

**Minutes of the 21st Meeting of SERTAB held on 23 September 2005
at GOSE, Bridge House, Guildford**

Present:

Pete Raine	Chairman
Bryan Lyttle	Berkshire Joint Planning Unit
Marcus Wood	Berkshire Joint Planning Unit (Atkins)
Tony Cook	East Sussex CC
Bill Murphy	Kent CC
Jeremy Smith	Hampshire CC
Bryan Geake	Medway Council
Rebecca Trowse	Milton Keynes Council
Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC (Secretary)
David Lamb	Surrey CC
Tony Odam	West Sussex CC
Joanna Colvin	ESA (Cory)
John Gower	Environment Agency (EA)
David Payne	SEERA
Dom Veasey	SEERA
Richard Lemon	GOSE
Nigel Pye	Environment Agency (for item 4)
Sam Ashby	ODPM (for item 4)

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies were received from:

Graham Liddiard	Buckinghamshire CC
Richard Read	Hampshire CC (represented by Jeremy Smith)
Gill King	Milton Keynes Council (represented by Rebecca Trowse)
Hilary Herbert	Surrey CC (represented by David Lamb)
John Boldon	ESA (Cory) (represented by Joanna Colvin)
Owen Dimond	ESA (Grundon)
Nick Hollands	ESA (Onyx)
Gareth Phillips	ESA (SITA)
John Prosser	ESA (Cleanaway)
Paddy Johnston	SEFS (Greenworks Trust)
Melvin Caton	SEEDA
Terry Clarke	GOSE
Roy Leavitt	East of England RTAB (Essex CC)
Wayne Hubbard	London RTAB (GLA)
Chris Waite	SEERAWP (observer)

2. Confirmation of Chairman

- 2.1 Pete Raine (Strategic Planning Director, Kent CC) was confirmed as the new Chairman of SERTAB. He introduced himself and outlined his background.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 May 2005 and Matters Arising

- 3.1 The minutes of the SERTAB meeting held on 24 May 2005 were agreed.

3.2 Item 2.2 – West Sussex BPEO report; Tony Odam said two reports are now available on the West Sussex CC website, on MSW and C&I waste.

3.3 Item 4.6 – A bid to the Regional Waste Support Fund for setting up a monitoring system would now be put to the October 13 meeting of SEWAG.

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

4. Project on Planning for Construction, Demolition and Excavation Wastes (including excavated soil from contaminated sites) in Thames Gateway

4.1 Nigel Pye (EA), the project manager, gave a presentation on this project. It is intended to provide guidance on the amounts and types of waste to be generated by developments within the Thames Gateway over the next 15 to 25 years, particularly brownfield developments. The overall objective is to inform the planning process of financial and other implications of having to handle, treat and dispose of wastes. Two particular objectives are to develop a model to predict waste that will arise from different types of development; and to investigate waste management capacity available to deal with these wastes.

4.2 The proposed timescale for the project is: preliminary report September 2006; final report December 2006. The cost of the project is £166,000, but funding from ODPM is now in doubt. Nigel Pye asked for support for the project from SERTAB, to help in gaining funding.

4.3 It was agreed that this would be a useful project, particularly if it produced a generic model for predicting waste arisings that could be applied to brownfield sites elsewhere, especially in other growth areas. It could also provide important input to District LDFs. It was agreed the Chairman should write to ODPM giving SERTAB's support for the project and urging that it should produce generic conclusions.

ACTION: Pete Raine

4.4 Nigel Pye will provide a copy of his presentation and of the project proposal and an interim report for circulation. He asked for comments to be sent to him.

ACTION: Nigel Pye / Peter Day / All

5. Information and Monitoring

5(i) Recent / Current Research Projects

5.1 Paper SERTAB 05-2 had been circulated, giving an update on the following three projects:

(a) Towards a Methodology for the Apportionment of London's Exports of Waste to the South East of England (Jacobs Babbie)

5.2 The consultants' report had been finalised and circulated, and published on the SEERA website. David Payne explained the need for an apportionment of London's waste exports to the region to be included in the RSS and asked that SERTAB gives advice to SEERA on how to apply the consultants' report. But he added that there are still discrepancies in the figures of actual amounts of waste exported from London and that the wider issue of how London's exports should be split between the East of England and South East regions has still to be addressed.

