

North London Waste Plan to 2035

Hearing Statement

B Soundness

Main Matter 5 - Policy 2

Question 62



Green veined white butterfly Pinkham Way

The Pinkham Way Alliance

Representor No 36

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Q 62 Response	3

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

Question 62

Is the identification of the 'waste facility type' in Table 11 appropriate or should this matter be left to the development management process? If the waste facility type is proposed to remain, should Table 13 be introduced earlier or as part of Table 11 to explain what facility types A-E are?

1 Response

- 1.1 The case to retain a degree of restricted facility type appears to be strong.
- 1.2 Sites and Areas report January 2019 has been undertaken following NPPF guidance and individual site assessments said to be made in line with Government guidance. Conclusions are evidenced and drawn to exclude / include as appropriate specific forms of waste management.
- 1.3 The resultant determination, while not always completely accurate (eg A22-HR point 13, Flood Zone assessment) rules out the feasibility of certain types of plant on grounds of eg available area versus typical plant type size-need, or proximity to nearby receptors. There is no evidenced need why this independent analysis should be cast aside now only to be necessarily recast at a later date.
- 1.4 However, were it to be agreed, then changes to the enhanced suite of facility types then becoming available across the various Industrial Land areas would need to be fed into the capacity gap modelling process to assess wider implications and so ensure the plan's results were based on proportionate evidence.
- 1.5 With the resulting greater degree of flexibility implied, the inevitability would be a reduction in the resulting gross land need currently being sought.