

## **STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

### **BETWEEN**

### **THE NORTH LONDON BOROUGHS**

### **AND**

### **HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared to identify areas of agreement between the Boroughs working on the North London Waste Plan (“the North London Boroughs”) and Hertfordshire County Council. The North London Boroughs are Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest. The Statement of Common Ground is on matters relating to Hertfordshire County Council’s representations on the Proposed Submission North London Waste Plan (2019) to assist the Inspector during the examination of the North London Waste Plan.

#### **Hertfordshire County Council representations**

Hertfordshire County Council’s representations relate to clarifications, particularly around waste exports and draft new London Plan targets, and are not related to the soundness of the North London Waste Plan (NLWP).

Hertfordshire County Council’s representations are set out in full in Appendix A, alongside the section of the NLWP they refer to.

#### **Areas of Agreement**

The proposed modifications to the Proposed Submission NLWP set out in Appendix B are sufficient to address Hertfordshire’s points about waste exports.

#### Safeguarding

All existing waste sites in London are safeguarded through the London Plan. Policy 1 makes clear that all waste sites in North London are safeguarded. It is therefore not considered necessary to include a hierarchy of sites.

#### Policy 3 – Windfall Sites

The NLWP includes a spatial principal of a geographical spread of waste sites across North London. The policy of directing new waste facilities firstly towards Areas identified as most suitable for new waste facilities is in line with the spatial framework.

**Signed on behalf of the North London  
Boroughs**

Signed:  
Archie Onslow  
Programme Manager, North London  
Waste Plan  
Date:

**Signed on behalf of Hertfordshire  
County Council**

Signed:  
Julie Greaves  
Minerals and Waste Policy Manager  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Date:

## Appendix A: Representations from Hertfordshire County Council

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
40-1/13	3 and 4	All	I am writing in response to the above publication and thank the NLWA for its continued engagement with Hertfordshire County Council. As stated at previous stages of plan production; HCC support the Strategic Objectives and Spatial Principles set out in the North London Waste Plan.
40-2/13	7	SP	<p>In particular, HCC is supportive of the continued commitment to planning for net self-sufficiency in respect of Local Authority Collected waste, Commercial &amp; Industrial waste and Construction &amp; Demolition waste. The county council recognise the difficulties in planning for net self-sufficiency with regard to Excavation waste and welcome ongoing engagement with the NLWA, GLA, East of England and South East of England authorities regarding this issue.</p> <p>It is recognised that the total existing capacity in the area is greater than the current waste arising and that some facilities have a 'wider than local' catchments. It is also recognised and supported that, in line with net self-sufficiency, not all types of facility/waste are or can be facilitated in the area and therefore, import and export will continue.</p>
40-3/13	5	5.21	With particular regard to C,D&E waste, para 5.21 states that the London Plan includes a target of 95% recycling of this waste stream by 2020, however, the most recent discussions with the GLA (and still to be addressed at the EiP sessions) have suggested that the 'E' element be separated from this target. The North London Waste Plan will need to reflect this and focus on the 'beneficial use' of excavated materials as best it can prior to export.
40-4/13	7	7.6	It is noted that 14% of the waste arising in the NLWP area is exported to Hertfordshire and that the plan seeks to reduce exports by treating waste up the hierarchy, with Excavation waste being the remaining issue of concern.
40-5/13	6	6.3	Landfill is clearly constrained in both the East and South East of England, however, waste should (with the implementation of policies) be moved up the hierarchy with the closure of landfill sites putting pressure for the delivery of better market solutions. The county council support the recycling targets that

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
			are set out in the plan together with the land take requirements for facilities to ensure that waste is moved up the hierarchy and that these targets can be met.
40-6/13	7	SP	The Strategic Policy is supported however; the distinction between other strategic and non-strategic policies is unclear. HCC would support the safeguarding of existing facilities as a strategic policy as this would contribute to the continued distribution of facilities, thereby ensuring sufficient land to meet requirements.
40-7/13	9	Policy 1	HCC would also support and suggests the identification of Strategic Safeguarded Sites, such as Edmonton, as they provide a significant contribution to the waste capacity needs of the area and beyond. The plan could have an overarching safeguarding policy (for all waste sites) which then specifically lists those most important sites to maintaining a suitable network. This would highlight their importance together with the level of protection that they should be afforded.
40-8/13	9	Policy 1	HCC support Policy 1- Existing Waste Sites and believe that it could be strengthened to identify Strategic Sites and also state that compensatory provision should be delivered prior to the loss of existing capacity. This is set out in the supporting text (para 9.7) and would give greater weight and clarity if part of the policy.
40-9/13	7	Table 9	Table 9 of the plan, projected exports to landfill, recognises that sites outside the plan area are closing and that by moving waste up the hierarchy (via the provision of recycling and recovery facilities) this will reduce the need for landfill.
40-10/13	9	Policy 3	Policy 3 – Windfall Sites, suggests that there is a hierarchy for the delivery of sites with applicants having to demonstrate that the identified sites are ‘not available or suitable’. These would be difficult tests to demonstrate and potentially restrict/lessen the flexibility of the plan and choice of suitable sites. There may be a more suitable site other than those which have been identified. There is also the potential for this approach to stifle the relocation of existing sites.
40-	9	Policy 4	Policy 4 – Re-use and Recycling Centres, states that facilities will be permitted

