

Agenda Item No:

NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY

REPORT TITLE:

REVISED DRAFT MINOR ALTERATION TO THE LONDON PLAN

REPORT OF:

HEAD OF WASTE STRATEGY AND CONTRACTS

FOR SUBMISSION TO:

AUTHORITY MEETING

DATE:

7th February 2007

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

This report provides details of a REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan on borough level waste apportionment. Specifically it includes a table showing how much municipal solid waste and commercial/industrial waste needs to be managed in London between 2010 and 2020 and assigns these amounts to individual boroughs.

RECOMMENDATION

The Authority is recommended to approve the response to the REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration of the London Plan attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

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

.....

Date:

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following a previous consultation on draft ‘*Early* Alterations to the London Plan’ the spatial strategy for London, and a subsequent Examination in Public (EiP) of the same, a consultation on draft *Further* Alterations to the London Plan was issued by the London Mayor and discussed at the last Authority meeting.
- 1.2 However, during the EiP on the Early Alterations, the Greater London Authority (GLA), the Government Office for London, London Councils (the Association of London Government, as was) and the Association of London Borough Planning Officers announced that they had agreed that the GLA should commission an exercise to apportion tonnages of municipal and commercial/industrial waste at London borough level, rather than at the sub-regional level which was current at that time.
- 1.3 The results of this apportionment exercise were published for public consultation in November 2006, separately from the draft *Further* Alterations to the London Plan, but were withdrawn almost immediately to correct an error in the figures.
- 1.4 The REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan (essentially a revised version of the London Plan’s Table 4A.4) has therefore been re-issued as a result. Once finalised, the new table 4A.4 will be incorporated into the final document.
- 1.5 To summarise the various stages in the consultation process to date the table below outlines the key consultation milestones for the different stages.

Document	Published for Public Consultation	Consultation Deadline
Draft London Plan	June 2002	30 th September 2002
Draft <i>Early</i> Alterations	October 2005	20 th January 2006
Draft <i>Early</i> Alterations to the London Plan, Examination in Public Panel Report - Published but <i>NOT</i> for consultation September 2006		
Draft <i>Further</i> Alterations	19 th September 2006	22 nd December 2006
Draft <i>Minor</i> Alteration – Borough level waste apportionment	22 nd November 2006	<i>Withdrawn</i> 1 st December 2006
REVISED draft <i>Minor</i> Alteration – Borough level waste apportionment	1st December 2006	2 nd March 2007

- 1.6 This report sets out the basis and development of the apportionment in section 2, the detailed methodology in section 3 and the implications for the Authority at section 4.

2.0 REVISED DRAFT *MINOR* ALTERATION – BOROUGH LEVEL WASTE APPORTIONMENT

- 2.1 Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) requires the London Plan to apportion the tonnages of waste to be managed in the region to each Waste Planning Authority area (WPA) or to groups of WPAs where they have agreed to work jointly (see PPS10 paragraph 9).
- 2.2 The underlying rationale is that this needs to be done in order to meet the national policy aim that most waste should be treated or disposed of within the region in which it is produced (regional self-sufficiency – see Appendix 1 for a definition). In practical terms this means that facilities are required for **all** wastes (municipal, other commercial & industrial and construction & demolition wastes) with sufficient capacity to manage 75% (15.1 million tonnes) of these wastes arising within London by 2010, rising to 80% (18.2 millions tonnes) by 2015 and 85% (19.6 million tonnes) by 2020. For municipal waste, the self-sufficiency targets are lower: 50% in 2010, 75% in 2015 and 80% in 2020. Table 1 below summarises the self-sufficiency targets by waste stream. The rest of this report focuses upon municipal waste (for which the Authority has responsibility) and commercial and industrial waste, which is also included in the modelling work:

	2010	2015	2020
	%	%	%
Municipal	50	75	80
Commercial & Industrial	75	80	85
Construction & Demolition	95	95	95
All wastes	75	80	85

- 2.3 The existing London Plan and the draft *Early* Alterations had included some proposals for setting a strategy for waste management and signaling a broad apportionment of waste to sub-regions. In particular, it was noted in the original London Plan that the Central London sub-region would be unable to achieve self-sufficiency and that ‘excess’ waste from the Central sub-region would need to be managed in other sub-regions. This acknowledgement was reflected in the draft *Early* Alterations, which also gave an indicative land requirement for waste facilities in each sub-region along with indicative numbers of facilities taking into account the redistribution of waste from Central London and the opportunities arising in the other sub-regions.
- 2.4 One of the principal matters addressed by the EiP of the draft *Early* Alterations to the London Plan was this matter of apportionment – the method by which waste being generated by boroughs which do not have the capacity to deal with their own rubbish, is apportioned to other boroughs to manage on the generating boroughs’ behalf so that London as a whole meets its regional ‘self sufficiency’ targets. Primarily the boroughs with a shortfall in waste management capacity are those within the centre of London and those which might be able to help by taking an apportionment of central London’s waste, on the outskirts north of the Thames.

