of the papers cited in the review were reviewed as part of the 2004 Defra and 2011 HPA reports [EV-G-05, Schedule B].
- 4.160 The majority of the papers which are not included in those reviewed in the 2004 and 2011 reports conclude that there are no significant relationships between living near a landfill site and ill health. Alternatively, they relate to sites which are all or mostly USA sites which are highly contaminated industrial waste dumps or other contaminated sites, rather than engineered landfill sites. Some of the other papers reviewed by Mattiello and not included in the 2004 Defra and 2011 HPA reports related to the potential effects on people living in houses built on uncontrolled, contaminated industrial dumps built between 1954 and 1962. We do not consider such sites to be representative of controlled sites such as Whitemoss [ibid].
- 4.161 A further report referred to in the Mattiello review identified a relationship between *"other congenital anomalies of the nervous system"* and residence near household waste sites, but not near sites taking difficult-to-handle wastes (similar to current hazardous waste sites). Also, it identified significant reductions in a number of other adverse health outcomes where the mothers lived close to landfill sites compared with those who lived further away. Therefore the data were unlikely to represent a causative effect [ibid].
- 4.162 The Mattiello review also refers to the EUROHAZCON study<sup>21</sup>, which detected an increase in risk of non-chromosomal birth defects in people living less than 3km from landfill sites containing hazardous wastes. There were, however, differences in the results from the different sites studied (which operated in the period 1974-1994). Some showed increases in risk of birth defects, and some not, and some showed a reduction in birth deformities with proximity to the landfill sites. No exposure or emissions data were obtained for the sites considered in the study. The authors note in

---

<sup>21</sup> 'Risk of congenital anomalies near hazardous waste landfill sites in Europe: the EUROHAZCON study', Dolk H et al, 1998 [REP-W-06]

the paper that there was a need for further investigation to determine whether the association of apparent raised risk was a causal one [EV-G-05; REP-W-06; REP-R17-1- REP-R17-05]

- 4.163 The sites included in the EUROHAZCON study, operated in ways different from current standard landfill sites. Not all the sites were containment sites, not all were capped or sealed and not all sites had gas controls in place, thus reducing the studies' relevance to current regulatory principles. A further study was published in 2002 to take the EUROHAZCON work forward<sup>22</sup>. Through ranking how well managed or contained the sites were, its results showed no evidence of a correlation between risk of congenital anomaly and distance from the sites based on their relative hazard potential. Both the initial study and the follow-up 2002 study were taken into account in the HPA's 2011 report.
- 4.164 In light of the above, we concur with the Applicant's assessment that the 2004 and 2011 reports represent comprehensive and authoritative reviews representing the views of Government and UK regulators. Confidence should therefore be placed in their conclusions rather than the later review cited by ARROW [EV-G-06].
- 4.165 The site's operation, its emissions and discharges would be subject to control through the environmental permitting regime administered and enforced by the EA, as is currently the case with the existing landfill operation. Despite certain suggestions to the contrary from ARROW<sup>23</sup> and local IPs as to the running of the existing landfill operation, the EA has stated:
- "Based on our Operational Risk Assessment (Opra) system, the Whitemoss operator is currently Band A. This is our top rating and identifies the operator as a good performer"* [EV-G-05, para B11; EV-G-18, para 2.87].
- 4.166 The EA has expressed its confidence in the accuracy and validity of monitoring undertaken by the Applicant [REP-1Q-03; EV-G-05, B11; REP -W-06; REP -17 Nov-07; PD-L-04]. On this basis, as the EA is the appropriate expert body charged with administering and enforcing control over such sites, we accept that the present operation represents a well-managed modern landfill facility.

---

<sup>22</sup> M Vrijheid et al, Occup Environ Med 2002 [REP-R17-1-05]

<sup>23</sup> ARROW refers to five enforcement notices served against the operators of the Whitemoss site and a prosecution for breaching permit conditions relating to odour [REP-W-06]. However, these all relate to the period 2006 and earlier, so at least some eight years ago. The Lathom South Parish Council suggests that local residents have lost faith in the EA in responding to complaints, citing examples of the recent pollution of the River Tawd which have not resulted in prosecutions. There is no suggestion that such incidents result from operations at the present Whitemoss site [REP-2Q-07; EV-G-05, Schedule B, para B43]. In response to our first written questions, LCC stated that it had carried out regular monitoring visits to the site to assess compliance with the conditions of the existing planning permissions. It has always found that the site is well managed with there being no complaints to the Council regarding operations there [REP-1Q-05].

- 4.167 The focus of public concerns is based on the operation of the site in its receipt of hazardous waste and the potential for hazardous emissions and discharges.
- 4.168 In our consideration of this proposal, and as advised in para 4.7.3 of the NPS, we have focussed on *"whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and on the impacts of that use, rather than on the control of processes, emissions or discharges themselves"*. We have worked on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime, in this case the environmental permitting regime, will be properly applied and enforced. On this basis, any requirement for a site-specific health risk assessment, as suggested by ARROW and others (including a local medical practice), would be within the ambit of the EA in its consideration of a variation to the site's existing environmental permit (EP) [REP-W-011; REP-2Q-02].
- 4.169 As noted in para 1.18, the Applicant has submitted an application to the EA for a variation of the existing EP to cover operations on the extended site. The application was deemed to have been duly made on 23 September 2014. This had not been determined by the close of the examination. The EP application documents include risk assessments. In accordance with the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 (as amended) an Environmental Permit variation will not be issued unless the Environment Agency is *"satisfied that the operations will be operated in a manner which will not result in an unacceptable risk to the environment and human health"* [PD-L-13].
- 4.170 Having regard to the source-pathway-receptor approach to assessment of emission management and control, it is the design and operation of the facility, the use of the land and surrounding areas and the surrounding and underlying water environment which determine the receptors and pathways present. These elements also point to the extent to which receptors may potentially be affected by a source of contamination. Without an exposure pathway there should be no risk even if a contaminant is present. Where there is an exposure pathway an assessment must be carried out to determine whether the potential impact is acceptable [EV-G-05, B15].
- 4.171 For these potential exposure pathways quantified risk assessment calculations are carried out as part of an EP application. Such pathways could include the seepage through the liner of the landfill to groundwater; airborne dust; or emissions from the landfill gas stack. It is for the EA to determine that emissions would be below acceptable concentrations, with emission limits protective of the environment and human health being specified in the EP [ibid, B16].
- 4.172 Emissions are set at levels which the Government (as advised by technical specialist bodies such as the Committee on Toxicity) has

determined will not result in unacceptable adverse effects on human health<sup>24</sup>. The setting of emission limits takes into account the exposure of people over their lifetime. They take into account different routes by which any emitted compounds could be taken up into the body whilst also taking into account the exposure of the most sensitive receptors [EV-G-05, Schedule B]. The significance of potential impacts on health is assessed through consideration of whether emissions may have an impact on health above the thresholds set by Government [REP -1Q-11].

4.173 Monitoring is carried out by the EA, with the monitoring regime being set out in the EP. The updated Table ES 1 [EV-G-05, App G] sets out the aspects of the proposal that would be controlled through the DCO and the EP. This makes clear that the EP would control:

- Site operations and waste acceptance, including access and egress.
- The operation and monitoring of the gas flare.
- The design, construction, operation and monitoring of the facility in terms of impact on water resources, including the design in relation to mine entries and stability.
- Operation of the leachate and surface water management systems.
- Long-term aftercare monitoring for pollution control.

4.174 Unless the EA is satisfied as to the measures to be incorporated into the design of the landfill, the regime of operation, and monitoring, an EP would not be issued and the proposal could not proceed [PD-L-13].

### ***Odour***

4.175 A particular recurring matter referred to in both written and oral representations is locally-expressed concern about odour that is claimed to be generated from the site. This has sometimes been colloquially referred to as the 'Pennylands Pong'. Representations note how this has affected individuals and, on occasions, institutions, such as local schools, in terms of restrictions on domestic and other activities [for example, REP -W-015; REP -W-018; REP -W-020-023; REP -W-046; REP -W-054].

4.176 There is acknowledgement that odour attributed to the site in 2005 occurred prior to the implementation of a gas management system and the provision of a gas flare [REP-1Q-11, para 12.8]. The ES records that there have been no substantiated odour complaints at the site since 2006, with this endorsed in the SoCG with LCC and WLBC [PD-1-05, para 4.16]. Receipt by the EA of a

---

<sup>24</sup> The way in which these thresholds are set are explained in documents such as 'Comparison of Processes and Procedures for Deriving Exposure Criteria for the Protection of Human Health; Chemicals, Ionising Radiation and Non-ionising Radiation', HPA 2007 [REP-1Q-11, para 12.9]



number of odour complaints from locations within 3km of the site between 2006 and 2012 have not identified the site as the source of the odour [APP-ES-02, para 12.8; REP-1Q-11]<sup>25</sup>.

- 4.177 The Applicant's health impact assessment notes that waste with a significant biodegradable content, with the potential to generate significant quantities of landfill gas, was accepted for deposition between 2003 and 2004. This is deposited in cells of the current landfill site [APP-ES-02, para 7.4.6.1]. The existing gas flare will continue to be operated as necessary to manage gas from these cells.
- 4.178 Hazardous waste to be deposited in the proposed extension would be unlikely to generate significant quantities of landfill gas as those wastes permitted for deposition would be subject to a limit on the biodegradable carbon content. Requirement 23 of the recommended DCO restricts wastes to be accepted at the site to hazardous waste only, or those materials necessary for engineering and restoration purposes. Nevertheless, monitoring boreholes would be installed and monitoring carried out in accordance with schemes approved through the EP [APP-ES-02, Section 7]. Emissions from the gas flare are controlled under the existing EP and are monitored by the EA. The EA would have to be satisfied that there would be no significant health or environmental impacts in relation to the application project before a revised permit would be issued [APP-ES-02, para 7.4.6.3].

### **Noise and Dust**

- 4.179 Potential effects arising from mineral working activities, such as noise and dust generation, unconnected with landfill construction activities, would not be covered by the environmental permitting regime. These are matters which themselves could have a direct impact on nearby receptors [REP-1Q-03].
- 4.180 As required by para 4.10.2 of the NPS we have taken account of health concerns in assessing the proposed requirements of the DCO. In terms of matters such as dust and noise emissions from mineral extraction, the nearest residential properties to the proposed landfill extension are Peel Farm and adjoining dwellings (Nos. 64, 66 and 68a White Moss Road South)<sup>26</sup>.
- 4.181 The environment at these dwellings is dominated by traffic noise from the adjacent M58 and is discussed more fully below [4.269; 4.270]. Proposed bunding between the site and the dwellings would provide noise attenuation and predicted noise levels would

---

<sup>25</sup> Whilst clearly not a scientific or representative assessment, on our various visits to the area, both accompanied and unaccompanied, members of the Panel did not register any significant odour beyond the car park area that could be attributed to the site.

<sup>26</sup> The dwelling within the application site, The Cottage, was not subject to assessment within the ES as this would be vacated prior to the start of development and demolished as operations progress.

be at or very close to existing background levels [APP-ES-02, section 13].

- 4.182 Requirement 19(1) of the recommended DCO imposes a noise limit and sets out controls for dust during construction and operation. Requirement 21 requires dust suppression measures for the crushing and screening of aggregate, and r20 prevents blasting. These requirements are agreed by LCC as the regulatory body in respect of mineral extraction [EV-G-12]. We are satisfied that these are appropriate and necessary in terms of controlling matters that could impinge on the health and well-being of nearby residential occupiers and which would complement controls available through environmental permitting.

### ***Perception of health risks***

- 4.183 Amongst others, ARROW submits that the perception of risk constitutes a health impact because of the fear and anxiety caused and that this is in its own right a material consideration to be weighed [REP-W-06; REP-2Q-03]. Cited case law makes this clear<sup>27</sup>.
- 4.184 We were keenly aware during the examination of the often forcefully expressed and no doubt genuinely held fears and apprehension of a number of residents about the project and its potential impact on health [for example, REP-W-012; REP-2Q-03; EV-OF1-01; EV-OF1-03; EV-OF2-01]. The Applicant accepts that perception of health risks can be a relevant consideration though it is the perception that is the issue and the perception may not reflect the reality. In the absence of actual harm the Applicant considers no weight should be given to perception of harm [EV-G-05, para B30].
- 4.185 ARROW draws attention to the World Health Organisation's (WHO) definition of health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity". It suggests that, in the light of this definition, health effects may arise either from exposure to harmful emissions or by anxiety caused by the perception that such exposure would be harmful. Even if the perception is unfounded, then there could still be a health impact having regard to the WHO definition [REP-W-07]. Where concerns are strongly felt they have the potential to give rise to mental anxiety, which can also manifest itself in physical symptoms.
- 4.186 It is suggested by ARROW that inequity in the distribution of risks and benefits is an important factor influencing attitudes to risk, often resulting in a particular community having to bear the

---

<sup>27</sup> For example, Newport County Borough Council v Secretary of State for Wales & Anor, 1997 EWCA Civ 189, and Westminster City Council v Great Portland Estates Plc, 1985 1 AC 661 [quoted in REP-W-07]

disadvantages of a development whilst not gaining the benefits. In the case of the White Moss site, ARROW has drawn attention to several factors that it submits increase the overall level of anxiety and perception of health risks. These include concerns about the cumulative impact of there being some 13 landfill sites within a 5km radius of Skelmersdale (two active and 11 closed). It is suggested that this represents a far greater concentration of waste sites than other areas. There are concerns that there may be potential for on-going pollution from sites where previous controls may not have been to present-day standards [REP-W-07].

- 4.187 A second factor which ARROW draws to attention is that parts of Skelmersdale that could be affected by the proposal are low-income communities, with some ranked as amongst the lowest nationally in the Government's 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation. Existing health problems include low birth weights and shorter life expectancy. ARROW suggests that the most deprived communities are well known to be those most vulnerable to other threats to health. Allowing the proposal close to deprived areas would maximise any health impacts from the operation of the site because of the particular vulnerability of those already suffering from ill health [ibid].
- 4.188 A third element noted by ARROW is that there have been successive extensions of the original planning permission for the Whitemoss site. The local community has felt that the planning process has not protected it by ensuring that operations are completed in accordance with the dates promised in successive permissions and that a further long-term extension in the land use would continue the blight created by the site's existence [ibid; REP-W-020].
- 4.189 To provide reassurance to local people about the development the Applicant has suggested the formation of a community liaison committee (CLC). It suggests that such a committee could provide an effective forum for direct discussion of concerns raised by the community with the site operators. An example of the successful operation of such a CLC was provided at the environment ISH<sup>28</sup>. Such a committee could comprise representatives of management from the Applicant, EA, LCC and WLBC and the local community [APP-ES-11; EV-G-05]. The proposed mechanism for securing the establishment of such a committee is within Schedule 5 of the s106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) [AS-056], which is referred to in paras 4.308 - 4.310 below.
- 4.190 Both the EA and LCC, based on experience have noted the value of such a liaison group as a means of improving understanding and mitigating fear and anxiety. Nevertheless, there is strong opposition to the formation of such a committee from a number of

---

<sup>28</sup> This related to a landfill site in Wales - Cwmrhydyceiw Quarry - with which the Applicant's planning representative was directly involved [EV-G-05, B33-B41]

local residents and bodies. This appears to be based on general sensitivity relating to the proposal, mistrust of the Applicant, and what some consider the Applicant's disregard in terms of past consultation with the local community [for example, REP-R17-1-03; REPS-2QC-08 to 20].

- 4.191 The originally proposed bilateral s106 agreement between the Applicant and LCC, which had not been signed at the close of the examination, required the terms of a CLC to be agreed with LCC. This is not now within the UU, such that LCC has no right to have any input to the terms. The removal of any LCC input is unlikely to improve the confidence of the community in the process. However, we are of the view that there would be advantages in providing a mechanism for dialogue between the operators of the site and the local community in the form of a CLC in the event that the DCO is made.
- 4.192 We consider that despite currently expressed community misgivings, the involvement of the regulator and the local councils in a CLC would keep the community informed of activities within the landfill site. With increased knowledge and the opportunity to hold the Applicant and the bodies responsible for the regulation of the site to account, the liaison committee would help to address the local community's fears and concerns.
- 4.193 As such, the obligation within the UU would be both appropriate and necessary. However, as we note in para 4.308 below, since the UU has not been correctly signed we do not consider it to have been validly made as a deed in accordance with s106(9) of the 1990 Act, and so is not legally enforceable. If the SoS agrees to make the DCO we consider provision for the establishment of a CLC should be made, with its terms to be agreed with LCC. As discussed in Section 7 below, this could be achieved by the insertion of an additional requirement into the DCO. Alternatively, provision could be made within a validly made s106 agreement or UU to include an obligation relating to the establishment and running of a CLC.
- 4.194 As a further attempt to address local perception of harm, the Applicant has indicated that regular updates on its website would be provided. This would be in respect of operations including current and anticipated engineering procedures and restoration updates, and issues relating to environmental management and monitoring reports to the EA [APP-ES-11, para 9.3]. We consider this too would provide helpful information on the activities within the site and contribute to allaying local concerns.

### ***Conclusion on health impacts***

- 4.195 Overall, applying the principle set out in the NPS that the relevant pollution control measures, in this case the environmental permitting regime, would be properly applied and enforced, and

having regard to the additional appropriate requirements of the recommended DCO, we are satisfied that the proposed development would not pose any unacceptable health risks to those living and working in the area.

- 4.196 We accept that weight should be accorded to the perception of health risks since people's fears resulting from their perceptions, whether grounded in reality or not, can, for some, impinge on health and general well-being. The Panel has accordingly given due and careful consideration to the fears and anxieties expressed. If the DCO is to be made, we consider that a CLC would be a means of allaying some of the community's concerns and influencing perceptions.
- 4.197 Notwithstanding the above, we are of the view that, in the balance, the weight to be given to these anxieties and perceptions must necessarily be limited. This is on the basis of our overall conclusion that, with the controls over the landfill operation available through the EP regime to ensure emissions of contaminants would not exceed well-established thresholds set by Government, and the requirements recommended within the DCO, there is no evidence that there is likely to be any materially significant impact on the health of those living and working within the area.

### **Socio-economic impacts**

- 4.198 As required by NPS 5.12, the Applicant has carried out an assessment of the socio-economic impacts of the proposed development [APP-ES-02 Section 9]. The assessment covers nine wards of which the population is about 42,698<sup>29</sup>. The application site is located within the South Skelmersdale ward which has a population of about 6,500.
- 4.199 Within the nine wards, the average unemployment rate was above the national average of 4.1% at 6.1% in 2010<sup>30</sup>. The average annual household income for the north-west region is £34,000. Six of the seven Skelmersdale wards have average annual household incomes of under £30,000, and represent the six lowest earning wards in WLBC<sup>31</sup>. With this relatively high level of unemployment, and low level of average household income, there are issues of deprivation and social inequality within the town.
- 4.200 The employment base for Skelmersdale has been subject to change as some employers move out of the area whilst other companies have relocated, in particular, to the White Moss Business Park [APP-ES-02 para 9.3.7]. The existing landfill operation employs 10 people of whom two live in Skelmersdale,

---

<sup>29</sup> Office for National Statistics Neighbourhood Statistics 2011 Census

<sup>30</sup> WLBC Spatial Evidence Paper for Skelmersdale and Up Holland August 2011

<sup>31</sup> LCC May 2012. Average gross household income 2012.

and has contributed to the local economy through the provision of a facility for the disposal of hazardous waste and through the extraction of fill materials from the site for local development projects. The site also uses about 23 local businesses to provide services to the site [ibid 9.3.8-10].

- 4.201 The construction of the application project would create about 20 additional jobs for contractors, and the additional landfilling operations would create six additional jobs [ibid 9.4.2]. During construction of the landfill site, there would be significant volumes of clay and other materials including coal available to local industries to facilitate other developments, and for the generation of electricity.
- 4.202 Through the continued provision of the hazardous waste disposal facility at White Moss, the application project would meet the need identified in NPS para 3.1 for nationally significant hazardous waste infrastructure facilities. NPS para 3.3.3 states that to comply with the principles of self-sufficiency and proximity in Article 16 of the revised Waste Framework Directive, "*sufficient disposal facilities must be provided in England to match expected arisings of all hazardous wastes*". With the capacity proposed at White Moss, there would be a significant contribution to meeting the national requirement for hazardous waste infrastructure identified in NPS para 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.
- 4.203 Skelmersdale town centre is about 1.8km to the north east of the application site boundary. Planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the town centre which, subject to funding, would include retail units, restaurants and a cinema creating 350 new jobs and representing £20m of investment [APP-ES-02 para 9.3.14]. We accept that this proposed redevelopment would make a significant contribution to the regeneration of the town centre.
- 4.204 A number of representations from residents and local businesses argue that the enlarged landfill site would present a negative image to potential investors and customers, and that visitors would not wish to come to a polluted area [for example RR-10024243; RR-10023847; RR-1022576; RR-10005508; EV-OF1-02]. WLBC and LCC also raise the issue of the impact of this proposal upon the image of Skelmersdale, especially in relation to WLBC's ability to deliver housing and employment land, including at White Moss Business Park [PD-L-01 and 02].
- 4.205 A number of the policies of the West Lancashire Local Plan aim to improve Skelmersdale as a place to live and work, the intention being to address the deprivation and social inequalities within the town. In particular WLBC is seeking to ensure that the town benefits from the regeneration of the Port of Liverpool, since Skelmersdale is just 30 minutes by road from the Port [PD-L-02 para 6.11.2].

- 4.206 WLBC accepts that it is difficult to assess the impact of the proposed landfill project on inward investment [ibid para 6.11.3]. The existing site has been accepting hazardous wastes for more than 30 years, and lorries accessing the landfill site use the same motorway junction as visitors to the business park. The Applicant refers to the relocation of businesses to the business park during 2013 [APP-ES-02 para 9.3.7], demonstrating that the current landfill site and the application for the larger site have not deterred those businesses from coming to the area.
- 4.207 The application proposal would not introduce a new land use to the area, and therefore the perception of the site as a hazardous waste landfill would not be altered. The existing landfill has been in operation for a number of years, and no conclusive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that it has inhibited economic development in the area. Without such evidence, we cannot conclude that the application project should deter inward investment to Skelmersdale, or conflict with the policies of the WLLP in this respect.
- 4.208 Local residents argued at the OFHs that complaints about the operation of the landfill have been withheld because of their fear that drawing attention to the impacts of the landfill site could affect their ability to sell their houses [EV-OF1-01; EV-OF2-01]. Submissions have also been made from within the town and further afield expressing concern about the effects of the landfill on human health. We deal with the effect on health earlier in this Section, but recognise that the perception of an area as being an unhealthy place in which to live could have a negative impact on the housing market.
- 4.209 However, in terms of the housing market in Skelmersdale, WLBC accepts that although the market is weak in certain places, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the past and current landfilling operations to the south of the M58 have had a negative impact on the market [PD-L-02 para 6.11.4]. In these circumstances, this is not a matter to which we can accord significant weight.
- 4.210 There are no public rights of way crossing the site. Footpath FP44/FP45 runs adjacent the southern boundary of the site and its route would not be affected by the development. There are a number of recreation facilities within the vicinity of the site, including public playing fields and the scouts' site in Skelmersdale, and the cycle track at Bickerstaffe Colliery. Beacon Country Park some 3.2km to the north east of the site boundary is a key area for recreation. There are also a number of clubs and community groups [ibid 9.3.18].
- 4.211 At the OFHs [EV-OF1-01; EV-OF2-01], objectors voiced their fears that air pollution would affect the recreational facilities in the area, making them unhealthy locations in which to carry out outdoor activities. We consider the effect of the project on health, and the

issues of air quality and pollution earlier in this Section. We have pointed out that NPS 4.7.3 requires us to assume that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. Through the pollution control regime and the requirements recommended within the DCO, we would not expect any harmful impact on the air quality of locations in the vicinity of the site in which outdoor activities take place.

4.212 The area has a relatively weak tourism economy [APP-ES-02 para 9.3.19], and there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development of the site would have an impact on tourism.

4.213 The restoration scheme would provide for the construction of a permissive footpath across the site which would link in with FP44/FP45 to the south. This would benefit the local community as well as visitors to the area. Since 2010 through the Whitemoss Community Fund, the Applicant has provided financial grants to community groups. The Applicant points out that the application project would ensure that such funds continue to be available over the 20 year lifetime of the project [ibid para 9.4.9].

#### ***Conclusion on socio-economic impacts***

4.214 In conclusion we find that there is no evidence to indicate that the application project would have an adverse impact on inward investment, such as the redevelopment of Skelmersdale town centre; or on recreation or tourism. There would be some local economic benefits from employment on the site, and to local businesses which act as suppliers to the site. There would also be a limited benefit to recreation arising from the restoration scheme for the site. We therefore find that there would be some minor socio-economic benefits, and there is no evidence of harm to inward investment or to the housing market.

#### **Design**

4.215 The NPS at para 4.5 states that applying good design to hazardous waste projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place; efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction and operation; and matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible. However, the NPS acknowledges that the nature of much hazardous waste infrastructure development will often limit the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area.

4.216 The application site is well located near the M58 junction and would make use of the access to the existing landfill site. In addition, it would make use of existing infrastructure and would not require the construction of new buildings. In the formation of the voids, extracted minerals and coal would be put to economic use, whilst peat and top soils would be retained on the site for use



in the restoration scheme [APP-ES-01 para 5.2.10]. All these elements of the proposal contribute to a sustainable use of resources.

- 4.217 During the operation of the landfill, there would be some screening of activities by the perimeter bunds to be constructed on the northern, western and southern boundaries of the site [APP-ES-01 paras 5.2.11; 5.6.1]. Whilst these would not prevent activities within the site from being seen within a number of longer distance or higher views towards the site, they would provide some screening from locations immediately adjacent to it. In our view there is little potential for the site to contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area during the operational phase, and mitigation is of necessity limited to the screening and good management of the activities.
- 4.218 Whilst we find that the mounding to be formed for the restoration of the site would be intrusive in the wider landscape character area, the restoration proposals would provide an opportunity to contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area. We consider the impact on landscape and visual amenity later in this Section [4.221 et seq].
- 4.219 Through the creation of ecological habitats, the restoration proposals would enhance biodiversity interest in the area. Furthermore, public access would be provided across the restored site through permissive links to footpaths FP44/FP45 to the south of the site. The restoration scheme would provide more varied landscape elements and would provide locally elevated views of the surrounding countryside.
- 4.220 We are satisfied that, given the purpose of the application project, it has been designed to achieve the efficient and sustainable operation of the landfill. Mitigation in terms of landscape and visual impact is limited during the operation of the site, but there would be enhancements in terms of biodiversity and public access in the restoration stage. The project therefore complies with the NPS in so far as it would make an efficient use of natural resources during its construction and operation; and would provide long-term environmental enhancement in the restoration phase.

## **Landscape and visual impact**

### ***Landscape***

- 4.221 NPS 5.9.5 states that landscape effects depend on the existing character of the local landscape, its current value, how highly it is valued and its capacity to accommodate change. The application site is not within or adjacent to any nationally designated landscape area.
- 4.222 Relevant development plan policies include WLLP Policy GN3 which requires proposed development to have regard to the historical

character of the local landscape and to visual amenity, and to complement or enhance any attractive attributes and/or local distinctiveness within its surroundings. WLLP Policy EN2 requires development to have regard to its landscape setting and make a positive contribution to key features of the landscape. The Policies of the MWCS and the MWLP also require proposals to protect and enhance landscape character and retain local distinctiveness.

- 4.223 The Lancashire Landscape Strategy designates the site as lying in the Skelmersdale Mosses character area. This is Landscape Character Area (LCA) 3: Upland Type Mosses in the WLBC Landscape SPG [PD-L-02 App 3]. The SPG recommends that within this landscape character area mounding should be avoided, tree planting should be kept to a minimum and extensive landscaping such as screening should be avoided. In addition, it states that the extension of peat and mineral extraction should be avoided and if extraction does take place, the mossland landscape should be rehabilitated on completion of extraction.
- 4.224 A landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) [AP-ES-18] has been submitted by the Applicant as part of the ES, in accordance with published guidance<sup>32</sup>. The ES describes the site as being located within a flat low lying topography that previously was an extensive area of lowland raised mire modified by drainage to accommodate agriculture and market gardening [APP-ES-02 para 11.3.3].
- 4.225 The application site shares the flat and open character of the landscape to the south of the M58, but unlike the land to the south of the site, it has not been in recent agricultural use. It is generally uncultivated, and has been colonised by scrubby vegetation, small trees and short lengths of hedgerow.
- 4.226 WLBC takes the view that the mounding which screens the existing landfill site is out of character with the landscape area, and that further mounding around the periphery of the extended site would further erode that character [PD-L-02 paras 6.3.12; 6.3.14]. Although there are existing mounds formed by colliery spoil heaps within the LCA, we consider that they are not of the scale or regular form of the peripheral mounding proposed to screen the new development. The peripheral mounding would be far more extensive than any existing areas of mounding; and would be an incongruous feature in what is currently a generally flat and open area of landscape.
- 4.227 The LVIA assesses impact on the Skelmersdale Mosses LCA during construction, operation and restoration phases. It identifies a

---

<sup>32</sup> Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment and the Landscape Institute (2013) Guidelines for the Assessment of Landscape and Visual Impacts, 3rd Edition; The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage (2002) Landscape Character Assessment. Guidance for England and Scotland; The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage (2004) Landscape Character Assessment. Guidance for England and Scotland: Topic Paper 6.

direct impact on the landscape character area resulting from removal and alteration of minor landscape features including temporary loss of areas of grassland, scrub and tree cover. The LVIA recognises that there would be some introduction of incongruous elements to the landscape and permanent disruption to landform generally, particularly during the construction and operational phases of the development [APP-ES-18].

- 4.228 The Applicant argues that the site area is relatively small in relation to the scale of the wider landscape area, and the overall effect on the landscape during the construction and operation phase is assessed as between Very Low Adverse to Low Medium Adverse. The extension to the mounding around the site would separate the site from the rest of the open and flat landscape to the south of the M58 and as such the physical changes within the site would be relatively self-contained. Nevertheless, having regard to the scale of the development and the period of time over which it would take place, we consider that the impacts during construction and operation would more likely be Medium Adverse in their effect on the landscape.
- 4.229 Once it is restored, the site would be covered by landscaped mounding up to 10m above the ground level of the surrounding land. This would be a permanent change in ground levels across the site, which would noticeably rise above the flat and open agricultural fields to the south.
- 4.230 The restoration proposals would restore the soil profiles across the mounding to achieve the status of best and most versatile (Grade 2) agricultural land; and there would be a mixture of grassland/meadow, scrub pockets and broadleaf woodland with peripheral marshland/moss habitats including ponds, scrapes and ditches to enhance opportunities for biodiversity. Marshlands/moss landscape and habitats would be included around the periphery of the site, which would help the restored site to integrate with the character of the surrounding landform. The Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat Management and Aftercare Scheme has been agreed with NE, and includes a 20-year period of aftercare [PD-L-12 App A and B]
- 4.231 SoCGs relating to landscape and visual impact matters have been submitted between the Applicant and LCC [PD-L-08] and the Applicant and WLBC [PD-L-09]. WLBC take the view that with its raised ground levels the final landform would not be typical of the landscape character area within which the site is located, and that the proposed landscaping including the woodland and hedgerows would not be typical of that found in this area of Lancashire.
- 4.232 However, LCC considers that the height of the final landform would be similar to that found on former colliery spoil mounds elsewhere in the general area. With the amendments to the soft landscaping and restoration scheme as agreed with NE [PD-L-12],

LCC is satisfied that the proposals would be more sympathetic to local landscape character; would improve the ecological potential of the site; and would increase connectivity between the site and the surrounding landscape. LCC maintains no objection on landscape or visual impact grounds to the application.

- 4.233 WLBC accepts that the proposed restoration scheme complies with some of the recommendations in the Landscape SPG, including the creation of wetland habitats which are framed within the existing field boundaries and tree planting adjacent to the M58. However WLBC remains of the view that the final restored scheme would not be beneficial compared with the current situation, on account of the increase in the area of raised ground which would be out of character with the local landscape, notwithstanding any ecological or other enhancements associated with the restoration.
- 4.234 The application site lies at the edge of LCA3, and the Applicant argues that the restored site would form a transitional area between two LCAs [PD-L-09]. WLBC is of the view that the change in landscape character takes place over a short distance and that the M58 and its screening planting form a clear boundary between the two LCAs [ibid]. The current landfill site is not typical of LCA3, but we find that the land proposed for the extended area of landfill exhibits the key characteristics of LCA3. We recognise the presence of other man-made mounding within LCA3, but that is not of the scale of the proposed restoration scheme.
- 4.235 We agree with WLBC that in terms of its appearance and many of its physical characteristics the restoration of the application site would be a change to the character of this part of LCA3. However, the site is not within or adjacent to any nationally designated landscape area, where great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty (NPS 5.9.6). Furthermore, whilst the site has many of the characteristics of LCA3, it does lie at the edge of the character area, and there would remain large areas of LCA3 which would not be affected by the change in character of the application site. We consider that in this location, LCA3 has the capacity to accommodate the degree of change which would result from the application project.
- 4.236 In addition, we find that the restoration scheme would provide long-term environmental benefits. Within the new raised area of land, the restoration scheme would reinstate and enhance many of the features which are typical of the LCA. Areas of peat would be restored, and new wetland habitats would be formed in accordance with the requirements of the WLBC Landscape SPG [PD-L-02 App 3]. There would be increased habitat diversity, and the proposed planting and woodland cover would be an attractive landscape amenity.
- 4.237 We conclude that the impact on the character of the landscape would be of some harm during the construction and operational

phases of the project, in conflict with WLLP Policies GN3 and EN2. At the end of the operational period, we consider that there would be a change in landscape character as a result of the proposed restoration scheme. However, the restoration scheme would secure an attractive landscape in the long term. In our view the quality of the restoration proposals would balance out any harm to the landscape as a result of the change in character to the restored site. Furthermore we find that the long term benefits of the restoration scheme would provide some compensation for the harm to the landscape during the 20-year period of excavation and landfill.

### ***Visual Impact***

- 4.238 The Applicant's assessment of visual impact focusses on a radius of about 5 km around the application site [APP-ES-18]. It concludes that the greatest level of visual effects would occur during the construction and early operational phases of the development. The most sensitive receptors of visual impact are identified as nearby residents; users of the network of rights of way within 1 km of the site boundary; and users of elevated routes and areas of promoted landscape to the north east of the site. Located at a distance from the site are users of the public open space including Beacon Country Park and Ashurst's Beacon.
- 4.239 Construction of the peripheral bunds and the appearance of the tops of stockpiles together with vehicular movements would cause visual disturbance within the immediate surrounding area. At close range, there would be significant visual impact on residential occupiers of houses adjoining the site on White Moss Road South, and on users of the public rights of way which lie to the south of the site. These impacts are assessed by the Applicant as High to Medium Adverse during the construction phase [APP-ES-02 para 11.4.11]. The proposed peripheral bunds would provide screening of the site from close views at ground level once they are established, and the Applicant expects the magnitude of adverse visual effects to decline.
- 4.240 There would be significant visual impact for users of the pedestrian bridge over the M58 to the north during both the construction and operation of the landfill site. The impact from the M58 footbridge is assessed by the Applicant as Very High Adverse during the construction phase, and High Adverse during the operation of the site [ibid].
- 4.241 We also noted on our site visits that there would be some views across the site from within the upper floors of residential properties lying to the north of the M58. The level of visual disturbance from within residential properties would depend on whether there was a direct view from a room which was in regular use. The potential for visual impact would occur throughout the construction and operation of the site. However, views from these

properties would be interrupted by the presence of the M58, and as a result we consider that the harm to outlook would be minimal.

- 4.242 At greater distance from the site there would be views from higher ground to the north and east including from within the public open space around Beacon Country Park and the footpath network around Ashurst's Beacon. We observed the movement of vehicles within the existing landfill site from these locations. Over this distance, the activities within the site would be a very small part of the view, and would not be readily distinguished. As a result we agree with the Applicant's assessment that any visual impact would be Very Low Adverse [APP-ES-02 para 11.4.12].
- 4.243 With the restoration of the application site, the visual impact would change from that of a working landfill site to one which has been landscaped with new soil contours, wooded areas and planting characteristic of the LCA in which the site is located. We consider that with restoration complete, the site would provide benefits within the immediate and wider area in terms of visual amenity. We agree with the Applicant's assessment that the impact would be between Slight and Very Slight Beneficial [APP-ES-02 para 11.4.15].
- 4.244 There would also be views across the landfill site from the M58 and other public highways in the locality. However, these views would be transient and would vary in significance as the occupants of vehicles travel through the surrounding area. We do not consider that there would be significant harm to the visual amenity of the occupants of vehicles using the roads in the vicinity of the site.
- 4.245 Overall, we consider that in visual terms the presence of the proposed development would be apparent to local residents and visitors to the area, in particular from locations to the north of the site, and also from the network of public rights of way to the west and south of the site. The peripheral mounding would provide screening from locations immediately adjoining the site. However from more distant locations, or at levels raised above the site, there would be views of the excavation and landfill activities across the site. For local residents who fear the impacts on their health of the development, its visual presence would have the potential to add to their anxieties.
- 4.246 We conclude that there would be varying degrees of harm to visual amenity for local residents, visitors and recreational users of the adjoining areas of the countryside during the period of construction and operation of the site. Following the restoration of the site, its visual amenity would be improved to a limited degree over the existing situation, to the benefit of residents and recreational users.

## **Wildlife, Habitats and Agricultural Land**

- 4.247 We deal with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (“The Habitats Regulations”) in section 5.
- 4.248 The Applicant has carried out an assessment of the potential ecological impacts of the proposed development [APP-ES-17]. This is based on baseline survey work carried out in and around the site in 2012 and 2013. The scope for the survey work was agreed with NE and included an extended Phase 1 habitat survey, a hedgerow survey and species-specific surveys for Great Crested Newts, breeding birds, reptiles, badgers, and bats. The potential effects on ecology during the construction, operation, restoration and aftercare periods were included within the assessment.
- 4.249 A number of interested parties raise the issue of impact on wildlife and habitats of the application project. These include the Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside [REP-W-063]. The representations of the Trust were submitted before amendments were made to the Landscaping, Restoration and Habitat Management Scheme in response to concerns raised by NE [REP-W-047] and LCC [PD-L-01].
- 4.250 SoCGs have been agreed between the Applicant and NE [PD-L-06; PD-L-12] and with LCC [PD-L-11]. Amendments to the Landscaping, Restoration and Habitat Management Scheme are included in the schemes appended to each of the SoCG with NE. The final amended scheme [PD-L-12] includes a 20-year period of aftercare as sought by LCC.
- 4.251 In the SoCG [PD-L-06; PD-L-12], NE has agreed the Applicant’s assessment of the habitats and ecological features which are present at the application site; the sites which are of ecological interest in the vicinity of the site; and the agricultural land classification of the site. NE also agrees that there would not be a significant impact on the population of Pink-footed Geese<sup>33</sup> grazing in the vicinity of the site. Pre-commencement habitat enhancement works have been agreed as sought by NE [PD-L-06 para 2.3], and additional surveys for Common Toad and Marsh Orchid have been agreed with LCC [PD-L-11 p3] prior to the commencement of Phases B, C and D of the project. Requirement 10 is included in the recommended DCO to cover the additional survey work. LCC has agreed that the peripheral ponds created as part of the restoration scheme would provide suitable breeding habitat for Common Toad, and that the mitigation proposed for Marsh Orchids, if identified, is appropriate.

---

<sup>33</sup> Pink-footed geese are one of the 100 species of wildfowl which use Martin Mere SPA as a wintering ground, and because of their importance, reinforce the international status of the site [Martin Mere SPA Citation].

- 4.252 An area of Japanese Knotweed lies within the area of Phase B of the project [APP-ES-02 para 10.3.5]. A scheme for the eradication of the plant is required by r8 of the recommended DCO to be submitted for approval from LCC before any of the Phase B activities are commenced.
- 4.253 The Landscaping, Restoration and Habitat Management and Aftercare Scheme [PD-L-12 App A] has been agreed with both NE and LCC. LCC is satisfied that extending the aftercare period following restoration to 20 years would provide a framework for creating increased ecological potential and for increasing the connectivity between the site and the surrounding landscape [PD-L-11].
- 4.254 Whilst there is no evidence that any European protected species would be harmed as a result of the application project, r10 requires further survey work to be carried out before the commencement of operations in each of phases B, C and D of the application land, and if necessary, a mitigation scheme to be approved and carried out.
- 4.255 NE has agreed [PD-L-06 para 3.3] that the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on:
- Any nationally protected species including common lizard, common toad, breeding birds or overwintering birds.
  - The following non-designated but valuable habitats in the vicinity of the site: Bawdy Brook Local Wildlife Site, Elmer's Green Common and Clough Biological Heritage Site (BHS), Ferny Knoll Bog BHS, Holland Moss BHS, Nipe Lane BHS, Tawd Valley Park BHS and Westheads Clough BHS.
  - Local wildlife and wildlife within the proposed landfill site.

We therefore find that there are no adverse impacts in relation to biodiversity or ecology under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

- 4.256 NE has also agreed that the site is of low ecological value at the local level, and is satisfied that the mix of species-rich grassland/meadow, scrub pockets and broadleaf woodland with peripheral marshland/moss habitats including ponds, scrapes and ditches is an appropriate restoration strategy for the site. NE considers that the restoration scheme would increase biodiversity through the development of a number of habitats that would be of benefit to a range of species including breeding birds, reptiles and bats.
- 4.257 Before works commence, vegetation would be removed and soils stripped as necessary from the haul routes, soil storage areas and from Phase A of the project. Vegetation removal and soil stripping would continue progressively as the western landfill area is



developed. Vegetation would be removed outside the bird breeding season wherever possible in accordance with r9 of the recommended DCO.

- 4.258 In addition to the Landscaping, Restoration and Habitat Management and Aftercare Scheme, a Soils Handling and Management Scheme [PD-L-06 App A] has been agreed with NE and LCC. NE agree that there would be no unacceptable impact on the sustainable use of soil resources or land drainage, and that proposals for the management and use of peat resources at the site are appropriate [PD-L-06 para 3.7]. LCC is also satisfied that, based on the soil handling and movement measures set out in the Soils Handling and Management Scheme and in the restoration proposals, there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on soil resources [PD-L-11]. A soil audit would be required at the end of each soil moving season in accordance with r18 in the recommended DCO.
- 4.259 Since equivalent areas of peatland would be restored on the site, we consider that the concerns of the Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside in this respect are met.
- 4.260 There would be a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land during the construction and operation of the landfill. However, that land is not currently considered by NE to be capable of agricultural use [PD-L-06 para 3.6]. The soils would be managed on site to maintain the best and most versatile agricultural land for potential future use and for species rich grassland, and would enable an equivalent area of land to retain its potential as Grade 2 agricultural land [PD-L-06 para 2.8]. Furthermore the restoration would eliminate the small areas of Grade 3b disturbed land, hence NE agrees that there would be an overall positive impact on agricultural land quality [ibid para 3.6].
- 4.261 In view of the low ecological value of the existing site, we find that there would be a limited impact on biodiversity during construction and operation of the landfill. On completion of the landfill, the site would be restored to include habitats characteristic of the Skelmersdale Mosses character area. The restoration proposals would increase biodiversity through the development of a number of habitats that would be of benefit to a range of species including breeding birds, reptiles and bats.
- 4.262 The proposals for soil handling and management would ensure that there is no adverse impact on soil resources and that the restoration proposals would restore the equivalent areas of land to peatland and to best and most versatile agricultural land quality.
- 4.263 In conclusion, we find that there would be long-term benefits in terms of the value of the site as an ecological resource as a result of the application project. Having regard to the current condition of the agricultural land, we also consider that the project would

result in a long term benefit to the availability of best and most versatile agricultural land.

### **General and residential amenity**

- 4.264 During the construction and operation and decommissioning of hazardous waste infrastructure there is potential for nuisance from the impacts of noise, litter, odour, dust, mud on the road, vermin and outdoor lighting. These are matters of significant concern to those who live or work in the vicinity of the application site, and we address concerns raised about the impact on health earlier in this Section [4.148 et seq].
- 4.265 NPS para 4.20.4 states that emissions to air, land and water during operation should be controlled through the EP, and as stated in NPS para 4.7.3 we must work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. The control of emissions from the landfill operation which are enforced through the EP are not matters for regulation through the DCO. We consider the relationship between the EP and controls to be exercised through the DCO elsewhere in this Section [4.95].
- 4.266 As ARROW points out, [REP-W-04], the proximity of a proposed waste project to residential/recreational areas is a matter which waste planning authorities should consider. The residential accommodation closest to the site comprises the four dwellings to the west of the site access on White Moss Road South. The residential areas of Skelmersdale including the Stocks Hall residential care home are also located from about 110m to the north of the northern boundary of the application site. The property located in the centre of the western landfill area would be vacated before activities on site are commenced.
- 4.267 In a southerly direction from the site, Higherend Farm is the closest dwelling located about 600m from the southern boundary. The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to FP44/FP45, and FP66 runs along White Moss Road South about 40m to the west of the western site boundary.
- 4.268 Recreation facilities within the vicinity of the site include public playing fields and the scouts' site in Skelmersdale, and the cycle track at Bickerstaffe Colliery. Land to the east is used by the Skelmersdale Model Aircraft Club, and there are a number of public footpaths which cross the agricultural land south and west of the site.
- 4.269 A noise impact assessment has been undertaken by the Applicant [APP-ES-02 s13]. The assessment is based upon background noise levels taken at three locations to the north of the site and one location at a farm to the south of the site. The dominant noise source in the area is from traffic on the adjacent M58.

The highest predicted noise levels would arise during the excavation and construction of the new landfill site but the predicted noise levels would still be within those levels specified in the NPPF at three of the four properties. Only at the properties on White Moss Road South would the noise levels exceed the levels specified in the NPPF and then only marginally.

