

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee LA: Local Authority LO: Landowner CC: Community Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council HSE: Health and Safety Executive LBE: London Borough of Enfield LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority LWL: London Waste Limited WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1. Community benefits</b>							
<b>1.1 Community impact</b>							
1.1.1	Concerns regarding impact on residents, including reduced house prices, increased traffic and inconvenience				8	9, 23, 24, 25, 37, 40, 10018, 10019	The proposed use of the site will be a continuation of the current waste management use. The potential impacts of the proposal at sensitive receptors, such as residential areas, will be considered as part of the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. Potential traffic effects both during construction and operation will be detailed in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> . During Phase 2 Consultation the emerging findings of the environmental impact assessment will be available in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</i> and an <i>Interim Draft of the Transport Assessment</i> will be available.



							creation along the eastern boundary of the EcoPark and marginal planting along Enfield Ditch.  The Picketts Lock site is located over 2km to the north of the EcoPark and as such is not likely to be significantly affected by the proposal.
1.1.3	No concerns/mitigation measures are sufficient				4	21, 27, 10006, 10018	Support for the scheme is noted and welcomed.
<b>1.2 Visitor centre</b>							
1.2.1	General support for the visitor centre				19	5, 9, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 37, 44, 48, 10006, 10008, 10009, 10019, 10020	Support for provision of a visitors' centre is noted and welcomed.
1.2.2	Suggestions for the facilities at and operation of the visitor centre including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support for community education and involvement;</li> <li>• Support for use as a meeting place;</li> <li>• should be more accessible than current facility;</li> <li>• should be advertised;</li> <li>• should include education facilities and materials on waste management and the facility, for the benefit of various groups;</li> </ul>		LBE	LVRPA	20	5,6, 9, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27 31, 36, 37, 38, 43, 45, 47, 10006, 10009, 10019,10020	EcoPark House would be a multifunctional building which provides replacement accommodation for the Edmonton Sea Cadets, office accommodation for staff, an area to receive visitors, meeting space and flexible space which can be used for education and community uses.  EcoPark house would be located on the eastern side of the EcoPark in an area which would be open to members of the public using the RRC. During Phase 2 Consultation details of the proposed access routes will be provided.  Detailed comments on the facilities at and operation of EcoPark House are noted and will

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• should include leisure facilities such as a café, a shop, a train ride and telephone facilities</li> <li>• keeping it clean;</li> <li>• not having a booking requirement.</li> </ul>						<p>be taken into consideration in developing our proposals. This will include the potential to include a café. The lack of space on site prohibits providing a train ride on site.</p> <p>EcoPark House would be maintained to be a clean and welcoming facility.</p>
1.2.3	Use of centre as a meeting place is unrealistic				1	24	EcoPark House would provide meeting space to replace the existing meeting space within the EfW. The meeting space would predominantly be used by staff and visitors to the EcoPark, however the space would be designed flexibly with a view to its also being used by the community and other groups.
1.2.4	Visitor centre is unnecessary				1	47	Base for those taking tours of the proposed facility, which would continue to be provided as they are now of the existing facility.
<b>1.3 Other community benefit comments</b>							
1.3.1	Regular communication and transparency, including visible and accessible information and clear mechanism for dialogue		WCC		8	6, 9, 14, 16, 24, 25, 37, 39, 10019	We agree that communication and transparency are important. A Community Liaison Group is proposed for the construction phases and we would welcome ongoing engagement with local residents and business with regard to the operation of the facility and the site during operation.
1.3.2	More publicity and/or education in schools to reduce stigma associated with site, particularly regarding the plume				5	9, 18, 37, 42, 10006	<p>We will consider with the Community Liaison Group how to best manage publicity during operation when there are no specific points at which consultation would take place.</p> <p>We agree that enabling education about waste management, the waste hierarchy and operations at the site would be beneficial. During the development of our proposals and</p>

							preparation for operations we will consider how to best manage engagement with the public generally and children in particular.
1.3.3	Foster sense of community pride, for example by having a striking building design or sponsoring a local Friends of NLHPP group		WCC		2	31, 10019	As the weight of opinion appears to be in favour of making the building less obvious within its setting we are approaching the question of community pride both in the facility and operation through sensitive design and landscaping to enhance the overall standing of the site and the facility within the area.
1.3.4	General community engagement and involvement, for example through closer liaison with community sector organisations		WCC		2	9, 10020	During consultation we have made contact with a number of community groups and as part of Phase 2 Consultation we will directly contact more groups. On an on-going basis it is for community groups to contact us if they want information or input but we will continue to have regular liaison with LB Enfield about provision of information to the community. There will also be a Community Liaison Group during construction.
1.3.5	Support for EcoPark tours				4	9, 16, 39, 47	Currently site tours are offered and the proposal is that tours would continue when the new facility is operational. Support for these is noted and welcomed.
1.3.6	Improve surrounding areas such as Lee Valley Park, nearby retail park and an area used by fly-tippers				3	22, 23, 25	This area is outside the EcoPark boundary and as such beyond the scope of this project.  Proposals do include the enhancement of the eastern boundary of the EcoPark through habitat enhancement and creation and marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. This would improve the visual impact of the EcoPark from the Lee Valley Park.
1.3.7	Provide leisure facilities in				1	23	The EcoPark will continue to be an operational

	addition to those suggested as part of the visitor centre						waste management site. The site does not include any areas which would be suitable for leisure facilities.
1.3.8	Use the generated heat and/or electricity to supply local buildings and businesses				3	18, 33, 45	The scheme is designed to deliver both heat and electricity. NLWA is working closely with the promoters of the Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN) to develop proposals for the heat from the ERF to be used as part of the heat network. The LVHN would provide heat to local buildings and businesses.
1.3.9	Create job opportunities both during the construction and operation stages, e.g. building apprenticeships or part time-jobs for young people				3	31, 39, 10019	There would be increased job opportunities during construction and on-going jobs opportunities during operation. Apprenticeships would be considered for construction and work and for future operations.
1.3.10	Accommodate the Edmonton Sea Cadets who are currently based on the EcoPark site			LWL LVRPA	0		The Edmonton Sea Cadets would continue to be accommodated at the site in EcoPark House which would include suitable replacement facility for this group designed to take their use into account..

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority
LA: Local Authority	HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council
LO: Landowner	HSE: Health and Safety Executive
CC: Community Consultee	LBE: London Borough of Enfield
	LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
	LWL: London Waste Limited
	WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1. Cooling system</b>							
<b>1.1 Cooling system options</b>							
1.1.1	Agree with NLWA's assessment of the cooling system options		WCC		5	26, 27, 33, 40, 48	Noted.
1.1.2	Support air cooled condenser because wastes less water and does not have a plume				3	22, 24, 27	Noted.
1.1.3	Further information requested on noise pollution of air cooled condenser and energy required to run it.				1	6	The operation of air cooled condensers does produce some noise from the operation of fans but they are not loud and are not expected to be audible by those living or working near the site. The operation of the air cooled condensers does not consume a large amount of energy.
1.1.4	Support water cooling system because it is more energy efficient and preferred by residents				18	5, 16, 18, 19, 26, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 46, 47, 10006, 10008, 10009, 10019, 10020	Noted.
1.1.5	Support water cooling system with caveat that there has not been sufficient information				2	27, 31	Noted.

1.1.6	No preference between two options				1	25	Noted.
<b>1.2 Plume</b>							
1.2.1	Concern with a plume from the cooling system including that it is unsightly, harmful to birds, contains pollutants and would travel over resident's house				3	24, 27, 45	Noted. The plume is water vapour which does not contain pollutants. The plume is not harmful to birds.
1.2.2	No concern. comments included that it is acceptable/unimportant, residents are used to it and no concern as long as it is not harmful				10	9, 16, 19, 21, 25, 40, 46, 10006, 10018, 10019	Noted.
1.2.3	Other comments including the need for more publicity about the plume, query about plume composition and query about the water scrubbing system				5	9, 37, 39, 45, 1006	The plume from a water cooled system is water vapour only and contains no combustion exhaust gases. NLWA understand that in the absence of regular communications, the composition of the plume will not be understood by those who see it or who live and work nearby and is likely to be mistaken for smoke.
<b>1.3 Criteria and concerns</b>							
1.3.1	Choose most energy-efficient system		WCC		16	9, 16, 18, 19, 21, 26, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 47, 10008, 10018	Noted.
1.3.2	Choose most cost-efficient system				3	16, 21, 23	Noted.
1.3.3	Choose system with no odour				2	16, 23	Noted.
1.3.4	Choose system with least impact on residents				1	5	Noted.
1.3.5	Release only clean, toxin-free vapour				2	16, 22	With both air and water cooling only toxin-free vapour would be released.
1.3.6	Concern regarding legionella and how it will be prevented				1	6	Noted.
1.3.7	No concerns				1	48	Noted.

