



Examination of the East London Joint Waste Plan

Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions

Thea Davis BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State

Introduction

1. Following our initial review of the supporting evidence for and the representations on the East London Joint Waste Plan (the Plan), and the Boroughs' response to our preliminary letter (ID01) we have identified the following matters that will form the basis of our consideration of soundness and legal compliance, and will therefore guide discussion at the hearing sessions, which are due to commence at **13.00 on 15 June 2026 at Barking Town Hall.**

Matter 1: Legal and procedural requirements

Matter 2: The approach to meeting London Plan apportionments and any other arisings

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

Matter 4: Proposals for new waste uses

Matter 5: The soundness and general conformity of the Plan's policies

2. The document contains a number of issues and questions, which flow from the identified matters. Questions have been framed with regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (including the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 35); National Planning Policy for Waste (the NPPW); the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and other relevant national guidance and policy where specifically indicated. The Framework also sets out that plans should only contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals – a consideration that has formed the basis of several questions.
3. Moreover, as the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) (the 2004 Act) establishes, local development documents in London Boroughs are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan. Consequently, several of the questions focus on the general conformity of the Plan's policies with those of the London Plan.
4. It is important to note that the matters, issues and questions we have set out below have arisen from our initial assessment of the submission documents, the responses made by interested parties thus far, and the Boroughs' responses to our preliminary questions. Consequently, they may evolve throughout the

Examination, not least following on from any responses the Boroughs or others make on these matters prior to the hearing sessions.

5. The Boroughs have provided a schedule of suggested modifications to the Plan alongside its submission documents (CD11). As set out in our preliminary letter, Main Modifications (that is those that we would consider to be necessary to ensure the soundness or legal compliance of the Plan) can only be made if we recommend them, and would be subject to public consultation following the closure of the hearings in accordance with the procedure set out in the Planning Inspectorate's '[Procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations](#)'.
6. Some of the changes in the Boroughs' schedule would, if taken forward, materially alter the Plan's policies and/or the interpretation of them and would thus constitute main modifications. Accordingly, some of the questions below are focused on whether the changes proposed in the Boroughs' schedule would be necessary to ensure the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, the schedule to this document sets out the Boroughs' proposed changes which would constitute Main Modifications were we to consider them necessary to secure the soundness and/or legal compliance of the Plan. Where necessary, those proposed changes are the subject of some of the following questions and the references used are those that we have given them in the Schedule below (that is **SM1**, **SM2** and so on). Where several of the Council's proposed changes relate to the same policy or block of supporting text we have sought to amalgamate them in the interests of clarity.
7. We may also recommend other main modifications as a result of discussions at the hearings.
8. The MIQs below should be addressed in hearing statements. A Guidance Note accompanies this document and sets out the arrangements for submitting hearing statements to the Programme Officer.
9. If any clarification is required on what follows, please contact us via the Programme Officer.

Thea Davis

G J Fort

INSPECTORS

10 April 2026

Matter 1: Legal and procedural requirements

Notes: The Duty to Cooperate is no longer a legal requirement relating to development plans by virtue of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2026. The 'Reforming plan-making' Written Ministerial Statement of 27 November 2025 and a Ministerial Letter to the Planning Inspectorate of the same date set out that aspects relating to cooperation would be matters of soundness in the context of national policy on this matter set out in the Framework. Accordingly, whether effective cooperation has been maintained forms the basis of some of the questions relating to Matter 2.

Whilst general conformity with the London Plan is a legal compliance matter (per the 2004 Act) its cross-cutting implications are the focus of questions in Matters 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Issue (i) does the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) contained within the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) comply with the requirements of the 2004 Act, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (SEA Directive) and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations); have equality implications been taken into account?