- 4.270 The bund proposed for construction around the boundary of the application site would provide some mitigation from noise to the properties on White Moss Road South. In addition, r19 is included in the recommended DCO to control noise levels, and r30 is included to restrict hours of operation. These requirements are as sought by LCC and WLBC [PD-L-01 and 02]. With the imposition of the requirements, we consider that noise impacts from activities within the site would not be significant.
- 4.271 Since HGVs would be required to access the site from the east, they would not pass or cause disturbance to any dwelling on White Moss Road South.
- 4.272 The release of potentially contaminated dust is an issue of significant concern to local residents and recreational users, and submissions were made by Mr Carr and others concerning the release of dust during tipping operations [eg EV-OF2-06 and 07]. An assessment of dust nuisance is included within the Applicant's ES [APP-ES-36].
- 4.273 Dust monitoring is currently undertaken at the site on a quarterly basis at four locations [APP-ES-02 Figure ES 2] in accordance with the current EP for the existing landfill. The EP sets limits for emissions of particulate matter, fibres and specified contaminants.
- 4.274 There are days when wind conditions at the site are such that there is the risk of wind-blown dust if no mitigation measures were in place [APP-ES-36 para 3.4-3.6]. Dust control measures include the use of wheel cleaning facilities before a vehicle leaves the site, watering of haul and access roads and the spraying of storage heaps or areas of landfilling and restoration as necessary during dry weather conditions.
- 4.275 Photographs submitted by Mr Carr of tipping operations on the 18 July 2014 are said to show dust blowing from a deposit being made to the site [EV-OF2-06 and 07; REP-R171-02]. The Applicant states that the deposit was ash from the burning of paper at a paper mill, and this is confirmed by the consignment note [EV-G-05 App O]. Since it was potentially dusty it was damped down using a water jet prior to tipping. The ash can be very hot in the middle of a load, so the Applicant states that the photographs showed the steam which was generated as a result of water on the hot load [REP-2QC-28 A30; EV-G-05 E10].

- 4.276 Dust monitoring of existing activities at the site indicates that there has been no recorded exceedance of the emission limits from 2006 to 2013 [APP-ES-02 para 19.3.2], and we have no evidence of any more recent exceedance. We consider that, in the absence of any breach, the current dust management measures are effective. The current dust monitoring would be extended to the western landfill area in accordance with the EP. Dust control measures would remain in place for the control of dust throughout the duration of the application project. Having regard to the detailed assessment of the probability of dust generation we consider it is unlikely that there would be significant dust emissions from construction and waste disposal operations at the site.
- 4.277 Odour is another issue of significant concern to local residents, but there have been no substantiated odour complaints for the site since 2006. We deal with this issue which arose as a result of past deposits of municipal waste, in the section of our report on Health. In any event, the application site would only accept hazardous wastes, which contain minimal quantities of putrescible material such that it is unlikely that significant odorous emissions would be generated from imported waste [APP-ES-02 para 19.4.5]. The Applicant points out that if odorous materials were to be accepted at the site they would immediately be covered following placement of the waste in the landfill in accordance with the Whitemoss Environmental Management System and schemes agreed with the EA under the EP [ibid].
- 4.278 Land immediately adjacent to the application site is farmed for arable crops and for the production of fruit and vegetables. Concerns were raised by Mr Scarisbrick, Wash Farm and others [eg REP-W-09; 024; 043; 068-70] that there would be pollution of crops as a result of contamination of water resources, and from settlement of polluted dust from the landfill site; and that produce grown in the vicinity of the landfill site would not be saleable because of the fear of potential purchasers that they would be contaminated.
- 4.279 At the ISH on Environment [EV-IS3-04-09] the EA explained that through the EP, emissions of water or dust from the site would be controlled to ensure that they did not contain any contaminants regarded as unsafe for human health. This would ensure that produce grown on nearby land does not become unfit for human consumption. Wash Farm and others argued that standards of control change over time as new research highlights the dangers of contaminants which had previously been thought to be harmless. However, we can only work on the basis that current standards are sufficient and effective. In the event that there is any change in the standards of emissions considered to be safe, new standards would be reflected in changes to the EP.

- 4.280 The existing landfill site has been in operation since the late 1970s. There is no evidence of contamination to produce from adjoining agricultural land or areas of market garden, and no evidence has been produced to indicate difficulties in the sale of locally produced crops. On the basis of the controls which are exercised by the EA through the EP, we find that there is no basis to consider that either the quality or marketability of locally produced crops would be affected by the application project.
- 4.281 The existing static lighting at the site would remain during construction and operation of the application project, and no further static lighting would be added. Mobile lighting would be used in the operational landfill area. All lighting is directed downwards where practicable and, other than security lighting, it is switched off at the end of the working day [APP-ES-02 19.4.1]. There is no evidence of adverse impact to amenity as a result of lighting at the site. With the imposition of an appropriate requirement in the DCO, we do not anticipate that any future adverse impact would occur.
- 4.282 Within the landfill site, haul roads are formed of compacted hardcore or similar material. All vehicles leaving the site following delivery of waste or collection of construction materials use the wheel wash. The site access road is hard-surfaced between the wheel wash and the access to the public highway to minimise the potential for mud and debris to be carried onto the local road network. The site access road and White Moss Road South are swept by a road sweeper when necessary [APP-ES-02 19.4.3]. We consider that with the continuation of these controls the risk of nuisance from mud and debris on the road is negligible.
- 4.283 We agree with the Applicant's assessment that litter generation and associated problems mainly relate to landfill sites receiving municipal solid waste [ibid para 19.4.4]. The nature of hazardous waste and its packaging would mean that the risk of any nuisance from litter being blown from the site would be low.
- 4.284 The Applicant points out that vermin such as rats, flies, birds and foxes are unlikely to be attracted to the site since hazardous waste contains minimal quantities of putrescible material which would be regarded as food by scavengers [ibid para 19.4.6].
- 4.285 For emissions which are not subject to control through environmental regulations, appropriate requirements are included within the recommended DCO. These would secure the controls necessary to ensure there is no nuisance arising from emissions which are not subject to control under the EP. They include:
- Requirement 12: Treatment of mine shafts.
  - Requirement 13: Water management and monitoring.
  - Requirement 16: External lighting and control of artificial light emissions.

- Requirement 19: Control of noise and dust emissions during construction and operation.
- Requirement 20: Blasting.
- Requirement 21: Crushing and screening of aggregate.
- Requirement 22: Disposal of waste.
- Requirement 23: Quantities and types of waste.
- Requirement 27: Control of vehicular movements.
- Requirement 29: Wheel cleaning.
- Requirement 30: Hours of operation.

4.286 The need for and composition of each of these requirements was discussed in the course of the examination and agreement was reached between LCC, WLBC and the Applicant.

***Conclusions on general and residential amenity***

4.287 Whilst there are residential properties close to the application site, those immediately adjoining the site would be largely screened from views into the site and from noise by the proposed mounding. The residential areas of Skelmersdale, would be separated from the site by the physical barrier of the M58 Motorway. We are satisfied that, through the application and enforcement of the relevant pollution regime and the requirements in the DCO, the impact on amenity for the local community, including residents and users of the recreational facilities and public footpaths, would be minimal, and at a level that is acceptable in accordance with NPS para 5.6.3.

4.288 In view of our conclusion above, we are satisfied that there would be no disproportionate interference with the private and family life and home of the occupants of the nearby residential care home and residential dwellings in contravention of Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998; or interference in the peaceful enjoyment of possessions in contravention of Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act.

**Traffic and Transport**

4.289 An assessment of the effect of traffic associated with the application project on the traffic network has been submitted by the Applicant [APP-ES-19], in accordance with NPS para 5.13. The proposal would continue to use the existing access to the current landfill site from White Moss Road South. White Moss Road South joins Moss Lane at a T junction about 470m east of the site access, and the M58 motorway Junction 4 roundabout lies about 70m north of the T junction. This provides access to both the M58 and Glenburn Road which runs north to Skelmersdale.

4.290 The M58 motorway interchanges with the M6 about 6.5km east of the site, and about 11km west of the site it connects with both the M57 towards Prescott and the A50 towards central Liverpool. We

consider that the application site is well related to the strategic road network.

- 4.291 The current site policy to direct all HGV traffic to and from the site to the east of the access to White Moss Road South would continue for the duration of the proposed development, and is specified as r27 in the recommended DCO. White Moss Road South was widened between the site entrance and the junction with Moss Lane in 2001 and no traffic capacity issues have been identified at the site access or at the junction between White Moss Road South and Moss Lane [APP-ES-02 para 12.4.2].
- 4.292 The enforceability of r27 (previously r24 in application DCO) was raised through our first and second round questions. LCC has some reservations about its enforceability [REP-1Q-05 Q1.3], but the Applicant states that the wording was discussed and agreed with LCC and WLBC during the drafting of the DCO [REP-1Q-11 Q1.3].
- 4.293 There is no such control under the current planning permission for the site. The Applicant instructs delivery drivers to leave the M58 at Junction 4 and approach the site from the east, and there have been very few occasions when HGVs have approached from the west. We consider that by including r27 within the DCO, it would ensure that the current practice continues to be observed by any future owners of the landfill site.
- 4.294 An assessment of the performance of the M58 Junction 4 roundabout during the worst case peak hours including traffic associated with the development indicates that the junction is forecast to operate well within capacity with no significant queues or delays to traffic. The impact of directional split between the east or the west on the M58 has been assessed to have little effect on the capacity of the junction. The impact on the slip roads at Junction 4 has also been assessed and no adverse impact has been found [APP-ES-02 para 12.4.3].
- 4.295 Issues have been raised concerning the dangers to pedestrians using White Moss Road South. From our observations, recreational walkers are more likely to use the road to the west of the site access, where the pedestrian footbridge and access to public rights of way are located. Pedestrians using the road east of the site are likely to be aware of the potential for HGVs accessing the landfill site.
- 4.296 A number of interested parties raised concerns about subsidence in White Moss Road South which is said to have occurred since 2011 [eg EV-OF2-06]. We consider that mining and peat extraction are historic activities which might affect land stability. In addition the construction of the M58 with its embankments and road drains could have some effect. No causation has been demonstrated, but the subsidence has occurred to the west of the

site access, so it is unlikely to have been the result of the use of the road by HGVs accessing the existing landfill site.

- 4.297 We conclude that the traffic associated with the proposed development, including the associated material extraction and exportation, could be satisfactorily accommodated on the local road network.

### **Other Matters**

#### ***Safety***

- 4.298 We have no reason to consider that the project would not comply with any legislation for which the Health and Safety Executive is responsible (NPS 4.8.1).

#### ***Security considerations***

- 4.299 There are no national security considerations which arise in the application project (NPS 4.12).

#### **Appropriateness and necessity of any planning obligations with LPAs**

- 4.300 A bilateral s106<sup>34</sup> obligation agreement between Whitemoss Landfill Ltd (WLL) and LCC was under negotiation in the course of the examination. However, it had not been signed at the time the examination closed, and WLL submitted a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) made under s106 [APP-S106-03] on the 21 November, the final day of the examination.
- 4.301 There are some changes which have been made to the terms of the s106 obligations as set out in the red line version submitted by the Applicant [ibid]. In view of the late submission of the UU, we were not able to seek the views of LCC and any other interested parties on the amended deed. Neither have we been able to ask any questions of the Applicant in respect of the provisions in the UU. For this reason the SoS may wish to undertake further consultation in respect of this document.
- 4.302 The UU generally covers the same issues as the previous draft s106 agreement [APP-S106-02]. However, as LCC is not a party to the UU, no obligations can be placed upon it, and the document has been reworded to reflect this. We report below on the provisions of the UU, and identify matters which the SoS may wish to raise, in particular with the Applicant and LCC.

---

<sup>34</sup> Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)



*The obligations*

- 4.303 There are three main obligations which are proposed to be secured under s106. The first is included in Schedule 3 to the UU and would secure the revocation of the existing planning permission. This would remove the existing development rights granted by the planning permission under which the current Whitemoss Landfill site is being operated.
- 4.304 The DCO application includes the current Whitemoss Landfill site. The project proposes to continue the use of the Whitemoss Landfill infrastructure, and to use the existing access into Whitemoss Landfill, crossing the current site to gain access to the new areas proposed for excavation and landfill to the west of the existing facility. Since the access track across the existing site would continue in use, the completion and restoration of the current landfill site would, if the DCO is made, be delayed and would take place as an integral part of the restoration of the larger application site.
- 4.305 With the delay in the restoration of the existing site, the conditions imposed on the current planning permission could not be met. There would be benefits in the continued use of the existing access and infrastructure, and therefore the revocation of the existing planning permission would be appropriate and necessary as part of an obligation under s106.
- 4.306 The second obligation is in Schedule 4 which deals with Future Interest Land. Clause 1.1 covers the payment of security to LCC before any powers of Compulsory Acquisition (CA) can be exercised. Clause 1.2 provides a covenant not to transfer the benefit of the DCO to a transferee until the transferee has entered into a similar supplementary undertaking not to exercise any powers of CA in respect of any Future Interest Land until security has been provided to LCC [1.2].
- 4.307 Schedule 4 Clause 1.4 deals with the security of finance. In the draft s106 Agreement, the agreement of LCC was required if the security sum was to be reduced. In the UU, it can be reduced without such agreement, albeit in defined circumstances. These include, if the Applicant buys land by agreement and so reduces the need to use CA powers, or the Applicant pays compensation to an affected owner. However, the security sum can never be reduced below twice the value of any remaining unpaid compensation. The changes to this part of the s106 obligation do affect the powers of LCC, and we recommend that the views of LCC should be sought by the SoS.
- 4.308 The third obligation is in Schedule 5 which deals with the establishment of a community liaison committee (CLC). There was much debate during the examination as to the benefits or otherwise of setting up a CLC in the event that the DCO is made.

We report on the issues raised earlier in the section on Health [4.148 et seq].

- 4.309 The draft s106 agreement required that the terms of reference of the CLC should be agreed with LCC. This is removed from the UU such that LCC has no right to have any input to the terms. There is a great deal of sensitivity and mistrust within the local community towards the establishment of a CLC. Whilst the UU may be adequate for the establishment of a CLC, by removing the input of LCC the confidence of the local community in the process is unlikely to be improved.
- 4.310 We discuss in the Section on the DCO whether the CLC could be established through an additional requirement in the DCO, and put forward a draft requirement for the SoS to consider. The SoS should note that there was no discussion as to such a requirement during the examination, and the SoS may wish to consult on the wording proposed. In the event that a requirement to secure the CLC is not imposed, we consider that an obligation under Schedule 5 would be appropriate and necessary.
- 4.311 The plan which accompanies the s106 may also require alteration. This indicates Future Interest Land which does not match up with the revised Land Plan [WS010003/WLL/PLANS/LAND, within EV-G-13]. The revised plan shows the LCC land adjacent to White Moss Road as being land over which a new right would subsist.

#### ***Validity of the s106 undertaking***

- 4.312 There is finally an issue as to whether or not the UU as submitted has been validly executed. S44 of the Companies Act 2006 allows execution on behalf of companies in the form of signatures :
- by two authorised signatories, or
  - by a director of the company in the presence of a witness who attests the signature.

It appears that the intention of the UU is to use the first form of execution, since it has spaces marked director/secretary and director. However, it does appear to have been signed by the same person twice, since the signatures appear to be identical.

- 4.313 Since the document has not been signed by two authorised persons, we do not consider that it has been validly made as a deed in accordance with s106(9) of the 1990 Act, and so it is not legally enforceable.

#### ***Conclusion on s106 undertaking***

- 4.314 The panel is of the view that the obligations which are intended to be secured through s106 of the 1990 Act are appropriate and necessary to the making of the DCO. We have indicated to the SoS that further consultation may be appropriate on the wording

of Schedules 4 and 5 of the UU, or, alternatively, a requirement might be substituted for Schedule 5. If a requirement is considered to be appropriate, then the SoS might wish to undertake consultation on the wording of the requirement which we set out in Section 7.

- 4.315 Finally, in the event that the SoS considers that the DCO should be made, we consider that a validly made s106 agreement or UU which includes the relevant obligations must first be secured.

### **Conclusions on the main issues and whether very special circumstances exist**

- 4.316 Under s104(3) of PA2008 the application must be decided in accordance with the NPS, subject to certain exceptions [NPS paras 4.11, 4.13]. Having examined the application we are satisfied that it does not fall within any of the exceptions. The NPS therefore applies.
- 4.317 Fundamental to our consideration of the White Moss project is the location of the application site within the Green Belt. NPS para 5.10.8 refers to the general presumption against inappropriate development, and states that such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The application project is not infilling or redevelopment of a major developed site in the GB, so is not a site which the NPS states "may be suitable for hazardous waste infrastructure".
- 4.318 NPS para 5.10.2 states that the most important attribute of the Green Belt is its openness, and refers to the NPPF for advice on the purposes of the GB. NPS 5.10.9 refers the Applicant to the NPPF for the relevant criteria to be applied to proposals for hazardous waste infrastructure in the GB. We have applied the criteria in the NPPF and find that the application project would constitute an engineering operation that may not be inappropriate in the GB provided that it does not harm the openness of the GB.
- 4.319 We have found that the project would fail to preserve the openness of the GB during its construction and operation. There would then be some impact on openness when the site is restored, but that would be largely mitigated by the proposed restoration scheme. Because of the impact on openness, we find that the project would be inappropriate development in the GB [4.57].
- 4.320 Turning to the NPPF for advice on the application of policy in relation to inappropriate development in the GB, NPPF para 87 states that such development "*is, by definition, harmful to the GB and should not be approved except in very special circumstances*". Para 88 states that "*very special circumstances*" will not exist "*unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations*".

4.321 We have tested the application in this Section of the report to identify any harmful impacts which would arise as a result of its development. We conclude below on harm to the GB and any other harm, and then turn to those “other considerations” which must be weighed in the balance against the identified harm. It is only where those other considerations clearly outweigh the totality of the harm that very special circumstances will exist, and the presumption against the application project on this GB site would be overcome.

***Harm to the GB and any other harm***

4.322 The application project is inappropriate development in the GB and as such it is by definition harmful to the GB. We have identified the intrusive nature of the development during construction and operation, and the more limited impact on openness when the site is restored. In addition to the impact on openness, the extension to the existing landfill operation would conflict with one of the five purposes of the GB, which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Once the site is restored, the new landscaping proposals would ensure that the site is more readily assimilated into its rural location. As a result we consider that the harm to the countryside from encroachment following restoration would not be significant.

4.323 There would also be some harm to the character of the landscape in which the site is located during the construction and operation of the site [4.237]. Whilst the restoration scheme would cause some change to the characteristics of the LCA3, it would enhance the rural qualities of the site, and, in this location, we find that the landscape has the capacity to accommodate the degree of change which would result. In the long term therefore, there would be no significant harm in terms of the landscape.

4.324 We also find some harm to visual amenity for local residents, visitors and recreational users of the adjoining area of the countryside during the construction and operation of the project [4.246]. The restoration scheme would re-establish and enhance the rural character of the site, and provide opportunities for a new permissive footpath across the site. We therefore consider that there would be some improvement in terms of visual amenity following restoration.

4.325 There is limited scope for mitigation through design during construction and operation, but efficient use would be made of resources within the site, and there would be some enhancements as a result of restoration [4.220].

4.326 Whilst there would be some minor economic benefits from the project, there is no conclusive evidence of harm to inward investment or the housing market [4.213].

- 4.327 We recognise that the perception of a risk to health is a material consideration. However, there is no substantive evidence of a significant risk to health and therefore we give it limited weight [4.194].
- 4.328 The application site is of limited ecological value so there is unlikely to be any significant impact on wildlife or habitats. The Grade 2 agricultural land is not in use and is in poor condition. There would be no significant harmful effect on wildlife, habitats or agricultural land [4.263].
- 4.329 We have also assessed the impact of the proposals on general and residential amenity [4.287], the geological setting and water resources [4.104], and traffic and transport [4.297], and have had regard to the many concerns raised by interested parties before and during the examination. We have found that with the implementation of the requirements recommended in the DCO, and the control which would be exercised by the EA through the EP, there would be no significant harmful effects in respect of these matters as a result of the application project.

***Considerations which weigh in favour of the application***

- 4.330 The NPS para 1.5.3 establishes the importance of hazardous waste infrastructure as essential for public health and a clean environment. Need for hazardous waste infrastructure is established by the NPS, and applications for infrastructure of national significance should be examined on the basis that need has been demonstrated. Although the disposal of hazardous waste to landfilling is intended to be used as a last resort, the NPS recognises that there remains a need for such facilities. Through the exercise of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, hazardous waste is only sent to landfill facilities where there is no alternative form of recovery or disposal [4.24].
- 4.331 There is no target level of provision, or limit to the capacity or location of new facilities set within the NPS. It is left for operators to use their judgement as to the location and capacity of new facilities [4.23]. The importance of providing for all types of hazardous waste infrastructure, including landfill, is clear from the wide range of activities which rely on the availability of such infrastructure [4.17]. With growth in the economy, the level of arisings is expected to increase [4.15]. The availability of suitable facilities within England to meet the demands resulting from economic growth is essential to comply with the principles of self-sufficiency and proximity in the revised Waste Framework Directive [4.17].
- 4.332 Hazardous waste infrastructure of national significance is necessary to meet a national rather than a regional or local need [4.28]. Nevertheless, in this case the project would be located in the North West region which is a national hub for treating and

processing hazardous waste, and with its industrial legacy and the regeneration of the Liverpool/Merseyside and Manchester conurbations, the region is itself a major generator of hazardous waste [4.26]. The application project would be well located to serve this market.

- 4.333 Existing provision for hazardous waste landfill in the North West is limited [4.27]; the examination into the Lancashire MWCS identified a need for some 17,000 tpa of hazardous waste generated from within its plan area; and Policy LF3 provides support for new provision subject to certain criteria.
- 4.334 We have noted the arguments as to whether there is a need for a facility of the capacity proposed at White Moss. In view of the provisions of the NPS, we do not question the level of need. We do, however, recognise that there could be environmental consequences if the rate of deposits is not sufficient to fill the capacity of the voids, and address this through r32 in the recommended DCO [4.140].
- 4.335 We find that in addition to the national need for hazardous waste landfill identified in the NPS, the application project would be well located to meet a regional need for such a facility. Without the application project, the existing Whitemoss Landfill would have no capacity beyond 2015, and the need identified in the examination of the MWCS would not be met [4.68].
- 4.336 In terms of the socio-economic benefits which would arise from the provision of a hazardous waste facility, there would be some employment created from the construction and operation of the larger landfill site, and some benefit to local businesses which act as suppliers to the site [4.214].
- 4.337 NPS 5.10.2 indicates a preference for the use of previously developed land, to reduce the use of green field sites. No alternative site has been put forward for hazardous waste landfill and the relatively recent review of hazardous waste sites through the Development Plan process did not identify any alternatives [4.85].
- 4.338 There are benefits from the location of the application project. Part of the site is the current hazardous waste landfill and use would be made of the existing site infrastructure including the interceptor waste treatment plant. This would ensure that no further new buildings would be required. The existing site access is strategically well placed to provide the application project with ready access to the national motorway network [4.290].
- 4.339 The site is geologically suited to accommodate a landfill facility [4.126]. It is separated from the residential areas of Skelmersdale by the motorway, and those few dwellings in close proximity would

be well screened by the proposed boundary treatment during construction and operation.

- 4.340 Finally, the restoration scheme would enhance the biodiversity of the site and reinstate the Grade 2 agricultural land to useable quality; it would create a landscaped site which would contribute to visual amenity; and provide for recreation through public access within the site [4.219; 4.262; 4.237; 4.246]. These would be long-term benefits of the project.

### **Balance and conclusions**

- 4.341 We conclude that the application project would constitute inappropriate development which in itself is harmful to the GB. In summary, we find the harm to the GB and any other harm to comprise:

- During the 20 years of construction and operation, an adverse impact on openness and conflict with a purpose of the GB to protect the countryside from encroachment.
- Following restoration, there would be some impact on openness but the restoration proposals would restore the rural character of the site such that there would no longer be encroachment.
- A limited degree of harm to the character and appearance of the countryside during the 20 years of construction and operation.
- The perception of a risk to health within the local community to which we attribute limited weight.

- 4.342 In relation to the "other considerations" which fall to be weighed against harm to the GB and any other harm, in summary we find as follows:

- The presumption in favour of granting consent to applications for hazardous waste NSIPs, which clearly meet the need for such infrastructure established in the NPS. The application project would meet that need.
- As a project which accords with the policy and requirements of the NPS, it would constitute sustainable development which attracts the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF.
- The project would contribute towards meeting the principles of national self-sufficiency and of proximity in the revised Waste Framework Directive.
- The importance of the facility to meet the need for hazardous waste disposal within the North-West of England.
- The locational benefits of the landfill facility at White Moss, reflecting its proximity to the national motorway network, with consequently no significant adverse transport impacts and being easy to reach by businesses looking to manage waste.

- The ability to make use of current infrastructure, reducing the environmental footprint of creating new facilities.
- The limited life-span of the landfill operations and its consequent impacts.
- The long-term benefits to biodiversity from the restoration proposals, replacing an ecologically poor site with a more habitat and species-rich environment.
- The other long-term benefits in terms of restoration of Grade 2 agricultural land, visual amenity and recreation.

4.343 Our overall conclusion is that these “other considerations” are of such importance that they clearly outweigh the harm to the GB and the limited other harm that we have identified. Looking at the case as a whole, we conclude that very special circumstances exist which justify the making of the White Moss Landfill DCO.



## **5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN RELATION TO HABITATS REGULATIONS**

- 5.1 The Secretary of State must, under the Habitats Regulations, consider whether the project may have a significant effect on a European site, or any site to which the same protection is applied as a matter of policy, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects (NPS, para 4.3.1). Information should be provided to allow the Secretary of State, as the competent authority, to determine whether an Appropriate Assessment is required (NPS, para 4.3.2).
- 5.2 The Applicant carried out a Habitats Regulations Screening Assessment to determine if there are likely to be any significant effects on European sites as a result of the proposed development [APP-Rep-02]. The nearest internationally-designated site for nature conservation is Martin Mere, which is both a Ramsar site and a Special Protection Area (SPA), approximately 9.5km to the north-west of the development site<sup>35</sup>. In addition, the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site is some 17km to the west-north-west of the site, whilst the Mersey Narrows and North Wirral Foreshore SPA and Ramsar site is about 17.5km to the west<sup>36</sup>.
- 5.3 Natural England (NE) has noted that it has worked closely with the Applicant to provide advice and guidance since November 2012 and it has also liaised with the EA to provide coordinated advice. It is satisfied that the Applicant has submitted a thorough ES, together with a satisfactory Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment [RR-002394; REP-W-047].
- 5.4 NE has concluded that there are no European sites, Ramsar sites or nationally-designated landscapes located within the vicinity of the project that could be significantly affected [REP-W-047]. As a consequence, NE is satisfied that Habitats Regulations assessment Stage 2 - an Appropriate Assessment - is not required by the competent authority for this project [ibid]. We have neither seen nor heard any evidence within the course of the examination to lead us to a different conclusion. We conclude that implementation of the project would not breach the Habitats Directive or compromise the coherence of the Natura 2000 network.

---

<sup>35</sup> Martin Mere is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

<sup>36</sup> The location of these sites is shown on Figure HAB 2 within APP-REP-02

## **6 COMPULSORY ACQUISITION**

### **The Request for Compulsory Acquisition Powers**

- 6.1 The request for CA powers is made through the inclusion of Articles 11 - 16 in the Applicant's initial draft DCO [APP-DCO-01] and as Articles 12 - 17 in the ExA's recommended DCO [App 4]. This is supported by a Statement of Reasons [APP-CA-02], a Book of Reference [APP-CA-01], which was subsequently updated during the examination [APP-CA-04], and a Funding Statement [APP-CA-03]. Individual plots are shown on the Land Plan [APP-Plan-01, subsequently updated as APP-Plan-11].
- 6.2 The bulk of the land for which CA powers are sought comprises the main body of the site to be excavated and landfilled. Plots 10 to 14 and 18A on the Land Plan are within the Applicant's land-ownership and comprise the site of the current landfilling operation. The latter plot was acquired through adverse possession from West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC) and notified to the Council in December 2013 [EV-CA1-05]. Plots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 to the western side of the current operation are various portions of agricultural land owned by Hardstone Properties Ltd. Plots 4 and 8, which divide the Hardstone Properties land, comprise a detached single dwelling, The Cottage, and associated land (Plot 8), and the access to this property from White Moss Road South (Plot 4). They are owned by residential third parties.
- 6.3 Three small parcels of land within the southern highway verge and ditch of White Moss Road South (Plots 15 to 17) are within the ownership of Lancashire County Council (LCC). These include manholes to surface water drains. They were originally shown within the Land Plan as being subject to CA to allow connection of the proposed surface water management scheme from the development.
- 6.4 However, by the close of the examination, following discussions between the Applicant and LCC, and the Council's objection to CA, an 'in principle' agreement that an easement for the connection of surface water drainage had been reached [EV-G-05, para 11; EV-CA1-04]. A further amended Land Plan [EV-G-13, Ref. WS010003/WLL/PLANS/LAND] shows these parcels as 'land over which a new right would subsist'. CA would not therefore be applicable to these plots<sup>37</sup>.
- 6.5 Plot 18B is a narrow strip of scrubland along the south-eastern boundary of the present landfilling operation. This is owned by

---

<sup>37</sup> The power to acquire land compulsorily is provided by Article 12 of the DCO and relates to the Order land shown on the Land Plan. The LCC land is no longer shown on the Land Plan as land to be acquired and is therefore not subject to CA, although the parcels of land continue to be referred to in Part 1 of the Book of Reference, which was not updated.

WLBC and leased to the Skelmersdale Model Aircraft Club. WLBC maintain an objection to the CA of this land.

- 6.6 Para 1.8.2 of The Statement of Reasons notes that the Applicant has negotiated to acquire all the relevant land and interests by agreement where this is achievable at reasonable cost, within the project timescale and on terms that allow the project to proceed. However, the Applicant has sought to keep CA powers in reserve to ensure the project would be realised in the event of negotiated sale not being achievable.

### **The purposes for which the land is required**

- 6.7 The purpose of the acquisition powers is to enable the Applicant to construct the new landfill void and associated development. The acquisition of the freehold of Plots 1 -9 is sought as these comprise the area for the western landfill extension. The freehold of the WLBC land (Plot 18B) is required for the installation and management of part of the surface water management system and restoration landscaping associated with the development.
- 6.8 Various title covenants and restrictions also exist over the development site, which benefit third parties, including over land already within the Applicant's ownership. To allow the development to proceed unhindered by such covenants and restrictions the right to compulsorily acquire these interests has been reserved. Relevant known interests are set out in Part 3 of the Book of Reference [APP-CA-04].
- 6.9 Article 13 of the DCO is included to incorporate the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 into the Order to deal with the required procedure for acquiring any mineral interests identified in relation to rights of third parties over the site [APP-DCO-02].
- 6.10 No Crown Land is sought to be acquired. Although coal would be extracted as part of the development, this would be done by virtue of a licence and lease granted by the Coal Authority. Clause 1(5) of the Coal Industry Act 1994, which set up the Coal Authority, indicates that the Authority's property shall not be regarded as property of, or property held on behalf of, the Crown [APP-CA-02].

### **The Requirements of the Planning Act 2008**

- 6.11 Compulsory acquisition powers can only be granted if the conditions set out in sections 122 and 123 of the PA2008 are met.
- 6.12 Section 122 (2) requires that the land must be required for the development to which the development consent relates or is required to facilitate or is incidental to the development. In respect

of land required for the development, the land to be taken must be no more than is reasonably required and be proportionate.<sup>38</sup>

- 6.13 Section 122(3) requires that there must be a compelling case in the public interest which means that the public benefit derived from the compulsory acquisition must outweigh the private loss that would be suffered by those whose land is affected. In balancing public interest against private loss, compulsory acquisition must be justified in its own right. But this does not mean that the compulsory acquisition proposal can be considered in isolation from the wider consideration of the merits of the project. There must be a need for the project to be carried out and there must be consistency and coherency in the decision-making process.
- 6.14 Section 123 requires that one of three conditions is met by the proposal<sup>39</sup>. The ExA is satisfied that the condition in s.123 (2) is met because the application for the DCO included a request for compulsory acquisition of the land to be authorised.
- 6.15 A number of general considerations also have to be addressed either as a result of following applicable guidance or in accordance with legal duties on decision-makers:
- All reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition must be explored.
  - The Applicant must have a clear idea of how it intends to use the land and to demonstrate funds are available.
  - The decision-maker must be satisfied that the purposes stated for the acquisition are legitimate and sufficient to justify the inevitable interference with the human rights of those affected.

### **How the ExA examined the case for Compulsory Acquisition**

- 6.16 An ISH on CA was held on 22 October 2014 [EV-CA1-11]. Following receipt of written summaries arising from the hearing, the ExA issued a request for further information under Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) on 6 November 2014, which included clarification questions [DEC-G-010].

---

<sup>38</sup> Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition DCLG February 2010

<sup>39</sup> (1) An order granting development consent may include provision authorising the compulsory acquisition of land only if the Secretary of State is satisfied that one of the conditions in subsections (2) to (4) is met.

(2) The condition is that the application for the order included a request for compulsory acquisition of the land to be authorised.

(3) The condition is that all persons with an interest in the land consent to the inclusion of the provision.

(4) The condition is that the prescribed procedure has been followed in relation to the land.

## **The case for acquisition of land and rights**

### *The general case*

- 6.17 The overall case for the CA of land and/or rights is set out by the Applicant in the Statement of Reasons [APP-CA-02]. Para 7.2.2 states that:

*"...the land is required for the purposes of the DCO. Without the land the project pursuant to the Application cannot take place. The location of the works on the Works Plan demonstrates that the land is needed to construct the landfill void and associated works/development. The need to ensure that the development can be delivered requires the acquisition of a number of property interests in so much of the land as is in third party ownership and a means of overriding existing rights and interests in or over land".*

- 6.18 The rights to be acquired over the development site are necessary for the purposes of constructing, inspecting and maintaining the works to be carried out. Those with rights or easements are listed in Part 3 of the Book of Reference [APP-CA-01]. Compulsory acquisition of these is secured by Article 15 of the DCO. The extinguishment or suspension of private rights of way over the development site is secured by Article 16 of the DCO. This is necessary so as not to interfere with the development and its operation. There have been no objections to the CA of these rights.

### *Alternatives*

- 6.19 Para 8 of the September 2013 DCLG Guidance relating to procedures for the CA of land states that:

*"The Applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored".*

- 6.20 Para 1.7.1 of The Statement of Reasons [AP-CA-02] indicates that the Applicant does not own any other land suitable for the proposed development and no other sites have been identified that would not also require the use (or reservation) of CA powers. The issue of overall alternatives to the proposed scheme itself has been dealt with in Section 4 above which reports on the ES and EIA. We have concluded that the consideration of alternatives has been set out as required by the EIA Regulations.
- 6.21 There are two aspects to alternatives to CA. The first relates to the nature and location of any works for which CA is required. The second relates to seeking to avoid CA through the adoption of other means to acquire land or rights.

- 6.22 The main body of the application site, where the formation of a void and the subsequent landfilling would take place, is where the bulk of the land and rights to be acquired are focussed. We consider there to be no doubt this land is required if the development is to proceed in the manner intended.
- 6.23 With reference to alternative methods of acquisition, as is evidenced below, through voluntary negotiations all affected persons other than WLBC have come to an agreement with the Applicant. The proposed acquisition of the WLBC strip of land (Plot 18B) along the south-eastern edge of the application site is considered in detail below in respect of that Council's objection to the use of CA powers.

***The case for the acquisition of land and rights for development for specific parcels of land***

*Hardstone Properties Limited - Plots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9*

- 6.24 These plots would form the bulk of the landfill extension. Development could not proceed in the manner intended without them. The company made a relevant representation expressing support for the proposed development [RR-001181]. The Applicant has provided a summary of 30 October 2014 of the position regarding individual plots [EV-G-05, Schedule D]. This records that option agreements between the Applicant and Hardstone Properties Limited, dated 14 February 2014, have been made for the sale of each of relevant the plots.

*Ernest Rylance, The Coal Authority (presumption in respect of mines and minerals), Homes and Communities Agency (presumption in respect of mine shafts and disused colliery workings), James Alan Rylance and Elizabeth Joan Carr - Plot 4*

*James Rylance, Elizabeth Carr, The Coal Authority (presumption in respect of mines and minerals), Homes and Communities Agency (presumption in respect of mine shafts and disused colliery workings) - Plot 8*

- 6.25 These plots together comprise a dwelling and associated open land and its access to White Moss Road South within what would be a central portion of the western extension of the landfill site. Two former mine entries, with the possibility of historic unrecorded shallow mine workings, lie within the plots.
- 6.26 There have been no submitted representations from the individual affected persons or from the Homes and Communities Agency. A relevant representation from the Coal Authority indicated it had no objection to the proposed development [RR-003122]. The Applicant's summary of the position regarding individual plots [EV-G-05, Schedule D] records that an agreement for sale of 25 November 2013 has been made.

*WLBC - Plot 18B*

*The Applicant's case for compulsory acquisition*

- 6.27 The Applicant indicates that acquisition of this narrow strip of scrubland of almost 0.75ha is necessary to implement the proposed surface water management of the development and to provide final restoration landscaping. In discussions with WLBC the Applicant sought agreement to acquire the necessary rights and land by private treaty. WLBC made clear its opposition to CA of this land in its Written Representation [REP-W-071]. It maintained its objection at the CA hearing held on 22 October 2014 [EV-CA1-05].
- 6.28 The proposed Surface Water Management Plan [APP-ES-06] includes the provision of a peripheral ditch around the site at the base of all slopes in order to capture any surface water flows from the capped, restored landfill. As part of this scheme, an existing ditch on the south-eastern boundary of the site (within the Applicant's ownership) would be extended southwards (within Plot 18B) [Plan E00173-301 within APP-ES-06, and Restoration Proposals Plan attached to REP-R-17-203].
- 6.29 In the absence of agreement to acquire the land, the Applicant indicates that alternative solutions were assessed:
- In respect of the existing drain the best technical solution was considered to be its retention, together with allowing access to both sides to ensure maintenance, and the creation of the proposed marshland/moss landscape and habitats including ponds, scrapes and ditches.
  - Any realignment of the existing drain would involve moving it closer to the existing landfill.
  - The retention of existing tall *leylandii* trees would be inconsistent with the marshland/moss landscape restoration proposals which have been agreed with LCC and Natural England.
  - Formation of the marshland/moss habitat could not be located on the current landfill as the restored areas of the landfill site are designed to shed water to minimise ingress through the cap.
  - Movement of the proposed habitat further to the north-west would also interfere with the existing access, which it would be necessary to maintain during the aftercare period and beyond [REP-R-17-2-03].
  - Further to the south-east there would need to be removal of the existing bund and the placement of restoration materials at the toe of the landfill slope to tie in with ground levels. If located further to the north-west the proposed marshland/moss landscape would be on higher land on the slope of the landfill. This would be inconsistent with the

design concept of shedding surface water from the restored landfill [REP-R-17-2-03].

- 6.30 The rest of the WLBC land to the east forms part of a functional sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS). The Applicant does not consider the land to be acquired comprises part of this system; even if it did, the proposed landscaping and drainage would not be incompatible with a SUDS. A deed of indemnity to protect WLBC against liability for flooding could form part of the settlement of the Council's claim for compensation if the CA of its land is confirmed [REP-R17-2-03].

*WLBC's objection to compulsory acquisition*

- 6.31 Plot 18B forms part of a SUDS system which drains the White Moss Business Park. This site is only partially developed, with a potential for a further 4ha of land to be brought forward and developed and which could drain to the SUDS [EV-CA1-05]<sup>40</sup>.
- 6.32 Plot 18B does not overlap with, but is adjacent to, the proposed emergency storage area of the system. This has not yet been constructed as it is designed to drain a much larger quantum of development than currently exists. If or when the SUDS is fully constructed and servicing the intended larger development, any call on the emergency storage area would also impact on immediately surrounding land. Adverse weather conditions or other drainage events could bring the emergency storage area into use. Adjacent planting could affect ground conditions, including saturation points. This could alter the point at which the emergency storage area is called into use and disrupt the balance of the SUDS [REP-R17-2-02].
- 6.33 It would not be in the public interest to allow the CA of the land because of the unknown effect the land-take might have on the SUDS and the impact this could have on the Business Park and occupiers of future development [EV-CA1-05].
- 6.34 The Applicant has not fulfilled the tests in s122 of the PA2008, especially the test in s122(2)(a) - that the land is needed for the development being applied for. In particular, the Applicant has provided no justification for the acquisition of the northern section of the plot as no works are proposed for this. Furthermore, the Applicant has failed to consider all reasonable alternatives to CA insofar as it has not considered moving the line of the ditch or revisiting its restoration scheme following the determination of its adverse possession claim [ibid].

*Conclusions on Plot 18B*

---

<sup>40</sup> Land is allocated in the Council's Local Plan as a Strategic Employment Site



- 6.35 In coming to our conclusions on Plot 18B we have taken account of the use to which the land would be put. Whilst it would not itself be directly used for landfilling, it would be integral to the development as a whole by reason of its proposed use for surface water management and for landscaping/habitat formation. These elements are themselves essential functional and mitigating components required to facilitate the development. Acquisition would accord with s122(2)(a) of the PA2008.
- 6.36 The Applicant has considered alternatives to CA of this plot, including negotiation to purchase. However, for the reasons set out in summary of its case above, in terms of the location and nature of the works proposed, we consider no alternatives to be reasonable or feasible.
- 6.37 Given the quantum of land to be acquired, the use to which it would be put, and its relationship with the as yet to be constructed emergency storage area of the Council's SUDS scheme, we do not consider the evidence points to any materially adverse impact on the SUDS scheme function of protecting current Business Park users. Nor would loss of the land to the proposed use be likely to place a material constraint on future development there.
- 6.38 In Section 4 we concluded that there are very special circumstances which clearly outweigh the harm to the GB and any other harm from the application project. On the basis of this conclusion we find that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the development as a whole and there is a compelling case in the public interest for the acquisition of Plot 18B. Compulsory acquisition would therefore be compliant with s122 of the PA2008 as a whole.

#### ***Availability and Adequacy of Funds***

- 6.39 In considering the availability and adequacy of funding for both acquiring the land and implementing the project for which the land is required, we have had regard to the September 2013 DCLG Guidance on procedures for the CA of land, in particular paras 9, 17 and 18.
- 6.40 The Applicant's case is set out in the Funding Statement [APP-CA-03]. Questions and points of clarification were asked at the CA hearing [EV-CA1-11] and in our R17 letter of 6 November 2014 [DEC-G-010]. Responses were provided by the Applicant within letters of 29 October and 12 November 2014 [EV-G-05, App M; REP-R17-2-03].
- 6.41 The Applicant, Whitemoss Landfill Limited, is a private limited company with a single director and three shareholders. The company has no parent or subsidiary companies and, as such, is not part of any larger group or joint venture structure. The company has had experience of running the extant landfill

operation on the site for some 20 years. The total estimated project costs have been calculated on the basis of this experience [EV-G-05, App M; APP-CA-03].

- 6.42 The Applicant's audited accounts for the year ending December 2013 show the company to be in a healthy trading position [EV-G-05, App L]. It has no borrowings other than for lease agreements on excavation equipment [EV-G-05, App M]. Consultancy and professional fees associated with the DCO application have already been funded out of cash flow [ibid].
- 6.43 Much of the construction and operation of the site would be funded from wastes deposited by the site's customers, with the Applicant having sufficient funds available to cover the significant capital outlay for the construction of the first cell [EV-G-05, App M]. During construction of a cell to be filled no waste could be accepted until it is built. Once constructed, income generated by that cell would fund construction of the next cell [ibid]. The Hardstone Properties Limited land to be purchased is controlled by the majority shareholder of the Applicant company. There is agreement to defer payment for this land until the first cell of the landfill extension is operational [ibid].
- 6.44 Financial provision for aftercare and maintenance of the existing landfill has been agreed with the Environment Agency (EA) and is fully funded with a Trust which has the EA as a Trustee. This could be extended for the western landfill area. Financial provision for the restoration of the site is backed by a bank-provided bond fully supported by a bank-held cash deposit [APP-CA-03; EV-G-05, App M].
- 6.45 ARROW has queried the adequacy of funding for the discharge of obligations required by an Environmental Permit (EP), details of which were provided with the Applicant's EP application [REP-17-Nov-02]. This is particularly in light of the timescale ARROW considers it would be necessary to continue to deal with contaminated leachate. However, the adequacy of funding for this aspect would be a matter for the EP regime. The funding provision information included in the EP application will be reviewed by the EA as part of its determination of the EP. A permit would only be issued provided the EA was satisfied as to the level of provision to be made [A1-057]. This does not go to the heart of adequacy of funding for acquisition or implementation.
- 6.46 The Applicant has undertaken an independent valuation of the level of compensation should CA be necessary. It is confident that it has sufficient committed funds to finance any compensation and/or statutory blight claims [EV-G-05].
- 6.47 The DCO would provide for the transfer of the Order to a third party (Article 6 of the DCO). As a result, the Funding Statement

indicates the Applicant's intention to enter into a s106 Agreement to confirm that both the Applicant and any future purchasers or occupiers of the development site would be required to enter into a security deed. This would be to demonstrate adequate funding for potential compensation or blight payments before the exercise of CA powers or the benefit of the DCO being transferred [APP-CA-03].

- 6.48 As already referred to in Section 4 above, the Applicant has not been able to secure the completion of a bilateral s106 obligation by agreement with LCC prior to the close of the examination. Instead, in an effort to secure the same outcomes, a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) has been provided which would provide for security to be in place before the exercise of any authorised CA powers. This was received on the final day of the examination [APP-S106-03].
- 6.49 The provisions within the UU would, in principle, achieve the necessary security of funding for CA purposes. Nevertheless, as set out in para 4.313 above, we consider the Undertaking has not been validly executed. It is not, therefore, a validly made deed and so is not legally enforceable. However, we consider that the obligations relating to security which are intended to be secured through s106 are appropriate and necessary in the context of the exercise of CA powers. In the event that the SoS considers the DCO should be made, we consider a validly made s106 Agreement or UU which includes such obligations must first be secured.

#### *Conclusion on funding*

- 6.50 Having regard to the DCLG Guidance, we are satisfied that the evidence points to the Applicant having the adequacy of resources to ensure that the proposed development would be financially viable. We have neither seen nor heard anything substantive within the examination to suggest the contrary.
- 6.51 With regard to security of funding for CA, the absence of a validly made, and therefore enforceable, UU that would have provided the mechanism for ensuring this, is a drawback. However, we believe it is one which would be capable of rectification should the Secretary of State consider this to be required.

#### ***Human Rights Act 1998 considerations***

- 6.52 In the event that CA rights are granted, Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998 is engaged. Article 8 is also engaged in relation to Plots 4 and 8A (The Cottage and its access). These latter plots are within the midst of the site and development could not take place in the manner proposed without this land. The other land to be acquired is necessary for the development to proceed in the manner intended. No objections have been raised by affected persons other than in respect of the

WLBC-owned land, Plot 18B. Those affected would be entitled to compensation and, as noted above, there is, in principle, the ability for this to be available. Interference with private rights in order to carry out the development would be both proportionate and justified in the public interest.

