

**Minutes of the 29th Meeting of SERTAB held on 12 November 2007
at ESA, 154 Buckingham Palace Road, London SW1 9TR**

Present:

Paul Archer	Chairman (Hampshire CC)
Marcus Wood	Atkins – for Berkshire JSPU
Chris Colbourn	Buckinghamshire CC
Tony Cook	East Sussex CC
John Prosser	Kent CC
Rebecca Trowse	Milton Keynes Council
Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC (Secretary)
Hilary Herbert	Surrey CC
Mike Elkington	West Sussex CC
Steve Storey	Environment Agency (EA)
Tony Odam	ESA (Veolia)
Graham Gunby	ESA (Cory)
Joe McIndoe	SEFS (Groundwork South East)
Sarah Earis	GOSE
David Payne	SEERA
Melvin Caton	SEEDA
Andy Richmond	London RTAB (GLA)
Angela Graham	Scott Wilson (for agenda item 3)

1. Introductions, Apologies and Confirmation of New Chairman

1.1 Apologies were received from:

Graham Liddiard	Buckinghamshire CC – represented by Chris Colbourn
Richard Read	Hampshire CC
Bryan Geake	Medway Council
Nick Hollands	ESA (Veolia) – represented by Tony Odam
Roy Leavitt	East of England RTAB (Essex CC)

- 1.2 Paul Archer, Assistant Director (Waste and Environment) at Hampshire CC introduced himself and outlined his background. He was confirmed as the new Chairman of SERTAB.

2. Minutes of Meeting held on 5 June 2007 and Matters Arising

- 2.1 The minutes of the SERTAB meeting on 5 June 2007 were agreed.

- 2.2 Item 2.2 – Tony Odam reported that Nick Hollands has raised the issue of ESA representation on SERTAB at the ESA Planning Committee. No additional names have come forward yet. He will raise it again at the next meeting.

ACTION: Nick Hollands

- 2.3 Item 11.5 – The Surrey Waste Plan Inspector's Report should be out in December. It was agreed that a meeting/workshop on Waste and Minerals LDFs should be held early in 2008, if possible on the day of the next SERTAB meeting.

ACTION: Peter Day

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

3. Review of Arisings and Management Requirements for Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Wastes in South East England

3.1 David Payne briefly explained the need for this project, stemming from the Panel Report on the EIP into the Waste Alterations to RPG9 and changing Government policy on low level radioactive waste towards more local planning and provision for management of this waste. It had been agreed it made sense to combine the two types of waste in a single study because they raised similar issues. He confirmed that a successful bid had been made to the Defra WIP Regional Support Fund for £10,000 funding for this project. SEERA and SERTAB had both agreed to contribute £10,000, to make a total of £30,000.

3.2 Scott Wilson had been appointed to undertake the project. An inception meeting between Mike Nutting (Project Manager) and Angela Graham from Scott Wilson and the Project Steering Group had been held on 5 November. The Steering Group comprises: David Payne (SEERA), Sarah Earis (GOSE), Steve Storey (EA), John Prosser (Kent), Melissa Spriggs (Hampshire) and Peter Day (Oxfordshire).

3.3 Angela Graham was welcomed to the meeting. She gave an introduction to the project and set out what the consultants intend to do. The brief for the project and the Consultants' proposal and project plan had been circulated. She outlined the 5 stages of the project, as in the consultants' proposal:

Stage 1: Data collection and review;

Stage 2: Waste management techniques review;

Stage 3: Waste growth/capacity modelling;

Stage 4: Development of locational criteria and policy recommendations;

Stage 5: Final reporting.

The methodology to be used is similar to that used by Scott Wilson in the similar study of hazardous waste that they have just completed for the East of England. The locational criteria and policy recommendations would be developed with input from SERTAB. The Consultants will make a presentation to SERTAB at the end of the project. All spreadsheets and calculations used will be made available to SERTAB/SEERA to use.

3.4 Angela Graham confirmed that data on waste movements will be taken into account, including contracts for disposal of EFW residues outside the South East. Information will be needed from WPAs, the EA and Industry. District Environmental Health Officers will be contacted for information on

contaminated land. A request was made to the Consultants to plan information requests well in advance and allow plenty of time for WPAs and others to provide the information.

