



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Plenary sitting

A7-0335/2011

7.10.2011

REPORT

on the issues raised by petitioners in relation to the application of the Waste Management Directive, and related directives, in the Member States of the European Union
(2011/2038(INI))

Committee on Petitions

Rapporteur: Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	14
ANNEX.....	18
RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE.....	24

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on the issues raised by petitioners in relation to the application of the Waste Management Directive, and related directives, in the Member States of the European Union (2011/2038(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the right of petition enshrined in Article 227 TFEU;
- having regard to the petitions received and contained in the annex;
- having regard to Directive 2008/98/EC¹ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives;
- having regard to Directive 2008/99/EC² of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on the protection of the environment through criminal law;
- having regard to Council Directive 1999/31/EC³ of 26 April 1999 on the landfill of waste;
- having regard to Directive 2000/76/EC⁴ of the European Parliament and the Council of 4 December 2000 on the incineration of waste;
- having regard to Directive 2001/42/EC⁵ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (SEA);
- having regard to Directive 2003/4/EC⁶ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2003 on public access to environmental information and repealing Council Directive 90/313/EEC;
- having regard to Directive 2003/35/EC⁷ of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 providing for public participation in respect of the drawing up of certain plans and programmes relating to the environment and amending with regard to public participation and access to justice Council Directives 85/337/EEC and 96/61/EC (EIA);
- having regard to the Convention on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters (Aarhus, Denmark, 25 June 1998);
- having regard to the expert study ‘Waste management in Europe: main problems and best practices’ of July 2011;

¹ OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3.

² OJ L 328, 6.12.2008, p. 28.

³ OJ L 182, 16.7.1999, p. 1.

⁴ OJ L 332, 28.12.2000, p. 91.

⁵ OJ L 197, 21.7.2001, p. 30.

⁶ OJ L 41, 14.2.2003, p. 26.

⁷ OJ L 156, 25.6.2003, p. 17.

- having regard to Rule 202(2) of its Rules of Procedure;
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Petitions (A7-0335/2011);
- A. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received and declared admissible 114 petitions over the period 2004-2010 alleging breaches of this regulatory framework from the following Member States: Italy, Greece, France, Spain, Ireland (over 10 petitions each), Bulgaria, the UK, Poland, Romania, Germany (3-10 petitions each), Austria, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal and Slovakia (1 petition each);
- B. whereas the Committee on Petitions has drafted five reports on fact-finding visits related to petitions on waste to Ireland¹, Fos-sur-Mer (France)², Path Head landfill (UK)³, Campania (Italy)⁴ and Huelva (Spain)⁵;
- C. whereas petitions on environmental issues consistently constitute the primary group of petitions received and those on waste represent an important sub-group, and whereas concern about waste affects citizens very directly throughout the EU, notably as regards the permitting procedure for new waste management facilities or the operation of existing ones, followed by concerns about the overall management of waste;
- D. whereas a large majority of petitions on waste concern waste management facilities, with about 40% concerning the permitting procedure for planned new plants and another 40% referring to the operation of existing ones, of which 75% concern landfills and 25% concern incinerators, while the remaining petitions raise problems of overall waste management;
- E. whereas the most recent figures from Eurostat (2009) show that EU citizens produce on average 513 kg of waste per year, with many new Member States well below the average and the most industrialised countries in the lead;
- F. whereas those countries which produce the most waste show the highest rates for recycling, composting and incineration of waste for energy, while approaching or having reached zero for landfilling, whilst by contrast, those Member States which produce the least average waste are at the top of the league for landfilling and show much lower rates of recycling and even incineration;
- G. whereas some incinerators suffer from a lack of appropriate infrastructure for the separation and treatment of waste; whereas there do not appear to be clear limits for the kind of waste incinerated and concerns remain over the fate of toxic ash resulting from incineration;
- H. whereas Directive 2008/98/EC on Waste (the Waste Framework Directive (WFD))⁶ lays down rules designed to protect the environment and human health by preventing or

¹ DT 682330.

² DT 745784.

³ DT 778722.

⁴ DT 833560 + B7-0073/2011.

⁵ DT 820406.

⁶ 2008/98/EC.

reducing the adverse impacts of the generation and management of waste and by reducing overall impacts of resource use and improving the efficiency of such use, providing benefits to EU citizens in terms of health and well-being while at the same time achieving an environmentally sustainable method of waste disposal;

- I. whereas Directive 2008/99/EC on the protection of the environment through criminal law defines a minimum number of serious environment-related offences and requires Member States to provide for more dissuasive criminal penalties for this type of offence when committed intentionally or as a result of gross negligence;
- J. whereas a waste management strategy in compliance with the WFD has to guarantee that all waste is collected and directed to a network of appropriate waste treatment plants for recovery and ultimately disposal, which must include measures to reduce waste generation at source;
- K. whereas the deadline for transposition of the WFD was December 2010, yet only six Member States complied, and the Commission is taking active measures to ensure that the remainder complete transposition and begin implementation urgently;
- L. whereas household waste should be managed in compliance with the waste hierarchy, which is built on prevention, reduction, reuse, recycling, recovery (e.g. energy) and disposal, in accordance with Article 4 of the WFD;
- M. whereas a resource-efficient Europe is one of the flagship targets of the Europe 2020 Strategy and the WFD introduced a 50% target for recycling of municipal waste, to be met by 2020 in all Member States, recognising that developing the EU into a circular and green economy that uses waste as a resource is an important element of the resource efficiency goal;
- N. whereas there are several reasons why waste management plans in compliance with the WFD are not in place: these include a lack of implementation and enforcement, properly trained personnel at local and regional level and coordination at national level; insufficient controls at EU level, failure to allocate adequate resources and the lack of a fine system, thereby neglecting the opportunities of good waste management to reduce GHG emissions and other environmental impacts and for reducing Europe's dependency on imported raw materials;
- O. whereas an important factor, often neglected, is that the recycling industry offers the potential of up to half a million jobs, as certain types of waste constitute a productive resource which can contribute to enhancing environmental sustainability and to the move towards a green economy;
- P. whereas biowaste management in the EU is still in its relative infancy and the current legislative instruments need to be developed and techniques made more efficient;
- Q. whereas compliance with EU targets for collection, recycling and landfill diversion must remain a priority;
- R. whereas the Member States – at national, regional and local level – bear the main

responsibility for implementing EU legislation, and whereas the EU is held responsible by citizens for ensuring implementation of waste policy but does not have the adequate means to enforce the legislation;

