Examination-in-Public Topic Paper

Main Matter 4:

Site Specific Issues
**Issue 1: General Points**

**Technology neutral (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.1)**

4.1.1 National and regional policy both suggest the most appropriate approach is to be technology neutral (Chapter 5, Para 27 of 13.40 and Para 5.40-5.41 of SLWP14.22). In addition, PPS10 advises waste planning authorities to take “care to avoid stifling innovation in line with the waste hierarchy” when considering the link between allocated sites or areas and types of waste management facilities (paragraph 18 of SLWP13.27). The boroughs consider the PPS10 reference is also justification for not giving guidance on what type of facility would not be permitted.

4.1.2 Furthermore, bearing in mind that technology will change over the lifetime of the South London Waste Plan, the boroughs consider it would be premature and counter productive to rule out some types of waste management, ahead of technical studies being prepared that justify support for waste management projects.

4.1.3 In terms of the impact on amenity and the environment, the boroughs consider that the type of waste facility is one of a number of factors and it would be an inappropriate approach to single out one factor from others that are similarly important. For instance, the throughput handled by a facility can be as equally disruptive to local residents as the type of waste technology employed, especially if the waste facility is well-designed as required by other policies in the plan.

4.1.4 Against a background of preference to treat waste as high up the waste hierarchy as possible, the boroughs consider that the waste industry are in the best position to determine what should be delivered, based on need and market forces. It follows that delivery should be ‘industry led’ and based on all appropriate technical studies that should be robust and well reasoned to justify the particular technology and site chosen. It would be premature to rule out some types of technology on specified sites ahead of detailed technical appraisals designed to test suitability.

4.1.5 Therefore, the boroughs consider that to give guidance on what type of facility would not be permitted would be contrary to national policy, a bar on utilising technological advances and therefore a bar on the effectiveness of the plan, an inappropriate spotlight on one factor in site location and contrary to the Government’s pro-growth agenda, as outlined in Planning for Growth (SLWP20.3).

**Waste transfer to treatment at Partnership reference sites (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.2)**

4.1.6 Sites 1 (Factory Lane), 6 (Villers Road) and 9 (Garth Road) are included in the South London Waste Partnership procurement process and therefore precise details of any proposals are not available at this time.

4.1.7 However, given that waste operators have shown an interest in progressing projects at these three sites, the boroughs consider that the sites are suitable for a residual waste treatment facility and that there is a reasonable prospect of a project coming to fruition in the next few years. Whilst there is also a viability or achievability judgement to be made, this is for the market to determine and, such is the interest, once again it is reasonable to assume viability is not an issue. Notwithstanding the constraints at Sites 6 and 9, development proposals will be subject to detailed appraisals and any mitigating measures that might be necessary.
4.1.8 Furthermore, the South London Waste Partnership consultant representatives have satisfied themselves, through their own technical studies, that constraints identified for sites 1, 6 and 9 can be satisfied or mitigated against. Therefore, the boroughs consider there has been sufficient technical work conducted by the waste operators and others to confirm that a residual waste treatment facility could be delivered in respect of the three sites.

Sites 1 (Factory Lane) and 9 (Garth Road) – Energy from Waste (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.3)

4.1.9 Policy WP8 states that energy from waste proposals will be required to demonstrate that the process could not be dealt with higher up the waste hierarchy, will achieve a positive carbon outcome, deliver renewable heat and power locally and minimise impact on local amenity.

4.1.10 The ‘constraints’ identified for Sites 1 and 9 in Section 5 are mainly in respect residential amenity, recreation, nature conservation, flooding and traffic impacts. These are not ‘show stoppers’ but it would be a matter for an applicant to demonstrate that an energy from waste facility could comply with Policies WP7 and WP8.

4.1.11 End-users for an energy-from-waste facility on either site could be the national electricity and gas grids, local industry, which are favoured end-users because of their year-round heat demands, or local residents. The Garth Road site offers the opportunity to develop a local network involving a mixture of users, while the boroughs are aware of feasibility studies for a local energy network in the Factory Lane area.