5.3 In discussion of the report, the following points were raised:

- the methodology does not take availability of landfill void over time into account;
- it is not clear whether landfill includes land raising;
- there are other concerns over the methodology and the weightings used;
- the methodology has not been subject to public consultation or SEA;
- any apportionment needs to be tested at the local level, through the preparation of waste development frameworks;
- figures for Kent and Medway should be disaggregated.

5.4 Although some SERTAB members had concerns over the methodology put forward in the report, it was agreed to recommend to SEERA that the apportionment proposed in the report be used in the RSS, subject to caveats based on the concerns outlined above, for testing through waste development frameworks. However, in view of the lack of public consultation or SEA, it should not be included in the current round of Changes to RPG9 but should go into the new South East Plan. David Payne asked that any concerns about the methodology and apportionment be sent to him; he will then circulate a list of caveats and health warnings.

ACTION: All / David Payne

(b) Updating Model of Future Waste Management Capacity Needs (ERM)

5.5 A project wrap-up / dissemination seminar led by ERM had been held in the morning, which everyone present had attended. The consultants had distributed final reports for each WPA and given a presentation of the model and how it works. They had highlighted certain problems which limited its use, including: lack of good, meaningful and up to date site capacity data; and lack of agreed definitions of waste and waste management facility types. The consultants had outlined further work that could be done to resolve these problems, improve the model and set up an effective monitoring procedure.

5.6 ERM had asked that WPAs re-check the figures for their areas and raise any queries with them immediately. ERM will send an e-copy of the full report to David Payne for circulation.

ACTION: WPAs / David Payne

(b) Towards a Methodology for the Apportionment of Recycled Aggregate Provision in the South East (Land Use Consultants)

5.7 The consultants' final report had been circulated following the presentation they gave to the SEERAWP meeting on 5 September (to which SERTAB members were invited). SEERA have asked the Project Steering Group to consider the 3 options in the report and make a recommendation. SERTAB members had been asked to send any views on this to the Secretary, for consideration at the Steering Group meeting on 27 October, which is to be facilitated by Land Use Consultants. The recommendation of the Steering Group will be reported to the next meetings of SERTAB and SEERAWP for agreement.

5.8 In discussion the following points were made:

- it is difficult to relate figures for recycled aggregates to figures for CD&E waste;
- plan provision should be made only through large-scale infrastructure, since small sites do not really produce recycled aggregates.

5.9 It was agreed that, in view of the lack of public consultation or SEA, any

recommended apportionment should not be included in the current Changes to RPG9 but should go into the new South East Plan. It was also agreed that, if necessary, SERTAB should pay for the final Steering Group meeting.

5(ii) Monitoring of Regional Waste Management Strategy and Regional Annual Monitoring Report

- 5.10 In view of the lack of a paper, specific discussion of this item was deferred.

5(iii) Requirements for and Availability of Data from Environment Agency and Other Sources

- 5.11 John Gower distributed copies of a CD containing 2002/03 raw data inputs for the South East to the new SWMA. This is not for publication yet, but can be used by WPAs. The new SWMA is now expected to be published at the end of October, together with the results of the new national C&I waste survey. Data on capacity of waste management facilities will be published separately. Comprehensive data on waste movements is not available.

- 5.12 John Gower asked that SERTAB produce a list of future data requirements that the EA could use in bidding to Defra for future surveys. It was agreed this should set out what data is needed, in what form and by when, and also what data is not needed. Jeremy Smith will convene a small task group to pull together a detailed list, and this will be sent to Howard Davidson (Regional Director, EA Southern Region).

ACTION: Jeremy Smith

- 5.13 It was agreed the Chairman should send an initial letter to Howard Davidson, thanking the EA for the SWMA data but expressing concern that it is late, out of data, and lacks data on movements.

ACTION: Pete Raine

- 5.14 Concerns were raised about the lack of joined up working between Defra and ODPM. They need to work together to ensure a single consistent set of waste data that will meet planning as well as waste management requirements.