6.53 Article 6 is engaged. This entitles those affected by CA powers sought for the development to a fair and public hearing. Those whose rights would be affected have been notified by the Applicant [PD-A-01]. There has been adequate opportunity during the six months of the examination to express their views, including at the CA hearing held on 22 October 2014.

6.54 However, concerns have been voiced by certain landowners and occupiers adjacent to the application site about the adequacy of consultation<sup>41</sup>, particularly in relation to their absence from inclusion within Category 3 of the Book of Reference (s57 of the PA2008) [for example, REP-2Q-12; REP-W-055; REP-W-068 & 069; REP-2QC-26; REP-17-Nov-07]. In its Statement of Reasons the Applicant indicates that:

*"...in accordance with part 5 of the 2008 Act, Whitemoss consulted each set of persons required to be consulted including those set out in section 44 of the 2008 Act. This included known owners and occupiers of the land and those who might make claims either under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 in respect of injurious affection, or under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973" [APP-CA-01, para 9.4.4].*

6.55 The Applicant responded to our question at the CA hearing as to whether consideration had been given to the inclusion of adjoining owners and occupiers as Category 3 interests. Given the Applicant's view that there would be no materially harmful impacts arising from the operation of the proposed development, it had concluded that no direct consultation was required [EV-CA1-11; REP-1RC-03, paras 1.2-1.2.5; REP-2QC-28]. This was a judgement for the Applicant to make. In terms of possible claims for compensation for depreciation in land value or for injurious affection, there are avenues available for any aggrieved party.

6.56 There has been opportunity throughout the six months of the examination for those objecting to the proposed development to engage in the process and voice their opinions, including at both IS and OFHs. As outlined above, several availed themselves of that opportunity, including neighbouring landowners and tenants. All those affected have therefore had the opportunity for a fair and public hearing in accordance with Article 6.

---

<sup>41</sup> Concerns about the adequacy of pre-application consultation have been addressed in Section 4 above.

## **The ExA's Conclusions**

- 6.57 Our approach to the question of whether and what CA powers the Panel should recommend to the Secretary of State to grant has been to seek to apply the relevant sections of the PA2008, notably s122 and s123; the DCLG Guidance; and the Human Rights Act 1998. In the light of the representations received and the evidence submitted, we then consider whether a compelling case has been made in the public interest, balancing the public interest against private loss.
- 6.58 The draft DCO deals with both the development itself and CA powers. The case for these powers cannot properly be considered unless and until a view is taken on the case for the development overall. The case for CA must be dependent on and consistent with the view that the DCO as a whole should be made.
- 6.59 The ExA has shown in the conclusions to Section 4 that it has reached the view that development consent should be granted. Having regard to all the particular circumstances in this case for compulsory acquisition, in the event that the Secretary of State decides to give consent and make the Order, there would be a compelling case in the public interest for acquisition. There is no disproportionate or unjustified interference with human rights so as to conflict with the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

## **7 RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO)**

### **Introduction**

- 7.1 This Section considers the process of developing the DCO, from the version which was submitted with the application [APP-DCO-01], to the final version which is recommended by the ExA [App 4]. There have been a number of iterations of the DCO through the examination. The ExA has issued comments on the Applicant's versions, and comments have been made by, and discussions have taken place with, statutory bodies and interested parties.
- 7.2 Our consideration focuses on the more significant issues which have been addressed during the examination. We do not discuss every change made to the DCO where there has been a consensus, often with the statutory bodies, and where we, as the ExA, share that consensus. Nor do we duplicate discussion, mainly in Section 4 above, where significant issues and implications for the DCO have already been subject to substantive consideration.

### **Structure and main features of the DCO**

- 7.3 The DCO contains 3 main sections:
- The articles setting out the principal and supplemental powers, powers of compulsory acquisition (CA) and various miscellaneous provisions. With the exception of CA, discussed in Section 6, this has raised few issues.
  - Schedule 1 identifying the main works associated with the development and operation of the landfill site, associated development and ancillary works. The main feature to note is that the Schedule does not separately identify works as associated development or ancillary works, an issue discussed briefly below. Again, this has raised few issues during the examination.
  - Schedule 2 setting out the requirements and which has been the main focus of consideration in relation to the drafting of the DCO during the examination.

### **The evolution of the DCO**

- 7.4 The initial draft DCO [APP-DCO-01], accompanied by an Explanatory Memorandum [APP-DCO-02], has been subject to consideration between the Applicant and a range of interested parties (IPs), most notably Lancashire County Council (LCC), West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC) and the Environment Agency (EA). Engagement with these and other IPs continued throughout the examination and informed the development of the DCO, with much of this engagement reflected in the suite of Statements of Common Ground [PD-L-03 et seq].

- 7.5 We commented on and asked questions of the initial DCO in our first round questions [DEC-G-05] and second round questions [DEC-G-07]. Comments, primarily from the Applicant, were received in response [REP-1Q-11; REP-2Q-14] and also from IPs, principally the statutory bodies.
- 7.6 A revised draft of the DCO [PD-U-01] was provided in advance of an issue-specific hearing (ISH) [EV-IS3-06,7,8]. Also in advance of that hearing we provided a schedule of comments from IPs and ourselves, as ExA [EV-IS3-02]. The Applicant provided responses to these comments and a revised draft for the hearing and following the hearing the Applicant provided a further revised draft DCO [PD-U-07].
- 7.7 We subsequently issued an ExA Draft for comment [PD-U-09], together with a schedule of comments on our suggested changes [PD-U-08]. Minor changes did not feature in the schedule but were shown as tracked changes within the ExA draft. Responses to our suggested changes were generally supportive and are discussed below.
- 7.8 Following consideration of responses to our draft, and some further consideration on a small number of issues, we have revised the ExA draft and produced a recommended DCO at App 4. All references to individual Articles (a) or Requirements (r) are to this recommended DCO unless otherwise indicated.

### **Main issues addressed during the examination**

- 7.9 The main issues addressed through the changes from the application version of the DCO [APP-DCO-01] to the recommended DCO [App 4] relate to Sch 1 (2) and the requirements.
- 7.10 In relation to Schedule 1 the issue was the acceptability and implications of not separately identifying associated development from ancillary works (Sch 1, (2)). We explored this in written questions. The Applicant in response noted there is no clear method of splitting the constituent parts and there is precedent for its approach [REP-1Q-11, Qs1.9 - 1.11]. We find this persuasive, and confirm that all works shown in Schedule 1 properly fall within the parameters of the authorised project. Given this approach to classifying works, changes have been made during the examination to ensure that there are no requirements dependent on identifying the scope of the authorised development as this would not, in practice, be something LCC, for example, could unambiguously identify.
- 7.11 The issues raised in relation to requirements include:
- The enhancement of r12 dealing with mine shafts and the addition of r13 to address water management and monitoring issues that fall outwith the scope of the Environmental Permit (EP), substantively discussed in Section 4.

- Significant changes to proposals for the review of void consumption (r13), substantively discussed in Section 4.
- Enhancements to the restoration and aftercare requirements, most notably increasing the aftercare provision from 10 to 20 years for the Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat management and Aftercare Scheme (r7) following discussions between the Applicant and LCC [PD-U-05, 4.8.7].
- An additional requirement for an annual soil audit (r18) in response to issues raised by Natural England [PD-L-12, p10], with technical amendments made in the ExA draft to align the structure of the requirement with other requirements [PD-U-08].
- Clarification of the scope of maintenance works permitted under the recommended DCO, discussed further below.
- The enhancement of the tailpiece requirement, with the principal change designed to ensure (r34(c)) that no amendments may be approved to the scheme which have significant adverse environmental effects that have not been assessed in the ES or relevant supplementary information.
- The addition of requirements relating to blasting (r19) and dust suppression (r20), reflecting concerns of LCC [PD-U-02].
- Developing consistency between the certified plans in a20 and the requirement to comply with those plans (r4). In keeping with current drafting guidance we have removed the references to “any other plans referred to in this Order” (a20(n) and r4(14) in the ExA draft). We conclude all necessary plans and documents have been included in a20.

### **The ExA’s draft DCO and responses**

- 7.12 The ExA draft [PD-U-09] and accompanying schedule [PD-U-08] took account of the comments at the ISH and the Applicant’s subsequent redraft. We proposed two main changes and sought views on a suggested addition by LCC.
- 7.13 We have put forward a definition of ‘maintain’. This definition was a source of considerable interchange throughout the examination, with no substantive analysis of the impacts of maintenance in the ES. The Applicant has justified this by noting the limited impact of maintenance works that might be associated with the proposed development [EV-IS3-08, 1.45 et seq], and we concur that there is no likely need for maintenance works with significant environmental effects. Our proposed change to the definition, as reflected in a2 of App 4, requires that maintenance works may not be undertaken if they give rise to significant adverse environmental impacts that have not been assessed within the ES. The Applicant noted the change and made no comment [REP-17 Nov10, Sch 1]. No other comments have been made.
- 7.14 We have also recommended a revised requirement to deal with the review of void consumption (r32). Our consultation draft



substantially recast this requirement, with the main change linking the approval to start phases B to D of the development to the reviews of disposal capacity. The change was noted by the Applicant [REP-17 Nov10, Sch 1], and supported by LCC [REP-R17-2-01] but reservations were expressed by CPRE over the length of time that might arise between reviews with our proposed revision [REP17 Nov 04]. While supporting the revision LCC requested that additional flexibility might be helpful in the timescale for approving variations to plans and schemes, with the eight weeks set out in r32(3) subject to revision with the agreement of the Applicant. We can see no obvious disadvantage to this, and given the requirement that any extension be agreed in writing have added it to r32(b)(ii) at App 4. The substantive issue of void consumption is discussed more fully in Section 4 above.

- 7.15 LCC requested an addition to r13(1) to clarify the details of groundwater monitoring [PD-U-08]. This is discussed in Section 4 (Geological Setting and Impact on Water Resources) [4.104] and in line with that assessment r13(1)(c) has been added to the recommended DCO.
- 7.16 Other comments were received following the issue of our draft DCO not linked to the changes we proposed. These were not in general substantive or necessarily relevant to the DCO:
- CPRE suggested a requirement to ensure the landfilling proceeds through phases A to D sequentially and could not be subject to change [REP-17 Nov04]. We consider this to be unnecessary; r6 includes the sequence of phasing, and we further note that the ES [APP-ES-02, s5.2.3] records that operations will proceed through phases A, B, C and D. Compliance with s5 of the ES is secured through r4(1).
  - ARROW argued that the planned duration of leachate management and monitoring is inadequate as are the financial provisions in the EP application [REP-17 Nov-02]. We consider these to be EP matters as discussed in Section 4.
  - Submissions from members of the public included suggestions that health and safety of workers and site visitors needed to be addressed [REP-17 Nov-01, Pt 2], with no evidence provided as to why this was seen as a planning matter, and that additional detail was needed in the DCO on a range of specific issues including monitoring, but with no evidence to suggest why the assessment in the ES or the requirements in the DCO were inadequate [REP-17 Nov-09].
- 7.17 We have suggested no changes to the recommended DCO following consideration of these additional comments.

## **Outstanding Matters**

- 7.18 As reported in Section 4, the Applicant failed to secure agreement with LCC in relation to a S106 agreement, including provision for a Community Liaison Committee. This late failure and the lack of a properly authorised Unilateral Undertaking means there is no provision for a local liaison committee. A requirement for such a committee could readily be included within the DCO and the form of words below follows closely those included with the UU [AS-056], supplemented by a requirement on LCC to respond to the proposed terms of reference, as included within the draft s106 agreement circulated after the ISH [EV-G-05, App C) at which this was discussed.

*Community liaison committee:*

*1. The undertaker must*

*(a) submit terms of reference for a Community Liaison Committee to the County Council no later than eight weeks prior to the first Community Liaison Committee meeting taking place.*

*(b) convene the first meeting of the Community Liaison Committee so as to take place on a date which is no earlier than six weeks and no later than four weeks prior to implementation of the development.*

*(c) after the first meeting of the Community Liaison Committee has taken place to convene meetings of the Community Liaison Committee once every 12 months, unless otherwise agreed between the undertaker and the members of the Community Liaison Committee, throughout the operation of the Development.*

*(d) provide all practical administrative and secretarial facilities which may be necessary to enable the Community Liaison Committee to function effectively including the provision of a suitable local venue for every meeting and the production and keeping of minutes for every meeting (which shall be available to the public).*

*(e) appoint and ensure the regular attendance at the Community Liaison Committee of an appropriate representative who shall participate fully in the activities of the Community Liaison Committee.*

*2. The County Council will notify the undertaker of its approval to the terms of reference, or provide its comments on those terms of reference, within 14 days of receiving them. If no response is provided within 14 days then it will be deemed that the County Council has approved the terms of reference as submitted.*

*3. This requirement shall be of no effect during any period in which the DCO shall be subject to any legal challenge.*

*4. In the event that no members of the public attend three consecutive Community Liaison Committee meetings then this requirement shall cease to be of effect and the undertaker shall be released of its obligations under this requirement.*

- 7.19 A number of other minor changes of an editorial nature which have no impact on the substance of the DCO have been made to the recommended DCO at App 4.

#### **Secretary of State's (SoS's) powers to make the DCO**

- 7.20 In considering changes made to the DCO throughout the examination we have been conscious of the need to consider whether the changes made to the application have the effect of creating a different application from that originally applied for. If so, this would raise questions about the SoS's power under S104 of the Planning Act 2008 to make the DCO.

- 7.21 We conclude, as the ExA, that the revisions and refinements made throughout the examination and as reflected in our recommended DCO have no such effect, and that the SoS can make the DCO in the form recommended at App 4.

#### **Overall conclusion and recommendation on the DCO**

- 7.22 The recommended DCO at App 4 reflects a broad measure of agreement between the parties, particularly with the statutory bodies, and has been subject to considerable scrutiny and refinement, with the main issues identified above. We conclude that the recommended DCO provides the appropriate balance between the need to facilitate the development with the requirements necessary to mitigate potentially adverse consequences. We recommend it to the SoS.

## **8 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8.1 As a hazardous waste landfill facility which would be capable of accommodating more than 100,000 tpa of hazardous waste, the application project is an NSIP as defined in s30 of the PA2008.
- 8.2 S104 of the PA2008 sets out the issues to which the SoS must have regard in taking a decision on an NSIP where a NPS has effect. The Hazardous Waste NPS is the relevant NPS. The need for large scale hazardous waste infrastructure is demonstrated in the NPS. We address the other issues set out in the NPS in Section 4 of our report.
- 8.3 We have concluded that the project has been assessed in accordance with statutory environmental requirements, in accord with the expectations set out in the NPS.
- 8.4 We consider that if the SoS were to approve the project he would not be in breach of any duty or any international obligation. The Applicant has carried out a Habitats Regulations Screening Assessment. NE has agreed that there are no European sites, Ramsar sites or nationally-designated landscapes located within the vicinity of the project that could be significantly affected, and that it is not necessary to carry out an Appropriate Assessment. We conclude that implementation of the Project would not breach the Habitats Directive or compromise the coherence of the Natura 2000 network.
- 8.5 Our assessment has taken account of the LIRs submitted by LCC and WLBC, and these have influenced proposals for mitigation. In particular, we have considered the risks to the project of lower levels of actual arisings, with the risk of unfilled voids. However, the threshold for an NSIP is met, and need is demonstrated through the NPS. It is the Applicant's market based risk to provide the capacity, and we have mitigated any risk of unfilled voids through r32 in the DCO.
- 8.6 We find that the project would be inappropriate development in the GB, with a harmful impact on the openness and function of the GB during its 20 year period of construction and operation. In the period of construction and operation, impacts on the GB would be largely unmitigated, but they would not be permanent. Restoration at the end of the 20-year period would have a limited impact on the openness of the GB, and would provide other benefits.
- 8.7 There would be some harm to the character and visual amenity of the landscape, and to visual amenity for some residents and for recreational users during construction and operation of the landfill. The proposed landscape bund would provide some mitigation for visual amenity. Amendments have been made to the Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat management and Aftercare Scheme, including the extension to the period for aftercare to 20 years.

- 8.8 We have considered the impact on health, general and residential amenity, wildlife habitats, agricultural land, socio-economic matters, the geological setting and water resources. With the control which would be exercised through the EP, together with the requirements recommended in the DCO, sufficient measures would be in place to mitigate any adverse impacts in respect of these issues.
- 8.9 There would be some benefit in terms of employment, and, following restoration, improvements to biodiversity, recreation, landscape and visual amenity.
- 8.10 We conclude that the requests for CA powers meet the relevant tests for approving such powers, with a compelling case which is in the public interest.
- 8.11 We find that the potential harm to the GB together with the limited other harm is clearly outweighed by the need for national hazardous waste infrastructure set out in the NPS, combined with the other benefits of the project including its location, the use of existing infrastructure, and the benefits following restoration. As a result the very special circumstances exist to justify making the White Moss DCO.

### **Recommendation**

- 8.12 The Examining Authority recommends that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government:
- (i) Considers the need for further consultation on:
    - The terms of the s106 Unilateral Undertaking submitted on the 21 November 2014 [4.301].
    - As an alternative to Schedule 5 of the s106 Unilateral Undertaking, the wording of a requirement to secure the establishment of a Community Liaison Committee [7.18].
  - (ii) Secures a valid s106 Agreement or Unilateral Undertaking accompanied by an amended plan.
  - (iii) Subject to the above, makes the White Moss Landfill Order 2015 in the form attached at Appendix 4.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**EXAMINATION LIBRARY**

The following list of documents has been used during the course of the Examination. The documents are grouped together by document type.

Each document has been given an identification number (i.e. APP-001), and all documents are available to view on the Planning Inspectorate's National Infrastructure Planning website at the Whitemoss page:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/north-west/whitemoss-landfill-western-extension>

## **INDEX**

<b>Document type</b>	<b>Reference</b>
Application Documents	APP-xxx
Procedural Decisions	DEC-xxx
Project Documents	PD-xxx
Relevant Representations	RR-xxx
Representations	REP-xxx
Events Documents	EV-xxx
Additional Submissions	AS-xxx

## APPLICATION DOCUMENTS

<b>Application Documents</b>	
APP-01	<u>Applicant's submission covering letter</u>
APP-02	<u>1.1 Application Form</u>
<b>Draft Development Consent Order</b>	
APP-DCO-01	<u>1.12 Draft DCO</u>
APP-DCO-02	<u>1.13 Draft EM</u>
<b>Section 106 Agreement</b>	
APP-S106-01	<u>1.14 Draft S106 Agreement -Lancashire County Council and Whitemoss Landfill Ltd</u>
APP-S106-02	<u>WLL S106 Rev C</u>
APP-S106-03	<u>Whitemoss landfill- Unilateral undertaking</u>
<b>Plans</b>	
APP-Plan-01	<u>1.2 Land Plan</u>
APP-Plan-02	<u>1.3 Works Plan</u>
APP-Plan-03	<u>1.4 Restoration Plan</u>
APP-Plan-04	<u>1.5 Proposed restoration contours</u>
APP-Plan-05	<u>1.6 Elevations of the Stockpiles and bunds</u>
APP-Plan-06	<u>1.7 Main infrastructure elevations</u>
APP-Plan-07	<u>1.8 Site access Plan</u>
APP-Plan-08	<u>1.9 Statutory and non-statutory sites or features of the Historic environment Plan</u>
APP-Plan-09	<u>1.10 Statutory and non-statutory Ecological and geological interest, river basin area</u>
APP-Plan-10	<u>1.11 Statutory and non-statutory sites of ecological interest Closest to the site</u>
APP-Plan-11	<u>Updated Book of Reference Plan</u>
<b>Compulsory Acquisition Documents</b>	
APP-CA-01	<u>1.19 Book of Reference</u>
APP-CA-02	<u>1.17 Statement of Reasons</u>
APP-CA-03	<u>1.18 Funding Statement</u>
APP-CA-04	<u>Whitemoss BoR 07-05-14</u>
<b>Reports/Statements</b>	
APP-Rep-01	<u>1.15 Statutory Nuisance Statement</u>
APP-Rep-02	<u>1.16 Habitats regulation screening assessment</u>
APP-Rep-03	<u>2.1 Planning Statement</u>
APP-Rep-04	<u>2.2 Planning Statement Appendix PSA</u>
<b>Consultation Report</b>	
APP-CR-01	<u>4.1 Consultation Report</u>
APP-CR-02	<u>4.2 CR Appendix CONSA</u>
APP-CR-03	<u>4.3 CR Appendix CONSB</u>
APP-CR-04	<u>4.4 CR Appendix CONSC</u>
APP-CR-05	<u>4.5 CR Appendix CONSD</u>
APP-CR-06	<u>4.6 CR Appendix CONSE</u>
APP-CR-07	<u>4.7 CR Appendix CONSF</u>
APP-CR-08	<u>4.8 CR Appendix CONSG</u>
APP-CR-09	<u>4.9.1 CR Appendix CONSH (part 1 of 2)</u>
APP-CR-10	<u>4.9.2 CR Appendix CONSH (part 2 of 2)</u>



APP-CR-11	<u>4.10 CR Appendix CONSI</u>
APP-CR-12	<u>4.11 CR Appendix CONSJ</u>
APP-CR-13	<u>4.12 CR Appendix CONSK</u>
APP-CR-14	<u>4.13 CR Appendix CONSL</u>
APP-CR-15	<u>4.14 CR Appendix CONSM</u>
APP-CR-16	<u>4.15 CR Appendix CONSN</u>
APP-CR-17	<u>4.16 CR Appendix CONSO</u>
APP-CR-18	<u>4.17 CR Appendix CONSP</u>
APP-CR-19	<u>4.18 CR Appendix CONSQ</u>
APP-CR-20	<u>4.19 CR Appendix CONSR</u>
APP-CR-21	<u>4.20 CR Appendix CONSS</u>
APP-CR-22	<u>4.21 CR Appendix CONST</u>
APP-CR-23	<u>4.22 CR Appendix CONSU</u>
APP-CR-24	<u>4.23 CR Appendix CONSV</u>
APP-CR-25	<u>4.24 CR Appendix CONSW</u>
APP-CR-26	<u>4.25 CR Appendix CONSX</u>
APP-CR-27	<u>4.26 CR Appendix CONSY</u>
APP-CR-28	<u>4.27 CR Appendix CONSZ</u>
APP-CR-29	<u>4.28 CR Appendix CONSAA</u>
APP-CR-30	<u>4.29 CR Appendix CONSAB</u>
APP-CR-31	<u>4.30 CR Appendix CONSAC</u>
APP-CR-32	<u>4.31 CR Appendix CONSAD</u>
APP-CR-33	<u>4.32 CR Appendix CONSAE</u>
APP-CR-34	<u>4.33 CR Appendix CONSAF</u>
APP-CR-35	<u>4.34 CR Appendix CONSAG</u>
APP-CR-36	<u>4.35 CR Appendix CONSAH</u>
APP-CR-37	<u>4.36 CR Appendix CONSAI</u>
APP-CR-38	<u>4.37 CR Appendix CONSAJ</u>
APP-CR-39	<u>4.38 CR Appendix CONSAK</u>
APP-CR-40	<u>4.39 CR Appendix CONSAL</u>
APP-CR-41	<u>4.40 CR Appendix CONSAM</u>
APP-CR-42	<u>4.41 CR Appendix CONSAN</u>
APP-CR-43	<u>4.42 CR Appendix CONSAO</u>
APP-CR-44	<u>4.43 CR Appendix CONSAP</u>
APP-CR-45	<u>4.44 CR Appendix CONSAQ</u>
APP-CR-46	<u>4.45 CR Appendix CONSAR</u>
APP-CR-47	<u>4.46 CR Appendix CONSAS</u>
APP-CR-48	<u>4.47 CR Appendix CONSAT</u>
<b>Environmental Statement</b>	
APP-ES-01	<u>3.1 ES Non Technical Summary</u>
APP-ES-02	<u>3.2 ES Environmental Statement</u>
APP-ES-03	<u>3.3 ES Appendix ESA</u>
APP-ES-04	<u>3.4 ES Appendix ESB</u>
APP-ES-05	<u>3.5 ES Appendix ESC</u>

APP-ES-06	<a href="#">3.6 ES Appendix ESD</a>
APP-ES-07	<a href="#">3.7 ES Appendix ESE</a>
APP-ES-08	<a href="#">3.8 ES Appendix ESF</a>
APP-ES-09	<a href="#">3.9 ES Appendix ESG</a>
APP-ES-10	<a href="#">3.10 ES Appendix ESH</a>
APP-ES-11	<a href="#">3.11 ES Appendix ESI</a>
APP-ES-12	<a href="#">3.12 ES Appendix ESJ (electronic appendices).zip</a>
APP-ES-13	<a href="#">3.12 ES Appendix ESJ</a>
APP-ES-14	<a href="#">3.13 ES Appendix ESK</a>
APP-ES-15	<a href="#">3.14 ES Appendix ESL</a>
APP-ES-16	<a href="#">3.15 ES Appendix ESM</a>
APP-ES-17	<a href="#">3.16 ES Appendix ESN</a>
APP-ES-18	<a href="#">3.17 ES Appendix ESO</a>
APP-ES-19	<a href="#">3.18 ES Appendix ESP</a>
APP-ES-20	<a href="#">3.19 ES Appendix ESQ</a>
APP-ES-21	<a href="#">3.20 ES Appendix ESR</a>
APP-ES-22	<a href="#">3.21 ES Appendix ESS</a>
APP-ES-23	<a href="#">3.22 ES Appendix EST</a>
APP-ES-24	<a href="#">3.23 ES Appendix ESU</a>
APP-ES-25	<a href="#">3.24 ES Appendix ESV</a>
APP-ES-26	<a href="#">3.25 ES Appendix ESW</a>
APP-ES-27	<a href="#">3.26 ES Appendix ESX</a>
APP-ES-28	<a href="#">3.27 ES Appendix ESY</a>
APP-ES-29	<a href="#">3.28 ES Appendix ESZ</a>
APP-ES-30	<a href="#">3.29 ES Appendix ESAA</a>
APP-ES-31	<a href="#">3.30 ES Appendix ESAB</a>
APP-ES-32	<a href="#">3.31 ES Appendix ESAC</a>
APP-ES-33	<a href="#">3.32 ES Appendix ESAD</a>
APP-ES-34	<a href="#">3.33 ES Appendix ESAE</a>
APP-ES-35	<a href="#">3.34 ES Appendix ESAF</a>
APP-ES-36	<a href="#">3.35 ES Appendix ESAG</a>
<b>Core documents received 6 August 2014</b>	
APP-CD-01	<a href="#">Core Docs Cover Letter</a>
APP-CD-02	<a href="#">Application for a development consent order - Volume I &amp; II</a>
APP-CD-03	<a href="#">Application for a development consent order - Volume III &amp; IV</a>
APP-CD-04	<a href="#">Application to vary environmental permit</a>
APP-CD-05	<a href="#">Core Docs Correspondence</a>

## PROJECT DOCUMENTS

<b>Updates to draft Development Consent Order</b>	
PD-U-01	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd DCO Rev A</a>
PD-U-02	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd EM Rev A</a>
PD-U-03	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd DCO Boundary Plan</a>
PD-U-04	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd DCO Rev B</a>
PD-U-05	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd EM Rev B</a>
PD-U-07	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd DCO Rev D</a>
PD-U-08	<a href="#">ExA Draft DCO issued 12 November</a>
PD-U-09	<a href="#">ExA Draft DCO issued 12 November- Schedule of comments</a>
PD-U-10	<a href="#">ExA Draft DCO issued 12 November- Comparison with Rev D</a>
<b>Comments on draft Development Consent Order &amp; Explanatory Memorandum</b>	

PD-C-01	<a href="#">CPRE Lancashire</a>
PD-C-02	<a href="#">CPRE Lancashire November comments</a>
PD-C-03	<a href="#">Lancashire county council</a>
<b>Scoping Documents</b>	
PD-S-01	<a href="#">Scoping Opinion</a>
PD-S-02	<a href="#">Scoping Report</a>
<b>Local Impact Reports &amp; Statements of Common Ground</b>	
PD-L-01	<a href="#">Lancashire County Council LIR</a>
PD-L-02	<a href="#">West Lancashire Borough Council LIR</a>
PD-L-03	<a href="#">SoCG Coal Authority</a>
PD-L-04	<a href="#">SoCG Environment Agency</a>
PD-L-05	<a href="#">SoCG LCC &amp; WLBC</a>
PD-L-06	<a href="#">SoCG Natural England</a>
PD-L-07	<a href="#">SoCG Public Health England</a>
<b>Local Impact Reports &amp; Statements of Common Ground- submitted for 07 October deadline</b>	
PD-L-08	<a href="#">SoCG Lancashire CC</a>
PD-L-09	<a href="#">SoCG West Lancashire BC</a>
PD-L-11	<a href="#">Further SoCG Lancashire CC</a>
PD-L-12	<a href="#">Further SoCG Natural England</a>
PD-L-13	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd and Environment Agency SOCG</a>
<b>Applicant's certificates</b>	
PD-A-01	<a href="#">Certificates of Compliance</a>
<b>Correspondence from/to Interested Parties</b>	
PD-Cor-01	<a href="#">S51 Advice to Whitemoss Landfill Ltd</a>

## PROCEDURAL DECISIONS

<b>General Procedural Decisions</b>	
DEC-G-01	<a href="#">Whitemoss Notification of Decision to Accept Application</a>
DEC-G-02	<a href="#">Whitemoss s55 Acceptance of Application Checklist</a>
DEC-G-03	<a href="#">Notice of the Preliminary Meeting - Rule 6 letter</a>
DEC-G-04	<a href="#">Invitation to attend the Preliminary Meeting to those who did not register as interested parties</a>
DEC-G-05	<a href="#">Notice of Procedural Decisions and the Examination Timetable - Rule 8 and 9 letter</a>
DEC-G-06	<a href="#">Notice of cancellation of events and procedural decisions</a>
DEC-G-07	<a href="#">Notice of Procedural Decision and issue of ExA's second written questions</a>
DEC-G-08	<a href="#">Notification of a Procedural decision, a hearing and requests for further information - Rule 8(3), Rule 13 and Rule 17</a>
DEC-G-09	<a href="#">Rule 8(3) letter</a>
DEC-G-010	<a href="#">Notification of a Procedural decision requesting further information</a>
DEC-G-011	<a href="#">Notification of Completion of ExA Examination</a>

## REPRESENTATIONS

<b>Adequacy of Consultation</b>	
REP-A-01	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation - St Helen Metropolitan District Council</a>
REP-A-02	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation- Fylde District Council</a>
REP-A-03	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation- West Lancashire Borough Council</a>
REP-A-04	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation-Chorley District Council</a>
REP-A-05	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation-Cumbria County Council</a>
REP-A-06	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation-Knowsley Metropolitan District Council</a>
REP-A-07	<a href="#">Adequacy of consultation-North Yorkshire County council</a>

REP-A-08	<u>Adequacy of consultation-Sefton Metropolitan District Council</u>
REP-A-09	<u>Adequacy of consultation-South Ribble District Council</u>
REP-A-010	<u>Adequacy of consultation-Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority</u>
REP-A-011	<u>Adequacy of Consultation -Bolton Metropolitan District</u>
REP-A-012	<u>Adequacy of Consultation -Lancashire County council</u>
<b>Written Representations</b>	
REP-W-01	<u>1st Southport Lockhart Scout Troop</u>
REP-W-02	<u>A Robinson</u>
REP-W-03	<u>A Tootill</u>
REP-W-04	<u>Arrow</u>
REP-W-05	<u>Arrow</u>
REP-W-06	<u>Arrow 2 health</u>
REP-W-07	<u>Arrow 3 - Risk Perception</u>
REP-W-08	<u>Arrow 4 - from Friends of the Earth</u>
REP-W-09	<u>Arthur Scarisbrick</u>
REP-W-010	<u>Barry Carr</u>
REP-W-011	<u>Beacon Primary Care and Sandy Lane Health Centre</u>
REP-W-012	<u>Bickerstaffe Children's Services Ltd</u>
REP-W-013	<u>Bickerstaffe Parish Council</u>
REP-W-014	<u>Brenda Lowe</u>
REP-W-015	<u>Carol Fenlon</u>
REP-W-016	<u>Chris Carr</u>
REP-W-017	<u>Chris Davies</u>
REP-W-018	<u>Christine Mcbrinn</u>
REP-W-019	<u>Councillor Neil Pye</u>
REP-W-020	<u>Councillor Nicola Pryce Roberts</u>
REP-W-021	<u>Dalton Parish Council</u>
REP-W-022	<u>Del Ellis</u>
REP-W-023	<u>Diane Roberts</u>
REP-W-024	<u>Earl of Derby Estate</u>
REP-W-025	<u>Energetics</u>
REP-W-026	<u>Equality and Human rights commission</u>
REP-W-027	<u>ES Pipelines</u>
REP-W-028	<u>EW and KM Webster</u>
REP-W-029	<u>GP Development Testing Ltd</u>
REP-W-030	<u>Heather Cowley</u>
REP-W-031	<u>Helen Porter</u>
REP-W-032	<u>Highways Agency</u>
REP-W-033	<u>Howard Gray</u>
REP-W-034	<u>Island Park Ltd</u>
REP-W-035	<u>Jackie Lee</u>
REP-W-036	<u>Janet Williams</u>
REP-W-037	<u>Joanne Taylor</u>
REP-W-038	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
REP-W-039	<u>Justin Wilde</u>
REP-W-040	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
REP-W-041	<u>Lathom South Parish Council</u>
REP-W-042	<u>Lisa Edwards</u>
REP-W-043	<u>Liverpool Road Allotment Society</u>
REP-W-044	<u>M and W Hudson</u>
REP-W-045	<u>Maciej Welzman</u>
REP-W-046	<u>Mrs J Sandison</u>
REP-W-047	<u>Natural England</u>
REP-W-048	<u>Neil Bisarya</u>
REP-W-049	<u>Nicola Gray</u>

REP-W-050	<a href="#">Patrick McGuinness</a>
REP-W-051	<a href="#">Peter Baker</a>
REP-W-052	<a href="#">Quantil Ltd</a>
REP-W-053	<a href="#">Rainford Timber Ltd</a>
REP-W-054	<a href="#">Rosie Cooper</a>
REP-W-055	<a href="#">RS and LM Webster partnership</a>
REP-W-056	<a href="#">Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</a>
REP-W-057	<a href="#">Say No To More Hazardous Waste in Skelmersdale</a>
REP-W-058	<a href="#">Skelmersdale Junior Football League</a>
REP-W-059	<a href="#">Skelmersdale Writers Group</a>
REP-W-060	<a href="#">South Lathom Residents' Association</a>
REP-W-061	<a href="#">Thai Boxing and MMA Academy</a>
REP-W-062	<a href="#">The Derby Arms</a>
REP-W-063	<a href="#">The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester &amp; North Merseyside</a>
REP-W-064	<a href="#">TMR Development</a>
REP-W-065	<a href="#">Tow and Stow Ltd</a>
REP-W-066	<a href="#">Vicky Shearer</a>
REP-W-067	<a href="#">Virosafe Ltd</a>
REP-W-068	<a href="#">Wash Farm and RS and LM Webster</a>
REP-W-069	<a href="#">Wash Farm</a>
REP-W-070	<a href="#">Wash Farm 2</a>
REP-W-071	<a href="#">West Lancashire Borough Council</a>
REP-W-072	<a href="#">West Lancashire Training and Learning Centre</a>
REP-W-073	<a href="#">Whitemoss Letter to Planning Inspectorate 26 June 2014</a>
REP-W-074	<a href="#">Whitemoss Consultation Report Addendum June 2014 - Text &amp; Tables</a>
REP-W-075	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 A</a>
REP-W-076	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 B</a>
REP-W-077	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 C</a>
REP-W-078	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 D</a>
REP-W-079	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 E</a>
REP-W-080	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 F</a>
REP-W-081	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 G</a>
REP-W-082	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 H</a>
REP-W-083	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 I</a>
REP-W-084	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 J</a>
REP-W-085	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 K</a>
REP-W-086	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 L</a>
REP-W-087	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 M</a>
REP-W-088	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N</a>
REP-W-089	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix A</a>
REP-W-090	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix B</a>
REP-W-091	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix C</a>
REP-W-092	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix D</a>
REP-W-093	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix E</a>
REP-W-094	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix F</a>
REP-W-095	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix G</a>
REP-W-096	<a href="#">Whitemoss- Consultation Report Addendum- Appendix CONS2 N Appendix H</a>
REP-W-097	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix I</a>
REP-W-098	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix J</a>
REP-W-099	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix K</a>
REP-W-100	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 N Appendix L</a>
REP-W-101	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 O</a>
REP-W-102	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 O Appendix B Part 1 of 3</a>
REP-W-103	<a href="#">Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 O Appendix B</a>

	<u>Part 2 of 3</u>
REP-W-104	<u>Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 O Appendix B Part 3 of 3</u>
REP-W-105	<u>Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 P</u>
REP-W-106	<u>Whitemoss-Consultation Report Addendum-Appendix CONS2 Q</u>
<b>Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions</b>	
REP-1Q-01	<u>ARROW 1</u>
REP-1Q-02	<u>Campaign to Protect Rural England</u>
REP-1Q-03	<u>Environment Agency</u>
REP-1Q-04	<u>Health and Safety Executive</u>
REP-1Q-05	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
REP-1Q-06	<u>Natural England</u>
REP-1Q-07	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery and Bickerstaffe Cycle Track</u>
REP-1Q-08	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</u>
REP-1Q-09	<u>St Helens Council</u>
REP-1Q-10	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
REP-1Q-11	<u>Whitemoss Limited</u>
<b>Comments Received for the deadline of 8 July 2014</b>	
REP-1RC-01	<u>ARROW 5 Part 1 and ARROW 6</u>
REP-1RC-02	<u>CPRE comments</u>
REP-1RC-03	<u>Whitemoss Comments</u>
<b>Responses to Examining authority's Second Round of Written Questions</b>	
REP-2Q-01	<u>ARROW 8</u>
REP-2Q-02	<u>Beacon Primary Care and Sandy Lane Health Centre</u>
REP-2Q-03	<u>Bickerstaffe Children's Services</u>
REP-2Q-04	<u>CPRE Lancashire</u>
REP-2Q-05	<u>Environment Agency</u>
REP-2Q-06	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
REP-2Q-07	<u>Lathom South Parish Council</u>
REP-2Q-08	<u>Natural England</u>
REP-2Q-09	<u>Rosie Cooper</u>
REP-2Q-10	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</u>
REP-2Q-11	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery 2</u>
REP-2Q-12	<u>Wash Farm</u>
REP-2Q-13	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
REP-2Q-14	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Limited</u>
<b>Comments on the Second Round of Written Questions responses</b>	
REP-2QC-01	<u>ARROW 7</u>
REP-2QC-02	<u>Barry Carr</u>
REP-2QC-03	<u>Bickerstaffe Children's Services</u>
REP-2QC-04	<u>Carol Fenlon</u>
REP-2QC-05	<u>Chris Carr</u>
REP-2QC-06	<u>Christine McBrinn</u>
REP-2QC-07	<u>Diane Roberts</u>
REP-2QC-08	<u>Heather Cowley</u>
REP-2QC-09	<u>Helen Taylor</u>
REP-2QC-10	<u>Janet Williams</u>
REP-2QC-11	<u>Janice Alty</u>
REP-2QC-12	<u>Joanne Homson</u>
REP-2QC-13	<u>Joanne Taylor</u>
REP-2QC-14	<u>Joseph Homson</u>
REP-2QC-15	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
REP-2QC-16	<u>Lynda Hegarty</u>
REP-2QC-17	<u>Marion Flavell</u>
REP-2QC-18	<u>Paul Victor Thomas</u>

REP-2QC-19	<u>Pauline Homson</u>
REP-2QC-20	<u>Peter Brierly</u>
REP-2QC-21	<u>Rachel Foley</u>
REP-2QC-22	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</u>
REP-2QC-23	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery 2</u>
REP-2QC-24	<u>The Derby Arms</u>
REP-2QC-25	<u>Wash Farm</u>
REP-2QC-26	<u>Wash Farm 2</u>
REP-2QC-27	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
REP-2QC-28	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd</u>
REP-2QC-29	<u>ARROW 9 (Late Submission)</u>
<b>Response to Rule 17 Letter- Submitted for the deadline of 30 September 2014</b>	
REP-R17-1-01	<u>ARROW reference documents</u>
REP-R17-1-02	<u>ARROW 5 Part 2</u>
REP-R17-1-03	<u>Barry Carr</u>
REP-R17-1-04	<u>Barry Carr - Submission 2</u>
REP-R17-1-05	<u>Beacon Primary Care and Sandy Lane Health Centre</u>
REP-R17-1-06	<u>Chris Carr</u>
REP-R17-1-07	<u>Councillor Nicola Pryce Roberts</u>
REP-R17-1-08	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
REP-R17-1-09	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</u>
REP-R17-1-10	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd navigation map</u>
REP-R17-1-11	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd Documents referenced in past submissions part 2 MJCA 21 - 40</u>
REP-R17-1-12	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd Documents referenced in past submissions part 3 MJCA 41 -57</u>
REP-R17-1-13	<u>Bickerstaffe Children's Services(Late Response)</u>
REP-R17-1-14	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council(Late Response)</u>
<b>Response to Rule 17 Letter- Submitted for the deadline of 7 October 2014.</b>	
REP-R17-1-15	<u>Chris Carr (Late response)</u>
REP-R17-1-16	<u>Chris Carr</u>
REP-R17-1-17	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
REP-R17-1-18	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
REP-R17-1-19	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd - Letter from West Lancashire borough council</u>
REP-R17-1-20	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd 1</u>
REP-R17-1-21	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd navigation map Rev A</u>
<b>Comments on responses to Rule 17- Submitted for the deadline of 14 October 2014.</b>	
REP-R17-1C-01	<u>Natural England</u>
REP-R17-1C-02	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd</u>
REP-R17-1C-03	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd 1 navigation map Rev B</u>
REP-R17-1C-04	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd 2 navigation map Rev C</u>
REP-R17-1C-05	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd 3 navigation map Rev D</u>
REP-R17-1C-06	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd 4 navigation map Rev E</u>
REP-R17-1C-07	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd 5 navigation map Rev F</u>
<b>Responses to Rule 17- Submitted for the deadline of 12 November 2014.</b>	
REP-R17-2-01	<u>Lancashire County Council Late submission</u>
REP-R17-2-02	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
REP-R17-2-03	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd</u>

<b>Responses to the ExA's draft DCO and comments on documents submitted before 17 November 2014- Submitted for the deadline of 17 November 2014</b>	
REP-17 Nov-01	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
REP-17 Nov-02	<u>ARROW 17</u>
REP-17 Nov-03	<u>Chris Carr</u>
REP-17 Nov-04	<u>CPRE Lancashire</u>
REP-17 Nov-05	<u>Diane Roberts</u>
REP-17 Nov-06	<u>Knowsley Estate</u>
REP-17 Nov-07	<u>Linda Webster on behalf of Island Park Ltd and Wash Farm</u>
REP-17 Nov-08	<u>Roger Webster on behalf of Tow&amp; Stow Ltd, Island Park Ltd and Wash Farm</u>
REP-17 Nov-09	<u>S Barnes</u>
REP-17 Nov-10	<u>Whitemoss landfill Ltd</u>
REP-17 Nov-11	<u>Bickerstaffe Children's services</u>

### **Additional Submissions**

AS-001	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd-Correspondence regarding UK Power Networks</u>
AS-002	<u>Arthur George Scarisbrick - submission on 2nd draft ASI itinerary</u>
AS-003	<u>Barry Carr - submission on consultation</u>
AS-004	<u>Chris Carr submission in response to the Whitemoss Landfill submission on consultation</u>
AS-005	<u>Heather Cowley</u>
AS-006	<u>Combined Rep and Signatures</u>
AS-007	<u>Jacqueline Smith</u>
AS-008	<u>Linda Webster response to Whitemoss Landfill submission on consultation and notification</u>
AS-009	<u>Linda Webster submission on the draft Accompanied Site Inspection itinerary</u>
AS-010	<u>Marion Flavell</u>
AS-011	<u>Marion Flavell (continued)</u>
AS-012	<u>Mr and Mrs FM Galletly</u>
AS-013	<u>Mrs Jenny Littlewood</u>
AS-014	<u>Public Health England</u>
AS-015	<u>Rosie Cooper MP - representations submitted via Rosie Cooper MPs office</u>
AS-016	<u>Rosie Cooper MP letters</u>
AS-017	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Limited letter to St Helens Council</u>
AS-018	<u>Equality and Human Rights Commission</u>
AS-019	<u>Stephen Bennett</u>
AS-020	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
AS-021	<u>Examining Authority's response to Save Bickerstaffe Colliery's submission dated 3 June 2014</u>
AS-022	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</u>
AS-023	<u>John Appleton</u>
AS-024	<u>Outhwaite Litherland</u>
AS-025	<u>Quadrant Properties</u>
AS-026	<u>The Gas Transportation Company and others</u>



AS-027	<u>B. Cowley</u>
AS-028	<u>CPRE Lancashire</u>
AS-029	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd correspondence regarding the timetable</u>
AS-030	<u>Lathom South Parish Council regarding the timetable</u>
AS-031	<u>Whitemoss Landfill Ltd errata data</u>
AS-032	<u>ARROW 9 – renumbered</u>
AS-033	<u>Chris Carr</u>
AS-034	<u>Christine Harris</u>
AS-035	<u>Christine McBrinn</u>
AS-036	<u>Daniel Wilde</u>
AS-037	<u>Energetics Design &amp; Build</u>
AS-038	<u>English Heritage</u>
AS-039	<u>Emma Hunt</u>
AS-040	<u>Equality and Human Rights Commission 1</u>
AS-041	<u>Fulcrum Pipelines Limited</u>
AS-042	<u>The Gas Transportation Company Limited and others</u>
AS-043	<u>Greg Barker</u>
AS-044	<u>Heather Cowley (2)</u>
AS-045	<u>Joanne Homson</u>
AS-046	<u>Joanne Wilde</u>
AS-047	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
AS-048	<u>Judith Alexander 2</u>
AS-049	<u>Justin Wilde</u>
AS-050	<u>Rosie Cooper MP</u>
AS-051	<u>Reply to Rosie Cooper MP</u>
AS-052	<u>Liz Savage</u>
AS-053	<u>Patrick McGuinness</u>
AS-054	<u>Vicky Shearer</u>
AS-055	<u>Forestry Commission England</u>
AS-057	<u>Whitemoss landfill ltd</u>
AS-058	<u>The Gas Transportation Company Limited</u>
AS-059	<u>Roger Webster</u>
AS-060	<u>Bickerstaffe Children’s services</u>
AS-061	<u>Chris Carr</u>
AS-062	<u>Joanne Taylor</u>
AS-063	<u>Karen Roach</u>
AS-064	<u>Knowsley Estate</u>
AS-065	<u>Linda Webster on behalf of Wash Farm</u>
AS-066	<u>Paul Thomas</u>

