



3/18 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000  
e-mail: [whitemoss@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:whitemoss@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk)

---

Your Ref:

Our Ref: WS010003

Date: 30 May 2014

---

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning Act 2008 (as amended) – Section 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) – Rule 8**

**Application by Whitemoss Landfill Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for Whitemoss Landfill**

**Notice of procedural decisions made at and following the Preliminary Meeting**

I write to inform you about the procedural decisions made by me at and following the Preliminary Meeting held on 21 May 2014 at the DW Sports Fitness Lounge, DW Stadium, Loire Drive, Robin Park, Wigan, WN5 0UZ. This letter provides you with the timetable for the examination and the first round of written questions that I am asking in the examination.

A note of the Preliminary Meeting has been published on the Whitemoss project page of the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website, and can be accessed by following this link:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/document/2510216>

A hard copy of the Preliminary Meeting note will also be made available for inspection at Skelmersdale Library (details in Annex E). An audio recording of the Preliminary Meeting has also been published on our website and can be accessed by following this link:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/document/2500400>

## 1. Procedural decision and timetable

I am grateful to all those who attended the Preliminary Meeting and for all the views expressed at the meeting. All matters raised have been considered carefully. I have now made procedural decisions about the way in which the application is to be examined. A copy of the procedural decisions is enclosed with this letter at Annex A

and the timetable now set by the Examining Authority is at Annex B. If I consider it necessary to vary the timetable, I will write to you and inform you of the changes. I will also do this if the date, time or place of any hearing is changed, except in the event of an adjournment.

## 2. Written questions

I have decided to ask a number of questions and to receive further information on matters relevant to the application. These questions are set out in Annex C, and responses must be received **on or before Thursday, 26 June 2014**.

## 3. Written representations

I invite all parties to submit written representations and evidence on any matters concerning the application, and on relevant representations which they have already submitted. Please send your representations to us using the email or postal address at the top of this letter quoting reference **WS010003** and your unique reference number, if one is quoted on this letter or covering email. Please also clearly state in your email or letter that it is your written representation. All such written representations must also be received **on or before Thursday, 26 June 2014**.

## 4. Guidance for the submission of written representations

Representations can deal with any relevant matter. They are not restricted to the matters set out in my initial assessment of principal issues which was discussed at the Preliminary Meeting, nor restricted to the questions set out in Annex C. Please note if you are submitting a written representation, you must identify those parts of the application or specific matters with which you agree and those parts with which you do not agree. You must state the reasons for your agreement or disagreement.

There is no prescribed form for written representations under primary or secondary legislation. In accordance with DCLG 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent (April 2013)', participants should provide with their written statements, "any data, methodology and assumptions used to support their submissions".

Any written representation that exceeds 1500 words should also be accompanied by a summary. This summary should not exceed 10% of the original text. The summary should set out the key facts of the written representation and must be representative of the submission made.

To assist in the timely processing of written representations to be submitted **on or before Thursday, 26 June 2014** I ask that interested parties send, where practicable, electronic copies of their submissions as email attachments to [whitemoss@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:whitemoss@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk) **on or before Thursday, 26 June 2014**. Electronic attachments should be clearly labelled with a subject title and should not exceed 12MB for each email. It is helpful if written requests to attend hearings are forwarded separately. Should electronic submissions include a number of technical surveys of 300 pages or more, interested parties are advised to send to us, by post, an additional full paper copy of their submission<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Subject to examination Procedure Rule 10(6)(a), I request that, in addition to the electronic copy, the applicant supply 2 hard copies of their submissions for me to use and make available for public inspection under Rule

## **5. Availability and inspection of documents, representations and other submissions to the examination**

Written representations, responses to relevant representations and to questions, Local Impact Reports, comments or any other documents and submissions to the examination or information about the application, must be made available to all interested parties and to anyone who requests an opportunity to inspect and take copies of them.

We will make these available by publishing them as soon as practicable on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website. We shall also provide an opportunity for inspection and copying at Skelmersdale Library, Southway, Skelmersdale, Lancashire, WN8 6NL (further details of this deposit location is at Annex E).

## **6. Deadlines for receipt of documents, other submissions and requests for hearings**

Timely submissions in advance of the deadlines set in the timetable are encouraged and welcomed. It would also be helpful if respondents could provide duplicate electronic copies of their submissions from which their signature and contact details have been redacted. It is important to note that if written representations, responses to relevant representations and to written questions, local impact reports, further information or requests for hearings and any other submissions are not received by the dates specified in the timetable, I may disregard them.

If no written requests for an open floor hearing or a compulsory acquisition hearing are received by **Thursday, 26 June 2014**, I am not required to hold any such hearings, although I may choose to do so. For issue specific hearings, dates have been reserved in the timetable, and I have provided an indication of the issues which may be covered.

The time, date and place of all hearings will be confirmed in writing to all registered interested parties in advance of the hearings stated in the timetable at Annex B, providing at least 21 days notice. The date, time and place for some of the hearings and the accompanied site visit have already been provided in the timetable at Annex B. Where practicable, an agenda for each hearing will be published on the examination website at least one week in advance of a hearing. A copy of each agenda will also be made available at Skelmersdale Library shortly after publication (details at Annex E).

## **7. Award of costs**

I also draw your attention to the possibility of the award of costs against any party who behaves unreasonably. You should be aware of the relevant costs policy that applies to National Infrastructure Projects. The policy is available on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website, and can be assessed by following this link:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/guidance/>

## **8. Future notifications**

If you are an interested party you will continue to receive notifications from the

Planning Inspectorate about the examination throughout the process. If you are a statutory consultee who has not made a relevant representation but wishes to become an interested party, you should inform me as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully

*Wendy Burden*

**Wendy Burden**  
**Examining Authority**

**Annexes**

- A. Examining Authority's Procedural Decisions
- B. Timetable for the Examination of the Application
- C. Examining Authority's First Written Questions and Requests For Information
- D. List of Matters to be Covered in Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)
- E. Availability of Application Documents, Representations and Other Submissions to the Examination

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

## Examining Authority's Procedural Decisions

I have made the following procedural decisions under section 89(1) of the Planning Act 2008.

