

Appendix 3: Summary of Regulation 19 Representations and Borough Responses

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
General					
Barbara Holland-Davies	2/001	<p>Wherever waste requires removal, its relocation should be allocated into specific places by a government or council-run department, ensuring there is no likelihood of fumes or leaks, and health & safety measures are observed. The unscrupulous dealers, builders or waste removal companies do not then have a scam to build on or lie about. The huge extra benefit of unsavoury characters losing their chance of taking a payment for removal of such waste, as it is dealt with free of charge by a proper department, will save police time, council enforcement officers' involvement, threats to honest workmen and fly tipping.</p> <p><i>Comment reference:</i></p>	No modification sought	<p>This relates to services and controls that sit outside the ELJWP.</p>	None
Eddie Dee	3/001	<p>No comment provided.</p> <p><i>Comment reference:</i></p>	No modification sought	No comment	None
Gary Pier	4/001	<p>Since the Gerpins lane site has implemented the van and trailer once a month booking scheme, it means more trips to dispose of garden waste, this is evident by the amount of waste dumped in the surrounding lanes / area. Does this plan make it easier for residents to dispose of unwanted house hold and garden waste?</p>	No modification sought	<p>This relates to services and controls that sit outside the ELJWP. No comment.</p>	None
Ann-Marie Ashton	24/001	No comment provided.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
Redbridge	37/001	I am not entirely sure who the consultation on the East London Joint Waste Plan is aimed at. However, a few observations as a resident	No modification sought	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The waste plan covers where waste is</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
resident		<p>concerned primarily with domestic waste management.</p> <p>The "video" presentations which introduce the consultation are extremely dry and do not help to describe the waste plan or bring any vision to life. I'm being polite here.</p> <p>I did not complete the survey as I did not feel qualified to comment on the relevant regulations.</p> <p>The Information I have seen reads like an attempt to undertake the minimum effort to ensure regulatory compliance. There is no sense of vision or innovation.</p> <p>We are facing an ever growing waste mountain so I would want to see how East London are planning to face up to this challenge and how this fits into a national plan. I would like to see the context for the compliance in terms of where waste will be processed, what types of material will be processed and how it will be processed? I would also like to know how waste created in East London is dealt with when it is exported out of the area to be dealt with (and in particular have assurance that none of it is exported).</p> <p>Waste is not generally created by the councils but by private businesses and domestic citizens. On that basis, the waste management plan should make clear how the council will engage with these parties with regard to waste management. The starting point is people knowing how to dispose of waste and present it for recycling. While the approach to recycling may not form part of the regulatory element of the plan, it most certainly needs to be part of the plan on a practical level. We are currently faced with a situation where: residents are not convinced of the need to separate</p>		<p>managed in each borough and includes the locations of all safeguarded waste sites in East London (appendix 2 starting at page 120). As well as waste site locations appendix 2 also indicates types of waste facilities and what materials they process. However, the key purposes of the waste plan is to provide policies for deciding planning applications and to ensure waste is managed in a sustainable manner, it is not a technical study of how waste is processed.</p> <p>With regards to fly-tipping this is a criminal offence and is enforced by each borough through their own enforcement/local waste teams and cannot be controlled through the waste plan. Each council has its way of reporting fly-tipping which can often rely to some extent on being alerted by local residents. You are advised to report fly-tipping to your local council wherever you see it. This is usually done online through the council's enforcement page on their website.</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>glass/plastic/metal from paper/card; find it easier to cart mattresses down the street to dump them than use free council collection services; and when presenting hard plastics at the council tip we are now told to dispose in the general rubbish section.</p> <p>As I said earlier, I am not qualified to comment on the regulations but if the council wishes citizens to engage (and comply) with the waste management plan it needs to be able to present both context and compelling vision.</p>			
Ian Macdonald	43/001	No comment made.	No modification sought	No comment	None
Sport England	5/001	Reference NPPF Section 8 and Sport England's Active Design Guidance. This response relates to Sport England's planning function only. Sport England encourages local authorities to base their Local Plans for sport and physical activity on up-to-date, robust evidence, such as playing pitch or sports facility strategies. Where evidence does not exist, a proportionate assessment of local sporting needs should be undertaken with community consultation. The guidance stresses the importance of designing new or improved facilities to be fit for purpose and recommends using Sport England's design and Active Design guidance, which outlines principles for promoting healthy, active communities through thoughtful development planning.	No modification sought	No comment	None
Thurrock	9/001	Policy JWP6 'Deposit of waste on land' has been amended following our suggestion that the policy text include confirmation of the need for ongoing liaison with neighbouring areas and monitoring regarding landfill of inert excavation	No modification sought	The East London Boroughs welcome ongoing engagement with Thurrock on waste matters. The East London Boroughs have been working on a Statement of Common ground with	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		waste and this is welcomed. As outlined at our recent meeting on 19th June, Thurrock are commissioning work that will update the waste evidence in relation to the development of the new Thurrock Local Plan and it is intended that this will provide an up-to-date position on waste capacity over the Plan period. At that point we will also be able to discuss our position on the capacity for Thurrock to accept and plan for waste movement across its boundaries and its capacity to accept external waste flows.		Thurrock since January 2025. The Duty to Cooperate Statement (submission version) gives full details of our cooperation and details our requests to agree a Statement of Common Ground before submission.	