Questions:

1. Has the SA process complied with the requirements of the SEA Directive and the SEA Regulations?
2. Is the approach to SA compliant with the advice set out in the 'Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal' and 'Waste' PPG and based on an appropriate methodology?
3. Has the SA process been genuinely iterative and carried out in step with the stages of plan preparation?
4. Are the alternatives considered by the SA clear and sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each?
5. Does the SA realistically take into account the objectives of the ELJWP in relation to the alternatives?
6. Has the preparation of the SA considered the potential for cumulative effects with other Plans with regard to the release of waste sites and the absence of allocations for any new waste sites in the ELJWP area?
7. Is there clear evidence to indicate why, having considered reasonable alternatives, the Plan's strategy is an appropriate one?
8. Has the Plan been informed by a robust assessment of its potential equality impacts?

Issue (ii) Is the Plan supported by a robust approach to Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)?

Question:

1. Is the approach to HRA adequate and how has the Plan taken account of its findings?

Issue (iii) Has consultation on the Plan been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (the 2012 Regulations) and the Boroughs' Statements of Community Involvement (SCI)?

Questions:

1. Are the Boroughs' SCIs up to date in accordance with Regulation 10A(1)(b) of the 2012 Regulations?
2. Has the consultation on the Plan been carried out in accordance with the SCIs of the East London Boroughs?
3. Have the publication, advertisement and availability of the Plan followed the procedures set out in the 2004 Act and 2012 Regulations?

Issue (iv) To what extent has the production of the Plan complied with the Boroughs' published Local Development Schemes (LDS)

Questions:

1. Is the scope of the Plan accurately described in the Boroughs' LDSs?
2. Has the timing of the production of the Plan followed the timetable set out in LDSs?

Issue (v) To what extent does the Plan contain policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the Boroughs contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?

Question:

1. To what extent does the ELJWP contain policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the Boroughs contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?

Issue (vi) Is the Plan compliant with Regulations 5 and 8 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (the 2012 Regulations)?

Questions:

1. Is the Plan period to be covered by the ELJWP clear and unambiguous for the purposes of Regulation 5(1)(a)(i) of the 2012 Regulations and in the context of the Framework and the NPPW?
2. For the purposes of Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations, and in the context of paragraph 16(d) of the Framework, is the fact that the Plan intends to supersede other policies in the development Plan stated in a clear way?

-
3. Are all superseded policies identified?
 4. Is the Plan otherwise consistent with the adopted development plans for the Boroughs (per Regulation 8(4) of the 2012 Regulations)?

Matter 2: The approach to meeting London Plan apportionments and any other arisings

Issue (i) Are the Vision and Objectives of the Plan appropriate and justified and do they provide a sound basis for the management of waste in the Plan area?

Questions:

1. With reference to the relevant statutory duties of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and national planning policy, is the description of the overarching approach of the Plan in the Executive Summary, and Strategic Objective 3 justified insofar as they state that capacity should be designed in a way that protects *and* enhances communities and the natural and historic environment? Is it consistent with the NPPW (paragraph 5), which references “significant adverse impacts on environmental quality”? Would use of this phrase elsewhere in the plan (for example the Purpose of Policy blocks) be justified?
2. Is the Plan’s vision clear and unambiguous and thus consistent with paragraph 16 of the Framework insofar as it requires “hazardous properties [to be] virtually eliminated in construction and demolition waste”?
3. With reference to paragraphs 2.22 to 2.26, would the vision, objectives and policies of the Plan be effective insofar as they relate to water quality?

Issue (ii) Whether the methodology used to identify waste arisings (other than those identified in the London Plan) over the plan period is justified on the basis of a robust analysis of the best available data and information?

Questions:

1. Is the methodology used to identify construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste arisings justified, up to date and consistent with the ‘Waste’ PPG; and does it provide a robust basis for the Plan’s policies in this regard?
2. Are the methodologies used to identify other arisings justified, up to date and consistent with the ‘Waste’ PPG; and do they provide a robust basis for the Plan’s policies in these regards?

Issue (iii) Whether the assessment of site capacities is justified and based on a robust analysis of the best available data and information?

Questions:

1. Is the assessment of site capacities up to date, justified and based on a robust analysis of the best available data and information?
2. Bearing in mind the challenges with data accuracy in relation to HIC and CDE waste in particular, are the assumptions about capacities for individual sites justified and effective?
3. How have the capacities of sites with temporary permission due to expire in the Plan period been assessed?