### Principle issues

In response to the Rule 6 letter, dated 22 April 2014, comments have been made about the range of topics set out in my initial assessment of principle issues contained in Annex C to the Rule 6 letter. Matters relating to the consultation process and to the acceptance of the application as a nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP) were raised in submissions to the Preliminary Meeting, and I deal with those matters below. Whilst I understand that there may be other matters which are not explicitly identified within the list of principle issues, I will consider any matter raised by interested parties where they are relevant to the application.

### Timetable

I have made some changes to the timetable following discussions at the Preliminary Meeting. In particular I have scheduled a hearing on Policy and Need to take place before Environmental issues are discussed on 16 July 2014. I have also included deadlines for comments on the initial Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) on 8 July 2014, and on any SoCG on the draft DCO articles and requirements on the 10 September 2014.

No other comments were made about proposed deadlines, so I confirm that the Examination will proceed in accordance with the timetable set out in Annex B of this letter. For the avoidance of doubt, the hearings concerning the draft DCO will be on a without prejudice basis, and my decision to hold such a hearing does not imply that any view has been taken about whether the Order should be granted. Time is reserved for any compulsory acquisition and open floor hearings which may be requested by **Thursday, 26 June 2014** deadline in the timetable at Annex B.

I confirm my request for SoCG, and a list of matters to be covered is set out at Annex D to this letter. The deadlines for the submission of SoCG are set out in the timetable as **Thursday, 26 June 2014 and Friday, 25 July 2014** for a SoCG on the draft DCO requirements and articles.

Other than affirming the important next major deadline of **Thursday, 26 June 2014** for the submission of written representations by all interested parties and Local Impact Reports from local authorities amongst other matters for submission by that deadline; I do not intend to issue reminders of subsequent deadlines for submissions to the examination. It is important therefore for all interested parties to make sure they note the various stages of the confirmed examination timetable accordingly.

There are provisions in The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) (EPR) (Rules 8, 13 and 17) for me to amend the timetable if required, but no power for me to change the date for the closure of the Examination.

The examination will end on or before **Friday, 21 November 2014**.

## **Accompanied site inspection (ASI)**

I confirm my intention to carry out a site inspection of the site and the surrounding area accompanied by representatives of the applicant and the local authorities, and by representatives of interested parties on **Tuesday, 15 July 2014**. Those attending the ASI should meet at the car park outside the main entrance of the West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG. It will start at 10.00am on Tuesday, 15 July 2014. An itinerary is being prepared which will incorporate a number of the locations identified by interested parties. The itinerary for the ASI will be published on the National Infrastructure Whitemoss Landfill project examination pages of the Planning Portal website.

In the event of poor weather conditions, **Thursday, 23 October 2014** is reserved for any further ASI, and I will be making unaccompanied inspections in the area during the course of the examination.

The applicant has stated that he will provide a mini bus for the ASI on Tuesday, 15 July 2014. The mini bus has a capacity of 12 passengers. The applicant has proposed that two representatives from Whitemoss Landfill Limited, one representative from Lancashire County Council, one from West Lancashire Borough Council, one from the Environment Agency, four other interested parties and the Examining Authority could travel via the mini bus during the ASI. At the Preliminary Meeting, the interested parties agreed to send representatives to fill the remaining four seats on the mini bus. With regard to the section of the ASI within the boundary of the existing Whitemoss Hazardous Waste Facility, it will be necessary for all parties to wear appropriate sturdy footwear. Other relevant personal protective equipment such as high visibility jackets and hard hats will be provided by the applicant. Whitemoss Landfill Limited will assume that the section of the ASI at the site will be attended by the same individuals attending the off-site section of the ASI. I remind all parties that the ASI is not an opportunity to make any representations or discuss evidence. It is an opportunity for me to look at physical features only. I would therefore encourage interested parties to liaise together and appoint four persons to represent them in order to avoid an excessive number of vehicles at the ASI.

## **Submissions at the Preliminary Meeting**

### **Community Consultation**

Linda Webster, member of Bickerstaff Parish Council (PC), on behalf of Bickerstaffe residents, Save Bickerstaffe Colliery Action Group and others, raised the issue of consultation before and after the submission of the application. Residents of Bickerstaffe had not been included in the applicant's leafleting of households; and material sent to Bickerstaffe PC was sent to an outdated address and were not received. Other speakers raised concerns about what they felt was inaccessible language used in consultation documents; the lack of provision of documents in other languages; and a perceived lack of consultation with local landowners.

As the Examining Authority, I am mindful of the matters raised in relation to the adequacy of consultation. However, the legislative tests for the adequacy of public consultation were considered by the Secretary of State at the s55 acceptance stage.

The acceptance letter confirms:

“The Secretary of State has decided to accept this application for examination. In reaching this decision, the Secretary of State has:

- in respect of section 55(3)(e) had regard to the matters set out in section 55(4), and concluded that the applicant has complied with Chapter 2 of Part 5 of PA2008; and
- in respect of section 55(3)(f), had regard to the extent to which those matters set out in section 55(5A) have either been complied with or followed, and concluded that the application (including accompaniments) is of a satisfactory standard.”

The Secretary of State took into account the views of a number of local authorities when coming to this decision. The decision has been published on the Whitemoss project page of the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal Website, and can be assessed by following this link:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/north-west/whitemoss-landfill-western-extension/?ipcsection=docs&stage=2&filter=Procedural+Decisions>

Although I have carefully read and noted the submissions regarding consultation and note with concern the dissatisfaction of a number of local residents, there is regrettably a clear difference between what some parties expect or would wish that the applicant was required to do, and what the law in fact requires them to do.