London Borough of Lambeth	10/001	As part of the Regulation 18 consultation on the ELJWP, the London Borough of Lambeth confirmed that it did not need to request the ELJWP to accommodate any shortfall in waste capacity within our borough. This remains the case, and we have no additional comments to make on the Regulation 19 consultation.	No modification sought	No comment	None
Surrey County Council	13/001	No comment	No modification sought	No comment	None
Wakefield Council	22/001	We consider the plan to be sound and understand there is a surplus of capacity needed for the management of current and future waste arisings in East London. We note the Submission Plan states there may be scope for the development of additional capacity including the intensification of existing sites, to provide for management further up the waste hierarchy such as residual derived fuel waste. As mentioned in our response at the Regulation 18 stage, a significant amount of refuse derived fuel (RDF) waste has been exported to Wakefield from East London for final disposal at Ferrybridge 1 and 2.	No modification sought	Noted	None
NGET	17/003	National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) need to make changes to the network of	No modification sought	Noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		overhead lines, pylons, cables and other infrastructure that transports electricity around the country, so that everyone has access to clean electricity from these new renewable sources. The UK Government has committed to reach net zero emissions by 2050. NGET's infrastructure projects in England and Wales will support the country's energy transition and make sure the grid is ready to connect to more and more sources of low carbon electricity generated in Britain.			
NGET	17004	Please remember to consult NGET on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, NGET wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets.	No modification sought	Noted	None
London Gatwick	19/001	We have no aerodrome safeguarding concerns in relation to Gatwick Airport with regard to the ELJWP. Aerodrome safeguarding is the process used to ensure the safety of aircraft while taking off and landing or flying in the vicinity of aerodromes. This is to ensure that Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) that are utilised by Gatwick air traffic will not be impacted. Please consult on any proposed buildings or structures that will exceed 300m AGL, within the plan area.	No modification sought	Noted	None
Network Rail	20/001	Network Rail have previously responded to the Regulation 18 draft and our comments remain the same at this stage.	No modification sought	Noted	None
National Highways	21/002	We would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as a result of planned growth in waste capacity without careful consideration of mitigation measures.	No modification sought	Noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
National Highways	21/003	Although individual sites might not have a significant impact, cumulatively, developments have the potential to impact road safety and the operation of the SRN. The transportation of waste has the potential to generate a significant number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) trips, a large proportion of which are likely to use the SRN. In particular, we would be concerned with an increase in slow moving HGVs causing queuing at on-slips when accessing the SRN.	No modification sought	Noted	None
National Highways	21/006	Based on our review of the Submission Plan, we are satisfied that the ELJWP would not affect the safety, reliability and/or operation of the SRN (based the tests set out in DfT Circular 01/2022 and MHCLG NPPF 2024 [particularly paras 109 to 115]).	No modification sought	Support noted	None
Canal & River Trust	31/002	Within the plan boundary, the Trust own and manage the River Lee Navigation, the Bow Back Rivers (Waterworks River, City Mill River, St Thomas Creek, The Prescott Channel, and part of the Old River Lea), as well as being Navigation Authority for Bow Creek. In accordance with London Plan Policy SI 15, the Trust would support the use of waterborne freight to and from the waste sites identified adjacent to Bow Creek, subject to appropriate assessment of each proposal, to be considered on its merits. A previous study on London's waterways demonstrated the benefits of moving waste by water	No modification sought	Support noted. Policy JWP2 sets out the plan's support for waste management uses having good access to railheads and wharves and that utilise non road modes of transportation. Where this is not practicable, proposals are required to demonstrate why this is the case.	None
LBTH	30/003	The plan should explicitly include the capacity and apportionment it is planning for. As the ELJWP must offer capacity to boroughs that have a need before proposing release of safeguarded sites, assistance that can be offered to other boroughs should be included within the plan. Statements of Common Ground	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		are not considered an effective mechanism for securing this assistance.		<p>Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>Any agreements are to be formalised through a Statement of Common Ground. This approach is effective and allows for capacity sharing agreements to be agreed through the lifetime of the plan, recognising each waste planning authority is at different stages of plan preparation. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities. Formalising a single capacity sharing agreement through the wording of the plan would undermine this flexibility and</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>effectiveness of the approach and may compromise east London's future ability to contribute towards London's net self-sufficiency aims.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". This approach allows for flexibility in allowing capacity sharing agreements at different points of the plan's lifecycle, while ensuring borough's planning to utilise east London's surplus capacity optimise sustainable management capacity within their boundaries. A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'. [The GLA agree that signed Statements of Common Ground are an acceptable way to demonstrate capacity sharing agreements.]