## **PRELIMINARY MEETING, HEARING AND ACCOMPANIED SITE VISIT DOCUMENTS**

<b>Preliminary Meeting – 21 May 2014</b>	
EV-PM-001	<u>Bickerstaffe Children's Services</u>
EV-PM-002	<u>Bickerstaffe Parish Council RE Planning Process Flawed</u>
EV-PM-003	<u>Bickerstaffe Parish Council</u>
EV-PM-004	<u>Chris Carr</u>
EV-PM-005	<u>Claire Robinson</u>
EV-PM-006	<u>Diane Roberts</u>
EV-PM-007	<u>Garry Green</u>
EV-PM-008	<u>Heather Cowley</u>
EV-PM-009	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
EV-PM-010	<u>Linda Webster and RS</u>

EV-PM-011	<a href="#">Linda Webster on behalf of Family</a>
EV-PM-012	<a href="#">Linda Webster on behalf of Island Park Ltd</a>
EV-PM-013	<a href="#">Linda Webster</a>
EV-PM-014	<a href="#">Mr and Mrs Webster</a>
EV-PM-015	<a href="#">Natural England</a>
EV-PM-016	<a href="#">Roger Webster</a>
EV-PM-017	<a href="#">Save Bickerstaffe Colliery Cycle</a>
EV-PM-018	<a href="#">Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</a>
EV-PM-019	<a href="#">Stephen Bengel on behalf of West Lancashire Council</a>
EV-PM-020	<a href="#">The Gas Transportation Company Limited</a>
EV-PM-021	<a href="#">David Cheetham</a>
EV-PM-022	<a href="#">Judith Alexander</a>
EV-PM-023	<a href="#">Preliminary Meeting Audio</a>
EV-PM-024	<a href="#">Preliminary Meeting Note</a>
EV-PM-025	<a href="#">Whitemoss landfill Ltd - Itinerary</a>
EV-PM-026	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd (2)</a>
EV-PM-027	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd</a>
EV-PM-028	<a href="#">Lancashire County council (2)</a>
<b>Open floor hearing-17 July 2014</b>	
EV-OF1-01	<a href="#">Hearing Audio recording</a>
EV-OF1-02	<a href="#">Chris Carr</a>
EV-OF1-03	<a href="#">David Cheetham</a>
EV-OF1-04	<a href="#">Chris Carr Part 2</a>
EV-OF1-05	<a href="#">Carol Fenlon- Written submission</a>
<b>Open floor hearing- 18 July 2014</b>	
EV-OF2-01	<a href="#">Hearing Audio recording</a>
EV-OF2-02	<a href="#">CPRE Lancashire and West Lancashire District Group</a>
EV-OF2-03	<a href="#">Del Ellis</a>
EV-OF2-04	<a href="#">Diane Roberts Part 1</a>
EV-OF2-05	<a href="#">Diane Roberts part 2</a>
EV-OF2-06	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Limited</a>
<b>Accompanied site Inspection- 15 October 2014</b>	
EV-ASV1-01	<a href="#">Whitemoss Ltd</a>
<b>Issue specific hearing on Policy and Need - 16 October 2014</b>	
EV-IS1-01	<a href="#">Agenda for issue specific hearing on Policy and Need</a>
EV-IS1-02	<a href="#">Issue Specific Hearing audio recording - Part 1</a>
EV-IS1-03	<a href="#">Issue Specific Hearing audio recording - Part 2</a>
EV-IS1-04	<a href="#">Issue Specific Hearing audio recording - Part 3</a>
<b>Issue specific hearing on Environment – 16/17 October 2014</b>	
EV-IS2-01	<a href="#">Agenda for issue specific hearing on the Environment - 16 17 October 2014</a>
EV-IS2-02	<a href="#">Bickerstaffe Children's Services</a>
EV-IS2-03	<a href="#">Environment Agency</a>
EV-IS2-04	<a href="#">Issue specific hearing audio recording - Part 1</a>
EV-IS2-05	<a href="#">Issue specific hearing audio recording - Part 2</a>
EV-IS2-06	<a href="#">Issue specific hearing audio recording - Part 3</a>
EV-IS2-07	<a href="#">Issue specific hearing audio recording - Part 4</a>
EV-IS2-08	<a href="#">Issue specific hearing audio recording - Part 5</a>
<b>Issue specific hearing on revised draft DCO (including the articles, requirements and any s106 requirements) – 22 October 2014</b>	
EV-IS3-01	<a href="#">Agenda for issue specific hearing on the DCO - 22 October 2014</a>
EV-IS3-02	<a href="#">Examining Authority's draft comments on DCO for DCO hearing</a>
EV-IS3-03	<a href="#">Examining Authority's comments on revised draft s106 agreement</a>
EV-IS3-04	<a href="#">ARROW 14</a>
EV-IS3-05	<a href="#">ARROW 10 and 11</a>
EV-IS3-06	<a href="#">Issue Specific hearing audio recording - Part 1</a>

EV-IS3-07	<u>Issue Specific hearing audio recording - Part 2</u>
EV-IS3-08	<u>Issue Specific hearing audio recording - Part 3</u>
EV-IS3-09	<u>Issue Specific hearing audio recording - Part 4</u>
EV-IS3-10	<u>Issue Specific hearing audio recording - Part 5</u>
EV-IS3-11	<u>ISH on Environment on 22 Oct-part 6 Audio</u>
<b>Compulsory acquisition hearing –22 October 2014</b>	
EV-CA1-01	<u>Compulsory Acquisition Hearing Agenda</u>
EV-CA1-02	<u>Revised Agenda for Issue Specific Hearing on the DCO- 22 OCT 2014</u>
EV-CA1-03	<u>Arthur Scarisbrick</u>
EV-CA1-04	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
EV-CA1-05	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
EV-CA1-06	<u>Compulsory purchase and compensation 1- Compulsory purchase procedure</u>
EV-CA1-07	<u>Compulsory purchase and compensation 2- Compensation to business owners and occupiers</u>
EV-CA1-08	<u>Compulsory purchase and compensation 3- Compensation to agricultural owners and occupiers</u>
EV-CA1-09	<u>Compulsory purchase and compensation 4- Compensation to residential owners and occupiers</u>
EV-CA1-10	<u>Compulsory purchase and compensation 5- Reducing adverse effects of public development mitigation works</u>
EV-CA1-11	<u>Compulsory Acquisition hearing audio recording</u>
<b>Open floor Hearing- 23 October 2014</b>	
EV-OF2-01	<u>Alaric J Hicks</u>
EV-OF2-02	<u>Angela Green</u>
EV-OF2-03	<u>ARROW 12</u>
EV-OF2-04	<u>ARROW 13</u>
EV-OF2-05	<u>Bickerstaffe Parish Council</u>
EV-OF2-06	<u>Chris Carr 001</u>
EV-OF2-07	<u>Chris Carr 002</u>
EV-OF2-08	<u>CPRE Lancashire</u>
EV-OF2-09	<u>Dalton Parish Council</u>
EV-OF2-10	<u>Diane Roberts</u>
EV-OF2-11	<u>Del Ellis</u>
EV-OF2-12	<u>Heather Cowley</u>
EV-OF2-13	<u>Ian Granite</u>
EV-OF2-14	<u>J.E.Hodson</u>
EV-OF2-15	<u>Jackie Lee and Chris Forsyth</u>
EV-OF2-16	<u>Joseph Welsh</u>
EV-OF2-17	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
EV-OF2-18	<u>Judith Alexander 001</u>
EV-OF2-19	<u>Knowsley Estate</u>
EV-OF2-20	<u>Lathom Souh Parish Council</u>
EV-OF2-21	<u>Linda Webster</u>
EV-OF2-22	<u>Linda Webster on behalf of Wash Farm</u>
EV-OF2-23	<u>M C Flavell</u>
EV-OF2-24	<u>Patrick Conachey</u>
EV-OF2-25	<u>Paul Victor Thomas</u>
EV-OF2-26	<u>Rose and Ted Barclay</u>
EV-OF2-27	<u>Roger Webster on behalf of Tow and Stow Ltd</u>
EV-OF2-28	<u>Roy Alexander</u>
EV-OF2-29	<u>S Barnes</u>
EV-OF2-30	<u>South Lathom Residents' Association</u>
EV-OF2-31	<u>Stephen Bennett</u>
EV-OF2-32	<u>Susan Birch</u>
EV-OF2-33	<u>Vicky Shearer</u>

EV-OF2-34	<a href="#">Open floor hearing audio recording - Part 1</a>
EV-OF2-35	<a href="#">Open floor hearing audio recording - Part 2</a>
<b>General hearing documents</b>	
EV-G-01	<a href="#">Press Notice of Hearings in July</a>
EV-G-02	<a href="#">Press Notice of IS Hearings in October</a>
EV-G-04	<a href="#">Press Notice of OF Hearing in October</a>
EV-G-05	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd Hearing Summaries including DCO Rev C</a>
EV-G-06	<a href="#">ARROW 15</a>
EV-G-07	<a href="#">ARROW 16 Comments on hearing summaries</a>
EV-G-08	<a href="#">Bickerstaffe Children's services comments on hearing summaries</a>
EV-G-09	<a href="#">CPRE Lancashire</a>
EV-G-10	<a href="#">CPRE Lancashire comments on Hearing summaries</a>
EV-G-11	<a href="#">Lancashire County Council comments on national policy for waste</a>
EV-G-12	<a href="#">Lancashire County Council</a>
EV-G-13	<a href="#">Plans to accompany the letter to PINS dated 30 October 2014</a>
EV-G-14	<a href="#">References to accompany the letter to PINS dated 30 October 2014</a>
EV-G-15	<a href="#">West Lancashire Borough Council</a>
EV-G-16	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd (151014) (v1)</a>
EV-G-17	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd contents list</a>
EV-G-18	<a href="#">Whitemoss Landfill Ltd Comments on October hearings Late submission</a>

## RELEVANT REPRESENTATIONS

RR-0001	<a href="#">1st Skelmersdale Methodist Scout Group ( 17thOrmskirk)</a>
RR-0002	<a href="#">1st Southport Lockhart Scout Troop</a>
RR-0003	<a href="#">4 RECYCLING</a>
RR-0004	<a href="#">A58 Automotive</a>
RR-0005	<a href="#">A Bridge</a>
RR-0006	<a href="#">A Green</a>
RR-0007	<a href="#">Mrs A Hobson</a>
RR-0008	<a href="#">A Holmes</a>
RR-0009	<a href="#">A Hunt</a>
RR-0010	<a href="#">A Johnson</a>
RR-0011	<a href="#">Master A Johnson</a>
RR-0012	<a href="#">Mr A Nightingale</a>
RR-0013	<a href="#">A Nux</a>
RR-0014	<a href="#">A Smith</a>
RR-0015	<a href="#">Miss A Tomaselli</a>
RR-0016	<a href="#">Miss A Wallace</a>
RR-0017	<a href="#">Aaliyah Webber</a>
RR-0018	<a href="#">Mr A Yardley</a>
RR-0019	<a href="#">Aaron Alty</a>
RR-0020	<a href="#">Aaron Shaw</a>
RR-0021	<a href="#">Abbey Marie Jones</a>
RR-0022	<a href="#">Abbie Lunt</a>
RR-0023	<a href="#">Abbie Robinson</a>
RR-0024	<a href="#">Abid Makba</a>
RR-0025	<a href="#">Abigail Gould</a>
RR-0026	<a href="#">Rachel Webb</a>
RR-0027	<a href="#">Adam Hill</a>
RR-0028	<a href="#">Adam James Dollimore</a>
RR-0029	<a href="#">Adam Levitt</a>

RR-0030	<u>Adam Lynch</u>
RR-0031	<u>Adam Martland</u>
RR-0032	<u>Adam Mcbrinn</u>
RR-0033	<u>Adam Middlehurst</u>
RR-0034	<u>Adam Mitchell</u>
RR-0035	<u>Adam Stanley Cooper</u>
RR-0036	<u>Amelia Gardner</u>
RR-0037	<u>Adam Storey</u>
RR-0038	<u>Adam Tittle</u>
RR-0039	<u>Adele Cave</u>
RR-0040	<u>Mrs Adele Greenall</u>
RR-0041	<u>Adele Robbins Brown</u>
RR-0042	<u>Adele Watson</u>
RR-0043	<u>Adrian Fairhurst</u>
RR-0044	<u>Agnes Ryland</u>
RR-0045	<u>Agnes Scarisbrick</u>
RR-0046	<u>Miss Aimee-Leigh Mosquito</u>
RR-0047	<u>Aimee Smith</u>
RR-0048	<u>Aimee Thomas</u>
RR-0049	<u>Aisling Bassett</u>
RR-0050	<u>Alan Arthur</u>
RR-0051	<u>Alan Cullen</u>
RR-0052	<u>Alan Davies</u>
RR-0053	<u>Alan Flynn</u>
RR-0054	<u>Alan Gore</u>
RR-0055	<u>Alan Griffin</u>
RR-0056	<u>Alan Halliwell</u>
RR-0057	<u>Alan Horridge</u>
RR-0058	<u>Alan Hughes</u>
RR-0059	<u>Alan James Read</u>
RR-0060	<u>Alan Jones</u>
RR-0061	<u>Alan Lawton</u>
RR-0062	<u>Mr Alan Paul Kelly</u>
RR-0063	<u>Alan Ralfs</u>
RR-0064	<u>Alan Treanor</u>
RR-0065	<u>Alan Wharton</u>
RR-0066	<u>Alec Yates</u>
RR-0067	<u>Alesha Holland</u>
RR-0068	<u>Alex Bow</u>
RR-0069	<u>Alex Brown</u>
RR-0070	<u>Alex Johnson</u>
RR-0071	<u>Alex Lyons</u>
RR-0072	<u>Alex Trainor</u>
RR-0073	<u>Alex Wood</u>
RR-0074	<u>Mr Alexander Lemaire</u>
RR-0075	<u>Alexandra Flynn</u>
RR-0076	<u>Alexandra Gould</u>
RR-0077	<u>Alexia A Lloyd</u>
RR-0078	<u>Alfie Dickinson</u>
RR-0079	<u>Alfie Miller</u>

RR-0080	<u>Alfie Richardson</u>
RR-0081	<u>Alfie Wooding</u>
RR-0082	<u>Alfred John Jameson</u>
RR-0083	<u>Alice O'Hanlon</u>
RR-0084	<u>Alice Taylor</u>
RR-0085	<u>Alina Byrne</u>
RR-0086	<u>Alisha Bailey</u>
RR-0087	<u>Alisha Jones</u>
RR-0088	<u>Alison Barlow</u>
RR-0089	<u>Alison Ball</u>
RR-0090	<u>Alison Bennett</u>
RR-0091	<u>Alison Braskova</u>
RR-0092	<u>Alison Farrell</u>
RR-0093	<u>Alison Hunt</u>
RR-0094	<u>Alison Louise Lloyd</u>
RR-0095	<u>Alison Martin</u>
RR-0096	<u>Alison Mercer</u>
RR-0097	<u>Alison Woods</u>
RR-0098	<u>Mr Alister Brown</u>
RR-0099	<u>Alix Edwards</u>
RR-0100	<u>Allan Brophy</u>
RR-0101	<u>Allan Fraser</u>
RR-0102	<u>Allan Marshman</u>
RR-0103	<u>Allan Shepherd</u>
RR-0104	<u>Alma Mercer</u>
RR-0105	<u>Alma Mercer</u>
RR-0106	<u>Amanda Birchall Vural</u>
RR-0107	<u>Amanda Crosby</u>
RR-0108	<u>Amanda Fazackerley</u>
RR-0109	<u>Amanda Fowell</u>
RR-0110	<u>Amanda Hillier</u>
RR-0111	<u>Amanda Rose</u>
RR-0112	<u>Amanda Schofield</u>
RR-0113	<u>Amanda Wainwright</u>
RR-0114	<u>Amber Fitzgerald</u>
RR-0115	<u>Amelia Houghton</u>
RR-0116	<u>Amelia Rose Hindley</u>
RR-0117	<u>Amie Lea</u>
RR-0118	<u>Amirah Audhali</u>
RR-0119	<u>Amy Caden</u>
RR-0120	<u>Amy Cartwright</u>
RR-0121	<u>Amy Davies</u>
RR-0122	<u>Amy Edmond</u>
RR-0123	<u>Amy Martin</u>
RR-0124	<u>Amy McDonald</u>
RR-0125	<u>Amy Mehaffy</u>
RR-0126	<u>Amy Nicole Smith</u>
RR-0127	<u>Amylea Johnson</u>
RR-0128	<u>Andi Fowler</u>
RR-0129	<u>Andre Antunes</u>

RR-0130	<u>Andrea Fowler</u>
RR-0131	<u>Andrea McDonough</u>
RR-0132	<u>Andrea McGuinness</u>
RR-0133	<u>Andreas Backstrom</u>
RR-0134	<u>Andrew Kenworthy</u>
RR-0135	<u>Andrew Barlow</u>
RR-0136	<u>Mr Andrew Boyer</u>
RR-0137	<u>Andrew Bradshaw</u>
RR-0138	<u>Andrew Bunting</u>
RR-0139	<u>Andrew Cahill</u>
RR-0140	<u>Andrew Carlson</u>
RR-0141	<u>Andrew Carmichael</u>
RR-0142	<u>Andrew Evans</u>
RR-0143	<u>Andrew Hilton</u>
RR-0144	<u>Andrew Housley</u>
RR-0145	<u>Andrew Huxley</u>
RR-0146	<u>Andrew Jones</u>
RR-0147	<u>Andrew Lamb</u>
RR-0148	<u>Andrew Lamb</u>
RR-0149	<u>Andrew Maguire</u>
RR-0150	<u>Andrew Marsh</u>
RR-0151	<u>Andrew McDonald</u>
RR-0152	<u>Andrew Mercer</u>
RR-0153	<u>Andrew Obrien</u>
RR-0154	<u>Andrew Riding</u>
RR-0155	<u>Andrew Roberts</u>
RR-0156	<u>Andrew Robinson</u>
RR-0157	<u>Andrew Rowan</u>
RR-0158	<u>Andrew Schofield</u>
RR-0159	<u>Andrew Sharples</u>
RR-0160	<u>Andrew Taylor</u>
RR-0161	<u>Andrew Tootill</u>
RR-0162	<u>Andrew Traynor</u>
RR-0163	<u>Andrew Williams</u>
RR-0164	<u>Andy Barnes</u>
RR-0165	<u>Andy Bradshaw</u>
RR-0166	<u>Andy Lawson</u>
RR-0167	<u>Andy Phillips</u>
RR-0168	<u>Andy Singleton</u>
RR-0169	<u>Angela Caden</u>
RR-0170	<u>Angela Donnelly</u>
RR-0171	<u>Angela Draper</u>
RR-0172	<u>Angela Eadie</u>
RR-0173	<u>Angela Forshaw</u>
RR-0174	<u>Angela Harrison</u>
RR-0175	<u>Angela Jones</u>
RR-0176	<u>Angela Lawday</u>
RR-0177	<u>Angela Murray</u>
RR-0178	<u>Angela Newton</u>
RR-0179	<u>Angela Parkes</u>

RR-0180	<u>Angela Sheridan</u>
RR-0181	<u>Angela Tymon</u>
RR-0182	<u>Angela Tymon</u>
RR-0183	<u>Angela Webber</u>
RR-0184	<u>Ann Ashburner</u>
RR-0185	<u>Ann Brown</u>
RR-0186	<u>Ann Chesworth</u>
RR-0187	<u>Ann Dickinson</u>
RR-0188	<u>Ann Faragher</u>
RR-0189	<u>Ann Fillingham</u>
RR-0190	<u>Ann Grimshaw</u>
RR-0191	<u>Ann Hunt</u>
RR-0192	<u>Ann MacRae</u>
RR-0193	<u>Ann Marie Hughes</u>
RR-0194	<u>Ann Marshman</u>
RR-0195	<u>Ann Mckenzie</u>
RR-0196	<u>Ann Murphy</u>
RR-0197	<u>Ann Petty</u>
RR-0198	<u>Ann Redwood</u>
RR-0199	<u>Ann Roocroft</u>
RR-0200	<u>Ann Train</u>
RR-0201	<u>Anna Culshaw</u>
RR-0202	<u>Anna Green</u>
RR-0203	<u>Anna Jones</u>
RR-0204	<u>Mrs Anne Popely</u>
RR-0205	<u>Anne Williams</u>
RR-0206	<u>Anne-Marie Evans</u>
RR-0207	<u>Annemarie Treanor</u>
RR-0208	<u>Annette Davis</u>
RR-0209	<u>Annette Hanley</u>
RR-0210	<u>Annette Michaela Brown</u>
RR-0211	<u>Annie Mercer</u>
RR-0212	<u>AnnMarie Shaw</u>
RR-0213	<u>Ann-Marie Woods</u>
RR-0214	<u>Anthony Bamin</u>
RR-0215	<u>Anthony Bray</u>
RR-0216	<u>Anthony Clark</u>
RR-0217	<u>Anthony Duffus</u>
RR-0218	<u>Mr Anthony Jackson</u>
RR-0219	<u>Anthony John Curtin</u>
RR-0220	<u>Anthony Lunt</u>
RR-0221	<u>Anthony Murphy</u>
RR-0222	<u>Anthony Myers</u>
RR-0223	<u>Anthony O</u>
RR-0224	<u>Anthony Reed</u>
RR-0225	<u>Anthony Rimmer</u>
RR-0226	<u>Anthony Ross</u>
RR-0227	<u>Anthony Rutland</u>
RR-0228	<u>Anthony Tennant</u>
RR-0229	<u>Antonia Blythe</u>



RR-0230	<u>Antonia Hunt</u>
RR-0231	<u>Antonia Jenkins</u>
RR-0232	<u>Antony Currie</u>
RR-0233	<u>Antony Dickson</u>
RR-0234	<u>Aoife Norris</u>
RR-0235	<u>Arkadiusz Bialomyzy</u>
RR-0236	<u>Arnold Haughton</u>
RR-0237	<u>Aaron James Keown</u>
RR-0238	<u>Arron Shaw</u>
RR-0239	<u>ARROW (Action to Reduce and Recycle Our Waste)</u>
RR-0240	<u>Arthur George Scarisbrick</u>
RR-0241	<u>Ashleigh Lowe</u>
RR-0242	<u>Ms Ashley Burns</u>
RR-0243	<u>Ashley Cookey</u>
RR-0244	<u>Ashley Fitzgerald</u>
RR-0245	<u>Ashley Rimmer</u>
RR-0246	<u>Ashley Viggor</u>
RR-0247	<u>Ashurst Junior Football Club</u>
RR-0248	<u>Ashurst Junior Football Club under 13's</u>
RR-0249	<u>Ashurst Junior Football Club under 8</u>
RR-0250	<u>Ashurst Junior Football Club under 9</u>
RR-0251	<u>Ashurst One Tenants and Residents Accociation</u>
RR-0252	<u>Audrey Clements</u>
RR-0253	<u>Audrey Lloyd</u>
RR-0254	<u>Audrey O'Neill</u>
RR-0255	<u>Aughton Properties Ltd</u>
RR-0256	<u>Ava Holland</u>
RR-0257	<u>Avonbraid Ltd</u>
RR-0258	<u>AWC Waste Care Ltd</u>
RR-0259	<u>Mr B Brady</u>
RR-0260	<u>B Davies</u>
RR-0261	<u>B Fairclough</u>
RR-0262	<u>B. Hilton</u>
RR-0263	<u>B Horrocks</u>
RR-0264	<u>B Johnson</u>
RR-0265	<u>Mrs B J Leah</u>
RR-0266	<u>Miss B Lyons</u>
RR-0267	<u>B Martin</u>
RR-0268	<u>Mr B Mooney</u>
RR-0269	<u>Mrs B Sanderson</u>
RR-0270	<u>B Sharrock</u>
RR-0271	<u>Mrs B Swift</u>
RR-0272	<u>Mrs B Tomaselli</u>
RR-0273	<u>B Wright</u>
RR-0274	<u>Mrs B Yardley</u>
RR-0275	<u>Mr Bailey</u>
RR-0276	<u>Mrs Bailey</u>
RR-0277	<u>Bailey Edwards</u>
RR-0278	<u>Bailey Smith</u>
RR-0279	<u>Bannatyne</u>

RR-0280	<u>Mrs Barbara Carol Brady</u>
RR-0281	<u>Barbara Carter</u>
RR-0282	<u>Barbara Hart</u>
RR-0283	<u>Barbara Henson</u>
RR-0284	<u>Barbara Mooney</u>
RR-0285	<u>Barbara Smith</u>
RR-0286	<u>Barbara Turner</u>
RR-0287	<u>Barrie Brown</u>
RR-0288	<u>Barry Carr</u>
RR-0289	<u>Barry Evans</u>
RR-0290	<u>Mr Barry Foster</u>
RR-0291	<u>Barry Gay</u>
RR-0292	<u>Barry Henry Lloyd</u>
RR-0293	<u>Barry Powell</u>
RR-0294	<u>Barry Smith</u>
RR-0295	<u>Barry Smith</u>
RR-0296	<u>Barry Welsh</u>
RR-0297	<u>Beacon Primary Care</u>
RR-0298	<u>Beata Birch</u>
RR-0299	<u>Mrs Beatrice Baker</u>
RR-0300	<u>Beatrice Ellen Cowley</u>
RR-0301	<u>Beauty in Motion</u>
RR-0302	<u>Becky O'Connell</u>
RR-0303	<u>Belinda Watson</u>
RR-0304	<u>Ben Britton</u>
RR-0305	<u>Ben Carlson</u>
RR-0306	<u>Ben Holroyd</u>
RR-0307	<u>Ben Hunt</u>
RR-0308	<u>Ben McDonald</u>
RR-0309	<u>Ben McNamara</u>
RR-0310	<u>Ben Rose</u>
RR-0311	<u>Benjamin Charles Sach</u>
RR-0312	<u>Benjamin Wood</u>
RR-0313	<u>Bernadette Dalrymple</u>
RR-0314	<u>Bernadette Hill</u>
RR-0315	<u>Mrs Bernadette Wales</u>
RR-0316	<u>Bernie Cartwright</u>
RR-0317	<u>Beryl Woods</u>
RR-0318	<u>Beth McBride</u>
RR-0319	<u>Bethan Ashburner</u>
RR-0320	<u>Bethany Gardner</u>
RR-0321	<u>Bethany Latimer</u>
RR-0322	<u>Betty Phillips</u>
RR-0323	<u>Beverly Linderman</u>
RR-0324	<u>Beverly Smith</u>
RR-0325	<u>Bickerstaffe Children</u>
RR-0326	<u>Bickerstaffe cycle track</u>
RR-0327	<u>Bickerstaffe Cycle Track</u>
RR-0328	<u>Bickerstaffe JFC</u>
RR-0329	<u>Bickerstaffe Parish Council</u>

RR-0330	<u>Biffa Waste Services Limited</u>
RR-0331	<u>Bill Evans</u>
RR-0332	<u>Billie Talbot</u>
RR-0333	<u>Billy Chambers</u>
RR-0334	<u>Billy Furlong</u>
RR-0335	<u>Bishop Martin Church of England Primary School</u>
RR-0336	<u>Bithell's Waste Disposal Limited</u>
RR-0337	<u>Bob Gilfoyle</u>
RR-0338	<u>Brad Dillon</u>
RR-0339	<u>Mrs Brady</u>
RR-0340	<u>Bradley Miller</u>
RR-0341	<u>Brandon Fallon</u>
RR-0342	<u>Brandon Sherrington</u>
RR-0343	<u>Mrs Brenda Johnson</u>
RR-0344	<u>Mrs Brenda Jones</u>
RR-0345	<u>Brenda Lowe</u>
RR-0346	<u>Brendan Begg</u>
RR-0347	<u>Brent Perry</u>
RR-0348	<u>Brett Winn</u>
RR-0349	<u>Brian Day</u>
RR-0350	<u>Brian Edmond</u>
RR-0351	<u>Mr Brian Edmond</u>
RR-0352	<u>Brian Geoff Swift</u>
RR-0353	<u>Brian Grimes</u>
RR-0354	<u>Brian Jopson</u>
RR-0355	<u>Brian Joynston</u>
RR-0356	<u>Brian Lewis</u>
RR-0357	<u>Brian Martin</u>
RR-0358	<u>Brian Menard</u>
RR-0359	<u>Brian Read</u>
RR-0360	<u>Brian Roache</u>
RR-0361	<u>Brian Sharkey</u>
RR-0362	<u>Brian Sharkey</u>
RR-0363	<u>Brian Sharkey, Jnr</u>
RR-0364	<u>Brian Shufflebotham</u>
RR-0365	<u>Brian Sweeney</u>
RR-0366	<u>Brian Thompson</u>
RR-0367	<u>Brian Wainwright</u>
RR-0368	<u>Brian Williams</u>
RR-0369	<u>Bridget Hughes</u>
RR-0370	<u>Mrs Bridget Hughes</u>
RR-0371	<u>Bridy Hughes</u>
RR-0372	<u>BrighthouseWolff Estate Agents</u>
RR-0373	<u>Briian Jones</u>
RR-0374	<u>Brookside Residents association</u>
RR-0375	<u>Bryan Barton Collier</u>
RR-0376	<u>Bryan Irving</u>
RR-0377	<u>Bryan Wall</u>
RR-0378	<u>Bryan Wareing</u>
RR-0379	<u>Bryn Jones</u>

RR-0380	<u>Bryony Simcox</u>
RR-0381	<u>C Billington</u>
RR-0382	<u>C C Barker</u>
RR-0383	<u>C Causer</u>
RR-0384	<u>Mr C F Nickson</u>
RR-0385	<u>C G Neil</u>
RR-0386	<u>Mrs C Gillham</u>
RR-0387	<u>C Gregson</u>
RR-0388	<u>Miss C Hughes</u>
RR-0389	<u>Mrs C Lyons</u>
RR-0390	<u>C Pennington</u>
RR-0391	<u>C R. Smith</u>
RR-0392	<u>Mrs C Wallace</u>
RR-0393	<u>C Woodward</u>
RR-0394	<u>Caitlin Griffin</u>
RR-0395	<u>Caitlin Roache</u>
RR-0396	<u>Caitlin Smith</u>
RR-0397	<u>Caitlin Whittaker</u>
RR-0398	<u>Caleb Roberts</u>
RR-0399	<u>Mr Callan Scott</u>
RR-0400	<u>Calli Anne Rowlands</u>
RR-0401	<u>Callum Brown</u>
RR-0402	<u>Callum Fitzgerald</u>
RR-0403	<u>Callum Hegarty</u>
RR-0404	<u>Callum Latimer</u>
RR-0405	<u>Callum Lea</u>
RR-0406	<u>Callum Tipton</u>
RR-0407	<u>Callum Tobin</u>
RR-0408	<u>Callum Wilson</u>
RR-0409	<u>Cameron McLintock</u>
RR-0410	<u>Cameron Smith</u>
RR-0411	<u>Camille Fitzgerald</u>
RR-0412	<u>Campaign to Protect Rural England West Lancashire District Group</u>
RR-0413	<u>Captain Peter Bone</u>
RR-0414	<u>Carina Sweeney</u>
RR-0415	<u>Carl Linderman</u>
RR-0416	<u>Carl Maddock</u>
RR-0417	<u>Carl Melia</u>
RR-0418	<u>Mr Carl Shinnick</u>
RR-0419	<u>Carl Webb</u>
RR-0420	<u>Carl Wilde</u>
RR-0421	<u>Carly McDonald</u>
RR-0422	<u>Master C Mooney</u>
RR-0423	<u>Carly Morris</u>
RR-0424	<u>Carly Morris</u>
RR-0425	<u>Carly Ryan</u>
RR-0426	<u>Carol Carlson</u>
RR-0427	<u>Carol Duggan</u>
RR-0428	<u>Carol Fenlon</u>
RR-0429	<u>Carol Hailwood</u>

RR-0430	<u>Carol Horne</u>
RR-0431	<u>Carol Rooney</u>
RR-0432	<u>Carol Sinnott</u>
RR-0433	<u>Carol Smith</u>
RR-0434	<u>Carol Smith</u>
RR-0435	<u>Carol Thomas</u>
RR-0436	<u>Carole Atherton</u>
RR-0437	<u>Carole Sutcliffe</u>
RR-0438	<u>Mrs Caroline Aydin</u>
RR-0439	<u>Caroline Constable</u>
RR-0440	<u>Caroline Grice</u>
RR-0441	<u>Caroline Lock</u>
RR-0442	<u>Caroline O'Conell</u>
RR-0443	<u>Carolyn Wignall</u>
RR-0444	<u>Carringtons Catering Ltd</u>
RR-0445	<u>Castle Claysales Ltd.</u>
RR-0446	<u>Catherine Ashcroft</u>
RR-0447	<u>Catherine Blytze</u>
RR-0448	<u>Catherine Carmichael</u>
RR-0449	<u>Catherine Eglin</u>
RR-0450	<u>Catherine Elaine Garry</u>
RR-0451	<u>Catherine Fenney</u>
RR-0452	<u>Mrs Catherine Glover</u>
RR-0453	<u>Catherine Hearty</u>
RR-0454	<u>Catherine Lunt</u>
RR-0455	<u>Catherine Macbeth</u>
RR-0456	<u>Catherine McDonald</u>
RR-0457	<u>Catherine McHale</u>
RR-0458	<u>Catherine McNee</u>
RR-0459	<u>Catherine Morgan</u>
RR-0460	<u>Catherine Morris</u>
RR-0461	<u>Catherine Murphy</u>
RR-0462	<u>Catherine Ormesher</u>
RR-0463	<u>Catherine Sutcliffe</u>
RR-0464	<u>Catherine Whittaker</u>
RR-0465	<u>Cathie Jamieson - Murphy</u>
RR-0466	<u>Ceejay Browning</u>
RR-0467	<u>Celia Buswell</u>
RR-0468	<u>Ceri Griffiths</u>
RR-0469	<u>Cevik Ahmet</u>
RR-0470	<u>Chamali Samarasekara</u>
RR-0471	<u>Charles Critchley</u>
RR-0472	<u>Charles Norman Price</u>
RR-0473	<u>Charley- Lea Pennington</u>
RR-0474	<u>Charlie Beeley</u>
RR-0475	<u>Charlie Bone</u>
RR-0476	<u>Charlie Daniels</u>
RR-0477	<u>Charlie Dawber</u>
RR-0478	<u>Charlie Morris</u>
RR-0479	<u>Charlie Morris</u>

RR-0480	<u>Charlie O</u>
RR-0481	<u>Charlie Platts</u>
RR-0482	<u>Charlie Sackett</u>
RR-0483	<u>Charlie Sharkey</u>
RR-0484	<u>Charlie Wainwright</u>
RR-0485	<u>Charlotte Benton</u>
RR-0486	<u>Charlotte Crossley</u>
RR-0487	<u>Charlotte Edwards</u>
RR-0488	<u>Charlotte Latimer</u>
RR-0489	<u>Charlotte Mowatt</u>
RR-0490	<u>Charlotte Taylor</u>
RR-0491	<u>Charlotte Wohler</u>
RR-0492	<u>Chase Schofield</u>
RR-0493	<u>Chelsea Ashcroft</u>
RR-0494	<u>Chelsea Downs</u>
RR-0495	<u>Chelsea Gibson</u>
RR-0496	<u>Chelsea Woods</u>
RR-0497	<u>Cheryl Atkinson</u>
RR-0498	<u>Cheryl Littler</u>
RR-0499	<u>Cheryl Littler</u>
RR-0500	<u>Cheryl Littler</u>
RR-0501	<u>Cheryl Sharp</u>
RR-0502	<u>Cheryl Williams</u>
RR-0503	<u>Chloe Atkin</u>
RR-0504	<u>Chloe Edwards</u>
RR-0505	<u>Chloe Robinson</u>
RR-0506	<u>Chloe Slocombe</u>
RR-0507	<u>Chris Birrell</u>
RR-0508	<u>Chris Boulton</u>
RR-0509	<u>Chris Carr</u>
RR-0510	<u>Chris Hall</u>
RR-0511	<u>Chris Haughton</u>
RR-0512	<u>Chris Haynes</u>
RR-0513	<u>Chris Holcroft</u>
RR-0514	<u>Chris Norris</u>
RR-0515	<u>Chris Roscoe</u>
RR-0516	<u>Chris Stock</u>
RR-0517	<u>Chris Tucker</u>
RR-0518	<u>Chris Wood</u>
RR-0519	<u>Chris Wynn</u>
RR-0520	<u>Christie Binks</u>
RR-0521	<u>Mrs.Christina Apa</u>
RR-0522	<u>Christina Clarke</u>
RR-0523	<u>Christine Ainslie</u>
RR-0524	<u>Christine Ann Rimmer</u>
RR-0525	<u>Christine Brierly</u>
RR-0526	<u>Mrs Christine Byrne</u>
RR-0527	<u>Christine Clarke</u>
RR-0528	<u>Mrs Christine Conroy</u>
RR-0529	<u>Mrs Christine Dutton</u>

RR-0530	<u>Christine Fagan</u>
RR-0531	<u>Christine Fitzpatrick</u>
RR-0532	<u>Christine Halliwell</u>
RR-0533	<u>Christine Harris</u>
RR-0534	<u>Christine Levitt</u>
RR-0535	<u>Christine Marsh</u>
RR-0536	<u>Christine Mary Naylor</u>
RR-0537	<u>Christine McBrinn</u>
RR-0538	<u>Christine McBrinn</u>
RR-0539	<u>Christine McNamara</u>
RR-0540	<u>Mrs Christine Ollerton</u>
RR-0541	<u>Christine Pacey</u>
RR-0542	<u>Christine Parkes</u>
RR-0543	<u>Christine Pownall</u>
RR-0544	<u>Christine Rome</u>
RR-0545	<u>Christine Smith</u>
RR-0546	<u>Christine Stockton</u>
RR-0547	<u>Christopher Bason</u>
RR-0548	<u>Christopher Browning</u>
RR-0549	<u>Christopher Day</u>
RR-0550	<u>Christopher Dixon</u>
RR-0551	<u>Christopher Foley</u>
RR-0552	<u>Christopher Fowell</u>
RR-0553	<u>Christopher Gallagher</u>
RR-0554	<u>Christopher Gibbs</u>
RR-0555	<u>Christopher Hunt</u>
RR-0556	<u>Christopher Morgan</u>
RR-0557	<u>Christopher Orchard</u>
RR-0558	<u>Christopher Robinson</u>
RR-0559	<u>Christopher Sandison</u>
RR-0560	<u>Christopher Sawyer</u>
RR-0561	<u>Christopher Thomas</u>
RR-0562	<u>Cianan Simpson</u>
RR-0563	<u>Civil Aviation Authority</u>
RR-0564	<u>Clair Coffey</u>
RR-0565	<u>Clair Wilson</u>
RR-0566	<u>Claire Beddoes</u>
RR-0567	<u>Claire Chong</u>
RR-0568	<u>Claire Cooper</u>
RR-0569	<u>Claire E Mossman</u>
RR-0570	<u>Claire Fielding</u>
RR-0571	<u>Claire Gardner</u>
RR-0572	<u>Claire Holliday</u>
RR-0573	<u>Claire Lloyd</u>
RR-0574	<u>Miss Claire Louise Townley</u>
RR-0575	<u>Claire Morgan</u>
RR-0576	<u>Claire Oldfield</u>
RR-0577	<u>Claire Oldfield</u>
RR-0578	<u>Claire Reynolds</u>
RR-0579	<u>Claire Robinson</u>

RR-0580	<u>Claire Rooney</u>
RR-0581	<u>Claire Ryder</u>
RR-0582	<u>Claire Sanders</u>
RR-0583	<u>Clare Gibson</u>
RR-0584	<u>Clare Hallam</u>
RR-0585	<u>Clare Lowe</u>
RR-0586	<u>Clare Maloney</u>
RR-0587	<u>Clare Monaghan</u>
RR-0588	<u>Clare Nickson</u>
RR-0589	<u>Clare Pollard</u>
RR-0590	<u>Mrs Clare Ralph</u>
RR-0591	<u>Clear Motors</u>
RR-0592	<u>Clear Removals</u>
RR-0593	<u>Cleo Rose Bhamra</u>
RR-0594	<u>Cliff Potter</u>
RR-0595	<u>Clifford Duffey</u>
RR-0596	<u>Clive Hurt Plant Hire Limited</u>
RR-0597	<u>Codie Kelly</u>
RR-0598	<u>Cole Ashton</u>
RR-0599	<u>Colette Grimes</u>
RR-0600	<u>Colette Hare</u>
RR-0601	<u>Colette Taylor</u>
RR-0602	<u>Colin Bradshaw</u>
RR-0603	<u>Colin Duffey</u>
RR-0604	<u>Colin Horne</u>
RR-0605	<u>Colin McHugh</u>
RR-0606	<u>Mr Colin Sandison</u>
RR-0607	<u>Colin Storey</u>
RR-0608	<u>Colin Tittle</u>
RR-0609	<u>Colin Warwick</u>
RR-0610	<u>Colin wright</u>
RR-0611	<u>Collette Gorman</u>
RR-0612	<u>Collette Hoare</u>
RR-0613	<u>Collette Smalley</u>
RR-0614	<u>Conner Lakin</u>
RR-0615	<u>Connie Cockroft</u>
RR-0616	<u>Connolly Contractors Ltd</u>
RR-0617	<u>Connor Brown</u>
RR-0618	<u>Connor brownie</u>
RR-0619	<u>Connor Keggin</u>
RR-0620	<u>Connor Walsh</u>
RR-0621	<u>Connor Watson</u>
RR-0622	<u>Connor Wilky</u>
RR-0623	<u>Connor Wright</u>
RR-0624	<u>Mr Constantine</u>
RR-0625	<u>Corinne Gibson</u>
RR-0626	<u>Cornelius Alexander Jones</u>
RR-0627	<u>Courtney Felton</u>
RR-0628	<u>Courtney Shaw</u>
RR-0629	<u>Craig David robin</u>



RR-0630	<u>Craig Dickson</u>
RR-0631	<u>Craig Edis</u>
RR-0632	<u>Craig Jones</u>
RR-0633	<u>Craig Sinnott</u>
RR-0634	<u>Craig Warwick</u>
RR-0635	<u>Crawford Wall</u>
RR-0636	<u>Cristy Watt</u>
RR-0637	<u>Cynthia Moakes</u>
RR-0638	<u>Mrs D Ball</u>
RR-0639	<u>D Bushrod</u>
RR-0640	<u>Mr D Byrne</u>
RR-0641	<u>Mr D Cameron</u>
RR-0642	<u>Miss D Cartwright</u>
RR-0643	<u>D court</u>
RR-0644	<u>D D Feeley</u>
RR-0645	<u>D Fletcher</u>
RR-0646	<u>Mrs D Fletcher</u>
RR-0647	<u>Mr D Garner</u>
RR-0648	<u>Mr D Hardman</u>
RR-0649	<u>Mrs D Hardman</u>
RR-0650	<u>D Hutton</u>
RR-0651	<u>Mrs D I Weston</u>
RR-0652	<u>D Marsh</u>
RR-0653	<u>Mr D McCrudden</u>
RR-0654	<u>D Messman</u>
RR-0655	<u>Mrs D Mooney</u>
RR-0656	<u>Miss D Mould</u>
RR-0657	<u>D Perry</u>
RR-0658	<u>D Price</u>
RR-0659	<u>Mr D Quagliano</u>
RR-0660	<u>Mr D Riley</u>
RR-0661	<u>Mrs D Riley</u>
RR-0662	<u>Mr D Scarisbrick</u>
RR-0663	<u>Mr D Tomaselli</u>
RR-0664	<u>Mrs D Tomaselli</u>
RR-0665	<u>D Tomlinson</u>
RR-0666	<u>Mrs D Wallace</u>
RR-0667	<u>D Wilson</u>
RR-0668	<u>Daisy Dodgson</u>
RR-0669	<u>Daisy Latimer</u>
RR-0670	<u>Daisy Taylor</u>
RR-0671	<u>Daisy Wilde</u>
RR-0672	<u>Dale Slater</u>
RR-0673	<u>Dalton Parish Council</u>
RR-0674	<u>Damian Swift</u>
RR-0675	<u>Daniel Brady</u>
RR-0676	<u>Daniel Carmichael</u>
RR-0677	<u>Daniel Cookey</u>
RR-0678	<u>Daniel Dignam</u>
RR-0679	<u>Daniel Feeley</u>

RR-0680	<u>Daniel Fowler</u>
RR-0681	<u>Daniel Gandy</u>
RR-0682	<u>Daniel Gaskell</u>
RR-0683	<u>Daniel Grace</u>
RR-0684	<u>Daniel Gray</u>
RR-0685	<u>Daniel Greenall</u>
RR-0686	<u>Daniel Hollingsworth</u>
RR-0687	<u>Daniel hunt</u>
RR-0688	<u>Daniel Lea</u>
RR-0689	<u>Daniel Lemaire</u>
RR-0690	<u>Daniel May</u>
RR-0691	<u>Daniel P. Waite</u>
RR-0692	<u>Daniel Pearson</u>
RR-0693	<u>Daniel Reeder</u>
RR-0694	<u>Daniel Ryan Brown</u>
RR-0695	<u>Daniel Schofield</u>
RR-0696	<u>Daniel Skelhorn</u>
RR-0697	<u>Daniel Taylor</u>
RR-0698	<u>Daniel Traynor</u>
RR-0699	<u>Daniel Wilde</u>
RR-0700	<u>Daniel wood</u>
RR-0701	<u>Danielle Baines</u>
RR-0702	<u>Danielle Barlow</u>
RR-0703	<u>Danielle Beeley</u>
RR-0704	<u>Danielle Best</u>
RR-0705	<u>Danielle Butler</u>
RR-0706	<u>Miss Danielle Kelly</u>
RR-0707	<u>Danielle king</u>
RR-0708	<u>Danielle Wayne</u>
RR-0709	<u>Danny Brady</u>
RR-0710	<u>Mr Danny Burns</u>
RR-0711	<u>Danny Jackson</u>
RR-0712	<u>Darcy Baines</u>
RR-0713	<u>Darren Connor</u>
RR-0714	<u>Darren Donnelly</u>
RR-0715	<u>Darren Flint</u>
RR-0716	<u>Darren Hodson</u>
RR-0717	<u>Darren Shire</u>
RR-0718	<u>Darren Sumner</u>
RR-0719	<u>Darren Wilson</u>
RR-0720	<u>Darren Wynn</u>
RR-0721	<u>Dave Beeston</u>
RR-0722	<u>Dave Fendle</u>
RR-0723	<u>Dave Lehan</u>
RR-0724	<u>Dave McComb</u>
RR-0725	<u>David Ashley</u>
RR-0726	<u>David Birch</u>
RR-0727	<u>David Bradshaw</u>
RR-0728	<u>Mr David Carter</u>
RR-0729	<u>David Cheetham</u>