Section 5 sites – Issues to Consider (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.4)

4.1.12 The Section 5 ‘Issues to consider’ are derived from three sources: (i) representations received during the previous stages of consultation; (ii) officers’ in-depth local knowledge of their boroughs; but principally (iii) the relevant borough’s Proposals Map.

4.1.13 Therefore, the “Issues to consider” sections are essentially a written version of the Proposals Map for the site or area with other matters that would be likely to be raised at a planning application stage.

4.1.14 The “Issues to consider” section has been designed to give developers guidance on what the relevant borough would consider to be site constraints, although as Page 53 of SLWP1.1 notes it is not exhaustive. The section has also been designed to address resident concerns which arose during public consultations.

Issue 2: Sites in Sutton

The extent of the nature conservation issues (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.5)

4.2.1 Conservation management is an important part of the boroughs’ approach to the production of the South London Waste Plan. The Wandle Valley Regional Park, when realised, will have a rich and thriving biodiversity spread across four separate London Boroughs, sites 17 and 18 as part of the Beddington Farmlands, represent a small part of the proposed Regional Park.

4.2.2 Site 17 is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, a Preferred Location for Industry, Land Safeguarded for the Wandle Valley Regional Park and an Archaeological Priority Area. The London Borough of Sutton has resolved to grant planning permission for waste management facilities on the site, and there is a previous permission, granted on appeal for waste management facilities. The current use of the site has compromised any existing nature conversation value.
4.2.3 Site 18 is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, a Metropolitan Green Chain, a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, a Preferred Location for Industry, Land Safeguarded for the Wandle Valley Regional Park and an Archaeological Priority Area.

4.2.4 The site currently has permission and resolution to grant permission for waste management, waste transfer and landfill. The resolution to grant planning permission for the uses on site 18 is limited to 2023. Existing planning permissions have restoration conditions in order to secure the creation of Wandle Valley Regional Park.

4.2.5 Potential damage to the nature conservation values from the intensification of these sites, as raised by Beddington Farm Bird Group, can be addressed by mitigation measures, restoration conditions and the imposition of planning obligations through the planning application process.

Issues arising from the Viridor site boundary amendment (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.6)

4.2.6 The original land search was limited to the areas of the site which undertook direct waste management activity, and omitted to include land which is used for access and ancillary operations.

4.2.7 The map in Proposed Minor Change 111, and re-calculation of land area in Proposed Minor Change 112, deals with this exclusion and is in keeping within the area over which the resolution to grant planning permission by Sutton Council for waste management and landfill purposes extends [Application D2005/54794/FUL Sutton’s Development Control Committee 30 April 2008]. Additional information on these Proposed Minor Changes can be found in SWLP1.18 Statement of Common Ground 5 with Viridor, the current operator on the site. There are no additional issues arising from the Proposed Minor Changes 111 and 112.

PMC111 and PMC112

The soundness of deleting Site 1006 Wandle Valley Trading Estate (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.7)

4.2.8 To be sound the Waste Plan must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

4.2.9 Justified means that the document must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base and the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. Deleting Site 1006 could compromise the findings and conclusions of the Evidence Base Study as Evidence Base Study 3A – Delivery of Sites (SLWP2.8) states that Site 1006 has good potential for deliverability in the short, medium and longer term. The site is also considered favourable as it is not in a floodplain, the current freeholders have expressed an interest in delivering waste management facilities on the site and deleting the site would undermine the Evidence Base Study.

4.2.10 Effective means that the document must be deliverable, flexible and able to be monitored. Deleting Site 1006 could compromise the deliverability, because again, as stated in the Evidence Base Study SLWP2.8 (Evidence Base Study 3A – Delivery of Sites), Site 1006 has good potential for deliverability in the short, medium and longer term. Deleting the site could compromise the deliverability of waste facilities.
4.2.11 Deleting Site 1006 as requested by the Metropolitan Police Authority would not compromise the soundness of the plan in relation to consistency with national policy.

4.2.12 It should be noted that the site is listed in Schedule 2 of the South London Waste Plan, so it is not protected or safeguarded exclusively for waste, merely identified as an industrial area which is suitable for waste management facilities. That is to say that, notwithstanding its inclusion in Schedule 2, the site may be appropriate for community facilities, should this come forward in a planning application and satisfy the London Borough of Sutton’s planning policies.