</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets are the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how east London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency. While the Greater London Authority have highlighted the need to adhere to this supporting text in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation, they have also not raised a general conformity objection to this policy approach.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not current consider that Tower Hamlets have adequately</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/004	<p>LBTH is requesting a transfer of 34,370 tonnes per annum (tpa) of Household, Commercial and Industrial (HIC) waste capacity and 56,953tpa of Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste capacity. Given their large surplus waste capacity, it must be considered practical for them to meet LBTH's unmet waste capacity needs. This point is addressed in more detail in the Capacity and Apportionment section of this response. The NPPF sets out four tests of soundness against which development plan documents should be assessed: Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/005	<p>The Plan does not meet the NPPF positively prepared test – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other Housing & Regeneration authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>Given their large surplus waste capacity, it must be considered practical for them to meet LBTH's unmet waste capacity needs.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
LBTH	30/006	Plan does not meet 'justified' test. The Integrated Impact Assessment fails to appropriately test an alternative scenario in which the ELJWP safeguards waste capacity specifically for neighbouring authorities facing a shortfall. The evidence also does not recognise the existing waste flows from LBTH to the ELJWP area and vice versa this point is addressed in more detail in the Evidence section of this response.	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is justified.</p> <p>We do not consider assessing inclusion of a waste sharing agreement with London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) in Policy JWP2 is a reasonable alternative that needs to be assessed in the IIA. The plan already includes provisions to assess requests to share capacity under paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12, which seek to positively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>To inform the process of sharing east London's surplus management capacity, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'.</p> <p>As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH are the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through Duty to Cooperate discussions.</p> <p>We also consider that the alternative suggested by LBTH would not require the alteration of any of the policy requirements currently included in the plan.</p> <p>The Waste Management Topic Paper that supports the Submission ELJWP sets out strategically significant flows from east London to other Waste Planning Authorities. The full methodology for identifying flows that might be strategic is set out in Identification of Strategically Significant Cross Boundary Waste Movements paper that supports the plan. It is noted there is no single established methodology for identifying strategically significant cross boundary waste movements, and so the evidence base adopts a proportionate and justified approach to undertaking Duty to Cooperate engagement. Using this methodology, it is identified that there are not strategically significant</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>flows from east London to LBTH. Notwithstanding this, we will continue to engage in Duty to Cooperate discussions with LBTH, noting their geographical proximity as a neighbouring borough and their request to share east London's surplus management capacity.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/007	<p>While LBTH clearly set out its capacity shortfall in our response to the Regulation 18 consultation on the ELJWP, the ELJWPG has deferred action on this matter and has not addressed it in their proposed submission ELJWP.</p> <p>The ELJWP does not meet the Effective test – deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground.</p>	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>Any agreements are to be formalised through a Statement of Common Ground. This approach is effective and allows for capacity sharing agreements to be agreed through the lifetime of the plan, recognising each waste planning authority is at different stages of plan preparation. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities. Formalising a single capacity sharing agreement through the wording of the plan would undermine this flexibility and effectiveness of the approach and may compromise east London's future ability to contribute towards London's net self-sufficiency aims.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not current consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/008	<p>THE ELJWP does not meet the Consistent with national policy test – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.</p> <p>Paragraph 33 of the NPPF expects development plan documents to be informed by a Sustainability Appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements. The IIA published as part of this consultation does not assess the reasonable alternative of safeguarding waste capacity for neighbouring authorities facing a shortfall; more detail on this point can be found in the Integrated Impact Assessment section of this response. Paragraph 22 of the NPPF expects strategic policies to look ahead and anticipate and respond to long term requirements. LBTH has set out its requirement in terms of waste management capacity and the ELJWP has not responded to that requirement.</p> <p>In addition to the requirement to be consistent with national policies, Section 24(1)(b) of the</p>	No modification sought	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission East London Joint Waste Plan is justified.</p> <p>We do not consider assessing inclusion of a waste sharing agreement with Tower Hamlets in Policy JWP2 is a reasonable alternative that needs to be assessed in the IIA. The plan already includes provisions to assess requests to share capacity under paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12, which seek to positively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>To inform the process of sharing east London's surplus management capacity, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires development plan documents within London to be in conformity with the London Plan. Paragraph 9.8.6 of the London Plan states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release.