

HAL 3R NW Proposal – waste management clarification query

The Airport Commission has received a formal response from Grundon Waste Management Ltd, in relation to the proposed North West Runway development at Heathrow Airport.

The Grundon response identifies a number of issues considered to be of significance, as a consequence of the currently proposed runway extension by Heathrow Airport Limited. It is to be noted that the current RIL Heathrow Hub proposal does not directly impact the current Lakeside site, although it is considered likely that there may be a requirement for further consideration under that proposal also). The HAL 3R NW solution requires reprovision of the existing Lakeside Road Colnbrook facility. The existing site handles 420,000 tonnes annually, generating 34MW of electricity to grid (and in the near future to Heathrow Airport itself). Alongside municipal waste incineration, the facility includes a high temperature incinerator for hazardous and difficult wastes, for which limited capacity exists nationally.

The technical submission by Heathrow provides some reference but limited detailed information regarding the (re)provision of energy from waste facility:

Volume 1 - 5.1.3 - Assessment of Effects, Methods and Assumptions – including Figure 5.2, which visually summarises key land based impacts and mitigation (including loss of existing EfW facility, re-provision of new EfW facility)

Volume 1 - 5.8.3 (bullet) - Taking electricity and heat from a new Energy from Waste (EfW) plant that will be needed to replace the existing Lakeside EfW facility

Volume 1 - 5.10.2 – which states here are also industrial/commercial estates, an energy from waste plant, a gravel pit, a petrol station and a fuel depot, all of which are considered to have moderate potential for contamination.

Appendix 09 (Geo-Environmental Assessment) – 2.2.1 – Zone 1...land uses comprise...an energy from waste plant.

The key issues raised by Grundon, and developed by extension of their comments within the context of SE England waste management provision, which are not addressed by the current technical submission from HAL are as follows:

Issue 1 - A feasibility assessment to secure an alternative site of 15 acres (6 hectares) to replace the full extent of waste management operations that would be displaced at Lakeside, which includes a high temperature incinerator for hazardous and difficult wastes, for which limited capacity exists nationally;

Issue 2 - How the existing waste contract arrangements, which are currently held by Lakeside will be honoured;

Therefore, we seek clarification on the following points:

CLARIFICATION ONE (relating to Issue 1)

1a Feasibility assessment which has considered securing an alternative site of 15 acres (6 hectares) - can the promoter clarify the extent of work to date (e.g. outline feasibility) regarding the reprovision of the Lakeside EfW facility?

1b Feasibility assessment of interim replacement EFW capacity available during the transition to the replacement EFW

1c Feasibility assessment of transport impact studies for the proposed EFW re-provision.

1d Can the promoter comment on the estimated cost of reprovision of the lakeside facility, including land, planning, design, build and integration?)

CLARIFICATION TWO (relating to Issue 1)

Appendices submitted with the TBF document (volume 3) includes the map from which this extract is taken, which shows the proposed EfW re-provision location – Please can you confirm the area currently presumed (and indicated on the map below) for EfW site re-provision?

CLARIFICATION THREE (Relating to issue 2)

Please confirm what, if any, consideration has been given to how the existing waste contract arrangements that Lakeside currently holds will be honoured as a consequence of site re-provisioning.

CLARIFICATION FOUR (Relating to issue 2)

Please confirm what, if any, consideration has been given to the regulatory impacts of the re-provision of the EfW site in a different local authority area under different legislative requirements (e.g Waste Incineration Directive, Air Quality Directive, London Plan, local planning authority DPDs)

Heathrow Response

It has been our assumption in developing our proposals that the current Grundon/Viridor Lakeside plant would be reprovided before the need to demolish the plant to make way for the development of the runway arises. This would avoid impacts on the continuity of the current operation with its consequent effects on Local Authorities strategies for waste.

The exact nature of the commercial arrangements by which the reprovision would be effected have of course not yet been established. There are a number of options some of which might include joint ventures between HAL and Grundon/Viridor. The party who would be making any planning application is therefore not yet clear but opportunities may exist for including the issue as associated development in any larger DCO application for the main works if the phasing can be made to work and PINS are happy with the plant reprovision being designated in this way. We have not yet discussed this issue with PINS.

Further to initial discussions with Local Authorities and with local residents we have developed a revised plan which seeks to keep the site for the replacement plant as close to its existing location as possible. (Please see attached updated plan and extract from that plan). This has a number of potential advantages:-

- The original site selection process which was validated in the original planning application is likely to still be broadly applicable
- The new location will still be directly on the A4 trunk road and only a few hundred metres from the original location. Any impact of road traffic movements will therefore be the same as the existing impact. For this reason we do not believe that a detailed transport impact study is necessary at this stage of assessment
- Impacts on local residents, whether real or only anticipated, should be improved. The new site would be further from Colnbrook / Poyle and with no residential properties in the vicinity in a north east direction (the direction in which the prevailing wind would carry any combustion products)

We have estimated the cost of reprovision of the plant and this is included in our overall budget for Commercial compensation (currently shown as £1.8bn total for all properties). The assessment was prepared for us by CBRE. We do not think it appropriate to share at this point the details of the precise amount we have allowed for this facility since the Commission data will necessarily be made public and we believe there are reasons of commercial confidence why this figure should not be in the public domain.

The attached plan is updated to show this change but also detailed changes in the Stanwell Moor area concerning car parking and balancing ponds. This updated plan is being used during our current local consultation process and we would be happy to issue a copy to the Airports Commission if that would be helpful.