- 2.5 The draft *Early Alterations* to the London Plan proposed that 50% of the surplus waste from Central London be redistributed to the East sub-region, 28% to the West sub-region and 22% to the North sub-region (nothing to the South). For the purposes of the draft *Early Alterations* and clarification: Camden and Islington were at that draft *Early Alterations* stage in the 'Central' sub-region area and Hackney in the East, the four remaining boroughs in the Authority's area comprised the 'North'.
- 2.6 Representation from the Eastern Planning sub-region in particular at the EiP argued strongly that the apportionment was based upon out-of-date information regarding available land for facilities for example, that insufficient account was being taken of the historical legacy of waste management facilities in the East and that the apportionment of the majority of central London's excess waste to the Eastern region was inequitable for the above and a range of other additional reasons.
- 2.7 Discrepancies between the sub-regional planning groupings used in the London Plan and waste groupings such as the NLWA also made the issue of apportionment difficult for groups of authorities in terms of showing conformity with the London Plan on the issue of waste apportionment. In North London for example the work on the Joint Waste Development Plan Document assumed that because the boroughs in the Authority's area were seeking to manage the waste produced by two 'central' London boroughs (Camden and Islington) as well as one from the 'Eastern' planning area (Hackney), as well as the four 'Northern' planning boroughs (Barnet, Enfield, Haringey and Waltham Forest), then the group of planning authorities in the Authority area would be in conformity with the London Plan because they were planning to manage an appropriate 'share' of central London's waste.
- 2.8 As a consequence of these difficulties, it was agreed as outlined in paragraph 1.2, to commission an exercise to apportion tonnages of municipal and commercial/industrial waste at a London borough level.
- 2.9 A borough apportionment would have the benefit that if planning and waste sub-regional boundaries were different, it would still be possible to calculate the amount of waste to be managed in the area by simply summing the borough apportionment figures together. This proposal was subsequently endorsed by the EiP Panel Report and in early September 2006 a draft borough level apportionment was completed by Jacobs Babbie consultants following input from the Authority and others provided at a stakeholder workshop on 9th August. Whilst the Authority expressed concerns about the information base to be used in calculating the borough apportionment figures at the stakeholder workshop and in a subsequent note, (which was approved by the Authority at its meeting on 20th September 2006), the principle of apportioning total London self-sufficiency targets to a Borough level was supported by the Authority.

Sustainability appraisal of the apportionment model

- 2.10 The Jacobs Babtie apportionment model and report was subsequently subjected to a sustainability appraisal. This appraisal found that one of the key inputs to the apportionment model – vacant and potentially available industrial land from a 2003 GLA industrial land availability study – was not sufficiently up-to-date to provide a reliable basis for the apportionment, particularly in the light of large-scale schemes which have come forward since that date, such as the Olympic development in the Lower Lea Valley, a point which had also been raised by the Authority (and others) in its comments on the model. The appraisal therefore recommended that the apportionment model should be recalculated using new data provided at a borough level.
- 2.11 The London Mayor accepted the advice from the sustainability appraisal and gave a commitment in paragraph 4.10f of the draft *Further Alterations* to the London Plan that a table (Table 4A.4) showing the borough level waste apportionment would be published separately as a further ‘*Minor Alteration*’ to the London Plan.

First version of the apportionment model

- 2.12 On 22nd November the ‘*Minor Alteration*’ to the London Plan was released showing borough apportionment figures, primarily a revised table 4A.4 of the London Plan. Subsequently an accompanying report from Jacobs Babtie, was also issued. This explained the methodology behind the modelling work.

Second version of the apportionment model

- 2.13 However, subsequent to the release of the borough apportionment figures on Friday 1st December the London Mayor formally withdrew the “*Minor Alteration*” document because of an error in the figures and published a new table A4.4 as a “REVISED draft *Minor Alteration*” with a new twelve week consultation period. An accompanying revised Jacobs Babtie report was also issued, see paragraph 2.16.
- 2.14 The new formal consultation period is from Friday 1st December 2006 to Friday 2nd March 2007.

Reiteration of the Model

- 2.15 Because the Jacobs Babtie model was revised the accompanying report which explains the modelling methodology was also revised/reiterated. Consequently the Jacobs Babtie report – *London Waste Apportionment Study*, has been issued in two separate parts:
- **part B the original report** and detailed modelling methodology
 - **part A the revised report** taking into consideration the revised figures following error correction and the results of the revised land use survey outlined in paragraph 2.10 above.
- Part A includes a ‘reiteration’ section that explains the differences between the first version of the model and the second final version.

- 2.16 The following Authority report and draft response to the REVISED draft *Minor Alteration to the London Plan*, comments upon both the methodology of the model and the resulting apportionment.

3.0 MODELLING METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 Jacobs Babbie was commissioned to develop an apportionment methodology to achieve the 2020 85% self-sufficiency target for London as a whole. The methodology was to be developed having regard to the guidance provided within the Companion Guide to PPS10¹ and a range of sustainable development criteria and practical factors. In addition the criteria on which the apportionment was modelled were to be devised with input from stakeholders, which was provided at the event on 9th August 2006. A subsequent stakeholder meeting held on 20th December 2006 was also used to review the results and final report. An Authority officer attended both of these events as did the Programme Manager for and other representatives from the North London Planning Officers' Group.
- 3.2 The modelling project was managed by a Steering Group comprising officers from the GLA, London Councils, Association of London Borough Planning Officers, the London Regional Technical Advisory Board and the Government Office for London.
- 3.3 The project had four main objectives, as listed below.
1. To prepare a methodology and agree apportionment criteria (through a facilitated stakeholder workshop) to be used as a basis for the methodology.
 2. To prepare an apportionment modelled for *Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)* and *Commercial and Industrial (C&I)* waste to be managed within London, having regard to the agreed criteria.
 3. To prepare a number of options through which the self sufficiency target of 85% by 2020 could be achieved.
 4. To quantify both in percentage and tonnages the quantity of London's waste that is required to be managed by each borough to achieve the overall London self sufficiency target.

Criteria for determining the suitability of an area for waste treatment facilities

- 3.4 Nine criteria were developed as shown in the table below. Each criterion is a factor that contributes to the suitability of a given borough for the development of waste treatment facilities. When modelled together, the criteria combine to determine the suitability of an area for waste treatment facilities. The criteria are discussed in turn.