</p>		<p>surplus capacity requests). This methodology seeks to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'. [The GLA also agree that signed Statements of Common Ground are an acceptable way to demonstrate capacity sharing agreements.]</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets are the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how east London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency. While the Greater London Authority have highlighted the need to adhere to this supporting text in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation, they have also not raised a general conformity objection to this policy approach.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that Tower Hamlets have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>We also consider that the alternative suggested by Tower Hamlets would not require the alteration of any of the policy requirements currently included in the plan.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/009; 30/013	Objections that LBTH raised in its response to the ELJWP Regulation 18 consultation have not been included in the Consultation Statement. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether these objections were considered in drafting the Regulation 19 plan. It is also important to note that the objections that LBTH raised in its response to the ELJWP Regulation 18 consultation (attached to this response at Appendix 2) have not been included in the Consultation Statement. This has made the process of responding to the regulation 19 consultation on the ELJWP particularly challenging.	No modification sought	Comment noted. Ongoing discussions around the sharing of capacity have taken place throughout the preparation of the ELJWP, as demonstrated through the Duty to Cooperate Statement. We have also set out how the LBTH Regulation 18 representations have been considered through the Regulation 22 statement.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
LBTH	30/011	<p>We have completed a first Regulation 19 consultation (in 2024) and are preparing to carry out a second Regulation 19 consultation focused only on several policies, one of which is RW1 – Managing our waste, which sets out the borough's waste apportionment and capacity, and safeguards sites for waste. The adopted London Plan (at paragraph 9.8.6) expects boroughs with surplus waste management capacity to share this capacity with boroughs that are unable to meet their waste management needs within their boundaries, before considering releasing sites from safeguarding. Waste planning is also governed by legislation: the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) was incorporated into UK law via the Waste (Circular Economy) (Amendment) Regulations 2020.</p>	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>Comment noted. The East London Boroughs have submitted a formal response to policy RW1 as part of the Tower Hamlets Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Focused Consultation.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p>	None
LBTH	30/012	<p>Our 2024 Waste Study Update included untested strategies to find waste capacity within the borough, including the use of On-site Segregation Facilities. Given the lack of certainty regarding the sharing of waste capacity from the ELJWPG and other neighbouring waste planning authorities, LBTH sought to plan for waste self-sufficiency. Given the relatively small volume of waste capacity that we are requesting and the very high level of</p>	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>Comment noted. Discussions with the LBTH around meeting their unmet needs are ongoing as part of the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>To inform the process of sharing east London's surplus management capacity, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		surplus capacity within the ELJWPG, our initial response to the criteria was proportionate.		<p>(Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology seeks to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.	
LBTH	30/015	<p>The Regulation 19 consultation includes a Waste Topic Paper summarising evidence for the ELJWP, detailing cross-boundary waste movements and identifying 16 key facilities receiving significant waste from the ELJWPG in 2022. However, the paper does not note facilities within the ELJWPG that receive substantial waste from other authorities. LBTH's Waste Data Study (2023) highlights two Newham sites handling large volumes of HIC waste from Tower Hamlets, and also reveals that Havering, Newham, and Barking & Dagenham receive considerable C&D waste from Tower Hamlets. Additionally, Northumberland Wharf Transfer Station in Tower Hamlets takes significant HIC waste from the ELJWPG.</p> <p>The Waste Topic Paper omits LBTH's formal request for waste capacity sharing and its discussions about joining the ELJWPG. As a result, the evidence base is considered inadequate and disproportionate due to these omissions.</p>	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is justified. The Waste Management Topic Paper that supports the Submission ELJWP sets out strategically significant flows from east London to other Waste Planning Authorities.</p> <p>The full methodology for identifying flows that might be strategic is set out in Identification of Strategically Significant Cross Boundary Waste Movements paper that supports the plan. It is noted there is no single established methodology for identifying strategically significant cross boundary waste movements, and so the evidence base adopts a proportionate and justified approach to undertaking Duty to Cooperate engagement. Using this methodology, it is identified that there are not strategically significant flows from east London to Tower Hamlets. Notwithstanding this, we will continue to engage in Duty to Cooperate discussions with LBTH, noting their geographical proximity as a neighbouring borough and their request to share east London's surplus management capacity.</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.	
