## Amended page

due to the implementation of kerbside garden waste collections and increased participation in kerbside recycling.

| Table 24: Core Indicator W2 - Municipal Waste Arising (tonnes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Management Type | $2000-1$ | $2001-2$ | $2002-3$ | $2003-4$ | $2004-5$ | $2005-6$ | $2006-7$ | $2007-8$ |
| Green (Compost) | 1,852 | 4,965 | 8,006 | 7,953 | 12,644 | 13,540 | $14,207^{*}$ | 17,916 |
| Other Recycled | 22,308 | 32,737 | 33,888 | 40,357 | 53,570 | 57,389 | $61,118^{*}$ | 67,667 |
| Total Recycled | 24,160 | 37,702 | 41,894 | 48,310 | 66,214 | 70,929 | $75,325^{*}$ | 85,583 |
| Waste Incinerated | 0 | 0 | 1,293 | 113 | 100 | 87 | 1,700 | 1,160 |
| Waste Landfilled | 275,080 | 280,143 | 284,690 | 283,828 | 271,677 | 261,439 | 260,600 | 243,374 |
| Total | 299,240 | 317,845 | 327,877 | 332,250 | 337,990 | 332,455 | $337,625^{*}$ | 330,117 |


| Table 25: Core Indicator W2 - Municipal Waste Arising (percentages) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Management Type | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1 - 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2 - 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6 - 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7 - 8}$ |
| Green (Compost) | 0.6 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 4.1 | $4.2^{*}$ | 5.4 |
| Other Recycled | 7.5 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 12.1 | 16.1 | 17.3 | $18.1^{*}$ | 20.5 |
| Total Recycled | 8.1 | 11.9 | 12.8 | 14.5 | 19.9 | 21.3 | $22.3^{*}$ | 25.9 |
| Waste Incinerated | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | $<0.0$ | $<0.0$ | $<0.0$ | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Waste Landfilled | 91.9 | 88.1 | 86.8 | 85.4 | 80.1 | 78.6 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 2}$ | 73.7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

* revised


## Flooding / Water Quality

4.5.14 Indicator E1 records the number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency that approval would have adverse consequences for flood risk or water quality.

| Flood risk | Water quality | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 1 |

This information is derived from the EA's own list of planning applications to which it had objected in 2007-8. Their schedule identifies 30 applications in Leeds. In 19 of these cases, the objection was subsequently withdrawn, often as a result of the provision of missing information. 4 applications were refused (on 3 of which flood risk was cited as a refusal reason), 2 were withdrawn by the applicant, and 4 had not yet been determined.

The sole application approved against EA advice was for one detached house in Collingham (07/01091/FU). This was allowed because there was