1.4 Other comments/questions on cooling system							
1.4.1	<p>Other questions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if cooling system impacts on heat output to local network;</li> <li>• if an energy-consuming cooling agent is required;</li> <li>• if steam tubes could be diverted through the earth for cooling instead</li> </ul>		LBE		1	33	<p>The cooling system will not impact on the level of heat which is anticipated to be required from the LVHN heat network being promoted by LB Enfield. If other district heating schemes come forward in the future, will be capable of supplying these schemes with additional heat.</p> <p>No energy-consuming agents are required for the cooling system which relies on condensation of water.</p> <p>It is not possible to divert steam through the earth in part because of cost and long term effectiveness of the localised ground to absorb heat.</p>

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority
LA: Local Authority	HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council
LO: Landowner	HSE: Health and Safety Executive
CC: Community Consultee	LBE: London Borough of Enfield
	LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
	LWL: London Waste Limited
	WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>Environment</b>							
<b>1. 1 Impact on air quality</b>							
1.1.1	General concern regarding impact on air quality and concern about efficacy of monitoring measures		LBE	LVRPA	10	9, 22, 24, 27, 29, 41, 43, 45, 10028, 10031	<p>NLWA proposes to use emissions cleaning technology that would mean emissions would be reduced to well below the current regulatory requirement.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</i>.</p> <p>Stakeholders such as the Environment</p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							<p>Agency and local authorities have been consulted on the scope of the assessment to ensure that it is adequate.</p> <p>Air quality monitoring is carried out by the surrounding local authorities at a number of locations around the local area to monitor air quality concentrations at relevant receptor locations. Modelling will be carried out which allows concentrations of gases such as NO to be predicted over a wider area than monitoring. This ensures any high concentrations of pollutants are included in ambient monitoring. Air quality modelling measures will be set out in the environmental impact assessment.</p>
1.1.2	<p>Concern regarding CO<sub>2</sub> and NO including the following comments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• will be high;</li> <li>• should be minimised;</li> <li>• comply with London Plan carbon targets;</li> <li>• the NO scrubber would not be efficient in removing the NO gas</li> </ul>	GLA	LBE		3	38, 42, 10028	<p>The ERF must comply with stringent emission standards set by the Environment Agency. The replacement facility would have even better emission control technology than the existing plant does now. The proposed ERF would use the best currently available technology to clean flue gas and reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The scheme would include Selective Catalytic Reduction which is the most effective available treatment available for NO<sub>x</sub>.</p>
1.1.3	Concern regarding particulates in particular the impact on those with				1	27	<p>The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the</p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
	chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)						<p>environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i>.</p> <p>The environmental impact assessment will include consideration of fine particulate matter.</p> <p>A <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> is also being undertaken for the scheme and will form part of the DCO application.</p>
1.1.4	Concern regarding accident-related air pollution. Questioned what bulk elements will be stored on site				2	6, 10018	No dangerous volatile materials are expected to be stored in large quantities on-site.
1.1.5	Concern regarding cumulative impact when combined with North Circular Road pollution				1	24	<p>The new facility is a replacement of an existing facility. The air quality assessment will set out the effects of the project on the existing air quality conditions of the site and surrounding area (taking into consideration impacts that the North Circular has on the air quality).</p> <p>The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging</p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i> .
1.1.6	Concern regarding emissions during demolition including release of contaminants and release of dust containing asbestos/heavy metals during demolition		LBE		1	25	<p>The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i>.</p> <p>This will include the demolition and construction works and appropriate mitigation measures will be included in the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.1.7	Concern regarding emissions during start-up and shut-down period				1	6	<p>The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i>. Worst case emissions will be assessed to ensure all impacts are considered, including those during start up and shut down.</p>
1.1.8	Concern regarding emissions/dust from transport vehicles including the cumulative with existing pollution				5	17, 24, 45, 46, 10006	<p>The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which</p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							<p>will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i>.</p> <p>An assessment of traffic generated from the development, including vehicle exhaust emissions and dust emissions from transport will be included. Appropriate measures to control emissions/dust during construction will be included in the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.1.9	Request to prioritise low emissions and aim for zero pollution				7	21, 25, 36, 37, 41, 44, 10018	The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i> being undertaken for the scheme. Best available measures to reduce emissions to air will be included in the scheme design, for example, within the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.1.10	No air quality concerns. Comments that it would have minimal impact and will reduce emissions compared to existing site		WCC		3	17, 39, 10006	Noted

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
1.1.11	Suggest mitigation measures including low-emission vehicles and carbon capture technology				3	21, 24, 38	<p>The majority of vehicles visiting the EcoPark are those owned and operated by the north London boroughs and as such it are outside the control of the applicant. A small number of vehicles are owned and operated by LondonWaste Limited (who operate the site on behalf of NLWA) the requirements for these vehicles would be kept under review.</p> <p>A initial review of carbon capture and storage technologies has found that such technology remains unproven for this type of operation and is current not financially viable.</p>
<b>1.2 Visual impact</b>							
1.2.1	<p>Concerns about the visual impact of the scheme including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• facility will have high visibility;</li> <li>• impact on Green Belt;</li> <li>• impact on LVRP and Navigation Corridor;</li> <li>• landscaping proposals not sufficient</li> </ul>		LBE	LVRPA	1	9	The environmental impact assessment for the scheme will include a visual assessment that uses representative viewpoints from sensitive receptors to assess the effects of the proposed development. These sensitive receptors will include both residential and recreational receptors including the LVRP and Navigation Corridor and will be agreed with stakeholders. The proposed development is being designed to take account of visual impact and landscaping.
1.2.2	Removal of the Camden Aggregates		LBE		1	26	The Camden Aggregates site is not within

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
	site will increase visual impact of proposed facility						the control of the applicant. The environmental impact assessment for the scheme will include a visual assessment that uses representative viewpoints from sensitive receptors to assess the effects of the proposed development. These sensitive receptors will include both residential and recreational receptors which will take into account the potential removal of the material storage mounds currently located on the Camden Aggregates site.
<b>1.3 Impact on ecology/wildlife</b>							
1.3.1	<p>Concern about impact on ecology/wildlife including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of vegetation and habitat in north/east of site;</li> <li>• impact on Salmons Brook, Lee Navigation Corridor, SSSI, Tottenham Marshes, Lee Park Way;</li> <li>• impact on habitat connectivity;</li> <li>• not covered sufficiently in EIA</li> </ul>		LBE	LVRPA	1	12	The impact of the proposed development on ecology will be considered within the environmental impact assessment. <i>A Habitats Regulation Assessment screening (HRA)</i> is also being undertaken and will be available during Phase 2 Consultation. The <i>HRA</i> screening will identify any potential significant effects on European designated sites. Appropriate ecological measures will be included in the scheme design, including the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> .
1.3.2	Concern regarding impact of light pollution on ecology/wildlife		LBE	LVRPA	0		The impact of the proposed development on ecology will be considered within the environmental impact assessment. This will include consideration of light pollution on ecology/wildlife During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							assessment will be available in the <i>PEIR</i> . The <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme will include measures regarding lighting during construction.
1.3.3	<p>Suggested mitigation measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase viable habitat on/around the site and include in landscaping strategy;</li> <li>• set back main massing from eastern edge;</li> <li>• dark corridor along Lee Park Way/Navigation;</li> <li>• provision of Living Walls</li> </ul>		LBE	LVRPA	1	10010	Appropriate ecological measures will be included in the scheme design, including the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> . These measures will be summarised in the ecology section of the <i>Environmental Statement</i> and any mitigation identified.
<b>1.4 Noise pollution</b>							
1.4.1	Concerns regarding noise pollution including traffic noise, lorry alarms, long operating hours and noise from air cooled condenser				4	6, 25, 46, 10006	The impact of the proposed development on noise will be considered within the environmental impact assessment. This will include an assessment of construction and operational road traffic noise. Target noise criteria for operational plant will be specified in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> . The <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme will include measures regarding the management of noise during construction.
1.4.2	Request to keep construction noise as low as possible to reduce impact on residents				4	16, 22, 24, 45	The impact of the proposed development on noise will be considered within the environmental impact assessment. The <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme will include measures regarding