LBTH	30/022	<p>Following discussions with the GLA and the Environment Agency, LBTH removed the majority of the capacity in exempt sites from its overall waste management capacity, which increased the shortfall in HIC waste management capacity to 34,370tpa.</p> <p>LBTH seeks to continue collaborative efforts with neighbouring boroughs on waste management. To meet its waste requirements, the borough requests the transfer of specific waste capacities under London Plan Policy SI8: 34,370 tonnes per annum (tpa) of HIC waste and 56,935 tpa of C, D & E waste. The capacity could be sourced from the ELJWPG collectively or from individual boroughs, with a preference for HIC capacity to come from LB Barking & Dagenham. LBTH recommends that safeguarding these capacities be explicitly included in the ELJWP. In the case of the HIC waste capacity, it may be preferable to transfer the capacity from LB Barking & Dagenham to reflect the transfer of capacity from the Hepscott Road site to the River Road site. As all parties review their local plans, ongoing cooperation and engagement with the GLA are emphasised as crucial to ensure sustainable and effective waste planning at this pivotal time.</p>	<p>The safeguarding of capacity to meet LBTH's needs should be clearly set out in section 4 of the ELJWP, in an additional clause in Policy JWP2, or in an additional policy that establishes the ELJWPG's approach to sharing capacity.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Discussions with the LBTH around meeting their unmet needs are ongoing as part of the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>Comments relating to each of the concerns raised by LBTH are responded fully to in response to each individual point raised above.</p>	None
LBTH	30/023	LBTH began discussions with the East London Joint Waste Planning Group (ELJWPG) in 2023, seeking either to join the group or to transfer some of its waste apportionment, as required by the London Plan, due to a shortfall in the borough's own waste capacity. LBTH is the only London borough not currently in any waste	As above	<p>Comment noted. Discussions with the LBTH around meeting their unmet needs are ongoing as part of the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>To inform the process of sharing East London's surplus management</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>planning group, and geographically, ELJWPG is the most suitable. However, ELJWPG advised that admitting a new borough would delay the development of their new waste plan, so membership was not possible at that time. LBTH requested information on potential future membership, but did not receive a response. ELJWPG indicated they might be open to transferring some excess waste capacity to Tower Hamlets if it could be demonstrated that Tower Hamlets could not meet its own apportionment. This approach was supported by the Greater London Authority (GLA), who advised LBTH to seek surplus capacity from other boroughs, given the ELJWPG's substantial demonstrated surplus.</p> <p>During the Regulation 18 consultation in October 2024, LBTH calculated its need as 26,363 tonnes per annum (tpa) of Household, Industrial, and Commercial (HIC) waste capacity. After further consultation with the GLA and Environment Agency and the removal of most exempt site capacity from calculations, the identified shortfall increased to 34,370 tpa of HIC waste. The borough's request for Construction & Demolition (C&D) waste management capacity remained at 56,953 tpa. From late 2024 to early 2025, LBTH and ELJWPG discussed the process for agreeing a capacity transfer. ELJWPG said an agreement would be made via a Statement of Common Ground and that formal submission would need to meet specified criteria. These criteria were supposed to be included in the Regulation 19 draft of the waste plan, but were not. The process was justified by ELJWPG officers due to multiple requests from boroughs to share</p>		<p>capacity, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology seeks to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of East London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>capacity, although the Duty to Cooperate Statement for the Regulation 19 consultation suggested only LBTH had formally requested assistance.</p> <p>In March 2025, LBTH made a formal request to ELJWPG for a capacity transfer, addressing all pre-circulated criteria. In April 2025, ELJWPG responded that LBTH had not provided sufficient evidence to prove a real shortfall and justify assistance. LBTH, however, maintains that its request is reasonable and proportionate given the relatively modest capacity needed and the large surplus available, and has submitted further responses to address ELJWPG's concerns.</p>		<p>matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/024	<p>The owner of the LLDC site (McGrath) was also the owner of the site in Barking and Dagenham (River Road) and demonstrated that there was spare capacity within the River Road site to accommodate all of the waste processing from the LLDC site. Given the lack of available locations in the borough for new waste facilities, the Waste Data Study recommended that LBTH approach neighbouring waste authorities to request that some of their excess capacity be transferred to LBTH to help meet its apportionment, as set out in the adopted London Plan (2021). LBTH' Waste Data Study recommended that this lost capacity – 26,353tpa - be 'transferred' back to Tower Hamlets to help meet its apportionment, meaning that it would be specifically safeguarded within the ELJWP to process waste from Tower Hamlets.