I understand the concern that documents are not accessible to local residents for whom English is not a first language. However, the applicant has made it clear that translations would be provided if requested. This is consistent with the approach taken for public consultation by the Lancashire County Council and West Lancashire Borough Council as confirmed at the meeting.

I have no power to revisit the decision to accept the application. If the consultation has indeed been ineffective, as some submissions suggest, then it is the quality of the proposed scheme that will show it. However, the community itself has been successful in ensuring that large numbers of local people are aware of the project. The examination has now commenced, and I urge all those who are concerned about the proposal to participate fully in the examination process to address the merits of the proposal as submitted.

### **Should the application be considered as an NSIP?**

Stephen Bengé for West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC) summarised the concern of WLBC and Lancashire County Council that the application project would not have the capacity to be defined as an NSIP, and that the application should be determined locally.

The Secretary of State concluded at the s55 acceptance stage that the application is for a Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008, and falls within the definition of a nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP) in accordance with s14(1)(p) and s30 of the Act. I am not aware of any express provision in law for the

Secretary of State to retract from that decision to accept the application as a NSIP. As the Examining Authority I have no power to revisit the Secretary of State's decision, or to rule that it should be determined by the local planning authority.

### **The Issue of Need**

John Haine for Lancashire County Council (LCC) and Jackie Copley for CPRE Lancashire (CPRE) raised the issue of need for a facility of the scale proposed.

At the meeting, I referred to the reference to need in the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Hazardous Waste. I shall be inviting debate during the examination as to whether the need identified in the NPS (para 3.1) constitutes need at a strategic level, or whether it prescribes a need for any proposed hazardous waste facility, including a landfill facility of the scale and in the location of the Whitemoss proposal.

### **Other matters**

David Cheetham for CPREWLDG: raised three matters which he then clarified by email to the Whitemoss team as follows:

1. Noting that mitigation measures will be considered under all the principal issues (Annex C [Rule 6 letter]), would the Environment Agency be present to advise or comment on the practicability of any mitigation measures that might be suggested?
2. Will the Landfill Regulations (England and Wales) 2002 Schedule 2 General Requirements for Landfill (SI 2002 No 1559) be considered when making the decision whether or not to grant the DCO?
3. How will the enforcement of any conditions imposed by the DCO (if granted) be co-ordinated between the Environment Agency and the Lancashire County Council?

I respond as follows:

1. In the first round of questions (Annex C) a number of questions relating to the Requirements in the draft DCO; to Policy matters and to the Environmental Statement are addressed to the Environment Agency. I expect the Environment Agency to give advice or comment on all the matters which fall within their remit.
2. A question is included in Annex C.
3. A question is included in Annex C.

## Timetable for the Examination of the Application

The Examining Authority (ExA) is under a duty to complete the examination of the application by the end of the period of 6 months beginning with the day after the start day. In addition to the timetable set out below, please note that I may at any time before the completion of the examination of the application or specific matters, request further information or written comments from the applicant or other parties to be supplied by the deadline I set and in a manner which I may set out. **All deadlines will be at the end of the specified deadline day.** Amendments may be made to the examination timetable under EPR rules 8, 13 and 17.

| Item | Matters   | Due Dates                 |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 1    | Preliminary Meeting   | Wednesday,<br>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<br>2014    |
| 3    | <b>Deadline</b><br><br>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on relevant representations (RRs)</li> <li>• Summaries of all RR's 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 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 Policy, Need and 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 applicant's draft itinerary for the Accompanied Site Inspection</li> </ul> | Thursday, 26<br>June 2014 |
| 4    | <b>Deadline</b><br><br>Deadline for receipt by the ExA of:  | Tuesday 8 July<br>2014    |

|    |  |                         |
|----|--|-------------------------|
|    | <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>   |                         |
| 5  | <p>Accompanied site inspection<br/>Meet at the car park at the West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG.<br/>Registration: 09.30am<br/>start time: 10.00am</p>   | Tuesday, 15 July 2014   |
| 6  | <p>Issue specific hearing on Policy and Need<br/>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG.<br/>Registration: 09.30am start time: 10.00am</p> <p>Issue specific hearing on Environment to follow immediately after the above hearing. It will be held at the same venue as the above hearing.</p> <p>First open floor hearing – evening hearing<br/>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG.<br/>Registration: 6.00pm<br/>start time: 6.30pm</p> | Wednesday, 16 July 2014 |
| 7  | <p>Issue specific hearing on Environment (continued)<br/>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG.<br/>Registration: 09.30am<br/>start time: 10.00am</p> <p>Second open floor hearing - evening hearing<br/>Digmoor Community Centre, Birleywood, Skelmersdale, Lancashire, WN8 9HR.<br/>Registration: 06.00pm<br/>start time: 06.30pm</p>   | Thursday, 17 July 2014  |
| 8  | <p>Third open floor hearing – morning hearing</p> <p>Digmoor Community Centre, Birleywood, Skelmersdale, Lancashire, WN8 9HR.<br/>Registration: 09.30am<br/>start time: 10.00am</p>  | Friday, 18 July 2014    |
| 9  | <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 issue specific hearings, and the open floor hearings</li> <li>• SoCG on draft DCO articles and requirements</li> </ul>   | Friday, 25 July 2014    |
| 10 | Issue by the ExA of:   | Wednesday,              |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second written questions</li> <li>• Comments on SoCG on the draft DCO articles and requirements</li> </ul>   | 10 September 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>• Applicant's revised draft DCO</li> <li>• Responses to any comments on the SoCG on the draft DCO articles and requirements</li> </ul>  | Wednesday, 1 October 2014                   |
| 12 | <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 applicant's revised draft DCO</li> </ul>   | Wednesday, 8 October 2014                   |
| 13 | <p>Issue specific hearing on the revised draft DCO (including the articles, requirements and any S106 matters)</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG.<br/> Registration: 09.30am<br/> Time: 10.00am</p>   | <p>Wednesday, 22 October 2014</p> <p>AM</p> |
| 14 | <p>Compulsory Acquisition (CA) hearing</p> <p>Poplar Suite, West Lancashire Investment Centre, White Moss Business Park, Skelmersdale, WN8 9TG.<br/> Registration: 09.30am<br/> Time: 10.00am</p>   | <p>Wednesday, 22 October 2014</p>           |
| 15 | <p>Date reserved for any further hearings and accompanied site inspections if required</p>  | <p>Thursday, 23 October 2014</p>            |
| 16 | <p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written summaries of submissions made at the issue specific hearing on the revised draft DCO and the CA hearing.</li> <li>• Final revised draft DCO from the applicant.</li> </ul> <p>Publication of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Report on the Implication on European Sites (RIES). The RIES will be published on the examination</li> </ul> | <p>Friday, 31 October 2014</p>              |

