

Minutes of the 22nd Meeting of SERTAB held on 12 January 2006 at ODPM, Eland House, London

Present:

Pete Raine	Chairman (Kent CC)
Chris Colbourn	Buckinghamshire CC
Tony Cook	East Sussex CC
Bill Murphy	Kent CC
Gill King	Milton Keynes Council
Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC (Secretary)
Hilary Herbert	Surrey CC
Tony Odam	West Sussex CC
Owen Dimond	ESA (Grundon)
Gerald Owen	ESA (Cory)
Brian Jones	Environment Agency (EA)
Paddy Johnston	SEFS (Greenworks Trust)
David Payne	SEERA
Dom Veasey	SEERA
Melvin Caton	SEEDA
Richard Lemon	GOSE
Chris Waite	SEERAWP
Philip Short	ERM (for item 3)
Peter Garrett	ERM (for item 3)

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies were received from:

Bryan Lyttle	Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit
Graham Liddiard	Buckinghamshire CC (represented by Chris Colbourn)
Richard Read	Hampshire CC (represented by Jeremy Smith)
Bryan Geake	Medway Council
John Boldon	ESA (Cory) (represented by Gerald Owen)
Nick Hollands	ESA (Onyx)
Gareth Phillips	ESA (SITA)
Roy Leavitt	East of England RTAB (Essex CC)
Wayne Hubbard	London RTAB (GLA)

- 1.2 John Prosser has left Cleanaway and therefore resigned from SERTAB. This leaves ESA currently with 4 representatives on SERTAB (for 5 places).

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 September 2005 and Matters Arising

- 2.1 The minutes of the SERTAB meeting on 23 September 2005 were agreed.

- 2.2 Item 7.1 – Hazardous Waste: Bill Murphy had received no views on what further work needs to be done. The need for a hazardous waste strategy remains, stemming from the Review of RPG9. What action is needed on this and when will be kept under review.

- 2.3 Item 12.7 – Bill Murphy will draft a letter to ODPM on the time taken to deal with departure applications for the Chairman to send.

ACTION: Bill Murphy

- 2.4 Item 15.1 – Invoices for 2005/06 contributions have not yet been sent out to WPAs by Surrey CC; Hilary Herbert will chase this up.

ACTION: Hilary Herbert

- 2.5 Item 15.5 – David Payne advised that SEERA have now appointed an Assistant Regional Planner, who will deal with waste.

- 2.6 Other matters arising were covered under items elsewhere on the agenda.

3. Regional Waste Capacity Survey and Establishment of Methodology and Monitoring Procedure for Regional Waste Management Capacity

- 3.1 As explained in paper SERTAB 06-1, ERM had been appointed by SEERA to undertake the project 'Regional Waste Capacity Survey and Establishment of Methodology and Monitoring Procedure for Regional Waste Management Capacity'. This project is to be funded from the Defra WIP Regional Waste Support Fund (£35,000). The project specification had been circulated with paper SERTAB 06-1.

- 3.2 Philip Short and Peter Garrett from ERM gave a presentation on how they propose to carry out the project. Philip Short will circulate the presentation slides by email. He highlighted two key issues on which the agreement of WPAs is required before the survey can be carried out: definitions of facility types; and definitions of capacity. Philip Short will circulate draft definitions, drawing on similar work done by ERM for the East of England and using EA OPRA code definitions, to WPAs for comments and agreement.

ACTION: ERM / WPAs

- 3.3 ERM will draft a waste facility capacity questionnaire and also circulate this to WPAs for comments before finalising it. ERM originally proposed to trial use of the questionnaire with one WPA, but now thought seeking comments from all WPAs on a draft to be a better approach. ERM are obtaining a list of waste facility sites from the EA and this will need to be checked, and new and exempt sites added by WPAs. ERM will send out the finalised questionnaire for checking and completion by WPAs when they have obtained data on sites from the EA.

ACTION: ERM / WPAs

- 3.4 In discussion on definitions and the questions that should be asked, 4 key areas of uncertainty with the previous capacity survey carried out by MEL were highlighted: where do civic amenity sites fit in; the definition of a MRF; the definition of specialist and non-specialist incinerators; and the definition of 'other physical treatment'. It was also felt strongly that a new waste capacity model, similar to the model developed by ERM for the East of England, should be used rather than the existing flawed model developed by MEL.