4. Regional Waste Capacity Monitoring – Use of ERM Model for WPA and Regional Annual Monitoring Reports

4.1 David Payne said this had been discussed before by SERTAB and he had raised it at the Regional Waste Summit on 1 November. It has generally been agreed that SERTAB should now focus on information and monitoring. The ERM survey and model provides a means for doing this, particularly for information on waste management capacity which is critical. WPAs need to have systems in place for regular updating of the model, to provide information for their WDFs and AMRs and for the Regional AMR. ERM have now visited each WPA to give training in use of the model.

4.2 Joe McIndoe asked whether the model allowed for waste growth rates to be changed, given that the latest Defra growth rates are lower than those used in the Regional Waste Management Strategy. David Payne confirmed that these could be changed, either at WPA or regional level, but that for regional monitoring purposes any change should be made at the regional level.

4.3 On Paul Archer's suggestion, it was agreed to aim to produce a Regional Strategic Monitoring Report for 2007/08, on waste production, management, growth trends and management capacity, for the second SERTAB meeting in 2008. But it was recognised it is unlikely that any of the WPAs would have the capacity to produce this report and it was suggested that SERTAB should buy in the required capacity. David Payne will draft a specification for this work and a note of what is needed by when for reporting to SERTAB meetings.

ACTION: David Payne

4.4 It was agreed that all WPAs would use the ERM model for monitoring next year, for providing input to the 2008 Regional AMR.

ACTION: All WPAs

5. Waste Data

5(i) Environment Agency Waste Data

5.1 Steve Storey had pulled together the datasets currently available from the EA and these had been circulated to SERTAB members in August (email 21 August 2007). Steve Storey expressed disappointment at the lack of feedback so far. He wanted to know whether this is the type of data that is wanted, the extent to which it meets needs and whether there are any significant errors.

The data has not yet been finalised but it needs to be signed off soon so that it can be published on the web in January. It was agreed that feedback on the data should be sent to Steve Storey by the end of November.

ACTION: All

5.2 Melvin Caton said there is a need for better, more up to date data on C&I waste; we are still having to use 2002/03 data. He referred to a recently completed study for the North West RTAB; that work had cost £140,000. The East of England Region is now looking into a possible study of C&I waste. We particularly need data on trends in waste generation and on materials flows, to identify economic opportunities. Steve Storey said there is data in existence but there is a problem extracting it; it would take a lot of time and effort. Getting data from exemption sites is a particular problem.

5.3 Paul Archer said Hampshire CC is carrying out a C&I materials flow study this year, but they could not afford to go on financing ad hoc, isolated projects. He thought it would be better if C&I waste was addressed nationally, rather than individual regions and authorities doing their own thing. Steve Storey said the RTABs needed to keep up the message on what data they need. It was agreed the Chairman should write to the EA.

ACTION: Paul Archer / Peter Day

5.4 John Prosser and Tony Cook said there is a need for better data on intra and inter regional waste flows. Steve Storey thought it should be possible to provide this data.

5(ii) SERTAB / Environment Agency Memorandum of Understanding

5.5 Steve Storey said it is not clear what data the EA should produce and when in order to meet the needs of WPAs and RTABs. He therefore proposed that a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) be drawn up between the EA and SERTAB. Such a MoU was in the process of being drawn up for the East of England. Paul Archer suggested there is a core of data that is required by all RTABs and that a MoU should reflect regional variations on this. Steve Storey said he wanted to get a MoU in place by the end of March 2008 and therefore a first draft is needed in December.

ACTION: Steve Storey

5.6 John Prosser will find out progress on the East of England MoU and circulate a draft when it is available. East Sussex has a separate MoU with the EA; Tony Cook will forward this to the Secretary. Tony Cook agreed to prepare a first draft MoU based on the East Sussex one.

ACTION: Tony Cook

6. SERTAB / Other Regional Groups

6.1 Paul Archer said he wanted to use this item to generate discussion on the 3 regional groups: SERTAB, SEWAG and Waste Market Development Group.