|    |   |                                      |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|
|    | website and made available at Skelmersdale Library (Annex E).   |                                      |
| 17 | <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> </ul>  | Friday, 7 November 2014              |
| 18 | Any further request for further information if required. Any further request for information made during the week commencing 10 November 2014 will be published on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website and made available at Skelmersdale Library (Annex E). | Week commencing 10 November 2014     |
| 19 | Issue of ExA's draft DCO  | Tuesday, 11 November 2014            |
| 20 | <p><b>Deadline</b></p> <p>Deadline for receipt of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses to the RIES published on 31 October 2014.</li> </ul>  | Friday, 14 November 2014             |
| 21 | <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>• Responses to any request for further information issued during week commencing 10 November 2014.</li> </ul>                                       | Monday, 17 November 2014             |
| 22 | <p>Completion of the examination:</p> <p>The ExA is under a duty to complete the examination of the application by the end of the period of 6 months beginning with the day after the close of the Preliminary Meeting.</p>   | On or before Friday 21 November 2014 |

## Examining Authority's First Written Questions and Requests for Information

Unless otherwise stated, the questions are generally addressed to the applicant. However the ExA invites all interested parties to consider whether they have evidence on the issues raised, and to provide answers to any questions where they can.

Where questions are relevant to the applicant, relevant planning authorities or statutory bodies or undertakers, it is expected that answers will be given by each party unless an agreed position on relevant matters is to be included in a Statement of Common Ground.

### 1. Development Consent Order

#### General

- 1.1 **Applicant:** Limits of deviation: there are limits of deviation shown on a number of plans (including the works plan and the restoration contours plan). If these are to be retained, a power to deviate should be included within the DCO. A definition could be included in Article 2, for example "'the limits of deviation" means the limits of deviation referred to in article ? (power to deviate)' and a new Article introduced for example "In constructing or maintaining the authorised development comprising works listed in Schedule 1 (authorised works), the undertaker may deviate laterally from the lines or situations shown on the (list all relevant ) plans to the extent of the limits of deviation shown on those/those plan(s)."
- 1.2 **EA:** are adequate control measures included in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) to ensure that any future variation to the Environmental Permit (EP) is compliant with the development as proposed in the DCO?
- 1.3 **Applicant; Lancashire County Council (LCC); West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC);:** Highway access is proposed to be to the east on White Moss Road South. White Moss Road South also extends to the west of the site. Are adequate control measures included in the DCO to ensure that vehicles accessing the site only use routes which have been assessed in the ES?
- 1.4 **Applicant:** Proposed mitigation measures are summarised in ES Section 7.5. However, the DCO only makes reference to two of the proposed mitigation techniques. No drafts have been supplied of any further documents which would secure the delivery of all the listed mitigation. Can the applicant please explain how the measures listed in Section 7.5 would be delivered through the DCO, and provide draft documents where appropriate to indicate their adequacy in delivering the measures proposed.
- 1.5 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC:** The general provision (as per s156(1) PA 2008) is that the benefit of the DCO will run with the land. However, s156(2) allows contrary provision to be made in the Order. Does provision need to be made

in the DCO with regard to contrary provisions (for the purposes of s156) and is wording required to secure compulsory acquisition funding in the event of any change in ownership? If so, what form should that take?<sup>2</sup>

## Articles

- 1.6 **Applicant:** Article 2 - the following definitions need to be considered for addition or amendment:
- a) There is no definition of environmental statement as the statement submitted with the application and certified as the environmental statement by the Secretary of State for the purposes of this Order. Should this be added?
  - b) A broad definition of "maintain" has been given. The definition should include wording which limits the scope of such works to that which is described as the authorised project in Schedule 1 and only to the extent that such works have been assessed in the ES.
- 1.7 **Applicant:** Please confirm that there is no statutory undertakers' land or equipment which might be affected by the project.
- 1.8 **Applicant:** Article 14(1) refers to new rights. Although Part 3 of the Book of Reference (BoR) describes the existing rights, there are no details of the new rights to be acquired, either in the BoR or on the Land Plans. For example, the Land Plans could show much more detail, colouring the land to identify areas where ownership is to be permanently acquired, where rights are to be temporarily acquired, where land will be temporarily used/possessed, etc. Can the applicant consider how the details of the new rights to be acquired are to be defined in the DCO.