- 3.5 In order to meet the project funding deadline of 31 March, ERM proposed a very tight timescale for the project. SERTAB members were concerned that this was unrealistic and that insufficient time was being allowed for this important project. A similar project undertaken by ERM in the East of England had taken 6 to 8 months. It was agreed it is more important that sufficient time

is allowed to enable the project to be carried out well to give robust results than that a deadline for Defra funding is met. If necessary the project can be funded from SERTAB funds. David Payne was therefore asked that SEERA agree a revised timetable for the project with ERM, in consultation with WPAs, and that SEERA seek a re-negotiation of the contract with Defra to extend the timescale of the project. Richard Lemon offered to assist with the latter negotiations.

ACTION: David Payne / Richard Lemon

3.6 ERM will send out the definitions of facility types and of capacity in w/c 16 January, with the aim of agreement being reached by WPAs by the end of January. It was felt that 3 to 4 months need to be allowed for the data collection part of the project. It was agreed a workshop (or workshops) should be held with WPAs after the finalised questionnaires have been sent out to WPAs and they have had an opportunity to try completing them, if possible in the 3rd or 4th week of March.

3.7 Brian Jones will ask John Gower to inform ERM about what site data will be available from the EA for which year and when.

ACTION: Brian Jones / John Gower

4. Methodology for Apportionment of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates in the South East (report by Land Use Consultants, November 2005); Recommendation to SEERA for sub-regional apportionment

4.1 The consultants' final report on the project 'Methodology for Apportionment of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates in the South East' had been circulated on 28 November 2005, as noted in paper SERTAB 06-2. Following consultation with SEERAWP and SERTAB members, the project steering group had on 27 October agreed on a preferred option for recommendation to SEERA, as attached to paper SERTAB 06-2. The recommendation was sent to SERTAB and reported to the Regional Planning Committee on 7 December. David Payne advised that the Committee had agreed that the sub-regional apportionment figures in Figure 1 of the recommendation be included in Policy M2 in the South East Plan. This would be an amendment of this policy from its wording in the Changes to RPG9.

4.2 Concerns were raised by Brian Jones, who thought the consultants' approach of including environmental constraints was fundamentally flawed; and Gill King who pointed to the lack of brownfield land for development in Milton Keynes as meaning the requirement for recycling of C D&E waste would be small. It was recognised there are many reservations about the consultants report and the steering group's recommendation, but it was agreed that the proposed sub-regional apportionment be recommended to SEERA as the advice of SERTAB for testing through the South East Plan.

5. Proposed Changes to RPG9 / South East Plan

5.1 David Payne explained his report to the Regional Planning Committee on 14 October 2005 on the Proposed Changes to RPG9 – Waste and Minerals. This included proposals for amendments to the following policies from the wording in the Changes to RPG9 for inclusion in the South East Plan: W7 – Provision of Waste Management Capacity; W10 – Regionally Significant Facilities; and W15 – Hazardous Waste. The proposed amendment to policy W7 is to include the sub-regional apportionment of landfill provision for exports of waste from London to the South East from the report by Jacobs Babbie 'Towards a

Methodology for the Apportionment of London's Exports of Waste to the South East of England'. The Committee agreed that the recommended apportionment should be used in updating policy W7, but that further work should be done on translating this into tonnages. A revised version was taken back to the Committee on 7 December and agreed. It was pointed out that the apportionment can only be implemented through new planning permissions and that existing permitted landfill capacity, some of which will have a long life, cannot be altered.

- 5.2 The issue of apportionment of London's exports of waste between the South East and East of England regions was raised; this has never been agreed between the 3 regions; the figures being used are based on past / current movements. Richard Lemon advised that this matter is to be considered at the East of England Plan EIP the following week. The Government Office for the East of England has prepared a paper on inter-regional waste movements from London which shows the figures being used are compatible and do add up. He agreed to send this paper to the Secretary for circulation.

ACTION: Richard Lemon / Peter Day

- 5.3 There is uncertainty over the meaning of residual waste from London, whether it means residues from waste treatment processes in London or residual (untreated) waste that is not subject to treatment in London. It is important to clarify this as it will affect the type of waste facilities required to deal with waste exported from London to the South East, especially as much of it will be C&I waste. It was thought most likely that it means untreated residual waste. David Payne will seek clarification of this.

