

## **STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND**

**BETWEEN**

**THE NORTH LONDON BOROUGHS**

**AND**

**NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY**

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 the North London Waste Authority (NLWA). The North London Boroughs are Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest. The Statement of Common Ground is on matters relating to North London Waste Authority’s representations on the Proposed Submission North London Waste Plan (2019) to assist the Inspector during the examination of the North London Waste Plan.

### **North London Waste Authority representations**

The NLWA wish to reiterate that it considers the NLWP generally sound and legally compliant, however, there are a limited number of minor textual changes required for clarity and accuracy, but which are not required for soundness.

The NLWA’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 meet North London Waste Authority’s points on accuracy and clarity (NLWA Reps 17-1, 17-2 17-3, 17-6 and 17-7).

Both parties agree it is common ground that area A15-HC is suitable for waste management facility type C. We also agree with that a thermal treatment facility would not be suitable on the site and therefore whole category of category D is excluded.

### **Areas of Disagreement**

Areas of disagreement relate to NLWA Reps 17-4 and 17-5.

#### **Rep 17-4: Broad type of waste facilities suitable for Pinkham Way**

**NLWA considers** that: the NLWP should not specify to the extent that it does, what types of waste facility are suited to each identified area in the NLWP. In addition, since the NLWP submission version there have been a number of government consultations in the past year about the framework for wastes management in the UK, including proposals for introducing

a Deposit Return Scheme and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) which could have a significant impact on the way in which waste is managed in the future. As a result, the requirements for waste reuse, recycling and recovery infrastructure could be very different from what is needed now. NLWA also considers that some of the suitability information in Table 11 requires further review and updating.

**The Boroughs consider** that the waste facility types set out in table 11 are a key part of the NLWP site assessment process. The process is described in NLWP section 8 and para 8.21 and in the Sites and Areas Report.

The approach regarding waste facility types is in line with government guidance. In section 4 of the NPPW, it says that WPAs should identify the broad type or types of waste management facility that would be appropriately located on the allocated site or in the allocated area, taking care to avoid stifling innovation in line with the waste hierarchy.

In light of this, as part of the assessment process, an appraisal of the suitability of the site for accommodating a range of waste management facilities has been undertaken. This draws on Government guidance - ODPM (2004) *Planning for Waste Management Facilities – A Research Study*. The suitability of the site in relation to a range of facility types was indicated and a commentary provided. The ODPM sets out key characteristics and planning issues related to different facility types. The impacts are different and so different facilities are suitable for different areas. NLWP is otherwise technology neutral. It recognises that other technologies may come forward. The Boroughs therefore wish to retain table 11 in the plan.

It is common ground that area A22-HR is suitable for waste management facility types A, B and E. The Boroughs consider that a thermal treatment facility would not be suitable on the site and therefore whole category of category D is excluded. The Boroughs do not consider that an Integrated Resource Park would be appropriate on the site and therefore have excluded category C. In coming to this conclusion the Boroughs considered the results of the assessment and of the consultation.

**The NLWA supports** the inclusion and assessment of Millfields LSIS (A15-HC) as detailed above for waste management facility type C 'Integrated resource recovery facilities / resource parks' is supported by NLWA, we therefore agree that this is common ground. However, the description of this area in Appendix 2 refers to it as 'Industrial site occupied by Hackney Council Waste Transfer Station and Fleet Depot and a former Power Station'. If transfer is already being undertaken in this area it should also be listed as suitable for waste operation type E (waste transfer). Could Table 11 updated accordingly?

Appendix 2 of the NLWP states in relation to the Friern Barnet Sewage Works/ Pinkham Way (A22-HR) that it is suitable for the following types of waste use: 'Integrated resource recovery facilities/resource parks, anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis/gasification, mechanical biological treatment. Waste transfer, processing and recycling, indoor composting, in-vessel composting and outdoor composting. Thermal Treatment facilities may be viable but should only be considered if a combined heat and power facility could be incorporated into the

facility and linked up to a district heating system. Areas not lying within Flood Zone 3 are potentially suitable to handle hazardous waste.'

However, table 11 lists this site as only suitable for waste uses A, B and E, i.e. recycling, composting (including indoor/in-vessel composting) and waste transfer. The list of waste facility types that this site is identified as being suitable for, is not the same as the list included in Appendix 2. Again, we consider that it is necessary to review the descriptions of the site's suitability in the appendix and compare it with the description of its suitability for waste use in table 11 so that they are consistent.