Why would the DPD be unsound if Site 57 was not to be included in policy WP4? (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.8)

4.2.13 The South London Waste Plan would not be unsound if this site was not included in WP4. Those sites identified in Schedule 2 of WP4 were found to be the most suitable out of the approximately 140 evaluated in the Stage 2 Technical Report (SLWP5.2). Site 57 was not considered to be one of the most suitable sites and so is not listed in Schedule 2.

How would the site perform against the development management policies—are there any ‘showstoppers’?

4.2.14 Site 57 is designated as Metropolitan Open Land, a Metropolitan Green Chain, a Site of Importance to Nature Conservation, Land Safeguarded for the Wandle Valley Regional Park, and an Archaeological Priority Area.

4.2.15 Paragraph 7.47 of the Consolidated Draft Replacement London Plan (SLWP14.21) states that Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) should have the same level of protection from development as the Green Belt. Paragraph 7.47 also states that open spaces and the links within a green chain should be designated as MOL. Policy 7.17 states that the Mayor strongly supports the current extent of MOL.

4.2.16 National guidance on appropriate uses for the Green Belt and, by extension, Metropolitan Open Land, comes from PPG2, which lists appropriate uses as outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, the retention and enhancement of landscapes, nature conservation and agricultural, forestry and related uses. Development of the site for waste management would therefore conflict with the emerging London Plan policies.

4.2.17 Part of the site is located in an area designated as Land Safeguarded for the Wandle Valley Regional Park. The London Borough of Sutton’s Core Strategy Policy PMP5 states that the council will implement proposals for creating the Wandle Valley Regional Park as shown on the Proposals Map. Given this policy, development of this site, as part of it is included in the Proposals Map as designated for the Wandle Valley Regional Park, would be contrary to this policy. Sutton’s Core Strategy Policy PMP9 states that the council will safeguard and enhance the borough’s open space network, including land comprising the Wandle Valley Regional Park. Given Policy PMP9, development of this site, as part of it is included in the Proposals Map as designated for the Wandle Valley Regional Park, would again be contrary to this policy.

4.2.18 The history of this site in relation to Sutton’s Core Strategy is also of relevance. In February 2009, Sutton’s Core Strategy was submitted for examination. The Submission version of the Core Strategy proposed the de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land fronting Beddington Lane, including Site 57, to provide land for industrial purposes, including strategic waste
management. The Inspector’s Report of September 2009 found the Core Planning Strategy to be sound, provided three principal changes were made, one being the removal of references to proposed de-designation of MOL. The Inspector’s opinion was that it was premature to de-designate this land for industrial uses in advance of the South London Waste Plan. Since the South London Waste Plan has now reached the Examination-in-Public stage and the capacity gap in terms of waste arisings, let alone apportionments, has been identified as achievable. There are no special circumstances with regard to waste management that would warrant Site 57 to be de-designated as MOL.

What is the precise history of the site in terms of sustainability appraisal iterations and to what extent has there been public consultation on the site as part of the submission process?

4.2.19 In the Stage 1 Issues and Options Consultation (19 September - 31 October 2008), the document included draft locational criteria for waste management facilities and assessed existing facilities, employment areas and industrial locations against the Strategic Framework and the flood risk assessment. As such the document did not consider specific sites and this site was not mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisal.

4.2.20 In the Stage 2 Potential Sites and Policies Consultation (20 July to 16 October 2009), the document considered this site to ‘have potential’ as it was assessed on the basis that it would be de-designated from Metropolitan Open Land through the London Borough of Sutton’s Core Strategy. No obvious deliverability constraints were identified, and it was considered that there could be early deliverability possibilities. As such, it was suggested that the site should be listed in Schedule 2 (Page 27, SLWP3.2). The Sustainability Appraisal made the same comments (Page 100, SLWP).