5(iv) Proposed Project on Design of Survey Methodology and Proforma for Regular Monitoring of Waste Management Capacity

- 5.15 Paper SERTAB 05-4 had been circulated, setting out the background to this proposed project and a project brief. The need for this project had been identified at a meeting of MPA/WPA officers hosted by Kent CC on 5 August. SERTAB members had subsequently indicated agreement to this project being carried out and being funded by SERTAB, and to ERM being appointed to undertake it as an extension of their recent work on modelling waste capacity needs. The meeting at Kent had also highlighted the need for a new regional survey of waste management capacity.

- 5.16 Following discussion of how this work should be carried out, it was agreed:
- (i) that ERM be invited to undertake the survey methodology / monitoring system design project;
 - (ii) that a project brief be prepared for a 2005/06 survey of waste management capacity, and tenders invited;
 - (iii) that funding for these projects be sought from the Defra WIP Regional Support Fund, but if funding is not available they be funded by SERTAB.

ACTION: David Payne

6. Proposed Changes to Regional Planning Guidance for the South East

(RPG9) – Waste (Regional Waste Management Strategy)

- 6.1 Richard Lemon introduced the Proposed Changes, which had been published by GOSE on 19 August and were out for consultation until 11 November. He drew particular attention to Table 4 in policy W7, being the only significant insertion that was not a Panel recommendation. This table accords with PPS10 and allows for local flexibility on waste management facility type. He also invited comments on the usefulness of Tables 1 – 3. It was pointed out that the figures in the bottom row of Table 4 need updating and that policies W7 and W13 need to be consistent.
- 6.2 David Payne referred to the following issues that he proposed to raise in a report to the Regional Planning Committee:
- Policy W5 – percentage figures should be put back in; this was supported;
 - Policy W7 – figures should be updated to reflect recent work done by ERM;
 - Policy W7 – figures for CD&E waste are not included in Table 4 but should be referred to in the explanatory text;
 - Policy W7 – figures for imports of MSW and C&I waste from London in Table 4 should be combined as their impact is the same;
 - Policy W10 – the report from the Material Resource Streams Working Group (agenda item 8) points to a need for facilities for sorting and bulking of recycled materials rather than new reprocessing capacity in the South East, reflecting the reality of national and international trade in these materials; the focus should be more on getting materials to markets rather than providing markets; the policy as worded seems too simplistic and may need to be amended to reflect this;
 - Policy W15 – the Hazardous Waste Task Group had identified a need for new facilities in the region for: treatment of APC residues; de-manufacturing of WEEE; contaminated soil treatment; and hazardous waste landfill cells; these requirements should be included, but in the text rather than the policy as they have not been subject to testing.
 - Policy W17 – windrow composting should be included in paragraph 2.111, as per the Panel recommendation.

David Payne will circulate a draft of what he proposes to include in the report to the Regional Planning Committee to SERTAB members for comment.

ACTION: David Payne

- 6.3 On policy W9, the Chairman suggested it should say more than just ‘work together’ and should include something about how market development is to be encouraged. It was noted that advocacy policies cannot be included in RSS. This may be more of an issue for the Regional Economic Strategy. SEEDA have appointed Beyond Waste to do work on markets.
- 6.4 It was noted that Policy W17 does not preclude development of waste facilities in Green Belt in particular circumstances, but it is not clear whether this applies to development plan policies or development control or both. Richard Lemon said the policy is aimed at development plan documents. The Chairman thought it seems more generic. The inclusion of ‘proximity principle’ in Policy W17 was also noted and it was suggested this may need to be reworded to be consistent with PPS10.

7. Hazardous Waste

- 7.1 This item had largely been covered under item 6. David Payne suggested a

need to develop a regional strategy for hazardous waste when we have a better understanding of the situation. The task needs to be redefined; this will be discussed at the next meeting, when Owen Dimond is present. In the meantime views on what work needs to be done should be sent to Bill Murphy, who will coordinate these and forward them to Owen Dimond.