## Schedule 1

- 1.9 **Applicant:** According to Article 2, "authorised project" includes both the "authorised development" and "ancillary works". Schedule 1 is confusing since it is headed "Authorised Project and Ancillary Works". Can this be clarified? If Schedule 1 is headed "Authorised Project", then it could be divided into Part 1 "Authorised Development", and Part 2 "Ancillary Works". The Schedule would then clearly distinguish the authorised development from the ancillary works and avoid any confusion.
- 1.10 **Applicant:** If Schedule 1 is divided into 2 parts as suggested above, the description of the authorised development could be made more clear with each constituent part separately identified. Furthermore it should be made clear either through Schedule 1 or in the Explanatory Memorandum which of the works are new and which are a continuation of an existing use or facility.
- 1.11 **Applicant:** Associated development and ancillary works are together under (2). A clear distinction needs to be made between development which is associated and development which is ancillary. Since the definition of

---

<sup>2</sup> The applicant and local authorities may wish to refer to examples of such a provision as proposed in for example the Thames Tideway Tunnel DCO; Able Marine DCO; North Norwich Distributor DCO.

authorised development in Article 2 includes the development and associated development, those parts of the project which are associated development should be included under (1).

## Requirements

- 1.12 **Lancashire County Council (LCC); West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC); Environment Agency (EA):** Requirement 4 – the wording of this requirement indicates that the list of plans and schemes included in 4(1) – (11) are to be approved together with the application. Any significant amendments should therefore be sought before the examination is closed.
- a) Does this requirement make it clear what is intended to be secured by this provision?
  - b) Is any further clarification needed?
  - c) Are the consultees satisfied with the detail included in the list of documents, plans and schemes listed under R4?
- 1.13 **LCC; WLBC; Environment Agency (EA); Natural England (NE):** Do Requirements 4(10) and 6 provide adequate control for the implementation of the Habitat Management Plan?
- 1.14 **LCC; WLBC; EA; NE:** Does Requirement 7 provide adequate information for the annual aftercare report?
- 1.15 **LCC; WLBC; EA; NE:** Is Requirement 29 sufficiently precise to secure the restoration of the site in accordance with an approved scheme?
- 1.16 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC; NE:** Requirement 11 – should NE be consulted before the survey work is carried out in order to ensure that the appropriate surveys are undertaken, or is this a matter which should be left for the Local Planning Authority to deal with?
- 1.17 **LCC, WLBC; NE; EA:** Requirement 17 – would the measures set out in this requirement provide adequate safeguarding and control for the stockpiling of the materials identified in the requirement?
- 1.18 **LCC, WLBC; NE; EA:** Requirement 20 – does this make adequate provision for monitoring and control, or would monitoring and control be secured through the EP?
- 1.19 **LCC, WLBC:** Requirement 25: does this provide adequate details of the fencing to be maintained and erected?
- 1.20 **Applicant; LCC, WLBC; EA; NE:** Requirement 27(2) – would any “essential” repairs be likely to cause noise or disturbance to local residents or other environmental damage? 27(3) - would any of the environmental management infrastructure be likely to cause noise, disturbance or other harm to local amenity as a result of full time operation?

- 1.21 **LCC, WLBC; EA:** Can the LCC as local planning authority and the EA as regulatory body clarify how responsibility for the enforcement of requirements in the DCO would be co-ordinated between the two bodies?

### **The Book of Reference**

- 1.22 **Applicant:** Why, given the requirements of Regulation 7(1)(a) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009, is White Moss Coal Company Ltd included in Part 1 of the Book of Reference, as the applicant is unable to provide an address for service of notice for it?
- 1.23 **Applicant:** Why is White Moss Coal Company Ltd only included in relation to plot 10 in Part 1 of the Book of Reference but not plot 6, even though it is included in respect of both plots 6 and 10 in Part 3 of the Book of Reference?
- 1.24 **Applicant:** Why is White Moss Coal Company Ltd referred to in Part 1 of the Book of Reference as having the benefit of certain rights, whereas in Part 3 reference is made to unknown successors to this company?
- 1.25 **Applicant:** Is White Moss Coal Company Ltd, or any successor to it, considered to be an "affected person" for the purposes of s59 of the Planning Act 2008?
- 1.26 **Applicant; interested parties; Executors of Ernest Rylance; The Coal Authority; The Homes and Communities Agency:** in relation to the amendments to the BoR Parts 1 and 3 Plots 8 and 18 submitted at the Preliminary Meeting on the 21 May, has any necessary consultation been carried out with regard to the changes? Do all affected persons consent to the changes?

### **The Explanatory Memorandum and the Plans**

- 1.27 **Applicant; LCC, WLBC; EA:** Are all the structures listed in Schedule 1 to the DCO shown on the works plan? Would any further structures be required by the EA in order to secure the grant of the EP?
- 1.28 **Applicant; Coal Authority (CA); EA:** What agreements, if any, have been reached with the Coal Authority and the EA?
- 1.29 **Applicant; CA:** Is the CA able to indicate that there would be no impediment to the issue of a licence for the extraction of coal?
- 1.30 **Applicant; EA:** what is the position in relation to the Trans-pennine ethylene pipeline? Is this owned by SABIC, and if so have any discussions been held with the owners? Is any licence or consent required in regard to the pipeline?
- 1.31 **Applicant; EA:** is it appropriate to leave the control of dust emissions during the operation of the site to be controlled through the EP?

## 2. Policy matters

- 2.1 **Applicant; EA; LCC; WLBC:** S 30 of the Planning Act 2008 sets out the criteria to be met for a Hazardous Waste facility to fall within s 14(1)(p) of the Act and be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project NSIP. Those criteria include a requirement for a landfill facility to have a capacity for the disposal of hazardous waste of more than 100,000 tonnes per year. Although the application for the Whitemoss project is stated to be for an annual capacity of 150,000 tonnes per year, what evidence is included in the application documents to demonstrate that the actual capacity of the development would be in excess of 100,000 tonnes per year?
- 2.2 **Applicant; EA; NE; CA; LCC; WLBC:** For an NSIP, the National Policy Statement (NPS) on Hazardous Waste provides the primary basis for the SoS's decision on the development consent application. Is there any reason to consider that deciding the application in accordance with the NPS would lead to the UK being in breach of any of its international obligations?
- 2.3 **Applicant; EA; LCC; WLBC:** To what extent would the project accord with the requirement for new hazardous waste facilities as set out in A Strategy for Hazardous Waste Management in England (2010), in particular having regard to the statement in Annex 2 that existing hazardous waste landfill appears to be sufficient for current need?
- 2.4 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC; EA:** the NPS states at para 3.1 that the SoS will assess applications for hazardous waste infrastructure on the basis that need has been demonstrated. However, the ExA notes that the NPS does not "deliberately identify the exact technologies to be used to treat the waste"(para 3.4.1) and that Hazardous Waste Landfill "should only be used where, overall, there is no better recovery or disposal option"(para 3.4.13).