4.2.21 However, in his response to this consultation, the Mayor commented with regard to Site 57:
“This site is designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Site of Metropolitan Importance (SMI) for nature conservation. The subject site has recently been subject to a MOL and SMI de-designation proposal via the Sutton Core Strategy document. The Secretary of State inspector’s report found that the reasoning provided had no basis and did not support the proposed de-designation. Therefore the existing designations remain. London Plan policy 3D.10 (‘Metropolitan Open Land’) states boroughs should maintain a presumption against inappropriate development of MOL and that essential facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they do not have an adverse impact on the openness of MOL. It goes on to inform that appropriate development should minimise any adverse impacts on the open character of MOL through sensitive design and siting and be limited to small-scale structures to support outdoor open space uses. Therefore the proposed use of this site for waste management facilities would be contrary to London Plan policy 3D.10 (‘Metropolitan Open Land’). In addition London Plan policy 3D.14 (‘Biodiversity and nature conservation’) is clear on the expectation of boroughs to strongly protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance (SMI) for nature conservation. The proposed use of this site for waste management facilities is contrary to the intentions of London Plan policy 3D. 14 (‘Biodiversity and nature conservation’) and therefore this site is not supported and should be eliminated from the proposed site list.”

4.2.22 In the Stage 2a Additional Sites Consultation (8 February to 22 March 2010) the document did not include Site 57, and as such it was not mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisal.
4.2.23 In the Stage 3 Publication Consultation (4 January to 15 February 2011), following the Mayor’s comments at Stage 2, the document did not include Site 57 and, consequently, the site was not mentioned in the Sustainability Appraisal.

4.2.24 As part of the submission process, there was no specific additional public consultation on the site.

What public consultation has there been on the SA provided as part of the Regulation 28 representation by Sterecycle and what are the Councils’ comments on this SA?

4.2.25 Sterecycle submitted a representation to the Boroughs, as part of the Stage 3 consultation, see SLWP1.6 and SLWP1.6b-1.6f. The representation included as an appendix a four page document referred to as both the ‘Preliminary Sustainability Appraisal’ and the ‘Sustainability Appraisal’. This document is specific to site 57. This document is not referenced elsewhere in the representation.

4.2.26 It is considered that the document does not meet the requirements of the European Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment, nor with the guidance on production of Sustainability Appraisals in A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and the Plan-Making Manual in so far as:
- it does not have a clear purpose and objectives,
- it does not develop objectives, indicators and targets,
- it has not been subject to consultation,
- it does not discuss technical, procedural and other difficulties, and
- it does not make explicit assumptions and uncertainties.

4.2.27 The boroughs did not undertake any additional consultation on the representation or the SA, other than making the representation available as per usual statutory requirements.

4.2.28 The boroughs undertook to meet Sterecycle, in an attempt to establish common ground. This meeting took place on 5 April 2011, however the meeting failed to produce any common ground.

4.2.29 The contents of the Preliminary Sustainability Appraisal was not sufficiently relevant to alter the existing Sustainability Appraisal, evidence base, technical reports, or policy constraints (see 4.82.14 above) for the boroughs to see fit to include site 57 within the South London Waste Plan.

Issue 3: Sites in Croydon

Site 102: Purley Way, Lysander Road and Imperial Way Industrial Area (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.9)

4.3.1 SLWP1.1 is a spatial plan for four boroughs, containing spatial options and giving developers a choice of potential sites to deliver new or expanded existing waste facilities. It is therefore important that suitable sites are identified in Croydon.

4.3.2 The King Sturge Report (Page 20 of its report in SLWP2.8) identified the Purley Way, Lysander Road and Imperial Way Industrial Area as an area of low potential for deliverability due to the presence of multiple owners and occupiers. However, Page 23 of SLWP2.8 identified some potential in the longer term due to the range of sites within the area.
4.3.3 A waste facility in the Purley Way, Lysander Road and Imperial Way Industrial Area could be of high quality and small in scale, for example, a facility to recycle local materials from other businesses on the industrial estate. Modern waste facilities can be designed and operated to be compatible with other occupiers of this estate. Waste facilities, such as those in SLWP14.18, would have much less of an impact on the amenity of the local area. They would also be in keeping with the high quality environment of this industrial area.

