

# GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

## Deadline 3 - Sheet 3: GLA Commentary on other parties' Local Impact Reports / Written Representations

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
<b>Bexley Local Impact Report</b>	
<b>Need for additional waste capacity</b>	<p>LBB provides some detailed analysis at paragraph 4.15 of their LIR on the current position with regard to the need for additional waste capacity, as set out in the latest joint waste technical paper prepared by South East London boroughs in support of local plan preparation. It notes that the most recent joint waste report (2017) identifies a surplus of waste capacity from operational waste management facilities through to 2036. LBB also refer to the need position identified in the draft London Plan. LBB comment that <i>"the accordance of the proposals with these policy elements is uncertain"</i>. GLA concurs with this view, and provides detailed evidence elsewhere, including its LIR and written representations, and also in its Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
<b>River transport</b>	<p>LBB states at paragraph 9.11 that <i>"Unless river transport of waste material is maximised then the development would not accord with Policies CS03 and CS15"</i>, and further information has been requested from the Applicant with regard to the underlying assumptions. As set out in the GLA's Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case and the commentary on the Applicant's answers to the ExA's first questions, both submitted for Deadline 3, the GLA consider that the use of the river should be maximised for transportation of wastes to/from the site.</p>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
<p><b>Combined Heat and Power</b></p>	<p>LBB states at paragraph 4.10 that the difficulty in delivering the export of heat from EfW plants is evidenced by the fact that heat export has yet to be realised from the existing RRRF EfW plant. LBB refers to ongoing heat studies being prepared by the Applicant to help meet policy objectives. The GLA notes that the final study was completed on 5 May 2019 and was submitted as an appendix to the Written Representation, submitted for Deadline 2. This report concluded that revised heat demand remains within the capacity of the existing RRRF.</p> <p>The GLA agrees with LBB that the Applicant’s position on CHP is underdeveloped and is concerned that the updated Supplementary Statement (document 5.4.1) still does not adequately address the key issues regarding need and deliverability. The GLA sets out the reasons for this in document Sheet 4, Other Documents Prepared by the Applicant, when discussing Requirement 20 – Combined Heat and Power.</p>
<p><b>Anaerobic Digestion</b></p>	<p>The GLA supports LBB’s statement at paragraph 4.11 that the digestate produced by the AD plant should be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible and should not be burned in a dedicated CHP gas engine.</p>
<p><b>ERF Capacity</b></p>	<p>LBB notes at paragraph 4.12 that the London Waste Strategy Assessment (LWSA) appended to the Applicant’s ‘Project and its Benefits Report’ (document 7.2) does not assess the need for an EfW facility with a capacity of 805,920 t/pa, but only assesses a facility with capacity of 655,000 t/pa. The GLA agrees that this is a failing on the part of the DCO application, and results in an underestimate of the overcapacity that would be provided by the REP.</p> <p>The GLA noted in its written representations that the DCO application estimates a need for 272,300 tpa of additional EfW capacity by 2036 and, that based on the lower throughput of 650,000 tpa, this represents less than half of the proposed ERF capacity. Whereas, under the higher case of 805,920 tpa, the Applicant’s estimate of need represents less than one third of the proposed ERF capacity. It is clear that the proposed ERF has the potential to provide an unacceptable level of overcapacity even based on the Applicant’s own estimates of demand.</p> <p>The GLA has provided, at Appendix 2a of its Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case submitted at Deadline 3, a commentary on the waste tonnage and EfW capacity scenarios presented in Table 6.1 of The Project and its Benefits</p>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
	<p>Report. the commentary has been provided at the Examining Authority's (ExA) request to further explain the divergence between the GLA's and the Applicant's projections.</p>
<b>Air quality</b>	<p>LBB raise two specific issues: the in-combination effects with the existing plant; and potential under-reporting of emissions of some pollutants.</p> <p>The GLA's understanding is that the existing impacts of Crossness and the RRRF have been included in the modelling study.</p> <p>The GLA are not clear what is meant by Bexley's point about under-reporting of emissions of some pollutants. However, the applicant should confirm that the emission rates are correct and, if necessary, explain what abatement is used to secure these emission rates, as they have done for NO<sub>2</sub>.</p>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
