

# NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN TO 2035

## INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION

### HEARING SESSIONS - PROGRAMME

Between 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> November 2019

**Venue: Crowndale Centre, 218 Eversholt Street, London NW1  
1BD**

**Sitting times: Wednesday and Thursday – 10.00 to 13.00 and 14.00 to  
17.00**

*The number in square brackets after each question is the number allocated to the questions in the original Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions Document.*

*The timetable and list of participants may be subject to change.  
Hearing participants are representors who have requested an oral hearing.*

<b>DATE</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PARTICIPANT S</b>
-------------	--------------	--------------------------

<p><b>WEDNESDAY 20 NOVEMBER</b></p> <p><b>10.00 am</b></p>	<p>Introduction by the Inspector Opening Statement by the Boroughs</p> <p><b>AGENDA</b></p> <p><b>A LEGAL COMPLIANCE</b></p> <p><b>Main Matter 1 – Duty to Co-operate and Legal Issues</b></p> <p><b>Duty to Co-operate</b></p> <p>Have the Boroughs engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with all relevant organisations on strategic matters of relevance to the plan’s preparation, as required by the Duty to Co-operate (under s 20(5)(c) and 33A)? On which issues has co-operation taken place? How was co-operation carried out and with what results? Has this been documented? Are there any outstanding issues? [1]</p> <p>1. How has the Duty to Co-operate been met with regard to the spatial plans of:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) all the relevant prescribed bodies in London, including constituent Greater London Authority, City and London Borough Councils and neighbouring Councils?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) all relevant local authorities and prescribed bodies outside London on strategic and cross boundary matters in the wider South East? [2]</p> <p><b>Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 19 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)</b></p> <p>Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme including content and timescale? [3]</p> <p>Has the Plan been prepared in compliance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), allowing for effective engagement of all interested parties and meeting the minimum consultation requirements set out in the regulations? [4]</p> <p>Have the Boroughs carried out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and prepared a report on the findings of the appraisal? Is there clear evidence</p>	
--	--	--

## **B SOUNDNESS**

### **Main Matter 2 – Aim and objectives for Waste Development**

Issue: Whether the Aim and Strategic Objectives of the Plan are the most appropriate, are soundly based and provide an appropriate basis for meeting the future waste management needs sustainably.

Does the Plan reflect future patterns of growth in the plan area? [12]

Does the Plan cover everything necessary, as set out in the NPPF, NPPW and PPG? [13]

Explain how the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) have informed the Aim and Strategic Objectives of the Plan to reflect the principles of sustainable development with particular regard to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change and sustainable transport. [14]

Does the Plan demonstrate that adequate consideration has been given to cross-boundary issues and strategic priorities? In particular, is the aim correct as some of the North London Boroughs will be partially reliant on areas beyond the plan area for the management of waste by landfill? [15]

Is the aspiration for net self-sufficiency an appropriate strategy for all waste types, excluding excavation waste, and does the aim make it clear that this excludes excavation waste or should excavation waste be referred to in the aim/objectives? [16]

Is it clear when the aim of net self-sufficiency for the waste streams identified is to be achieved and is this aim of the Plan adequately reflected in the Monitoring and Implementation section? In particular, paragraph 5.6 identifies that North London is a net exporter of waste. Therefore, how does the Plan, and over what period, move the management of waste from a position of net exporter to net self-sufficiency and how is this to be monitored? [17]

Should the aim and objectives refer to waste imports and/or seek any reduction in waste imports taking into account the needs of neighbouring Councils? [18]

Is it clear which version of the London Plan is referred to in the strategic objectives and throughout the Plan? [19]

<p><b>14.00pm</b></p>	<p><b>Main Matter 3 – Spatial Framework for Waste</b></p> <p>Issue: Whether the Spatial Framework for waste management is appropriate and is soundly based.</p> <p>Does the Spatial Framework adequately reflect the aim and objectives for waste development? [23]</p> <p>Is the methodology/assessments used to calculate capacity gaps, amount of waste to be managed and land take requirements robust and clear and does it adequately take into account any potential future dampening factors on growth and forecasts in waste arisings? [24]</p> <p>Should any reference be made to the waste forecasts and methodology used in the emerging new London Plan? [25]</p> <p>Does the methodology/assessments utilise the latest data and could there be any 'over-inflation' in the outputs from the methodology? In particular, if Table 3 and paragraph 5.6 identify surplus capacity, and the same paragraph also refers to North London as being a net exporter, could there be an argument that the proposals for future waste facilities would result in over provision? If not, should there be more detailed explanation as to why this is not the case? [26]</p> <p>Should the Plan provide more data on waste imports and consider/identify the effect of imports on the aspiration of net self-sufficiency? [27]</p> <p>How does the Plan reflect the proximity principle in relation to sustainable waste transport movements? [28]</p> <p>Does/should the Plan consider opportunities for replacement capacity outside of the plan area? [29]</p> <p>In paragraph 4.11 is the phrase "Green Belt in the north, will be largely out of bounds" appropriate and overly constraining? Does this appropriately take into account the fact that a very special circumstance would be necessary to support waste development proposals in the Green Belt? [30]</p> <p>Should paragraphs 4.18 and 4.19 make any reference to the impact of decentralised heat and energy opportunities on climate change? Should any refence by made to the carbon dioxide emission objectives in the emerging new</p>	
-----------------------	--	--

<b>DATE</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>
-------------	--------------	---------------------

<p><b>THURSDAY 21 NOVEMBER  10.00am</b></p>	<p><b>AGENDA</b></p> <p><b>Main Matter 4 – Future Waste Management Requirements</b></p> <p><i>Issue: Whether the future waste management requirements are justified by the evidence based.</i></p> <p>Is the site and area search and selection process (methodology) clear, robust and justified? [49]</p> <p>Are facilities, existing and proposed, appropriately located in close proximity to waste sources, particularly as the Sustainability Appraisal identifies that some Boroughs are better equipped to deliver suitable waste sites than others? [50]</p> <p>Does the Plan provide sufficient guidance for the Boroughs to consider the implications of existing and future waste management facilities with regard to land use planning allocations and policy formulation within their Local Plans? [51]</p> <p>Does the Plan identify existing and future areas of focus to enable the waste industry to deliver the facilities that are needed over the plan period relevant to the types of waste streams that need to be managed and the operational requirements of the respective waste management facilities? [52]</p> <p>How does the Plan encourage co-locational waste management? [53]</p> <p><b>Main Matter 5 – Policies</b></p> <p><i>Issue: Whether the policies strike an appropriate balance between making appropriate provision for waste management over the plan period and protecting people and the environment.</i></p> <p><b>Policy 1</b></p> <p>Is there a conflict between the requirements of Policy 1 and supporting paragraph 9.7 and paragraph 8.11? In particular, Policy 1 and paragraph 9.7 requires that compensatory capacity will be delivered on a suitable replacement site within North London. However, paragraph 8.11 identifies that some replacement capacity will be replaced outside of North London. Whilst clarification of this matter is required, how can replacement capacity outside North London be achieved beyond the administrative boundaries of the plan area and how does this effect the aspiration for net self-sufficiency? [54]</p>	
---	--	--