Issue (iv) Would the Plan's approach to meeting the London Plan's apportionments and other identified arisings be effective; and is it positively prepared in these respects?

Questions:

1. Is the Plan informed by effective and on-going work between strategic policy-making authorities?
2. How have the Boroughs worked with neighbouring authorities to consider necessary facilities when planning for hazardous waste (per paragraph 9.8.18 of the London Plan)?
3. Is the Plan justified, positively prepared and in general conformity with the London Plan (in particular paragraphs 9.8.6, 9.8.7 and 9.8.18) insofar as its approach to unmet waste needs from neighbouring areas is concerned in terms of:
 - a) London Plan apportionments
 - b) Construction, demolition and excavation waste
 - c) Hazardous waste?
4. Does the Plan support capacity increases at existing waste sites in a way that is in general conformity with the London Plan, and which would enable a flexible response to currently unanticipated needs?
5. Are landfill operations at Rainham anticipated to cease within the Plan period, and if so, how has cooperation with planning authorities outside of the Plan area sought to address any demand for non-inert capacity (per paragraph 4.9 of the Plan)?

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

Issue (i) Is the Plan in general conformity with the London Plan in terms of the types of site considered to be in waste use for the purposes of safeguarding ?

Questions:

1. Is the description of waste sites set out in paragraphs 6.30 to 6.33 and Policy JWP2 justified, effective and in general conformity with the London Plan?
2. As the London Plan is part of the development plan, and in the context of s38(5) of the 2004 Act, would suggested modification **SM2** (see attached Schedule) be necessary to achieve soundness?
3. What is the justification for excluding from safeguarding sites that manage less than 500 tonnes of waste per year that do not provide specialist waste management capacity?

Issue (ii) is the safeguarding of individual sites justified; are the capacity assumptions they contain soundly based; and would the stock of safeguarded sites provide sufficient opportunities to meet waste needs?

Questions:

1. How have decisions about the safeguarding of individual sites been reached and has this process been informed by evidence such as the SA and the current established uses of sites?
2. Are the Plan's safeguarded sites justified and in general conformity with the London Plan?
3. Paragraph 9.8.18 of the London Plan 2021 identifies that, "without sustained action, there remains the risk of a major shortfall in the capacity [of London] to treat and dispose of hazardous waste safely". What action does the ELJWP take to help to address this risk through its approach to safeguarding sites?
4. Some minerals sites in the Plan area may have the potential to provide waste management capacity but are not safeguarded in the Plan. Is this approach effective, justified and positively prepared?
5. Is the information included in Appendix 3, including the indicative boundaries accurate and do they provide a justified basis for making decisions relating to safeguarded sites?

Issue (iii) is the Plan's approach to releasing sites from waste use or reducing their capacity justified and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Questions:

Sites released from safeguarding

1. 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?

-
2. 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?
 3. Is the approach of releasing sites from safeguarding in general conformity with the London Plan? Are paragraphs 6.29 and 6.37 of the Plan in general conformity with the approach to site release set out in Policy SI 9 and paragraphs 9.9.2 and 9.9.3 of the London Plan?
 4. Is it clear how compensatory capacity is to be provided for the sites to be released from safeguarding set out in Table 9? Is this approach effective and justified?
 5. Are the proposed site releases set out in Table 9 of the Plan justified?
 6. Paragraph 4.5 of the IIA indicates that the sites proposed for release present issues in terms of acceptability in planning terms. Is this an effective approach and is it justified by an assessment of the planning merits of the sites?
 7. What is the status of the Castle Green Masterplan, does it provide an adequate justification for identifying the Eurohub, Box Lane sites, as sites to be released from safeguarding?
 8. When is the occupancy of the Eurohub Sites due to conclude and what factors are relevant to the timetable for this?
 9. Is the Environment Agency advice relating to the Old Bus Depot, Perry Road (as referenced in paragraph 1.13, 3 of the 'Note on Release of Sites for Redevelopment for Non-waste uses through the Reg 19 Submission Draft ELJWP) available and could it be made available to the examination?
 10. Is the compensatory capacity secured for Connolley's Yard, Thames Road in LB Havering safeguarded by the Plan?
 11. Does the compensatory capacity secured for Connolley's Yard meet the maximum achievable throughput of the site to be removed from safeguarding?