<b>Bexley Written Representation</b>	
<b>Waste hierarchy</b>	<p>LBB says at paragraph 3.2 that, in accordance with the waste hierarchy, the ERF should only treat residual waste. Although LBB asks the ExA at paragraph 3.4 to consider the issue of the waste hierarchy, it makes no specific proposals.</p> <p>The GLA has been advised by the Environment Agency (EA) that, whilst the EA will review the EWC type codes presented in issuing a permit and will set caps on total waste managed, the extent to which residual waste contains material that could be recycled is not considered a matter for the Environmental Permit. The GLA has provided a note at Appendix 2b of its Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case setting out correspondence with the EA on this matter.</p> <p>The GLA would therefore request that the ExA's consideration of the waste hierarchy, as requested by LBB in its written representations, includes consideration of how the waste hierarchy would be enforced. In this regard, the GLA in its Written Representation, submitted for Deadline 2, and within the Written Summary of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3, has proposed that there should be a requirement committing the ERF to sourcing truly residual waste, and monitoring arrangements put in place to ensure that the ERF feedstock has been pre-treated to recover all materials for recycling before delivery to the ERF. The GLA considers that this would be an appropriate requirement in the circumstances in order to ensure that the proposed development complies with the waste hierarchy in accordance with NPS EN-1 as there is no other regulatory mechanism available.</p>

<b>Delivery by river</b>	<p>LBB confirms that Local Plan Policy CS20 and draft London Plan Table 9.2 identify waste apportionment targets for the LBB and these both suggest a lack of need for further EfW capacity in the LBB administrative area. LBB seeks clarification as to how waste from outside of LBB is to be transported to the REP site, having regard to other existing and committed waste management facilities in and around London.</p> <p>This representation by LBB aligns with the GLA's principal concerns about the lack of need for the ERF as a waste management facility and also how the feedstock deliveries to the ERF would be transported to the site. The GLA has made the case in its Written Representation, submitted at Deadline 2, and in its Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, submitted at Deadline 3, that there is sufficient recovery capacity for the management of residual waste in London and also in the surrounding counties if recycling targets are met. Overprovision risks impacting these targets not being met, with a consequential detrimental effect on the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>The GLA has also made the case in its Written Representation that the Applicant failed to demonstrate how waste feedstock for the ERF would be transported to the proposed ERF, and what the source of the material would be. The GLA shares LBB's concerns that the waste would not be sourced from the local area as there is a lack of need for residual waste treatment for Bexley's waste, and therefore waste would inevitably be travelling from further afield; this point is also made in the GLA's Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3.</p> <p>Whilst the GLA shares LBB's desire to see waste transported by river, it is concerned that the opportunities for waste to be transferred onto the river have not been sufficiently assessed. Similarly, although the Applicant has sought to show that waste could be sourced from surrounding counties, it is not clear how the waste from surrounding counties would be loaded onto barges for delivery by river. The potential for transporting waste from outside of London to waste transfer stations upstream of the REP (in inner London) would be inappropriate and unsustainable. However, the Applicant has not yet demonstrated that it has access to wharves downstream of the REP that would be suitable for the proposed volume of material.</p> <p>The GLA is of the view that the demonstrable lack of need for waste recovery in Bexley underlines the lack of a convincing sourcing and logistical strategy for the proposed REP. The application is vague and ambiguous about the source of waste and how it would be transported, as a result of which it is not possible to identify fully the potential impacts on the achievement of national and local waste management policy, nor potential environmental effects.</p>
--------------------------	--

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
<b>CHP</b>	<p>LBB confirms at paragraph 3.9 that to date no export of heat has been achieved from the RRRF but does not present any further evidence in this regard. It states that LBB wishes to see the Applicant provide further details to explain how the proposed development would meet the GLA's CIF requirements. The GLA has provided detailed comments in this regard in its LIR and Written Representations, and also in its Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3, Agenda Item 3.4.</p>