4.3.4 Whilst there are constraints, limited opportunities and an assessment that suggests a moderate potential for the delivery of waste facilities at Industrial Area 102, it is considered waste management capacity can nevertheless be delivered within the Plan period. The area was identified as having some potential in the early stage preferred sites technical report and is therefore deemed suitable. In terms of its location, accessibility, proximity to residential property and nature conservation interest, the constraints will be less onerous than at other sites. It is also well located in relation to the remainder of the South London Waste Plan area and to the commercial hubs at central Croydon and Sutton as well as the Purley Way retail parks where waste arisings are high.

4.3.5 To date there has been no industry interest in this industrial area, but other industrial areas locally have attracted interest. In the last year there have been proposals at four other sites in the Croydon area, two of which are being assessed under Policy WP5. This suggests interest in providing waste facilities in the borough. The four sites were generally not suitable, largely because they are generally less well located in transportation or nature conservation terms or due to proximity to residential accommodation.

4.3.6 The four Croydon proposals have either been unsuccessful on mainstream development management grounds or not yet progressed to the decision stage. The preferred locations identified in South London Waste Plan have been recommended to the owners and/or applicants. Furthermore, Croydon, like most boroughs is undertaking an assets review, and some council property lies within the Purley Way, Lysander Road and Imperial Way Industrial Area.

4.3.7 In light of the facts that the area is suitable, a council asset review is taking place and there is waste operator interest in the Croydon area, the boroughs consider there is credible evidence to suggest land could become available and could be delivered over the 10-year lifetime of the plan.

4.3.8 Notwithstanding DHL Real Estates assertion that the area has “local transport issues” and “potential impact on surrounding residential property”, it has nevertheless been identified as having low impact on residential property and good transport access to the Strategic Road Network (SLWP 5.1 and 5.2). Furthermore, whilst DHL Real Estates indicates a concern about potential impact on current industrial occupiers, modern waste facility design and the robustness of the development management policies will ensure any impact is minimal. Therefore, the Purley Way, Lysander Road and Imperial Way Industrial Area should remain in Schedule 2 of the South London Waste Plan.

Additional Site (Part) 111 – Ullswater Business Park (Inspector’s Paragraph 4.10)

4.3.9 The DPD would not be unsound if this site was not included in WP4. Those sites identified in Schedule 2 of Policy WP4 were found to be the most suitable out of the approximately 140 sites evaluated in the preferred sites technical report. Those others such as Site 111 were not as suitable due, in the case of Ullswater Business Park, to nature conservation, a source protection zone, local archaeology, strategic views, site circumstances and visual intrusion.
In common with other owners of land with property lying outside the identified industrial areas, the applicant could still go through Policy WP5 (windfall sites) to try to secure support for a waste project at the appropriate stage.

4.3.10 If the site were to be included in Schedule 2, consultation would be required so at this stage, in the absence of consultation, and the ensuing but very necessary consideration of representations, to include Site 111 would render the Plan unsound.

4.3.11 Coulsdon Investments Ltd suggests its part of the Ullswater Business Park is suitable for a waste management facility and, while it does have some merits as a waste management site, it also lies adjacent to residential property, within a nature conservation area, source protection zone, archaeology area and within a strategic view.

4.3.12 The main development management policies against which a proposal at Ullswater Business Park would be tested are WP5, WP6, WP7 and WP8. There are no ‘show stoppers’ in terms of WP5 (d) criteria and WP7 but a development at the site could have an adverse effect on the criteria set out above. Policies WP6 and WP8 would be addressed at the detailed planning stage. Therefore, it is not agreed that the site is suitable, nor necessarily achievable, as a waste management site.

4.3.13 At the Stage 1 Issues and Options consultation, the East Coulsdon Residents’ Associations raised concerns about a waste facility in the Coulsdon Industrial Area/Marlpit Lane/Ullswater Crescent area. However, the association did not comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

4.3.14 Following the Stage 1 consultation (SLWP 6.1), site assessment criteria were devised, comprising ‘show stoppers’, screening criteria and a site-based assessment. The site assessment criteria were linked to the sustainability appraisal objectives (Para 3.1.4 of SLWP5.2 and Page 83 of SLWP4.2). Whilst the published Sustainability Appraisal concentrates on the preferred sites and areas, it was also applicable to all of the sites. At the Stage 2 (Preferred Sites and Policies) consultation, the Preferred Sites Technical Report (which included all of the sites) was included as one of the consultation documents. Therefore, there was an opportunity to comment on the site and its site assessment at this consultation stage. However, there was no representation. The site was not considered in the Stage 2a: Additional Sites consultation or in the publication stage.