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							the management of noise during construction.
<b>1.5 Water pollution/flood risk</b>							
1.5.1	<p>Concerns regarding water pollution and flood risk including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• potential contamination of water courses/reservoir/ecosystem;</li> <li>• pollution from water-borne freight;</li> <li>• surface water drainage issues;</li> <li>• flood risk</li> </ul>	GLA Thames Water Utilities Ltd	LBE		3	6, 27, 39	The impact of the proposed development on water resources will be considered within the environmental impact assessment. The <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme will include measures to protect surface and ground water during construction. A Flood Risk Assessment is also being undertaken for the scheme which will be appended to the <i>Environmental Statement</i> .
1.5.2	<p>Suggested mitigation measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comply with London Plan surface water drainage hierarchy;</li> <li>• rainwater harvesting system;</li> <li>• liaise with EA;</li> <li>• apply for Trade Effluent Consent; s</li> <li>• seek groundwater discharge permit;</li> <li>• take account of required pipe pressure;</li> <li>• fit petrol/oil interceptors on facilities;</li> <li>• fat trap in catering areas;</li> <li>• waste oil collection and recycling into biodiesel</li> </ul>	GLA Thames Water Utilities Ltd	LBE		0		<p>The impact of the proposed development on water resources will be considered within the environmental impact, the approach for which will be agreed with the Environment Agency. This will include the identification of appropriate mitigation measures if required. The <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme will include measures to protect surface and ground water during construction.</p> <p>All necessary consents required for the operation of new facilities, such as Trade Effluent Consent and groundwater discharge consent where required would be secured in advance.</p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1.6 Impact on health/safety</b>							
1.6.1	Protect public from dangers posed by electrical equipment and comply with regulations	HSE			0		Safety on site would be assisted by the separation of public access areas from the operational zone. Public access to the site would be carefully managed. Electrical equipment would comply with all applicable regulations.
1.6.2	Check whether Hazardous Substances Consent is required and comply with regulations	HSE			0		The operations would be required to comply with all relevant consents and regulations including those relating to the use, storage, and treatment/disposal of hazardous substance.
1.6.3	Comments regarding the health impact of emissions including concern regarding cancer generally, respiratory cancer and asthma, impact on individual with COPD, request for evidence and stricter emission controls may be required				7	22, 24, 27, 29, 38, 10003, 10006	Best available technology would be used to ensure emissions are reduced as far as practicably possible. A <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> is also being undertaken for the scheme and a draft will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.6.4	Comply with all regulations and refer to HSE website	HSE			0		The project would comply with all applicable regulations.
<b>1.7 Odour</b>							
1.7.1	Concern regarding odour including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• odour comes from current site;</li> <li>• unsure where odour originates from;</li> <li>• odour will increase in new location for Russell Road resident;</li> <li>• conduct odour assessment</li> </ul>		LBE		5	22, 23, 24, 25, 10003	The impact of the proposed development on odour will be considered within the environmental impact assessment. Odour controls would be fitted to the site and some odorous processes on the existing site would be removed. It is expected that there would be a considerable improvement in odour conditions at the site.

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
1.7.2	Odour will be minimised due to removal of composting facility				1	10006	Noted
1.7.3	Suggested mitigation measure to use filters to minimise odours				1	23	Appropriate odour controls would be fitted to the plant to meet Environment Agency requirements.
<b>1.8 Impact on climate change</b>							
1.8.1	<p>Concern regarding impact on climate change and request that this is assessed. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimise carbon emissions conform with Enfield's Spatial Vision and Strategic Objective 2;</li> <li>• not covered in documents so far;</li> <li>• conduct full analysis of implications of proposal and alternatives;</li> <li>• minimise embodied carbon during construction</li> </ul>		LBE		3	21, 38, 10028	<p>The applicant is carrying out assessments based on the WRATE methodology, an Environment Agency tool for assessing the environmental impact of proposed developments or facilities. The assessment will consider the impacts of the proposed ERF, which will include carbon impact assessments.</p> <p>The proposal has sought to minimise carbon emissions through good design. The <i>Sustainability Statement</i> to be submitted as part of the DCO application will set out more details on this. The embodied carbon is assessed as part of the <i>BREEAM assessment</i> which will form part of the DCO application.</p>
1.8.2	Query if the scheme will reduce climate change impact and meet Carbon Intensity Floor target	GLA					The <i>Sustainability Statement</i> which will form part of the DCO application will identify a carbon intensity target for ancillary buildings on site taking into account London Plan targets and future zero carbon building regulations.
<b>1.9 General/other environmental impact</b>							
1.9.1	Request to minimise environmental			LVRPA	6	11, 16, 21, 22,	The environmental impact assessment will

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
	impact and statement that impact is being underplayed					24, 28	assess the environmental effects associated with the scheme development. This will identify if there are any likely significant environmental effects and mitigation will be identified where required. Effects will be minimised through environmental design input and measures contained within the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme.
1.9.2	Positive impact/ will minimise/reduce environmental impact. Comments include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less fossil fuel reliance;</li> <li>• provision of power to homes;</li> <li>• modern technologies</li> </ul>		WCC		7	8, 28, 37, 39, 43, 10002, 10006	
1.9.3	Other concerns including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effluent from wet treatment of flue gases;</li> <li>• leaks;</li> <li>• litter from waste vehicles;</li> <li>• fly tipping</li> </ul>				5	6, 17, 22, 23, 25	The environmental impact assessment will assess the environmental effects associated with the scheme development. The site would be subject to on-going good site management.
1.9.4	Suggested mitigation measures including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• align with London Plan;</li> <li>• robust CoCP;</li> <li>• support green charities;</li> <li>• recycle/re-use materials from old plant</li> </ul>	GLA	LBE		3	36, 48, 10019	<p>In line with good waste minimisation practice the demolition of the existing EfW would seek to recycle and reuse as many materials as possible. London Plan policies are being taken into consideration in the development of the design.</p> <p>The environmental impact assessment will assess the environmental effects associated with the scheme development, identifying appropriate mitigation measures where required. Such measures will be incorporated into the proposed development design and be contained within the <i>Code of Construction Practice</i></p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							for the scheme.
<b>1.10 Further assessments required</b>							
1.10.1	<p>Requests for further assessments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• carbon assessments;</li> <li>• climate change analysis for proposal and alternatives;</li> <li>• noise studies including impact on sensitive receptors;</li> <li>• local health impact of emissions;</li> <li>• protected species survey;</li> <li>• air pollution assessments using WHO levels;</li> <li>• visual impact study;</li> <li>• flood risk assessment;</li> <li>• cumulative impact assessment;</li> <li>• assessment of effects of increased water demand, waste treatment and surface water</li> </ul>	NE GLA Thames Water Utilities Ltd	LBE	LVRPA	5	6, 29, 38, 10016, 10028	<p>The environmental impact assessment will assess the environmental effects associated with the scheme development including effects on air quality and odour (which will examine the impacts of the plant against UK and European Air Quality Standards that are largely based on WHO proposals), ecology, ground conditions and contamination, noise and vibration, socio-economics, visual impact, traffic and transport, water resources, environmental wind and daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. Appropriate receptors will be considered for each of the environmental topic assessments. A cumulative effects assessment will be undertaken for all environmental topics. Supplementary studies also include a flood risk assessment (taking climate change into account) and health risk assessment.</p> <p>Based on our assessment, we considered, that an ERF is the most suitable technology to manage North London's residual waste. It is not practical to undertake climate change analysis on all alternatives, however having determined the most suitable technology an analysis of</p>

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
							potential climate change impacts is being undertaken and will be set out in the <i>Sustainability Statement</i> which will form part of the DCO application.
<b>1.11 No concerns/mitigation measures are sufficient</b>							
1.11.1	No concerns/ measures sufficient/ will provide more detailed comments after HRA/EIA	NE GLA	WCC		15	5, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 37, 40, 41 45, 47, 10008, 10009, 10019, 10020	Noted

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority
LA: Local Authority	HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council
LO: Landowner	HSE: Health and Safety Executive
CC: Community Consultee	LBE: London Borough of Enfield
	LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
	LWL: London Waste Limited
	WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1. Traffic and Transport</b>							
<b>1. 1 Impact on road traffic levels</b>							
1.1.1	Concerns regarding increased traffic during construction and operation, particularly during peak hours. Specific roads mentioned are the North Circular, Fore St, Cook's Ferry Roundabout, Great Cambridge Road, Montagu St and Conduit Way				10	16, 19, 24, 25, 26, 40, 45, 48, 10016, 10020	A full assessment of the potential effect on traffic during construction and operation for the highway peak hours and for the hours when the site generates the highest traffic flows is being undertaken. This includes the A406 North Circular Road, Fore Street, Cook's Ferry Roundabout, Great Cambridge Road, Montagu St and Conduit Way. The findings of the assessment will be set out in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> to be submitted with the DCO application. An interim draft of the <i>Transport Assessment</i> will be available during Phase 2 Consultation. This will include the detailed trip generation and assessment of these trips on the local transport network.
1.1.2	Concern regarding cumulative traffic				1	24	The <i>Transport Assessment</i> will include an

	impact of the proposals in combination with works at the nearby sewage plant and local housing development.						assessment of the cumulative effects of the scheme in combination with other projects. This assessment will include all local housing and other projects. Works at Deephams Sewage Treatment Plant will be completed prior to commencement of construction and therefore will not be included in the cumulative assessment, however it will be included in the future baseline used in the assessment. The findings of the cumulative assessment will be set out in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> to be submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
1.1.3	Proposals may lead to reduced traffic overall as more waste treated locally		WCC		1	9	An assessment of the potential transport effects is currently being undertaken. Initial findings indicate that there would be a slight overall increase (less than 10%) in traffic across a 24 hour period when compared with the existing volume of traffic generated at the EcoPark. The findings of the detailed trip generation exercise will be included in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> to be submitted with the DCO application.
1.1.4	Move freight by water or rail to reduce requirements for road transport and associated impacts	GLA	LBE		4	11, 39, 46, 10016	The use of the River Lee Navigation for transporting waste/materials has been fully explored. However, the overall cost of doing this out-weighs the benefits and as such, this would not form part of the transport strategy for the site. The findings of the water transport study will be included in the <i>Transport Assessment</i>