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



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

**Signed on behalf of North London Waste  
Authority**



Signed:  
Martin Capstick  
Deputy Clerk and Managing Director

Date: 28 October 2017

## Appendix A: Representations from North London Waste Authority

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
17-1/7	9	Schedule 2: Areas suitable for waste management	<p>NLWA would like to support the legal compliance and soundness of the NLWP. We would like to make some additional specific comments in respect of the proposed allocation of area A22-HR Friern Barnet Sewage Works/Pinkham Way.</p> <p>The NLWP aims to achieve net self-sufficiency for Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW), Commercial &amp; Industrial waste (C&amp;I) and Construction &amp; Demolition waste (C&amp;D) waste streams, including hazardous waste, and support a greener London by providing a planning framework that contributes to an integrated approach to management of materials further up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>It is essential that the NLWP allocates sufficient land for the sustainable development of waste facilities that are of the right type, in the right place and provided at the right time to enable the North London Boroughs to meet their waste management needs throughout the plan period. Area A22-HR is an essential component of this.</p> <p>NLWA does not have any immediate plans for the use of Pinkham Way however it remains an important asset for the Authority and is considered essential to achieving statutory waste management functions in the medium term. Exclusion of the area would make the NLWP unsound since it would not meet the requirements of National Planning Policy for Waste to identify sufficient sites to manage the area's forecast waste.</p> <p>The following characteristics of the A22-HR make it suitable for allocation as a proposed area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ it is located centrally within the seven north London boroughs, which can provide benefits in terms of reducing cost and environmental impact of road</li> </ul>

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
			<p>transport by reducing the distance collection vehicles need to travel. It is also compatible with the NLWP's principle to seek a geographical spread of sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the majority of the area is within the NLWA's control. The primary function of the NLWA is to arrange for the transport and disposal of waste collected by the seven boroughs and to promote waste minimisation and recycling. The landowner is therefore committed to using the site for waste management in the future and the site is deliverable within the plan period (2020 – 2035);</li> <li>○ the area is currently vacant;</li> <li>○ the area is already designated employment land in the adopted Haringey Site Allocations DPD (Site DEA 13);</li> <li>○ it has been subject to a robust site selection methodology and can be delivered in accordance with the requirements of Policy 5;</li> <li>○ its suitable for a range of waste uses in line with the waste hierarchy;</li> <li>○ allocation of A22-HR avoids the potential need to use Compulsory Purchase Powers to acquire additional sites;</li> <li>○ adjacent uses are compatible with a waste use and the nearest residential property is approximately 100m from the site; and</li> <li>○ there are no technical constraints in providing access to the adjacent A406.</li> </ul> <p>The NLWP includes ambitious targets to increase LACW recycling from 29% in 2016 to 50% by 2025 and achieving net self-sufficiency for LACW and C&amp;I by 2026, and C&amp;D by 2035. The NLWP clearly demonstrates that new capacity will be needed to meet North London's identified need for waste management over the Plan period. Furthermore, there is a need to plan for more land than might be needed as not all sites will come forward for waste development within the plan period, and not all proposals will secure planning consent.</p> <p>As acknowledged in Para 8.1.1 it should be expected that some existing waste sites will be lost during the Plan period and these cannot all be forecast. Similarly, some</p>

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
			<p>of the proposed areas might not be able to come forward for waste use during the Plan period, for example the exact alignment of Crossrail 2 might mean that some of the proposed areas come under increasing pressure to be used for higher value non-waste uses.</p> <p>Table 7 identifies that 9 hectares of land is required to meet net self-sufficiency for LACW, C&amp;I and C&amp;D. Furthermore, sites need to be available at the right time as the capacity needed for different treatment types varies over time. Although the site area of A22-HR (5.95 hectares) appears to be one of the smaller areas, in practice the largest areas in the table comprise multiple individual plots with different landownership/rights and the whole area is unlikely to come forward for waste use. Given the NLWA own the majority of area A22-HR, it has the potential to be one of the larger sites to come forward for future waste treatment. This means that if the site were not allocated potentially multiple sites would be needed to replace the capacity it could provide. The ability of areas to accommodate a range of types and sizes of waste treatment facility is important to the flexibility of the NLWP. A22-HR provides flexibility not only in site size and treatment type, but in timing of delivery since it is currently vacant and not subject to any land ownership constraints.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.11 states: <i>“The North London Waste Authority’s (NLWA) has produced the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) (2009)”</i> this should be corrected to: <i>“The North London Waste Authority’s (NLWA) and the seven constituent boroughs have produced the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) (2009)”</i>. The Strategy is jointly produced by the NLWA and boroughs, and we are all collectively working to achieve the recycling targets it includes.</p> <p>The same comment applies to Paragraph 7.9 which should be corrected to read: <i>“The NLWA and seven constituent boroughs are seeking to achieve a household</i></p>