- S. whereas, according to the Aarhus Convention, citizens have the right to be informed of the situation in their own territory and it is the duty of the authorities to provide information and to motivate citizens to develop a responsible attitude and behaviour; whereas, in accordance with Directive 2003/35/EC, Member States shall ensure that the public is given early and effective opportunities to participate in the preparation and modification or review of the plans or programmes required to be drawn up;
- T. whereas, through the petitions process, citizens express a feeling that the public authorities are not in control of the situation and are sometimes not prepared to make the efforts required to contribute to solutions, the relationship of trust is damaged and there is a downhill slide towards open confrontation and paralysis, thereby preventing action;
- U. whereas a recent study¹ conducted for the Commission to explore the feasibility of creating an EU Waste Management Agency highlighted the fact that many Member States lack sufficient capacity for preparing waste management plans and for inspections, controls and other actions to enforce waste legislation properly;
- V. whereas the study also identifies a high level of non-compliance, illegal waste dumping and shipments, large numbers of complaints from citizens and infringement cases before the ECJ, and therefore underachievement in protecting public health and the environment, an overarching goal of EU waste legislation;
- W. whereas illegal waste disposal has also become part of the activities of organised crime, which raises questions about the role of the authorities responsible and, in respect of industrial waste, of industry collusion;
- X. whereas monitoring and control procedures in place to ensure that household waste is not contaminated by toxic waste are sometimes weak or non-existent, leading to contamination of landfills and incinerators; whereas it must be stressed that disposing of toxic waste through incineration in installations conceived for burning household waste is categorically prohibited;
- Y. whereas an in-depth analysis of the petitions confirms that the legislation for a functioning and environmentally sound waste management system is largely in place and that the main issues concern implementation and enforcement, with 95% of the petitions related to failure at the local or regional level of government;
- Z. whereas one of the crucial factors identified for this state of affairs is a lack of information, awareness, administrative capacity and financial and other resources at local level;

¹ Study on the feasibility of the establishment of a Waste Implementation Agency, revised final report, 7 Dec. 2009.

- AA. whereas the Commission has stepped up support – including EUR 4.1 billion in 2005/6 – to improve implementation and enforcement of the EU waste acquis at national level; whereas, at the end of 2009, infringement cases related to waste nevertheless constituted 20% of all environmental infringements;
- AB. whereas the cost of bad waste management is high and a regional system capable of completing the whole cycle would produce substantial savings;
- AC. whereas, while the implementation of waste legislation in the EU is a public responsibility, private and multinational companies deal with 60% of household waste and 75% of waste from businesses, with an annual turnover of EUR 75 billion¹;
- AD. whereas the establishment of new landfills and incinerators falls under Annex I.9 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive², requiring an EIA under Article 4(1) or at least screening according to Article 4(2) if the landfill falls under Annex II 11.b;
- AE. whereas permits for landfills fall under Annex II of the EIA Directive if they are ‘likely to have significant effects on the environment’ and subject to threshold criteria set by the Member States;
- AF. whereas Article 6(4) of the EIA Directive lays down that ‘The public concerned shall be given early and effective opportunities to participate in the environmental decision-making procedures referred to in Article 2(2) and shall, for that purpose, be entitled to express comments and opinions when all options are open to the competent authority or authorities before the decision on the request for development consent is taken’;
- AG. whereas EU Directives and the Aarhus Convention make specific reference to access to information and public participation in decision-making in environmental matters;
- AH. whereas many petitions allege that the permitting procedure for waste management facilities was not fully in line with EU legislation, especially as regards the EIA and public consultation;
- AI. whereas, if permits are in compliance with the parameters set out in the directive and the EIA has been conducted, the Commission does not have the power to interfere with decisions taken by national authorities; whereas, however, some Member States have not conducted thorough EIAs before granting permits for opening or expanding landfills or building incinerators;
- AJ. whereas legal proceedings can only be launched once a project has been approved by the Member States; whereas it is hard for citizens to understand that the EU cannot effectively intervene until the whole procedure has been concluded and the project has been approved by the Member States;
- AK. whereas the questions raised by citizens during the public consultation process and the

¹ FEAD ‘Brussels Declaration’, 15 February 2011.

² 85/337/EEC.

Environmental Impact Assessment on planned locations for new landfills often concern alleged violations of protected areas, as in the case of the landfill in the Vesuvius national park, or fears over a negative impact on health and well-being;

- AL. whereas the Landfill Directive lays down the parameters for granting operating permits and for common monitoring procedures during the operation and after-care phases and whereas landfills closed before transposition of the Directive are not subject to its provisions; whereas the criteria enumerated in the Directive refer to location, water control and leachate management, protection of soil and water, gas control, nuisances and hazards, stability and barriers;
- AM. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received several petitions – notably the one which gave rise to the fact-finding mission to Path Head (UK) – which concerned landfills in close proximity to the nearest houses and where the population suffers noxious odours, increased air pollution and propagation of vermin close to their houses; whereas, however, as more precise criteria concerning the proximity of landfill sites to homes, schools and hospitals have not been laid down in EU law, the definition of the precise requirements to ensure the protection of human health and the environment are subject to the subsidiarity principle enshrined in the Treaties;
- AN. whereas petitions on landfills have frequently expressed concerns related to possible groundwater pollution, because older landfills may not have a liner preventing seepage into aquifers or the liners may look torn and create the suspicion of seepage or be on geologically unstable ground and too close to groundwater/drinking water reserves;
- AO. whereas the Commission reports that 177 infringements of the Landfill Directive have been initiated since 2001 and that a recent inventory identified a minimum of 619 illegal landfills across the EU;
- AP. whereas petitions and complaints to the Commission testify to the presence of a large number of illegal landfills operating without permits, though the exact number is unknown for lack of adequate monitoring;
- AQ. whereas it is recalled that landfilling should be a solution of last resort; whereas public authorities in some Member States which have fallen behind with waste prevention, recycling and reuse may be under pressure to expand existing – even non-compliant – landfills or open new ones in the short term as a method for eliminating refuse;
- AR. whereas the use of incinerators, which is low in the waste hierarchy, is well established and accepted by citizens in some countries considered to have reached a high level of compliance with the WFD and which recover energy in the process, and whereas countries which so far have not resorted to incineration may choose to do so in order to deal with accumulated backlogs;
- AS. whereas this can only be done on condition of strict control and respect for the relevant EU legislation and bearing in mind that such measures are likely to provoke understandable resistance from the most immediately affected populations in the vicinity, who are concerned about effects on their health;