							to be submitted with the DCO application.
1.1.5	Travel at night time/outside of peak hours		LBE		3	5, 21, 10019	<p>During construction, certain activities may be undertaken outside of the peak hours or at night time. As set out in the <i>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</i>, this will be agreed with LB Enfield and TfL for each activity where works are required outside of the core working hours. The <i>CoCP</i> will be available during Phase 2 Consultation and be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>During operation the site would operate over 24 hours and therefore some trips to/from the site would be undertaken at night-time and outside of peak hours. However, as is currently the case, the majority of waste deliveries would be received between 06:00 and 17:00.</p>
1.1.6	Support for new access points to relieve traffic congestion				2	10006, 10020	Support for the new access points is welcomed and noted.
1.1.7	<p>Other suggestions to mitigate impact of increased traffic including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• separate construction operation entrances;</li> <li>• hubs where fewer but larger vehicles are filled locally;</li> <li>• sensible traffic regulation during all phases;</li> <li>• do not park on the North Circular slip road.</li> </ul>		LBE		6	5, 16, 24, 36, 37, 48	<p>Construction and operational traffic would use separate entrances so far as is reasonably practical.</p> <p>Waste from some of NLWA boroughs is currently bulked and brought to the site in larger vehicles. This would continue to be the case in the future.</p> <p>The <i>CoCP</i> includes mechanisms for traffic management during construction. During operation, traffic would be managed in a similar manner to the</p>

						existing site.  No parking would be permitted on any A406 North Circular Road slip roads.
<b>1.2 Impact on residents</b>						
1.2.1	Concerns regarding the impact of increased traffic on residents' quality of life				2	24, 10018  Routes to and from the site would be predominantly away from the residential areas. While the route to and from the northern site access would pass close to the residential area to the north of the Montagu Recreation ground, the small number of additional trips to this entrance during construction and operation is not anticipated to introduce any new significant environmental effects as the area is already characterised by high traffic flows including heavy goods vehicles travelling to the industrial area to the north of the EcoPark on Ardra Road.  <i>As part of the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEIR) the potential effects of the construction and operational traffic have been assessed. The PEIR will be available during Phase 2 consultation. A full Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement will also be submitted with the DCO application.</i>
1.2.2	Minimise night time traffic in residential areas				1	47  As with the current site operation, the majority of waste deliveries would be received between 06:00 and 17:00. The EcoPark would continue to operate over 24 hours meaning that a small number of trips, such as staff trips would be undertaken at night-time and outside of

							peak hours however these trips would be accessing the site from the A406.
1.2.3	Large vehicles should avoid Hall Lane				1	22	Hall Lane is not one of the primary access routes to the EcoPark. However a small number of trips, predominately from waste collections in the local area, would use this route.
1.2.4	Avoid schools				1	21	Construction traffic routes would be agreed with LB Enfield and TfL prior to construction and your point is noted. The routes for vehicles travelling to/from the site are expected to remain similar to the existing routes.
<b>1.3 Impact on other road users and pedestrians</b>							
1.3.1	Concern regarding impact of large vehicles on road users generally and specifically in terms of safety				2	9, 11	The composition of vehicles visiting the EcoPark would not be significantly altered from that of the existing site.
1.3.2	<p>Concerns regarding safety risk to cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>Suggestion to introduce safety standards/measures such as zebra crossings, vehicles with safety technologies, and vehicle safety standards compliant with London Cycling Campaign's recommendations.</p> <p>Promote measured/responsible driving through driver awareness training and ensuring mobile phones are not used by lorry drivers whilst driving.</p> <p>Provide cycle facilities such as segregated cycle lanes, or segregated</p>			LVRPA	6	6, 9, 10, 11, 21, 10006	<p>Construction vehicles would be fitted with the most up-to-date safety technology and drivers would be required to undergo safety training. This will be secured through the <i>CoCP</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>New cycle facilities would be provided along Lee Park Way and a safe crossing point would be provided for cyclists where this intersects with National Cycle Network Route 1. A safe crossing point would also be provided on Lower Hall Lane where the cycle route is intersected by the access to the construction layover area.</p>

	pedestrian and cycle lanes along Lee Park Way						
1.3.3	Concerns regarding impact of vehicle residue and dirt on pedestrians and motorcyclists				2	6, 23	Wheel washes would be provided during the construction period to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site are clean and would not contribute to an increase in dirt on the local highway network. This will be included in the <i>CoCP</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.3.4	Liaise with local road planners to ensure safety of all road users				1	9	LB Enfield and TfL have been consulted throughout the development of proposals and will continue to be engaged.
<b>1.4 Impact on existing infrastructure and nearby development</b>							
1.4.1	Concern regarding impact of traffic on National Grid gas pipeline, Lee Navigation Corridor and Lee Park Way	National Grid		LVRPA	0		<p>Measures would be put in place to protect the National Grid gas pipeline.</p> <p>The potential traffic impact on Lee Navigation Corridor and Lee Park Way has been assessed and the preliminary findings will be set out in the <i>PEIR</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation. The full assessment will be set out in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> to be included in the DCO application.</p> <p>Vehicles would access the eastern side of the EcoPark from along Lee Park Way. This route is currently closed to members of the public and as such there would be an increase in the number of vehicles using this road. However only a 200m stretch of this road would be used and this route would only be used by light vehicles (cars/vans). New pedestrian and cycle</p>

							<p>facilities would be provided along Lee Park Way to ensure its continued safe operation as a pedestrian and cycle route.</p> <p>The transportation of waste by water is not proposed and as such there is not anticipated to be any significant effect on the Lee Navigation.</p>
1.4.2	Concern regarding potential road damage caused by heavy vehicles				1	10006	<p>The area is already characterised by a large number of heavy vehicles. The proposals would see a small increase in the number of vehicles travelling to the site when operational and the main increase in traffic associated with construction would be employee (light) vehicles. The potential effects of heavy vehicles will be assessed in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> to be included in the DCO application.</p>
1.4.3	Safeguard pipeline from construction traffic by using a temporary raft at crossing points and ensuring early liaison with National Grid	National Grid			0		<p>Measures would be put in place to protect the National Grid gas pipeline.</p>
1.4.4	Improve / maintain existing transport infrastructure including Lee Park Way, the road and bridge over the Lee Navigation Corridor and local access roads around the A406.			LVRPA	2	5, 10010	<p>New cycle facilities would be provided along Lee Park Way and a safe crossing point would be provided for cyclists where this intersects with National Cycle Network Route 1. A safe crossing point would also be provided on Lower Hall Lane where the cycle route is intersected by the access to the construction layover area.</p> <p>The visibility and road markings at the</p>

							junction of Lee Park Way would be improved.
<b>1.5 Further assessments are required</b>							
1.5.1	<p>Further studies/detail requested on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Construction Logistics Plan to include more information on management of trips, deliveries and parking;</li> <li>more detail on sustainable transport measures;</li> <li>baseline employee trips assessment;</li> <li>ongoing review by TfL</li> </ul>	GLA	LBE		2	25, 10016	<p>A <i>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</i> has been prepared and forms part of the DCO application. The CoCP provides information on how construction trips and deliveries will be managed as well as the provision of parking during construction. The CoCP also includes details the Construction Management Plan that will be prepared prior to commencement of construction</p> <p><i>The Transport Assessment</i> which will be included in the DCO application, will include a Framework Construction Travel Plan and Framework Operation Travel Plan. These sets out details of the sustainable transport measures. The Operational Travel Plan to be completed prior to the completion and occupation will provide details of the baseline employee assessment.</p> <p>TfL has been consulted regularly throughout the pre-application process. Details of engagement will be set out in the <i>Consultation Report</i> and <i>Transport Assessment</i> to be included in the DCO application.</p>
<b>1.6 No concerns/proposed measures are sufficient</b>							
1.6.1	No concerns/would have minimal impact/proposals are necessary				4	18, 19, 10008, 10009	Noted