The ExA puts forward the view that the strategic need for hazardous waste infrastructure identified in the NPS should not be interpreted as an accepted need for a hazardous waste landfill facility at the application site. Not all applications for hazardous waste NSIPs will necessarily "clearly meet the need for infrastructure established in the NPS" (para 4.1.2) having regard to the policy objectives set out in the NPS in 2.1 and 2.3.

Submissions on the issue of whether or not there is a need for this particular facility in the location proposed are invited. The ExA does not consider that such submissions would relate to the merits of Government policy set out in the NPS, which is not a topic for debate during the examination.

The following questions are raised:

- a) Can it be demonstrated that the project would be consistent with the aims of the revised Waste Framework Directive (rWFD) (NPS para 2.3.2-4)?
- b) Can the applicant specify the origins, types and quantities of the expected arisings of hazardous waste which the application project would process? To what extent would the application project promote self

sufficiency and proximity by matching the expected arisings of hazardous wastes (NPS para 2.3.5-7)?

- c) How does the proposed landfill relate to the waste hierarchy and would it undermine options higher up the hierarchy (NPS para 2.4.1)?
- d) Can it be demonstrated that there is no better recovery or disposal option for the hazardous waste which would provide a better overall environmental outcome than a landfill facility (NPS para 4.4.2-3; 5.14.4)?
- e) Would the project make use of the most up to date technologies to secure environmentally sound management (NPS paras 2.5.5; 3.4.8; 4.13.1)?
- f) How would the project meet Government objectives to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and maximise opportunities for climate change adaptation and resilience (NPS 2.1(d); 4.6.2; 4.6.6-4.6.14)?

2.5 **Applicant; Health and Safety Executive (HSE):** NPS paragraph 4.8.1 advises that liaison with the HSE should take place at an early stage in relation to safety issues. Has such liaison taken place, and is there any reason to expect that the project would not comply with health and safety regulations?

2.6 **Applicant; HSE:** Is the project likely to require a hazardous substance consent, and if so is there any reason why such consent would not be forthcoming?

2.7 **Applicant; EA; NE; CA; LCC; WLBC:** The application includes proposals for the extraction of coal and other minerals from the application site. Which are the relevant national policy documents against which that part of the project should be assessed?

2.8 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC:** to what extent would the project comply with the policies of the Local Development Plan?

2.9 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC:** Would the development be appropriate in the Green Belt and what would be its effect on openness?

2.10 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC; EA:** to what extent are the Landfill Regulations (England and Wales) 2002 Reg 5 and Schedule 2 1(1) a relevant consideration in the determination of the DCO application?

### 3. Environmental Statement

#### The Environmental Statement (ES) and the Environmental Permit (EP)

3.1 **Applicant; EA:** It is difficult to be certain about the adequacy of the prediction/evaluation of impact in the ES due to the reliance on the EP to control potential impacts. It is also difficult to be certain about the proposed mitigation measures in the ES for the same reason. The ES should be a self contained document which provides the decision maker with all the environmental information necessary to reach a decision. If the ES relies on

the later submission of environmental information to support an application for an EP, there is a risk that the maximum parameters assessed in the ES may not fall within those that would be necessary to secure an EP. Furthermore, I need to be satisfied that there is no reason in principle, why the particular impact should not be adequately regulated under the EP regime (NPS para 4.13.4). The applicant is requested:

- a) To identify how the ES deals with the uncertainties associated with the EP.
- b) **Applicant:** Following the closure of the landfill the leachate treatment plant, landfill gas management, surface water management and associated fuel storage and infrastructure are proposed be retained at the site as necessary (ES para 5.6.3). The characteristics of these buildings are not described however and they are not illustrated on Figure ES 5 (Restoration Proposals), meaning it is unclear whether their retention has been considered in the assessment and/or adequate mitigation measures are proposed to minimise/avoid any related potential impacts. How would the retention of the buildings influence the restoration proposals, and does the ES provide an assessment of any impacts which might arise as a result of their retention?
- c) To identify those matters which it considers would be covered within the EP if the EP were to be granted.
- d) To provide an update on the status of the application to the Environment Agency (EA).

3.2 **EA; Applicant:** How certain can the ExA be that any potential requirements from an EP would be likely to fall within the development parameters described and assessed in the ES?

3.3 **EA:** the SoS would need to be confident that an EP is likely to be granted when considering the application for the DCO. At what stage would the EA be in a position to issue a letter to indicate that there is unlikely to be any impediment to the issue of an EP?

### **Input rates**

3.4 **Applicant, EA, LCC; WLBC; ARROW:** Chapter 3 of the ES sets out the proposed maximum input rates to the landfill void (150,000 tonnes per annum (tpa)). If these input rates are achieved, they would secure the filling/restoration of the site by the end of the permitted period.

- a) How do these input rates compare with the rates which have been achieved historically at the site?
- b) Can evidence be provided of the likely source and quantities of the hazardous waste arisings which would be deposited at this site in order to demonstrate the actual input levels likely to be achieved?
- c) To what extent could the hazardous waste arisings identified in b. be processed in alternative facilities which are geographically closer to the

source of the arisings<sup>3</sup> or which are at a higher level in the waste hierarchy than landfill?

- d) In the event that the input rates are not achieved, what would be the implications for the restoration of the site at the end of the permitted period?
- e) Would any potential changes to input rates fall within the parameters assessed in the ES?