¹ Planning for Sustainable Waste Management: Companion Guide to Planning Policy statement 10, DCLG, 2006

Table 2 – Modelling Criteria and Weighting Used for the ‘Base Model’ of Apportionment with Weightings Taken from a Stakeholder Workshop

Criteria	Description	Weighting
1	Capacity – Identification of Theoretical Surplus/Deficit in Each Borough	High
2	Proximity to Waste Arisings	High
3	Proximity to Sustainable Transport Modes	Medium
4	Proximity to the Road Network	Medium
5	Ability to Use Sustainable Transport Modes	Medium
6	Historic Patterns of Waste Movement	High
7	Other Land Uses / Environmental Factors	Medium
8	Flood Risk	Low
9	Socio-Economic Factors	High

- 3.5 **Criterion 1 & 6 Theoretical Potential Capacity** – *Identification of theoretical surplus/deficit in each borough in 2020 and historic patterns of waste movement*
The objective of these criteria was to allocate greater suitability scores to boroughs with vacant employment land capacity over and above their own needs. The model only took into account the quantity of waste requiring management, existing capacity and future capacity, together with an allowance for contracted waste. Existing capacity was assumed to be 75% of total licensed capacity. Both of these criteria were weighted highly in the model.
- 3.6 **Criterion 2 Proximity to Waste Arisings**
A highly rated criterion, the management of waste close to its source is one of the key national waste management planning principles set out in PPS10. Proximity to arisings was modelled on the basis of travel time by road and distance by water respectively from the centre of boroughs with a deficit in capacity (under criteria 1&6 in 2020) to boroughs with surplus capacity.
- 3.7 **Criteria 3 & 5 Proximity to and Availability of Sustainable Transport Modes**
Sustainable transport is a major national, regional and local planning policy driver. Density of rail network and navigable waterways (i.e. centimetres of rail track/canal per square kilometre) was used as an indicator for sustainable transport. In addition, these criteria took account of the ability to use sustainable transport modes by incorporating a representative value for the number of protected wharfs in each borough. Although the initial stakeholder meeting had recommended that the number of rail nodes also be taken into account, the researchers concluded that data was not available for the number of rail nodes and therefore availability of sustainable transport modes is more weighted towards water than rail.

3.8 **Criterion 4 Proximity to the road network**

This criterion took account of the density of primary road network per borough. The model utilised both the Transport for London strategic route network (TFRN) and the Borough Primary Road Network.

3.9 **Criterion 7 Other Land Use/ Environmental Factors**

Environmental designations are a major factor in determining suitability for the development of waste treatment facilities. This criterion sought to direct the management of waste towards those boroughs with fewer environmental constraints. The total area per borough designated as Green Belt, Sites of Interest to Nature Conservation (SINCs), Metropolitan Open Land (MOLs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Sites of Metropolitan Importance (SMIs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Ramsar Sites and World Heritage Sites. Boroughs were given a suitability score based on the number of hectares of non-designated land.

There had been some discussion at the stakeholder event about whether this criterion simply intensified the development of waste facilities into particular areas. However, on balance it was felt that this was a relevant criteria to include in the model.

3.10 **Criterion 8 Flood Risk**

Flood Risk is a key indicator in determining suitability of land for waste treatment facilities. The apportionment took into account flood risk areas as they would normally constrain planning applications for waste treatment facilities. However, because participants at the stakeholder event felt that it was still possible for facilities to be built on areas of flood risk, with mitigating measures in place, this criterion was weighted low. The total area per borough designated as at risk from flooding was calculated. Boroughs were then allocated a suitability score based on the number of hectares not constrained by flood risk.

3.11 **Criterion 9 Socio-Economic Factors**

The objective of this criterion was to take account of social deprivation issues and the potential cumulative impacts of waste development. Lower suitability scores were allocated to boroughs with high levels of social deprivation and which have existing waste infrastructure.

This criteria was heavily weighted as a result of the stakeholder event.

Developing a range of apportionment options

- 3.12 The third objective of the Jacobs Bantie study was to develop a range of apportionment options through which the self sufficiency target could be reached. Options were devised in response to feedback from the Steering Group, stakeholders attending the stakeholder workshop and the Sustainability Appraisal process.

3.13 The base model was the model with all criteria weighted as derived from the stakeholder workshop which are outlined in table 2, but seven alternative options were also modelled. The different weightings of each criterion affect the amount of waste management capacity required in each borough. e.g. Barking and Dagenham would be required to manage 4.91% of London's waste under the base model, 2.97% under Option 5 or 5.39% under Option 2 according to the *initial* modelling work included in the Part B report. The different options that were modeled by the consultants are outlined below:

Different Options which were Modelled

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Option 1 | Within criteria 1 & 6, (the actual capacity of existing facilities) modelled as 50% (Option 1a) and 100% (Option 1b) of licensed capacity (compared to the base model of 75%). |
| Option 2 | Criteria 7 and 8 (other land uses and flood risk) weighted 0% while all other criteria are weighted as derived from the stakeholder workshop and shown in table 1. |
| Option 3 | Criterion 9 (socio-economic factors) weighted 0% while all other criteria are weighted as derived from the stakeholder workshop and shown in table 1. |
| Option 4 | All criteria weighted as derived from the stakeholder workshop, as shown in table 1, but with those boroughs with a deficit in capacity to manage their waste to be weighted according to the extent of that deficit within criteria 2 (proximity to waste arisings). |
| Option 5 | Criteria 1 & 6 (capacity and historic patterns of waste movement) receive 100% weighting and all other criteria receiving 0% weighting. |
| Option 6 | Model all criteria without any final weighting i.e. all criteria weighted equally. |
- 3.14 Apportionment of waste management capacity is a difficult issue. The consultants say in their part B report that they therefore felt that it was critical to the success of any apportionment exercise that the constituent units, in this case London Boroughs engaged in the process. However, the short timescale of the project limited the extent to which consultation could be undertaken and consensus could be formed amongst stakeholders. Nonetheless the consultants say in their part B report that the consultation which was undertaken yielded valuable information and opinion, and significantly raised levels of awareness on the apportionment modelling process and its implications.

