

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Focus Groups  
**Date:** 22 November 2021 19:14:08  
**Attachments:** [Resident Focus Groups summary messages 22.11.21.docx](#)

---

Hi [REDACTED],

With apologies for the late hour, I have attached a note summarising the key findings of the Focus Group report, received a short while ago. There is a little more detail than was provided in the summary I sent you. I've pulled out the key points below:

- 94 people attended the groups, 41x male and 53x female between 18 years to 60 plus.
- 98 people were recruited, four did not turn up, one had technical difficulties, three did not dial in without providing a reason.
- The facilitators reported there have been no difficult or disruptive respondents including people with negative views trying to influence others in the group.
- The facilitators estimate that 15-20 respondents knew about the existing facilities, of these estimate that less than 12 respondents were aware of NLHPP
- Across the seven Boroughs, where respondents knew of the EcoPark they did not necessarily know what it is for and respondents generally saw the site as positive
- None of the respondents in Camden knew of the current site or NLHPP
- None of the respondents in Hackney or Islington knew about NLHPP
- Less than five respondents had seen negative messaging about the incinerator, and one person was openly negative because of the information they had read on Facebook
- Respondents generally felt positive about the current and future facilities (...). Some respondents felt that the information provided was only showing one side of the story and thought it was on-sided, wanting to know what the negatives are.

#### **Energy from Waste (EfW)**

- Circa 60% thought it was more positive than negative but would have liked more information about the process itself to be able to comment more. They also wanted to know about the negative consequences of the process.
- Some felt 127,000 homes sounded like a lot, whilst others were unable to judge as they were unsure how many homes are in North London. Some felt that it would be more useful if a comparison was given about what the existing facilities can provide.

#### **Apprenticeships & training**

- Many respondents considered the benefits (as set out in the discussion guide) to be generally positive. Some were sceptical and felt it was not clear how many permanent jobs would be created.
- Some were unsure whether 100 apprenticeships and 225 skills training opportunities was a good target and asked if the opportunities will continue once the new facilities are operational.
- Many respondents questioned the definition of 'local area' and how local is local, wondering how far the benefits extend.

#### **Recycling and technology**

- Respondents suggested that comparisons with other facilities would be useful and one

respondent asked if there are any statistics about the facility that is considered to be the best either in the UK or elsewhere.

#### **Alternative options to Energy from Waste**

- Many said that it is best to process waste locally rather than sending further afield. Some respondents felt that NLHPP was the best option from the information provided but many felt the information suggested there are other options that weren't explored in the information provided, adding that whilst the targets and jargon sound good, they felt there was a lack of transparency (in the information provided).

#### **Environment 'v' cost effectiveness**

- The response was mixed. Respondents said they would want their council to prioritise what is best for the environment and future generations and would be willing to pay more if required in their council tax, even though some feel it is already high. Others said the most cost-effective solution should be pursued due to the increasing cost of living for people generally and felt some middle ground needs to be found to avoid significant cost implications for residents in the local area. Some felt that action needs to be taken 'regardless of cost', but that the cost should not be borne by the taxpayer but from allocated funding and budgets.

#### **Air quality and Climate Emergency**

- Some respondents felt that concerns about smoke and other emissions (from EfW facilities) and the impact on peoples' health and the environment are a key concern. They suggested that if people were made aware of what the smoke really was i.e., steam then it would put people at ease, especially those with respiratory issues and children.
- A few respondents felt there should be more information about how emissions will be captured, controlled, and monitored.
- A couple of respondents said they would feel reassured if the new facilities had support from reputable environmental groups or key figures in the sector.
- Some respondents pointed out that this is a current issue in the public eye and can be seen through the COP26 press and on-going changes with the London ULEZ boundary.

#### **Priorities**

- Some respondents felt that better education about reducing waste and consumerism will improve the environment, as well as lobbying businesses to reduce levels of packaging
- Some felt better education about Energy from Waste would help reassure those who have concerns about the new facilities.
- Most felt that awareness of the NLHPP should be raised and suggested that social media, billboards, bus advertising, and messaging through schools/education would be the best way to raise awareness of the facilities. One respondent suggested providing information with information about council tax.
- A few respondents felt that caution is needed with any awareness raising or promotional activities. They felt it may cause people to oppose the new facilities, saying that this often happens when information is provided about new developments.

I have asked for a copy of the draft report asap this week, it is being proof read at the moment and I will send it as soon as I can. Unfortunately it wasn't possible today due to staff leave.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Principal Consultant, Stakeholder Engagement Services

E: [Redacted]

Tel: [Redacted]

**AECOM**

The Colmore Building  
Colmore Circus Queensway  
Birmingham, B4 6AT, United Kingdom

T [Redacted]

[aecom.com](http://aecom.com)

**Delivering a better world**