Waste

(EN22)

Office	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Number of buildings	52	47	43	36	34	30	46
Waste and resources (tonnes)	17,564	19,947	17,426	15,136	14,880	14,675	16,957
Waste (landfill or incineration)	5,835	6,524	5,277	4,312	4,273	4,410	6,006
Resources (recycled materials)	11,729	13,423	12,149	10,824	10,607	10,264	10,951
Waste diversion rate (%)	66.8%	67.3%	69.7%	71.5%	71.3%	70.0%	64.6%

Retail	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Number of buildings	6	7	8	8	10	9	11
Waste and resources (tonnes)	12,298	13,599	15,615	15,226	15,882	22,658	22,207
Waste (landfill or incineration)	5,835	6,542	5,277	4,312	6,044	4,525	9,845
Resources (recycled materials)	5,605	6,870	8,737	8,756	9,838	14,549	11,962
Waste diversion rate (%)	45.6%	49.4%	56.0%	57.5%	61.9%	64.2%	53.9%

Hotels	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Number of buildings	–	–	–	–	6	7	7
Waste and resources (tonnes)	–	–	–	–	3,980	7,212	11,066
Waste (landfill or incineration)	–	–	–	–	1,347	3,439	3,682
Resources (recycled materials)	–	–	–	–	2,633	3,773	7,384
Waste diversion rate (%)	–	–	–	–	66.2%	52.3%	66.7%

NOTES:

1. This indicator aligns with Oxford's waste target, which has been in place since 2011 for both office and retail assets, as follows: office target – 60% in 2011 and 2012, 65% in 2013 and 70% in 2014; retail target – 35% in 2011 and 2012, 45% in 2013 and 50% in 2014.
2. Number of buildings refers to buildings with actual, third-party audited waste data.
3. Waste denotes the materials generated on-site which were sent to landfill or incineration. Resources (recycled materials) denote materials generated on-site which were re-used or recycled.
4. Waste numbers do not include construction materials, as the cumulative weight would skew data. Construction diversion rates from landfill and incineration for both office and retail assets is over 99%.
5. Numbers in chart above do not include diversion from different forms of incineration. Diversion from incineration would increase rates to 71% for Office and 62% for Retail.
6. Vacancy across the portfolio was generally stable between 2005 and 2016 (around 9%).
7. Positive trends in waste diversion are driven by improved waste and recycling infrastructure and signage, increased composting, and introduction of new food courts offering real plates and tableware, as well as composting in our retail assets (e.g., sculleries).
8. Percentage increase/decrease in diversion is listed to maintain consistency across all indicators (rather than simple increase/decrease in diversion rate).
9. Building acquisitions in under-serviced recycling markets have contributed to decreased diversion rates in our managed portfolio.