ACTION: David Payne

- 5.4 Richard Lemon advised that the timescale for publishing the final version of the Changes to RPG9 depends on when Ministerial approval is given. He acknowledged that SEERA needs to have it by mid February in order to include the changes in the South East Plan.

6. Information and Monitoring

6(i) Data Requirements – SERTAB wish list for Environment Agency

- 6.1 The Chairman had sent an initial letter to Howard Davidson at the EA about data requirements, expressing SERTAB's concerns. A more detailed list of data requirements now needs to be drawn up and sent to the EA, Defra and ODPM. Paper SERTAB 06-3 had been circulated, including:
- a paper on Waste Data Issues drawn up by Jeremy Smith setting out data requirements, which the Secretary had put to the RTAB Chairs meeting on 3 November 2006; and
 - a draft list of RTAB Waste Data Requirements which formed the basis of a meeting Jeremy Smith and Peter Day had with Paul Franc – Defra Waste Data Manager – on 8 December 2006, the points arising from which were to be put to the next meeting of the Defra Waste Data Advisory Panel.
- 6.2 Discussion focussed on priorities, omissions and comments. Chris Waite pointed out that information on C D&E waste is critical for aggregates supply policy and felt this needed to be emphasised. The lack of a mandatory requirement for site returns to be made by waste operators to the EA was highlighted as a problem, as was the confidentiality of returns. The need for a clear definition of site capacity is needed, otherwise operators are likely to relate it to the EA charging bands, which would give a false picture.

6.3 Brian Jones reported that the SWMA 2005 (containing data for 2002/03) had still not been published. He had not been able to find out the reason for the delay or when it would be published.

6.4 It was agreed the paper SERTAB 06-3 should be used as the basis of a detailed letter on data requirements from the Chairman to the EA, also to be sent to Defra and ODPM. The Chairman will also liaise with John Gower and the EA Waste Data Team to gain an understanding of the limitations on data availability.

ACTION: Pete Raine

6(ii) SEERA Regional Annual Monitoring Report – Waste Section

6.5 The revised waste section of the SEERA Draft Regional Monitoring Report 2005 had been circulated. Concerns were raised about the age of the data and the concentration on MSW. The issue of targets for reduction in growth of waste arisings was discussed. David Payne said that future Regional AMRs would focus on South East Plan policies.

6.6 The need to develop consistency between WPA AMRs and the Regional AMR was highlighted. This should be sorted out over the next 6 months. Bryan Lyttle is the WPA link on the SEERA Monitoring Group and is working on this.

7. Hazardous Waste

7.1 David Payne referred to his report to the Regional Planning Committee on 14 October 2005 on the Proposed Changes to RPG9, which included the amendment of Policy W15 on hazardous waste for inclusion in the South East Plan. This amendment was based on the report by Beyond Waste 'Overview of Hazardous Waste in South East England', May 2005 and the May 2005 report of the SERTAB Hazardous Waste Task Group.

7.2 It was felt that on the need to provide hazardous waste landfill capacity, there is a question of when this will be required; and that the need for other more specialist facilities needs to be kept under review in the light of changing circumstances. On the need for WEEE facilities, Melvin Caton said it was difficult currently to see how this would pan out; he was concerned that the proposed policy is too prescriptive and will not reflect reality. The amended Policy W15 will be subject to testing through the South East Plan; in particular, consultation and the EIP will provide opportunity for different views to be put forward and debated.

8. Report from SEEDA Waste Market Development Group

8.1 Melvin Caton reported on a Defra sponsored roundtable event on 'What the Future Holds for Commercial and Industrial Waste' he had attended in Birmingham on 14 December 2005, run by ERM. The key points arising from discussions had been circulated.

8.2 Melvin Caton also reported on a SEEDA 'Waste Visioning' event at Dorking on 23 November 2005. This event had been successful, with a lot of input from the waste re-processing sector. The general view was that the focus should be on collection and transport of recycled waste for re-processing elsewhere rather than on establishing re-processing capacity in the South East. This

pointed to locating collection and bulking up sites at ports. It also called into question the concept of resource recovery parks, but SEEDA will help to facilitate the establishment of these if there is market demand. The output from this event is being used to inform a report being prepared by SEEDA.