RR-0730	<u>David Clark</u>
RR-0731	<u>David Clark</u>
RR-0732	<u>David Cookson</u>
RR-0733	<u>David Crawford</u>
RR-0734	<u>David Cunningham</u>
RR-0735	<u>David Faulkner</u>
RR-0736	<u>David Fenney</u>
RR-0737	<u>Mr David G Fletcher</u>
RR-0738	<u>David Green</u>
RR-0739	<u>David Holtby</u>
RR-0740	<u>David J A Lewin</u>
RR-0741	<u>David Jack</u>
RR-0742	<u>David Jago</u>
RR-0743	<u>David Jenkins</u>
RR-0744	<u>David Jenkins</u>
RR-0745	<u>David Jevons</u>
RR-0746	<u>David Johannessen</u>
RR-0747	<u>David John Swift</u>
RR-0748	<u>David Jones</u>
RR-0749	<u>David Kitson</u>
RR-0750	<u>David Lawless</u>
RR-0751	<u>David Lawrenson</u>
RR-0752	<u>David Lunn</u>
RR-0753	<u>David Lunt</u>
RR-0754	<u>David Mulhaney</u>
RR-0755	<u>David Murphy</u>
RR-0756	<u>David Murray</u>
RR-0757	<u>David Naylor</u>
RR-0758	<u>David Nolan</u>
RR-0759	<u>David Nunes</u>
RR-0760	<u>David O'Brien</u>
RR-0761	<u>David Owens</u>
RR-0762	<u>David Parkes</u>
RR-0763	<u>Mr David Parsonage</u>
RR-0764	<u>Mr David Parsonage</u>
RR-0765	<u>David Peel</u>
RR-0766	<u>David Povey</u>
RR-0767	<u>David Roe</u>
RR-0768	<u>Mr David Routledge</u>
RR-0769	<u>David Sewell</u>
RR-0770	<u>David Shaw</u>
RR-0771	<u>David Sheridan</u>
RR-0772	<u>David Sims</u>
RR-0773	<u>David Smith</u>
RR-0774	<u>David Stephen Brookfield</u>
RR-0775	<u>David Stewart</u>
RR-0776	<u>David Storey</u>
RR-0777	<u>David Turner</u>
RR-0778	<u>David Whittaker</u>
RR-0779	<u>David Williams</u>

RR-0780	<u>Dawn Ashcroft</u>
RR-0781	<u>Dawn Hughes</u>
RR-0782	<u>Dawn Huxley</u>
RR-0783	<u>Dawn Robson</u>
RR-0784	<u>Dawn Rutherford</u>
RR-0785	<u>Dean Bolton</u>
RR-0786	<u>Dean Edwards</u>
RR-0787	<u>Dean Evans</u>
RR-0788	<u>Dean Higham</u>
RR-0789	<u>Dean Mackin</u>
RR-0790	<u>Dean Mackin</u>
RR-0791	<u>Dean Shaw</u>
RR-0792	<u>Debbie Ann Lunt</u>
RR-0793	<u>Debbie Crawford</u>
RR-0794	<u>Debbie Cross</u>
RR-0795	<u>Debbie Dean</u>
RR-0796	<u>Debbie Deeming</u>
RR-0797	<u>Debbie Fleetwood</u>
RR-0798	<u>Debbie Jenkinson</u>
RR-0799	<u>Debbie Jevons</u>
RR-0800	<u>Debbie Johnson</u>
RR-0801	<u>Debbie Kelly</u>
RR-0802	<u>Debbie Ran</u>
RR-0803	<u>Debbie Shaw</u>
RR-0804	<u>Debbie Timmis</u>
RR-0805	<u>Deborah Davies</u>
RR-0806	<u>Deborah Glover</u>
RR-0807	<u>Deborah Pearson</u>
RR-0808	<u>Deborah Pearson</u>
RR-0809	<u>Debra Roberts</u>
RR-0810	<u>Debra Shire</u>
RR-0811	<u>Debra Wilkinson</u>
RR-0812	<u>Declan Sinnott</u>
RR-0813	<u>Dee Sorrell</u>
RR-0814	<u>Del Ellis</u>
RR-0815	<u>Della Tunstall</u>
RR-0816	<u>Delores McDonald</u>
RR-0817	<u>Demi Gardner</u>
RR-0818	<u>Dene Hunter</u>
RR-0819	<u>Denis Hegarty</u>
RR-0820	<u>Denis Hegarty</u>
RR-0821	<u>Denise Cole</u>
RR-0822	<u>Denise Hare</u>
RR-0823	<u>Cllr. Denise Michell</u>
RR-0824	<u>Denise Taylor</u>
RR-0825	<u>Denise Waite</u>
RR-0826	<u>Dennis Fairclough</u>
RR-0827	<u>Denny Melia</u>
RR-0828	<u>Mr Derek Cresswell</u>
RR-0829	<u>Derek Hill</u>

RR-0830	<u>Derek Hunt</u>
RR-0831	<u>Derek Kain</u>
RR-0832	<u>Derek Lowe</u>
RR-0833	<u>Dermot Glennon</u>
RR-0834	<u>Desmond Brennan</u>
RR-0835	<u>Desmond Hogan</u>
RR-0836	<u>Desray Weedall</u>
RR-0837	<u>Diane Beeston</u>
RR-0838	<u>Diane Clarke</u>
RR-0839	<u>Mrs Diane Dixon</u>
RR-0840	<u>Diane Dobson</u>
RR-0841	<u>Diane Freeman</u>
RR-0842	<u>Diane Givnan</u>
RR-0843	<u>Diane Moran</u>
RR-0844	<u>Mrs Diane Porter</u>
RR-0845	<u>Diane Roberts</u>
RR-0846	<u>Dianne Coverdale</u>
RR-0847	<u>Dominic Simcox</u>
RR-0848	<u>Donna Duffey</u>
RR-0849	<u>Donna Dyson</u>
RR-0850	<u>Donna Fowell</u>
RR-0851	<u>Donna Millar</u>
RR-0852	<u>Donna Riley</u>
RR-0853	<u>Councillor Donna Marie West</u>
RR-0854	<u>Donna Wilkie</u>
RR-0855	<u>Doreen Ball</u>
RR-0856	<u>Mrs Doreen Green</u>
RR-0857	<u>Doreen Ohare</u>
RR-0858	<u>Doris Aspinall</u>
RR-0859	<u>Doris Roberts</u>
RR-0860	<u>Dorothy Buxton</u>
RR-0861	<u>Dorothy Cambell</u>
RR-0862	<u>Dorothy Hawkes</u>
RR-0863	<u>Dorothy Littler</u>
RR-0864	<u>Dorothy Whelby</u>
RR-0865	<u>Dot Binhall</u>
RR-0866	<u>Dot Wildridge</u>
RR-0867	<u>Dr Bisarya GP Surgery</u>
RR-0868	<u>Dr Erica Page</u>
RR-0869	<u>Dr Geoff King</u>
RR-0870	<u>Dr John Parsons</u>
RR-0871	<u>Dr P Reston</u>
RR-0872	<u>Dr Paul C Davies</u>
RR-0873	<u>Draper Entertainments Limited</u>
RR-0874	<u>Drew Smith</u>
RR-0875	<u>DSM Demolition Ltd</u>
RR-0876	<u>Duncan Petty</u>
RR-0877	<u>Duo Skip Hire</u>
RR-0878	<u>Dylan Carr-Dickson</u>
RR-0879	<u>Dylan Morgan</u>

RR-0880	<u>Dylan Nixon</u>
RR-0881	<u>Dylan Thomas Shepherd</u>
RR-0882	<u>Dynamo Rangers FC</u>
RR-0883	<u>Dynamo Rangers Football Club</u>
RR-0884	<u>Dynamo Rangers Football Club Girls Under 12's</u>
RR-0885	<u>Dynamo Rangers Football Club Under 7</u>
RR-0886	<u>Dynamo Rangers Under 15 Boys</u>
RR-0887	<u>Miss E</u>
RR-0888	<u>Mrs E A Bott</u>
RR-0889	<u>E Davies</u>
RR-0890	<u>Mrs E Kilpatrick</u>
RR-0891	<u>Mrs E Leadbetter</u>
RR-0892	<u>E McCaig</u>
RR-0893	<u>Mr E Moss</u>
RR-0894	<u>Master E Mould</u>
RR-0895	<u>E Thomas</u>
RR-0896	<u>Mr E W Webster</u>
RR-0897	<u>Eco Garden Homes</u>
RR-0898	<u>Eco Warriors Westhead Lathom St James Primary School</u>
RR-0899	<u>Ecotex Engineering Systems Ltd</u>
RR-0900	<u>Eddie Best</u>
RR-0901	<u>Eddie Pestana</u>
RR-0902	<u>Edie Rimmer</u>
RR-0903	<u>Edith Berkley</u>
RR-0904	<u>Edith Tinsley</u>
RR-0905	<u>Edmund Miller</u>
RR-0906	<u>Edna Murphy</u>
RR-0907	<u>Edna Obrien</u>
RR-0908	<u>Edward Barclay</u>
RR-0909	<u>Edward Parkes</u>
RR-0910	<u>Edward R Salisbury</u>
RR-0911	<u>Edward Victor Frank Thomas</u>
RR-0912	<u>Eileen Jennings</u>
RR-0913	<u>Eileen Lowe</u>
RR-0914	<u>Mrs Eileen M Rochford</u>
RR-0915	<u>Eileen Millar</u>
RR-0916	<u>Eileen Plillips</u>
RR-0917	<u>Elaine Callaghan</u>
RR-0918	<u>Elaine Challinor</u>
RR-0919	<u>Elaine Edmond</u>
RR-0920	<u>Elaine Elliott</u>
RR-0921	<u>Elaine Glennon</u>
RR-0922	<u>Elaine Grimshaw</u>
RR-0923	<u>Elaine Jeffers</u>
RR-0924	<u>Elaine Johnston</u>
RR-0925	<u>Elaine Macleod</u>
RR-0926	<u>Mrs Elaine Ratcliffe</u>
RR-0927	<u>Elaine Shaw</u>
RR-0928	<u>Elaine Smith</u>
RR-0929	<u>Mrs Elaine Willan</u>

RR-0930	<u>Eleanor Ashburner</u>
RR-0931	<u>Eleanor Williams</u>
RR-0932	<u>Elena Hume</u>
RR-0933	<u>Elise Thomas</u>
RR-0934	<u>Elisha Griffin</u>
RR-0935	<u>Elite Building and Joinery Services</u>
RR-0936	<u>Mrs Elizabeth-Anne Broad</u>
RR-0937	<u>Mrs Elizabeth Bateman</u>
RR-0938	<u>Elizabeth Brown</u>
RR-0939	<u>Elizabeth Burrows</u>
RR-0940	<u>Elizabeth Darley</u>
RR-0941	<u>Elizabeth Gates</u>
RR-0942	<u>Elizabeth Gould</u>
RR-0943	<u>Elizabeth Gould</u>
RR-0944	<u>Elizabeth Green</u>
RR-0945	<u>Elizabeth Holtby</u>
RR-0946	<u>Elizabeth Mitchell Parr</u>
RR-0947	<u>ClIr Elizabeth Savage</u>
RR-0948	<u>Elizabeth Sumner</u>
RR-0949	<u>Elizabeth Taylor</u>
RR-0950	<u>Elizabeth whittle</u>
RR-0951	<u>Ella Daw</u>
RR-0952	<u>Ella Fowell</u>
RR-0953	<u>Ella Whittaker</u>
RR-0954	<u>Elle Mercer</u>
RR-0955	<u>Elle Riley</u>
RR-0956	<u>Elle Shepherd</u>
RR-0957	<u>Elle-May Edwards</u>
RR-0958	<u>Ellen Walker</u>
RR-0959	<u>Ellice Roughley</u>
RR-0960	<u>Ellie Naylor</u>
RR-0961	<u>Ellie Nesbitt</u>
RR-0962	<u>Ellie Smith</u>
RR-0963	<u>Ellis Gould</u>
RR-0964	<u>Elsie Davies</u>
RR-0965	<u>Emille Wolstenholme</u>
RR-0966	<u>Emily Higham</u>
RR-0967	<u>Emily Clegg</u>
RR-0968	<u>Emily O'Hanlon</u>
RR-0969	<u>Emily Sharples</u>
RR-0970	<u>Emily Swift</u>
RR-0971	<u>Emily Taylor</u>
RR-0972	<u>Emily Wohler</u>
RR-0973	<u>Emma Anderson</u>
RR-0974	<u>Emma Buchanan</u>
RR-0975	<u>Emma Fenney</u>
RR-0976	<u>Emma Foley</u>
RR-0977	<u>Emma Francis</u>
RR-0978	<u>Emma Graham</u>
RR-0979	<u>Emma Green</u>

RR-0980	<a href="#">Emma Hunt</a>
RR-0981	<a href="#">Emma Killick</a>
RR-0982	<a href="#">Emma Latimer</a>
RR-0983	<a href="#">Emma Lawler</a>
RR-0984	<a href="#">Emma Louise Rowlstone</a>
RR-0985	<a href="#">Emma Norris</a>
RR-0986	<a href="#">Miss Emma Parsonage</a>
RR-0987	<a href="#">Emma Powling</a>
RR-0988	<a href="#">Emma Sharples</a>
RR-0989	<a href="#">Emma Sherrington</a>
RR-0990	<a href="#">Emma Taylor</a>
RR-0991	<a href="#">Emma Taylor</a>
RR-0992	<a href="#">Emma Wignall</a>
RR-0993	<a href="#">Emma Wood</a>
RR-0994	<a href="#">Enid Jones</a>
RR-0995	<a href="#">Enid Randell</a>
RR-0996	<a href="#">Environment Agency</a>
RR-0997	<a href="#">Eoanna Stathopoulos</a>
RR-0998	<a href="#">Eric Peel</a>
RR-0999	<a href="#">Erin Carroll</a>
RR-1000	<a href="#">Erin Hoy</a>
RR-1001	<a href="#">Miss Erin Kenny</a>
RR-1002	<a href="#">Erin Martin</a>
RR-1003	<a href="#">Erin Sandison</a>
RR-1004	<a href="#">Erin Williams</a>
RR-1005	<a href="#">Ernest Ackers</a>
RR-1006	<a href="#">Mr Ernest Sandison</a>
RR-1007	<a href="#">Eryn Henwood</a>
RR-1008	<a href="#">Estelle Hall</a>
RR-1009	<a href="#">Ethan Armstrong</a>
RR-1010	<a href="#">Ethan Brown</a>
RR-1011	<a href="#">Ethan Connolly</a>
RR-1012	<a href="#">Eva Rimmer</a>
RR-1013	<a href="#">Eva Taylor</a>
RR-1014	<a href="#">Evan Collett</a>
RR-1015	<a href="#">Evelyn Mulcahy</a>
RR-1016	<a href="#">Evie Mckenzie</a>
RR-1017	<a href="#">Evie Tittle</a>
RR-1018	<a href="#">Ewan Cobain</a>
RR-1019	<a href="#">Ewan Shaw</a>
RR-1020	<a href="#">Excel Northwest</a>
RR-1021	<a href="#">Exposing the Enemies of Skelmersdale</a>
RR-1022	<a href="#">Mrs F Atchinson</a>
RR-1023	<a href="#">Mr F Atherton</a>
RR-1024	<a href="#">Mrs F Atherton</a>
RR-1025	<a href="#">Mr F Davies</a>
RR-1026	<a href="#">Mr F Dignam</a>
RR-1027	<a href="#">Mrs F Jones</a>
RR-1028	<a href="#">Mr F Lemaire</a>
RR-1029	<a href="#">F Oldfield</a>



RR-1030	<u>Faith Fhain</u>
RR-1031	<u>Fay Mckenzie</u>
RR-1032	<u>Finda Hughes</u>
RR-1033	<u>Fiona Hughes</u>
RR-1034	<u>Fiona Hughes</u>
RR-1035	<u>Fiona Verron</u>
RR-1036	<u>Fran Hutcheon</u>
RR-1037	<u>Frances Green</u>
RR-1038	<u>Frances Holland</u>
RR-1039	<u>Mrs Francesca Latham</u>
RR-1040	<u>Francis William Ainslie</u>
RR-1041	<u>Frank Bateman</u>
RR-1042	<u>Frank Birchall</u>
RR-1043	<u>Frank Edwards</u>
RR-1044	<u>Frank Edwards</u>
RR-1045	<u>Frank Marsh</u>
RR-1046	<u>Mr Fred Jones</u>
RR-1047	<u>Frederick Wainwright</u>
RR-1048	<u>Freedom Bedrooms</u>
RR-1049	<u>Freya Lewis</u>
RR-1050	<u>Freya Orritt</u>
RR-1051	<u>Freya Rawsthorne</u>
RR-1052	<u>Fulvius Fernandrs</u>
RR-1053	<u>G A Barker</u>
RR-1054	<u>Mr G Diamond</u>
RR-1055	<u>Miss G Dudley</u>
RR-1056	<u>G Feeley</u>
RR-1057	<u>G Green</u>
RR-1058	<u>G Jones</u>
RR-1059	<u>Mrs G Lemaire</u>
RR-1060	<u>Mr G Mooney</u>
RR-1061	<u>Miss G Moss</u>
RR-1062	<u>G P Development Testing</u>
RR-1063	<u>Mrs G Sandison</u>
RR-1064	<u>G T King</u>
RR-1065	<u>G Walton</u>
RR-1066	<u>G Williamson</u>
RR-1067	<u>Gail Hodson</u>
RR-1068	<u>Gail Hunt</u>
RR-1069	<u>Gail Hunt</u>
RR-1070	<u>Gail Tomkins</u>
RR-1071	<u>Gails beauty room</u>
RR-1072	<u>Gareth Dowling</u>
RR-1073	<u>Gareth Evans</u>
RR-1074	<u>Gareth Oakley</u>
RR-1075	<u>Garry Cahill</u>
RR-1076	<u>Garry Cave</u>
RR-1077	<u>Garry Crompton</u>
RR-1078	<u>Gary Berkley</u>
RR-1079	<u>Gary Carlson</u>

RR-1080	<u>Gary Carr</u>
RR-1081	<u>Gary Chambers</u>
RR-1082	<u>Gary Clarke</u>
RR-1083	<u>Gary Feeley</u>
RR-1084	<u>Gary jones</u>
RR-1085	<u>Gary Lynch</u>
RR-1086	<u>Gary Owens</u>
RR-1087	<u>Mr Gary Picken</u>
RR-1088	<u>Mr Gary Picken</u>
RR-1089	<u>Gary Shannon</u>
RR-1090	<u>Gary Thompson</u>
RR-1091	<u>Gary Welsh</u>
RR-1092	<u>Gary Wood</u>
RR-1093	<u>Gavin Cleland</u>
RR-1094	<u>Gavin Jones</u>
RR-1095	<u>Gaynar Owen</u>
RR-1096	<u>Gaynor McLeod</u>
RR-1097	<u>Gaynor Taylor</u>
RR-1098	<u>Gaynor Whittle</u>
RR-1099	<u>Gaynor Woodward</u>
RR-1100	<u>GB Accessories</u>
RR-1101	<u>Ged Seddon</u>
RR-1102	<u>Gemma Bradbury</u>
RR-1103	<u>Gemma Petherick</u>
RR-1104	<u>Gemma Price</u>
RR-1105	<u>Gemma Reilly</u>
RR-1106	<u>Gemma Rigby</u>
RR-1107	<u>Gemma Singleton</u>
RR-1108	<u>Mr Geoff King</u>
RR-1109	<u>Geoff McDonald</u>
RR-1110	<u>Geoff Wainwright</u>
RR-1111	<u>Mr Geoffrey Arkinstall</u>
RR-1112	<u>Geoffrey Piers Brown</u>
RR-1113	<u>Geoffrey Stringman</u>
RR-1114	<u>Geoffrey Stuart Jones</u>
RR-1115	<u>George Whelby</u>
RR-1116	<u>George Barnes</u>
RR-1117	<u>George Blanshard</u>
RR-1118	<u>George Blanshard</u>
RR-1119	<u>George Dricoll</u>
RR-1120	<u>George Dricoll Jnr</u>
RR-1121	<u>George Jones</u>
RR-1122	<u>George Mc Allister</u>
RR-1123	<u>George Miller</u>
RR-1124	<u>George Oliver</u>
RR-1125	<u>George Sharkey</u>
RR-1126	<u>George Spafford</u>
RR-1127	<u>George Tedford</u>
RR-1128	<u>George Wainwright</u>
RR-1129	<u>Georgia Flynn</u>

RR-1130	<u>Georgia Grice</u>
RR-1131	<u>Georgia Simpson</u>
RR-1132	<u>Gerald Walker</u>
RR-1133	<u>Miss Geraldine Coakley</u>
RR-1134	<u>Gerard Wilson</u>
RR-1135	<u>Gerrard Driscoll</u>
RR-1136	<u>Gerrard Traynor</u>
RR-1137	<u>Gill Wohler</u>
RR-1138	<u>Gill Wright</u>
RR-1139	<u>Gillian Cordingley</u>
RR-1140	<u>Gillian Crompton</u>
RR-1141	<u>Gillian O'Hanlon</u>
RR-1142	<u>Mrs Gillian Rainford</u>
RR-1143	<u>Gillian Yates</u>
RR-1144	<u>Glynis Griffith</u>
RR-1145	<u>Golded Lion Fishing Club</u>
RR-1146	<u>Gordon Campbell</u>
RR-1147	<u>Gordon Campbell</u>
RR-1148	<u>Grace Alexander</u>
RR-1149	<u>Grace Antunes</u>
RR-1150	<u>Grace Connolly</u>
RR-1151	<u>Grace Hurst</u>
RR-1152	<u>Gracie Hodson</u>
RR-1153	<u>Graham Carlson</u>
RR-1154	<u>Graham Clansey</u>
RR-1155	<u>Graham Clarke</u>
RR-1156	<u>Graham Cooper</u>
RR-1157	<u>Graham Davies</u>
RR-1158	<u>Graham Dowling</u>
RR-1159	<u>Graham Edwards</u>
RR-1160	<u>Graham Grimshaw</u>
RR-1161	<u>Graham Johnson</u>
RR-1162	<u>Mr Graham Meadley</u>
RR-1163	<u>Graham Mowatt</u>
RR-1164	<u>Mr Graham West</u>
RR-1165	<u>Graham White</u>
RR-1166	<u>Graham Younger</u>
RR-1167	<u>Graysons Barn livery yard</u>
RR-1168	<u>Greg Barker</u>
RR-1169	<u>Greg McBride</u>
RR-1170	<u>Greg Neale</u>
RR-1171	<u>Gregg Litherland</u>
RR-1172	<u>Grundy &amp; Co Excavations Ltd</u>
RR-1173	<u>Gwen Hignett</u>
RR-1174	<u>H Edwards</u>
RR-1175	<u>Miss H Sutton</u>
RR-1176	<u>Hadley-Jack Hooper</u>
RR-1177	<u>Hannah Bramwell</u>
RR-1178	<u>Hannah Foley</u>
RR-1179	<u>Hannah Gill</u>

RR-1180	<u>Hannah Needham</u>
RR-1181	<u>Hardstone Properties Limited</u>
RR-1182	<u>Mr Harold Hill</u>
RR-1183	<u>Harold Swift</u>
RR-1184	<u>Harold Swift</u>
RR-1185	<u>Harry Cordingley</u>
RR-1186	<u>Harry Coulthard</u>
RR-1187	<u>Mr Harry Crombleholme</u>
RR-1188	<u>Harry Hayes</u>
RR-1189	<u>Harry James</u>
RR-1190	<u>Harry keeling</u>
RR-1191	<u>Harry Miller</u>
RR-1192	<u>Harry Oakley</u>
RR-1193	<u>Mr Harry Parsonage</u>
RR-1194	<u>Hayden Armstrong</u>
RR-1195	<u>Hayden Fitzgerald</u>
RR-1196	<u>Hayley Bulpitt</u>
RR-1197	<u>Hayley Clarke</u>
RR-1198	<u>Hayley Evans</u>
RR-1199	<u>Mrs Hayley Fletcher-Slaughter</u>
RR-1200	<u>Hayley Hodges</u>
RR-1201	<u>Hayley Maxwell</u>
RR-1202	<u>Mrs Hayley Meadley</u>
RR-1203	<u>Hayley Roberts</u>
RR-1204	<u>Hayley Rutland</u>
RR-1205	<u>Hayley Shaw</u>
RR-1206	<u>Hazel Jakeman</u>
RR-1207	<u>Heather Alexander- Ross</u>
RR-1208	<u>Heather Cowley</u>
RR-1209	<u>Heather Davies</u>
RR-1210	<u>Heather Draper</u>
RR-1211	<u>Heather Hart</u>
RR-1212	<u>Heather Jeffers</u>
RR-1213	<u>Heidi Cahill</u>
RR-1214	<u>Heidi Green</u>
RR-1215	<u>Heidi Orritt</u>
RR-1216	<u>Helen Brown</u>
RR-1217	<u>Helen Flynn</u>
RR-1218	<u>Helen Gallagher-McNevin</u>
RR-1219	<u>Helen Glover</u>
RR-1220	<u>Helen Holcroft</u>
RR-1221	<u>Helen Jevons</u>
RR-1222	<u>Helen Lynch</u>
RR-1223	<u>Helen moss</u>
RR-1224	<u>Mrs.Helen Porter</u>
RR-1225	<u>Helen Power</u>
RR-1226	<u>Helen Rawsthorne</u>
RR-1227	<u>Helen Taylor</u>
RR-1228	<u>Helen Timmis</u>
RR-1229	<u>Helen Watson</u>

RR-1230	<u>Helen Williams</u>
RR-1231	<u>Helen Wynn</u>
RR-1232	<u>Helen Yates</u>
RR-1233	<u>Helgaleena Healingline</u>
RR-1234	<u>Henry Holtby</u>
RR-1235	<u>Henry McGuinness</u>
RR-1236	<u>Henry Piillips</u>
RR-1237	<u>Henry Woods</u>
RR-1238	<u>Hewkin and associates limited</u>
RR-1239	<u>Highways Agency</u>
RR-1240	<u>Mrs Hilda Jackson</u>
RR-1241	<u>Hilda White</u>
RR-1242	<u>Holly Blythe</u>
RR-1243	<u>Holly Fowell</u>
RR-1244	<u>Holly Parry</u>
RR-1245	<u>Holly Younger</u>
RR-1246	<u>Homes &amp; Communities Agency</u>
RR-1247	<u>Hooters Hand Car Wash</u>
RR-1248	<u>Horace Jones</u>
RR-1249	<u>Howard Gray</u>
RR-1250	<u>Howard Gray</u>
RR-1251	<u>Hugh Rimmer</u>
RR-1252	<u>Hydraclean Ltd</u>
RR-1253	<u>Miss I Byrne</u>
RR-1254	<u>Mr I Craddock</u>
RR-1255	<u>Mrs I Culshaw</u>
RR-1256	<u>Mrs I Halewood</u>
RR-1257	<u>Mrs I Hampson</u>
RR-1258	<u>Mr I Hobson</u>
RR-1259	<u>Mrs I Reston</u>
RR-1260	<u>Mrs I Sutton</u>
RR-1261	<u>Iain Bell</u>
RR-1262	<u>Ian Armstrong</u>
RR-1263	<u>Ian Barber</u>
RR-1264	<u>Ian Berkley</u>
RR-1265	<u>Ian Birnbaum</u>
RR-1266	<u>Ian Blythe</u>
RR-1267	<u>Ian Clegg</u>
RR-1268	<u>Ian Crossley</u>
RR-1269	<u>Ian Dearden</u>
RR-1270	<u>Ian Dobson</u>
RR-1271	<u>Ian Forsyth</u>
RR-1272	<u>Ian G Todd</u>
RR-1273	<u>Ian Harrison</u>
RR-1274	<u>Mr Ian Lemaire</u>
RR-1275	<u>Ian Lunt</u>
RR-1276	<u>Ian McGinnigle</u>
RR-1277	<u>Ian McKenzie</u>
RR-1278	<u>Ian Moran</u>
RR-1279	<u>Ian Murray</u>

RR-1280	<u>Ian Rigby</u>
RR-1281	<u>Ian Rigby</u>
RR-1282	<u>Ian Robert Causer</u>
RR-1283	<u>Ian Rylan</u>
RR-1284	<u>Ian Schofield</u>
RR-1285	<u>Ian Thomas</u>
RR-1286	<u>Ian Thompson</u>
RR-1287	<u>Mr Ian Whittington</u>
RR-1288	<u>Ian Woods</u>
RR-1289	<u>Imogen Dos Anjos</u>
RR-1290	<u>Imogen Moss</u>
RR-1291	<u>Imogen Storey</u>
RR-1292	<u>Imogen Webster</u>
RR-1293	<u>Ioana Balan</u>
RR-1294	<u>Irene Critchley</u>
RR-1295	<u>Irene Hague</u>
RR-1296	<u>Irene Perry</u>
RR-1297	<u>Irene Wilkinson</u>
RR-1298	<u>Isaak Viggor</u>
RR-1299	<u>Isabelle Dearden</u>
RR-1300	<u>Isla Webster</u>
RR-1301	<u>Island Park Ltd</u>
RR-1302	<u>Isobel Radcliffe</u>
RR-1303	<u>Mrs. J.A Halliwell</u>
RR-1304	<u>Mrs J Adams</u>
RR-1305	<u>J.Appleton</u>
RR-1306	<u>Mrs J Ashcroft</u>
RR-1307	<u>J Beech</u>
RR-1308	<u>Miss J Bentham</u>
RR-1309	<u>Mr J Bolton</u>
RR-1310	<u>Mrs J Cartwright</u>
RR-1311	<u>Mr J Crawley</u>
RR-1312	<u>Mr J D Smith</u>
RR-1313	<u>Mr J Doud</u>
RR-1314	<u>J Doyle &amp; Co (Demolition) Ltd (t/a Sloyan Doyle Demolition)</u>
RR-1315	<u>Mrs J Edelfton</u>
RR-1316	<u>Mr J Greenwood</u>
RR-1317	<u>Mrs J Greenwood</u>
RR-1318	<u>Mr J Rawlinson</u>
RR-1319	<u>Mrs J Reil</u>
RR-1320	<u>Mrs J Roberts</u>
RR-1321	<u>Mr J Roscoe</u>
RR-1322	<u>Mrs J Roughley</u>
RR-1323	<u>Miss J Eva</u>
RR-1324	<u>J Feeley</u>
RR-1325	<u>J Gaskell</u>
RR-1326	<u>Miss J Glover</u>
RR-1327	<u>J Hart</u>
RR-1328	<u>J Highton</u>
RR-1329	<u>Miss J Lemaire</u>

RR-1330	<u>Mrs J Lemaire</u>
RR-1331	<u>Mrs J M Berry</u>
RR-1332	<u>Mrs J Mckintyre</u>
RR-1333	<u>J Molyneux</u>
RR-1334	<u>J Murphy and Sons Ltd</u>
RR-1335	<u>J Murray</u>
RR-1336	<u>Mrs J Nightingale</u>
RR-1337	<u>Mrs J Noble</u>
RR-1338	<u>Miss J Preston</u>
RR-1339	<u>Master J Sanderson</u>
RR-1340	<u>Miss J Sanderson</u>
RR-1341	<u>J Wright</u>
RR-1342	<u>Jack Flaherty</u>
RR-1343	<u>Jack Gregory</u>
RR-1344	<u>Jack Grimshaw</u>
RR-1345	<u>Jack Kelly</u>
RR-1346	<u>Jack Lehan</u>
RR-1347	<u>Jack Neale</u>
RR-1348	<u>Jack Oneil</u>
RR-1349	<u>Jack Rigby</u>
RR-1350	<u>Jack Rowlands</u>
RR-1351	<u>Jackie Coyle</u>
RR-1352	<u>Jackie Gobin</u>
RR-1353	<u>Jackie Haverson</u>
RR-1354	<u>Jackie Noon</u>
RR-1355	<u>Jackie W M Smith</u>
RR-1356	<u>Jacky Edwards</u>
RR-1357	<u>Jacob Kenworthy</u>
RR-1358	<u>Jacob Ashburner</u>
RR-1359	<u>Jacob Jones</u>
RR-1360	<u>Jacqueline Davies</u>
RR-1361	<u>Jacqueline Georgeson</u>
RR-1362	<u>Jacqueline Jones</u>
RR-1363	<u>Jacqueline Messam</u>
RR-1364	<u>Jacqueline Mosquito</u>
RR-1365	<u>Jacqueline Murphy</u>
RR-1366	<u>Jacqueline Ryland</u>
RR-1367	<u>Jacqueline Taylor</u>
RR-1368	<u>Jacqueline V Blakey</u>
RR-1369	<u>Jacquelyn Whalin</u>
RR-1370	<u>Jacquenline Canning</u>
RR-1371	<u>Jacqui Hegarty</u>
RR-1372	<u>Jacqueline Slocombe</u>
RR-1373	<u>Jade Flack</u>
RR-1374	<u>Jade Greenhalgh</u>
RR-1375	<u>Jade Parsons</u>
RR-1376	<u>Jaime Rabaca</u>
RR-1377	<u>Jake Gabriel</u>
RR-1378	<u>Jake Lowe</u>
RR-1379	<u>Jake Marshman</u>

RR-1380	<u>Jake Nesbitt</u>
RR-1381	<u>James Adams</u>
RR-1382	<u>James Bell</u>
RR-1383	<u>James Bethell</u>
RR-1384	<u>James Burke</u>
RR-1385	<u>James Cavaghan</u>
RR-1386	<u>James Clarke</u>
RR-1387	<u>James Duffey</u>
RR-1388	<u>James Duffey</u>
RR-1389	<u>James Higham</u>
RR-1390	<u>James Hoy</u>
RR-1391	<u>James Macefield</u>
RR-1392	<u>James McArdle</u>
RR-1393	<u>Mr James McMahon</u>
RR-1394	<u>James Morgan</u>
RR-1395	<u>James Murphy</u>
RR-1396	<u>James Noon</u>
RR-1397	<u>Mr James Platt</u>
RR-1398	<u>Mr James Smith</u>
RR-1399	<u>James Traynor</u>
RR-1400	<u>James Walsh</u>
RR-1401	<u>James Weir</u>
RR-1402	<u>James Williams</u>
RR-1403	<u>James Wilson</u>
RR-1404	<u>Jamie Birch</u>
RR-1405	<u>Jamie Clifford</u>
RR-1406	<u>Jamie David Murphy</u>
RR-1407	<u>Jamie Dickinson</u>
RR-1408	<u>Mr Jamie Dolan</u>
RR-1409	<u>Jamie Murphy</u>
RR-1410	<u>Jamie Nash</u>
RR-1411	<u>Jamie O'Connell</u>
RR-1412	<u>Jamie Price</u>
RR-1413	<u>Jamie W Lloyd</u>
RR-1414	<u>Jamie-Lee Colgan</u>
RR-1415	<u>Jan Fitzsimons</u>
RR-1416	<u>Jan Parry</u>
RR-1417	<u>Jan Sumner</u>
RR-1418	<u>Jane Ashcroft</u>
RR-1419	<u>Jane Barrett</u>
RR-1420	<u>Jane Cave</u>
RR-1421	<u>Jane Doyle</u>
RR-1422	<u>Jane Doyle</u>
RR-1423	<u>Jane Fisher</u>
RR-1424	<u>Jane Hines</u>
RR-1425	<u>Jane Smith</u>
RR-1426	<u>Jane Taylor</u>
RR-1427	<u>Mrs Janet Beckett</u>
RR-1428	<u>Janet Burke</u>
RR-1429	<u>Janet Crawford</u>



RR-1430	<u>Janet Poole</u>
RR-1431	<u>Janet Reid</u>
RR-1432	<u>Janet Sawyer</u>
RR-1433	<u>Mrs Janet Williams</u>
RR-1434	<u>Janice Alty</u>
RR-1435	<u>Janice Mcstein</u>
RR-1436	<u>Janine Halliday</u>
RR-1437	<u>Jaromir Buran</u>
RR-1438	<u>Jasmine Bamin</u>
RR-1439	<u>Jasmine Mae Holcroft</u>
RR-1440	<u>Jasmine Murren</u>
RR-1441	<u>Jason Graham</u>
RR-1442	<u>Jason Molyneux</u>
RR-1443	<u>Jason Rowlands</u>
RR-1444	<u>Jason Smaje</u>
RR-1445	<u>Jason Speakman</u>
RR-1446	<u>Jason Tilley</u>
RR-1447	<u>Jason Wood</u>
RR-1448	<u>Jayne Berry</u>
RR-1449	<u>Jayne Carr</u>
RR-1450	<u>Jayne Curry</u>
RR-1451	<u>Jayne Smith</u>
RR-1452	<u>Jean Daniels</u>
RR-1453	<u>Jean Fowell</u>
RR-1454	<u>Jean Haughton</u>
RR-1455	<u>Jean hunt</u>
RR-1456	<u>Jean Hutson</u>
RR-1457	<u>Jean Johnson</u>
RR-1458	<u>Jean Lawton</u>
RR-1459	<u>Jean Mercer</u>
RR-1460	<u>Jean Mumford</u>
RR-1461	<u>Jean Peers</u>
RR-1462	<u>Jean Richards</u>
RR-1463	<u>Jean Sealey</u>
RR-1464	<u>Jeanette Deegan</u>
RR-1465	<u>Jeanette Hennessey</u>
RR-1466	<u>Mrs Jeanette Lemaire</u>
RR-1467	<u>Jeanette Sandison</u>
RR-1468	<u>Jeanette Smithurst</u>
RR-1469	<u>Mrs Jeannie Parker</u>
RR-1470	<u>Jeff Daw</u>
RR-1471	<u>Jeff Hughes</u>
RR-1472	<u>Jemma Cullen</u>
RR-1473	<u>Jemma Newnes</u>
RR-1474	<u>Jemma Reilly</u>
RR-1475	<u>Jen Roberts</u>
RR-1476	<u>Jeninifer Fleming</u>
RR-1477	<u>Jenna Huxley</u>
RR-1478	<u>Jenna Stannard</u>
RR-1479	<u>Jennie Jackson</u>

RR-1480	<u>Jennie Thomson</u>
RR-1481	<u>Jennifer Backstrom</u>
RR-1482	<u>Jennifer Ballard</u>
RR-1483	<u>Jennifer Currie</u>
RR-1484	<u>Jennifer Grady</u>
RR-1485	<u>Jennifer Griggs</u>
RR-1486	<u>Jennifer Harker</u>
RR-1487	<u>Jennifer Hunter</u>
RR-1488	<u>Jennifer Lloyd</u>
RR-1489	<u>Jennifer Nolan</u>
RR-1490	<u>Jennifer Patterson</u>
RR-1491	<u>Jennifer Pemberton</u>
RR-1492	<u>Jennifer Sewell</u>
RR-1493	<u>Jennifer Chambers</u>
RR-1494	<u>Jennifer Chambers</u>
RR-1495	<u>Jennifer Chambers</u>
RR-1496	<u>Jennifer Chambers</u>
RR-1497	<u>Jenny Curran</u>
RR-1498	<u>Jenny Gilfoyle</u>
RR-1499	<u>Jenny Jones</u>
RR-1500	<u>Jenny Platts</u>
RR-1501	<u>Jeremy Bowler</u>
RR-1502	<u>Jessica Cordingley</u>
RR-1503	<u>Jessica Fowell</u>
RR-1504	<u>Jessica Grimshaw</u>
RR-1505	<u>Jessica Haynes</u>
RR-1506	<u>Jessica Rose Sutcliffe</u>
RR-1507	<u>Jessica Roughley</u>
RR-1508	<u>Jessica Sawyer</u>
RR-1509	<u>Jessica Taylor</u>
RR-1510	<u>Jessica Watts</u>
RR-1511	<u>Jill Charnock</u>
RR-1512	<u>Jill Child</u>
RR-1513	<u>Jill Lowe</u>
RR-1514	<u>Jill Rigby</u>
RR-1515	<u>Jim Dolce</u>
RR-1516	<u>JMO Sports Park</u>
RR-1517	<u>Jo Blackwell</u>
RR-1518	<u>Jo Davies</u>
RR-1519	<u>Jo Warmington</u>
RR-1520	<u>Joan C McNally</u>
RR-1521	<u>Joan Duffey</u>
RR-1522	<u>Joan Duffey</u>
RR-1523	<u>Joan Feeley</u>
RR-1524	<u>Joan Gore</u>
RR-1525	<u>Mrs Joan Neville</u>
RR-1526	<u>Joan Matthews</u>
RR-1527	<u>Joan Stewart</u>
RR-1528	<u>Mrs Joan Stevens</u>
RR-1529	<u>Joan Sung</u>

RR-1530	<u>Joan Swift</u>
RR-1531	<u>Joan Swift</u>
RR-1532	<u>Joan Thomas</u>
RR-1533	<u>Joanna Grace</u>
RR-1534	<u>Joanna Housley</u>
RR-1535	<u>Joanne Ball</u>
RR-1536	<u>Joanne Bold</u>
RR-1537	<u>Joanne Carr</u>
RR-1538	<u>Joanne Carr</u>
RR-1539	<u>Joanne Cave</u>
RR-1540	<u>Joanne Davenport</u>
RR-1541	<u>Joanne Dutton</u>
RR-1542	<u>Joanne Haworth</u>
RR-1543	<u>Joanne Homson</u>
RR-1544	<u>Joanne Homson</u>
RR-1545	<u>Joanne Houghton</u>
RR-1546	<u>Joanne Johnson</u>
RR-1547	<u>Joanne Lamb</u>
RR-1548	<u>Joanne Martland</u>
RR-1549	<u>Miss Joanne Mcnay</u>
RR-1550	<u>Joanne Morris</u>
RR-1551	<u>Joanne Parker</u>
RR-1552	<u>Joanne Petre</u>
RR-1553	<u>Joanne Rawsthorne</u>
RR-1554	<u>Joanne Skelhorn</u>
RR-1555	<u>Joanne Speakman</u>
RR-1556	<u>Mrs Joanne Taylor</u>
RR-1557	<u>Joanne Wallace</u>
RR-1558	<u>Joanne Wilde</u>
RR-1559	<u>Joanne Wilson</u>
RR-1560	<u>Jodie Ashworth</u>
RR-1561	<u>Jodie Ashworth</u>
RR-1562	<u>Jodie Slocombe</u>
RR-1563	<u>Miss Jody Robertson</u>
RR-1564	<u>Joe Caden</u>
RR-1565	<u>Joe Edmond</u>
RR-1566	<u>Joe Foster</u>
RR-1567	<u>Joe Gregory</u>
RR-1568	<u>Joe Lawler</u>
RR-1569	<u>Joe Nelson</u>
RR-1570	<u>Joe Newnes</u>
RR-1571	<u>Joe Sherville</u>
RR-1572	<u>Joe Williams</u>
RR-1573	<u>Joel Curry</u>
RR-1574	<u>Joel Edwards</u>
RR-1575	<u>Joel Greener</u>
RR-1576	<u>Joel Maguire</u>
RR-1577	<u>Joel Thomas</u>
RR-1578	<u>John Abrahams</u>
RR-1579	<u>John Ashcroft</u>

RR-1580	<u>John Brian Barnes</u>
RR-1581	<u>John Carter</u>
RR-1582	<u>Mr John Corkill</u>
RR-1583	<u>John Critchley</u>
RR-1584	<u>John Culshaw</u>
RR-1585	<u>John Deegan</u>
RR-1586	<u>John Doyle</u>
RR-1587	<u>John Fillingham</u>
RR-1588	<u>John Fillis</u>
RR-1589	<u>John Forshaw</u>
RR-1590	<u>John Frederick</u>
RR-1591	<u>John Fuller</u>
RR-1592	<u>John Grimshaw</u>
RR-1593	<u>John Hargate</u>
RR-1594	<u>John Heyes</u>
RR-1595	<u>John Hodson</u>
RR-1596	<u>John Hutchinson</u>
RR-1597	<u>John Keough</u>
RR-1598	<u>John Lawrence</u>
RR-1599	<u>John Louis Trussell</u>
RR-1600	<u>John Lowe</u>
RR-1601	<u>Mr John Lowe</u>
RR-1602	<u>John Martland</u>
RR-1603	<u>John Mercer</u>
RR-1604	<u>John Mercer</u>
RR-1605	<u>John Mercer</u>
RR-1606	<u>John Middlehurst</u>
RR-1607	<u>John Moore</u>
RR-1608	<u>Mr John Morton</u>
RR-1609	<u>John Orritt</u>
RR-1610	<u>John Prynallt Owen</u>
RR-1611	<u>John Rainford</u>
RR-1612	<u>Mr John Roughley</u>
RR-1613	<u>John Thomas</u>
RR-1614	<u>John Tilley</u>
RR-1615	<u>John Tunstall</u>
RR-1616	<u>John Uniacke</u>
RR-1617	<u>John Waite</u>
RR-1618	<u>Mr John Wilcox</u>
RR-1619	<u>John Wilde</u>
RR-1620	<u>John William Jones</u>
RR-1621	<u>John Wilson</u>
RR-1622	<u>Johnny Anglow</u>
RR-1623	<u>Mr Jojn Patrick Rochford</u>
RR-1624	<u>Jolande Mace</u>
RR-1625	<u>Jon Ashburner</u>
RR-1626	<u>Jon Bommert</u>
RR-1627	<u>Jonathan Edwards</u>
RR-1628	<u>Jonathan Hyland</u>
RR-1629	<u>Josef Carr-Dickson</u>