---

1.6.2	Proposed mitigation measures are sufficient				3	26, 27, 40	Noted
-------	---	--	--	--	---	------------	-------

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee LA: Local Authority LO: Landowner CC: Community Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council HSE: Health and Safety Executive LBE: London Borough of Enfield LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority LWL: London Waste Limited WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1. Views on the consultation process</b>							
<b>1.1 Consultation process</b>							
1.1.1	Support for the consultation process. Comments include that it is open, accountable, has with various feedback mechanisms and sufficient information			LVRPA	7	16, 27, 37, 43, 44, 10019, 10024	Noted and welcomed.
1.1.2	Support with the caveat that information should focus on elements with scope for influence				1	40	Noted and welcomed.
1.1.3	Challenge the consultation process including that there is no/limited opportunity to influence proposals and that a second phase of consultation is unnecessary				7	18, 22, 24, 37, 42, 10028, 10031	The consultation process has been undertaken accordance with clear guidelines for consultation on Development Consent Order (DCO) applications. Our proposed approach to consultation was set out in our Statement of Community Consultation. Comments can be received on any aspect of the scheme and will be taken into consideration as part of the design

							development. The DCO process requires us to report how consultation responses have been taken into account and this will be set out in the <i>Consultation Report</i> submitted with the DCO application. A summary of the comments received during Phase 1 Consultation will also be published prior to the commencement of Phase 2 Consultation.
1.1.4	Suggestion to add a few extra days to the consultation period				1	10006	The minimum period for consultation on DCO applications is 28 days. Both Phase 1 and the planned Phase 2 Consultation periods exceed this.
1.1.5	Suggestion to use simple feedback mechanisms e.g. multiple-choice questions and quick and comprehensive online mechanisms				1	19	We used 'open' questions rather than multiple choice in order to allow respondents to say as much or as little as they wanted in response to each question. Respondents did not have to respond to every question. We also accepted emailed responses. We will be making it clearer in Phase 2 that all responses are welcome – short and long.
1.1.6	Suggestion to extend consultation to other groups / consult all those affected, including wider area and children and young people				4	11, 22, 31, 45	Phase 1 Consultation was undertaken in accordance with our published Statement of Community Consultation and was open to all. It was advertised in all seven north London boroughs and widely in the 1.5km vicinity zone, (i.e. 1.5km from the perimeter of the EcoPark site) through adverts, newsletters, leaflets to libraries and some schools. Community groups were identified by Enfield Council and additional community groups will be contacted as part of Phase 2 Consultation.
1.1.7	Suggestion to seek / listen to the public opinion, including format and		WCC		3	23, 25, 10020	Noted and welcomed.

	content of information						
1.1.8	Requests to be further involved in consultation/assessments	National Grid, NE, GLA, Thames Water	HBC	LVRPA	2	10002, 10006	The respondent's identification code will be checked to ensure they are on our email reminder list.
<b>1.2 Events</b>							
1.2.1	Support for the consultation events. States that exhibition materials were straightforward, easy to understand and high quality				2	47, 10019	Noted and welcomed.
1.2.2	Challenge that there were not enough exhibitions and not many locations covered				1	22	<p>Noted. Exhibition venues were identified from a range of sources including suggestions by Enfield Council. All selected venues had to comply with all health and safety and accessibility requirements and had to be available when required. A shortlist of potential venues was visited to identify the most suitable.</p> <p>We propose to use a mobile information vehicle as part of our Phase 2 communications to reach additional locations. This will not be a substitute for exhibitions but will provide additional opportunities to raise awareness about the consultation.</p>
1.2.3	Suggestion to include display board describing how Phase 1 feedback will be used in determining next steps				1	10019	Noted. A summary of the comments received during Phase 1 Consultation will also be published prior to the commencement of Phase 2 Consultation.

1.3 Information and materials							
1.3.1	Satisfied with the level/ quality/ accessibility of info provided in consultation booklet, leaflets and website. Consultation feedback form easy to use.	GLA	WCC		22	5, 6, 9, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 27, 39, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 10006, 10008, 10009, 10018, 10019, 10020	Noted and welcomed.
1.3.2	More information needed on climate change/emissions/ alternatives considered. States that there are blank appendices in Outline Business Case. States that information on the website/consultation document is circular/repetitive.		LBE	LVRPA	9	23, 24, 25, 36, 38, 42, 10006, 10019, 10028	<p>An <i>Alternatives Assessment</i> report, detailing NLWA's decisions which have led to a proposal an ERF at the Edmonton EcoPark will be available at Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>NLWA is carrying out assessments based on the WRATE methodology, an Environment Agency tool for assessing the environmental impact of proposed developments or facilities. The assessment will consider the impacts of the proposed ERF, which will include carbon impact assessments. A draft of the WRATE assessment will be available at Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.3.3	Information should be tailored/ focused/easy to understand. Suggest that a summary of Phase 1 comments and how they have been addressed is provided. Suggestion to include indicative costs info and provide a 3D view of site during construction and	GLA	WCC		9	8, 16, 21, 38, 40, 42, 10019, 10028	<p>The <i>Consultation Report</i> which will form part of the DCO application will set out how comments received during consultation have been taken into account in the design. A summary of the comments received during Phase 1 Consultation and responses will also be published prior to the commencement of Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>Indicative costs for the replacement ERF were included in the Frequently Asked Questions</p>

	final design.						provided in Phase 1 Consultation. Indicative costs for the wider scheme will be provided in Phase 2 Consultation however detailed costs will only be identified in the preparation for procurement of the facility.  Phase 2 Consultation will include new videos covering the site layout and the design of the ERF.
1.3.4	One respondent notes a mistake in the consultation materials.				1	10016	The Phase 1 Consultation materials stated: "In north London only 32% of the waste from households in the area is reused, recycled or composted. This leaves 78% that must be disposed in some way." 78% should have been recorded as 68%. This will be corrected in Phase 2 Consultation materials.
<b>1.4 Request for information</b>							
1.4.1	Information requested on the cost of waste management, cost of the district system to local residents and financial assessment of the operating model				3	23, 45, 10021	Indicative costs for the wider scheme will be provided in Phase 2 Consultation; however, detailed implications of the cost to the north London Boroughs will be calculated in conjunction with preparation for procurement of the facility.
1.4.2	Information requested on the heating network including use of pressurised heated steam for community heating systems				3	23, 45, 10021	The Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN) is being brought forward by Enfield Council. NLWA is working closely with the promoters of the LVHN to develop proposals for the heat from the ERF to be used as part of the heat network. Please see the following website for more information on the LVHN: <a href="http://www.leevalleyheatnetwork.co.uk">www.leevalleyheatnetwork.co.uk</a>
1.4.3	Request for information on where generated electricity will be used				2	42, 45	Electricity generated by the scheme would be used on the EcoPark site and distributed to National Grid.

1.4.4	Request for information on the timeline for construction including the sequence of events and relationship timeline of waste hierarchy commitments		LBE		2	33, 45	Further information will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.4.5	Request for information on how green walls will be maintained				5	17, 23, 24, 25, 10021	Green walls were given as an example of possible treatments for external appearance during Phase 1 Consultation but are not proposed. Further information on the reasons for this can be found in the Landscape and Design theme table.
1.4.6	Request for information on how dust / litter will be minimised during delivery / disposal				1	10006	Operational arrangements to ameliorate dust and litter are already in place. These measures would continue to be used in future operations.
1.4.7	Request for information on air quality including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• measures to prevent / reduce air pollution;</li> <li>• the health impact of air pollutants;</li> <li>• any bulk chemicals to be stored on the site;</li> <li>• the treatment of residue ashes;</li> <li>• emissions during start-up/ shut-down of combustion units;</li> <li>• the water scrubbing system</li> </ul>				7	6, 24, 27, 29, 39, 42, 45	The impact of the proposed development on air quality will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</i> .
1.4.8	Request for information on		LBE		1	10008	The proposals include landscaping to create a

	design including plans for enhancement of retained open spaces						high quality environment that maximises ecological enhancement and sustainable water management. The landscaping design also seeks to integrate the site into the wider landscape character to minimise visual impact.  Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.4.9	Request for information on environmental impacts including effects of waste pollution on the nearby river and noise levels caused by the air cooled condensers				6	6, 23, 24, 25, 39, 45	The impact of the proposed development on noise and water resources will be considered within the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the Environmental Statement which forms part of the DCO application. During Phase 2 the emerging findings of this assessment will be available in the <i>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</i> .  The <i>Code of Construction Practice</i> for the scheme will include measures regarding the management of noise during construction.
1.4.10	Request for information on the cooling system including percentage of energy produced needed to run the air cooled condensers, how water cooled condensers would be treated, need for an energy-consuming cooling agent system, impact on the heat output of the Lee Valley Heat Network and provision of water pumping		LBE		2	6, 33	This information will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.

	station.						
1.4.11	Request for information on the location of the new access points.		LBE		1	25	This information will be included during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.4.12	Request for more information on NLWA governance and funding arrangements.				1	10019	This information is available in the Finance and Resources section (8) of NLWA's Annual Report available on NLWA's website <a href="http://www.nlwa.gov.uk/docs/26-6-14/3-nlwa-2013-14-annual-report.pdf">http://www.nlwa.gov.uk/docs/26-6-14/3-nlwa-2013-14-annual-report.pdf</a>
1.4.13	Request for more information on community benefits including local job opportunities and skills required, meeting point at the visitor centre, community benefits for managing extra waste and offsite works and construction laydown areas		LBE		4	25, 39, 10006, 10021	There would be increased job opportunities during construction and on-going jobs opportunities during operation. Apprenticeships would be considered at all points for construction and work and for future operations.  EcoPark House would be a multifunctional building which provides replacement accommodation for the Edmonton Sea Cadets, office accommodation for staff, an area to receive visitors, meeting space and flexible space which can be used for education and community uses.
1.4.14	Request for more information on traffic and transport including steps taken to minimise impacts on road users and the relocation of vehicle depot		LBE		4	6, 11, 42, 45	As part of the <i>Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEIR)</i> the potential effects of the construction and operational traffic have been assessed. The PEIR will be available during Phase 2 consultation. A full <i>Transport Assessment</i> and <i>Environmental Statement</i> will also be submitted with the DCO application.
1.4.15	Request for more information on recycling targets including whether 50% recycling target is a priority for NLWA, how		LBE		1	10021	Recycling is a key priority for NLWA and its host seven boroughs which are working towards achieving 50% household recycling by 2020. The proposed replacement facility has been sized for 50% recycling.

