

Examination of the East London Joint Waste Plan

London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Response to Main Matter 3

Matter 3: Safeguarded sites and sites to be released from waste use

Issue (iii)

Q1: Paragraph 9.8.6 of the London Plan expects that Boroughs with surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those Boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release – is the Plan’s approach in general conformity with this expectation?

1. No. London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) does not consider the Plan’s approach is in general conformity as the draft East London Joint Waste Plan (ELJWP) proposes site releases without including arrangements to share some of its identified surplus capacity with LBTH, which is a directly adjacent borough and Waste Planning Authority that has an evidenced shortfall. Please refer to our statement on Matter 2/Issue (iv)/Q3 for a more detailed response on this point.

Q2: Paragraph 9.8.7 of the London Plan sets out that Boroughs should aim to meet their waste apportionment as a minimum (as set out at Table 9.1 of the London Plan) and will need to agree the transfer of apportioned waste where this is not possible. Within the context of the release of sites, what consideration has been made of Boroughs that are unable to meet their own apportionments?

2. The proposed submission ELJWP does not demonstrate that LBTH’s outstanding request for capacity sharing has been appropriately considered. As evidenced in our response to Matter 2/Issue (iv)/Q2, LBTH’s request for capacity sharing has not been addressed within the ELJWP and no agreement has been reached within the SoCGs for both the ELJWP and the LBTH Draft Local Plan.
3. Within the Regulation 22 Consultation Statement Appendix 3 (CD08), the East London Joint Waste Planning Group (ELJWPG) rejects the need to amend the ELJWP to account for LBTH’s request for an assignment of surplus capacity to meet its London Plan apportionment. CD08 confirms the ELJWPG’s position that any agreements for capacity sharing should be reached within Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) rather than in the plan itself. This does not represent a plan-led approach to plan-making. LBTH does not agree that deferring the matter to SoCGs is appropriate when the request is longstanding and there have been several opportunities for the ELJWP to be updated to make provision for LBTH’s apportionment. LBTH has continuously and effectively worked with the ELJWPG to provide the evidence base to support the ongoing request for assistance, namely responding to the criteria provided for requests and undertaking the LBTH Waste Land Availability Study (2026) which forms Appendix 4 of LBTH’s Matter 2

statement. In this context, LBTH has robustly engaged with the ELJPWG to demonstrate justification for its request but the ELJPWG have not duly considered the request within the proposed submission ELJWP. In any event, and as noted above, no agreement has been reached outside of the ELJWP.

4. As the ELJWP has not recognised and accommodated LBTH's shortfall in capacity per the requirements set out in London Plan paragraphs 9.8.6 and 9.8.7, LBTH does not consider that the proposed release of sites has been informed by appropriate consideration of the LBTH request for assistance. The proposed release should only be undertaken if provision for an assignment of surplus capacity to LBTH is first made within the ELJWP.