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
11/13			in area of identified need 'or elsewhere' which may contradict the wording of policy 3 which suggests a clear hierarchy.
40-12/13	9	Policy 8	Policy 8 – Control of Inert Waste, could be strengthened by adding the need to first move such waste up the hierarchy prior to final disposal. This policy could also encourage the on- site recycling and reuse of such waste and any clean excavated materials.
40-13/13	12	All	In summary, Hertfordshire County Council has no substantial issues regarding the soundness of the document and welcomes the opportunity to comment on the NLWP

## Appendix B: Proposed Modifications

Section	Proposed change	Representation code
5.21	[...] The <u>draft New London Plan</u> includes a target of 95% <u>reuse/recycling/recovery of C&amp;D waste CD&amp;E by 2020 and 95% beneficial use of excavation waste.</u>	Hertfordshire (Rep 40-3/13)
5.31	Engagement to date has identified a constraint to the continuation of waste exports to landfill from North London relating to the scheduled closure of landfill sites during the plan period. Details can be found in the paper, Exports to Landfill 2017-2035, on the NLWP website ( <a href="http://www.nlwp.net">www.nlwp.net</a> ), though the operation of some of these sites may be extended beyond their currently permitted end date. <u>The destination of waste is largely dependent on market forces and therefore it is not possible to identify specific alternative destinations where North London's waste will go after the closure of landfill sites during the plan period.</u> The boroughs will continue to monitor this information <del>throughout the preparation of the NLWP, and after it</del> <u>the NLWP</u> is adopted as reflected in the monitoring framework in section 10.	Hertfordshire 40-5/13
5.32	<del>Nonetheless, as set out in the exports to landfill paper, alternative capacity at other potential destinations has been identified for the amount of waste currently being exported to those sites earmarked for closure during the plan period. It is recognised that non-hazardous landfill capacity in the wider south east is declining and no new non-hazardous landfill sites are being put forward by waste operators. A small number of new inert waste sites are being put forward in former mineral works. The lack of landfill capacity in the wider south east is an issue for all WPAs preparing plans and there is a continuing need to plan to manage waste further up the waste hierarchy to help reduce the need for landfill capacity. The paper shows that</del> <u>There is opportunity for the market to find an are both alternative destinations sites and adequate void space in London, South East and East of England for to take North London's 'homeless' waste in the short term between 2018 and 2035. In the longer term, beneficial use of</u>	Hertfordshire 40-5/13

	<u>excavation waste and the Circular Economy Statements will assist the North London Boroughs to reduce exports of waste to landfill and monitor the destinations of waste exports.</u>	
P4	<p><b>Policy 4 – Re-use &amp; Recycling Centres</b></p> <p>Proposals for Re-use &amp; Recycling Centres will be permitted where:</p> <p>a) They <u>improve the coverage of centres across the North London Boroughs, in particular are sited in an area of identified need for new facilities in Barnet or Enfield or elsewhere where they improve the coverage of centres across the North London Boroughs, and;</u></p> <p>They are in line with relevant aims and policies in the North London Waste Plan, London Plan, Local Plans and other related guidance.</p>	Hertfordshire Rep 40-11/13
P8	<p><b>Policy 8: Control of Inert Waste</b></p> <p><u>Inert waste should be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible, including on-site recycling and reuse of such material.</u></p> <p>Proposals for development using inert waste will be permitted where the proposal is <u>for beneficial use, including but not limited to: both essential for, and involves the minimum quantity of waste necessary for:</u></p> <p>a) <del>The purposes of</del> Restoring former mineral working sites; or  b) Facilitating an improvement in the quality of land; or  c) Facilitating the establishment of an appropriate use in line with other policies in the Local Plan; or  d) Improving land damaged or degraded as a result of existing uses and where no other satisfactory means exist to secure the necessary improvement.</p> <p><del>Where one or more of the above criteria (a-d) are met, a</del> <u>All proposals using inert waste should:</u></p> <p>a) Incorporate finished levels that are compatible with the surrounding</p>	Hertfordshire 40- 12/13

	<p>landscape. The finished levels should be the minimum required to ensure satisfactory restoration of the land for an agreed after-use; and</p> <p>b) Include proposals for high quality restoration and aftercare of the site, taking account of the opportunities for enhancing the overall quality of the environment and the wider benefits that the site may offer, including biodiversity enhancement, geological conservation and increased public accessibility.</p> <p>Proposals for inert waste disposal to land will not be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the waste can be managed through recovery operations <del>and that there is a need to dispose of waste.</del></p>	
--	--	--