	other waste streams will be treated, further information on the RRF and ash recycling						Further information on how other waste streams will be treated, the RRF and ash recycling will be available at Phase 2 Consultation.
1.4.16	Request for more information on waste forecasting including the basis for the correlation between increased spending and waste generation, Eunomia's waste data report and Waste Forecast Model and NLWA's response to it				2	10021, 10024	The waste forecasting is based on estimates of residual waste which will be collected by the north London boroughs over the years to 2051, allowing for a 50% recycling rate for household waste. The methodology is clearly set out in the <i>Need Case</i> document, which will be available at Phase 2 Consultation, and based on a range of data and compiled by nationally recognised external advisers. In considering the forecasts various scenarios were considered.
1.4.17	Request for more information on other strategies including coordination with current waste strategy of North London authorities				2	38, 10021	The North London Waste Plan is a separate process, and is a land use Plan, agreed by the seven boroughs in their capacity as local planning authorities. It is understood, through liaison with the NLWP process, in which NLWA is a key stakeholder, that the NLWP data studies will take into account the forecasting carried out for this project. The NLWP is due for consultation in the summer of 2015, and the EcoPark, as a protected waste management site, is expected to be listed in that plan. . The scheme proposed is consistent with the Joint Waste Strategy of NLWA and seven north London Boroughs.

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee LA: Local Authority LO: Landowner CC: Community Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council HSE: Health and Safety Executive LBE: London Borough of Enfield LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority LWL: London Waste Limited WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1. Need for a replacement facility</b>							
<b>1.1 Reasons for support</b>							
1.1.1	General support, no reasons stated		WCC HBC	LWL	21	5, 8, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 31, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 10006, 10008, 10009, 10018, 10020	Support for the scheme is noted and welcomed.
1.1.2	Support because the current facility is reaching the end of its life.			LWL	3	5, 6, 16	
1.1.3	Support because less waste will be sent to landfill	GLA		LWL	0		
1.1.4	Support because the new technology would allow waste to be treated more efficiently	GLA	WCC LBE	LWL LVRPA	6	19, 25, 33, 37, 10006, 10008	

1.1.5	Support because the new technology is more environmentally-friendly		WCC		7	8, 16, 18, 28, 37, 43, 10006
1.1.6	Support because the new technology is future-proof and will not become outdated soon.				1	16
1.1.7	Support because it encourages recycling by increasing the recycling capacity	GLA	HBC		3	35, 39, 10019
1.1.8	Support if the financial gains are secured through competitive gate fees, economies of scale and reduced reliance on gas imports. Perceived as good value for the residents of North London.		WCC	LWL	1	8
1.1.9	Support because it meets future demand. Population and waste volumes are growing.	GLA	WCC	LVRPA	0	
1.1.10	Support because it makes use of existing site and workforce.	GLA		LWL	3	5, 9, 10005
1.1.11	Support promotes waste and net self-sufficiency	GLA			0	
1.1.12	Support because more waste will be managed closer to source. This in turn would minimise travel.	GLA	WCC		1	47
1.1.13	Other reasons for support		WCC		2	10005, 10006

	include serving as a flagship project, avoiding Pinkham Way, protecting current and providing future job opportunities and delivering integrated waste management service.						
1.1.14	<p>Support with the following caveats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• should not disturb the local community and environment,</li> <li>• should not discourage recycling,</li> <li>• should be cost and energy efficient</li> <li>• should use future-proof technology</li> <li>• should demonstrate it provides sustainable and efficient solution that meets all policy requirements</li> </ul>		LBE		7	9, 23, 25, 28, 36, 42, 47	<p>Support for the scheme is noted and welcomed. All of the caveats noted are supported by the NLWA and further responses are set out in the remainder of the table.</p> <p>More detailed information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
<b>1.2. Reasons for challenging the proposed facility</b>							
1.2.1	Oppose because residents will not benefit.				2	24, 48	<p>NLWA is proposing a cost effective waste disposal solution which would benefit all residents of north London for the cost of waste management paid for through the council tax.</p> <p>The replacement facility would provide a solution to the whole of north London's waste left over after recycling. During Phase 1 Consultation the applicant sought views on what would help in the local area and a number of suggestions were made, such as landscaping and a visitors centre. These are</p>

							described in more detail in the 'Community Benefits' table.
1.2.2	Negative impact on recycling/re-use/prevention. Incineration should be a last resort.				8	9, 36, 38, 47, 10016, 10021, 10025, 10031	<p>The NLWA is committed to the waste hierarchy, in which incineration or its main alternative, landfill, come after other forms of waste management such as recycling and composting, and has active programmes to encourage waste prevention, re-use and recycling. The NLWA's 'Wise up to Waste' campaign has more details of this activity (See: <a href="http://www.wiseuptowaste.org.uk/">http://www.wiseuptowaste.org.uk/</a>).</p> <p>The need case is based on the central recycling scenario of 50%, which is considered to be an appropriate target for modelling purposes, and consistent with existing strategy. The forecasting methodology gives a lower estimate of residual waste arisings over the period than if we had used population growth (which is the basis of the GLA estimates).</p>
1.2.3	NLWA should have demonstrated why alternatives have been rejected. Focus should be on other more-environmentally friendly waste management methods.				2	38, 10016	Based on our assessment, we considered that an ERF is the most suitable technology to manage North London's residual waste, that is, waste remaining after waste reduction and recycling activity. Details of our assessment process will be set out in the <i>Alternatives Assessment Report</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.4	Overcapacity due to higher than assumed waste arisings and achieving higher than assumed recycling targets across household, commercial and industrial and other waste				5	6, 38, 10016, 10021, 10025	The waste forecasting is based on estimates of residual waste which will be collected by the north London boroughs over the years to 2051, allowing for a 50% recycling rate for household waste. The methodology is clearly set out in the <i>Need Case</i> document, which will be available at Phase 2

						<p>Consultation, and based on a range of data and compiled by nationally recognised external advisers. In developing the forecasts various scenarios were considered.</p> <p>The forecasting methodology gives a lower estimate of residual waste arisings over the period than if we had used population growth (which is the basis of the GLA estimates).</p>	
1.2.5	Overcapacity will lead to the facility seeking to become provider of waste services to a wider area. Concerns that this is not viable and/or not in interest of the local community.				2	10016, 10021	<p>Should the amount of residual waste collected by the NLWA boroughs be less than assumed in the ERF sizing then the facility would have spare capacity. If this were to be the case then other waste could be taken in, to ensure that the facility is managed efficiently, and could include waste from other public authorities as currently done at the existing facility.</p> <p>To fail to plan for a facility of sufficient size to deal with the estimates of residual waste collected by the NLWA boroughs in the future would not be in the interests of the local community due to the risk that this waste would have to treated or diverted to landfill outside the area in contravention of the Mayor’s plan for net self-sufficiency in the treatment of London’s waste by 2026.</p>
1.2.6	<p>Flaws in waste forecasting approach including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not look into other forecasting scenarios</li> <li>• uses wrong/unreliable data</li> </ul>				3	10016, 10021, 10024	<p>The waste forecasting is based on estimates of residual waste which will be collected by the north London boroughs over the years to 2051, allowing for a 50% recycling rate for household waste. The methodology is clearly set out in the need case document, which will be available at phase 2 consultation, and based on a range of data and compiled by nationally recognised external</p>

							<p>advisers. In considering the forecasts various scenarios were considered.</p> <p>No waste forecasting approach is without this uncertainty but for the scheme the forecasting has been based on comprehensive regression analysis to identify the social/economic indicator variables most closely correlated with historic household waste arisings using the most up-to-date publically-available data. A comparison with a number of alternative approaches to modelling future waste arisings including, for example, those based on waste per household using various household growth scenarios examined for the development of the updated London Plan shows that the scheme forecast is broadly consistent with these alternatives and generates a more conservative estimate of overall household waste arisings compared to the main London Plan projection which uses population growth as the basis.</p>
1.2.7	Waste arisings forecast inconsistent with the North London Waste Plan (NLWP).		LBE		3	38, 10016, 10025	The North London Waste Plan is a separate process, and is a land use Plan, agreed by the seven boroughs in their capacity as local planning authorities. It is understood, through liaison with the NLWP process, in which the NLWA is a key stakeholder, that the NLWP data studies will take into account the forecasting carried out for this project. The NLWP is due for consultation in the summer of 2015, and the EcoPark, as a protected waste management site, is expected to be listed in that plan. The scheme proposed is consistent with
1.2.8	Lack of integration with other strategies and the partner authorities are inconsistent in their waste and recycling targets. The proposed approach could result in some waste processes being outsourced.				2	10016, 10021	