- 3.15 The results of the different options modeling were included in Part B of the London Waste Apportionment Study. However, although a number of options were modelled as outlined above, **the option derived from the outputs of the stakeholder workshop (i.e. the base model) was considered to be the best basis for apportionment by the Mayor of London and the project Steering Group and was accordingly selected as the chosen option.** The base model also had the advantage that the criteria and weightings had been determined at the stakeholder workshop and had been presented at the workshop to a range of stakeholders.
- 3.16 Because the base model had been selected as the best model, of the eight, when the calculations were revisited the different options modelling was not re-run. Accordingly, the information on the options modelling is only available in the Part B Jacobs Babbie report and is not discussed further in this Authority report.

Waste apportionment by borough

- 3.17 The fourth objective of the modelling work was to quantify, in percentage and tonnages, the quantity of London's waste to be managed by each borough in 2020 to achieve the self sufficiency target. The model generated 'suitability indices' for each criterion, which were weighted and combined to produce apportionment percentages, i.e. the percentage of London's total waste which each borough is expected to manage.

Deliverability assessment

- 3.18 On the advice of the steering group, a *deliverability assessment* was also undertaken on the apportionment results arising from the base model. The results were examined to identify issues that may impact on the realistic delivery of the apportionment. The assessment revealed that the delivery of the required amount of new waste management capacity in the City of London appeared unrealistic, given the limited land available. As a result an amended apportionment of 100,000 tonnes per annum for the City of London and a redistribution of additional tonnage to be managed by other London Boroughs was applied. **Table 3 includes the final apportionment in tonnage terms determined from the modelling work following the deliverability assessment.** The list in paragraph 3.19 shows the apportionment in percentage terms for the North London boroughs.
- 3.19 In summary the North London boroughs are allocated the following percentages of London's waste:

Barnet	2.7%
Camden	2.3%
Enfield	3.7%
Hackney	2.5%
Haringey	2.3%
Islington	2.4%
Waltham Forest	<u>2.4%</u>
Total	18.3%

Source: Table 6-1 London Waste Apportionment Study: PART A, prepared by Jacobs Babbie for the Greater London Authority, December 2006

It is important to note that these percentages are the percentage of all of London's waste to be managed by the borough and include both waste which is already being managed by the borough as well as any additional waste which has been apportioned from elsewhere.

- 3.20 Table 3 show the *tonnages* of municipal and commercial and industrial waste that require management by each borough, and therefore for which facilities are required in order to meet the regional self sufficiency targets in the London Plan. The tonnages take into account current contracts that are in place within the London Boroughs.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE AUTHORITY

Waste requiring to be 'managed' in London

- 4.1 The *Early* Alterations to the London Plan (Annex 2) sets out the Mayor of London's predictions for the total waste projections at a borough level between 2010 and 2020. These are the arisings and totals that must be provided for, but in doing so, planners must also take into account the "minimum" requirements for waste requiring 'management' which are outlined in the REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan and Table 3 of this report.
- 4.2 Waste is deemed to be 'managed' in London, according to the London Plan, if:
- It is used for energy recovery in London (e.g. through anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis/gasification or through existing incinerators);
 - It is recycle or compost, and has been sorted or bulked in London Material Recycling Facilities for reprocessing either in London or elsewhere."
- 4.3 Table 3 shows how much municipal and commercial and industrial waste is required to be managed by each borough in the future. These are minimum figures requiring 'management' within each borough.

**Table 3 Tonnes of waste requiring management in each borough
in key years for both municipal solid waste and
commercial and industrial waste – base model plus deliverability assessment**

Borough	2010	2015	2020
Barking and Dagenham	494,214	654,568	769,058
Barnet	222,237	294,344	345,828
Bexley	448,255	593,697	697,540
Brent	285,047	377,533	443,568
Bromley	244,192	323,423	379,993
Camden	188,534	249,706	293,383
City	100,000	100,000	100,000
Croydon	253,333	335,529	394,217
Ealing	360,401	477,377	560,828
Enfield	303,949	402,569	472,982
Greenwich	359,109	475,626	558,817
Hackney	206,914	274,050	321,984
Hammersmith and Fulham	246,385	326,327	383,405
Haringey	187,836	248,782	292,297
Harrow	180,378	238,904	280,691
Havering	341,059	451,719	530,730
Hillingdon	299,400	396,543	465,903
Hounslow	293,259	388,410	456,347
Islington	202,795	268,594	315,574
Kensington and Chelsea	198,677	263,140	309,165
Kingston upon Thames	144,222	191,017	224,428
Lambeth	221,563	293,452	344,780
Lewisham	205,777	272,543	320,214
Merton	240,610	318,679	374,419
Newham	429,106	568,335	667,742
Redbridge	155,230	205,596	241,556
Richmond upon Thames	178,250	236,085	277,378
Southwark	244,256	328,508	380,092
Sutton	197,874	262,076	307,916
Tower Hamlets	306,956	406,552	477,662
Waltham Forest	201,462	266,829	313,500
Wandsworth	300,846	398,459	468,154
Westminster	139,127	184,268	216,498
Total for North London	1,513,727	2,004,874	2,355,548

Source: Table 0-1 & 6-2 London Waste Apportionment Study: PART A, prepared by Jacobs Babbie for the Greater London Authority, December 2006

4.4 The London Plan (Table 4A.4) shows the self-sufficiency minimums broken down by waste type – municipal solid waste, commercial and industrial waste and the total combined. The Authority is primarily concerned about the municipal element and accordingly needs to compare the forecast tonnages arising and the tonnages requiring management (both as outlined in the REVISED draft *Minor Alteration* to the London Plan) with the tonnages that are being predicted by the Authority's consultants for the Procurement Strategy. A comparison is set out in Table 4 below.

