

**NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY**

**REPORT TITLE:**

**HENDON RELOCATION UPDATE**

**REPORT OF:**

**HEAD OF WASTE STRATEGY AND CONTRACTS**

**FOR SUBMISSION TO:**

**AUTHORITY MEETING**

**DATE:**

**7<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2007**

**SUMMARY OF REPORT:**

This report advises Members of the current dialogue with Cricklewood Redevelopments Limited, the developers wishing to develop the Cricklewood and Brent Cross area including the relocation of the Authority's Hendon Rail Transfer Station. The developer outlined draft proposals to the Authority and sought comments. At this time there is no firm commitment or proposal that can be presented to Members.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Authority:

- i) endorses the response to the consultation sent to Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd in December 2006, attached as Appendix 1; and
- ii) instructs officers to formally request a firm outline proposal and commercial terms from Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd for the relocation of the Authority's existing facility.

**Signed by Head of Waste Strategy  
and Contracts**

.....

Date:.....

## **1.0 UPDATE SINCE PREVIOUS REPORT.**

- 1.1 This report updates Members of developments since the previous Hendon Relocation report submitted to the Authority meeting on 20 September 2006.
- 1.2 Members will recall that the Authority's lease on the current Hendon Rail Transfer Station is due to expire in March 2009. An extension of the current lease is still being discussed with Freightliner Heavy Haul.
- 1.3 Since the previous report to Members presented at the Authority's meeting in September 2006, there has been further dialogue between Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd (CRL) the Authority, London Borough of Barnet and the Greater London Authority (GLA) regarding the potential relocation of the Authority's Hendon Rail Transfer Station.
- 1.4 CRL is understood to be preparing a submission to the Planning Authority (LB Barnet) in the next few months. This submission is thought to be a master plan for the entire development of which the relocation of the existing Hendon Rail Transfer Station is a relatively small part. Officers are in dialogue with LB Barnet and expect to be informed of progress on this matter and consulted when appropriate.
- 1.5 Officers are advised by LB Barnet planning officers that their planning policy and the GLA's London Plan will require the developer to provide a replacement facility with equivalent maximum throughput for the Authority to use as a condition of the planning permission. The LB Barnet Unitary Development Plan also identifies a shortage of energy supplies in the area and would require any developer to also address this matter.
- 1.6 CRL has indicated that the Authority will be offered a site that the developer considers to be suitable elsewhere within the development and that the location and area of the land that will be offered is not negotiable due to it already having been approved in the development's master plan, although there may be some flexibility about precise site boundaries. The proposed land is on the west side of the main railway line (opposite side to the current site), adjacent to the A5 Edgware Road almost parallel to the existing facility. The proposed site has an estimated area of 2.6 Hectares, which is significantly smaller than the estimated 4 Hectares that the Authority currently occupies.
- 1.7 Members should further note that Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd has recently sold the land immediately south of the area proposed for the Authority's replacement site to a third party for a housing development. This action may negatively affect the chances of a successful application for planning permission for a waste management facility on the site in the future.

## **2.0 WASTE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS STUDY.**

- 2.1 CRL has commissioned technical advisers SLR Consulting to produce a Waste Treatment Technology Options study which investigates the technologies that the developer considers would be suitable as a replacement for the existing facility and could be sited on the plot of land that the developer has identified as a suitable replacement site as outlined above. The choice of facilities that is recommended in this study has not been subjected to any procurement exercise or scrutiny by the Authority, but they do represent potential solutions that comply with the Joint Waste Management Strategy, albeit that the study assesses only a limited range of potential solutions that the market might offer, and therefore does not necessarily arrive at a conclusion that would satisfy the Authority's best value duties..
- 2.2 The nominated land is restricted in area being just over half the size of the existing site. The SLR options study claims that this in turn dictates the suitable technology that could be provided on the site. The report concludes that there are two principal options (designated A and B) for the development that are suitable. Both options would be designed to treat 250,000 tonnes per annum of waste so are similar to the throughput capacity of the current facility.

### **OPTION A**

- 2.3 Option A is for the replacement site to host a plant which would produce a high-quality, pelletised, refuse-derived fuel, with transfer of the product to one or more energy from waste (EfW) or combined heat and power (CHP) facilities located elsewhere within the regeneration scheme. (There is considered to be insufficient room to produce the pellets and generate the energy on the same site). A site for the EfW or CHP has not yet been determined. SLR recommends this option as it is considered to be more "acceptable" and "deliverable" even though they have not been able to identify any reference plants of the scale required. This option is also projected as the more costly of the two although no actual costs are available at this stage in the process.

### **OPTION B**

- 2.4 Option B is the production of a coarse "floc" by shredding and screening the waste. This floc is then used to generate heat and power within an advanced thermal treatment technology or combined heat and power facility located on the same site. This option is predicted to be less costly and there are also believed to be existing plants of a similar size performing this relatively "low-tech" form of fuel preparation. Again, no actual costs are available for comparison at this time.