RR-1630	<u>Joseph Brady</u>
RR-1631	<u>Joseph Brady</u>
RR-1632	<u>Joseph Edwards</u>
RR-1633	<u>Joseph Foley</u>
RR-1634	<u>Joseph Foster</u>
RR-1635	<u>Joseph Homson</u>
RR-1636	<u>Joseph Judge</u>
RR-1637	<u>Joseph McCann</u>
RR-1638	<u>Joseph Welsh</u>
RR-1639	<u>Joseph Whittington</u>
RR-1640	<u>Josephine Atherton</u>
RR-1641	<u>Josh Burns</u>
RR-1642	<u>Josh McDonald</u>
RR-1643	<u>Joshua Kenworthy</u>
RR-1644	<u>Joshua Grice</u>
RR-1645	<u>Joshua Haynes</u>
RR-1646	<u>Joshua Houghton</u>
RR-1647	<u>Joshua Shepherd</u>
RR-1648	<u>Josie Dykes</u>
RR-1649	<u>Joy Bradshaw</u>
RR-1650	<u>Joy Williamson</u>
RR-1651	<u>Joyce Murphy</u>
RR-1652	<u>Joyce Schofield</u>
RR-1653	<u>Joyce Turner</u>
RR-1654	<u>Mrs Judith A Hulme</u>
RR-1655	<u>Judith Alexander</u>
RR-1656	<u>Judith Holland</u>
RR-1657	<u>Judith Sharples</u>
RR-1658	<u>Judith Smith</u>
RR-1659	<u>Judy Spargo</u>
RR-1660	<u>Julie Ann Beckett</u>
RR-1661	<u>Julie Cross</u>
RR-1662	<u>Julie Dewer</u>
RR-1663	<u>Julie Edwards</u>
RR-1664	<u>Julie Else</u>
RR-1665	<u>Julie Fearn</u>
RR-1666	<u>Julie Forshaw</u>
RR-1667	<u>Julie Gibson</u>
RR-1668	<u>Julie Gregory</u>
RR-1669	<u>Julie Griffin</u>
RR-1670	<u>Julie King</u>
RR-1671	<u>Mrs Julie Leedam</u>
RR-1672	<u>Julie Liversidge</u>
RR-1673	<u>Julie Mason</u>
RR-1674	<u>Julie Nunes</u>
RR-1675	<u>Julie Parkinson</u>
RR-1676	<u>Julie Riley</u>
RR-1677	<u>Julie Rimmer</u>
RR-1678	<u>Julie Seddon</u>
RR-1679	<u>Julie Taraldsen</u>

RR-1680	<u>Julie Taylor</u>
RR-1681	<u>Julie Wright</u>
RR-1682	<u>Julie Wright</u>
RR-1683	<u>Juliet Taylor</u>
RR-1684	<u>June Wilkie</u>
RR-1685	<u>Justin Morris</u>
RR-1686	<u>Justin Wilde</u>
RR-1687	<u>Justine Knox</u>
RR-1688	<u>Justine Maher</u>
RR-1689	<u>K Forrester</u>
RR-1690	<u>Miss K Greenwood</u>
RR-1691	<u>K Jackson</u>
RR-1692	<u>K K Smith</u>
RR-1693	<u>Mrs K M Webster</u>
RR-1694	<u>K Nelson - Glover</u>
RR-1695	<u>Mr K Noble</u>
RR-1696	<u>Mrs K Robinson</u>
RR-1697	<u>Mr K Rotheram</u>
RR-1698	<u>K Sharples</u>
RR-1699	<u>Miss K Tomaselli</u>
RR-1700	<u>K Vwohler</u>
RR-1701	<u>K Woodward</u>
RR-1702	<u>K Wright</u>
RR-1703	<u>Master Kian Leedam</u>
RR-1704	<u>Kaci Leigh Kelly</u>
RR-1705	<u>Kadie Armstrong</u>
RR-1706	<u>Kaitlyn Morgan</u>
RR-1707	<u>Kaitlyn Wooding</u>
RR-1708	<u>Kaleb Sherrington</u>
RR-1709	<u>Karen Aspden</u>
RR-1710	<u>Karen Booth</u>
RR-1711	<u>Karen Bradley</u>
RR-1712	<u>Karen Gagen</u>
RR-1713	<u>Karen Garrity</u>
RR-1714	<u>Karen Hodges</u>
RR-1715	<u>Karen Langley</u>
RR-1716	<u>Karen Long</u>
RR-1717	<u>Karen Louis</u>
RR-1718	<u>Karen Marshall</u>
RR-1719	<u>Karen Matthews</u>
RR-1720	<u>Karen McHugh</u>
RR-1721	<u>Karen Nelson Glover</u>
RR-1722	<u>Karen Parkinson</u>
RR-1723	<u>Karen Roach</u>
RR-1724	<u>Karen Sanderson</u>
RR-1725	<u>Karen Smith</u>
RR-1726	<u>Karen Wall</u>
RR-1727	<u>Karen Welsh</u>
RR-1728	<u>Karl Hunter</u>
RR-1729	<u>Karl ONeill</u>

RR-1730	<u>Karl Taraldsen</u>
RR-1731	<u>Karl Taraldsen Jnr</u>
RR-1732	<u>Karl Williams</u>
RR-1733	<u>Karla Parry</u>
RR-1734	<u>Karla Roberts</u>
RR-1735	<u>Kate Barker</u>
RR-1736	<u>Kate Edwardd</u>
RR-1737	<u>Kate Fenlon</u>
RR-1738	<u>Kate Hennessy</u>
RR-1739	<u>Kate Meadows</u>
RR-1740	<u>Kate Rathbone</u>
RR-1741	<u>Kate Strickland</u>
RR-1742	<u>Kate Sutcliffe</u>
RR-1743	<u>Kate Whittle</u>
RR-1744	<u>Kath Gibbons</u>
RR-1745	<u>Kath Sephton</u>
RR-1746	<u>Katherine Burns</u>
RR-1747	<u>Katherine Davies</u>
RR-1748	<u>Katherine Johnstone</u>
RR-1749	<u>Kathleen Bhamra</u>
RR-1750	<u>Kathleen Gresty</u>
RR-1751	<u>Kathleen Mcdonough</u>
RR-1752	<u>Kathleen Shaw</u>
RR-1753	<u>Kathryn Burslem</u>
RR-1754	<u>Kathryn Carr</u>
RR-1755	<u>Kathryn Cranney</u>
RR-1756	<u>Kathryn Elliot</u>
RR-1757	<u>Kathryn Harrison</u>
RR-1758	<u>Mrs Kathryn Parsonage</u>
RR-1759	<u>Kathy Douglas</u>
RR-1760	<u>Kathy Farrington</u>
RR-1761	<u>Katie</u>
RR-1762	<u>Katie Brown</u>
RR-1763	<u>Katie Cliffe</u>
RR-1764	<u>Katie Culshaw</u>
RR-1765	<u>Katie Donlan</u>
RR-1766	<u>Katie Jones</u>
RR-1767	<u>Katie Maria Robinson</u>
RR-1768	<u>Katie McCluney</u>
RR-1769	<u>Katie Mercer</u>
RR-1770	<u>Katie Norris</u>
RR-1771	<u>Katie Rawsthorne</u>
RR-1772	<u>Katie Stewart</u>
RR-1773	<u>Katrina Cox</u>
RR-1774	<u>Katrina Watkins</u>
RR-1775	<u>Katy Dickinson</u>
RR-1776	<u>Katy Sandison</u>
RR-1777	<u>Katy Sutton</u>
RR-1778	<u>Kay Hardman</u>
RR-1779	<u>Kay Nixon</u>

RR-1780	<u>Kayla Whittaker</u>
RR-1781	<u>Kayleigh Cooper</u>
RR-1782	<u>Kayleigh Jones</u>
RR-1783	<u>Kayleigh Ledger</u>
RR-1784	<u>Kayleigh Maddock</u>
RR-1785	<u>Kayleigh Miller</u>
RR-1786	<u>Keira Chambers</u>
RR-1787	<u>Keira Reilly</u>
RR-1788	<u>Keira Whittaker</u>
RR-1789	<u>Keith Fallon</u>
RR-1790	<u>Keith Hadwin</u>
RR-1791	<u>Keith Halwell</u>
RR-1792	<u>Keith Moakes</u>
RR-1793	<u>Kelly Anderson</u>
RR-1794	<u>Kelly Beeley</u>
RR-1795	<u>Kelly Brown</u>
RR-1796	<u>Kelly Carlson</u>
RR-1797	<u>Kelly Clegg</u>
RR-1798	<u>Kelly Denton</u>
RR-1799	<u>Kelly Farley</u>
RR-1800	<u>Kelly Hall</u>
RR-1801	<u>Kelly Hunt</u>
RR-1802	<u>Kelly Lee</u>
RR-1803	<u>Kelly Rutland</u>
RR-1804	<u>Kelly-May Harris</u>
RR-1805	<u>Kelsea Lunt</u>
RR-1806	<u>Kelsey Beddoes</u>
RR-1807	<u>Kelsey Sykes</u>
RR-1808	<u>Ken Macleod</u>
RR-1809	<u>Kenneth G Langley</u>
RR-1810	<u>Kenny Haughon</u>
RR-1811	<u>Kenny Thomas</u>
RR-1812	<u>Kenny Wilkinson</u>
RR-1813	<u>Kerensa Gaskell</u>
RR-1814	<u>Kerrie Sandison</u>
RR-1815	<u>Kerry - Ann Dodgson</u>
RR-1816	<u>Kerry Ahmet</u>
RR-1817	<u>Kerry Attwell</u>
RR-1818	<u>Kerry Edwards</u>
RR-1819	<u>Kerry Hughes</u>
RR-1820	<u>Mrs Kerry Langton</u>
RR-1821	<u>Kerry Leaver</u>
RR-1822	<u>Mrs Kerry Phillips</u>
RR-1823	<u>Kerry Riley</u>
RR-1824	<u>Kerry Robertson</u>
RR-1825	<u>Kerys Foley</u>
RR-1826	<u>Kevin Roberts</u>
RR-1827	<u>Kevin Brophy</u>
RR-1828	<u>Kevin Bushrod</u>
RR-1829	<u>Kevin Clarke</u>



RR-1830	<u>Kevin Foster</u>
RR-1831	<u>Mr Kevin Hutton</u>
RR-1832	<u>Mr Kevin Kenny</u>
RR-1833	<u>Kevin Makin</u>
RR-1834	<u>Kevin Rutland</u>
RR-1835	<u>Kevin Shaw</u>
RR-1836	<u>Kevin Talbot</u>
RR-1837	<u>Kevin Thomas</u>
RR-1838	<u>Kevin Veale</u>
RR-1839	<u>Kevin Wilkie</u>
RR-1840	<u>Kian-James Cooper</u>
RR-1841	<u>Kieran McNamara</u>
RR-1842	<u>Kieran Rogers</u>
RR-1843	<u>Kim Green</u>
RR-1844	<u>Kim O</u>
RR-1845	<u>Kim Orritt</u>
RR-1846	<u>Kimberley Morgan</u>
RR-1847	<u>Kimberley Taylor</u>
RR-1848	<u>Kirkby Skips Limited</u>
RR-1849	<u>Kirsten Kelly</u>
RR-1850	<u>Kirsty Felton</u>
RR-1851	<u>Kirsty Hoy</u>
RR-1852	<u>Kirsty Lloyd</u>
RR-1853	<u>Kirsty Roberts</u>
RR-1854	<u>Kirsty Smith</u>
RR-1855	<u>Klaudia Sobiegala</u>
RR-1856	<u>Kley Armstrong</u>
RR-1857	<u>Klint Hunter</u>
RR-1858	<u>Kris Kelly</u>
RR-1859	<u>Kris Roughley</u>
RR-1860	<u>Kristian Silcock</u>
RR-1861	<u>Kristine Jevons</u>
RR-1862	<u>Kristopher Johnson</u>
RR-1863	<u>KSL Garage Services Ltd</u>
RR-1864	<u>Kyle Beddoes</u>
RR-1865	<u>Kyle Watson</u>
RR-1866	<u>Mrs L Bason</u>
RR-1867	<u>Miss L Adams</u>
RR-1868	<u>L Daly</u>
RR-1869	<u>Mrs L Gardiner</u>
RR-1870	<u>Mrs L Hibbott</u>
RR-1871	<u>L Lloyd</u>
RR-1872	<u>Master L Mould</u>
RR-1873	<u>L Oerire</u>
RR-1874	<u>Mrs I parsonage</u>
RR-1875	<u>Master L Preston</u>
RR-1876	<u>Mr L Preston</u>
RR-1877	<u>Mr L Tomaselli</u>
RR-1878	<u>L Webster</u>
RR-1879	<u>L Wilson</u>

RR-1880	<u>L Wright</u>
RR-1881	<u>Laceigh McKinney</u>
RR-1882	<u>Lady Jay Gibbs</u>
RR-1883	<u>Lancashire County Council</u>
RR-1884	<u>Lathom Parish Council</u>
RR-1885	<u>Lathom South Parish Council</u>
RR-1886	<u>Latiesha y Lloyd</u>
RR-1887	<u>Laura Crossley</u>
RR-1888	<u>Laura Davies</u>
RR-1889	<u>Laura Davies</u>
RR-1890	<u>Laura Haynes</u>
RR-1891	<u>Laura Lakin</u>
RR-1892	<u>Miss Laura Manley</u>
RR-1893	<u>Laura Murray</u>
RR-1894	<u>Laura Naylor</u>
RR-1895	<u>Laura Paxton</u>
RR-1896	<u>Laura Quagliano</u>
RR-1897	<u>Laura Spafford</u>
RR-1898	<u>Laura Ward</u>
RR-1899	<u>Lauren Beckett</u>
RR-1900	<u>Lauren Fewtrell</u>
RR-1901	<u>Lauren Hallam</u>
RR-1902	<u>Miss Lauren Jacqueline Zia Kelly</u>
RR-1903	<u>Lauren Quigley</u>
RR-1904	<u>Lauren Sandison</u>
RR-1905	<u>Lawrence Clifford</u>
RR-1906	<u>Lawrence Shirley</u>
RR-1907	<u>Layla Maggie Perry</u>
RR-1908	<u>Layla Wooding</u>
RR-1909	<u>Layton Johnson</u>
RR-1910	<u>Leah Clarke</u>
RR-1911	<u>Leah Duffey</u>
RR-1912	<u>Leah-Ella Hegarty</u>
RR-1913	<u>Leann Fitzpatrick</u>
RR-1914	<u>Leanne Elliott</u>
RR-1915	<u>Leanne Graham</u>
RR-1916	<u>Leanne Moore</u>
RR-1917	<u>Leanne Roper</u>
RR-1918	<u>Leanne Stockton</u>
RR-1919	<u>Leanne Waite</u>
RR-1920	<u>Leanne Webster</u>
RR-1921	<u>Lee Armstrong</u>
RR-1922	<u>Lee Baines</u>
RR-1923	<u>Lee Betteridge</u>
RR-1924	<u>Lee Buckby</u>
RR-1925	<u>Lee Chesworth</u>
RR-1926	<u>Lee Dickinson</u>
RR-1927	<u>Lee Duffy</u>
RR-1928	<u>Mr Lee Greenall</u>
RR-1929	<u>Lee Griffiths</u>

RR-1930	<u>Lee Martin</u>
RR-1931	<u>Lee Nixon</u>
RR-1932	<u>Lee Oldman-Smith</u>
RR-1933	<u>Lee Pennington</u>
RR-1934	<u>Lee Ryan</u>
RR-1935	<u>Lee Scott</u>
RR-1936	<u>Mr Lee Taylor</u>
RR-1937	<u>Lee Tomkins</u>
RR-1938	<u>Leigh Kelly</u>
RR-1939	<u>Leighton Hume</u>
RR-1940	<u>Leila Creswell</u>
RR-1941	<u>Lena Molyneux</u>
RR-1942	<u>Leo Brown</u>
RR-1943	<u>Leon Rawsthorne</u>
RR-1944	<u>Leon Taraldsen</u>
RR-1945	<u>Leonard Brown</u>
RR-1946	<u>Leonard Chesworth</u>
RR-1947	<u>Leonard Johnson</u>
RR-1948	<u>Les Johannessen</u>
RR-1949	<u>Les Littler</u>
RR-1950	<u>Les Taylor</u>
RR-1951	<u>Lesley Cavaghan</u>
RR-1952	<u>Lesley Parker</u>
RR-1953	<u>Mrs Lesley Rawlinson</u>
RR-1954	<u>Lesley Rimmer</u>
RR-1955	<u>Mrs Leslie Fenton</u>
RR-1956	<u>Leslie James Baldwin</u>
RR-1957	<u>Mr Leslie W. Thomas</u>
RR-1958	<u>Levi Bailey</u>
RR-1959	<u>Levi-Mae Scott</u>
RR-1960	<u>Levitt Parkes</u>
RR-1961	<u>Lewis Dearden</u>
RR-1962	<u>Lewis Caden</u>
RR-1963	<u>Master Lewis Harrison</u>
RR-1964	<u>Lewis Keane</u>
RR-1965	<u>Mr Lewis Paul Kelly</u>
RR-1966	<u>Lewis Mercer</u>
RR-1967	<u>Lewis Miller</u>
RR-1968	<u>Lewis Small</u>
RR-1969	<u>Lewis Smalley</u>
RR-1970	<u>Lewis Willan</u>
RR-1971	<u>Liam Barlow</u>
RR-1972	<u>Liam Bhamra</u>
RR-1973	<u>Liam Clarke</u>
RR-1974	<u>Liam Creighton</u>
RR-1975	<u>Liam Greaves</u>
RR-1976	<u>Liam Hutchison</u>
RR-1977	<u>Liam Kelly</u>
RR-1978	<u>Liam McKinney</u>
RR-1979	<u>Liam West</u>

RR-1980	<a href="#">Liam West</a>
RR-1981	<a href="#">Liam West</a>
RR-1982	<a href="#">Liam West</a>
RR-1983	<a href="#">Mrs Lilian McBrinn</a>
RR-1984	<a href="#">Mrs Lilian Wainwright</a>
RR-1985	<a href="#">Lilly-Jane Elizabeth Edwards</a>
RR-1986	<a href="#">Lily Kelly</a>
RR-1987	<a href="#">Lily Kelly</a>
RR-1988	<a href="#">Lily-Rae Hindley</a>
RR-1989	<a href="#">Linda Boardman</a>
RR-1990	<a href="#">Linda Crombleholme</a>
RR-1991	<a href="#">Linda Fitzpatrick</a>
RR-1992	<a href="#">Mrs Linda Griffiths</a>
RR-1993	<a href="#">Linda Hargate</a>
RR-1994	<a href="#">Linda Hargate</a>
RR-1995	<a href="#">Linda Hughes</a>
RR-1996	<a href="#">Linda Jack</a>
RR-1997	<a href="#">Linda Kirby</a>
RR-1998	<a href="#">Linda Lunt</a>
RR-1999	<a href="#">Linda McMullin</a>
RR-2000	<a href="#">Linda Poulter</a>
RR-2001	<a href="#">Linda Preston</a>
RR-2002	<a href="#">Linda Pye</a>
RR-2003	<a href="#">Linda Weaver</a>
RR-2004	<a href="#">Linda Webster</a>
RR-2005	<a href="#">Linda Williamson</a>
RR-2006	<a href="#">Lindsay Millar</a>
RR-2007	<a href="#">Lindseay Latham</a>
RR-2008	<a href="#">Lindsey Chambers</a>
RR-2009	<a href="#">Lindsey Rushton</a>
RR-2010	<a href="#">Lindy Kirks</a>
RR-2011	<a href="#">Lisa Bond</a>
RR-2012	<a href="#">Lisa Creighton</a>
RR-2013	<a href="#">Lisa Daw</a>
RR-2014	<a href="#">Lisa Denn</a>
RR-2015	<a href="#">Lisa Edwards</a>
RR-2016	<a href="#">Lisa Fenney</a>
RR-2017	<a href="#">Lisa Field</a>
RR-2018	<a href="#">Mrs Lisa Hughes</a>
RR-2019	<a href="#">Lisa Knowles</a>
RR-2020	<a href="#">Lisa Molyneux</a>
RR-2021	<a href="#">Lisa Neale</a>
RR-2022	<a href="#">Lisa Roberts</a>
RR-2023	<a href="#">Lisa Southern</a>
RR-2024	<a href="#">Lisa Sung</a>
RR-2025	<a href="#">Lisa Taylor</a>
RR-2026	<a href="#">Lisa Thomas</a>
RR-2027	<a href="#">Lisa Turner</a>
RR-2028	<a href="#">Lisa Vose</a>
RR-2029	<a href="#">Lisa Wilson</a>

RR-2030	<a href="#">Lisa Wood</a>
RR-2031	<a href="#">Lisa Wynn</a>
RR-2032	<a href="#">Little Dignumoor Primary School</a>
RR-2033	<a href="#">Liverpool Road Allotment Society</a>
RR-2034	<a href="#">Liz Kurszewski</a>
RR-2035	<a href="#">Llivia Tittle</a>
RR-2036	<a href="#">Lloyd Mooney</a>
RR-2037	<a href="#">Loaf Creative</a>
RR-2038	<a href="#">Lois Armstrong</a>
RR-2039	<a href="#">Lois Mckenzie</a>
RR-2040	<a href="#">Lois Molly</a>
RR-2041	<a href="#">Lola Armstrong</a>
RR-2042	<a href="#">Lola Bamin</a>
RR-2043	<a href="#">Lord David Gibbs</a>
RR-2044	<a href="#">Loren Mccarthy</a>
RR-2045	<a href="#">Lorraine Brady</a>
RR-2046	<a href="#">Lorraine Clark</a>
RR-2047	<a href="#">Lorraine Gerrard</a>
RR-2048	<a href="#">Lorraine Howard</a>
RR-2049	<a href="#">Lorraine Minton</a>
RR-2050	<a href="#">Lorrin Nelson</a>
RR-2051	<a href="#">Louise Armstrong</a>
RR-2052	<a href="#">Louise Birch</a>
RR-2053	<a href="#">Louise Collett</a>
RR-2054	<a href="#">Louise Cropper</a>
RR-2055	<a href="#">Louise Flavell</a>
RR-2056	<a href="#">Louise Forshaw</a>
RR-2057	<a href="#">Louise Henshall</a>
RR-2058	<a href="#">Louise Kendall</a>
RR-2059	<a href="#">Louise Miller</a>
RR-2060	<a href="#">Louise Quirk</a>
RR-2061	<a href="#">Louise Shire</a>
RR-2062	<a href="#">Louise Todd</a>
RR-2063	<a href="#">Luca Scott</a>
RR-2064	<a href="#">Lucas Antunes</a>
RR-2065	<a href="#">Lucas Carlson</a>
RR-2066	<a href="#">Lucas Green</a>
RR-2067	<a href="#">Lucas Orritt</a>
RR-2068	<a href="#">Lucas Skelhorn</a>
RR-2069	<a href="#">Lucia Bonetta</a>
RR-2070	<a href="#">Lucia Bonetta</a>
RR-2071	<a href="#">Lucy Brooks</a>
RR-2072	<a href="#">Lucy Fowell</a>
RR-2073	<a href="#">Lucy Gray</a>
RR-2074	<a href="#">Lucy Hodson</a>
RR-2075	<a href="#">Lucy Molyneux</a>
RR-2076	<a href="#">Luke Gallagher</a>
RR-2077	<a href="#">Luke Heath</a>
RR-2078	<a href="#">Mr Luke Kenny</a>
RR-2079	<a href="#">Luke Smalley</a>

RR-2080	<u>Lydia Ashton</u>
RR-2081	<u>Lydia Halliwell</u>
RR-2082	<u>Lydia King</u>
RR-2083	<u>Lydia King</u>
RR-2084	<u>Lydia Maddox</u>
RR-2085	<u>Lydia Roberts</u>
RR-2086	<u>Lyn Quayle</u>
RR-2087	<u>Lynda Fashioni</u>
RR-2088	<u>Lynda Haughton</u>
RR-2089	<u>Lynda Hegarty</u>
RR-2090	<u>Lynda Jones</u>
RR-2091	<u>Lyndsay Hare</u>
RR-2092	<u>Lyndsey Heaton</u>
RR-2093	<u>Lyndsey Jones</u>
RR-2094	<u>Lynn Conachey</u>
RR-2095	<u>Lynn Wilson</u>
RR-2096	<u>Lynne Brown</u>
RR-2097	<u>Lynne Compton</u>
RR-2098	<u>Lynne Connor</u>
RR-2099	<u>Lynne Hardy</u>
RR-2100	<u>Lynne Jackson</u>
RR-2101	<u>Lynne Johnstone</u>
RR-2102	<u>Lynne McCaffrey</u>
RR-2103	<u>Lynne Sweeney</u>
RR-2104	<u>Lynne Wainwright</u>
RR-2105	<u>Lynne Wells</u>
RR-2106	<u>Lynsey Handley</u>
RR-2107	<u>Lynsey Lehan</u>
RR-2108	<u>Lynsey Shipstone</u>
RR-2109	<u>Mrs M Brady</u>
RR-2110	<u>Mr M Byrne</u>
RR-2111	<u>Mr M Byrne</u>
RR-2112	<u>Mrs M Byrne</u>
RR-2113	<u>M Davies</u>
RR-2114	<u>Mrs M Davies</u>
RR-2115	<u>Mrs M Fahey</u>
RR-2116	<u>M Fletcher</u>
RR-2117	<u>Mrs M Gallagher</u>
RR-2118	<u>Mr M Gee</u>
RR-2119	<u>Mrs M Grady</u>
RR-2120	<u>Mrs. M. Higgins</u>
RR-2121	<u>M Johnson</u>
RR-2122	<u>Mr M Litherland JP</u>
RR-2123	<u>Mr M Lyons</u>
RR-2124	<u>Miss M Lyons</u>
RR-2125	<u>M Mercer</u>
RR-2126	<u>M Molyneux</u>
RR-2127	<u>Mrs M Mooney</u>
RR-2128	<u>Mrs M Moss</u>
RR-2129	<u>Ms M Quagliano</u>

RR-2130	<u>Mrs M Riley</u>
RR-2131	<u>Mrs M Shearer</u>
RR-2132	<u>Mr M Sutton</u>
RR-2133	<u>Mr M Wallace</u>
RR-2134	<u>Miss M Wood</u>
RR-2135	<u>M Woods</u>
RR-2136	<u>M Woodward</u>
RR-2137	<u>Mrs Mabel Battel</u>
RR-2138	<u>Macaulay Smith</u>
RR-2139	<u>Maddison Mercer</u>
RR-2140	<u>Madeleine Treanor</u>
RR-2141	<u>Madison Gibbs</u>
RR-2142	<u>Maisie Mccrudden</u>
RR-2143	<u>Maiya Kiki Miller</u>
RR-2144	<u>Maizie Bo Brown</u>
RR-2145	<u>Malcolm Speakman</u>
RR-2146	<u>Malcolm Taraldsen</u>
RR-2147	<u>Manchester Tippers Limited</u>
RR-2148	<u>Mandy Mercer</u>
RR-2149	<u>Mandy Phillips</u>
RR-2150	<u>Mandy Whittington</u>
RR-2151	<u>Margaret McNeillie</u>
RR-2152	<u>Margaret Anderson</u>
RR-2153	<u>Margaret Bennett</u>
RR-2154	<u>Margaret Blake</u>
RR-2155	<u>Margaret Copeland</u>
RR-2156	<u>Margaret Eileen Tunstall</u>
RR-2157	<u>Margaret Helen Ross</u>
RR-2158	<u>Margaret Hunt</u>
RR-2159	<u>Margaret Kelley</u>
RR-2160	<u>Margaret Keown</u>
RR-2161	<u>Margaret Lawler</u>
RR-2162	<u>Margaret Lunt</u>
RR-2163	<u>Margaret Lunt</u>
RR-2164	<u>Margaret Mccann</u>
RR-2165	<u>Margaret Nuttall</u>
RR-2166	<u>Margaret Sumner</u>
RR-2167	<u>Margaret Taylor</u>
RR-2168	<u>Margaret Traynor</u>
RR-2169	<u>Mrs Margeret Traynor</u>
RR-2170	<u>Margaret Twigg</u>
RR-2171	<u>Margaret Walsh</u>
RR-2172	<u>Margaret Warnes</u>
RR-2173	<u>Margery Storey</u>
RR-2174	<u>Margery Storey</u>
RR-2175	<u>Maria Antunes</u>
RR-2176	<u>Maria Bamin</u>
RR-2177	<u>Maria Dumbell</u>
RR-2178	<u>Maria Lawton</u>
RR-2179	<u>Maria Lewis</u>

RR-2180	<u>Maria Szymanska-Michalak</u>
RR-2181	<u>Marian Watterson</u>
RR-2182	<u>Marie Burns</u>
RR-2183	<u>Marie Burns</u>
RR-2184	<u>Marie Erron Bamin</u>
RR-2185	<u>Marie Hale</u>
RR-2186	<u>Marie Herbert</u>
RR-2187	<u>Marie Johnson</u>
RR-2188	<u>Marie Johnson</u>
RR-2189	<u>Marie Kelley</u>
RR-2190	<u>Marie King</u>
RR-2191	<u>Marie Welsh</u>
RR-2192	<u>Marie-Therese Hill</u>
RR-2193	<u>Marijke Fenney</u>
RR-2194	<u>Mario Bonetta</u>
RR-2195	<u>Mario Hill</u>
RR-2196	<u>Marion</u>
RR-2197	<u>Marion Flavell</u>
RR-2198	<u>Marjorie Harris</u>
RR-2199	<u>Mark</u>
RR-2200	<u>Mark Bolan</u>
RR-2201	<u>Mark Bunting</u>
RR-2202	<u>Mark Counce</u>
RR-2203	<u>Mark Flude</u>
RR-2204	<u>Mark Gibson</u>
RR-2205	<u>Mark Houghton</u>
RR-2206	<u>Mark Hudson</u>
RR-2207	<u>Mark Hurst</u>
RR-2208	<u>Mark Keown</u>
RR-2209	<u>Mr Mark Harrison</u>
RR-2210	<u>Mark Mccrudden</u>
RR-2211	<u>Mark Parkin</u>
RR-2212	<u>Mark Rigby</u>
RR-2213	<u>Mark Rimmer</u>
RR-2214	<u>Mark Roughley</u>
RR-2215	<u>Mark Rutherford</u>
RR-2216	<u>Martin Cockayne</u>
RR-2217	<u>Mr Martin Kelley</u>
RR-2218	<u>Martin Webster</u>
RR-2219	<u>Martinez Croft</u>
RR-2220	<u>Martyn Lewis</u>
RR-2221	<u>Mr Martin Langan</u>
RR-2222	<u>Martyn Lewis</u>
RR-2223	<u>Mary Ann Smith</u>
RR-2224	<u>Mrs Mary-Ann Wall</u>
RR-2225	<u>Mary Gaunt</u>
RR-2226	<u>Mary Heyes</u>
RR-2227	<u>Mary Jeffers</u>
RR-2228	<u>Mrs Mary June Welsby</u>
RR-2229	<u>Mary Jones</u>



RR-2230	<u>Mary Lindblad</u>
RR-2231	<u>Mary Mckenzie</u>
RR-2232	<u>Mary Parkin</u>
RR-2233	<u>Mary Robinson</u>
RR-2234	<u>Mary Sephton</u>
RR-2235	<u>Mathew Harrison</u>
RR-2236	<u>Matt Sunderland</u>
RR-2237	<u>Matthew Corrigan</u>
RR-2238	<u>Matthew Denton</u>
RR-2239	<u>Matthew Hanson</u>
RR-2240	<u>Matthew Huxley</u>
RR-2241	<u>Matthew Johnson</u>
RR-2242	<u>Matthew Mosquito</u>
RR-2243	<u>Matthew Robinson</u>
RR-2244	<u>Matthew Smith</u>
RR-2245	<u>Matthew Spafford</u>
RR-2246	<u>Matthew Webster</u>
RR-2247	<u>Maura Muszanyka</u>
RR-2248	<u>Maureen Cannell</u>
RR-2249	<u>Maureen Craig</u>
RR-2250	<u>Maureen Doran</u>
RR-2251	<u>Maureen Perrin</u>
RR-2252	<u>Maureen Wall</u>
RR-2253	<u>Maurice George</u>
RR-2254	<u>Marcie Taylor</u>
RR-2255	<u>Maxine Bailey</u>
RR-2256	<u>Maxine Hollins</u>
RR-2257	<u>MCP Environmental LLP</u>
RR-2258	<u>Meaghan Lawday</u>
RR-2259	<u>Meg Britton</u>
RR-2260	<u>Megan Brady</u>
RR-2261	<u>Megan Burns</u>
RR-2262	<u>Miss Megan Harrison</u>
RR-2263	<u>Megan Nixon</u>
RR-2264	<u>Megan Owen</u>
RR-2265	<u>Megan Rimmer</u>
RR-2266	<u>Mel Grice</u>
RR-2267	<u>Melanie Burton</u>
RR-2268	<u>Melanie Day</u>
RR-2269	<u>Melanie Donnelly</u>
RR-2270	<u>Melanie Hickey</u>
RR-2271	<u>Melanie McGovern</u>
RR-2272	<u>Melanie Ramsay</u>
RR-2273	<u>Mercedes Dianne Broad</u>
RR-2274	<u>Mia Mccann-Jones</u>
RR-2275	<u>Michael Anderson</u>
RR-2276	<u>Michael Beddoes</u>
RR-2277	<u>Mr Michael Bolton</u>
RR-2278	<u>Michael Burke</u>
RR-2279	<u>Michael Byrne</u>

RR-2280	<a href="#">Michael Caden</a>
RR-2281	<a href="#">Michael Cave</a>
RR-2282	<a href="#">Michael Curtin</a>
RR-2283	<a href="#">Michael Dean</a>
RR-2284	<a href="#">Michael Diep</a>
RR-2285	<a href="#">Michael Duffey</a>
RR-2286	<a href="#">Michael Else</a>
RR-2287	<a href="#">Michael Evans</a>
RR-2288	<a href="#">Michael Fawcett</a>
RR-2289	<a href="#">Michael Fenney</a>
RR-2290	<a href="#">Michael Fenney</a>
RR-2291	<a href="#">Michael Flaherty</a>
RR-2292	<a href="#">Michael Gowan</a>
RR-2293	<a href="#">Michael Green</a>
RR-2294	<a href="#">Michael Halewood</a>
RR-2295	<a href="#">Michael Hilton</a>
RR-2296	<a href="#">Michael Hindley</a>
RR-2297	<a href="#">Michael Jevons</a>
RR-2298	<a href="#">Michael Johnson</a>
RR-2299	<a href="#">Michael Lee</a>
RR-2300	<a href="#">Michael McCaffrey</a>
RR-2301	<a href="#">Michael Norris</a>
RR-2302	<a href="#">Michael Ryder</a>
RR-2303	<a href="#">Michael Scott Brown</a>
RR-2304	<a href="#">Michael Todd</a>
RR-2305	<a href="#">Michael Westhead</a>
RR-2306	<a href="#">Michael Whittaker</a>
RR-2307	<a href="#">Michael Whittaker</a>
RR-2308	<a href="#">Michael William Brown</a>
RR-2309	<a href="#">Michael Wohler</a>
RR-2310	<a href="#">Michael Woods</a>
RR-2311	<a href="#">Michaela Crompton</a>
RR-2312	<a href="#">Michaela J Lloyd</a>
RR-2313	<a href="#">Michelle Atherton</a>
RR-2314	<a href="#">Michelle Bankier</a>
RR-2315	<a href="#">Michelle Bolton</a>
RR-2316	<a href="#">Michelle Boyer</a>
RR-2317	<a href="#">Michelle Boyer</a>
RR-2318	<a href="#">Michelle Bunting</a>
RR-2319	<a href="#">Michelle Drummond</a>
RR-2320	<a href="#">Michelle Fowell</a>
RR-2321	<a href="#">Michelle Hegarty</a>
RR-2322	<a href="#">Michelle Heyes</a>
RR-2323	<a href="#">Michelle Hilton</a>
RR-2324	<a href="#">Michelle Karalius</a>
RR-2325	<a href="#">Michelle Kervin</a>
RR-2326	<a href="#">Michelle Lynch</a>
RR-2327	<a href="#">Michelle Marshman</a>
RR-2328	<a href="#">Michelle McMahon</a>
RR-2329	<a href="#">Michelle McNeil</a>

RR-2330	<u>Michelle Mercer</u>
RR-2331	<u>Michelle Moss</u>
RR-2332	<u>Michelle O</u>
RR-2333	<u>Michelle Perry</u>
RR-2334	<u>Michelle Roderick</u>
RR-2335	<u>Michelle Rutherford</u>
RR-2336	<u>Michelle Shepherd</u>
RR-2337	<u>Michelle Whittaker</u>
RR-2338	<u>Michelle Wilkin</u>
RR-2339	<u>Michelle Younger</u>
RR-2340	<u>Mike Brown</u>
RR-2341	<u>Mike Brown</u>
RR-2342	<u>Mike Dunphy</u>
RR-2343	<u>Mike Henson</u>
RR-2344	<u>Mike Marshall</u>
RR-2345	<u>Mike Noon</u>
RR-2346	<u>Mike Roberts</u>
RR-2347	<u>Mike Wooding</u>
RR-2348	<u>Millie Armstrong</u>
RR-2349	<u>Millie Watson</u>
RR-2350	<u>Milly Keeling</u>
RR-2351	<u>Mitchell Slocombe</u>
RR-2352	<u>Moira Chambers</u>
RR-2353	<u>Ms Moira Chambers</u>
RR-2354	<u>Moira Warburton</u>
RR-2355	<u>Mollie Bamin</u>
RR-2356	<u>Mollie Lawton</u>
RR-2357	<u>Molly Armstrong</u>
RR-2358	<u>Molly Evans</u>
RR-2359	<u>Molly O'Hanlon</u>
RR-2360	<u>Ms Monika Byrne</u>
RR-2361	<u>Monica Monaghan-Shepherd</u>
RR-2362	<u>Moorhead Excavations Ltd. / Moorhead Demolition Ltd.</u>
RR-2363	<u>Morgan Pennington</u>
RR-2364	<u>Morgan Simm</u>
RR-2365	<u>Mr N Benson</u>
RR-2366	<u>Mr N Dignam</u>
RR-2367	<u>Mrs N Gail</u>
RR-2368	<u>N Walker</u>
RR-2369	<u>Nadine Aspinwall</u>
RR-2370	<u>Nadine Hague</u>
RR-2371	<u>Naomi Riley</u>
RR-2372	<u>Naseer Audhali</u>
RR-2373	<u>Natalia d Lloyd</u>
RR-2374	<u>Natalie Barlow</u>
RR-2375	<u>Natalie Burden</u>
RR-2376	<u>Natalie Clansey</u>
RR-2377	<u>Natalie Gardner</u>
RR-2378	<u>Natalie Griffin</u>
RR-2379	<u>Natalie Lenehan</u>

RR-2380	<u>Mrs Natalie Louise Harrison</u>
RR-2381	<u>Natalie Quirk</u>
RR-2382	<u>Natalie Read</u>
RR-2383	<u>Natalie Schofield</u>
RR-2384	<u>Mrs Natalie Scott</u>
RR-2385	<u>Natalie Timson</u>
RR-2386	<u>Natasha Fairhurst</u>
RR-2387	<u>Natasha Shaw</u>
RR-2388	<u>Natasha Skelton</u>
RR-2389	<u>Nate Tittle</u>
RR-2390	<u>Nathan Eades</u>
RR-2391	<u>Nathan King</u>
RR-2392	<u>Nathan Schofield</u>
RR-2393	<u>Nathaniel Green</u>
RR-2394	<u>Natural England</u>
RR-2395	<u>Neal Bricklebank</u>
RR-2396	<u>Neil Beddoes</u>
RR-2397	<u>Neil Bisarya</u>
RR-2398	<u>Neil Davies</u>
RR-2399	<u>Neil Edden</u>
RR-2400	<u>Neil Edwards</u>
RR-2401	<u>Neil Evans</u>
RR-2402	<u>Mr Neil Flavell</u>
RR-2403	<u>Neil Furey</u>
RR-2404	<u>Neil Jennings</u>
RR-2405	<u>Neil Johnstone</u>
RR-2406	<u>Neil Marshall</u>
RR-2407	<u>Neil Parkinson</u>
RR-2408	<u>Neil Pye</u>
RR-2409	<u>Neil Ralph</u>
RR-2410	<u>Neil Shearer</u>
RR-2411	<u>Neil Skelton</u>
RR-2412	<u>Neil Wohler</u>
RR-2413	<u>Network Installation Solutions Limited</u>
RR-2414	<u>NFU Mutual - Graves, Roberts and Shove</u>
RR-2415	<u>Niall Barrow</u>
RR-2416	<u>Niall Hogan</u>
RR-2417	<u>Niamh Brown</u>
RR-2418	<u>Niamh Donnelly</u>
RR-2419	<u>Niamh Norris</u>
RR-2420	<u>Nic Carr</u>
RR-2421	<u>Nichola Brophy</u>
RR-2422	<u>Nichola Edmond</u>
RR-2423	<u>Nichola Elliott</u>
RR-2424	<u>Miss Nicola Jayne Adams</u>
RR-2425	<u>Nichola Schofield</u>
RR-2426	<u>Nick Glover</u>
RR-2427	<u>Nick Grice</u>
RR-2428	<u>Nick Matthews</u>
RR-2429	<u>Nicky Murphy</u>

RR-2430	<u>Nicola</u>
RR-2431	<u>Nicola Bow</u>
RR-2432	<u>Nicola Dudley</u>
RR-2433	<u>Nicola Escott</u>
RR-2434	<u>Nicola Gray</u>
RR-2435	<u>Nicola Hennessy</u>
RR-2436	<u>Nicola Hutton</u>
RR-2437	<u>Nicola McCann</u>
RR-2438	<u>Nicola Miller</u>
RR-2439	<u>Nicola Mutch</u>
RR-2440	<u>Nicola Perry</u>
RR-2441	<u>Nicola Pile</u>
RR-2442	<u>Councillor Nicola Pryce Roberts</u>
RR-2443	<u>Nicola Roberts</u>
RR-2444	<u>Nicola Tune</u>
RR-2445	<u>Nicole Johnston</u>
RR-2446	<u>Nigel Anthony Smith</u>
RR-2447	<u>Nigel Hesketh</u>
RR-2448	<u>Nigel Page</u>
RR-2449	<u>Nikita M Lloyd</u>
RR-2450	<u>Nikki Sinnott</u>
RR-2451	<u>Noala Bradshaw</u>
RR-2452	<u>Noel Booth &amp; Sons</u>
RR-2453	<u>Noleen Thompson</u>
RR-2454	<u>Norma Bolton</u>
RR-2455	<u>Norma Dorothy Roach</u>
RR-2456	<u>Mrs Norma Gower</u>
RR-2457	<u>Norma Griffith</u>
RR-2458	<u>Norman Hurst</u>
RR-2459	<u>Nuala Maher</u>
RR-2460	<u>O Yarwood</u>
RR-2461	<u>O'Callaghan Ltd</u>
RR-2462	<u>Oli Carlson</u>
RR-2463	<u>Oliver Corrigan</u>
RR-2464	<u>Oliver Preston</u>
RR-2465	<u>Oliver Shepherd</u>
RR-2466	<u>Olivia Foley</u>
RR-2467	<u>Olivia Sealey</u>
RR-2468	<u>Olivia Sinnott</u>
RR-2469	<u>Olivia Wainwright</u>
RR-2470	<u>Ormskirk Christian Fellowship</u>
RR-2471	<u>Ormskirk F.C</u>
RR-2472	<u>Oscar Viggor</u>
RR-2473	<u>Oscar Wall</u>
RR-2474	<u>Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Engineering College</u>
RR-2475	<u>Outhwaite and Litherland</u>
RR-2476	<u>Owen Campbell</u>
RR-2477	<u>Owen Hunt</u>
RR-2478	<u>Owen Wright</u>
RR-2479	<u>P Constinine</u>

RR-2480	<u>P Davies</u>
RR-2481	<u>Mrs P Divkar</u>
RR-2482	<u>P Green</u>
RR-2483	<u>Mr P Hammond</u>
RR-2484	<u>P Hunt</u>
RR-2485	<u>Mr P I Poole</u>
RR-2486	<u>Mrs PJ Dowling</u>
RR-2487	<u>Mrs P Molyneux</u>
RR-2488	<u>Mr P Roberts</u>
RR-2489	<u>Mrs P Spencer</u>
RR-2490	<u>P Tootill</u>
RR-2491	<u>P Walker</u>
RR-2492	<u>P Walton</u>
RR-2493	<u>Paddy Bradshaw</u>
RR-2494	<u>Paddy Murray</u>
RR-2495	<u>Paddy Sharkey</u>
RR-2496	<u>Pam Bow</u>
RR-2497	<u>Pam Crabb</u>
RR-2498	<u>Pam Egan</u>
RR-2499	<u>Pam Rugby</u>
RR-2500	<u>Pamela Ashton</u>
RR-2501	<u>Mrs Pamela Beer</u>
RR-2502	<u>Pamela Daw</u>
RR-2503	<u>Pamela Lloyd</u>
RR-2504	<u>Parbold Parish Council</u>
RR-2505	<u>Parish CLR.Gladys Gardiner</u>
RR-2506	<u>Pat Coffey</u>
RR-2507	<u>Pat Evans</u>
RR-2508	<u>Pat Litherland</u>
RR-2509	<u>Patricia Carr</u>
RR-2510	<u>Patricia Clarke</u>
RR-2511	<u>Patricia Duffy</u>
RR-2512	<u>Patricia Esp</u>
RR-2513	<u>Mrs Patricia Hughes</u>
RR-2514	<u>Patricia Krasborg</u>
RR-2515	<u>Patricia Murray</u>
RR-2516	<u>Patricia Reddington</u>
RR-2517	<u>Patricia Rigby</u>
RR-2518	<u>Patricia Wainwright</u>
RR-2519	<u>Patrick Joseph Conachey</u>
RR-2520	<u>Patrick McGuinness</u>
RR-2521	<u>Patrick O'Brien</u>
RR-2522	<u>Patrick Platts</u>
RR-2523	<u>Patrick Traynor</u>
RR-2524	<u>Patsy Begg</u>
RR-2525	<u>Paul Armstrong</u>
RR-2526	<u>Paul Ashton</u>
RR-2527	<u>Paul Bennett</u>
RR-2528	<u>Mr Paul Birch</u>
RR-2529	<u>Paul Brady</u>