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
			<p>waste recycling target of 50% by 2020 consistent with the targets set out in the North London Joint Waste Strategy.”</p> <p>Paragraph 1.11 requires an additional correction. It currently states “The NLWA is responsible for managing the waste collected by the north London boroughs, in particular household waste but also waste deposited at Reuse and Recycling Centres and some waste that the boroughs collect from local businesses; collectively this is known as Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW).” Waste collected at Reuse and Recycling Centres (RRCs) is household waste; business waste is not accepted at RRCs. Therefore, this paragraph should be corrected to read: “NLWA is responsible for managing the <u>household waste collected by the north London boroughs and also for the household waste deposited at Reuse and Recycling Centres and some waste that the boroughs collect from local businesses; collectively this is known as Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW).</u>”</p>
17-2/7	4	4.1	<p>The key diagram is hard to interpret and could be made more legible. The following changes are suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Key includes ‘Potential Area for Decentralised Heat’ and ‘Decentralised Energy Opportunity Area’, yet the latter does not appear on the diagram.</li> <li>• ‘Decentralised Energy Opportunity Area’ should be deleted from the Key.</li> <li>• Existing waste sites need to be added to the diagram.</li> <li>• Proposed waste sites should be added to the diagram and Key.</li> <li>• The ‘Potential Areas of Decentralised Energy’ are overly dominant. The existing and proposed waste sites should appear more dominant than other features such as roads and rail which are provided for context.</li> </ul>
17-3/7	4	4.13	<p>Figure 7 shows ten RRCs but there are only eight in operation, the following corrections should be made as marked up on the extracted image below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two RRCs are illustrated in Haringey, the site shown to the east of the borough is the former Park View RRC which has closed.</li> </ul>

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two RRCs are shown at Gateway Road to the south of Waltham Forest. This site comprises an RRC and a separate depot operated by Bywaters, however the Bywaters site is not an RRC. Only one RRC should be illustrated at this location.</li> </ul> <p>Related to this Paragraph 9.32 states: <i>“There are currently nine RRCs in North London of which eight are the responsibility of the North London Waste Authority (NLWA)”</i>. This should be corrected to <i>“There are currently eight RRCs in North London of which seven are the responsibility of the North London Waste Authority (NLWA)”</i>.</p> <p>These corrections should also be translated onto Figure 9 which shows all existing waste sites including RRCs and Figure 6 Key Diagram.</p>
17-4/7	9	Policy 2	<p>Table 11 identifies ‘Waste Facility Type’ for each of the proposed sites. The NLWP should not specify what type of treatment is appropriate at each site; this should be a matter for the planning application stage when proposals will be tested against the criteria in Policy 5, and other relevant local, regional and national policies.</p> <p>The NLWP should not favour one treatment type over another because it is likely that during the period covered by the NLWP new technologies will emerge, as will the ability to mitigate any impacts, meaning that some treatment types may become more acceptable at particular sites. The NLWP should seek to retain maximum flexibility by not indicating what type of treatment might be suitable, thereby prejudicing future planning applications. The ‘Waste Facility Type’ column should therefore be deleted from Table 11.</p> <p>Should ‘Waste Facility Type’ be retained for each site, we agree that proposed site A22-HR Friern Barnet Sewage Works/Pinkham Way is suitable for recycling (Category A), Composting (Category B) and waste transfer (Category E). Additionally, the site should be recorded as suitable for Category “D Waste treatment facility (including</p>



Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
			<p><i>thermal treatment, anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis / gasification, mechanical biological treatment</i>". The NLWA has no intention to use the site for thermal treatment or mechanical biological treatment during the lifetime of the NLWP. However, A22-HR might be suitable for other types of treatments included within Category D, for example anaerobic digestion is likely to have similar potential effects and material planning considerations to indoor composting in that it would be enclosed and potentially result in similar effects.</p> <p>Proposed site A22-HR should also be recorded as suitable for and Category "C <i>integrated resource recovery facilities / resource parks</i>". The site is well suited for use as an integrated resource recovery facility. <i>'Rubbish in – Resources Out'</i> produced for the Mayor of London and Design for London recognises that with good design waste treatment facilities are increasingly acceptable in urban locations. The document includes a concept design for an integrated resource recovery park on the urban fringe which bears many similarities with site A22-HR. It would receive waste in refuse collection vehicles directly from several boroughs – A22-HR's central location makes it ideal for this purpose. It is also of the right size for a facility of this nature and next to buildings which would be of a similar scale.</p> <p>These changes would make Table 11 consistent with Appendix 2 which identifies the site as having potential for <i>"Integrated resource recovery facilities/resource parks, anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis / gasification, mechanical biological treatment Waste transfer, processing and recycling, indoor composting, in-vessel composting and outdoor composting. Thermal Treatment facilities may be viable but should only be considered if a combined heat and power facility could be incorporated into the facility and linked up to a district heating system"</i>. Reference to <i>"mechanical biological treatment"</i> should be deleted from information on A22-HR in Appendix 2.</p> <p>Proposed site A15-HC Millfield LSI should also be recorded as suitable for Category "D <i>Waste treatment facility (including thermal treatment, anaerobic digestion,</i></p>