## Retention of buildings

## Machinery

- 3.5 **Applicant:** please provide details of the types of machinery likely to be involved with the extraction of materials from the site. In particular, would the machinery be the same as used on the existing area of extraction, or would any additional machinery be required to extract and export the coal from the site? Does the ES assess all the potential impacts of the machinery to be used?

## Impacts on Health

- 3.6 **Applicant; EA; LCC; WLBC:** The assessment has been carried out based on the source-pathway-receptor methodology. Is this the most appropriate methodology to use for the assessment of the health impacts of the project?
- 3.7 **Applicant:** no dust, noise and health risk assessments have been submitted to the EA for all the relevant receptors, including those on Peel Farm adjacent to the site. Whilst the assessments are required for the EP application, until the ExA is satisfied that they will be adequately covered by the EP, they remain matters which are material to the examination of the project for the granting of a DCO. Can the applicant please clarify at what stage these risk assessments will be produced?
- 3.8 **Applicant, EA:** ES Chapter 7 considers impacts on health but the approach used has not attempted to quantify potential health impacts. The impacts of odour are of significant concern to the general public, even though the ES indicates that atmospheric emissions from the landfill and predicted vehicle emissions are unlikely to be significant. However, quantification of the potential impacts where possible would provide a more robust assessment of potential health impacts. The applicant is requested to provide such an assessment.
- 3.9 **Applicant, EA:** Impacts on health are not described in terms of their significance, nor have descriptors of impacts in terms of magnitude, extent and duration, been included. Can the applicant please explain why attempts have not been made to further describe the characteristics of the impacts, which is good practice in EIA as it helps to understand whether they are likely to be significant?

---

<sup>3</sup> Such as the facility at Randle Island, Runcorn

- 3.10 **Applicant, EA:** A description of the baseline has been set out in ES Section 7.3. However, information about the current baseline has not been quantified. For example, why has information on baseline air quality not been quantified? Can the applicant provide quantified baseline information?
- 3.11 **Applicant:** The applicant is requested to include the property on the application site as a receptor in the health impact assessment since it could theoretically be inhabited.

### Other assessments

- 3.12 **Applicant:** at what stage will the Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (HgRA) be available for each parcel of land to confirm that any engineering containment proposals are suitably protective of the environment and human health?

### Landscape and visual impacts

- 3.13 **Applicant; LCC; WLBC:** The application includes the alteration of the operational period of the current site activities and the western landfill area to the end of 2035 with restoration by the end of 2036. This leads to uncertainties regarding the adequacy of the landscape/visual assessment as ES Paragraph 11.3.1 states that the baseline for the assessment comprises the approved restoration for the current landfill area and the current situation for the western landfill area. How has the restored site been modelled to provide the baseline?
- 3.14 **Applicant:** Cumulative landscape effects associated with the development are presented in ES Table 1, Appendix D. The cumulative assessment of visual impacts is described in ES Paragraph 5.40 of Appendix O. The developments which are included in the assessment are shown on ES figure 9. These are quarry developments. Why is there no assessment for cumulative landscape and visual impact effects which includes non-quarry development, given that potential cumulative landscape and visual impact effects may not be limited to quarry developments only?
- 3.15 **Applicant, NE:** ES Appendix B includes a landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme the final details of which are to be agreed with NE. What is the current position in relation to the consultation; have any changes been made to the scheme; and if so does the scheme remain within the parameters described and assessed in the ES?
- 3.16 **Applicant:** Monitoring is proposed within the landscaping, restoration, habitat management and aftercare scheme (ES Appendix B). This explains that the monitoring will be used to assess the success of the management proposals and make any necessary changes, however the criteria used to measure success are not defined. Without such criteria, how would it be determined what changes will be required?
- 3.17 **Applicant, LCC; WLBC:** The ES states (Appendix F) that the viewpoints used in the assessment have been agreed with Lancashire County Council with one further viewpoint to be added later as part of the on-going assessment process. Can a SoCG be produced to indicate i) the extent to

which the viewpoints have been agreed with the local authorities; and ii) the extent to which the conclusions of the landscape and visual impact assessment are agreed?

### **Water resources**

- 3.18 **Applicant, EA:** Can any matters which are in dispute in relation to the assessment in ES Chapter 14 be clarified through a SoCG?
- 3.19 **Applicant, EA:** the representation received from the EA refers to the presence of two mine shafts which would be involved in dewatering and excavation. No assessment is included in the ES of the structural condition or hydraulic conductivity of the shafts, or of the potential for differing impacts compared with the excavation of coal strata. Furthermore the applicant has not conducted any controlled tests to ascertain how much dewatering would be necessary to secure the proposed mineral excavation or what the effects of this dewatering would be. However, the comments made by the EA appear to conflict with advice provided by them to the applicant prior to the submission of the application. Can the applicant and EA please clarify the position in relation to the assessments which the EA identifies as necessary in their representation.
- 3.20 **EA:** The proposed mitigation measures are described in Section 14.6 of the ES. ES Table 1 sets out how delivery of the proposed measures would be secured through the DCO. To what extent are the mitigation measures described in the ES (and secured through the DCO) likely to be adequate to secure the EP and are additional measures likely to be necessary?
- 3.21 **Applicant, EA:** The potential for the proposed measures to give rise to adverse impacts on other aspects of the environment is considered where relevant. This includes for example the proposed preparation of a water management plan (ES Appendix D) to be regulated by the Environmental Permit and secured through the DCO. However, the means of delivering the proposed measures is not clear. Can this be clarified?