						<p>the Joint Waste Strategy of the NLWA and seven north London Boroughs. In developing these proposals, NLWA has been working with the seven boroughs as its partners.</p> <p>The scheme is being brought forward to replace the existing EfW and ensure continued sustainable treatment of north London's residual waste.</p> <p>The applicant has consulted with partner authorities, including the seven NLWA boroughs, on the use of recycling target assumptions in the modelling.</p> <p>Waste treatment operations which would be discontinued to make way for the new development would be sought from third party suppliers. These may be reinstated on site in the long term, subject to planning and permitting, but as yet no decisions have been made to do so.</p>	
1.2.9	Concern regarding waste forecasting including insufficient/incomplete assessments and no financial, risk or carbon comparative analysis. Also it is not clear how the proposal has been formally assessed by the partner authorities.				2	10016, 10028	<p>A WRATE (an Environment Agency tool for environmental assessment) assessment which includes covers carbon comparative analysis is currently being undertaken and will be available at Phase 2 Consultation</p> <p>Further cost information will be available at Phase 2 Consultation but will remain subject to detailed design after the Development Consent Order (DCO) application has been determined.</p> <p>Decisions are made by NLWA which is made up of 14 councillors, two from each of the seven constituent boroughs.</p>

							In developing this scheme, NLWA has been working with the seven boroughs as its partners.
1.2.10	Reduces availability of land and therefore does not conform with the Authorities' position to reduce land by co-locating facilities.				2	10016, 10021	The ERF would be located within the EcoPark on a part of the site currently used for other waste treatment facilities. The whole EcoPark site is designated for waste use. Once the ERF is commissioned and operational, other waste management uses would be considered for the area on which the existing plant now stands, which would then be vacant, taking account of waste management needs at that time but subject to separate planning process if pursued in future.
1.2.11	The facility is too close to residents		LBE		4	22, 24, 25, 10003	The facility would be located at the EcoPark which is an existing waste site safeguarded for future waste use in the London Plan. Regional policies promote self-sufficiency of waste management within London, and therefore because of the density of development in London, waste management sites would not be set in open space. The nearest residential properties are 600m to the east and west of the site. The likely significant effects at sensitive receptors, such as residential areas, will be considered as part of the environmental impact assessment which will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application.
1.2.12	Concerns about the environmental effect of the required feedstock				2	10016, 10021	The ERF would be fed with residual waste collected by the NLWA authorities from household, C&I and other sources (e.g. fly-tipping, highways etc). Should there be spare capacity, then other waste could be taken in, to ensure that the facility is managed efficiently, and could include waste from other public authorities as currently done at the existing facility. This waste would only

							be secured by offering competitive gate fees and would generate an income for the NLWA.
1.2.13	Concerns about impact on nearby developments		LBE		0		The site is a protected waste management site, and this will be clear to other developers in the area through the strategic/planning plans and policies for the area and site. Its use as a waste management site will be taken into account by other developers in assessing their own proposals. There will be the potential for nearby development wherever a waste site is located. The likely significant effects of the scheme on nearby developments is considered as part of the cumulative assessment in the environmental impact assessment will be reported in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which forms part of the DCO application.
1.2.14	Concerns about cost including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• financial implication of overcapacity</li> <li>• need for carbon capture facilities</li> </ul>		LBE		3	38, 10016, 10021	Should there be spare capacity, then other waste could be taken in, to ensure that the facility is managed efficiently, and could include waste from other public authorities as currently done at the existing facility.  An initial review of carbon capture and storage technologies has found that such technology remains unproven for this type of operation and are current not financially viable.
<b>1.3. Alternatives</b>							
1.3.1	Flexible approach that allows				2	10016, 10021	Based on our assessment the ERF is the optimum

	the facility to expand as and if required						<p>size taking into account the forecast waste arisings and NLWA's obligation to put in place arrangements to deal with residual waste collected in its area without being able to be certain about how much there would be.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that significant additional capacity would be required during the lifetime of the new facility, however should this be the case a new application would be required.</p>
1.3.2	Suggest the following as alternatives: anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis and the Norfolk solution				1	10031	<p>Based on our assessment, we considered, on balance that an ERF is the most suitable technology to manage North London's residual waste. Details of our assessment process are set out in the <i>Alternatives Assessment Report</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation. Anaerobic digestion is one of the methods of treating organic waste. NLWA is already treating organic waste as part of its recycling activity. Pyrolysis is considered in the <i>Alternatives Assessment Report</i>.</p>
1.3.3	Dual capability to be considered if there is less waste fuel in the future				1	10019	<p>We understand dual capability to mean the ability to process more than one type of fuel. It is not practical or economical to design facilities an ERF at this scale to have dual capability.</p> <p>Based on our assessment, we considered, that an ERF is the most suitable technology to manage North London's residual waste. Details of our assessment process will be set out in the <i>Alternatives Assessment Report</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
<b>1.4. Lee Valley Heat network</b>							
1.4.1	General support including,	GLA	WCC		5	18, 42, 47,	The scheme is designed to deliver both heat and

	support for low-carbon, inexpensive heat used locally, preference to spent money on this than on landscaping and request for confirmation that heat would be supplied to the Lee Valley Heat Network.		LBE			10019, 10031	electricity. The proposals also safeguard space for an energy centre on site (to be brought forward by the Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN)) and for pipework to leave the site. The NLWA is working closely with the promoters of the LVHN to develop proposals for the heat from the ERF to be used as part of the heat network.
<b>1.5 Timeline</b>							
1.5.1	Timeline is reasonable				1	43	Support for the timeline is noted and welcomed.
1.5.2	Questions about the duration of the construction stage such as when will the works begin and how long will they last.				1	24	Further detailed timescales including phasing will be provided at Phase 2 Consultation.
<b>1.6 Criteria</b>							
1.6.1	Should be cost-efficient	GLA			4	21, 23, 28, 39	The NLWA's Outline Business Case (OBC) identified ERF/EFW as the most cost effective option for the treatment of North London's residual waste.
1.6.2	Should be modern/efficient		LBE		2	16, 45	The ERF would be built using today's most advanced technology. It would be one of the most effective of its kind by current standards.  We are seeking sufficient flexibility within the DCO application to be able to assess the detailed solution before procurement allowing potential upgrading at this point. Future flexibility would also be required to respond to potential future regulatory change.
1.6.3	Should be future proof/upgradable				3	9, 28, 42	
<b>1.7 Further studies are required</b>							
1.7.1	Request studies that ensure that no National Grid's apparatus would be affected	National Grid			0		We are assessing all utilities which are required for the site or affected by the proposals as part of scheme development. As part of this we are liaising with UKPN who consult National Grid as part of the process.

1.7.2	Request strategic, financial and risk assessment of both the proposed facility and any alternative scenarios		LBE		2	10016, 10021	Based on our assessment, including cost of technologies available for management of waste at this scale, we considered, that an ERF is the most suitable technology to manage North London's residual waste. Details of our assessment process are set out in the <i>Alternatives Assessment Report</i> which will be available during Phase 2 Consultation. Further financial and risk assessment will take place before any procurement is carried out.
<b>1.8 Other</b>							
1.8.1	Request for the facility to remain in public ownership				1	10031	The site is currently owned by LondonWaste Limited, a company owned by NLWA and therefore in public ownership.

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority
LA: Local Authority	HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council
LO: Landowner	HSE: Health and Safety Executive
CC: Community Consultee	LBE: London Borough of Enfield
	LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
	LWL: London Waste Limited
	WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
<b>1. Landscape, design and appearance</b>							
<b>1.1 No concerns/proposals are acceptable</b>							
1.1.1	Satisfied with the proposed approach				6	18, 26, 40, 42, 48, 10020	Noted
1.1.2	Supports the proposed positioning of the chimney stack			LVRPA	0		Noted
<b>1.2 Appearance</b>							
1.2.1	Should look better than the current facility				4	19, 22, 24, 27	The ERF and other facilities on site would be new facilities of a high quality of design. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.2	Should blend in with the surrounding environment				5	9, 22, 24, 36, 44	The ERF is bring designed to respond to its surrounding context. The design seeks to minimise the visual impact of the building from the Lee Valley Regional Park. This would be achieved by stepping back the massing of the building and through a site wide landscaping strategy which integrates the site into the wider landscape. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available

							during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.3	Should be impressive and become a tourist attraction like similar facilities abroad		wcc		2	5, 6	<p>The ERF would be a new flagship facility of a high quality of design. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>The proposed EcoPark House would include space to be used for education and community purposes, and site tours would continue to be offered, however it is not proposed for the facility to become a tourist attraction because it is an operational waste management site with large numbers of waste vehicle movements.</p>
1.2.4	Should be modern and pleasant to look at			LVRPA	4	41, 45, 10006, 10010	The ERF would be a new flagship facility of a high quality of design. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.5	Should be simple and in keep with its industrial use				2	21, 25	The ERF would be a new flagship facility of a high quality of design. The ERF has been designed to respond to its surrounding context, including its industrial setting. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.6	Should employ a low-cost maintenance approach				1	10019	The maintenance of the ERF and other facilities on site has been considered throughout the design development.
1.2.7	<p>Appearance specific suggestions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use architectural detailing, height variation, fenestration,</li> </ul>		LBE	LVRPA	0		<p>Specific suggestions regarding the detailed design of EcoPark House will be taken into consideration in developing our proposals.</p> <p>LB Enfield's policy including the CLAAP, Core Strategy and DMD have informed the design.</p> <p>EcoPark House is ground plus two storeys and would therefore offer views across Lee Valley Regional Park. Further information on the design of EcoPark House will</p>