4.4.1 Section 1 of Table 4 – shows the Mayor of London's projections for the amount of waste that will be produced in North London between 2010 and 2020. This section also highlights the Mayor of London's estimate of current licensed waste management capacity to handle that waste.

4.4.2 Section 2 of Table 4 – shows the amount of waste which the North London boroughs will be required to 'manage' in order to comply with the REVISED draft *Minor Alteration* to the London Plan. The percentage given in the bottom line of this section shows this figure (waste requiring 'management' in North London) as a percentage of the total amount of waste arising in North London.

Table 4 Municipal and commercial/industrial waste projections at borough level at key milestones through to 2020
(thousand tonnes per annum)

		2010			2015			2020		
<i>Existing capacity stated in the London Plan model</i>		MSW	C&I	TOTAL	MSW	C&I	TOTAL	MSW	C&I	TOTAL
SECTION 1		Waste Arising in North London (London Plan Projection)								
Tonnes arising (Early Alterations to the London Plan (Annex 2))	<i>Existing capacity stated in the London Plan model</i>									
Barnet	5	203	245	448	230	269	499	260	291	551
Camden	0	148	494	642	156	555	711	164	637	801
Enfield	911	163	198	361	175	210	385	188	226	414
Hackney	204	152	166	318	179	184	363	207	207	414
Haringey	23	135	131	266	141	136	277	147	159	306
Islington	0	124	311	435	129	364	493	136	410	546
Waltham Forest	229	183	116	299	224	121	345	270	132	402
Total North London	1,372	1,108	1,661	2,769	1,234	1,839	3,073	1,372	2,062	3,434
SECTION 2		Waste to be Managed in North London (London Plan Targets)								
Tonnes to be "managed" (REVISED draft Minor Alteration to the London Plan)										
Barnet		64	158	222	105	190	294	121	225	346
Camden		54	134	189	89	161	250	103	191	293
Enfield		88	216	304	143	260	403	166	307	473
Hackney		60	147	207	97	177	274	113	209	322
Haringey		54	134	188	88	160	249	102	190	292
Islington		59	144	203	95	173	269	111	205	316
Waltham Forest		58	143	201	95	172	267	110	204	314
Total North London		437	1,076	1,514	712	1,293	2,006	826	1,531	2,356
Percentage of tonnes arising to be "managed" locally		39.4%			57.7%			60.2%		
SECTION 3		Municipal Waste to be managed in North London (from NLWA Procurement Strategy)								
Tonnes arising (NLWA Procurement Strategy)		1,092			1,236			1,397		
Tonnes to be "managed" (NLWA Procurement Strategy)		729			1,236			1,306		
Percentage of tonnes arising to be "managed" locally	NLWA %	66.8%			100%			93.5%		
	LP %	65.8%			100%			95.2%		
Target percentage requiring "management" – London wide		50%	75%	75%	75%	80%	80%	80%	85%	85%

Key: MSW = municipal solid waste, C&I = commercial & industrial waste

4.4.3 Section 3 of Table 4 – shows the Authority's projections for the amount of municipal waste which will be produced in North London between 2010 and 2020 and require facilities provided by the Authority. It is assumed in the Authority's procurement strategy that all of the municipal waste collected by our seven constituent borough councils will be received at within North London, i.e. 100% self sufficiency (to minimise collection costs through local tipping and to maximise planning potential as otherwise permission would be needed from an unrelated planning authority). The percentage figures shown in the penultimate lines of this section express this tonnage of municipal waste predicted by the Authority as a percentage of the totals that the Authority and the London Plan are predicting will be produced over the same period; however these vary year-to-year according to step-changes as new facilities are commissioned. The last line in this section shows the self-sufficiency targets for London as a whole.

Shortage of waste management capacity

- 4.5 Table 4 also shows the anticipated shortage of licensed waste management capacity within the Authority's area. For example, at present the REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan suggests that there is 1.372m tonnes of licensed waste management capacity in North London, but that 2.769m tonnes capacity will be required by 2010 and 3.434m tonnes by 2020, more than two and two-and-a-half times the current capacity available respectively.
- 4.6 Because the predictions in municipal waste arisings by the London Plan (in its entirety) and the Authority's own Procurement Strategy are so close, there should not be an issue of a shortfall of total capacity being identified and brought forwards by the North London JWDPD. There is a difference however in relation to the proportion of the waste that should be 'managed' locally. The REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan requires the North London sub-region to manage less waste locally than the Authority itself is predicting that it will need to manage in order to meet the North London Joint Waste Strategy targets. Essentially, this is because the Authority is intending to work within its allocation of allowances under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme, and is aiming to provide facilities for everything except landfill within its area (the landfill sites themselves having to be outside our area, but transfer stations being within it, but not falling within the London Plan definition of "managed").
- 4.7 The main risk is that if the boroughs as planning authorities only plan for 'management' on the basis of London Plan's self-sufficiency requirements, as far as municipal waste is concerned, then insufficient land will be allocated for waste 'management' facilities within the North London sub-region. It will be important for the Authority to engage with the constituent boroughs in their separate capacity as planning authorities to ensure that sufficient land is identified within the North London Joint Waste Development Plan Document to achieve the provision of the waste facilities needed to achieve the shared targets of the North London Joint Waste Strategy (as developed within the Authority's Procurement Strategy).