### **Soil resources and agriculture**

- 3.22 **Applicant:** Chapter 18 does not describe the criteria that have been used to define the significance of potential impacts (e.g. magnitude/extent). This approach is good practice in EIA and helps to determine whether the conclusions are valid. It is an approach which has been used in other ES chapters. Can the applicant please clarify why the approach has not been adopted for this matter?
- 3.23 **Applicant; NE:** The Relevant Representation from NE states that the proposed Soil Handling and Management Scheme is satisfactory, subject to the resolution of some matters of detail. Are these matters the subject of ongoing discussion between the applicant and NE, and how is the applicant seeking to respond to NE's comments?
- 3.24 **Applicant:** the cumulative impact assessment in ES Section 18.6 does not cover any external developments. It has only considered the cumulative impact of the different aspects of the development itself. Can the applicant

please clarify the reasons for this approach, given the potential for adverse effects on soil/agriculture to interact with those from other types of projects nearby?

- 3.25 **Applicant, NE, EA:** Would all the mitigation proposed in ES Section 18.5 be secured through the draft DCO? The Soil Handling and Management Scheme and the Landscaping, Restoration, Habitat Management and Aftercare scheme is referenced in the DCO. Is this an adequate means for delivering the mitigation proposed?

#### **General Amenity**

- 3.26 **West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC), LCC, St Helens Council (SHC), EA, IPs, ARROW, Applicant:** the applicant has carried out a quantitative assessment of the potential effects of odour. However, the subjective nature of this approach can increase difficulty in determining the validity of the assessment conclusions. Has the applicant's approach been agreed with relevant consultees? Is there any more objective methodology which might be applied to the assessment of odour impacts at the application site?
- 3.27 **WLBC, LCC, SHC, EA, IPs, ARROW, Applicant:** what evidence is there to support the applicant's argument that hazardous waste does not produce significant odorous emissions (ES Paragraph 19.4.5)? What controls could be put in place to ensure that the site does not receive waste which is potentially odorous?
- 3.28 **WLBC, LCC, SHC, EA, IPs, ARROW, Applicant:** reference is made in relevant representations to complaints of odour from the site. What is the history of odour complaints relating to the application site, and what evidence is available to demonstrate that the odour emanated from the operation of the existing landfill site? Are there other potential sources of odour within the vicinity of the site?
- 3.29 **WLBC, LCC, SHC, EA, IPs, ARROW, Applicant:** to what extent is the existing gas management system effective in minimising or eliminating significant odour impacts? Would the existing gas flare stay in its current position; would its use be extended beyond 2020, and how far is the gas flare from the nearest residential property? Where would any future gas flares be located and what would be the distance between any future gas flares and existing properties?

#### **4. Other matters**

- 4.1 **Applicant:** what is the position with regard to the road access to the site? Would there be any changes to the existing access?
- 4.2 **Applicant:** What is the position in regard to the surface mining licence and any lease from the Coal Authority?
- 4.3 **Applicant; Save Bickerstaffe Colliery:** Would the application project have any impact on the cycle track in Bickerstaffe?

- 4.4 **EA; WLBC, LCC:** is there any reason to consider that the applicant would not follow best practice in the operation of the new facility? Has there been any incidence of poor practice in the past?
- 4.5 **Applicant; EA:** has any consideration been given to the potential for any impact on the cells within the site in the event that fracking was to be carried out in the vicinity of the site?
- 4.6 **Applicant:** has consultation been carried out with the relevant aerodrome operator/licence holder about any relevant safeguarding maps or agreements which might be affected by the project?

## Revised List of Matters to Be Covered In Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)

I request the preparation of SoCG, with an early start on their preparation. The date for their submission is set in the examination timetable at Annex B.

A SoCG should identify, at an early stage of the examination, the areas of agreement between the interested parties and where the differences lie. It should identify those matters which need not be in dispute or the subject of further evidence, and state where and why there may be disagreement about the interpretation and relevance of the information. The reasons for the differences and the interpretation of the implications of a difference can then be expanded in the evidence.

Unless otherwise stated or agreed, the SoCG should be agreed between the applicant and the other relevant interested party(ies), and submitted by the applicant.

It would be of assistance through the examination for the applicant to provide within each submitted SoCG a table which identifies the matters which are agreed and those matters which remain at issue between the parties to the SoCG. The ExA requests that the tables be updated during the examination to reflect additional agreement achieved, and which may then be included within the ExA's Report.

The preliminary SoCG should address the principle issues identified in the notification of the Preliminary Meeting letter (Rule 6 letter) dated 22 April 2014, in addition to any other matter which the applicant or any other party to a SoCG considers to be of significance.

Separate SoCG should be produced between the applicant and relevant parties on the requirements and articles proposed in the draft DCO, in particular whether they would provide effective mitigation for the development and meet the tests set out in National Planning Practice Guidance.

The parties with whom the ExA would wish to see SoCG concluded are set out below. This list is not exhaustive.

Lancashire County Council  
West Lancashire Borough Council  
Environment Agency  
The Coal Authority  
Health and Safety Executive  
Natural England

I wish to receive the preliminary SoCG to be submitted as specified in the timetable at Annex B, on or before **Thursday 26 June 2014**.

SoCG on the requirements and articles in the draft DCO should be submitted on or before **Friday, 25 July 2014**.

## Availability of Application Documents, Representations and Other Submissions to the Examination

All submissions will be made available on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website, and can be accessed by following this link:

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

A hard copy of submissions will also be made available at:

Skelmersdale Library  
Southway  
Skelmersdale  
Lancashire  
WN8 6NL

|                |           |                    |
|----------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Opening times: | Monday    | 09.00 am – 7.00 pm |
|                | Tuesday   | 09.00 am – 5.00 pm |
|                | Wednesday | 09.00 am – 5.00 pm |
|                | Thursday  | 09.00 am – 7.00 pm |
|                | Friday    | 09.00 am – 5.00 pm |
|                | Saturday  | 09.00 am – 4.00 pm |
|                | Sunday    | closed             |

Copying charges: A4 black and white 10p per sheet  
A4 colour 25p per sheet  
Other copying charges are available at the library.