- AT. whereas it should be acknowledged that more recent technology has reduced emissions from incinerators significantly; whereas in certain Member States – in particular those with high levels of waste incineration – local populations seem to show a higher level of acceptance, perhaps in recognition of the production of heat or power by incinerators, and also because of the transparency and accessibility of information on their functioning;
- AU. whereas permits for the establishment of incinerators meet with similar resistance, for similar reasons, to landfills, with the emphasis on fears of air pollution and negative impact on public health and/or environmentally protected zones;
- AV. whereas public authorities often choose areas already suffering from heavy air pollution for the establishment of incinerators, cumulative effects on the health of the inhabitants of the area should not be ignored and exploration of alternative methods of disposal of waste and production of energy through methanisation is often neglected;
- AW. whereas a focus on incineration for energy production as a first choice nevertheless represents a more wasteful method of waste management than prevention, recycling and reuse, which is why these should be given priority, in accordance with the waste hierarchy of the WFD;
- AX. whereas what is required in order to meet legally established recycling and prevention targets is the active participation of civil society, improved stakeholder participation and increased public awareness, to be achieved through media campaigns to raise public awareness;
- AY. whereas all the reports on fact-finding missions of the Committee on Petitions on waste issues mention the poor or non-existent communication between citizens and authorities, which in some cases can lead to tense situations arising and also demonstrations by citizens, as often reported in the press;
- AZ. whereas the world population is growing and therefore the total consumption is expected to increase significantly, which puts more pressure on waste management; whereas the solution to this problem would require, among other things, an increased awareness and implementation of the waste hierarchy principle;
- BA. whereas the Committee on Petitions has no preventive or judicial competence, but is able to defend citizens' interests, notably when problems arise in the application of EU law, by cooperating with the responsible authorities to find solutions or explanations for the matters raised by petitions;
1. Calls on the Member States to transpose the WFD without further delay and to ensure full compliance with all its requirements, in particular establishing and implementing comprehensive waste management plans, including the timely conversion of all the set goals within the framework of European legislation;
 2. Calls on the Commission to carefully monitor the transposition by the Member States of the EU directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law, to ensure that it is done promptly and effectively;

3. Taking into consideration the fact that waste and pollution form a serious threat to human health and the integrity of the environment, urges the Member States to speed up the introduction of an advanced waste management strategy in accordance with the WFD;
4. Calls upon public authorities to recognise that major investments are required to establish correct waste management strategies, infrastructure and facilities in most Member States, and believes that they should give consideration to earmarking an appropriate proportion of Cohesion Fund resources for this purpose or seeking direct financing from the European Investment Bank;
5. Considers that on-site inspection and enforcement capacity needs to be strengthened at Member State and EU level in order to ensure better compliance with waste legislation and therefore urges Member States to strengthen their capacity for inspections, monitoring and other actions at all stages of the waste management chain to better enforce waste legislation, and calls on the Commission to make provision for specific procedures enabling the subsidiarity principle to be fully applied in the event of serious shortcomings on the part of Member States;
6. Calls on the Commission for more specific guidance to be provided for competent authorities in order to assist them with the correct implementation of the waste acquis but notes that the resources available at European level are currently inadequate; considers, therefore, that complementary financial and administrative measures should be taken to provide better guidance and training facilities for officials working in the waste sector;
7. Calls upon the Commission to identify and focus on the more systemic weaknesses in the implementation of waste-related directives by the Member States, such as inadequate networks of waste management facilities, excessive reliance on land filling, growing amounts of waste produced per capita or poor recycling rates;
8. Believes that the establishment of a new EU Agency for waste management is not desirable and considers that the present institutional structure at EU level – based upon the Commission’s DG Environment and the European Environment Agency as a centre of expertise and excellence – is more cost-effective, although these must be further reinforced in order to provide more active oversight and enforcement;
9. Believes that the existing European Environment Agency could assist with this process and play a more constructive role in reporting on Member State waste management strategies and identifying weakness by assessing the compliance of waste management plans established by Member States with EU legislation;
10. Considers that closer cooperation between authorities at local, regional and national level has the potential to deliver positive results in terms of identifying models of best practice; notes that the Committee of the Regions, Europol, the European Union Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law, Municipal Waste Europe and the FEAD, the European Federation representing the waste management industry, could play a more useful role in organising such exchanges and thus also help to build trust among the populations affected by essential waste policy implementation;
11. Calls on the Member States which are confronted with manifest waste crises to consider

the fact that more efficient waste management strategies provide opportunities for both employment creation and revenue enhancement while ensuring environmental sustainability through reuse, recycling and recovery of energy from waste;

12. Recalls that the waste cycle hierarchy is a key element in Directive 2008/98/EC and, pursuant to the directive, should constitute the basis for all waste management; notes also that economic arguments speak in favour of following the waste hierarchy and focus first on prevention, then on reuse and recycling before incineration for energy and that wasteful and unsustainable landfills should be avoided as far as possible;
13. Urges the Commission and the Member States to promote, in this context, greater environmental awareness among the population about the advantages of efficient waste management, notably by advising them of the merits of pre-sorting waste and the real cost of collecting household waste, as well as of the financial gain obtained from recovering this household waste;
14. Believes that closer cooperation between Member State authorities and the Petitions Committee when the latter is dealing with the direct concerns of local citizens would provide an excellent opportunity to facilitate dialogue between the responsible authorities and local communities on priorities as regards the implementation of waste strategies, and can in some cases constitute an effective remedy when this may be useful in resolving local disputes;
15. Proposes that a common EU standard for colour-coding categories of waste for sorting and recycling be agreed so as to facilitate and improve citizens' participation in and understanding of the waste process, and considers that this may assist Member States' efforts to increase recycling rates significantly and quickly;
16. Encourages early and effective dialogue between responsible local and regional authorities and local citizens in the planning stages before decisions are taken on the construction of waste treatment installations, while understanding that the NIMBY ('not in my back yard') attitude is a big challenge in this respect;
17. Emphasises the fundamental importance of the correct and full implementation of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and proper coordination of the permitting procedures required under environmental legislation;
18. Calls upon the Member States to ensure that a complete environmental impact assessment is conducted before any decision is taken to establish or construct a new waste facility, notably an incinerator or methanisation plant, or – as a last resort – a new landfill; believes that such assessments should be mandatory;
19. Understands that in some cases urgent decisions are required to manage acute waste crises or to prevent crises developing, but emphasises that even in these cases, full respect for existing EU legislation must be guaranteed, particularly as the long-term health and well-being of local communities is at stake;
20. Is convinced that dialogue between public authorities, private-sector operators and affected populations must be improved and that citizens must have better access to

objective information, with more effective mechanisms for administrative and judicial reviews where these are necessary;