ACTION: All / Bill Murphy

8. Report from Material Resources Streams Working Group

- 8.1 The final report from the Working Group had been circulated. David Payne highlighted the conclusions, particularly the following 3 key conclusions:
- ii local authorities need to be ready to facilitate a major shift to resource management when economic and legislative conditions bring this about;
 - iii one or two locations for strategic resource recovery parks should be identified, linked to ports;
 - iv provision for new facilities should be for sorting and/or bulking for onward shipment rather than for major reprocessing facilities.
- The report should be used to inform policy W10 in the Changes to RPG9 (as discussed under item 6) and to develop policies in the South East Plan.
- 8.2 It was suggested that the potential for using waste wood for renewable energy production should be more prominent. Recommendation vii that there should be a specific use class for waste/materials processing sites needs further careful consideration, and would require legislative change.
- 8.3 Work on material resource streams should mainly be progressed through SEEDA. SEEDA has recently commissioned further work to establish infrastructure needs for particular waste streams. Consideration needs to be given to which streams this should concentrate on.

9. Report from SEEDA Waste Market Development Group

- 9.1 As previously referred to, SEEDA have appointed Beyond Waste to do further work on markets for recycled materials and provision of regional waste and resource management processing infrastructure. Connected with this, a Visioning Workshop is being held at Dorking on 23 November.
- 9.2 The report of the Regional Waste Summit at Gatwick on 27 June is being prepared and will be circulated when it is available.
- Action: David Payne / Peter Day**

10. PPS10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management: implications for SERTAB

- 10.1 Paper SERTAB 05-6 had been circulated, summarising the key contents of PPS10 relating to RSS and RTABs. SERTAB needs to consider the implications of PPS10 for:
- the work it does and is planning to do, particularly on monitoring;
 - the advice it gives to SEERA, particularly for preparation, monitoring and review of RSS; and
 - its terms of reference and composition.
- The Chairman will send out a questionnaire to members on the role and composition of SERTAB. He asked members to bring ideas on a better name and acronym for SERTAB, preferably including 'waste', to the next meeting.
- ACTION: Pete Raine / All**

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

- 11.1 The note of the fourth meeting of SEWAG on 9 June had been circulated. Further money is available in the Defra WIP Regional Support Fund for 2005/06. Making a bid to this fund for projects on waste management capacity had already been discussed under item 5(iv).
- 11.2 The Chairman queried the role of SEWAG and its relationship with SERTAB. SEWAG had been set up as a sub-group of SERTAB, but mainly having a different membership. Richard Lemon said SEWAG provided a means for WCAs and WDAs to input to SERTAB.

12. Agenda Item 13: Liaison with Other Regions

(i) London

- 12.1 The London RTAB had met on 28 July and 26 August.
- 12.2 In July the Mayor published an Early Alteration to the Planning for Waste and Planning for Minerals Policies of the London Plan, for pre-consultation with the London Assembly and Functional Bodies. Details had been circulated. It was decided not to comment at this stage, but to wait for publication of the formal consultation document. The Secretary will circulate details of the Alteration.
ACTION: Peter Day

- 12.3 The Mayor's proposal for a single waste authority for London were briefly discussed. It was generally felt this would be beneficial if it would assist delivery of required waste management facilities in London and help London's waste management targets to be met.

(ii) East of England

- 12.4 The East of England RTAB met on 26 May, 14 July and 9 September. The minutes had been circulated.
- 12.5 David Payne reported that he had met EERA and GLA representatives in August to discuss inter-regional issues.

(ii) National

- 12.6 A note of the meeting of RTAB Chairs on 30 June had been circulated.
- 12.7 The next meeting of RTAB Chairs is on 3 November, prior to a meeting of the National RTABs Forum. The Secretary will represent the Chairman at these meetings. It was agreed the following items should be put forward:
- data requirements and the need for a joined-up approach (as identified under item 5(iii)), including the need for a nationally consistent approach to survey and modelling of waste management capacity; Jeremy Smith will write a paper, for agreement with the Chairman;
 - time taken by ODPM to deal with departure applications referred to them; Bill Murphy will write a paper, for agreement with the Chairman.