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
17-5/7	9	Policy 5	<p><i>pyrolysis / gasification, mechanical biological treatment</i>)” because the power facility here may make the site suitable for energy recovery.</p> <p>Policy 5 m) requires “<i>appropriate permits are held or have been applied for from the Environment Agency</i>”. Planning policy should not duplicate other regulatory requirements. In this case permits to operate waste facilities are already required by the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2019 and as such criteria m) of Policy 5 should be deleted. Furthermore, the policy as worded prevents permits being sought after planning consent is granted and before operation; in some cases, this sequencing may be most appropriate.</p> <p>Policy 5i) requires development to “<i>make the fullest possible contribution to climate change adaptation and mitigation</i>”. This is an unrealistic expectation for all waste developments and should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy 5 p) requires “<i>job creation and social value benefits, including skills, training and apprenticeship opportunities</i>”. This might not be appropriate for all scales of waste treatment facilities since small sites could have a very small number of employees. A caveat should be added to the criteria that this should be required unless a small number of employees are based at the site.</p> <p>Supporting text for Policy 5 at Paragraph 9.44 requires development “<i>to protect and enhance local biodiversity</i>”. The reference to enhancing biodiversity should be deleted to make it consistent with the wording of Policy 5 which requires “<i>no significant adverse effect on local biodiversity</i>”.</p>
17-6/7	Appendix 1:	Schedule 1: Existing safeguarded waste sites in North London	<p>The following corrections should be made to Table 17:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EcoPark is currently listed in Table 17 as several sites, as follows: ENF19 ‘London Waste Ltd Composting, Edmonton Eco Park, Advent’, ENF 20 “London Waste Ltd, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way”, ENF 20 “London Waste Bulk Waste Recycling Facility, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way”, ENF</li> </ul>

Code	Section	Policy / Para	Representation
		and Figure 9: Existing Waste Sites, p.33	<p>22 "Edmonton Clinical Waste Treatment Centre", ENF 27 "Edmonton EFW" and ENF 33 "Ballast Phoenix Ltd". Note there are two sites called 'ENF 20'. The table should include one entry - 'ENF 20' - covering the entirety of the EcoPark and all facilities within it. Although specific permitted activities take place within the EcoPark the entirety of the site is required to deliver effective, integrated waste treatment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HAR10 is listed as 'LondonWaste Ltd. Western Road HWRC', however the other RRCs operated by LondonWaste Ltd are not identified as such. To make the wording consistent HAR 10 should be recorded as 'Western Road RRC';</li> <li>• The full address and postcode of all safeguarded sites should be included; and</li> <li>• It is not clear why this table is referred to as both 'Schedule 1' and 'Table 17', it should have one title to avoid confusion.</li> </ul> <p>It is also noted that the references in Figure 9 Existing Waste Sites do not match those in Table 17, as an example on Figure 9 ENF 19 is the Bulky Waste Recycling Facility whereas in Table 17 ENF 19 is the Composting facility. Existing waste sites and safeguarded waste sites are not the same, so the references do not have to be identical, however, to avoid confusion it would be helpful if references could be made consistent where possible.</p>
17-7/7	12	All	All references to <i>LondonWaste Ltd</i> should change to <i>LondonEnergy Ltd</i> .