Longer-term development options

12. Is the Plan clear and unambiguous to decision-makers regarding the process for releasing the Longer-term development options from waste use?
13. Is the identification of Off Crow Lane, Romford (HV11) as a Longer-term development option justified in the context of "the risk of a major shortfall in [London's] capacity to treat and dispose of hazardous waste safely" per paragraph 9.8.18 and Policy SI 9 (D) of the London Plan?
14. Is the identification of Land at York Road, Rainham (HV04) and Ilford Recycling Centre as Longer-term development options, justified and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Compensatory capacity: Longer-term development options and other potential releases

15. Is the approach to compensatory capacity for the Longer-term development options clear and unambiguous, in general conformity with the London Plan, and otherwise justified and effective?
16. Would it be clear and unambiguous to a decision-maker how to react to development proposals which seek to demonstrate that the loss of a facility will not compromise the ability to meet the London Plan objective of net self-sufficiency for London?
17. Is the Plan's approach to the provision of compensatory capacity relating to sites outside of the Plan area (set out at paragraph 6.41) in general conformity with the London Plan and otherwise justified? Would the approach be clear and unambiguous to a decision-maker given its location in the reasoned justification rather than in policy?

Proposals resulting in a reduction of capacity

18. Is the Plan's approach (set out in Policy JWP2 (D)(3) and at paragraph 6.42) to a consideration of proposals resulting in reduction of throughput at sites justified and in general conformity with the London Plan? Is it clear how a decision-maker should react to such development proposals given the location of the considerations in the Plan's reasoned justification (at paragraph 6.42) rather than its policies?

Matter 4: Proposals for new waste uses

Issue (i) Is the Plan's approach to proposals for new waste uses effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Questions:

1. Are the Plan's policies effective in terms of how proposals for new waste uses at new and existing waste sites would be considered?
2. Is Policy JWP2 effective in distinguishing between the considerations to be applied to proposals for new waste developments, and those to be applied to the intensification and/or expansion of existing sites?
3. Are Policies JWP2 (particularly criteria C(4) and F) and JWP2B(D) justified and do they avoid unnecessary duplication of policies applying to the area (per paragraph 16 of the Framework)?
4. In requiring certain sorts of proposals to be consistent with "all other policies in the Development Plan" is Policy JWP2(D)(6) justified (with reference to *R v Rochdale Borough Council ex parte Milne* [2000] EWHC 650 and *R. (on the application of Laura Cummins.) v Camden London Borough Council* [2001] EWHC (Admin) 1116)?
5. Would the wording set out in paragraph 6.68 ("Other policies in the Development Plan for the area in which any development is located will also apply") provide the basis of a main modification to address any soundness concerns emerging in response to questions 3 and 4 above?
6. Is the Plan clear, effective and justified insofar as the consideration of proposals for waste uses relating to minerals sites (including the processing of secondary aggregates, and in terms of site restoration) is concerned, (noting that the 'Assessment of Existing Waste Management Capacity' (SD10) identifies a shortfall in management capacity relating to inert waste)?
7. Is the Plan positively prepared insofar as hazardous waste is concerned and is it in general conformity with the London Plan (see in particular paragraph 9.8.18) in these terms?
8. How is suggested modification **SM3** (see attached Schedule) intended to secure soundness and/or legal compliance, and would the wording achieve general conformity with the London Plan (in particular Policy SI 8) in requiring waste to be dealt with further up the hierarchy where capacity increases at existing sites are proposed?
9. Is the wording of **SM3** internally consistent with criterion D(1) of Policy JWP2?
10. Is Policy JWP2 D(3) in general conformity with the London Plan (in particular Policy SI 8) and internally consistent with Policy JWP2 D(1)?
11. Suggested modification **SM4** (see attached Schedule) would include a reference to safeguarded wharfs. Why is this necessary to achieve soundness?
12. Does Policy JWP2B support wastewater treatment investment as expected in Policy SI5 of the London Plan and does it do so in a justified and effective way?