- 4.8 The published Early Alterations to the London Plan, state in Policy 4A.1 that, “Boroughs should ensure that land resources are available to implement the Mayor’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy, Waste Strategy 2000, the Landfill Directive and other EU Directives on Waste”. In order to meet this requirement it will be necessary to have facilities to manage the total amount of municipal waste (and other wastes) arising in North London, and possibly at a higher level of self-sufficiency than is currently being proposed by the Mayor of London.
- 4.9 The Authority will be responding to any consultation on the North London Joint Waste Development Plan Document to ensure that adequate land of an appropriate nature and classification is identified to cater for the needs of the Authority and its constituent borough councils (as waste collection authorities) to fulfil the North London Joint Waste Strategy and thereby maximise resource recovery from our waste at the same time as avoiding costs or fines under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme.

5.0 CONCLUDING REMARKS

- 5.1 A full draft response to the consultation on the REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan for Member consideration and approval is enclosed in Appendix 2. This makes comment on:
- the principle of borough level apportionment
 - the process by which the apportionment model has been developed
 - the detail of the apportionment model
 - the results arising, including the use of the model and proving conformity over time.
- 5.2 The response recommends that some of these issues are considered further at the Examination in Public, although in broad terms the results of the apportionment modelling are:
- a) In line with Authority expectations regarding municipal waste.
 - b) A matter for further consideration by the constituent borough councils as planning authorities.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The Authority is recommended to approve the response to the REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan attached as Appendix 2.

7.0 COMMENTS OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISER

- 7.1 The Financial Adviser has been consulted in the preparation of this report and has no further comments to add.

8.0 COMMENTS OF THE LEGAL ADVISER

- 8.1 The Legal Adviser has reviewed this report and has no further comments to add.

Local Government Act 1972 – Access to information

Documents used: Borough level waste apportionment – REVISED Draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), December 2006

London Waste Apportionment Study, prepared by Jacobs Babbie for the Greater London Authority, December 2006 (Parts A & B)

Borough level waste apportionment – Draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), November 2006

Draft *Further* Alterations to the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London, September 2006

The London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London Housing Provision Targets, Waste and Minerals, Alterations, Mayor of London, December 2006 (The *Early* Alterations to the London Plan)

Draft *Early* Alterations to the London Plan, Examination in Public 2006, Panel Report, September 2006

Planning for Sustainable Waste Management: Companion Guide to Planning Policy Statement 10, DCLG, 2006

Planning Policy Statement 10, (PPS 10), Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, ODPM, July 2005

Contact Officers: Andrew Lappage, Head of Waste Strategy & Contracts
&
Barbara Herridge, Policy and Development Manager

Lee Valley Technopark
Unit 169, Ashley Road
Tottenham
N17 9LN

Tel: 020 8489 5730
Fax: 020 8365 0254
E-mail: post@nlwa.gov.uk

Regional Self Sufficiency

The Panel report from the Examination in Public (EiP) of the Draft *Early* Alterations to the London Plan, September 2006, noted that the definition of self-sufficiency had been omitted from the Draft Early Alterations to the London Plan and that it was not possible to find the definition by cross-referencing to any statutory document. The Panel Report also noted that the Mayor of London had accepted this.

A definition of self-sufficiency is included in Section 4.1 of the Alterations to the London Plan Policies on Waste Technical Report, but the EiP panel recommended a slightly fuller definition be included as follows:

Panel Report Recommendation W1 in relation to London Plan Policy 4A.1

That the definitions for self-sufficiency and managed waste given in Section 4.1 of the 2005 Waste Technical Report are tailored for inclusion within the Early Alterations in Policy 4A.1. The suggested wording for self sufficiency is:

“Regional planning bodies and all planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, prepare and deliver planning strategies that...provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities”.

And for managed waste is:

“Waste is deemed to be managed in London if:

- It is used for energy recovery in London (e.g. through anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis/gasification or through existing incinerators);
- It is recycle or compost, and has been sorted or bulked in London Material Recycling Facilities for reprocessing either in London or elsewhere.”

The public consultation draft of the Further Alterations to the London Plan incorporates the first definition of self sufficiency into Policy 4A.1, but does not include the definition of ‘managed in London’ within the policy itself.

APPENDIX 2.

Ken Livingstone, Mayor of London
(Waste Apportionment Alteration to the London Plan Consultation)
Greater London Authority
FREEPOST 15799
London
SE1 2BR

7th February 2007

Dear Mayor Livingstone,

Public consultation paper on REVISED Draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), December 2006

Thank you for providing the North London Waste Authority with the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan. The Authority will always be happy to engage with your proposals where they add value and assist the practical delivery of new, improved services to North Londoners.

You will note that the NLWA has been making substantial progress in implementing new recycling and composting services and in diverting waste from landfill in the past by working in close partnership with our constituent borough councils.

You will note too that we have set ourselves targets of 35% recycling and composting by 2010 and 45% recycling and composting by 2015 and that all our seven boroughs have shown vision and practical commitment in starting to prepare a joint waste development plan document for all waste in North London.

And finally, I would like to draw your attention to the NLWA's approval last December of a waste prevention implementation plan to address the top of the waste hierarchy in partnership with our boroughs, and a procurement strategy to satisfy North London's future municipal waste facility needs.

The Authority is broadly supportive of the apportionment process and the results of the same and the response which follows comments in turn upon:

- the principle of borough level waste apportionment, which the Authority supports.
- the process by which the apportionment modelling has been undertaken, about which the Authority makes some suggestions for improvements for future amendments.
- the detail of the apportionment model itself, with which the Authority is broadly satisfied, albeit with a couple of minor comments.
- the final results of the modelling exercise, with which the Authority generally concurs.
- the ongoing use of the model, about which the Authority makes some minor comment.