21. Urges the Commission to support and reinforce the public-private partnership network for projects of the awareness campaigns; calls for support for the ‘clean up the world’ campaign, for which over 400 MEPs have signed a written declaration supporting the event, which is expected to be supported by millions of volunteers next year;
22. Considers that petitioners could be encouraged to make full use of such mechanisms where they exist, which may be more effective and expedient than measures at EU level, particularly where individual waste facilities are concerned;
23. Urges the Commission to propose clearer and more specific criteria for the location of landfills in relation to local housing, schools or health facilities in order to ensure more robust guarantees against potential risks to human health and the environment, bearing in mind that there are a large number of variables and local considerations that need to be taken into account. with full respect for the subsidiarity principle;
24. Recommends that Member States authorities work together, especially when planning waste treatment plants in border areas, and ensure that cross-border impact assessments are conducted which take into account information of importance to all citizens and interested parties;
25. Encourages the Commission to fully recognise the linkage of effective environmental legislation regarding historical heritage sites and the conservation and promotion of biodiversity – such as that contained in the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats and Wild Birds Directives – with the EIA and Strategic Environmental Assessment Directives and with legislation regarding the management of waste;
26. Encourages the Commission, where it is the competent authority, to ensure compliance with procedural requirements under EU law (Environmental Impact Assessment, public consultation), including requirements under the Directives for the protection of nature and historical heritage sites;
27. Considers that only officially accredited landfill sites, compatible with the EU Landfill Directive and with duly established permits, should be used, and that their location should be clearly indicated and recorded, while all other landfill sites and discharges must be declared illegal, effectively closed, secured and rehabilitated and their immediate and surrounding environment effectively monitored for any potential negative consequences;
28. Considers that a public and clear definition of waste acceptance criteria is necessary, as well as the establishment of an effective tracking system for – especially hazardous – waste to ensure that only appropriate waste is transported to, and disposed of, in landfills or incinerators; believes that regular unannounced sampling and testing procedures should be applied consistently in all Member States;
29. Considers that more emphasis must be placed on the recovery of organic waste, especially in broadly agricultural regions, something which seems to have received little attention so far;

30. Urges that common criteria for the measurement of key emission values from incinerator plants be established and that measurements be available on-line in real time for public consultation, in order to establish trust within local communities and also to provide an effective alarm system in case of anomalies developing;
31. Reminds the Member States that, even when issues arise at local or regional levels of government, they are responsible for the effective monitoring and supervision of compliance with all EU standards and permits and encourages them to ensure adequate and competent staffing to perform this function, including frequent on-site inspections;
32. Notes that urgent attention is needed as regards the open and illegal dumping of mixed and unidentified waste and calls for the enforcement of strict management controls; reminds the competent authorities that, in full conformity with the IPPC Directive (2008/1, revised by Directive 2010/75), they must establish strict control over the handling of specific types of industrial waste, regardless of its origin, and calls on the Commission to do the utmost within its competence to monitor the competent authorities in effectively ensuring that waste is properly collected, separated and treated, for instance through systematic inspections, and that a credible plan is presented by regional authorities;
33. Invites all Member States to take measures to foster greater acceptance by populations in the vicinity of existing or planned waste management facilities, by demonstrating that the permitting and operating authorities are respecting the rules correctly and in full transparency;
34. Recommends the imposition of adequate and dissuasive fines and penalties for the illegal disposal of waste, especially toxic and hazardous waste, partly to compensate for environmental damage in accordance with the polluter-pays principle; believes that illegal dumping in the countryside of highly contaminated chemical or radioactive waste should be punished with very severe sentences commensurate with the dangers this practice poses for people and the environment;
35. Calls for effective measures to combat any infiltration of waste management by organised crime and against any connections between organised crime and industry or public authorities;
36. Recommends that, if public funds are allocated to private enterprises to manage waste processing, effective financial monitoring over the use of these funds should be put in place by local and/or national authorities to guarantee legal compliance with EU rules;
37. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Most European citizens expect public authorities to provide efficient and effective public services in terms of health, education, transport and security. However, one issue that provokes a growing number of petitions is the apparent inability of public authorities in many countries to deal satisfactorily with the problem of waste management.

The European Union has adopted a broad raft of legislation, applicable in all Member States, in order to ensure that the legal framework exists to deal with the inevitable result of our modern life-style, in terms of all the things we discard as waste, from our household, from our place of work, from our hospitals, from our industries and so on. It is obvious to all that failure to manage such issues, and failure to prioritise efforts in this respect, produces not only negative effects on human health and well-being, but also on the viability of the planet and its environment in the broadest sense.

Judging by the petitions received, the concern of many local communities is growing and this indicates that waste management is becoming a major political and social problem and people expect the European Union, which adopts such legislation, to deal with it. Indeed, it is the credibility of EU legislation which is at stake.¹

The waste industry in the European Union is a public responsibility, frequently managed by private interests and multinational companies, who deal with 60% of household waste and 75% of waste from businesses, with an annual turnover in excess of 75 billion euros.² The largest of these companies Onyx (Veolia) and Sita (Suez) are present in 2/3rds of the EU Member States employing more than 50,000 people in each case. These, and the many other companies such as Remondis and FCC, are experienced and professional businesses which have an interest in establishing and maintaining a good professional reputation for their key responsibilities in the management of the waste cycle. Waste is therefore not only a public service but a profitable industry and in this context the political authorities have a duty to ensure proper supervision and the strict application of the laws and regulations of the waste cycle.

An analysis of the waste management policies implemented in the Member States of the EU provides very contrasting information. A handful of Member States, including Denmark, Netherlands, Austria and Sweden are very advanced; indeed no petitions have been received from citizens in these countries expressing any concern about waste management. However, many other EU countries are far behind in their implementation of waste strategies and in this context the legacy of the past, and an excessive dependence on landfill options, linked to the need to change attitudes towards waste disposal³ has caused serious breaches of EU legislation to occur.