13. Does the Plan set out a justified and effective basis for the consideration of proposals for energy from waste facilities?

Matter 5: The soundness and general conformity of the Plan's policies

Issue (i) Does the Plan seek to achieve well-designed places in a manner that is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Questions:

1. Would suggested modification (see attached Schedule) **SM4** be necessary to ensure that Policy JWP2 is consistent with the Framework insofar as it expects planning policies to ensure that developments secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users of places, and would it do so in a justified way?
2. Are the sustainable construction aspects of Policy JWP4 in general conformity with Policy SI 2 of the London Plan in terms of offsetting?
3. Is Policy JWP4 (A)(3) clear and would it be evident to a decision-maker how to react to development proposals?
4. Is Policy JWP4(A)(7) consistent with national policy relating to the conservation of the historic environment (in particular paragraphs 212 to 218 of the Framework)?
5. Is Policy JWP4's requirement relating to 'Secure by Design' principles justified given that the 'Secured by Design' document is not part of the adopted development plan? Does the wording given in 6.87 provide the basis for a main modification for any soundness deficiencies in these regards?
6. Is the Plan clear as to the types of development that would need to provide the biodiversity enhancements set out in paragraph 6.97?
7. What soundness deficiency is suggested modification (see attached Schedule) **SM6** intended to address?
8. What soundness deficiencies relating to the design of SuDS is suggested modification (see attached Schedule) **SM7** intended to address? Would it result in an effective and justified policy position on this matter?

Issue (ii) Does the Plan promote sustainable transport in a manner consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

Questions:

1. Do the policies provide an effective basis for delivering the Plan's Strategic Objective 7 which seeks to minimize transportation and establish alternative infrastructure?
2. What soundness deficiencies do the transport aspects of suggested modification (see attached Schedule) **SM7** seek to address and would they do this in a justified and effective way?

Issue (iii) Would the Plan's policies be clear and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision-maker should react to proposals for development, and are their associated information or other requirements justified?

Questions:

1. Paragraph 21 of the Framework expects plans to make explicit which policies are strategic policies – would suggested modification **SM1** (see attached Schedule) achieve this?
2. Is it justified for the Plan to require a demonstration that *any* new development (of *any* scale) is necessary (per paragraphs 6.8, 6.12 and Policy JWP1(B)), and is this consistent with national policy (in particular 'Making effective use of land')?
3. Paragraph 6.4 includes a number of types non-waste use that facilitate the circular economy, and at paragraph 6.5 indicates that support would be provided for such uses should specific decisions be needed. Is the Plan clear and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision-maker should react to proposals for such uses? Would a more explicit link to Policy JWP1 (A) provide any necessary clarity?
4. References to supporting information and documents are included throughout the Plan, both in its policies and their reasoned justification. Are these included in the Boroughs' lists of local information requirements (per paragraph 45 of the Framework) and is the requested information relevant, necessary and material to the applications in question?
5. Following on from the question above:
 - a) Are paragraph 6.8's requirements for proposals to be accompanied by an assessment that shows why the service, e.g., housing provided by the development, is genuinely needed and cannot be met in a way that does not involve the demolition of new buildings and/or the construction of new ones justified? And is the scale of proposals that this requirement would be relevant to clear?
 - b) Is Policy JWP1's requirement for *all proposals* to provide a site waste management plan incorporating, as appropriate a pre-demolition audit justified?
 - c) Is the requirement for new development (not including minor household applications) to provide a Recycling and Waste Management Strategy justified? How are 'minor household applications' defined and is this approach effective?
 - d) Is the requirement for an Odour Impact Assessment as set out in paragraph 6.79 of the Plan justified, and is it clear what type of developments this would apply to?
 - e) What is the justification for a Waste Hierarchy Statement to accompany Energy from Waste, and non-inert landfill proposals?
6. What is the justification for the development threshold for the production of a Circular Economy Statement, which is lower than that set out in the London Plan?