4.3.15 A separate sustainability appraisal has not been carried out on this specific part of the Ullswater Business Park nor has it been consulted upon. However, the Sustainability Appraisal has been consulted upon for the whole of the Ullswater Business Park.

Issue 4: Sites in Kingston – Area 351, 352 and 353

4.4.1 SLWP1.1 is a spatial plan for four boroughs, containing spatial options and giving developers a choice of potential sites to deliver new or expanded existing waste facilities. It is therefore important that suitable sites are identified in Kingston. This area is the only industrial area identified in Kingston.

4.4.2 The King Sturge Report within SLWP2.8 omitted the Chessington Industrial Area from its assessment of deliverable sites due to the presence of multiple owners on the estate. The Deliverability of Sites Evidence Base document, SLWP2.8, included the Chessington Industrial Area in its assessment of deliverability. Despite the constraints present, the evidence base
document identified potential for the delivery of waste management facilities at Chessington Industrial Area in the long term. This is due to a number of leases expiring post 2016 (SLWP2.8 of Page 25 of the King Sturge Report), which may result in units becoming vacant towards the end of the plan period.

4.4.3 In addition, Surrey County Council has given its support for the potential use of the Chessington Industrial Estate for waste facilities due to it having good transport accessibility (Rep 80 of SLWP1.6). The Highways Agency (Rep 136 of SLWP1.6) has not raised an objection to this site.

4.4.4 The type of waste facility for the sites or areas listed in Policies WP3 and WP4 has not been indicated in the SLWP1.1 or in SLWP2.8 since there are a range of different types of waste facilities that could be proposed. A waste facility in the Chessington Industrial Area could be of high quality and small in scale, for example, a facility to recycle local materials from other businesses on the industrial estate. Modern waste facilities, such as those highlighted in SLWP14.18, can be designed and operated to be compatible with other occupiers of this estate. Waste facilities, such as those in SLWP14.18, would have much less of an impact on the amenity of the local area. They would also be in keeping with the high quality environment of the Chessington Industrial Estate.

**Issue 5: Sites in Merton – Area 641, 642 and 651**

4.5.1 SLWP1.1 remains sound if the proposed deletion of site 651 is confirmed. Site 651 is part of the “North Wimbledon (part)” site listed in Table A3.1 ‘Strategic Industrial Locations’ in the Consolidated Draft Replacement London Plan (SLWP14.21). The exclusion of Site 651 from Schedule 2 in Policy WP4 of the South London Waste Plan will not affect the site’s status as a Strategic Industrial Location within the London Plan.

4.5.2 As described in the Statement of Common Ground with the representors on Site 651 (SLWP 1.17) this site was erroneously included mainly due to its proximity to residential properties but, in combination with other assessment factors, it should have been assessed as a site less suitable for waste management and not progressed beyond the Stage 2 (Potential Sites and Policies) consultation. The retention of this site in Schedule 2 could therefore threaten the soundness of the plan.

4.5.3 The boroughs would however point out that all the sites listed in the Stage 2 (Potential Sites and Policies) Consultation Document (SLWP 3.2) received some criticisms but as is evident from the Officer’s Initial Comments in the Stage 2 Schedule of Representations (SLWP 6.4), although all the responses were given consideration, it was only with Site 651 that the boroughs’ officers were in agreement that the site was unsuitable.

4.5.4 The proposed deletion of Site 651 from Schedule 2 in Policy WP4 (SLWP 1.1) would therefore not affect the soundness of the DPD as it is in response to representations received, results in an improvement in the robustness of the evidence for the site assessments, and, due to the limited extent of the site in relation to all the sites listed in Schedule 2, its removal from Schedule 2 will not have a substantial affect on the ability of the plan to deliver facilities that would address the capacity gap.

4.5.5 The Proposed Minor Changes in relation to the removal of Site 651 are:
PMC89, PMC116, PMC124, PMC130, PMC131, PMC132, PMC133 and PMC134