- 2.5 The study concludes that Option A should be favoured because they believe it is in accordance with the NLJWS and will also meet the power generation needs in the area, even though it could not be made to fit entirely onto the proposed land area and would require the provision of additional land within the development for energy generation

## **ISSUES ARISING**

- 2.6 Members should note that the developers have discounted waste treatment options including Mechanical Biological Treatment and conventional energy from waste as these are considered to either be unacceptable to the public or the planners or do not generate energy on the site. Any of these technologies might be considered suitable by the Authority in accordance with the Joint Municipal Waste Strategy and should not be discounted in advance of a full procurement exercise.
- 2.7 Members should note that plans for a re-use and recycling centre and a materials recycling facility (MRF) at the site as part of the development are now being abandoned by the developer citing a lack of space available for these to be included. This would mean the replacement facility would not be able to serve all the municipal waste needs of the historic catchment area on the current facility.
- 2.8 Officers from London Borough of Barnet, Greater London Authority, the NLWA and Transport for London were consulted on the contents of the options study. All were asked to comment on the SLR options study. It is understood that LB Barnet had no formal comments to make; Transport for London are concerned that the proposed facilities are too small to accommodate safe vehicle movements and that the impact of traffic on the local road system during construction and operation needs to be addressed; and the GLA was concerned that proposed site is significantly smaller than the currently occupied site and wish to see more consideration of a wider range of technologies.
- 2.9 Authority officers submitted a preliminary response to the consultation subject to Members approval at this meeting. It focuses on the Authority's key interests of deliverability of the facility and the subsequent services from it (particularly the restricted size of the site) It says that Option A is preferred to Option B, subject to a list of qualifications, but reminds the developer that the Authority is not willing or able to rule out any technology options at this stage as this would be prejudicial to our procurement obligations. The full response is at Appendix 1 and it is recommended that Members endorse this.

- 2.10 It must be emphasised that to date the Authority has not received any definite proposals or commercial terms from the developer, Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd to consider and subject to the proper scrutiny. Hence it is not possible to ask Members to comment on specific proposals at this time.

### **3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Authority
- i) endorses the response to the consultation sent to Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd in December 2006, attached as Appendix 1; and
  - ii) instructs officers to formally request a firm outline proposal and commercial terms from Cricklewood Redevelopment Ltd for the relocation of the Authority's existing facility

### **4.0 COMMENTS OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISER**

- 4.1 The Financial Adviser has been consulted on this report and has no comments to add.

### **5.0 COMMENTS OF THE LEGAL ADVISER**

- 5.1 The Legal Adviser has been consulted on this report and has no comments to add.

### Local Government Act 1972 – Access to information

References: NLWA: '*Hendon Relocation – Update*'  
15 December 2004  
NLWA: '*Hendon Relocation – Update*'  
20 September 2006

Contact Officers: Jon Clark, Principal Policy and Projects Officer  
Andrew Lappage, Head of Waste Strategy & Contracts

Unit 169, Block 1B  
Lee Valley Technopark, Ashley Road  
N17 9LN

Tel: 020 8489 5730  
Fax: 020 8365 0254  
E-mail: [post@nlondon-waste.gov.uk](mailto:post@nlondon-waste.gov.uk)



**Response to: “Brent Cross Cricklewood Waste Handling Facility, Waste Treatment Technology Options Study; SLR Draft Final Report: November 2006”**

The NLWA is responsible for managing the waste delivered to it from its constituent Boroughs and therefore will be in the position of managing the running of the replacement Waste Handling Facility that is developed for its operational lifetime. With that in mind, a key area of interest for the Authority is to ensure that proposals put forward for any replacement facility are deliverable and operational.

Areas of main concern for the Authority are: -

1. The restricted size of land allocated to this project in relation to the existing Hendon Waste Transfer Station land-take;
2. The constraints surrounding the proposed site, such as access, transport and operational issues.

The NLWA welcomes the work completed by SLR and has the following comments to make. Of the two options put forward we have a preference towards Option A, because it aims to produce a higher quality product that can attract a greater range of end-markets and it provides a better means of integrating the WHF into the NLWA's over-arching strategy than Option B.

This preference is subject to consideration of points 1 and 2 above and to the following points being addressed: -

1. provision of alternative options in the event that it is concluded that neither Options A nor B can be accommodated on the allocated site and allow functional operation
2. provision of adequate information about the location and size of the site allocated for the energy from waste / CHP process to accompany the WHF to be included in the feasibility study
3. consideration of the impact of transporting / double-handling the RDF pellets to an 'off-site' facility
4. consideration of the provision of the energy from waste / CHP process on land adjacent to the WHF for co-location purposes
5. provision for dealing with gully-cleansing waste as stated previously

With regard to Option B, the production of a 'floc' would not be preferable and we believe a review of the layout of Option B would be beneficial with regard to the potential constraints raised by the exclusion area for chimney stacks.

The NLWA has a policy stated within the North London Joint Waste Strategy, reiterated in the approved Procurement Strategy not to rule out any waste treatment technologies at this stage. For this reason, we do not concur with the recommendation that certain waste treatment technologies be excluded in any feasibility studies. We also consider this to be prejudicial to the Authority's procurement obligations.