

Agenda Item No:

NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY

REPORT TITLE:

HENDON RELOCATION - UPDATE

REPORT OF:

HEAD OF WASTE STRATEGY AND CONTRACTS

FOR SUBMISSION TO:

AUTHORITY MEETING

DATE:

15th December 2004

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 Hendon Rail Transfer Station.

The Authority has received for comment a draft report that suggests a range of waste management technologies to be installed at a new purpose-built facility in Cricklewood.

The draft report has been examined and a future course of action is proposed, which Members are requested to consider and endorse.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Officers should conduct further negotiations with Cricklewood Redevelopments Ltd to establish the best replacement facilities for the Hendon Rail Transfer Station, giving full consideration to the Authority's obligations under the Waste and Emissions Trading Act and with liaison with the West London Waste Authority.

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

.....
.....

Date:.....

.....

1.0 INTRODUCTION.

- 1.1 This report is intended to update Members of developments since the previous report submitted to the Authority Meeting on 11 February 2004. The previous report outlined the Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon Development Framework published in January 2004, advised on its effects on the Authority and sought guidance from Members on the continuing negotiations with the London Borough of Barnet and the developers, Cricklewood Redevelopments Limited (CRL).
- 1.2 Since the last report to the Authority the consultants acting for the developers, Scott Wilson have produced a draft document entitled Waste Handling Facility - Process Feasibility Study.
- 1.3 The draft document reviews the anticipated needs and the recommended technologies and infrastructure to meet these.
- 1.4 The draft report has been examined and a future course of action is proposed, which Members are requested to consider and endorse.

2.0 DETAILS OF THE LATEST PROPOSALS

- 2.1 The latest proposals for the new waste management facility in Cricklewood attempt to take into account the comments made in response to previous proposals and address the Authority's stated needs, as well as wider circumstances in the future.
- 2.2 The facility proposed to replace the Hendon Rail Transfer Station is now expected to open in the year 2011. At this time there will be an increased restriction on the quantities of waste sent to landfill, due to European and national legislation, and a consequent need for greatly enhanced reduction, re-use, recycling and recovery of waste.
- 2.3 The Authority's own lease on the current site is due to end in March 2009, and this is being addressed urgently before agreement can be reached with CRL. The existing tri-partite arrangement with LondonWaste and Waste Recycling Group (formerly Shanks) is also being revised to permit its continuation until the end of the main waste disposal contract in December 2014.

- 2.4 The proposal takes into account the planning regime and waste strategy plans at the regional and national levels as well as the North London Joint Waste Strategy. It is anticipated that the planning application for the new facilities would be made during 2005 as part of the overall plan for the whole development. As such it will be ahead of our constituent boroughs' planning work on a joint development plan document for waste.
- 2.5 The Authority has required that the facility must meet the key targets for waste recycled, recovered and sent for landfill and so the following quantities of waste are anticipated and used in the proposal:
 - 2.4.1 120,000 tonnes per annum of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) to be sent for final disposal by either rail or road from the facility without further treatment.
 - 2.4.2 106,000 tonnes per annum capacity for MSW to be treated at the facility before being sent to landfill or another method of final disposal.
 - 2.4.3 96,000 tonnes per annum capacity for source separated household waste to be recycled or composted at the facility.
 - 2.4.4 Total waste to be received at the facility to be 322,000 tonnes per annum (sum of the above).
 - 2.4.5 On-site storage capacity for two days input of MSW and two days output of recyclables (estimated to be 1,238 tonnes and 526 tonnes respectively).
- 2.5 Additionally, CRL has agreed to provide:
 - 2.5.1 A terminal for loading ISO containers for the bulk export of residual waste for final disposal by road and rail transport.
 - 2.5.2 Equipment for the loading and handling of treated waste, recyclables and compostables.
 - 2.5.3 A Re-use and Recycling Centre for London Borough of Barnet.
 - 2.5.4 Ancillary and related facilities for plant, staff, visitors and transport.
- 2.6 Taking into account the requirements described above, the study recommends:
 - 2.6.1 Compactors to take 120,000 tonnes per annum of untreated MSW to landfill.
 - 2.6.2 Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) for 120,000 tonnes of MSW per annum. Proprietary systems are recommended in the report.
 - 2.6.3 Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) with associated recycling and composting bulking facilities to treat 150,000 tonnes per annum of MSW.
 - 2.6.4 Public Re-use and Recycling Centre for local residents.