-
7. Is Policy JWP1 and its reasoned justification consistent with the adopted development plans for the Boroughs in terms of the size thresholds for “development requiring certain arrangements for waste management” (per paragraph 6.16)? Is the Plan clear and unambiguous in these terms?
 8. Would it be clear and unambiguous to a decision-maker which elements of the documentation provided with planning applications would include the information requested in paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 of the Plan?
 9. Is Policy JWP2B consistent with paragraph 16 of the Framework which expects that plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, and that unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area should be avoided? How would the addition of the paragraph by way of suggested modification **SM5** (see attached Schedule) address any soundness shortcomings in these regards?
 10. Is the reasoned justification at paragraphs 6.59 and 6.71 consistent with the wording of Policy JWP2B insofar as development that would lead to loss of safeguarded wastewater sites is concerned?
 11. Suggested modification **SM5** (see attached Schedule) would see the inclusion of additional text relating to wastewater treatment facilities:
 - a) What soundness deficiencies are these changes expected to address?
 - b) If taken forward would it be clear and unambiguous to a decision-maker how to react to relevant development proposals given that the changes are included in the Plan’s reasoned justification rather than its policies?
 - c) Are the information requirements justified and would they be included in the Boroughs, lists of local information requirements?
 12. What is the justification for the radii around waste sites (set out in paragraph 6.75, 6.76 and 6.77) wherein proposals for non-waste uses would have to consider their amenity impacts?
 13. Is it clear to a decision-taker where the radii are measured from (for example the centres or edges of sites)?
 14. Are the relevant radii shown on policies maps?
 15. Is the Policy JWP4(A)(6) requirement for the provision of community benefits justified and consistent with the Framework’s requirements (at paragraph 58) relating to planning obligations?
 16. With regard to requirements to achieve BREEAM ‘Excellent’, are the criteria in Policy JWP4(A)(9) justified, effective and consistent with the Framework (particularly Chapter 14) and the ‘Climate Change’ PPG? Have the viability implications of this requirement been considered?
 17. Are Policy JWP4(B)’s requirements relating to local employment justified and effective?
 18. Does Policy JWP4(C) unnecessarily duplicate other regimes relating to development proposals and is its wording otherwise justified and effective?

-
19. Is the list of abbreviations contained in the Plan sufficiently comprehensive to ensure that policies would be clear and unambiguous (per paragraph 16 of the Framework)? In answering this question, the Boroughs are encouraged to undertake a review of acronyms included in the Plan including, but not limited to MBT, CLEUD, WTS, LSIS, LIL).

Issue (iv) does the Plan set out effective mechanisms for its implementation and monitoring?

Questions:

1. Are the Plan's monitoring arrangements set out in Appendix 1 clear as to how any agreements reached with other Boroughs (per paragraph 5.5 of the Plan) would be taken into account in assessments of available capacity over the Plan period?
2. Are the monitoring arrangements effective in terms of setting out the range of actions that may be required if targets or milestones are not met?
3. Are effective monitoring arrangements in place to assess the capacity effects of sites falling out of waste use by virtue of temporary permissions coming to an end or environmental permits being ceased or surrendered?

*****End of Matters, Issues and Questions*****

Schedule 1: The Boroughs' suggested changes that would constitute Main Modifications

Reference	Page nos.	Policy/paragraph	Proposed modification
SM1	59	Between 6.1 and 6.2 - new paragraph	<u>All policies within the East London Joint Waste Plan are identified as Strategic Policies, noting their importance in delivering cross-boundary waste management infrastructure.</u>
SM2	70	6.32	Additional sentence to be added to Paragraph 6.32: <u>Any revised London Plan definition of 'waste site' will be taken into account through a subsequent review of the ELJWP.</u>
SM3	75	JWP2 Clause C	Proposals for the management of HIC waste (LACW and C&I waste) which would result in waste management capacity exceeding that required to meet the London Plan apportionment for East London and any proposals for the management of other waste streams beyond those needed to meet Plan targets, will not be permitted unless they would:.....2. <u>result in an increase in the throughput of an existing waste management facility</u> and waste being dealt with further up the hierarchy (unless a life cycle assessment demonstrates that the method of management proposed is appropriate); and, 3. subject to criterion C2 above, increase the throughput of an existing waste management facility;
SM4	77	JWP2 Clause D	D. Subject to criterion C above, proposals for waste management uses, including changes to the operation and layout of safeguarded waste sites, will be permitted where it is demonstrated that:.... 4. The proposal will:....