ACTION: Jeremy Smith / Bill Murphy / Peter Day

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

- 13.1 **Kent:**

The Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Report is currently out for consultation. There is concern that the waste industry have little understanding of the new plan system and it is increasingly difficult to get them involved at the issues and options stage; it seems this is due to a shortage of planning and development staff; this should be raised with ESA. A revised application has been made for hazardous waste landfill, for APC residues from Allington incinerator. Construction of Allington incinerator is on track to commence operation in summer 2006.

13.2 Medway:

Preferred options papers are being prepared, but minerals and waste work has been shelved from the first LDF.

13.3 East Sussex and Brighton & Hove:

8000 representations were received on the modifications to the Waste Local Plan; this is now heading for adoption.

ERM are preparing a Waste Management Strategy, including a sustainability appraisal, with funding from WIP.

An application for a waste water treatment works in Brighton & Hove is subject to an appeal against non-determination.

Applications are expected for an incinerator at Newhaven, a composting plant and an asbestos transfer station.

13.4 West Sussex

The Waste Local Plan Inquiry opens in December.

Consultation on Minerals Issues and Options will start in November.

Applications for a MRF at Ford and for landfill have both been refused and inquiries are likely to be held conjoined with the Local Plan Inquiry.

A second landfill application is yet to be determined.

13.5 Hampshire:

The SCI is to be submitted in November.

Consultation on Core Strategy Preferred Options will commence at the end of September; a technical document and sustainability report have been produced.

The New Forest National Park have indicated they wish to prepare a joint LDF with Hampshire CC.

A C&D waste recycling plant has been permitted in Green Belt at Lymington, subject to referral to GOSE as a departure.

13.6 Surrey

The Waste DPD Preferred Options document is going to Committee this month; there are 34 supplementary documents.

There have been 800 representations on the Submission SCI.

13.7 Berkshire

A Joint Minerals and Waste Development Framework is being prepared for the Berkshire Unitary Authorities.

Regulation 25 consultation on Issues and Options will be carried out in October/November.

The Slough EFW plant is going ahead; the permission has been implemented and it is understood Grundons have secured finance.

Biffa have applied for permission to use 2 cells at Colnbrook Landfill for hazardous waste.

An Ecology Village is being proposed at Padworth Sidings, in West Berkshire; this would be a resource park taking all the Authority's MSW.

13.8 Oxfordshire:

The Draft SCI is to be published for consultation at the end of September. The minerals & waste Issues and Options and Report is due to be published for consultation at the same time, but may be delayed.

13.9 Milton Keynes:

Issues and Options consultation is being carried out for the Waste Development Framework and the Municipal Waste Management Strategy. It is hoped the Strategy will be adopted by the end of this year, to inform the tender process next year; this is suggested as a topic for future discussion.

13.10 Waste Industry (Cory)

The Belvedere Incinerator inquiry has been re-opened; this illustrates the potential conflict between the democratic process and delivery of new facilities.

The opportunity SERTAB provides to address common concerns is welcome; the group should be broadened.

14. Date of Next Meeting

- 14.1 It was agreed meetings should be held quarterly and dates should be set for the next 4 or 5 meetings, and that optional site visits should be held on the same day as some meetings – perhaps every other meeting; the other meetings should if possible be held in London. Members were asked to send ideas for site visits and offers to host meetings to the Secretary.

ACTION: Peter Day / All

15. Any Other Business

- 15.1 Funding of SERTAB was discussed. It was agreed that WPAs should be asked for contributions for 2005/06 on the same basis as the previous year.

ACTION: Secretary / Surrey CC

- 15.2 Richard Lemon asked that correspondence with GOSE be copied to him so he is aware of issues.

- 15.3 John Gower informed members that Defra figures for MSW arisngs in the South East fell from 2002/03 to 2003/04.

- 15.4 Bill Murphy queried whether the procedure for consultation with SEERA needs to be refined.

- 15.5 David Payne informed members that SEERA is advertising for an Assistant Regional Planner to deal specifically with waste and minerals.

- 15.6 It was agreed that the Secretary should send out a list of action points straight after each meeting, with full minutes following later. Papers for meetings should be sent out 5 days in advance. Emails should be marked as: urgent, respond by –; or please read; or for information.

ACTION: Peter Day