RR-2530	<u>Paul Carlson</u>
RR-2531	<u>Paul Coleman</u>
RR-2532	<u>Paul Cotterill</u>
RR-2533	<u>Paul Davies</u>
RR-2534	<u>Paul Delargy</u>
RR-2535	<u>Paul Dignam</u>
RR-2536	<u>Paul Drameh</u>
RR-2537	<u>Paul Draper</u>
RR-2538	<u>Paul Elliott</u>
RR-2539	<u>Paul Graham</u>
RR-2540	<u>Paul Hendrikse</u>
RR-2541	<u>Paul Johnson</u>
RR-2542	<u>Paul Keevil</u>
RR-2543	<u>Paul Kelly</u>
RR-2544	<u>Paul Kimberley</u>
RR-2545	<u>Paul Lakin</u>
RR-2546	<u>Paul Latimer</u>
RR-2547	<u>Paul Lewis Freedom Bedrooms</u>
RR-2548	<u>Paul Litherth</u>
RR-2549	<u>Paul Lloyd</u>
RR-2550	<u>Paul Lydiate</u>
RR-2551	<u>Paul McGee</u>
RR-2552	<u>Paul McKinney</u>
RR-2553	<u>Paul McNamara</u>
RR-2554	<u>Paul Michell</u>
RR-2555	<u>Paul Minton</u>
RR-2556	<u>Mr Paul Ratcliffe</u>
RR-2557	<u>Paul Rimmer</u>
RR-2558	<u>Paul Shepherd</u>
RR-2559	<u>Paul Smalley</u>
RR-2560	<u>Paul Thomas</u>
RR-2561	<u>Paul Tunstall</u>
RR-2562	<u>Paul Whittle</u>
RR-2563	<u>Paul Wildridge</u>
RR-2564	<u>Paula Baldwin</u>
RR-2565	<u>Ms Paula Battel</u>
RR-2566	<u>Paula Corrigan</u>
RR-2567	<u>Paula Gallagher</u>
RR-2568	<u>Paula Herrity</u>
RR-2569	<u>Paula Lea</u>
RR-2570	<u>Paula Ramsay</u>
RR-2571	<u>Paula Scott</u>
RR-2572	<u>Paula Stott</u>
RR-2573	<u>Paula Sung</u>
RR-2574	<u>Pauline Barraclough</u>
RR-2575	<u>Pauline Carter</u>
RR-2576	<u>Pauline Crossley</u>
RR-2577	<u>Pauline Egan</u>
RR-2578	<u>Pauline Fagan</u>
RR-2579	<u>Pauline Homson</u>

RR-2580	<u>Mrs Pauline Kelly</u>
RR-2581	<u>Mrs Pauline Rossiter</u>
RR-2582	<u>Pauline Smith</u>
RR-2583	<u>Pawel Michalak</u>
RR-2584	<u>Mrs Pearl Birchall</u>
RR-2585	<u>Penny Dorricott</u>
RR-2586	<u>Penny Fuller</u>
RR-2587	<u>Pete Marquis</u>
RR-2588	<u>Peter Baker</u>
RR-2589	<u>Mr Peter Baker</u>
RR-2590	<u>Mr Peter Baker</u>
RR-2591	<u>Peter Blakey</u>
RR-2592	<u>Peter Bland</u>
RR-2593	<u>Peter Brady</u>
RR-2594	<u>Peter Brierly</u>
RR-2595	<u>Peter Brown</u>
RR-2596	<u>Peter Carney</u>
RR-2597	<u>Peter Clarke</u>
RR-2598	<u>Peter Eastham</u>
RR-2599	<u>Peter Edmond</u>
RR-2600	<u>Peter Edmond</u>
RR-2601	<u>Peter Egan</u>
RR-2602	<u>Peter Foley</u>
RR-2603	<u>Peter Garrett</u>
RR-2604	<u>Peter Houghton</u>
RR-2605	<u>Peter Minards</u>
RR-2606	<u>Peter Phillips</u>
RR-2607	<u>Peter Rigby</u>
RR-2608	<u>Peter Riley</u>
RR-2609	<u>Peter Sealey</u>
RR-2610	<u>Peter Sealey</u>
RR-2611	<u>Peter Sealey</u>
RR-2612	<u>Peter Tong</u>
RR-2613	<u>Peter Wilson</u>
RR-2614	<u>Peter Wiltshire</u>
RR-2615	<u>Phil Beeley</u>
RR-2616	<u>Phil Dee</u>
RR-2617	<u>Mr Phil Rawsthorne</u>
RR-2618	<u>Philip Child</u>
RR-2619	<u>Philip Corrigan</u>
RR-2620	<u>Philip Lea</u>
RR-2621	<u>Philip Norris</u>
RR-2622	<u>Philip Poole</u>
RR-2623	<u>Philip Roughley</u>
RR-2624	<u>Philip Shepherd</u>
RR-2625	<u>Philip Smith</u>
RR-2626	<u>Philip Walker</u>
RR-2627	<u>Philippa Morris</u>
RR-2628	<u>Philippa Tubb</u>
RR-2629	<u>Phill Clarke</u>



RR-2630	<u>Phillip Tilley</u>
RR-2631	<u>Philomena Larkin</u>
RR-2632	<u>Ms Philomena Swift</u>
RR-2633	<u>Phoebe Baines</u>
RR-2634	<u>Polaris junior football club</u>
RR-2635	<u>Poppy Fowell</u>
RR-2636	<u>Poppy Sharkey</u>
RR-2637	<u>Pure hair salon</u>
RR-2638	<u>PVT Services Ltd</u>
RR-2639	<u>Quadrant Properties</u>
RR-2640	<u>Quantil Ltd</u>
RR-2641	<u>Quinn Smith</u>
RR-2642	<u>Mr R James</u>
RR-2643	<u>Mr R Jones</u>
RR-2644	<u>R P Bishop</u>
RR-2645	<u>Mr R Mosquito</u>
RR-2646	<u>R W Almond&amp;Co(Contractors)Ltd</u>
RR-2647	<u>Mr R Wallace</u>
RR-2648	<u>Mr R Wallace</u>
RR-2649	<u>Rachael Cowan</u>
RR-2650	<u>Rachael Croft</u>
RR-2651	<u>Rachael O'Neil</u>
RR-2652	<u>Rachel Brier</u>
RR-2653	<u>Rachel Foley</u>
RR-2654	<u>Rachel Giller</u>
RR-2655	<u>Rachel Greener</u>
RR-2656	<u>Rachel Hoskins</u>
RR-2657	<u>Rachel Jatto</u>
RR-2658	<u>Rachel Lea</u>
RR-2659	<u>Rachel Lindblad</u>
RR-2660	<u>Rachel Lynch</u>
RR-2661	<u>Rachel Scurry</u>
RR-2662	<u>Rachelle Barlow</u>
RR-2663	<u>Rachelle Briggs</u>
RR-2664	<u>Rafael Monteith</u>
RR-2665	<u>Railway Road Surgery</u>
RR-2666	<u>Rainford Parish Council</u>
RR-2667	<u>Rainford Timber</u>
RR-2668	<u>Ralph Gregson</u>
RR-2669	<u>Ralph Rawsthorne</u>
RR-2670	<u>Ray Cash</u>
RR-2671	<u>Ray Fowler</u>
RR-2672	<u>Ray Wildridge</u>
RR-2673	<u>Mr Raymond Hayes</u>
RR-2674	<u>Raymond Ryland</u>
RR-2675	<u>Rebecca Cook</u>
RR-2676	<u>Rebecca Fletcher</u>
RR-2677	<u>Rebecca Flynn</u>
RR-2678	<u>Rebecca Forsyth</u>
RR-2679	<u>Rebecca Keown</u>

RR-2680	<a href="#">Rebecca Mountain</a>
RR-2681	<a href="#">Rebecca O'Brien</a>
RR-2682	<a href="#">Rebecca Webster</a>
RR-2683	<a href="#">Red Industries Ltd</a>
RR-2684	<a href="#">Reece Greenall</a>
RR-2685	<a href="#">Reece Manson</a>
RR-2686	<a href="#">Reece Moore</a>
RR-2687	<a href="#">Regina Bulmer</a>
RR-2688	<a href="#">Reginald Shaw</a>
RR-2689	<a href="#">Renee Forster</a>
RR-2690	<a href="#">Mrs Rhian Griffiths</a>
RR-2691	<a href="#">Rhiannon Cooney</a>
RR-2692	<a href="#">Mrs Rhonwen Brown</a>
RR-2693	<a href="#">Rhys</a>
RR-2694	<a href="#">Rhys McDonald</a>
RR-2695	<a href="#">Mr Richard Atherton</a>
RR-2696	<a href="#">Richard Appleton</a>
RR-2697	<a href="#">Richard Cunningham</a>
RR-2698	<a href="#">Richard Daniel</a>
RR-2699	<a href="#">Richard dean</a>
RR-2700	<a href="#">Richard Fowell</a>
RR-2701	<a href="#">Richard Lines</a>
RR-2702	<a href="#">Richard Lines</a>
RR-2703	<a href="#">Richard McDonough</a>
RR-2704	<a href="#">Richard Michael King</a>
RR-2705	<a href="#">Richard Rimmer</a>
RR-2706	<a href="#">Richard Stephen Russell</a>
RR-2707	<a href="#">Mr Richard Taylor</a>
RR-2708	<a href="#">Richard Webber</a>
RR-2709	<a href="#">Ricky Hooper</a>
RR-2710	<a href="#">Riley Brown Speakman</a>
RR-2711	<a href="#">Master Riley Leedam</a>
RR-2712	<a href="#">Rita Brown</a>
RR-2713	<a href="#">Rita Codling</a>
RR-2714	<a href="#">Rita Jane Newby</a>
RR-2715	<a href="#">Rob Fairfield</a>
RR-2716	<a href="#">Rob Stoker</a>
RR-2717	<a href="#">Rob Usher</a>
RR-2718	<a href="#">Robert Adams</a>
RR-2719	<a href="#">Robert Alker</a>
RR-2720	<a href="#">Robert Barrow</a>
RR-2721	<a href="#">Robert Bowden</a>
RR-2722	<a href="#">Robert Carr</a>
RR-2723	<a href="#">Robert Cordingley</a>
RR-2724	<a href="#">Robert Edwards</a>
RR-2725	<a href="#">Robert Green</a>
RR-2726	<a href="#">Robert Green</a>
RR-2727	<a href="#">Robert Jackson</a>
RR-2728	<a href="#">Robert James Shirley</a>
RR-2729	<a href="#">Robert Murphy</a>

RR-2730	<u>Robert Perry</u>
RR-2731	<u>Robert Rainford</u>
RR-2732	<u>Robert Rome</u>
RR-2733	<u>Robert Scarisbrick</u>
RR-2734	<u>Robert Scott</u>
RR-2735	<u>Robert Shaw</u>
RR-2736	<u>Robert Shepherd</u>
RR-2737	<u>Robert Smyth</u>
RR-2738	<u>Robin Paterson</u>
RR-2739	<u>Rod Lunt</u>
RR-2740	<u>Roger Perry</u>
RR-2741	<u>Roger Webster</u>
RR-2742	<u>Roisin Shepherd Woods</u>
RR-2743	<u>Roland Shaw</u>
RR-2744	<u>Ron Edwards</u>
RR-2745	<u>Ron Kellett</u>
RR-2746	<u>Ron Walker</u>
RR-2747	<u>Mr Ronald Cooper</u>
RR-2748	<u>Ronald Hillier</u>
RR-2749	<u>Ronald Leslie Barnes</u>
RR-2750	<u>Ronald Moseley</u>
RR-2751	<u>Ronald Sung</u>
RR-2752	<u>Ronald Train</u>
RR-2753	<u>Ronnie Esp</u>
RR-2754	<u>Ronnie Schofield</u>
RR-2755	<u>Rory Holtby</u>
RR-2756	<u>Rosalind Wess</u>
RR-2757	<u>Rosemarie Domingos Daluz</u>
RR-2758	<u>Rosemarie Potter</u>
RR-2759	<u>Rosemary Jamieson</u>
RR-2760	<u>Rosemary Lewis</u>
RR-2761	<u>Rosemary Wood</u>
RR-2762	<u>Rosie Dickinson</u>
RR-2763	<u>Ross Webster</u>
RR-2764	<u>Ross Webster</u>
RR-2765	<u>Roy Alexander</u>
RR-2766	<u>Roy Bolton</u>
RR-2767	<u>Roy Nuttall</u>
RR-2768	<u>Roy Wilson</u>
RR-2769	<u>Roydon Recycling UK Limited</u>
RR-2770	<u>RS and LM Webster (partnership)</u>
RR-2771	<u>Rubie-Lou Norris</u>
RR-2772	<u>Ruby Richardson</u>
RR-2773	<u>Mrs ruby Robinson</u>
RR-2774	<u>Russell Heath</u>
RR-2775	<u>Russell Morris</u>
RR-2776	<u>Mrs Ruth Caroline Jones</u>
RR-2777	<u>Ruth Jackson</u>
RR-2778	<u>Ruth Jones</u>
RR-2779	<u>Ruttle Plant Ltd</u>

RR-2780	<u>Ryan Ashcroft</u>
RR-2781	<u>Ryan Brookes</u>
RR-2782	<u>Ryan Clifford</u>
RR-2783	<u>Ryan Gilbertson</u>
RR-2784	<u>Ryan hunt</u>
RR-2785	<u>Ryan Jones</u>
RR-2786	<u>Ryan Jones</u>
RR-2787	<u>Ryan Lewis</u>
RR-2788	<u>Ryan P Flack</u>
RR-2789	<u>Ryan Skelhorn</u>
RR-2790	<u>Ryan Smith</u>
RR-2791	<u>Rydalholme Bed &amp; Breakfast</u>
RR-2792	<u>S Barnes</u>
RR-2793	<u>Ms S Battel</u>
RR-2794	<u>Mrs S Charlesworth</u>
RR-2795	<u>Mr S Corrigan</u>
RR-2796	<u>Mrs S Craddock</u>
RR-2797	<u>Miss S Fletcher</u>
RR-2798	<u>Mrs S Hill</u>
RR-2799	<u>Mr S Lemaire</u>
RR-2800	<u>S Lewis</u>
RR-2801	<u>Mrs S Marsh</u>
RR-2802	<u>Mrs S Marsh</u>
RR-2803	<u>Master S Mooney</u>
RR-2804	<u>S Murray</u>
RR-2805	<u>Miss S Newton</u>
RR-2806	<u>Mrs S Nickson</u>
RR-2807	<u>Mr S Preston</u>
RR-2808	<u>Mrs S Preston</u>
RR-2809	<u>S Ross</u>
RR-2810	<u>S Smith</u>
RR-2811	<u>Master S Sutton</u>
RR-2812	<u>Mr S Vernon</u>
RR-2813	<u>S Webster</u>
RR-2814	<u>Sally Molyneux</u>
RR-2815	<u>Sally Shaw</u>
RR-2816	<u>Sam Beckett</u>
RR-2817	<u>Sam Brown</u>
RR-2818	<u>Sam Divkar</u>
RR-2819	<u>Sam Fagan</u>
RR-2820	<u>Sam Lindblad</u>
RR-2821	<u>Sam Lowe</u>
RR-2822	<u>Mr Sam McCracken</u>
RR-2823	<u>Sam Mellor</u>
RR-2824	<u>Sam Wohler</u>
RR-2825	<u>Samantha Dumbell</u>
RR-2826	<u>Samantha Fairhurst</u>
RR-2827	<u>Samantha Glover</u>
RR-2828	<u>Samantha Levitt</u>
RR-2829	<u>Samantha Marrs</u>

RR-2830	<u>Samantha Price</u>
RR-2831	<u>Samantha Winter</u>
RR-2832	<u>Samantha Woods</u>
RR-2833	<u>Sammie-Jo Sharkey</u>
RR-2834	<u>Samuel Wynn</u>
RR-2835	<u>Ms Sandra Beach</u>
RR-2836	<u>Sandra Critchley</u>
RR-2837	<u>Sandra Glover</u>
RR-2838	<u>Sandra Murphy</u>
RR-2839	<u>Mrs Sandra Morgan</u>
RR-2840	<u>Sandra Murphy</u>
RR-2841	<u>Mrs. Sandra Robinson</u>
RR-2842	<u>Sara Boyd</u>
RR-2843	<u>Sara Burns</u>
RR-2844	<u>Sara Jones</u>
RR-2845	<u>Sarah Bhamra</u>
RR-2846	<u>Sarah Blackhurst</u>
RR-2847	<u>Sarah Brislen</u>
RR-2848	<u>Sarah Carr</u>
RR-2849	<u>Sarah Coffey</u>
RR-2850	<u>Sarah Donnelly</u>
RR-2851	<u>Sarah Edwards</u>
RR-2852	<u>Sarah Ferrmood</u>
RR-2853	<u>Sarah Gidman</u>
RR-2854	<u>Sarah Hale</u>
RR-2855	<u>Sarah Hardy</u>
RR-2856	<u>Sarah Haynes</u>
RR-2857	<u>Sarah Hepke</u>
RR-2858	<u>Sarah Holland</u>
RR-2859	<u>Sarah Jane Edwards</u>
RR-2860	<u>Sarah Linderman</u>
RR-2861	<u>Sarah M Dean</u>
RR-2862	<u>Sarah Nixon</u>
RR-2863	<u>Sarah O</u>
RR-2864	<u>Sarah Rowden</u>
RR-2865	<u>Sarah Scanlan</u>
RR-2866	<u>Sarah Smyth</u>
RR-2867	<u>Sarah Taylor</u>
RR-2868	<u>Sarah Thomas</u>
RR-2869	<u>Sarah Trainor</u>
RR-2870	<u>Sarah Williams</u>
RR-2871	<u>Sarah Wilson</u>
RR-2872	<u>Save Bickerstaffe Colliery</u>
RR-2873	<u>save bickerstaffe colliery</u>
RR-2874	<u>Say No To More Hazardous Waste in Skelmersdale</u>
RR-2875	<u>Scott Mckenzie</u>
RR-2876	<u>Scott Reay</u>
RR-2877	<u>Scouts</u>
RR-2878	<u>Sean Lynch</u>
RR-2879	<u>Mr Sean Maiden</u>

RR-2880	<u>Sean Oneill</u>
RR-2881	<u>Sean Reilly</u>
RR-2882	<u>Sebastian Wach</u>
RR-2883	<u>Shahnaz Samyez</u>
RR-2884	<u>Shane Cave</u>
RR-2885	<u>Shannan Feeley</u>
RR-2886	<u>Shannika N Lloyd</u>
RR-2887	<u>Shannon Donnelly</u>
RR-2888	<u>Mrs Sharon Armson</u>
RR-2889	<u>Sharon Bennett</u>
RR-2890	<u>Sharon Bricklebank</u>
RR-2891	<u>Sharon Brown</u>
RR-2892	<u>Sharon Burton</u>
RR-2893	<u>Sharon Clarke</u>
RR-2894	<u>Sharon Delves</u>
RR-2895	<u>Sharon Hendrikse</u>
RR-2896	<u>Sharon Lawton</u>
RR-2897	<u>Sharon Lemaire</u>
RR-2898	<u>Sharon Lewis</u>
RR-2899	<u>Mrs Sharon Lloyd</u>
RR-2900	<u>Sharon Murphy</u>
RR-2901	<u>Sharon Smith</u>
RR-2902	<u>Sharon Spafford</u>
RR-2903	<u>Sharon Stoner</u>
RR-2904	<u>Sharon Storey</u>
RR-2905	<u>Sharon Thomas</u>
RR-2906	<u>Sharon Thomas</u>
RR-2907	<u>Sharon Waters</u>
RR-2908	<u>Sharron Jennings</u>
RR-2909	<u>Shaun David Hughes</u>
RR-2910	<u>Shaun Hunt</u>
RR-2911	<u>Miss Shauna Leedam</u>
RR-2912	<u>Shea Cooney</u>
RR-2913	<u>Sheila Swift</u>
RR-2914	<u>Sheleen Glover</u>
RR-2915	<u>Shelia Thomas</u>
RR-2916	<u>Shelley Clarke</u>
RR-2917	<u>Shellie Swanton</u>
RR-2918	<u>Shevington Parish Council</u>
RR-2919	<u>Shirley Ann Myers</u>
RR-2920	<u>Shirley Driscoll</u>
RR-2921	<u>Shirley Nelson</u>
RR-2922	<u>Shirley Norris</u>
RR-2923	<u>Shirley Waterman</u>
RR-2924	<u>Silvia Cahill</u>
RR-2925	<u>Mr Simon Adatsi</u>
RR-2926	<u>Mr Simon Baker</u>
RR-2927	<u>Simon Clarke</u>
RR-2928	<u>Simon Daw</u>
RR-2929	<u>Simon Kilshaw</u>

RR-2930	<a href="#">Simon L Raven</a>
RR-2931	<a href="#">Simon Taylor</a>
RR-2932	<a href="#">Sister Lynne Bone</a>
RR-2933	<a href="#">Skelmersdale junior football league</a>
RR-2934	<a href="#">Skelmersdale Junior Football League</a>
RR-2935	<a href="#">Skelmersdale junior football league</a>
RR-2936	<a href="#">Skelmersdale United Youth Academy under 11s team</a>
RR-2937	<a href="#">Skelmersdale United Youth Academy Under 8</a>
RR-2938	<a href="#">Skelmersdale United Youth Academy under 9s team</a>
RR-2939	<a href="#">Skelmersdale Writers Group</a>
RR-2940	<a href="#">Skem North JFC</a>
RR-2941	<a href="#">Skem North JFC Under 12</a>
RR-2942	<a href="#">Skem North Junior Football Club</a>
RR-2943	<a href="#">Sofia Roberta Keown</a>
RR-2944	<a href="#">Sonia Clark</a>
RR-2945	<a href="#">Sonia Kilshaw</a>
RR-2946	<a href="#">Sonny Carr</a>
RR-2947	<a href="#">Sophia - Rose Vaughan</a>
RR-2948	<a href="#">Sophie Buran</a>
RR-2949	<a href="#">Sophie burgess</a>
RR-2950	<a href="#">Sophie Clarke</a>
RR-2951	<a href="#">Sophie Dickinson</a>
RR-2952	<a href="#">Sophie Fowler</a>
RR-2953	<a href="#">Sophie Grace</a>
RR-2954	<a href="#">Sophie Green</a>
RR-2955	<a href="#">Sophie Paterson</a>
RR-2956	<a href="#">Sophie Roberts</a>
RR-2957	<a href="#">Sophie Whittle</a>
RR-2958	<a href="#">Sophie Wilding</a>
RR-2959	<a href="#">South Lathom Residents' Association</a>
RR-2960	<a href="#">Southern</a>
RR-2961	<a href="#">Spencer Westwood</a>
RR-2962	<a href="#">Spud Murphy</a>
RR-2963	<a href="#">St John</a>
RR-2964	<a href="#">St Richard's Catholic Primary School Governing Body</a>
RR-2965	<a href="#">St.Helens Council</a>
RR-2966	<a href="#">Stacy Houghton</a>
RR-2967	<a href="#">Steffan Krasborg</a>
RR-2968	<a href="#">Stella Todd</a>
RR-2969	<a href="#">Steph Ellis</a>
RR-2970	<a href="#">Stephanie Bamin</a>
RR-2971	<a href="#">Stephanie Chesworth</a>
RR-2972	<a href="#">Stephanie Foster</a>
RR-2973	<a href="#">Stephanie Lowe</a>
RR-2974	<a href="#">Stephanie Lunt</a>
RR-2975	<a href="#">Stephanie McDonald</a>
RR-2976	<a href="#">Stephanie O'Neill</a>
RR-2977	<a href="#">Stephen Abraham</a>
RR-2978	<a href="#">Stephen Bennett</a>
RR-2979	<a href="#">Stephen Britton</a>

RR-2980	<u>Stephen Broady</u>
RR-2981	<u>Stephen Collett</u>
RR-2982	<u>Stephen Draper</u>
RR-2983	<u>Stephen Duckworth</u>
RR-2984	<u>Stephen Duckworth</u>
RR-2985	<u>Stephen Edmond</u>
RR-2986	<u>Stephen Edward Myers</u>
RR-2987	<u>Stephen Foster</u>
RR-2988	<u>Stephen Fowler</u>
RR-2989	<u>Mr Stephen George Popely</u>
RR-2990	<u>Stephen H. Turner</u>
RR-2991	<u>Stephen Hennessey</u>
RR-2992	<u>Stephen Holland</u>
RR-2993	<u>Stephen Hughes</u>
RR-2994	<u>Stephen Ives</u>
RR-2995	<u>Stephen Kelly</u>
RR-2996	<u>Stephen Konetske</u>
RR-2997	<u>Stephen Low</u>
RR-2998	<u>Stephen Moores</u>
RR-2999	<u>Stephen Pearson</u>
RR-3000	<u>Stephen Porter</u>
RR-3001	<u>Stephen Powell</u>
RR-3002	<u>Stephen Rawsthorne</u>
RR-3003	<u>Stephen Sowden</u>
RR-3004	<u>Stephen Spedding</u>
RR-3005	<u>Stephine Mcdonald</u>
RR-3006	<u>Steria Ltd</u>
RR-3007	<u>Steve Birch</u>
RR-3008	<u>Steve Fitzgerald</u>
RR-3009	<u>Steve Pennington</u>
RR-3010	<u>Steve Radcliffe</u>
RR-3011	<u>Steven Atherton</u>
RR-3012	<u>Steven Brown</u>
RR-3013	<u>Steven Duffey</u>
RR-3014	<u>Steven Gibson</u>
RR-3015	<u>Steven Humphries</u>
RR-3016	<u>Steven Jameson</u>
RR-3017	<u>Steven Kenny</u>
RR-3018	<u>Steven Louis</u>
RR-3019	<u>Steven McBrinn</u>
RR-3020	<u>Steven Norris</u>
RR-3021	<u>Steven Rimmer</u>
RR-3022	<u>Steven Roberts</u>
RR-3023	<u>Steven Roughley</u>
RR-3024	<u>Steven Storey</u>
RR-3025	<u>Mr Steven Wainwright</u>
RR-3026	<u>Steven Watson</u>
RR-3027	<u>Steven William Keown</u>
RR-3028	<u>Steven Williams</u>
RR-3029	<u>Stewart Welsh</u>



RR-3030	<u>Stuart Ellis</u>
RR-3031	<u>Stuart Hunt</u>
RR-3032	<u>Stuart hunt</u>
RR-3033	<u>Stuart Joel-Welsh</u>
RR-3034	<u>Stuart Lawton</u>
RR-3035	<u>Stuart Martin</u>
RR-3036	<u>Stuart Singleton</u>
RR-3037	<u>Sue Ball</u>
RR-3038	<u>Sue Davison</u>
RR-3039	<u>Sue Hillman</u>
RR-3040	<u>Sue Orr</u>
RR-3041	<u>Sue Roughley</u>
RR-3042	<u>Summer McCann-Jones</u>
RR-3043	<u>Summer Rimmer Flynn</u>
RR-3044	<u>Susan A Evans</u>
RR-3045	<u>Susan Ackerley</u>
RR-3046	<u>Susan Andrews</u>
RR-3047	<u>Mrs Susan Birch</u>
RR-3048	<u>Susan Butterworth</u>
RR-3049	<u>Susan Daw</u>
RR-3050	<u>Mrs Susan Daw</u>
RR-3051	<u>Susan Dearden</u>
RR-3052	<u>Miss Susan Dickinson</u>
RR-3053	<u>Susan Ealey</u>
RR-3054	<u>Susan Fenney</u>
RR-3055	<u>Susan Gregson</u>
RR-3056	<u>Mrs Susan Heather Sharpe</u>
RR-3057	<u>Susan Henwood</u>
RR-3058	<u>Susan Holtom</u>
RR-3059	<u>Mrs Susan Kenny</u>
RR-3060	<u>Susan Janet Loye</u>
RR-3061	<u>Susan Jones</u>
RR-3062	<u>Susan Jones</u>
RR-3063	<u>Susan Kirkbride</u>
RR-3064	<u>Susan Lamb</u>
RR-3065	<u>Susan Langdon</u>
RR-3066	<u>Susan Mureanti</u>
RR-3067	<u>Susan Noone</u>
RR-3068	<u>Susan Pennington</u>
RR-3069	<u>Miss Susan Phillips</u>
RR-3070	<u>Susan Quirk</u>
RR-3071	<u>Susan Read</u>
RR-3072	<u>Susan Slater</u>
RR-3073	<u>Susan Stewart</u>
RR-3074	<u>Susan Tittle</u>
RR-3075	<u>Susan Valentine</u>
RR-3076	<u>Susan Whittington</u>
RR-3077	<u>Susan-Ann Trenwith</u>
RR-3078	<u>Suzanne Crompton</u>
RR-3079	<u>Suzanne Flynn</u>

RR-3080	<u>Suzanne Fyles</u>
RR-3081	<u>Suzanne Johannessen</u>
RR-3082	<u>Suzanne Johnson</u>
RR-3083	<u>Suzanne Jones</u>
RR-3084	<u>Suzanne Knowles</u>
RR-3085	<u>Suzanne Moor</u>
RR-3086	<u>Suzanne O'Loughlin</u>
RR-3087	<u>Mrs Suzanne Reed</u>
RR-3088	<u>Sylvia Fitzpatrick</u>
RR-3089	<u>Sylvia Green</u>
RR-3090	<u>Sylwia Wrobel</u>
RR-3091	<u>Mrs T Baryoun</u>
RR-3092	<u>Mr T Culshaw</u>
RR-3093	<u>Miss T Hibbott</u>
RR-3094	<u>Mr T Preston</u>
RR-3095	<u>Mrs T Rotheram</u>
RR-3096	<u>Talia McKinney</u>
RR-3097	<u>Tammi Theis</u>
RR-3098	<u>Miss Tammy Castley</u>
RR-3099	<u>Tanya Roberts</u>
RR-3100	<u>Mrs Tara Goodwin-Forshaw</u>
RR-3101	<u>Taryn Houston</u>
RR-3102	<u>Tata Chemicals Europe</u>
RR-3103	<u>Taylor Anthony Edwards</u>
RR-3104	<u>Taylor Neale</u>
RR-3105	<u>Ted Rotheram</u>
RR-3106	<u>Teddy Lakin</u>
RR-3107	<u>Teegan Leigh Cooper</u>
RR-3108	<u>Tegwyn Hughes</u>
RR-3109	<u>Terence James Devine</u>
RR-3110	<u>Terence Johnston</u>
RR-3111	<u>Teresa Sharkey</u>
RR-3112	<u>Teresa Sharkey</u>
RR-3113	<u>Mrs Teresa Taylor</u>
RR-3114	<u>Terianne Hunter</u>
RR-3115	<u>Terrell Cooley</u>
RR-3116	<u>Terry Maxwell</u>
RR-3117	<u>Terry Procter</u>
RR-3118	<u>The Business Advice Centre</u>
RR-3119	<u>The Campaign to Protect Rural England Lancashire Branch</u>
RR-3120	<u>The Coach House</u>
RR-3121	<u>The Coach House Bar and Restaurant</u>
RR-3122	<u>The Coal Authority</u>
RR-3123	<u>The Derby Arms</u>
RR-3124	<u>The Earl of Derby</u>
RR-3125	<u>The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester &amp; North Merseyside</u>
RR-3126	<u>Therese Stringman</u>
RR-3127	<u>Thomas A Leah</u>
RR-3128	<u>Thomas Corrigan</u>
RR-3129	<u>Thomas David Naylor</u>

RR-3130	<u>Thomas David Naylor</u>
RR-3131	<u>Thomas Denn</u>
RR-3132	<u>Thomas Donnelly</u>
RR-3133	<u>Thomas Foley</u>
RR-3134	<u>Thomas Gandy</u>
RR-3135	<u>Thomas Hennessey</u>
RR-3136	<u>Thomas Holland</u>
RR-3137	<u>Thomas Johannessen</u>
RR-3138	<u>Thomas Johnstone</u>
RR-3139	<u>Thomas Ralfs</u>
RR-3140	<u>Tianna McCann-jones</u>
RR-3141	<u>Tim Starkey</u>
RR-3142	<u>Tina Bowles</u>
RR-3143	<u>Tina Vos</u>
RR-3144	<u>Toby Horne</u>
RR-3145	<u>Tom Clegg</u>
RR-3146	<u>Tom Fitzgerald</u>
RR-3147	<u>Tom Fowler</u>
RR-3148	<u>Tom Holland</u>
RR-3149	<u>Tom Ocallaghan</u>
RR-3150	<u>Mr Tomasz Bich</u>
RR-3151	<u>Tommy Cartwright</u>
RR-3152	<u>Toni Nolan-Edwards</u>
RR-3153	<u>Toni Read</u>
RR-3154	<u>Tony Harford</u>
RR-3155	<u>Tony McKenzie</u>
RR-3156	<u>Tony Nelson</u>
RR-3157	<u>Tony Quayle</u>
RR-3158	<u>Tow and Stow Ltd</u>
RR-3159	<u>Trace Currall</u>
RR-3160	<u>Mrs Tracie Anderson Clough</u>
RR-3161	<u>Tracey Hale</u>
RR-3162	<u>Tracey Patton</u>
RR-3163	<u>Tracey Phillips</u>
RR-3164	<u>Tracey Riley</u>
RR-3165	<u>Tracey Ryan</u>
RR-3166	<u>Tracey Simpson</u>
RR-3167	<u>Ms Tracey Taylor</u>
RR-3168	<u>Tracey Weedall</u>
RR-3169	<u>Tracy Connor</u>
RR-3170	<u>Tracy M'Kinnell</u>
RR-3171	<u>Tracy Nesbitt</u>
RR-3172	<u>Tracy Roberts</u>
RR-3173	<u>Miss Tracy Watson</u>
RR-3174	<u>Tracy Watson</u>
RR-3175	<u>Trak-Rap Ltd</u>
RR-3176	<u>Mr Trevor Hilton</u>
RR-3177	<u>Trevor Griffith</u>
RR-3178	<u>Tricia Walker</u>
RR-3179	<u>Trinity CE/Methodist Primary School</u>

RR-3180	<u>Tudor Balan</u>
RR-3181	<u>Turbo Motorsports</u>
RR-3182	<u>UK Environmental Services (NW) Ltd</u>
RR-3183	<u>Urban Hair</u>
RR-3184	<u>Mr V Floren</u>
RR-3185	<u>V Wohler</u>
RR-3186	<u>Valarie Hogarth</u>
RR-3187	<u>Valerie Jean Watson</u>
RR-3188	<u>Valerie Morris</u>
RR-3189	<u>Valerie Rainford</u>
RR-3190	<u>Vanessa Newton</u>
RR-3191	<u>Vergilio Domingos Daluz</u>
RR-3192	<u>Mrs Veronica Edmond</u>
RR-3193	<u>Vernon Hill</u>
RR-3194	<u>Vic Thomas Family Butcher</u>
RR-3195	<u>Vicci Neilson</u>
RR-3196	<u>Vicki Langdon</u>
RR-3197	<u>Vicki Thomas</u>
RR-3198	<u>Vickie Dainty</u>
RR-3199	<u>Vickie Vickers</u>
RR-3200	<u>Vicky Fowell</u>
RR-3201	<u>Vicky Heyes</u>
RR-3202	<u>Vicky Lain</u>
RR-3203	<u>Vicky Lindblad</u>
RR-3204	<u>Vicky Robin</u>
RR-3205	<u>Vicky Shanley</u>
RR-3206	<u>Vicky Shearer</u>
RR-3207	<u>Vicky Tam</u>
RR-3208	<u>Vicky Wright</u>
RR-3209	<u>Victor Brown</u>
RR-3210	<u>Victoria Belle</u>
RR-3211	<u>Victoria Dickinson</u>
RR-3212	<u>Victoria Fitzsimons</u>
RR-3213	<u>Miss Victoria Foster</u>
RR-3214	<u>Victoria h Howard</u>
RR-3215	<u>Victoria Hotel Pub</u>
RR-3216	<u>Victoria O'Connor-Green</u>
RR-3217	<u>Victoria Smith</u>
RR-3218	<u>Victoria Smith</u>
RR-3219	<u>Victoria Wilkinson</u>
RR-3220	<u>Vincent John Lucker</u>
RR-3221	<u>Vincent Quirk</u>
RR-3222	<u>Vinicehalley Domingoes Daluz</u>
RR-3223	<u>Virosafe Ltd</u>
RR-3224	<u>Vivian Nolan</u>
RR-3225	<u>W. G. Hale</u>
RR-3226	<u>Mr W Sanderson</u>
RR-3227	<u>Wade Bean</u>
RR-3228	<u>Walkers snack foods</u>
RR-3229	<u>Warren Kelly</u>

RR-3230	<u>Warren Ryan</u>
RR-3231	<u>wash farm</u>
RR-3232	<u>Mrs Watsana Traynor</u>
RR-3233	<u>Wendy Brown</u>
RR-3234	<u>Wendy Hill</u>
RR-3235	<u>Wendy Hudson</u>
RR-3236	<u>West Lancashire Borough Council</u>
RR-3237	<u>west lancashire poultry ltd</u>
RR-3238	<u>West lances training and learning centre Vic</u>
RR-3239	<u>West Lancs Colts Junior Football Team</u>
RR-3240	<u>West Lancs Training and Learning Centre CIC</u>
RR-3241	<u>Westgate Tyres</u>
RR-3242	<u>Westhead Lathom St James Primary School</u>
RR-3243	<u>Westhead Lathom St James School PTFA</u>
RR-3244	<u>White House Kennels</u>
RR-3245	<u>Whitemoss Landfill LTD</u>
RR-3246	<u>Whitney Shaw</u>
RR-3247	<u>William Cookson</u>
RR-3248	<u>William Doherty</u>
RR-3249	<u>William Fitzgerald</u>
RR-3250	<u>William Frank Brown</u>
RR-3251	<u>Mr William Gardiner</u>
RR-3252	<u>William Gilmour</u>
RR-3253	<u>William Hind</u>
RR-3254	<u>Mr William Jones</u>
RR-3255	<u>Mr William McBrinn</u>
RR-3256	<u>William Morris</u>
RR-3257	<u>William Pye</u>
RR-3258	<u>William Wall</u>
RR-3259	<u>Winifred Whelby</u>
RR-3260	<u>WLK Angling</u>
RR-3261	<u>Wrightington Parish Council</u>
RR-3262	<u>Wrights Accountancy Service Ltd</u>
RR-3263	<u>Young Peoples Service</u>
RR-3264	<u>Yvonne Critchley</u>
RR-3265	<u>Yvonne Gagen</u>
RR-3266	<u>Yvonne Hill</u>
RR-3267	<u>Mrs Yvonne L Thomas</u>
RR-3268	<u>Yvonne Marsh</u>
RR-3269	<u>Yvonne Riley</u>
RR-3270	<u>Zac Mccrudden</u>
RR-3271	<u>Zak Pearson</u>
RR-3272	<u>Zoe Corteen</u>
RR-3273	<u>Zoe Fox</u>
RR-3274	<u>Zoe Hilton</u>
RR-3275	<u>Master Z Cartwright</u>
RR-3276	<u>Master Z Wallace</u>
RR-3277	<u>Zack McDonald</u>
RR-3278	<u>Miss Zoe Pinnington</u>
RR-3279	<u>Zoe Rutland</u>

RR-3280

Zoe Smith

**APPENDIX 2**  
**EVENTS IN THE EXAMINATION**

Item	Matters	Due Dates
1	Preliminary Meeting	Wednesday 21 May 2014
2	Issue by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examination timetable</li> <li>• ExA first written questions</li> </ul>	Friday 30 May 2014
3	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on relevant representations (RRs)</li> <li>• Summaries of all RRs exceeding 1500 words</li> <li>• Written representations (WRs) by all interested parties</li> <li>• Summaries of all WRs exceeding 1500 words</li> <li>• Local impact reports (LIR) from local authorities</li> <li>• Preliminary Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)</li> <li>• Responses to ExA's first written questions</li> <li>• Notification of wish to make oral representations at an open floor hearing</li> <li>• Notification of wish to make oral representations at the issue specific hearing on the Environment</li> <li>• Notification of wish to speak at a compulsory acquisition hearing</li> <li>• Notification of wish to make oral representations at the issue specific hearing on the draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</li> <li>• Notification of wish to attend the accompanied site inspection</li> <li>• Comments on the draft itinerary for the accompanied site inspection</li> </ul>	Thursday 26 June 2014
4	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on WRs and responses to comments on RRs</li> <li>• Comments on Local Impact Reports</li> <li>• Comments on responses to ExA's first written questions</li> <li>• Comments on any submitted preliminary SoCG</li> </ul>	Tuesday 8 July 2014
5	Issue by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice of the cancelation of Hearings and Site Visit</li> <li>• Notice of changes to the timetable</li> </ul>	Thursday 9 July 2014



6	<p>Issue by the Secretary of State of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice of a change to the composition of the ExA</li> </ul>	Thursday 9 July 2014
7	<p>First open floor hearing</p> <p>Digmoor Community Centre, Birleywood, Skelmersdale WN8 9HR</p> <p>start time: 6.30pm</p>	Thursday 17 July 2014
8	<p>Second open floor hearing</p> <p>Digmoor Community Centre, Birleywood, Skelmersdale WN8 9HR</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p>	Friday 18 July 2014
9	<p>Issue by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice of a second round of questions</li> <li>• Notice of changes to the timetable</li> </ul>	Thursday 24 July 2014
10	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written summaries of submissions made at the open floor hearings</li> <li>• Response to comments on preliminary SoCG</li> <li>• SoCG on draft DCO articles and requirements</li> </ul>	Friday 25 July 2014
11	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses to ExA's second written questions</li> <li>• Comments on the applicant's core documents list</li> </ul>	Tuesday 2 September 2014
11	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on responses to ExA's second written questions</li> <li>• Comments on SoCG on draft DCO articles and requirements</li> </ul>	Wednesday 16 September 2014
12	<p>Issue by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice of a third open floor hearing</li> <li>• Requests for information</li> </ul>	Thursday 17 September 2014

13	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant's revised draft DCO</li> <li>• Response to comments on SoCG on draft DCO and requirements</li> <li>• Notification of wish to attend the accompanied site inspection</li> <li>• Notification of wish to make oral representations at a third open floor hearing on 23 October 2014</li> <li>• Notification of wish to make oral representations at the issue specific hearing on Policy and Need</li> <li>• Notification of wish to make oral representations at the issue specific hearing on the Environment</li> </ul>	Tuesday 23 September 2014
14	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents referred to in submissions</li> <li>• Navigation Documents</li> </ul>	Tuesday 30 September 2014
15	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on applicant's revised draft DCO</li> <li>• Comments on Documents referred to in submissions</li> <li>• Statements of Common Ground</li> <li>• Responses to requests for information issued on 17 September 2014</li> </ul>	Tuesday 7 October 2014
16	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on responses to requests for information issued on 17 September 2014</li> </ul>	Tuesday 14 October 2014
17	<p>Accompanied site inspection</p> <p>Start Location: West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p>	Wednesday 15 October 2014
18	<p>Issue specific hearing on Policy and Need</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p>	Thursday 16 October 2014

19	<p>Issue specific hearing on the Environment</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: Immediately following the Issue specific hearing on Policy and Need</p>	Thursday 16 October 2014
20	<p>Issue specific hearing on the Environment (cont'd)</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p> <p>Adjourned by notice at the hearing to 10.00am on 22 October 2014 at the West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p>	Friday 17 October 2014
21	<p>Issue specific hearing on the Environment (cont'd)</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p>	Wednesday 22 October 2014
22	<p>Issue specific hearing on the revised draft DCO (including the requirements and any S106 matters)</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p> <p>Adjourned by notice at the hearing to immediately follow the resumed Issue Specific Hearing on the Environment on 22 October 2014 at the West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p>	Wednesday 22 October 2014
23	<p>Compulsory acquisition (CA) hearing</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG</p> <p>start time: Immediately following the Issue specific hearing on the revised draft DCO</p>	Wednesday 22 October 2014
24	<p>Third open floor hearing</p> <p>Digmoor Community Centre, Birleywood, Skelmersdale WN8 9HR</p> <p>start time: 10.00am</p>	Thursday 23 October 2014

25	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written summaries of submissions made at hearings</li> <li>• Final revised draft DCO from the applicant</li> </ul>	Thursday 30 October 2014
26	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on the final revised draft DCO</li> <li>• Comments on written summaries of submissions made at hearings</li> </ul>	Thursday 6 November 2014
27	<p>Issue by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests for information</li> </ul>	Thursday 6 November 2014
28	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses to requests for information issued on 6 November 2014</li> </ul>	Wednesday 12 November 2014
29	<p>Issue by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ExA draft DCO</li> </ul>	Wednesday 12 November 2014
30	<p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses to ExA's draft DCO</li> <li>• Comments on responses to requests for information issued on 6 November 2014</li> <li>• Any outstanding comments on documents submitted before that date</li> </ul>	Monday 17 November 2014
31	<p><b>Close of the examination</b></p>	Friday 21 November 2014
32	<p>Issue by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notice that they have completed their examination</li> </ul>	Monday 24 November 2014

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

a	Article, as in a numbered article in the DCO
AoD	Above Ordnance Datum
AoS	Appraisal of Sustainability
App	Appendix
ARROW	Action to Reduce and Recycle Our Waste
BHS	Biological Heritage Site
CA	Compulsory Acquisition (of land or rights)
CLC	Community Liaison Committee
CPRE	Council for the Protection of Rural England
DCO	Development Consent Order
EA	Environment Agency
EP	Environmental Permit
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
FRQ	The Examining Authority's First Round of Written Questions (DEC-G-05, Annex C)
GB	Green Belt
Ha	Hectares
HgRA	Hydrogeological Risk Assessment
HPA	Health Protection Agency
IP	Interested Parties (as defined in S102 of the Planning Act 2008)
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
LCA	Landscape Character Area
LCC	Lancashire County Council
LD	Landfill Directive
LIR	Local Impact Report
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
MWCS	The Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework Core Strategy
MWLP	The Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Allocation and Development Management Policies
NATS	National Air Traffic Services
NE	Natural England
NERC	Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPW	National Planning Policy for Waste
NPS	National Policy Statement (unless otherwise specified, the National Policy Statement for Hazardous Waste, June 2013)
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OFH	Open Floor Hearing
OPRA	Operational Risk Assessment
PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
PHE	Public Health England
r	Requirement, as in a numbered requirement in the DCO
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State

SPA	Special Protection Area
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
SRQ	The Examining Authority's Second Round of Written Questions (DEC-G-07, Annex A)
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage System
tpa	Tonnes per annum
UK	United Kingdom
UU	Unilateral Undertaking
WFD	Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy
WHO	World Health Organisation
WLBC	West Lancashire Borough Council
WLL	Whitemoss Landfill Limited
WLLP	The West Lancashire Borough Local Plan 2012-2027

**APPENDIX 4**

**RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**



**2015 No.**

**INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING**

**The White Moss Landfill Order 201[ ]**

*Made* - - - - - \*\*\*

*Coming into force* - - - - - \*\*\*

**CONTENTS**

**PART 1  
GENERAL**

1. Citation and commencement
2. Interpretation

**PART 2  
PRINCIPAL POWERS**

3. Development consent etc. granted by the Order
4. Maintenance of authorised project
5. Benefit of Order
6. Consent to transfer benefit of Order
7. Procedure in relation to approvals etc. under requirements
8. Power to deviate

**PART 3  
SUPPLEMENTAL POWERS**

9. Discharge of water
10. Authority to survey and investigate the land
11. Felling or lopping of trees

**PART 4  
POWERS OF ACQUISITION**

12. Compulsory acquisition of land
13. Compulsory acquisition of land – incorporation of the mineral code
14. Time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily
15. Compulsory acquisition of rights
16. Private rights of way
17. Application of the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981

PART 5  
MISCELLANEOUS

18. Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance
19. Application of landlord and tenant law
20. Certification of plans etc.
21. Arbitration

---

SCHEDULE 1 — AUTHORISED PROJECT  
SCHEDULE 2 — REQUIREMENTS

An application has been made to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009<sup>(a)</sup> for an order under sections 37, 115, 117, 120 and 122 of the Planning Act 2008<sup>(b)</sup>. The Secretary of State, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 114 of the Planning Act 2008, makes the following Order:

PART 1  
GENERAL

**Citation and commencement**

1. This Order may be cited as the White Moss Landfill Order [2015] and comes into force on [Date of issue].

**Interpretation**

2.—(1) In this Order—

“1961 Act” means the Land Compensation Act 1961<sup>(c)</sup>;

“1965 Act” means the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965<sup>(d)</sup>;

“1980 Act” means the Highways Act 1980<sup>(e)</sup>;

- 
- (a) SI 2009/2264 (as amended)
- (b) 2008 C.29. (as amended)
- (c) 1961 c.33. (as amended)
- (d) 1965 c.56. Section 3 was amended by section 70 of, and paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 15 to, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (c.34). Section 4 was amended by Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the Housing (Consequential Provisions) Act 1985 (c.71). Section 5 was amended by sections 67 and 80 of, and Part 2 of Schedule 18 to, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (c.34). Subsection (1) of section 11 and sections 3, 31 and 32 were amended by section 34(1) of, and Schedule 4 to, the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 (c.67) and by section 14 of, and paragraph 12(1) of Schedule 5 to, the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2006 (2006 No.1). Section 12 was amended by section 56(2) of, and Part 1 to Schedule 9 to, the Courts Act 1971 (c.23). Section 13 was amended by section 139 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 (c.15). Section 20 was amended by section 70 of, and paragraph 14 of Schedule 15 to, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (c.34). Sections 9, 25 and 29 were amended by the Statute Law (Repeals) Act 1973 (c.39). Section 31 was also amended by section 70 of, and paragraph 19 of Schedule 15 to, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (c.34) and by section 14 of, and paragraph 12(2) of Schedule 5 to, the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2006 (2006 No.1). There are other amendments to the 1965 Act which are not relevant to this Order.
- (e) 1980 c.66. Section 1(1) was amended by section 21(2) of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (c.22); sections 1(2), 1(3) and 1(4) were amended by section 8 of, and paragraph (1) of Schedule 4 to, the Local Government Act 1985 (c.51); section 1(2A) was inserted, and section 1(3) was amended, by section 259 (1), (2) and (3) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (c.29); sections 1(3A) and 1(5) were inserted by section 22(1) of, and paragraph 1 of Schedule 7 to, the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994 (c.19). Section 36(2) was amended by section 4(1) of, and paragraphs 47(a) and (b) of Schedule 2 to, the Housing (Consequential Provisions) Act 1985 (c.71), by S.I. 2006/1177, by section 4 of, and paragraph

“1990 Act” means the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(a);

“1991 Act” means the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991(b);

“2008 Act” means the Planning Act 2008(c);

“ancillary works” means the ancillary works described in Schedule 1 (authorised project) and any other works authorised by the Order and which are not development within the meaning of section 32 of the 2008 Act;

“application land” means the land on which the authorised project may take place and shown edged red on the application plan;

“application plan” means plan reference WS010003/WLL/PLANS/APPLICATION BOUNDARY indicating the extent of the application land;

“authorised development” means the development and associated development described in Schedule 1 (authorised project) and any other development authorised by this Order, which is development within the meaning of section 32 of the 2008 Act;

“authorised project” means the authorised development and the ancillary works authorised by this Order;

“book of reference” means the book of reference certified by the decision-maker as the book of reference for the purposes of this Order with reference WS010003/WLL/BOR “building” includes any structure or erection or any part of a building, structure or erection;

“compulsory acquisition notice” means a notice served in accordance with section 134 of the 2008 Act;

“county planning authority” means Lancashire County Council;

“the environmental statement” means the document submitted with the application as the environmental statement;

“highway” and “highway authority” have the same meaning as in the 1980 Act;

“land plan” means the plan certified as the land plan by the decision-maker for the purposes of this Order with reference WS010003/WLL/PLANS/LAND;

“limits of deviation” means the limits of deviation referred to in article 8;

“maintain” includes maintain, inspect, repair, remove, clear, refurbish, reconstruct, replace and improve, but not so as to vary from the description of the authorised project in Schedule 1, and not such as to give rise to any significant adverse environmental effects that have not been assessed in the environmental statement or any supplementary information and updated environmental statement supplied pursuant to The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009(d), and “maintained” and “maintenance” are to be construed accordingly;

“Order land” means the land shown on the land plan which is in the limits of the land to be acquired and described in the book of reference;

“Order limits” means the limits shown on the works plan within which the authorised project may be carried out;

---

45(3) of Schedule 2 to, the Planning (Consequential Provisions) Act 1990 (c.11), by section 64(1) (2) and (3) of the Transport and Works Act (c.42) and by section 57 of, and paragraph 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 6 to, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (c.37); section 36(3A) was inserted by section 64(4) of the Transport and Works Act 1992 and was amended by S.I. 2006/1177; section 36(6) was amended by section 8 of, and paragraph 7 of Schedule 4 to, the Local Government Act 1985 (c.51); and section 36(7) was inserted by section 22(1) of, and paragraph 4 of Schedule 7 to, the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994 (c.19). Section 329 was amended by section 112(4) of, and Schedule 18 to, the Electricity Act 1989 (c.29) and by section 190(3) of, and Part 1 of Schedule 27 to, the Water Act 1989 (c.15). There are other amendments to the 1980 Act which are not relevant to this Order.