¹ See Working Document on 'The issues raised by petitioners in relation to the application of the Waste Management Directive, and related directives, in the Member States of the European Union', DT867298.

² FEAD 'Brussels Declaration' 15 February 2011.

³ 'Waste culture' is a term employed to indicate the need to educate citizens about how to differentiate between different types of household waste and the corresponding requirements of the 'Waste hierarchy', notably prevention, selection and recycling - such imperative requirements should become natural in every household.

The 'waste hierarchy' establishes a prioritisation for waste prevention and management and, in contrast to the former Directive, in article 4 of the new WFD it becomes imperative: prevention, preparation for re-use, recycling, other recovery - including energy recovery, and disposal by means of safe incineration, with landfill as the very last resort.

The Committee recognises that for the newer Member States, some of which are seriously handicapped by their lack of previous administrative or technical ability in the waste sector, it will no doubt take some time before their waste management skills will be brought up to standard. But they should be in no doubt about the urgency of implementing a coherent waste policy. Other Member States have no such excuses.

The Commission reported in January 2011 that 177 infringement cases concerning landfills had been launched since the deadline for implementing the Landfill Directive in 2001. They had furthermore calculated that there were at the very least 619 illegal landfills still being used in the EU. Added to this are about 1000 substandard landfills which are either to be upgraded or closed as soon as possible - some 3,300 landfills were closed between 2004 and 2006.

In its strategic report on the prevention and recycling of waste the Commission clearly demonstrates that it is using its best efforts to address the issue of waste management.¹ It outlines its medium term proposals and suggests introducing what it calls 'life-cycle thinking' in waste policy. There is however, no attempt in the report to name or shame Member States which are not applying existing Directives, nor does it look at the sorts of persistent problems which have arisen over the years and which remain.

It should be recalled in this context that the large number of infringement cases mentioned aim at ensuring legal compliance, yet from the petitioners' perspective more efforts need to be made to ensure proper follow-up actions in the actual implementation of the law. This is where Member State enforcement becomes a critical factor. This is also where the Commission recognises more needs to be done, and it raises the prospect of a more pro-active verification procedure combined with an early-warning system on compliance. However again, your rapporteur is of the opinion that this does not address adequately the urgency of the many justified cases brought by petitioners to the attention of the Committee.

Closely linked to the waste management process, although upstream of the process, are the EU Directives dealing with Environmental Impact Assessment and the access of citizens to information concerning the environment. Whether plans are being prepared for incinerator plants, methanisation plants or landfill facilities, EU procedures as established through these Directives must be respected by all Member States and their regions and municipal authorities. From the information received from petitioners there appears to be serious shortcomings regarding the due respect by several Member States for the objectives contained in these Directives which appear to be often inexactly interpreted, if at all.

Publishing the results of a public consultation on the EIA Directive, the Commission notes that 56% of respondents felt the process should be improved to ensure more effective

¹ Report from the Commission to the EP, Council, EESC and CoR on the Thematic Strategy on the Prevention and Recycling of Waste. COM(2011) 13 Final.

environmental protection, although not radically changed. More specific guidelines were one option to be considered, as well as an improvement in monitoring and better synergies with other EU Directives, including the WFD.

Of course, in recent years the Petitions Committee has conducted a number of missions which have allowed its members to obtain first-hand information from interested parties on the problems faced by local communities on the waste issue.

A visit to Ireland in 2007 enabled the Committee to investigate the impact of large scale industrial waste from an aluminium plant on the banks of the Shannon at Aughinish, (similar risks to those later witnessed in Hungary when ponds containing the same red toxic sludge were breached leading to several deaths and the devastation of a village community) the problems related to the site of an incinerator on the Poolbeg Peninsular in Dublin, on Waste water treatment in Kilkenny and Galway as well as in Ringsend, and on the development of a landfill in Nevitt Lusk.

Visiting the huge landfill facility near Marseilles, in 2008, members were able to observe on the one hand the fact that the facility itself was near saturation (though well-managed) but the development of the incinerator plant at Fos-sur-Mer, strongly criticised by the petitioners and local authorities, remains deeply controversial with serious concerns about its impact on the health of the local population.

In the United Kingdom, the Committee had visited the Carntyne Incinerator plant in Glasgow about which it was strongly critical, situated as it was in a poor urban area which was exposed to the stench and pollution from cattle incineration following the BSE crisis. Later, the Committee visited a landfill in Path Head, near Gateshead where the site presented many anomalies compared to the provisions of the Landfill Directive, not least of which was its proximity to local houses, schools and a hospital. Several other landfills already existed in the same area.

More recently during the current legislature the Committee has sent fact-finding delegations to Italy, as a result of several petitions received from the Campania Region, and also to Spain, to investigate the impact of the industrial waste stored in Huelva from phosphorous factory.

Largely as a result of such investigations the Committee commissioned an expert study which was presented at its meeting in July 2011. This allowed an independent assessment to be made from which a number of important conclusions were drawn, all of which have contributed to the observations contained in the accompanying draft report¹.

It is of course obvious that one cannot formulate an overall assessment of the implementation of EU waste policy on the basis of even a large number of petitions as they necessarily deal with matters which have led to concerns being raised. They do not provide any information on countries or regions that have already an effective waste management record. Nevertheless, petitions do indicate shortcomings in waste management and the frequent inability of Member States to fulfil their legal obligations. Lessons should be learned from such examples and the

¹ Waste Management in Europe. main problems and best practices. Directorate General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C and A. July 8th 2011.

recommendations contained in this report should therefore contribute to better implementation of waste management policy in the future.

