

North London Waste Plan to 2035

Hearing Statement B Soundness

Main Matter 3 – Spatial Framework for Waste Question 38



Flora including Vetch on Pinkham Way

**The Pinkham Way Alliance
Representor No 36**

Contents

1.	Introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.	Main Matter 3: Question 38	1
3.	Conclusion	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Introduction

This Hearing Statement is submitted on behalf of the Pinkham Way Alliance (PWA).

Pinkham Way Alliance is a community campaign group which came together in early 2011 when residents living in the surrounding area of the Pinkham Way site became concerned about plans by the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) to develop the site for a large scale MBT waste facility.

Since then, PWA has taken an active interest in and has participated in the preparation of the original Submission version of the North London Waste Plan, the Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies document and the Haringey Site Allocations DPD, having made representations to and appeared at the examinations in public of all those plans.

PWA has approximately 3000 supporters

1. Question 38

Are the land take requirements in Table 7 robust and should the Plan seek to provide opportunity to intensify capacity at existing sites by seeking more efficient use of land?

- 1.1 As well as requiring the opportunity to intensify capacity at existing sites by optimising the use of land –horizontal footprint plus vertical opportunities¹ – the intensification of capacity should be considered via improving the productivity of existing throughput / processes. Few UK industries would expect to survive without continuous improvement in their productivity; waste processes are unlikely to be devoid of similar opportunity.
- 1.2 The implications from both site intensification mechanisms to the capacity gap (if then any) and its resulting land take need (if then any) should be brought out.

2. Conclusion

- 2.1 There is no evidence the modelling methodology of the NLWP allows for site productivity, process or general management improvements through capital or labour intensification over time. That is a real-world gap which can typically be of real value. They offer another area of potential to close the NLWP's identified capacity gap.
- 2.2 Combined with the downside potential from waste forecasts the aggregate effect is to indicate downside potential in the NLWP Table 7 land take requirement.

Suggested Approach

- 2.3 To construct a scenario overlay to the chosen option using viable productivity improvement parameters, eg:
- Building in 1.5% operational productivity improvement each year;
 - Building in (one off, flat) 5% uplift in operational capacity due to technological, process, production or other means from year ten;
 - Building in new entrant capacity of 25k tpa every five years, a proxy for "Windfall Sites";
 - Utilising the optimal land / throughput conversion ratio identified in the UK for equivalent waste streams.
- 2.4 This would be in addition to a parallel, aggregable, assessment of the footprint potential from individual sites.
- 2.5 The implications (opportunity) by utilising the consolidated input / output format (Main Matter 3 question / answer 24) would help scale the degree of downside potential in the current land take requirement.

¹ As captured eg in Mayors response Representations Received Representor order Aug 2019 GLA /30.11/4/4.5