- 2.7 The proposed handling capacity of the site is 390,000 tonnes per annum, but the required capacity is 322,000 tonnes. This additional capacity would allow for any increase in the amounts of waste delivered to the facility and some flexibility to re-align the balance between different processes.
- 2.8 Materials will be delivered to the site by road and removed using either road or rail transport as appropriate.

3.0 APPRAISAL OF THE PROPOSALS.

3.1 Waste to landfill.

3.1.1 The waste sent to landfill would be transported on the railway in the same manner, as is currently the case at the Hendon Rail Transfer Station. This disposal option is dependent on the presence of a suitable railhead at the landfill site to unload the waste. Landfill space is limited and it is possible that sites connected to the railway network may not be available for the whole length of the contract. This is one of the reasons that the transfer system must allow loading onto road vehicles with equal ease.

3.2 Mechanical Biological Treatment.

3.2.1 The main objective of the process is to dry the waste to ensure a moisture loss of approximately 30 percent over a seven-day period. The dried material can then be processed to produce a refuse-derived fuel (RDF). This treatment method will also allow the recovery of metals and an inert fraction containing glass and ceramic as by-products, which may potentially be recycled into aggregate.

3.2.2 It may be difficult to place the inert fraction in the aggregate market place as the material is likely to be contaminated with organic material making it unsuitable for mixing with concrete.

3.2.3 Market potential for sales of RDF is also small. The material is more variable in composition and material properties than traditional fuels. Additionally the UK classifies the use of RDF as a waste disposal practice, with all of the associated legislative controls that do not currently apply to other forms of energy generation.

- 3.3 Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) with associated bulking facilities.
 - 3.3.1 The proposed MRF is based on a similar plant with a capacity of 120,000 tonnes that is currently under construction in East London.
 - 3.3.2 The waste collection method for recyclables to be processed in any MRF must be considered in parallel with the design of the facility. At this early stage the feasibility study does not yet consider or suggest a collection method that would integrate with the MRF design.

- 3.4 Public Re-use and Recycling Centre.
 - 3.4.1 In the NLWA area the Boroughs provide re-use and recycling centres. Barnet already provides a facility at Summers Lane and so residents will be well served. A facility at the Cricklewood site is likely to attract considerable recyclable and non-recyclable waste from residents of neighbouring Boroughs that are not a part of the NLWA. This will affect the recycling performance of the Borough and hence the Authority and may increase the costs of disposal borne by the Authority.
 - 3.4.2 The space required for this facility could be used for additional waste treatment or recycling capacity. There is no requirement for the Authority to provide this particular facility.

- 3.5 The suggested capability to send a reduced amount of waste to landfill by rail and road is sensible, and was a stated Authority requirement. There will remain an amount of residual waste that needs to be landfilled for the foreseeable future. The option to use road transport must be maintained, as the landfill sites that can be accessed by rail will eventually be filled. At this point, road transport will become essential to transport waste, unless railheads are installed at other existing or new facilities (which appears unlikely given the increasing regional policies of self-sufficiency).

- 3.6 The proposed method of Mechanical Biological Treatment presents a greater problem. The purposes of the developer's proposed plan are to dry the waste to reduce mass sent to landfill, to produce a fuel and to facilitate metal and glass recycling. Recent guidance from the Government on the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme advises that the potential for the waste to re-hydrate in landfill will be taken into consideration when calculating the tradable Landfill Allowances used. The proposed method would reduce the mass and hence the gate fee paid to the landfill but would use a full quota of Landfill Allowances as if the waste had not been treated. This will reduce the benefit of the proposed scheme considerably.