ANNEX

Petitions received (2004-2010) alleging breach of EU waste legislation

Number	Title	Country
1885/2008	by Viniczay Tibor (Hungarian), on behalf of the Szentgotthard municipal authorities, concerning the siting of a waste incineration plant in Lafnitztal, Austria	AT
0431/2009	by Dimitar Platikanov (Bulgarian), on behalf of the "Initiative Committee for the village of Stozher", bearing 1180 signatures, concerning the establishment of a rubbish dump in the village of Stozher in north-eastern Bulgaria	BG
1296/2010	by R.B. (Bulgarian), on illegal incineration of waste at Lovech in northern Bulgaria	BG
1322/2008	by E.S. (German) on dioxin pollution in the town of Yakimovo-Montana in north-west Bulgaria	BG
1405/2007	by Ivaylo Asenov Krastev (Bulgarian), on behalf of Protection of the Health and Life of the Population and the Environment, on an unlawful operation of a solid residential waste disposal site	BG
1586/2009	by Kolio Kotev (Bulgarian), on behalf of the environmental movement 'Za Chista Priroda', bearing 2700 other signatures, on a refuse tip in the vicinity of the villages of Trudovets and Skravena	BG
1640/2008	by Georgi Gospodinov (Bulgarian) on the establishment of a waste disposal site in Dimitrovgrad in southern Bulgaria	BG
1923/2009	by Panayot Panayotov (Bulgarian), on behalf of the 'Campaign Committee of the Residents of the Villages of Kazashko and Topoli' on pollution from an incineration plant in the immediate vicinity of built-up areas	BG
0103/2007	by Volkhart Binner (German) on behalf of the 'Naturschutzbund Deutschland', German wildlife association and 10 co-signatories concerning sustainable EU waste disposal policy	DE
1024/2010	by Erich Pudewell (German), on the incidence of cancer among local residents near the Kamp-Lintfort waste disposal site (Germany)	DE
1277/2009	by Jochen Bremer (German), on behalf of the 'Sophienhütte am Harz' Citizens' Action Group, on a plant for the processing of solid, non-hazardous waste with a capacity of three tonnes per hour	DE
0166/2009	by José Manuel Dolon García (Spanish), on behalf of 'Grupo Municipal Los Verdes (Municipal Ecology Group), on a solid waste processing plant belonging to the Acciona company in Torre Vieja, Alicante, Spain	ES
0232/2010	by Manuel de la Calle Albero (Spanish), on behalf of 'Esquerra Unida de Elda', on an illegal solid urban waste disposal site near Cañadas de Elda, Alicante	ES
0612/2006	by Mr Angels Balanza Arrufat (Spanish), on behalf of 'Plataforma no a la incineración de Vall d'Alba', on local authorities' project to build a landfill of waste in Vall d'Alba	ES
0874/2008	by Mr. Miguel Angel Pedrosa Ruiz (Spanish), on the planned extension of the urban residual waste landfill in Colmenar Viejo (Madrid)	ES
1141/2010	by M.M.A. (Spanish), on the waste incinerator at Valdemingomez, Madrid	ES
1233/2007	by Ms Maria Carmen Castro Urzaiz (Spanish), on behalf of the Asociación de Vecinos Independiente de Butarque (AVIB), on public health risks related to the project of a waste recycling plant in Villaverde (Madrid)	ES
1266/2009	by H. H. Rogers (British) concerning the El Campello waste incinerator in Alicante.	ES

Number	Title	Country
1334/2010	by Samuel Martin-Sosa (Spanish), on behalf of the environmental movement 'Ecologistas en Acción', on the creation of a waste disposal site near the Spanish city of Toledo and its associated risks for local populations of rare and protected eagles	ES
1392/2007	by Iago Patiño (Spanish), on behalf of Izquierda Unida (United Left), on the incomplete closure of the landfill site at Chan dos Montes, Galicia	ES
1634/2008	by Domingo Trujillo Guedes (Spanish), on a landfill in San Bartolomé de Tirajana (Canaries, Spain) which is said to breach European legislation on solid waste.	ES
1769/2009	by Mario Silvan De Blas (Spanish), on the recycling of solid urban waste in the municipality of Valpielago, León.	ES
0091/2008	by Mrs Juliet Duff (Irish), on behalf of the Irish Doctors Environment Association (IDEA), on the reclassification of incineration in the Waste Framework Directive	EU
0023/2007	by Gerard Casanova (French), on behalf of the Port Saint Louis du Rhone Anti-incineration Collective, bearing 52 signatures, against the continued operation of a waste incinerator	FR
0074/2006	by Ms. Djamila Saidi Rebbadj (French), on a project of the local administration of Marseille (France) to build a plant for the incineration of domestic garbage in Fos sur Mer	FR
0148/2009	by Mrs J.S. (British) on chemical pollution resulting from the activity of Adisseo plant and its detrimental impact on the health of residents of a French town	FR
0252/2009	by Mr François Espuche (French), on behalf of Association Gratte Papiers, bearing 14 signatures, on alleged breaches of the European environmental legislation in connection with a planned landfill to be built at Lassac (Sallèles Cabardès, Aude)	FR
0415/2004	by Marc Baert (presumed French), on behalf of 'Association Transparence', on planning permission for a plant for the treatment of organic waste	FR
0474/2008	by C. Muet (French), on the projected extension of the CESSIEU landfill site	FR
0520/2007	by Philippe Carrier (French) against a landfill project	FR
0784/2007	by Yves Pinsard (French), on behalf of 'Friends of the Bucy Forest' association, bearing 2 036 signatures, on soil and water pollution from a waste discharge	FR
0818/2006	by Serge Jung (French), with 310 signatures, on the continued operation of the Fontvieille incinerator in the Principality of Monaco	FR
1102/2009	by Gerard Cussinet (French), on behalf of the Association de Défense pour le Droit au Logement et à la Consommation, on pollution caused by the improper use of the Cusset waste disposal site (Vichy Val d'Allier, France)	FR
1367/2007	by Eliane Audonet (French), with 16 signatories, against two plans for 'mega-dumps'	FR
1595/2009	by Alex Lesbros (French), on behalf of the Vendeuil municipal authorities, on the processing of hazardous waste and contaminated minerals near the river Oise within a conservation area in Vendeuil	FR
0034/2009	by Theodoros Tzioumis (Greek), on behalf of the Parish Council in Pallantio Tripoleos, on plans for a waste bundling plant in the vicinity of an archaeological site at Pallantio Tripoleos	GR
0039/2008	by Ch.L. (Greek), on inadequate treatment of hospital waste in Greece	GR
0078/2007	by Mavroudis Vouridis (Greek), on construction of a refuse tip in part of eastern Attica	GR
0212/2008	by Ioannis Papadopoulos (Belgian), on the creation of landfill sites	GR