- (a) 1990 c.8. section 206(1) was amended by section 192(8) of, and paragraphs 7 and 11 of Schedule 8 to, the Planning Act 2008 (c.29) (date in force to be appointed see section 241(3), (4)(a), (c) of the 2008 Act). There are other amendments to the 1990 Act which are not relevant to this Order.
- (b) 1991 c.22. Section 48(3A) was inserted by section 124 of the Local Transport Act 2008 (c.26). Sections 79(4), 80(4), and 83(4) were amended by section 40 of, and Schedule 1 to, the Traffic Management Act 2004 (c.18).
- (c) 2008 c.29. (as amended)
- (d) SI 2009/2263 (as amended)

“owner” in relation to land, has the same meaning as in section 7 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981(a);

“street” means a street within the meaning of section 48 of the 1991 Act, together with land on the verge of a street or between two carriageways, and includes part of a street;

“street authority” in relation to a street, has the same meaning as in Part 3 of the 1991 Act;

“undertaker” means in relation to any provision of this Order, Whitemoss Landfill Limited and its successors in title, as well as any party to whom the benefit of the Order has been transferred pursuant to article 6;

“watercourse” includes all rivers, streams, ditches, drains, canals, cuts, culverts, dykes, sluices, sewers and passages through which water flows except a public sewer or drain;

“works plan” means the plan certified as the works plan by the decision-maker for the purposes of this Order with reference WS010003/WLL/PLANS/WORKS.

(2) References in this Order to rights over land include references to rights to do or to place and maintain, anything in, on or under land or in the air-space above its surface.

(3) All distances, directions and lengths referred to in this Order are approximate and distances between points on a work comprised in the authorised project are to be taken to be measured along that work.

## PART 2 PRINCIPAL POWERS

### **Development consent etc. granted by the Order**

**3.** Subject to the provisions of this Order and to the requirements in Schedule 2 attached to this Order the undertaker is granted—

- (1) development consent for the authorised development; and
- (2) consent for the ancillary works,

to be carried out within the Order limits.

### **Maintenance of authorised project**

**4.** The undertaker may at any time maintain the authorised project, except to the extent that this Order or an agreement made under this Order, provides otherwise.

### **Benefit of Order**

**5.** The provisions of this Order have effect solely for the benefit of the undertaker (save in circumstances where the benefit of the Order has been transferred to a relevant third party in accordance with the terms of article 6 (Consent to transfer benefit of Order), in which case the benefit extends to that third party).

### **Consent to transfer benefit of Order**

**6.—**(1) The undertaker may, with the consent of the Secretary of State—

- (a) transfer to another person (“the transferee”) any or all of the benefit of the provisions of this Order and such related statutory rights as may be agreed between the undertaker and the transferee; or

---

(a) 1981 c.67. Section 7 was amended by section 70 of, and paragraph 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 15 to, the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (c.34). There are other amendments to the 1981 Act which are not relevant to this Order.

- (b) grant to another person (“the lessee”) for a period agreed between the undertaker and the lessee any or all of the benefit of the provisions of this Order and such related statutory rights as may be so agreed.

(2) Where an agreement has been made in accordance with paragraph (1) references in this Order to the undertaker, except in paragraph (3), include references to the transferee or the lessee.

(3) The exercise by a person of any benefits or rights conferred in accordance with any transfer or grant under paragraph (1) is subject to the same restrictions, liabilities and obligations as would apply under this Order if those benefits or rights were exercised by the undertaker.

### **Procedure in relation to approvals etc. under requirements**

7.—(1) Where an application is made to the county planning authority for any consent, agreement or approval required by a requirement, the following provisions apply, so far as they relate to a consent, agreement or approval of a local planning authority required by a condition imposed on a grant of planning permission, as if the requirement was a condition imposed on the grant of planning permission—

- (a) sections 78 and 79 of the 1990 Act (right of appeal in relation to planning decisions); and
- (b) subject to (c) below, any orders, rules or regulations which make provision in relation to a consent, agreement or approval of a local planning authority required by a condition imposed on the grant of planning permission; and
- (c) The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 apply to applications for approval of any matter in pursuance of any requirement imposed by this Order.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), a provision relates to a consent, agreement or approval of a local planning authority required by a condition imposed on a grant of planning permission in so far as it makes provision in relation to an application for such a consent, agreement or approval, or the grant or refusal of such an application, or a failure to give notice of a decision on such an application.

### **Power to deviate**

8. The undertaker may deviate from the lines or situations shown on the works plan and the elevation plans to the extent of the limits of deviation shown on those plans.

## **PART 3**

### **SUPPLEMENTAL POWERS**

#### **Discharge of water**

9.—(1) The undertaker may use any watercourse or any public sewer or drain for the drainage of water in connection with the carrying out or maintenance of the authorised project and for that purpose may lay down, take up and alter pipes and may, on any land within the Order limits, make openings into, and connections with, the watercourse, public sewer or drain.

(2) Any dispute arising from the making of connections to or the use of a public sewer or drain by the undertaker pursuant to paragraph (1) is to be determined as if it were a dispute under section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991(a) (right to communicate with public sewers).

(3) The undertaker must not discharge any water into any watercourse, public sewer or drain except with the consent of the person to whom it belongs; and such consent may be given subject

---

(a) 1991 c.56. Section 106 was amended by the Water Act 2003 (c.37), sections 36(2) and 99. There are other amendments to section 106 which are not relevant to this Order.

to such terms and conditions as that person may reasonably impose, but is not to be unreasonably withheld.

- (4) The undertaker must not make any opening into any public sewer or drain except—
  - (a) in accordance with plans approved by the person to whom the sewer or drain belongs, but such approval is not to be unreasonably withheld; and
  - (b) where that person has been given the opportunity to supervise the making of the opening.
- (5) The undertaker must not, in carrying out or maintaining works pursuant to this article, damage or interfere with the bed or banks of any watercourse forming part of a main river.
- (6) The undertaker must take such steps as are reasonably practicable to secure that any water discharged into a watercourse or public sewer or drain pursuant to this article is as free as may be practicable from gravel, soil or other solid substance, oil or matter in suspension.
- (7) This article does not authorise the entry into controlled waters of any matter whose entry or discharge into controlled waters is prohibited by Regulation 12 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010(a).
- (8) In this article—
  - (a) “public sewer or drain” means a sewer or drain which belongs to the Homes and Communities Agency, the Environment Agency, an internal drainage board, a joint planning board, a local authority, a sewerage undertaker; and
  - (b) other expressions, excluding watercourse, used both in this article and in the Water Resources Act 1991 have the same meaning as in that Act.

#### **Authority to survey and investigate the land**

**10.**—(1) The undertaker may for the purposes of this Order enter on any land shown within the Order limits and—

- (a) survey or investigate the land;
- (b) without prejudice to the generality of sub-paragraph (a), make trial holes in such positions on the land as the undertaker thinks fit to investigate the nature of the surface layer and subsoil and remove soil samples;
- (c) without prejudice to the generality of sub-paragraph (a), carry out ecological or archaeological investigations on the land; and
- (d) place on, leave on and remove from the land apparatus for use in connection with the survey and investigation of the land and making of trial holes.

(2) No land may be entered or equipment placed or left on or removed from the land under paragraph (1) unless at least 14 days’ notice has been served on every owner and occupier of the land.

- (3) Any person entering land under this article on behalf of the undertaker—
  - (a) must, if so required on entering the land, produce written evidence of their authority to do so; and
  - (b) may take with them such vehicles and equipment as are necessary to carry out the survey or investigation or to make the trial holes.
- (4) No trial holes are to be made under this article—
  - (a) in land located within the highway boundary without the consent of the highway authority; or
  - (b) in a private street without the consent of the street authority,but such consent is not to be unreasonably withheld.

---

(a) SI 2010/675 (as amended).

(5) The undertaker must compensate the owners and occupiers of the land for any loss or damage arising by reason of the exercise of the authority conferred by this article, such compensation to be determined, in case of dispute, under Part 1 (determination of questions of disputed compensation) of the 1961 Act.

### **Felling or lopping of trees**

**11.**—(1) The undertaker may fell or lop any tree or shrub near any part of the authorised project, or cut back its roots, if it reasonably believes it to be necessary to do so to prevent the tree or shrub—

- (a) from obstructing or interfering with the construction, maintenance or operation of the authorised project or any apparatus used in connection with the authorised project; or
- (b) from constituting a danger to persons using the authorised project.

(2) In carrying out any activity authorised by paragraph (1), the undertaker must do no unnecessary damage to any tree or shrub and must pay compensation to any person for any loss or damage arising from such activity.

(3) Any dispute as to a person’s entitlement to compensation under paragraph (2), or as to the amount of compensation, is to be determined under Part 1 of the 1961 Act.

## **PART 4**

### **POWERS OF ACQUISITION**

#### **Compulsory acquisition of land**

**12.**—(1) The undertaker may acquire compulsorily so much of the Order land as is required for the authorised project, or to facilitate or which is incidental to it, including the land set out in Part 1 to the book of reference.

(2) From the date on which a compulsory acquisition notice under section 134(3) of the 2008 Act is served, or the date on which the Order land, or any part of it, is vested in the undertaker, whichever is the later, that land or that part of it which is vested (as the case may be) is discharged from all rights, trusts and incidents to which it was previously subject.

(3) Any person who suffers loss by the extinguishment or suspension of any private right of way under this article is entitled to compensation to be determined, in case of dispute, under Part 1 of the 1961 Act.

#### **Compulsory acquisition of land – incorporation of the mineral code**

**13.** Parts 2 and 3 of Schedule 2 to the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 (a) (minerals) are incorporated in this Order subject to the modifications that—

- (1) paragraph 8(3) of Schedule 3 is not incorporated; and
- (2) for “the acquiring authority” substitute “the undertaker”.

#### **Time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily**

**14.** After the end of the period of 5 years beginning on the day on which this Order is made—

- (1) no notice to treat is to be served under Part 1 of the 1965 Act; and

---

(a) 1981 c.67. Sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 was amended by section 67 of, and paragraph 27(3) of Schedule 9 to, the Coal Industry Act 1994 (c.21) and paragraph 8 of Part 3 of Schedule was amended by section 46 of the Criminal Justice Act 1982 (c.48). There are other amendments to the 1981 Act which are not relevant to this Order.

(2) no declaration is to be executed under section 4 of the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 as applied by article 15 (application of the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981)(a).

### **Compulsory acquisition of rights**

**15.**—(1) The undertaker may acquire compulsorily the existing rights described in Part 3 of the book of reference.

(2) Any person who suffers loss as a result of the extinguishment or suspension of any private right of way under this article is entitled to compensation to be determined, in case of dispute, under Part 1 of the 1961 Act.

### **Private rights of way**

**16.**—(1) Subject to the provisions of this article, all private rights of way over land subject to compulsory acquisition under this Order are extinguished—

- (a) as from the date of acquisition of the land by the undertaker, whether compulsorily or by agreement; or
- (b) on the date of entry on the land by the undertaker under section 11(1) of the 1965 Act (power of entry),

whichever is the earlier.

(2) Subject to the provisions of this article, all private rights of way over land owned by the undertaker which, being within the limits of land which may be acquired shown on the land plan, is required for the purposes of this Order are to be extinguished on the appropriation of the land by the undertaker for any of those purposes.

(3) Any person who suffers loss by the extinguishment or suspension of any private right of way under this article is entitled to compensation to be determined, in case of dispute, under Part 1 of the 1961 Act.

(4) This article does not apply in relation to any right of way to which section 138 of the 2008 Act (extinguishment of rights, and removal of apparatus, of statutory undertakers etc.) applies.

(5) Paragraphs (1) to (3) have effect subject to—

- (a) any notice given by the undertaker before—
  - (i) the completion of the acquisition of the land,
  - (ii) the undertaker's appropriation of it, or
  - (iii) the undertaker's entry onto it,

that any or all of those paragraphs are not to apply to any right of way specified in the notice; and

- (b) any agreement made at any time between the undertaker and the person in or to whom the right of way in question is vested or belongs.

(6) If any such agreement as is referred to in paragraph (6)(b)—

- (a) is made with a person in or to whom the right of way is vested or belongs; and
- (b) is expressed to have effect also for the benefit of those deriving title from or under that person,

it is to be effective in respect of the persons so deriving title, whether the title was derived before or after the making of the agreement.

---

(a) 1981 c.66. Sections 2 and 116 were amended by section 4 of, and paragraph 52 of Schedule 2 to, the Planning (Consequential Provisions) Act 1990 (c.11). There are other amendments to the 1981 Act which are not relevant to this Order.



## **Application of the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981**

**17.**—(1) The Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981(a) applies as if this Order were a compulsory purchase order.

(2) The Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981, as so applied, is to have effect with the following modifications.

(3) In section 3 (preliminary notices), for subsection (1) there is to be substituted—

“(1) Before making a declaration under section 4 with respect to any land which is subject to a compulsory purchase order, the acquiring authority shall include the particulars specified in subsection (3) in a notice which is—

- (a) given to every person with a relevant interest in the land with respect to which the declaration is to be made (other than a mortgagee who is not in possession); and
- (b) published in a local newspaper circulating in the area in which the land is situated.”.

(4) In that section, in subsection (2), for “(1)(b)” there is to be substituted “(1)” and after “given” there is to be inserted “and published”.

(5) In that section, for subsections (5) and (6) there is to be substituted—

“(5) For the purposes of this section, a person has a relevant interest in land if—

- (a) that person is for the time being entitled to dispose of the fee simple of the land, whether in possession or in reversion; or
- (b) that person holds, or is entitled to the rents and profits of, the land under a lease or agreement, the unexpired term of which exceeds one month.”.

(6) In section 5 (earliest date for execution of declaration)—

- (a) in subsection (1), after “publication” there is to be inserted “in a local newspaper circulating in the area in which the land is situated”; and
- (b) subsection (2) shall be omitted.

(7) In section 7 (constructive notice to treat), in subsection (1)(a), the words “(as modified by section 4 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981)” are to be omitted.

(8) References to the 1965 Act in the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 are to be construed as references to that Act as applied by section 125 of the 2008 Act to the compulsory acquisition of land under this Order.

## **PART 5**

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

#### **Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance**

**18.**—(1) Where proceedings are brought under section 82(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990(b) (summary proceedings by person aggrieved by statutory nuisance) in relation to a nuisance falling within paragraphs (a), (c), (d), (e), (fa), (fb), (g) or (ga) of section 79(1) of that Act no order may be made, and no fine may be imposed, under section 82(2) of that Act if—

- 
- (a) 1981 c. 66. Sections 2(3), 6(2) and 11(6) were amended by section 4 of, and paragraph 52 of Schedule 2 to, the Planning (Consequential Provisions) Act 1990 (c. 11). Section 15 was amended by sections 56 and 321(1) of, and Schedules 8 and 16 to, the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 (c. 17). Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 was amended by section 76 of, and Part 2 of Schedule 9 to, the Housing Act 1988 (c. 50); section 161(4) of, and Schedule 19 to, the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 (c. 28); and sections 56 and 321(1) of, and Schedule 8 to, the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008. Paragraph 3 of Schedule 2 was amended by section 76 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Housing Act 1988 and section 56 of, and Schedule 8 to, the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008. Paragraph 2 of Schedule 3 was repealed by section 277 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Inheritance Tax Act 1984 (c. 51). There are other amendments to the 1981 Act which are not relevant to this Order.
  - (b) 1990 c.43. There are amendments to this Act which are not relevant to this Order.

- (a) the defendant shows that the nuisance—
  - (i) relates to premises used by the undertaker for the purposes of or in connection with the construction or maintenance of the authorised project and that the nuisance is attributable to the carrying out of the authorised project in accordance with a notice served under section 60 (control of noise on construction site), or a consent given under section 61 (prior consent for work on construction site) or 65 (noise exceeding registered level), of the Control of Pollution Act 1974(a); or
  - (ii) is a consequence of the construction or maintenance of the authorised project and that it cannot reasonably be avoided; or
- (b) the defendant shows that the nuisance—
  - (i) relates to premises used by the undertaker for the purposes of or in connection with the use of the authorised project and that the nuisance is attributable to the use of the authorised project which is being used in accordance with a scheme of monitoring and control agreed with the county planning authority and Environment Agency as described in the requirements; or
  - (ii) is a consequence of the use of the authorised project and that it cannot reasonably be avoided.

(2) Section 61(9) (consent for work on construction site to include statement that it does not of itself constitute a defence to proceedings under section 82 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and section 65(8) of that Act (corresponding provision in relation to consent for registered noise level to be exceeded), is not to apply where the consent relates to the use of premises by the undertaker for the purposes of or in connection with the construction or maintenance of the authorised project.

#### **Application of landlord and tenant law**

**19.**—(1) This article applies to—

- (a) any agreement for leasing to any person the whole or any part of the authorised project or the right to operate the same; and
- (b) any agreement entered into by the undertaker with any person for the construction, maintenance, use or operation of the authorised project, or any part of it,

so far as any such agreement relates to the terms on which any land which is the subject of a lease granted by or under that agreement is to be provided for that person's use.

(2) No enactment or rule of law regulating the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants is to prejudice the operation of any agreement to which this article applies.

(3) Accordingly, no such enactment or rule of law is to apply in relation to the rights and obligations of the parties to any lease granted by or under any such agreement so as to—

- (a) exclude or in any respect modify any of the rights and obligations of those parties under the terms of the lease, whether with respect to the termination of the tenancy or any other matter;
- (b) confer or impose on any such party any right or obligation arising out of or connected with anything done or omitted on or in relation to land which is the subject of the lease, in addition to any such right or obligation provided for by the terms of the lease; or
- (c) restrict the enforcement (whether by action for damages or otherwise) by any party to the lease of any obligation of any other party under the lease.

---

(a) 1974 c.40. Sections 61(9) and 65(8) were amended by section 162 of, and paragraph 15 of Schedule 3 to, the Environmental Protection Act 1990, c.25. There are other amendments to the 1974 Act which are not relevant to this Order.

### **Certification of plans etc.**

**20.**—(1) The undertaker must, as soon as practicable after the making of this Order, submit to the decision-maker copies of the following plans and documents—

- (a) Sections 3 and 5 of the environmental statement, and Table ES1 amended October 2014;
- (b) The works plan (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/WORKS);
- (c) The application plan (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/APPLICATION BOUNDARY);
- (d) The land plan (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/LAND);
- (e) Proposed restoration contours (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION1);
- (f) Elevations of the stockpiles and bunds (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION2);
- (g) Elevations of the main infrastructure including buildings (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION3);
- (h) The site access from White Moss Road South (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION4);
- (i) The phasing drawings presented in the soils handling and management scheme (WS010003/WLL/SOIL HANDLING, amended September 2014);
- (j) Restoration proposals (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/SITE1);
- (k) Landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme; (WS010003/WLL/LANDSCAPING, amended September 2014);
- (l) Soils handling and management scheme; (WS010003/WLL/SOIL HANDLING, amended September 2014); and
- (m) Proposed basal levels (Drawing reference LE00173-222),

for certification that they are true copies of the documents referred to in this Order.

(2) A plan or document so certified is admissible in any proceedings as evidence of the contents of the document of which it is a copy.

### **Arbitration**

**21.** Any difference under any provision of this Order, unless otherwise provided for, is to be referred to and settled by a single arbitrator to be agreed between the parties or, failing agreement, to be appointed on application of either party (after giving notice in writing to the other) by the President of the Royal Town Planning Institute for the time being.

Signatory text

Address  
Date

*Name*  
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State  
Department

# SCHEDULE 1

## AUTHORISED PROJECT

A nationally significant infrastructure project as defined in Sections 14(1)(p) and 30 of the 2008 Act comprising:

(1) The construction of a new hazardous waste landfill facility for the disposal at a direct input rate of up to 150,000 tonnes per annum of hazardous waste in the area and phases identified on the works plan including the operation of a landfill gas collection and flare system, the operation of a leachate collection, treatment and lagoon system, the extraction, stockpiling and exportation of clay, mudstones, coal and other suitable materials including general fill materials and all other associated engineering works to construct the landfill phases.

(2) And in connection with such works and to the extent that they do not otherwise form part of any such work, further associated development and/or ancillary works shown on the plans referred to in the requirements at Schedule 2 including the:

- (a) continuation of the filling with hazardous waste of the existing landfill cells 2 and 3D as shown on Figure ES 4 of the environmental statement and the phasing drawings presented in the soils handling and management scheme (WS010003/WLL/SOIL HANDLING);
- (b) operation of the interceptor waste treatment facility for the treatment of waste;
- (c) site compound;
- (d) wheel cleaning facilities;
- (e) weighbridge and weighbridge office;
- (f) offices and laboratory;
- (g) mess facilities;
- (h) garage facility;
- (i) electrical switchroom;
- (j) leachate storage tanks;
- (k) fuel storage tank;
- (l) monitoring boreholes;
- (m) security cameras;
- (n) boundary fencing;
- (o) security/operational lighting;
- (p) car parking area;
- (q) internal site roads;
- (r) bunding; and
- (s) surface and foul water management system.

## SCHEDULE 2 REQUIREMENTS

### CONTENTS

1. Interpretation
2. Time limits for commencement
3. Commencement
4. Detailed approval
5. Time limits for cessation and restoration
6. Phasing of landfill and restoration activities
7. Restoration and aftercare
8. Japanese Knotweed
9. Ecology
10. European protected species
11. Archaeology
12. Treatment of mine shafts and depths of excavation
13. Water management and monitoring
14. Trans-Pennine Ethylene Pipe
15. Rainford Drain
16. External lighting and control of artificial light emissions
17. Temporary stockpiles
18. Soil audit
19. Control of noise and dust emissions during construction and operation
20. Blasting
21. Crushing and screening of aggregate
22. Disposal of waste
23. Quantities and types of waste
24. Topographical survey
25. Demolition
26. Vehicular access
27. Control of vehicular movements
28. Fencing
29. Wheel cleaning
30. Hours of operation
31. Display of Order on-site
32. Review of void consumption
33. Removal of plant and machinery
34. Requirement for written approval and amendments to approved details

#### **Interpretation**

**1. In this Schedule—**

“aftercare” means the steps necessary to manage the application land following the completion of restoration so that the quality of the land is at a satisfactory standard for the afteruse;

“afteruse” means the ultimate use of the application land as species-rich grassland/meadow, scrub pockets and broadleaf woodland with peripheral marshland/moss habitats including

ponds, scrapes and ditches and the retention of the environmental management infrastructure until necessary;

“commence” means the carrying out of a material operation (as defined in section 56(4) of the 1990 Act) excluding any operations relating to soil investigations or works in respect of land contamination, archaeological investigations, site clearance, diversion of services, receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment, erection of temporary fencing hoardings and erection of site compound buildings and “commencement” and “commenced” are to be construed accordingly;

“completion of restoration” means the date that the county planning authority certifies in writing that the restoration of any phase of the application land has been completed;

“landscaping” means the works necessary to improve the aesthetic appearance of the application land;

“restoration” means the process which will return the completed landfill or any completed phase of the landfill to a condition suitable for its proposed aftercare, and includes design, initial landscaping works and soil spreading;

“western landfill area” means the landfill void created as part of phases A, B, C and D as shown on the works plan.

### **Time limits for commencement**

2. The authorised project must commence within 5 years of the date of this Order.

### **Commencement**

3. Notice of commencement of the authorised project must be given to the county planning authority a minimum of 7 days before the date that the authorised project is commenced.

### **Detailed approval**

4. The authorised project must be carried out in accordance with the sections of the environmental statement and the approved plans and schemes listed in this requirement (unless in respect of amendments as approved by the county planning authority in accordance with requirement 34)—

- (1) Sections 3 and 5 of the environmental statement, and Table ES1 amended October 2014;
- (2) The works plan (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/WORKS);
- (3) The application plan (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/APPLICATION BOUNDARY);
- (4) The land plan (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/LAND);
- (5) Proposed restoration contours (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION1);
- (6) Elevations of the stockpiles and bunds (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION2);
- (7) Elevations of the main infrastructure including buildings (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION3);
- (8) The site access from White Moss Road South (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION4);
- (9) The phasing drawings presented in the soils handling and management scheme; (WS010003/WLL/SOIL HANDLING, amended September 2014);
- (10) Restoration proposals (WS010003/WLL/PLANS/SITE1);
- (11) Landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme; (WS010003/WLL/LANDSCAPING, amended September 2014);
- (12) Soils handling and management scheme (WS010003/WLL/SOIL HANDLING, amended September 2014); and
- (13) Proposed basal levels (Drawing reference LE00173-222).

### **Time limits for cessation and restoration**

5. The landfilling of waste and the operation of the interceptor waste treatment facility must cease by not later than 31 December 2035 and the application land (with the exception of any facilities required for the long term management of landfill gas and leachate) must be finally restored in accordance with the Landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme listed under requirement 4(11) by not later than 31 December 2036.

### **Phasing of landfill and restoration activities**

6.—(1) No mineral extraction or landfill operations may be carried out except in accordance with the principles of phasing shown on the works plan and phasing plans presented in the soils handling and management scheme listed under requirement 4(9). Those operations must progress through phases A, B, C and D in accordance with those phasing plans. With the exception of the areas of the landfill which will be used for access, and areas of land that are to be used for temporary stockpiling, the landfill operations must progress from cell 3D through phases A, B, C and D, with the final phase of landfill being the access route and remaining areas of Cell 2.

(2) Capping and restoration of any phase must be completed in accordance with the Landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme listed under requirement 4(11) within 12 months of either:

- (a) The completion of landfilling operations in a phase reaching levels which will provide for the placement of capping and restoration materials (to ensure that the pre-settlement restoration contours shown on drawing reference WS0100003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION1 are not exceeded); or
- (b) On completion of the use of that phase for stockpiling (if it to be used as such) in accordance with requirement 17.

### **Restoration and aftercare**

7.—(1) Following certification in writing by the county planning authority of the completion of restoration in any phase on the application land, aftercare of that phase must be carried out for a period of 20 years in accordance with the Landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme listed in requirement 4(11).

(2) By the end of October in each year until the end of the aftercare period in the final phase on the application land, a report must be submitted to the county planning authority recording in detail:

- (a) The operations carried out on the land during the previous 12 months in respect of landfilling;
- (b) The measures taken to implement the restoration and aftercare provisions;
- (c) The intended operations for the next 12 months which will be implemented on the application land; and
- (d) The report must contain the topographical survey specified under requirement 24 to this Order.

### **Japanese Knotweed**

8. Prior to the commencement of the activities in Phase B of the authorised project (as shown on the works plan) a scheme for the eradication of any Japanese Knotweed identified in phase B must be submitted for approval by the county planning authority. The extent of the Japanese Knotweed in Phase B must be confirmed and detailed as part of the preparation of the scheme. The approved scheme must be implemented prior to the commencement of the activities of Phase B and thereafter the measures must be implemented throughout the period of the development if required.

## **Ecology**

**9.** No removal of trees or hedgerows may take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive in any year unless otherwise agreed with the county planning authority.

## **European protected species**

**10.**—(1) Prior to the commencement of the operations in each of phases B, C and D of the application land, further survey work must be undertaken to establish whether any European protected species or Common Toad are present on any of the application land, in any land affected, or likely to be affected, by the authorised project, in any of the trees to be lopped or felled, or in any buildings to be demolished, during that phase of the authorised project. The scope of the further survey work must be agreed with, and the results of the survey work submitted to, the county planning authority.

(2) “European protected species” has the same meaning as in regulations 40 and 44 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010(a).

(3) If European protected species or Common Toad are identified during the further survey work, no works within that phase may commence until a mitigation scheme has been approved by the county planning authority. The mitigation measures contained in the approved scheme must be undertaken prior to the commencement of development in that phase.

## **Archaeology**

**11.**—(1) No soil stripping operations may commence until a written scheme for the investigation of areas of archaeological interest as identified in section 17 of the environmental statement has been submitted to and approved by the county planning authority.

(2) The scheme must identify areas where field work and or/a watching brief are required, and the measures to be taken to protect, record or preserve any significant archaeological remains that may be found.

(3) Any archaeological works or watching brief carried out under the scheme must be by a suitably qualified person or body approved by the county planning authority.

(4) Any archaeological works or watching brief must be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

## **Treatment of mine shafts and depths of excavation**

**12.**—(1) No excavation or dewatering may take place below 48 metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) without prior approval by the county planning authority (such approval only to be given where necessary to create a basal sub-grade suitable for the construction of the basal lining system). This permitted depth of excavation is to include the excavation of any sumps for drainage or dewatering and the capping of any mine shafts beneath the proposed waste containment facility.

(2) Below a level of 65 metres AOD, no abstraction of water or mineral excavation may take place within an agreed stand-off horizontal distance of any mine shaft until or unless those shafts have been adequately sealed in accordance with details approved by the county planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency and Coal Authority. The stand-off distance must be approved by the county planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency and Coal Authority.

(3) The sealing methods must prevent against the transmission of water between any mined voids below a depth of 48 metres AOD and the proposed mineral excavation and landfill formation.

(4) The restriction on excavation and dewatering does not apply to the drilling of boreholes for ground investigation, monitoring or grouting. The restriction on abstraction of water does not

---

(a) SI. 2010/490 (as amended).



preclude the taking of samples for water quality analysis or the execution of permeability tests where the latter are limited in scope and agreed by the Environment Agency in advance.

### **Water management and monitoring**

**13.**—(1) No development, including dewatering activity, may commence until a scheme for the management and monitoring of groundwater and surface water levels, water abstraction, groundwater quality and site drainage has, following consultation with the Environment Agency, been approved by the county planning authority. The scheme must include:

- (a) The size, location, method of construction and capacity of the attenuation lagoons;
- (b) The anticipated discharge rates to the highway drainage system and the means of controlling that discharge rate; and
- (c) Details for the monitoring of groundwater levels around the site during the period of active dewatering including locations and techniques of monitoring, data to be collected and means of reporting monitoring results to the county planning authority, including comparison with background pre-development levels.

(2) Any variation to the approved water management and monitoring scheme must be approved by the county planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency.

(3) The approved scheme must be implemented and maintained throughout the authorised project until dewatering has ceased, the water table has recovered and restoration of the mineral void is complete in accordance with the plans approved in accordance with requirement 4.

### **Trans-Pennine Ethylene Pipe**

**14.** No soil stripping operations may be carried out until the precise route of the Trans-Pennine ethylene pipeline adjacent to the south western site boundary has been identified. The south western perimeter bund must be located a minimum of 10m from the route of the pipeline and the south western boundary of the landfill must be located a minimum of 28m from the route of the pipeline. The route of the pipeline together with the standoffs must be clearly identified with markers prior to the commencement of the authorised project.

### **Rainford Drain**

**15.** No soil stripping operations may be carried out until a scheme setting out how the Rainford Drain will be diverted around the perimeter of the landfill has been approved by the county planning authority. The drain must be diverted in accordance with that scheme. The diverted pipeline must be constructed to a standard which provides for the effective management of water.

### **External lighting and control of artificial light emissions**

**16.**—(1) All floodlighting used as part of the authorised project (including mobile units) must be directed towards the ground to minimise light spillage from the application land and, except for in emergencies, must only be operational during the working hours specified in requirement 30.

(2) No additional permanent floodlighting may be installed on the application land until a written scheme for the management and mitigation of artificial light emissions has been submitted to and approved by the county planning authority.

### **Temporary stockpiles**

**17.**—(1) The temporary stockpiles as shown on the plan WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION2 must be managed in accordance with the details set out in Section 5 of the environmental statement and the soils handling and management scheme (WS010003/WLL/SOIL HANDLING) listed in requirement 4(9) during the operation of the authorised project.

(2) Prior to the commencement of excavation in any phase, proposals for the anticipated temporary stockpiling of peat materials excavated from within that phase (where such materials are stockpiled on capped landfill areas) must be approved by the county planning authority. The proposals must include information on the following details:

- (a) the types, quantities, locations and heights of storage of the peat materials;
- (b) the duration of stockpiling, including a timescale for the removal of the stockpiled peat materials; and
- (c) details for the grading and landscaping of the peat materials for the duration of the stockpile period.

(3) Thereafter, stockpiling of the peat materials must take place in accordance with the approved details for each phase.

### **Soil audit**

**18.**—(1) In accordance with the soils handling and management scheme, an annual audit of all soil materials is to be completed at the end of each soil moving season and submitted to the county planning authority.

(2) The audit is to include:

- (a) drawings and tables to identify clearly the origin, intermediate storage and final location of the different soil types. The drawings and tables are to be prepared as part of the first soil audit to a format to be agreed with the county planning authority and are to be updated as part of each subsequent audit to provide the most accurate ongoing summary of soil management at the application land; and
- (b) volumetric information which is to be included in the tables.

(3) Any recommendations resulting from each soil audit must be carried out in the timescale to be agreed with the county planning authority

### **Control of noise and dust emissions during construction and operation**

**19.**—(1) During the construction and removal of the perimeter bunds and material storage mounds (as shown on the works plan, WS10003/WLL/PLANS/WORKS) the noise levels must be controlled to meet the construction noise limits specified in Table ES7 of the environmental statement. During mineral extraction, landfilling, maintenance, restoration and aftercare operations the application land must be operated to control noise so that noise levels recorded in free field conditions as a result of the proposed development do not exceed 55dB LAeq, 1h when measured from any point on the site boundary.

(2) All reversing warning systems fitted to mobile plant used on the application land must be either non audible or white noise type systems.

(3) All plant, equipment and other machinery used in connection with the operation and maintenance of the authorised project must be equipped with effective silencing equipment or sound proofing equipment to the standard of design set out in the manufacturer's specification and must be maintained in accordance with the specification at all times.

(4) Throughout the operation of the authorised project, measures are to be taken to ensure that no dust or windblown materials are carried on to adjacent property and in particular are to include the watering of all haul and access roads and the spraying of storage heaps or areas of the landfilling and restoration areas as necessary during dry weather conditions.

### **Blasting**

**20.** No blasting may be undertaken on the application land.

### **Crushing and screening of aggregate**

21. If crushing and screening of aggregate is undertaken on the application land all crushing and screening plant must be fitted with effective dust suppression measures including dust suppression on all conveyor outfall points.

### **Disposal of waste**

22. No waste materials may be disposed of or placed on the application land in such a way as would prejudice the restoration of the land in accordance with plan WS010003/PLANS/WLL/ELEVATION1.

### **Quantities and types of waste**

23. The maximum quantity of waste that is to be imported to the interceptor treatment facility per annum will be 20,000 tonnes and the maximum quantity of waste that is to be imported to the landfill per annum will be 150,000 tonnes. No waste materials may be accepted on the application land other than hazardous wastes or suitable waste materials for engineering and restoration purposes.

### **Topographical survey**

24. A topographical survey must be submitted to the county planning authority on or before 31 October in every year until the end of the aftercare period referred to in requirement 7 of this Order. The survey must have been carried out within 2 months preceding the date of the submission and must consist of a plan drawn to a scale of not less than 1:1250 which identifies all surface features on the application land and is contoured at 1 metre intervals, relating to Ordnance Datum over all the application land where waste has been deposited.

### **Demolition**

25.—(1) Subject to the following provisions of this requirement, the undertaker may at its own expense carry out any demolition works to buildings on the application land as the undertaker considers necessary or expedient for the authorised project.

(2) The residential property in phase B must remain uninhabited from the commencement of the authorised project until the residential property is demolished prior to the commencement of the operations in phase B.

(3) No demolition may commence until a code of construction practice has been submitted to and approved by the county planning authority. The code of construction practice must have regard to the results of any further surveys for European protected species carried out pursuant to requirement 10.

(4) All construction works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved code, unless otherwise agreed by the county planning authority.

### **Vehicular access**

26. The sole vehicular access for the authorised project hereby permitted is to be by way of the existing access to the application land on to White Moss Road South and as shown on plan WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION4. The visibility splays must be maintained at the junction with White Moss Road South in accordance with plan WS010003/WLL/PLANS/ELEVATION4.

### **Control of vehicular movements**

27. Vehicular traffic associated with the authorised project must be controlled as follows—

(1) The undertaker must direct all heavy goods vehicles entering and leaving the application land to travel to and from the M58 motorway via White Moss Road South to the east of the

application land with a direction that no such vehicles are to travel west along White Moss Road South towards Skelmersdale.

(2) Signs informing vehicle drivers of the requirements in paragraph (1) above must be maintained in a visible location near to the egress on application land throughout the term of the authorised project.

### **Fencing**

**28.** The fencing, including the gates at the site entrance, specified in the Landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme certified under requirement 4(11)) must be maintained and/or erected on the application land prior to the commencement of the authorised project and must be maintained as necessary for the duration of the authorised project. Any temporary fencing is to be removed on completion of the authorised project.

### **Wheel cleaning**

**29.—**(1) Wheel cleaning facilities installed at the application land as specified in section 5 of the environmental statement (or wheel cleaning facilities of a similar design and function) must be available for use at all times during the operation of the authorised project.

(2) The wheels of all vehicles leaving the application land must be cleansed of mud and other debris to prevent mud being carried onto the public highway.

(3) The wheel cleaning facilities must be maintained in full working order at all times throughout the authorised project.

(4) All vehicles transporting materials with the potential to give rise to airborne dust or spillage of materials must be sheeted.

### **Hours of operation**

**30.** All mineral extraction and landfill construction operations, delivery of waste, waste treatment, waste disposal, levelling and restoration operations, and any associated activities must be restricted to between the hours of 07.30 and 18.30 on Mondays to Fridays and 08.00 and 12.00 on Saturdays, with no such operations being carried out on the application land on Sundays or public holidays.

(1) Essential repairs to plant and machinery may be carried out outside of the authorised times of operation.

(2) Environmental management infrastructure including infrastructure for the management of water, leachate and landfill gas may operate continuously.

### **Display of Order on-site**

**31.** A copy of the terms of this Order must be displayed on the application land, and all documents hereby permitted and any documents subsequently approved in accordance with this Order (or amendments approved pursuant to this Order) must be available at the site office throughout the development.

### **Review of void consumption**

**32.** No excavation in accordance with each of phases B, C and D (as set out in the phasing plans) of the authorised project may commence:

(1) unless and until the undertaker has provided a review of the disposal capacity and rate of consumption of the space available for waste at the landfill facility to the county planning authority; and

(2) if the county planning authority determines (such determination to be made within 6 weeks of the submission of the review) that there has been a material shortfall in the quantities of waste

accepted on the application land, such that landfilling is unlikely to be completed by 31 December 2035, then no excavation of any phase may commence unless and until:

- (a) the undertaker has applied to the county planning authority for approval to vary the plans and schemes listed in subparagraphs (5), (9) and (13) of requirement 4 as necessary to meet the specified restoration date of 31 December 2036 in accordance with the restoration proposals set out in sub-paragraph (10) of requirement 4; and
- (b) the county planning authority has approved the application to vary the plans and schemes, such decision to be made within 8 weeks of the above application unless such other period is agreed in writing with the undertaker.

### **Removal of plant and machinery**

33. Except to the extent required for aftercare purposes (as approved pursuant to the scheme under requirement 4) and for any ongoing environmental management purposes, any building, plant, machinery, foundations, hardstanding, roadway, structure or erection in the nature of plant or machinery used in connection with the authorised project must be removed from the application land when they are no longer required for the purpose for which they were installed and in any case not later than 31st December 2056 upon completion of the aftercare of the land. The areas of the application land in which environmental management infrastructure are located must be restored in a manner consistent with the surrounding restoration.

### **Requirement for written approval and amendments to approved details**

34. Where under any requirement, details or a scheme or plan are to be submitted for the approval of the county planning authority, or where the county planning authority is authorised to approve changes to plans, schemes, drawings or other documents certified by the Secretary of State, then unless the requirement provides otherwise:

- (1) those details or scheme or plan and that approval must be in writing;
- (2) the details, scheme or plan must be implemented as approved;
- (3) the approved details, scheme or plan are to be taken to include any amendments that may subsequently be approved in writing by the county planning authority, provided that no amendments may be approved by the county planning authority where such amendments may give rise to any significant adverse environmental effects that have not been assessed in the environmental statement or any supplementary information and updated environmental statement supplied pursuant to The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009; and
- (4) where under any requirement there is an obligation to consult with a third party prior to the submission of any details, scheme or plan for approval to the county planning authority, then there is to be an obligation to consult with the same third party prior to the submission of any amendments.