If you require clarification on this or any of the points raised, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

Cllr. Brian Coleman
Chairman, North London Waste Authority

**Draft Response from the North London Waste Authority to
the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan
(Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London December
2006
- February 2007 -**

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This response from the North London Waste Authority comments in turn upon:

- the principle of borough level waste apportionment
- the process by which the apportionment model and REVISED draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan on borough level apportionment has been undertaken
- the detail of the apportionment model itself
- the final results of the modelling exercise including the ongoing use of the model and in particular the need for authorities to prove conformity with the London Plan.

1.2 The response is focused upon the municipal solid waste aspect of the apportionment model as this is the type of waste for which the Authority has responsibility.

1.3 Broadly, the North London Waste Authority supports:

- (i) The principle of borough apportionment.
- (ii) The method by which the apportionment has been carried out (although with some concerns regarding the detail used and the ongoing applicability and practical use of the apportionment model).
- (iii) The final outcomes of the process, with which the Authority generally concurs, although with some concerns about the ongoing applicability of the model and its practical application and ongoing use at a sub-regional level.

1.4 The apportionment modelling is also useful because it shows the current level of licensed waste management capacity in North London and highlights the shortfall in requirements, i.e. the scale of new waste management facilities which will be required in order to meet the 2020 self-sufficiency targets.

1.5 The Authority also notes that this consultation primarily affects land use planning. The North London boroughs as both waste collection and planning authorities may respond to this consultation separately.

2.0 Principle of Borough Apportionment

2.1 The principle of borough level waste apportionment is supported by the Authority. Borough level waste apportionment allows a sub-region such as the North London Waste Authority area, which is different from the North London planning sub-region, to model its requirements from the London Plan as a group of authorities more easily and to determine whether they are in conformity with the London Plan whilst implementing the North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS).

**Draft Response from the North London Waste Authority to
the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan
(Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London December
2006
- February 2007 -**

- 2.2 Previously conformance was difficult to assess because the North London boroughs in their capacity as planning authorities were working together in the North London Waste Authority grouping (which is helpful from a practical perspective and to fulfill the Mayor of London's requirement to develop and implement a joint waste strategy across this area), whilst the London Plan was setting requirements and targets for the smaller North London Planning Region and putting three of our boroughs in different sub-regions all together.
- 2.4 The Authority also supports the principle of pooling the apportionment requirements so that as a group of authorities, the constituent borough councils within the North London Waste Authority area, will be required to manage 826,000 tonnes of municipal solid waste by 2020 in order to be in conformity with the London Plan in terms of self-sufficiency requirements.
- 2.5 **Recommendation:** The Authority would like to see some specific reference to, and encouragement for, authorities to pool their targets within the new version of the London Plan so that a full mix of the different types of waste recycling, composting, and treatment facilities can be encouraged at optimal economies of scale sub-regionally, rather than all in each borough and at an uneconomic scale.
- 3.0 Process of revising the London Plan and the apportionment Modelling Process**
- 3.1 There have been a number of different stages in the consultation on alterations to the London Plan since October 2005. The process has also been somewhat disjointed and with a relatively large number of different stages of consultation on different aspects of the Plan. Whilst the Authority understands the reasons behind this, it has resulted in a considerable number of (5) Authority reports on the subject over the past year alone.
- 3.2 **Recommendation:** The Authority would urge that before any further alterations are considered again in the future that the process of change is considered carefully and that consultation documents, as far as possible, cover all aspects requiring revision and avoid repeated consultations.
- 3.3 The other aspect of the process on which the Authority wishes to comment is the process by which the apportionment model was developed with stakeholders. Again, the Authority understands the reasons behind the urgency to complete the apportionment model after it was announced at the Examination in Public of the draft *Early Alterations* to the London Plan in June 2006. However, because of the urgency to complete the modelling work, in the Authority's opinion, there was insufficient opportunity for all stakeholders to fully engage in the process. Some of the key aspects of the modelling work were carried out over the summer holiday period and with limited opportunity for everyone to input.

**Draft Response from the North London Waste Authority to
the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan
(Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London December
2006
- February 2007 -**

3.4 The Authority welcomes the offer from the GLA (made at the second stakeholder event on 20th December 2006) to visit boroughs and borough groupings to discuss the results of the apportionment modelling work which will be useful so that authorities fully understand the basis on which it is proposed that waste is apportioned to their area. However, as a result of the speed with which this work has been carried out, the Authority considers that there may be a number of detailed questions about the modelling work at the Examination in Public.

3.5 **Recommendation:** For any similar projects in the future the Authority recommends that the above comments are considered, as providing more time for stakeholders to engage with the process and more information throughout the process helps to give stakeholders more confidence in both the process and the end result.

4.0 Detail of the Apportionment Model

4.1 Although the Authority has raised above some suggestions for ways in which the process of developing the apportionment model could have been improved, the Authority is broadly supportive of the detail of the apportionment model, the criteria used to assess individual boroughs' suitability to manage waste and the weighting of the different criteria, as well as the final outcome of the work. The Authority also welcomes that the Mayor of London's steering group was so willing to heed the Authority's response to the strategic environmental assessment taking account of the impact of the Olympics and Paralympics in 2012 and the Authority's representations at the stakeholder event on the project on 9th August 2006 to incorporate more up-to-date land use information into the model.

4.2 The Authority has just three particular comments to make regarding the detail of the apportionment modelling:

Baseline of current licensed capacity per borough

4.3 The evidence for the model's Criteria 1 (Current licensed waste management capacity within each borough) appears to require further updating and the Authority anticipates that the individual constituent borough councils might wish to comment on the figures used. For example no existing licensed capacity is listed for the London Borough of Islington, although the Authority's contractor runs a large new road transfer station and dry recyclables bulking facility within the borough.