Number	Title	Country
0734/2008	by Ioannis Hatzioannou (Greek), on the unlawful processing and incineration of waste in the town of Rhodos in Greece	GR
0742/2007	by Andreas Varnakiotis (Greek), on the siting of a refuse tip in Achaia (Greece)	GR
0799/2008	by Dimitrios Kiriakopoulos (Greek) and one co-signatory on failure to comply with the provisions of Council Directive 1919/31/EC on the landfill of waste in connection with a landfill site in the Thessaloniki district of Greece	GR
0920/2005	by Evangelos Alexos (Greek), on behalf of the Domokos Citizens' Action Group, and 3 co-signatories concerning an illegal waste discharge in Domokos Ftiotidas in Greece	GR
0971/2006	by Panagiotis Stathas (Greek), on behalf of the Association of Stonemasons, Tilers and Related Professions (O Ermis), with one-signature, on legal discharges	GR
0978/2008	by Panagiotis Bouras (Greek), on behalf of the Megalopoli municipal council, on non-compliance by the Greek authorities with EU waste disposal criteria and procedures in connection with the projected landfill site near Megalopoli in the Peloponnese region of Greece	GR
1144/2009	by U.K.P. (German) on the waste situation in the town of Gythio in the Southern Peloponnese and the local authorities' failure to enforce EU regulations on waste management	GR
1152/2010	by Georgios Toussas (Greek), on behalf of the Greek Communist Party (KKE), on environmentally damaging activities in the Ermioni municipality of the north-eastern Peloponnese	GR
1467/2007	by Odiseas Nikou (French), on an illegal dump at Dafnousio Ftiotidas in Greece	GR
0455/2006	by Péter Fehér (Hungarian), on behalf of Szélkiáltó Nature Conservation Association, concerning the regional waste dump [being] constructed in Kiskunhalas with EU support	HU
0010/2006	by Patrick Culhane (presumably Irish), on behalf of Cappagh Farmers Support Group, on Aughinish Alumina Plant in Ireland	IR
0206/2007	by David Rogers (Irish), on foul odours and impairment of the environment in the vicinity of Whiteriver Landfill Site, Collon (Ireland)	IR
0295/2005	by James Lunney (presumably Irish), on behalf of the Nevitt Lusk Action Group against a Superdump, on a proposed landfill facility	IR
0495/2006	by Chris Andrews (Irish), on a planned waste incinerator on Poolbeg Peninsula in Dublin Bay	IR
0650/2008	by Mr. Billy Leonard (Irish), on public concern over the detrimental cumulative effect of four landfill sites situated in the Ringsend area (County Derry, Northern Ireland)	IR
0766/2004	by Martina Finn (Irish) on a planned landfill in the County of Galway	IR
0870/2008	by Mr. John Keogan (Irish), on behalf of North East Against Incineration, bearing approximately 7000 signatures, on opposition to the planned construction of a biomass heat and power plant at College Nobber (Meath County, Ireland)	IR
0994/2005	by Denis Leonard (Irish), on behalf of "Killucan Kinnegad Environment Group", on a breach of several European Union's environmental Directives by the Irish Environmental Protection Agency	IR
1024/2008	by Mr. T.B. (Irish), on behalf of The Friends of the Aquifer Ltd, on alleged irregularities in the process of granting a licence for building an incinerator at Carranstown (Meath County, Ireland)	IR
1037/2010	by Amy Cullen (British), on behalf of Cork Harbour Health Group, on the Haulbowline toxic landfill and its impact on the health of the residents of Cobh and Cork Harbour (Ireland)	IR

Number	Title	Country
1296/2008	by Ms. Josephine Mary Mackey (Irish), on the health risk posed by the presence of a hazardous waste landfill in the vicinity of a residential area (Cork, Ireland)	IR
0012/2008	by Francesco Miglino (Italian), on behalf of Partito Internettiano, on the situation regarding the storage and processing of domestic waste in Naples and the Campania region in Italy	IT
0016/2008	by F.C. (Italian), on the domestic waste crisis in Campania (Italy)	IT
0026/2007	by Monica Sepe (Italian), on behalf of the 'Serre per la vita' committee, against a solid urban waste tip	IT
0031/2006	by Giampiero Angeli (Italian), bearing 21 signatures, concerning major health hazards caused by dioxins from waste disposal	IT
0052/2009	by Francesco Zurlo (Italian), on behalf of 'Verdi Crotone - Comitato Vertenza Ambientale Provincia di Crotone' (Crotone Environmental Committee), on contamination from waste in Crotone, insufficient access to information and the 'polluter pays' principle	IT
0179/2006	by Giuseppe De Simone (Italian), on behalf of the Mosaico committee, bearing 13 signatures, concerning alleged infringement of Community legislation regarding public tendering procedures in the waste management sector	IT
0209/2008	by Sebastiano Perrone (Italian), on the waste disposal crisis and the democratic rights of residents of Marigliano near Naples	IT
0273/2010	by Mariagrazia Canuti (Italian), on the Malagrotta waste disposal site near Rome	IT
0276/2008	by Roberto Giurastante (Italian), on behalf of Greenaction Transnational, concerning pollution from a toxic waste disposal site in the Trieste resort of Barcola (Italy)	IT
0347/2008	by Tommaso Esposito and Virginia Petrellese (Italian), on behalf of the Anti-Incinerator Citizens' Action Group, on a waste incineration plant in Accerra (near Naples) in Italy	IT
0410/2009	by Santangelo Carmelo (Italian), on behalf of Comitato Cittadino "Mare Protetto", on illegal dumping of waste in a protected sea area	IT
0413/2010	by Anna Margherita Ranieri (Italian), on behalf of Rete dei comitati e dei movimenti vesuviani, bearing 2406 signatures, on 15 years of waste emergency in Campania	IT
0424/2008	by Ugo Berti en Luciana Venturini (Italian), and 7 co-signatories, on failure to carry out an environmental impact survey in respect of a waste processing plant in Albiano Magra (Italy)	IT
0547/2009	by Alfio Fabio Micalizzi (Italian), on pollution of the Area Marina Protetta Isole Ciclopi nature reserve (Italy)	IT
0587/2007	by Marina Salvatore (Italian), concerning the serious health problem in Campania and the responsibility of the regional and local authorities	IT
0683/2005	by Vincenzo Marmora (Italian), on behalf of the 'Campagna nostra' citizens' action group, opposing the opening of a waste disposal site	IT
0694/2010	by R.I. (Italian), on behalf of Valori Democratici Uniti, on cleaning up illegal landfills for toxic waste in the municipality of Quarto (NA)	IT
0732/2010	by Roberto Giurastante (Italian), on behalf of Greenaction Transnational, on an illegal landfill site in Porto San Rocco (Muggia, Italy)	IT
0756/2007	by Giovanni Roviello (Italian) objecting to a waste discharge endangering public health and groundwater resources	IT
0787/2010	by Carmela Alberico (Italian), on behalf of Co.Re.Ri, on the failure by the region of Campania to fulfil the terms of Regional Operational Programme for Structural Funds and violation of Directives 2006/12/EC and 1999/31/EC by the location of the Ferandelle and Maruzzella landfills in Caserta province	IT