6(i) South East Waste Advisory Group (SEWAG)

6.2 Sarah Earis explained that SEWAG had been established when Defra set up the WIP Regional Support Fund. Defra support has diminished as the focus of their work has changed; attendance at meetings has dwindled; and it is uncertain whether there will be further money for regional support funds in 2008/09. But, whatever happened to SEWAG, the input from the South East Centre for Excellence (SECE) should not be lost; and there is a need to continue a forum for dialogue between waste management practitioners.

6.3 The minutes of the SEWAG meeting on 24 October 2007 had been circulated. Sarah Earis referred to the main items of interest. There had been good feedback on the Regional Waste Summit held on 1 November.

6(ii) SEEDA Waste Market Development Group (WMDG)

6.4 Melvin Caton explained that the Waste Market Development Group was set up 5 or 6 years ago when waste market development was in its infancy. It was now time to review the direction of this work. There are parallels with the way WRAP has developed from a materials/end market approach to a more strategic approach and it may be that SEEDA should be moving in a similar direction. He could see SEEDA moving from a demand-pull role to a supply-push role. This would move the work of the WMDG closer to that of SERTAB. The Sub-National Review also points to a changing role for SEEDA.

6.5 SEEDA has recently published the Regional Economic Strategy 2006 – 2016 Implementation Plan. There is a commitment to waste reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery at the heart of this plan and it includes 2 priority actions relating to waste: Increase energy, water and materials efficiency in business; and Smart ('zero carbon/zero waste') construction.

6.6 A workshop was held, facilitated by Bob Lisney, to discuss the role of the WMDG and how to take its work forward. There are other important roles apart from providing infrastructure on the ground. There have also been discussions with the EA and WRAP.

6.7 An application was made to Defra for BREW funding for a Zero Waste project

looking at material flows in the region. (NB. Zero waste means zero waste to landfill.) Defra like the idea but the level of funding sought is not available. The project is to go through a feasibility stage and EU funding may be sought.

6(iii) Discussion

- 6.8 Paul Archer said he would like to see increased overlaps between the 3 groups, with more cohesion and a more joined-up debate. It was generally agreed that there is a good case for some rationalisation of the 3 groups and that this could be of overall benefit. It would help to bring waste planning and management together. It was noted that SERTAB has a quasi-official position, given that PPS10 says RTABs should be convened by the Regional Planning Bodies and sets out the role and composition of RTABs. Sarah Earis suggested SEWAG could change its focus to specific practical issues and case studies for waste management practitioners, leaving the more strategic issues to be dealt with by SERTAB.
- 6.9 It was agreed that a virtual sub-group should look at the terms of reference of the 3 groups and consider the options for rationalisation and report back to the next meeting. The sub-group comprises: Paul Archer, Sarah Earis, Melvin Caton, Steve Storey, David Payne and Peter Day.

ACTION: Sub-Group

7. Liaison with Other Regions

7(i) London

- 7.1 Andy Richmond reported that the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy is due for review. A Statement of Intent is due in December which will include headline policies and proposals for comment. A new Strategy is due to be published in early 2009.
- 7.2 The Panel Report on the London Plan Further Alteration EIP is generally supportive of the Mayor's policies, including the waste apportionment figures for the Boroughs. The Alteration is now being redrafted.
- 7.3 The Mayor's proposal for a Single London Waste Authority was not successful but the Mayor remains of a mind that this is needed. The Mayor is determined to pursue London self-sufficiency in waste management and will push the Boroughs to deliver, but it must be recognised that his powers are limited.
- 7.4 The GLA will be publishing (on the website in December) a report by Eunomia on greenhouse gas impacts of different waste management

technologies, looking at life cycle impacts. The Mayor's thinking is towards adaptable technologies, to accommodate future changes, rather than more fixed technology incineration. The GLA will also be going out to tender on a project to look at design of waste facilities, particularly how they can be delivered in an urban context and contribute to decentralised renewable energy policies.