- 3.7 The prospect of an MBT plant producing a fuel that cannot be placed in the market does not then appear to be the most inspired choice of technologies either even though more than one other Authority in the London area has selected this technology. There is a high risk that having prepared the fuel at a cost it will either have to be incinerated or sent to landfill at a further cost.
- 3.8 However, rather than discount MBT as an option the alternative suggestion of actually increasing reliance on this treatment should be considered. It is in the nature of the biological processes that during the initial stages large quantities of heat are produced as the micro-organisms present multiply and consume organic matter. This heat dries the waste by evaporating water from the surface of the waste. There is some mass reduction at this stage but this is limited as mass consumed is replaced by the biomass created.
- 3.9 In the latter stages of the process the mass present reduces as the organic matter is consumed but the micro-organisms present are not reproducing as rapidly as before and numbers may even start to decline.
- 3.10 It is this latter stage that may be useful to the Authority as a means of genuinely reducing the size of the biodegradable fraction of the waste. If the waste can be retained for a sufficient period to allow the reduction then a saving can be made in the amount of waste sent to landfill, its biodegradability, the landfill tax paid and the number of landfill allowances required. The difference with the proposal in paragraph 3.6 above should be noted.
- 3.11 In order to achieve this benefit a larger building than proposed would be necessary. As noted in paragraph 2.7, the proposed waste handling capacity is greater than the need anticipated by the Authority. It is possible that this additional capacity could be taken up by storing waste for a longer period than suggested in the study to achieve the desired mass reduction. Further work to explore the full implications and potential benefits of this work are proposed over the next few months. This work should be considered before agreement to relocate is reached.
- 3.12 A large MRF with a capacity of 120,000 tonnes is a sensible proposal for the development if space permits and subject to conclusions reached by the Strategy Implementation Board on the balance between kerbside sorted and co-mingled recyclables. This proposal will need to be integrated with a collection scheme operated by the boroughs delivering waste to the facility. Further work to integrate collection systems with the provision of a suitable facility is therefore required before this proposal is accepted.

- 3.13 All the above matters should also be discussed with the West London Waste Authority to see what opportunities exist for co-operation with their plans and those of their constituent boroughs, as the proposed facility is on the border.

4.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 Cricklewood Redevelopments Limited has released a draft document to support their plans to relocate the existing Hendon Rail Transfer Station and provide suitable replacement facilities.
- 4.2 The document describes a new facility incorporating waste management technologies that are considered to comply with the Authority's draft waste strategy and meet the perceived needs for the period between the years 2011 and 2020.
- 4.3 The proposed facility would incorporate waste transfer to landfill, biological treatment and recycling facilities for commingled waste and wastes delivered directly by the public. Waste would be delivered by road and removed using a combination of road and rail transport.
- 4.4 The proposed facilities may be suitable for the Authority's needs but at this time this is far from certain and a significant amount of additional work is required before a decision should be made on the matter.
- 4.5 Alternative uses of the proposed site may be more suitable to the future needs of the Authority and these have yet to be fully investigated. This further investigation and a more thorough scrutiny of the proposals should be conducted before any agreement to relocate the Hendon Rail Transfer Facility is reached.
- 4.6 The new facilities are proposed to open in 2011 but the Authority's existing lease for the Hendon Rail Transfer Station ends in 2009. Arrangements to cover the period between these dates are being discussed.
- 4.7 It is recommended that Officers should conduct further negotiations with Cricklewood Redevelopments Ltd to establish the best replacement facilities for the Hendon Rail Transfer Station, giving full consideration to the Authority's obligations under the Waste and Emissions Trading Act and with liaison with the West London Waste Authority.

5.0 COMMENTS OF THE FINANCE OFFICER

5.1 Whilst proposals are still evolving it is not possible to provide financial advice on their implications. A full financial appraisal will be undertaken however once the final preferred technical solutions have been identified.

6.0 COMMENTS OF THE LEGAL ADVISER

6.1 The Legal Adviser's comments are incorporated in the report.

Local Governments Act 1972 – Access to information

Report to the Authority:- 11th February 2004.

Contact Officer: Andrew Lappage, Head of Waste Strategy & Contracts
Contract House
Tottenham N17 9AY

Tel: 020 8489 5730

Fax: 020 8365 0254

Email: post@nlondon-waste.gov.uk

Report Ends