## Appendix B: Proposed Modifications

Section	Proposed change	Representation code
1.11	<p>The North London Waste Authority-s (NLWA) and the seven constituent boroughs have <del>has</del> produced the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) (2009). The NLWA, as the Waste Disposal Authority for the NLWP area, is a key stakeholder. The NLWA is responsible for managing the <u>household waste collected by the North London boroughs, in particular household waste but also and also for the household waste deposited at Reuse and Recycling Centres and some waste that the boroughs collect from local businesses; collectively this is known as Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW).</u> The NLWP is required to ensure there is adequate provision for the disposal and recovery of this waste stream.</p>	NLWA Rep 17-1/7
4.1 Key Diagram (Figure 6)	<p>Figure 6 Key Diagram update will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Decentralised Energy Opportunity Areas to the diagram.</li> <li>• Add Existing waste sites to the diagram.</li> <li>• Add Areas Suitable for New Waste Facilities to the diagram and Key.</li> <li>• Add Opportunity Areas</li> <li>• Correct RRCs</li> </ul>	NLWA (Rep 17-2/7 and 17-3/7)
4.13	<p>Amend Figure 7 to show eight RRCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Park View RRC which has closed</li> <li>• Remove one of the RRCs shown at Gateway Road</li> </ul>	NLWA (Rep 17-3/7)
5.10 Figure 9:	<p>Amend Figure 9 to show eight RRCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Park View RRC which has closed</li> <li>• Remove one of the RRCs shown at Gateway Road</li> </ul> <p>Update Figure 9 Existing Waste Sites to match those in Schedule 1</p>	NLWA (Rep 17-3/7 and 17-6/7)
7.9	<p>The North London Waste Authority (NLWA) and seven constituent boroughs are <del>is</del> seeking to achieve a household waste recycling target of 50% by 2020 consistent with</p>	NLWA Rep 17-1/7

	the targets set out in the North London Joint Waste Strategy. The Authority and partner boroughs will continue to seek to maximise recycling levels for LACW.										
9.32	Re-use & Recycling Centres (RRCs) provide members of the public with access to a wider range of recycling facilities and they also deal with bulky items. There are currently <del>eight</del> <u>nine</u> RRCs in North London of which <del>seven</del> <u>eight</u> are the responsibility of the North London Waste Authority (NLWA). They are safeguarded for waste use under Policy 1. [...]	NLWA Rep 17-3/7 and 17-6/7									
P5	5i) the development <u>avoids increasing the levels of vulnerability to climate change</u> , <u>makes appropriate adaption and mitigation measures to achieve this and helps reduce greenhouse gas emissions</u> <u>makes the fullest possible contribution to climate change adaption and mitigation</u>										
P5	5m) <u>appropriate permits are held or have been applied for from the Environment Agency</u>	NLWA Rep 17-5/7									
9.44	<u>Waste developments should be Criteria 5i seeks designed to protect and enhance local biodiversity. Development proposals will be assessed against this policy as well as other relevant principles and policies set out in the NPPF and Borough Local Plans. [...]</u>	NLWA Rep 17-5/7									
9.49	<u>Developers of waste facilities should at the time they submit their planning application be engaged with the Environment Agency and hold or be in the process of applying for appropriate permits from the Environment Agency as the contemporaneous consideration of planning and environmental permit enables the application to be considered in the round.</u>										
Schedule 1	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>ENF 19</td> <td><u>London Waste LondonEnergy Ltd Composting, Edmonton Eco Park, Advent Way</u></td> <td>Enfield</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ENF 20</td> <td><u>London Waste LondonEnergy Bulk Waste Recycling Facility, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way</u></td> <td>Enfield</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ENF 20</td> <td><u>London Waste LondonEnergy Ltd, Edmonton Ecopark, Advent Way</u></td> <td>Enfield</td> </tr> </table>	ENF 19	<u>London Waste LondonEnergy Ltd Composting, Edmonton Eco Park, Advent Way</u>	Enfield	ENF 20	<u>London Waste LondonEnergy Bulk Waste Recycling Facility, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way</u>	Enfield	ENF 20	<u>London Waste LondonEnergy Ltd, Edmonton Ecopark, Advent Way</u>	Enfield	NLWA Rep 17-7/7
ENF 19	<u>London Waste LondonEnergy Ltd Composting, Edmonton Eco Park, Advent Way</u>	Enfield									
ENF 20	<u>London Waste LondonEnergy Bulk Waste Recycling Facility, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way</u>	Enfield									
ENF 20	<u>London Waste LondonEnergy Ltd, Edmonton Ecopark, Advent Way</u>	Enfield									

	HAR 10	<del>LondonWaste</del> LondonEnergy Ltd. Western Road RRC HWRG	Haringey	
Schedule 1	Combine the following EcoPark sites into one: ENF19 'London Waste Ltd Composting, Edmonton Eco Park, Advent', ENF 20 "London Waste Ltd, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way", ENF 20 "London Waste Bulk Waste Recycling Facility, Edmonton EcoPark, Advent Way", ENF 22 "Edmonton Clinical Waste Treatment Centre", ENF 27 "Edmonton EFW" and ENF 33 "Ballast Phoenix Ltd"			NLWA (Rep 17-6/7)
Schedule 1	Include full address and postcode of all safeguarded sites			NLWA (Rep 17-6/7)
Schedule 1	<del>Table 17</del> Schedule 1			NLWA (Rep 17-6/7)