7(ii) East of England

- 7.5 John Prosser circulated a note on recent work by the East of England RTAB, at meetings on 26 July and on 10 and 25 October. A Regional Waste Technical Paper is being prepared, to be completed by December 2009, to inform a review of the RSS. A Hazardous Waste Study has recently been completed, by Scott Wilson. The main conclusions of this are set out in the note. A study of C&I Waste is now proposed, but they are looking to see if this can be done in a different way to the North West Region study. A landfill study is to be undertaken next year; this will look at the apportionment of London's waste and may have implications for the South East Region. A Memorandum of Understanding with the EA is to be drafted shortly.

8. Update on Waste Development Frameworks and Major Waste Management Development Proposals

- 8.1 A schedule of programmes for South East Region Waste Local Development Documents had been circulated. Any missing information or updates should be sent to Peter Day so that a revised schedule can be circulated.
ACTION: All WPAs / Peter Day
- 8.2 **Berkshire Authorities:**
Permission has been granted on appeal to Biffa for a non-reactive hazardous waste landfill cell at Colnbrook.
- 8.3 **Buckinghamshire:**
A revised LDS has just been agreed with GOSE; the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy will now be progressed first and will include sites.
- 8.4 **Milton Keynes:**
The Examination of the Waste DPD was held in October; the Inspector's Report is expected in December. One site is identified for a treatment facility and the Council is now in the process of purchasing the site. The applications for Bletchley Landfill, to enable import of waste from London, have been refused.

8.5 East Sussex and Brighton & Hove:

The LDS has been further updated. The application for the Newhaven EFW Plant is going back to Committee for the decision to approve to be confirmed, as the related legal agreement is near completion. The High Court has rejected a challenge to the Secretary of State's decision not to call in the application. The Secretary of State has refused the Brighton Sewage Treatment Works application on design grounds; a new application is expected in 2008.

8.6 Hampshire:

The timetable for the Waste Sites DPD is still being considered.

8.7 Kent:

A new LDF timetable is to be submitted to GOSE, showing greater time separation between the Core Strategy and the other DPDs. There are technical problems at the Allington EFW Plant and it is likely to be out of action until the Spring. But the plant is still being commissioned.

8.8 Oxfordshire:

The LDF timetable is still under review despite a lengthy period of dialogue with GOSE and PINS; it is still not clear how the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy needs to be changed to ensure soundness.

8.9 Surrey:

The Inspector's Report on the Waste DPDs is imminent and is expected to be published in early December. The Plan should be adopted in January 2008. An application has been received for a 110,000tpa EFW Plant at Capel, but it has not been validated yet.

8.10 West Sussex:

Formal work on DPDs has come to a halt as it has not been possible to agree a way forward with GOSE and, following the Planning White Paper, further changes to the system are now expected. A decision on how and when to proceed will be made when these changes are known and PPS12 has been revised. In the meantime, technical work is continuing.

9. Financial Contributions to SERTAB

9.1 Peter Day reported that the current balance of the SERTAB account is nearly £60,000, with a commitment to spend £10,000 in this financial year on the hazardous waste study. But there could be significant expenditure from next year on additional resources for preparing monitoring reports. It was

therefore agreed that contributions would not be requested from WPAs for 2007/08 and that a note should be sent to WPAs to say this but that contributions would be requested again in 2008/09, at the same levels as previously.

ACTION: Peter Day

10. Future Meetings

10.1 It was agreed meetings should be quarterly. The next meeting will be in February 2008. Dates for meetings in 2008 are to be arranged and circulated. There was interest in continuing to have some meetings combined with site visits; this will be discussed again at the February meeting.

ACTION: Peter Day

11. Any Other Business

11.1 John Prosser referred to the Panel Report on the South East Plan EIP. On the issue of Apportionment of London's Waste (Policy W3), the Panel say that advice from SERTAB and the EA may be needed on the scale of MSW and C&I waste to which the apportionment percentages should be applied. David Payne explained that SEERA can take no action on this and that any request for advice would have to come from GOSE. It was noted that the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the South East Plan are expected to be published by GOSE in January.