	<p>use of high quality finishing materials;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comply with CLAAP, Core Strategy and DMD;</li> <li>• two-stored reception building</li> </ul>						be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
<b>1.3 Chimney stack</b>							
1.3.1	Prefer an incorporated chimney stack				4	19, 21, 41, 10008	<p>As part of the design development of the stack a number of options have been considered and these were consulted on during Phase 1 Consultation with some respondents preferring an incorporated stack and others a separate stack.</p> <p>On balance it is proposed to have the stack separated from the bulk of the ERF but still part of the overall composition. Comments received during Phase 1 Consultation indicate that reducing visual impact is important. This arrangement would help to reduce the perceived scale and massing of the main processing hall thereby reducing visual impact.</p>
1.3.2	Prefer an independent chimney stack because it is less obtrusive				2	27, 39	The stack would be independent from the remainder of the ERF building, although remain part of the overall composition.
1.3.3	Prefer a chimney stack with two separate flues				2	16, 27	Two separate flues are an operational requirement of the ERF. The design development has considered incorporating both flues into a single chimney stack and

1.3.4	Prefer a chimney stack with a single flue because it is less obtrusive				8	19, 21, 39, 40, 41, 45, 10010, 10019	<p>having two chimney stacks. These options were consulted on during Phase 1 Consultation with some respondents preferring two separate flues and other preferring the flues to be combined into one chimney.</p> <p>On balance it is considered that a single chimney stack which incorporates both flues is a less visually intrusive option.</p>
1.3.5	Oppose a chimney stack altogether				1	24	The chimney stack is an operational requirement of the ERF and as such it is not possible to eliminate it entirely from the design.
1.3.6	Preference that the stack is green/brown to blend in and that a waterfall mural is used to emphasise that the plume not smoke				2	27, 47	The stack has been designed to be as unobtrusive as possible in line with comments raised during Phase 1 consultation. As such it is considered that a sculpture and water mural are not suitable. The intention is that the stack would be of a high quality design and would remain a visual marker of the site for the surrounding area.
1.3.7	Suggest that the design is innovative, with a narrower diameter, and that it is low and unobtrusive		LBE		1	24	<p>The size and profile of the stack is largely dictated by structural and operational requirements. The design intention is to minimise if possible the width in the views from the East and West where the residential areas are predominantly located.</p> <p>The height of the stack is determined by the air quality modelling work which will be set out in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which will form part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The stack has been designed to be as unobtrusive as possible.</p> <p>The stack has been designed to be as unobtrusive as possible in line with comments raised during Phase 1</p>

							Consultation. The stack has been designed as a component part of the overall design of the ERF.
<b>1.4 Landscaping</b>							
1.4.1	Landscaping is essential. Suggest that landscaping should comply with EcoPark Supplementary Planning Document, Suggest that landscaping should include Lee Navigation and area around A406		LBE	LVRPA	5	5, 16, 27, 41, 10006	<p>The proposals include landscaping to create a high quality environment that maximises ecological enhancement and sustainable water management. The landscaping design also seeks integrate the site into the wider landscape character to minimise visual impact.</p> <p>The proposals include habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting along the site's eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. Landscaping would also be provided along on the eastern boundary of the Lee Navigation opposite the site. These improvements would enhance the setting of the development. Landscaping would also be provided on the eastern side of the Lee Navigation. In addition, a connection to the tow path from the bridge on Lee Park Way would be provided.</p> <p>Guidelines for the landscaping of the EcoPark are predominantly set out in the <i>Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief</i> (LB Enfield, May 2013). The landscape design has been developed in accordance with the principles in this document. The key points are to create a green edge along the eastern boundary and create high quality waterside areas, both of which have been incorporated in to the landscape strategy.</p> <p>Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.4.2	Support for the use of trees/shrubs.	National Grid		LVRPA	6	9, 16, 25, 27, 37, 10010	The proposals include a habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting

	Suggestions that these should be native species, wildlife friendly and slow and low growing (near National Grid overhead line)						<p>along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. The proposals also include meadow planting (species rich mown grass) along the western boundary and tree planting is proposed along Lee Park Way.</p> <p>All trees and the vast majority of shrubs would be native. A small number of ornamental shrubs would be used in locations which require smaller species, for example next to EcoPark House. A schedule of the proposed species will be included in the <i>Design and Access Statement</i> which will form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>All trees and shrubs proposed are wildlife friendly.</p> <p>There is only a small area of the scheme which is located underneath or adjacent to National Grid overhead lines – this is at the junction with Advent Way and Lee Park Way. In this location only slow and low growing ornamental planting is proposed.</p> <p>Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.4.3	Support for green walls / roofs to mitigate visual impact, increase biodiversity and harvest water harvesting. Brown roof also noted as acceptable		LBE	LVRPA	9	16, 19, 27, 39, 43, 47, 48, 10006, 10019	<p>A green roof is proposed above the tipping hall and a brown roof is proposed above the waste bunker. These would mitigate visual impact and increase local biodiversity.</p> <p>It is proposed to have an earth bund incorporating landscaping along the eastern end of the ERF. This bund softens the effect of the building on the landscaped edge thereby mitigating the visual impact of the ERF from the Lee Valley Regional Park. The earth bund also provides</p>

							ecological enhancement.  Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.4.4	Support green walls/roof with the caveat that they must be maintained with water used in the process				1	27	Where possible, rain water would be harvested and used to water the green roof as process water is unlikely to be suitable for this purpose.
1.4.5	Oppose green walls/roofs because they are not cost-effective and not important. Suggestion to keep greenery and buildings separate				3	18, 10010, 10018	On balance, given the significant maintenance required for green walls, along with the other mitigation measures already incorporated into the design, it is not proposed to also have green walls.  Green roofs are proposed as these would provide visual mitigation and ecological enhancement.
<b>1.5 Other specific suggestions and comments</b>							
1.5.1	Other suggestions/queries including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• swift nests in the walls;</li> <li>• nature trail;</li> <li>• reduce bulk and massing on east side;</li> <li>• buffer zone to Lee Navigation;</li> <li>• public access to western bank of</li> </ul>		LBE	LVRPA	6	12, 25, 47, 10008, 10009, 10019	The proposals takes significant account of ecology in the local area however swift bricks are not proposed.  It is assumed that the suggestion to create a nature trail means within the Lee Valley Regional Park which is located outside the boundary of this project and as such it is outside the scope of this project to deliver a nature trail in this location.  The ERF has been designed to reduce the overall bulk and massing, particularly on the eastern side of the site. The building would step back from the eastern site boundary. The proposals include a habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting

	<p>canal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• restore ditch along Lee Park Way and install coir rolls;</li> <li>• use a natural barrier like Camden Aggregates;</li> <li>• liaise with local food growing projects re edible landscaping;</li> <li>• consult Capel Manor;</li> <li>• include Design Code in the submission;</li> <li>• would detached stack require ancillary structures</li> </ul>						<p>along Enfield Ditch.</p> <p>Lee Park Way runs along the western side of the Lee Navigation; this route is already open to pedestrians and cyclists. As part of the proposal it is proposed to use Lee Park Way to provide access for light vehicles to the RRF. This route would be upgraded and trees would be planted alongside the road.</p> <p>The proposals include marginal planting along Enfield Ditch as well as opening up the ditch by removing some vegetation. Coir rolls are not suitable due to the low volume of water flows in the ditch.</p> <p>Landscaping proposals to minimise the visual impact of the ERF have been incorporated into the proposal. The landscaping would include a bund partially obscuring the ERF at the northern end of the site and habitat enhancement and creation along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. These measures would screen the ERF and enhance the overall environment.</p> <p>The EcoPark does not include a sufficiently sized landscaped area which can be accessed safely by the public for edible landscaping to be a practical solution.</p> <p>Capel Manor will be consulted during Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>A Design Code will be included in the <i>Design and Access Statement</i> which will form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>More details on the design of the ERF chimney stack will</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

---

							be available during Phase 2 Consultation. It is not anticipated that it will require ancillary structures.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--