<b>Employment and Skills</b>	<p>LBB identifies in section 4 the need for the Applicant to agree an employment and skills plan to optimise local employment, skills and economic development benefits, and suggests that such a plan should be agreed in advance of any development by the Applicant, LBB and other stakeholders.</p> <p>This is a similar request to that put forward by the GLA in its LIR, and the GLA considers that such a plan is essential for the proposed REP to conform with London policy on employment and skills. The GLA would therefore wish to be a party to the development of an employment and skills plan as one of the relevant stakeholders, as set out in the Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3.</p> <p>The GLA notes that the Applicant has offered in its Revised Draft DCO document 3.1 Rev.1 to commit to an employment and skills plan, but no details are provided as to the scope or content of the plan. Also, as noted above, the GLA would wish to be consulted on the plan and would welcome engagement with the Applicant in this regard.</p>
<b>AQ</b>	<p>The concerns about under-reporting of some pollutants and in-combination effects are also made in Bexley's LIR.</p> <p>Bexley have requested that the Code of Construction Practice consider dust controls in line with guidance from the Institute of Air Quality Management and that the CoCP should apply at the pre-commencement phase as well as post-commencement, as set out in the Written Summary of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3.</p> <p>The GLA supports the imposition of the CoCP during the pre-commencement phase.</p>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
	<p>In the GLA's Written Representation it was requested that the CoCP be in accordance with the GLA's SPG on the Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition. With the exception of the NRMM Low Emission Zone, which the Applicant agreed to adopt at the Issue Specific Hearing on Environmental Matters, the GLA guidance is broadly similar to the IAQM guidance. The GLA do not foresee any likely conflict in drafting the CoCP between measures required by the different guidance document, however if there are differences in detail we would suggest that the Applicant be required to adopt the more stringent controls.</p> <p>Bexley have requested funding for monitoring if the development goes ahead. Monitoring of air quality is a responsibility of the London Boroughs and is not generally undertaken by the GLA. However, the GLA provides statutory guidance for London boroughs' Air Quality Action Plans and, in this guidance, it is recommended that s106 agreements should be used to secure funding for monitoring. The GLA support Bexley's request for funding for monitoring.</p>
<p><b>TfL – construction traffic</b></p>	<p>At paragraph 8.5, LBB states that the technical feasibility of river transport of construction materials needs to be fully investigated by the Applicant. LBB further states that while the Applicant has indicated that transporting abnormal loads by river may not reduce the number of movements by roads and that the jetty facilities are not suitable these statements need to be supported by firm evidence. TfL would agree with this statement and would want the outline CTMP to commit to exploring the option of river transport for construction deliveries including abnormal loads.</p> <p>At paragraph 8.9, LBB states the cumulative Impacts of REP Construction traffic and Electrical Connection traffic have not been established by the Applicant. LBB seeks clarification is from the Applicant as to how the combined potential impact of the REP construction and associated temporary works, and those regarding the Electrical Connection has been assessed. LBB further states that it is important that the added implication of the works associated with the Electrical Connection is considered with the impact of the REP construction especially as there may be programme overlap. TfL would agree that in the assessment of the impacts of the Electrical Connection construction on road users (including buses) as part of the CTMP, the applicant should show the combined impacts of the two construction activities whenever there is overlap. TfL would seek additional wording in the CTMP to state that cumulative effects of construction of the REP site and Electrical Connection will be assessed as part of the CTMP.</p>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
<b>LB Havering Local Impact Report</b>	
<b>AQ</b>	<p>The GLA note LBH’s point regarding the number of receptors potentially exposed to “minor” adverse impacts and agree with Havering that the Applicant needs to provide better estimates of the number of properties affected and that they should also provide more robust assessment of the health impacts.</p>
<b>ELWA Written Representation</b>	