Number	Title	Country
0788/2007	by Werner Pichler (Italian), objecting to a toxic urban waste discharge	IT
0789/2007	by Gigliola Izzo (Italian) objecting to ecological waste fuel pellet storage near farmland and residential areas	IT
0861/2008	by N.T. (Italian) on the problem of waste in Naples and Campania in Italy	IT
0864/2008	by T.G. (Italian), on behalf of Demograssic, on the problem of waste in Naples and Campania in Italy	IT
0910/2007	by Francesco Di Pasquale (Italian), concerning the environmental emergency in Campania.	IT
0955/2008	by Ferdinando Kaiser (Italian), on the location of a waste disposal site in Chiaiano (Italy)	IT
0991/2007	by Vincenzo Gala (Italian) seeking a system of separate waste collection in the Campania region	IT
1011/2008	by A.S. (Italian) on a waste disposal site in Chiaiano, near Naples, Italy	IT
1036/2009	by Antonio Lupo (Italian), on behalf of Comitato Vigiliamo per la Discarica, bearing 2 signatures, on solid waste management in the province of Taranto	IT
1071/2007	by Angelo Storari (Italian), on behalf of 'Grilli estensi', objecting to a waste incineration plant	IT
1082/2008	by Raffaele Pacilio (Italian) on the illegal burning of car tyres and other refuse in the Naples area (Italy)	IT
1166/2010	by Marana Avvisati (Italian), on the landfill sites at Terzigno, Campania	IT
1182/2008	by M.E. (Italian), on behalf of 'La rosa dei venti di Chiaiano', on his objection to a waste disposal site in Chiaiano (Naples)	IT
1274/2010	by Luigi Gallo (Italian), on behalf of Movimento Cinque Stelle Campania, on a protest against the establishment of a purification plant for toxic waste in Campania	IT
1277/2010	by Francesco di Pasquale (Italian), on resolving the waste management crisis in Campania, once and for all	IT
1347/2007	by Gerda Glebe Visconti (Italian), on the refuse disposal situation in the Piedmont region of Northern Italy	IT
1292/2009	by Mr. Juozas Imbrasas (Lithuanian), on alleged breaches of EC environmental legislation in connection with the planned waste incineration plant in Vilnius	LT
0954/2006	by Mario Calleja (Maltese), on behalf of the Committee against the Sant' Antnin Recycling Plant, bearing 8000 signatures, on the EU funded project to build a recycling plant at Sain Antnin in Marsaskala (Malta)	MT
0198/2008	by Marcin Szymanski (Polish), bearing 2187 signatures, on the Polish authorities' alleged failure to enforce the provisions of European Parliament and Council Directive No. 2006/12/EC on waste	PL
1060/2010	by Konrad Janson (Polish), on behalf of Wolin town council, and 1 co-signatory, on pollution of the Polish island of Wolin and related failure to comply with the EU provisions on the treatment of waste	PL
1086/2008	by Stanislaw Zgrizywa (Polish), bearing approximately 1200 signatures, on the dumping of asbestos waste at Tuczepy and Stasow in the province of Swietokrzyskie in southern Poland	PL
1525/2008	by Henryka Solak (Polish), on failure by the Polish authorities to enforce Council Directive 99/31/EC on the landfill of waste	PL
0977/2004	by Antero Oliveira Resende (Portuguese), on behalf of the 'Coligação Democrática Unitária-PCP/PEV', on toxic waste disposal and the resulting danger to the environment and public health in Lourosa-Santa Maria da Feira	PT
0584/2007	by Mr Nucu Istrate Moldovan (Romanian), bearing 253 signatures, concerning environmental protection in connection with the location of an ecological landfill site in Bistrița (Romania)	RO

Number	Title	Country
0600/2010	by ML (Romanian), on behalf of the residents of Lupac, concerning a dispute regarding an ecological landfill site near Lupac (county of Caraş - Severin, Romania)	RO
0688/2008	by Petre Deaconescu (Romanian) on closing the incinerator at the hospital in Sibiu (Romania)	RO
0735/2010	by Attila Csegzi (Romanian), bearing 518 signatures, on the failure of the local authorities in Cristesti (Mures, Romania) to consult the residents before deciding on the construction of a compound for the transfer, selection and composting of waste	RO
1709/2008	by Zuzana Čaputová and Jaroslav Pavlovič (Slovakian), supported by 8 010 other signatories, on the siting of a waste dump in Pezinok (Slovakia)	SK
0055/2007	by Lynda Pasquire (British), on enforcement of the environmental legislation and the recycling of waste ash	UK
0103/2004	by Doretta Cocks (British) on the frequency of household waste collections	UK
0249/2007	by Ms Pauline Smout (British) on breaches of EC legislation in connection with the granting of a landfill permit at Hafod Quarry, Wrexham (Wales, UK)	UK
0727/2005	by Valerie Gardner (British), on behalf of Residents against Rubbish, on a Landfill Project at Path Head Quarry, Blaydon, Tyne and Wear	UK
0944/2004	by Sheila Ellis (British), on behalf of 'Residents Against Toxic Site', bearing 7 signatures, on alleged failure of the UK to implement the EU-Directive on the landfill of waste	UK
1390/2009	by Margret and Alan Bereton (British), on problems related to the operation of Cold Meece Landfill Site (Staffordshire)	UK

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	4.10.2011
Result of final vote	+: 21 -: 0 0: 0
Members present for the final vote	Margrete Auken, Elena Băsescu, Victor Boştinaru, Bairbre de Brún, Ágnes Hankiss, Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo, Peter Jahr, Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, Erminia Mazzoni, Mariya Nedelcheva, Chrysoula Paliadeli, Nikolaos Salavrakos, Angelika Werthmann
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Kinga Göncz
Substitute(s) under Rule 187(2) present for the final vote	Sonia Alfano, Roberta Angelilli, Elisabeth Jeggle, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Jan Kozłowski, Ramona Nicole Mănescu, Maurice Ponga