			<p>iv. avoid creating an unacceptable due impact on the amenity associated with impact on existing permitted non-waste uses, or land allocated, or land with permission for non-waste uses that could conflict with the proposed waste management use; and,.....</p> <p>vi. for operations which generate bioaerosols (like composting), be situated at least 250m from sensitive receptors <u>or be fully contained within a building.</u></p> <p>5. In the following priority order, the proposal is situated:</p> <p>i. On a safeguarded existing waste site; or</p> <p>ii. where it is demonstrated that the use could not be located on an existing safeguarded waste site, in a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL), <u>including a safeguarded wharf</u>; or</p>
SM5	85 and 88	6.72 and 6.80	<p>Add new paragraph 6.72 to follow paragraph 6.71</p> <p><u>6.72 Applications resulting in the loss of wastewater treatment capacity will need to demonstrate they accord with relevant strategic objectives of the development plan and would not undermine the implementation of the AMP process.</u></p> <p>New paragraph to follow Para 6.80</p> <p><u>When considering sensitive development, such as residential uses, close to the Sewage Treatment Works, a technical assessment should be undertaken by the developer. The technical assessment should be undertaken in consultation with the responsible water and sewerage undertaker. The technical assessment should</u></p>

			<u>confirm that either: (a) there is no unacceptable amenity impact on future occupiers of the proposed development or; (b) the development can be conditioned and mitigated to ensure that any potential for unacceptable amenity impact is avoided.</u>
SM6	91	Policy JWP4	<p>A. Proposals for waste management and wastewater treatment development will only be permitted which have been designed to address the following during their construction and operation (including associated vehicle movements):....</p> <p><u>12. impacts to utility assets and infrastructure networks; and,</u></p> <p>132. measures to control and reduce vehicle impacts including:....</p>
SM7	93 and 94	6.95, 6.99, 6.100 and 6.101	<p>Add new paragraph to follow paragraph 6.95:</p> <p><u>The use of SuDS should take account of Environment Agency guidance, in particular Section G of the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection. Where infiltration SuDS are proposed in Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) for anything other than clean roof drainage, a hydrogeological risk assessment must be undertaken to ensure no unacceptable risk to groundwater sources.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>6.99 The Transport Assessment should illustrate <u>the following:</u></p> <p><u>i. accessibility to the site by all modes for the waste being delivered to and/or exiting the site; including the opportunities for the waste to be transported by water and rail; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. accessibility for persons accessing the site, such as staff</u></p>

			<p><u>and visitors, proposed measures to improve access or mitigate transport impacts using public transport, walking and cycling; and,</u></p> <p><u>iii. for the site as a whole,</u> the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site, impacts to the transport network, proposed measures to improve access or mitigate transport impacts using public transport, walking and cycling, as well as demonstrate compliance with other transport policies, including the London Plan (2021) Healthy Streets Approach. Applicants are recommended to discuss the potential transport implications of the development with the Boroughs' planning and transport teams, as well with relevant infrastructure providers such as Transport for London.</p> <p>...</p> <p>6.100 Proposals should reference the use of Direct Vision Lorries for waste vehicles or the use freight operators who can demonstrate their commitment to TfL's Freight Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) or similar.</p> <p>6.101 Transport for London's (TfL) Direct Vision Standard (DVS) for HGVs should be applied and freight operators should demonstrate their commitment to TfL's Freight Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) or similar. The DVS is intended to enhance road safety by ensuring that HGV drivers have better visibility, thereby reducing the risk of accidents involving vulnerable road users like pedestrians and cyclists. <u>All operators will be expected to achieve at least 4 out of 5 stars within the DVS standard.</u></p>
--	--	--	---