<b>Sources of Waste and River Transport</b>	<p>ELWA puts the case well that the concentration of waste facilities in one location is inefficient as far as transport deliveries are concerned. EfW, unlike most renewable technologies, has a requirement for a material feedstock using (in this case) road or river transport. ELWA notes the lack of capacity at existing waste transfer stations, and that the application does not appear to include any proposals for additional riverside capacity whether within the boundaries of Greater London or in locations along the Essex or Kent shorelines of the Thames Estuary. The GLA is similarly concerned that these matters have not been fully addressed and assessed in the application - as most of the feedstock available along the river axis has already been secured by the RRRF, waste deliveries to the REP will not be from sources located along the river axis, resulting in increased transport on the road network to reach the river.</p> <p>GLA would agree with ELWA that there is no obvious route by river from the north and therefore it is increasingly likely that the REP would not serve nearby London boroughs.</p>
<b>Heat Source Distribution</b>	<p>ELWA raises several points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existence of other substantial, unutilised heat sources at RRRF and Thames Water Crossness;</li> <li>• Disputes the Applicant’s claim that the RRRF and REP would provide for a resilient heat supply arrangement</li> </ul>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That such a concentration of heat production (Crossness, RRRF and REP) in a single area would lead to an expensive district heating system because of the longer distance of network needed to supply other neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> <p>The GLA has raised the above points (with the exception of the Crossness potential) in its Written Representation and in the Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3. The GLA agrees with ELWA that the proposed concentration of heat generation and waste management facilities in one location is excessive and results in operational inefficiencies in addition to environmental effects.</p>
<b>WRWA Written Representation</b>	
<b>Waste</b>	<p><b>OPS-11</b> Feedstock competition resulting from overcapacity in the region, leading to operational issues at RRRL. The suggestion is that the overcapacity would draw in undesirable waste, which could include (though not stated explicitly) recyclable waste. The GLA has raised similar concerns in its Written Representations regarding oversupply of waste recovery facilities and is of the view that the proposed ERF would undermine delivery of the waste hierarchy. Whilst this remains a concern, the GLA has also proposed in its LIR that there should be a DCO requirement to address the pre-treatment of waste to preclude the incineration of recyclable material.</p>
<b>Rt Hon Jon Cruddas MP</b>	
<b>Air Quality</b>	<p>In general, the GLA support the points made regarding Air Quality.</p>
<b>Carbon/ energy</b>	<p>Regarding energy, the letter claims that 2006 evidence suggests that waste incinerators produce more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than gas powered stations producing the same amount of energy.</p> <p>The GLA commissioned Eunomia to prepare a report, which is submitted at Appendix 3 of the Post Hearing Written Submission of Oral Case, which compares the carbon emissions of the REP in power-only mode against government forecasts for grid carbon intensity and determine the carbon impact of the REP electricity displacing grid electricity. The report established that the REP would produce more carbon dioxide emissions than gas-fired power stations producing</p>

Item / topic	GLA/TFL commentary
<b>Recycling Rates</b>	<p>the same amount of electricity. The report therefore reaffirms the 2006 letter's understanding about waste incinerator carbon dioxide emissions.</p> <p>The GLA agrees that the proposed REP fails to fit with the Mayor's recycling targets and would adversely affect movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy.</p>
<b>Rt Hon Jon Cruddas MP Petition</b>	
<b>Air Quality</b>	<p>The petition highlights the importance put on air quality by residents in the area most likely to be affected by the proposed development. The impact on Rainham in terms of air quality is raised in the Written Summary of Oral Case, submitted for Deadline 3.</p>
<b>Rt Hon Theresa Pearce MP</b>	
<b>AQ</b>	<p>In general, the GLA support the points made regarding Air Quality.</p>
<b>Recycling</b>	<p>The GLA agrees that management of waste further up the waste hierarchy would be preferable, and that the expansion of EfW is contrary to the urgent need to address climate change.</p>
<b>CHP</b>	<p>Regarding CHP, the letter raises concerns about the gaps in the evidence that CHP is viable. The letter recognises that CHP is an integral and necessary part of the scheme and highlights that the Examiner would no doubt wish to establish clarity on this. The GLA agree with this position.</p>