9. Report from South East Waste Advisory Group (SEWAG)

- 9.1 SEWAG met on 13 October 2005. The note of the meeting had been circulated. The meeting had considered bids for support from the Defra WIP Regional Waste Support Fund (RWSF). It agreed to support a project on 'Health Impact Assessment of Alternate Weekly Collections' for funding in 2005/06. The 'Establishment of Methodology and Monitoring Procedure for Regional Waste Management Capacity' project put forward by SEERA / SERTAB was seen as a second priority. (Funding from the RWSF has since become available for this project – see item 3 above.)

10. Agenda Item 13: Liaison with Other Regions

10(i) London

- 10.1 The Mayor of London published 'Draft Alterations to the London Plan – Housing, Waste and Minerals' for public consultation in October 2005. These were reported to SEERA Regional Planning Committee on 7 December 2005. SEERA supports the draft alterations to waste policies as they provide greater detail on the requirements to deliver the targets for self-sufficiency set out in the adopted London Plan. However, the self-sufficiency targets should be treated as minima and the targets for self-sufficiency in MSW should be increased between 2015 and 2020, with commitment for further improvement in performance beyond 2020. SEERA also seeks clarification on the degree of pre-treatment of wastes exported from London for disposal in the South East.

10(ii) East of England

- 10.2 The East of England RTAB met on 13 October 2005 and 5 January 2006. The minutes had been circulated. A report by ERM on 'Apportionment of Waste Capacity Needs in the East of England' was published in November 2005. The East of England Plan EIP was in progress, with the session on waste being held the following week.

11. Update on Waste Local Plans / Development Frameworks and Major Waste Management Development Proposals

11.1 Buckinghamshire

Consultation on Proposed Modifications to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan ends in February.

11.2 East Sussex and Brighton & Hove:

Notice of intention to adopt the Waste Local Plan has been published. A planning application has been submitted by Onyx for an incinerator at Newhaven.

An appeal has been lodged against non-determination of a planning application for a waste water treatment works in Brighton & Hove, and a second application has been submitted.

11.3 Kent:

Planning permission has been granted for a hazardous waste landfill, to take APC residues from Allington incinerator.

- 11.4 **Milton Keynes:**
Consultation has been carried out on the Issues and Options stage of the Waste Development Plan Document and on the Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
The new Strategy has now been approved and will provide the basis for procurement of new contracts; existing contracts end in 2007.
- 11.5 **Oxfordshire:**
Permission has been granted (subject to legal agreements) for a contaminated soil remediation facility at Witney, with a capacity of 150,000 tonnes pa, to take waste from the South East and West Midlands regions.
- 11.6 **Surrey**
Consultation on Preferred Options for the Waste LDF, comprising core strategy, sites and development control policies, has just ended. It identifies specific sites, including sites for thermal treatment plants.
A Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy is being prepared.
- 11.7 **West Sussex**
The Waste Local Plan Inquiry was due to open in December but the County Council has resolved not to continue with preparation of the Plan; it was decided the risk of legal challenge was too high. The draft Waste Local Plan has been confirmed as non-statutory planning policy and work will now switch to preparation of Waste Development Plan Documents under the new system. A revised planning application for a MRF at Ford has been permitted.
- 12. Future Role and Composition of SERTAB**
- 12.1 A questionnaire for SERTAB members had been distributed. The Chairman asked for completed questionnaires to be returned to him. He will then analyse the responses.
ACTION: All / Pete Raine
- 13. Date of Next Meeting**
- 13.1 24 March 2006 – meeting plus site visit (whole day). Hampshire was suggested, possibly the new Marchwood EFW plant. The Secretary will contact Richard Read to find out if this will be possible;
6 June 2006 – meeting only (half day);
21 September 2006 – meeting plus site visit (whole day);
12 December – meeting only (half day).
ACTION: Peter Day / Richard Read
- 13.2 Ideas and offers for future site visits / meetings were requested – to be sent to the Secretary.
ACTION: All
- 14. Any Other Business**
- 14.1 It was suggested that PPS10 and the 'Living Draft' companion guide document should be discussed at the next meeting.
- 14.2 David Payne and Melvin Caton had recently met Defra officials working on the Review of Waste Strategy 2000; it seems they are considering inclusion of a

statement that RSS should identify locations for waste facilities.