**Draft Response from the North London Waste Authority to
the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan
(Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London December
2006
- February 2007 -**

- 4.4 **Recommendation:** The Authority recommends that licensed capacity figures are checked and clarified. It needs to be made clear whether the 'existing capacity' for boroughs stated in the London Plan model just refers to sites which would be deemed to be 'managing' waste within the context of the self sufficiency requirements of the London Plan or whether all licensed waste facilities are included.
- 4.5 **Recommendation:** The Authority recommends that two figures are shown for 'existing capacity' in each borough within the London Plan; one for all existing 'licensed', 'permitted' and 'registered exempt' capacity and a second sub-total of facilities which would be deemed to be 'managing' waste within London as defined by the Examination in Public panel report recommendation W1. Using just the wider definition runs the risk that this would show a greater amount of licensed capacity available and so under-estimate the challenge of regional self-sufficiency, but the number is needed to indicate the potential sites available for conversion to 'management' in London Plan terms.

'Managing' waste and 'pre-treatment' under the Landfill Directive

- 4.6 Secondly, an additional reference should be made within the London Plan regarding the terminology used for 'managing' waste within London and how this compares to the 'pre-treatment' requirements of the Landfill Directive to be introduced in 2008. A very valuable service is provided by commercial MRFs and by municipal waste contractors (such as LondonWaste Ltd.) who sort bulky recyclable wastes from waste streams otherwise destined for landfill.
- 4.7 **Recommendation:** Such services are expected to count as 'pre-treatment' under the Landfill Directive, so the Authority believes that it would be consistent to record these as 'managing' waste within the definition of the London Plan, at least to the extent that they actually divert tonnages from landfill. The term 'managing waste' within the London should be updated accordingly.

**Draft Response from the North London Waste Authority to
the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan
(Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London December
2006
- February 2007 -**

Sustainable Transport

4.8 Lastly the Authority wishes to comment on the criteria regarding sustainable transport that were used in the model. Criterion 3 and 5 are 'proximity to', and 'availability of', sustainable transport modes - density of the rail and navigable waterway network within each borough and the number of rail depots and protected wharves. Unfortunately the consultants said that the data on the number of suitable rail depots was not available when they completed their work and so, whilst the density of the rail network is incorporated into the model, no allowance has been made for access to rail transport - i.e. depots available. This means that the model weights 'sustainable' waterway transport (including both the density of navigable waterways and the number of protected wharves) more highly than 'sustainable' rail transport, where only the density of the rail network is included.

4.9 **Recommendation:** The Authority recommends that when any further reviews of the London Plan are carried out in the future, then this additional information should be obtained and used.

5.0 Results of the Modelling Work and Using it Locally

5.1 In broad terms the Authority supports the outcomes of the modelling work as far as North London is concerned. The Authority's own projections of municipal waste tie very closely in with those provided by the GLA as outlined in Annex 2 of the published *Early Alterations* to the London Plan, December 2006:

- In **2010** the GLA is predicting **1.108** million tonnes of municipal waste arising in North London, the Authority's projections are **1.092** million tonnes.
- In **2015** the GLA is predicting **1.234** million tonnes of municipal waste arising in North London, the Authority's projections are **1.236** million tonnes.
- In **2020** the GLA is predicting that there will be **1.372** million tonnes of municipal waste arising in North London, the Authority is projecting **1.397** million tonnes.

5.2 The minor discrepancies between the two sets of figures arise because the London Plan apportionment modelling is using a 2% per annum straight line increase in waste arising each year, whilst the Authority is working on the North London Joint Waste Strategy projections of 3% to 2010 and 2.5% thereafter, but the base years are slightly different – 2003 for the London Plan, 2004 for the North London work (when waste growth was lower).

**Draft Response from the North London Waste Authority to
the REVISED draft *minor* alteration to the London Plan
(Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London December
2006
- February 2007 -**

Tonnes of municipal waste requiring management

- 5.3 The Authority is working in compliance with the North London Joint Waste Strategy in terms of 'managing' waste. This is based upon the Authority handling 100% of the municipal waste arising in North London now and in the future. The Authority's plans assume that all of its predicted 1.397m tonnes of municipal waste arising in 2020 should be handled or treated locally, i.e. 100% sub-regional self sufficiency for receipt of municipal waste.
- 5.4 The minimum self sufficiency targets contained within the draft *Minor* Alteration to the London Plan require the Authority to be managing 0.826m tonnes of municipal waste within the area, by 2020 or 60.2% of the total arising, compared to the GLA's predictions of 1.372m tonnes arising and the Authority's projections of needing to receive 1.397m tonnes by the same time.
- 5.5 The Authority's main concern is that if boroughs as planning authorities only plan on the basis of London Plan's self sufficiency requirements, then insufficient land will be allocated for the municipal waste facilities needed under the North London Joint Waste Strategy. Whilst the Authority recognises that its own definition of self sufficiency is wider than that contained within the planning terminology of the London plan, (i.e. including waste transfer), the Authority considers it important for the final London Plan to re-emphasise the potential need of waste authorities to manage and handle all the waste arising in an area in order to meet waste strategy targets and for the planning authorities to take account of this within their planning documents, even if self sufficiency targets are lower.
- 5.6 **Recommendation:** The Authority therefore recommends that further reiteration is given alongside table A4.4 which states that whilst the self-sufficiency targets contained within the table are minimum amounts, boroughs should ensure that land resources are available to implement the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy and local municipal waste management strategies as stated in Policy 4A.1 and that these might require larger amounts of land to be available in order to hit these targets.
- 5.7 **Recommendation:** The Authority also recommends that waste arisings projections are regularly reviewed to ensure that land use planning requirements and waste management projections and requirements stay in line with each other.

Report Ends