</p>	As above	<p>Comment noted. Discussions with the LBTH around meeting their unmet needs are ongoing as part of the Duty to Cooperate process.</p> <p>To inform the process of sharing East London's surplus management capacity, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology seeks to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of East London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>Regarding River Road, it is noted that this transfer of capacity would be allowed under the London Plan policy S19, which does not expressly require this transfer of capacity to be formalised through the waste plan-making process.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
LBTH	30/025	The 2024 Regulation 19 version of LBTH's local plan included a policy (RW1) that aimed for self-sufficiency in waste management within the borough, based on the Waste Study Update (2024). However, during the consultation in Autumn/Winter 2024, objections were raised by the GLA and EA regarding the inclusion of OSFs and exempt sites in the borough's waste capacity calculations, and they encouraged collaboration with neighbouring authorities. The ELJWPG also highlighted inconsistencies in LBTH's approach. As a result, LBTH is conducting a second Regulation 19 consultation in Summer 2025, focusing on three policies including a revised RW1. The updated policy removes OSFs and areas of search, reduces reliance on exempt sites, and acknowledges the need to work with neighbouring authorities to meet waste requirements, reflecting discussions with the GLA, EA, and ELJWPG.	As above	Comment noted. The East London Boroughs have submitted a formal response to this policy as part of the Tower Hamlets Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Focused Consultation. Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.	None
LBTH	30/026	Appendix 2: LBTH Response to ELJWP Regulation 18 Consultation attached to the response	As above	Comment noted. Ongoing discussions around the sharing of capacity have taken place throughout the preparation of the ELJWP, as demonstrated through the Duty to Cooperate Statement. We have also set out how the LBTH Regulation 18 representations have been considered through the Regulation 22 statement.	None
LBTH	30/027	Appendix 3: Revised Policy RW1 attached to the response	As above	Comment noted. The East London Boroughs have submitted a formal	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>response to this policy as part of the Tower Hamlets Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Focused Consultation.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p>	
LBTH	30/028	Appendix 4: Waste Topic Paper June 2025 attached	As above	<p>Comment noted. The East London Boroughs have submitted a formal response to this policy as part of the LBTH Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) Focused Consultation.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.	
Canal & River Trust	13/001	Waterways are historic, natural and cultural assets which form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a statutory consultee in the Development Management process, and as such we welcome the opportunity to input into planning policy related matters to ensure that our waterways are protected, safeguarded and enhanced within an appropriate policy framework. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time.	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None
Oxfordshire County Council	32/002	We note that there is an estimated 2,619,508tpa waste management capacity in East London, which is anticipated to provide sufficient capacity for the London Plan apportioned forecast arisings for the Plan period (2041), however it is considered that there is insufficient information on how East London will meet future landfill and hazardous waste requirements. The	No modification sought	Comment noted. Responses to the concerns raised by Oxfordshire County Council are provided below in relation to each individual issue raised.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		ELJWP does not include any allocated sites for waste facilities.			
MMO	34/001	Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure the necessary considerations are included. The South East Marine Plan (adopted June 2021 alongside the North East, North West, and South West), is of relevance. The plan was published for public consultation on 14th January 2020, at which point it became material for consideration.	Consider adding reference to South East Marine Plan.	Comment noted.	None
MMO	34/002	All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and any relevant adopted Marine Plan, in this case the South East Marine Plan, or the UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS) unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance, Explore Marine Plans and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.	Consider adding reference to MMO guidance	Comment noted	None
MMO	34/003	Specific Comments a) The inspector may seek reference to the South East Marine Plan which the relevant authorities for the ELJWP sit within. We would also recommend you consult the following references for further information: South East Marine Plan and Explore Marine Plans. b) These are recommendations and we suggest that your own interpretation of the South East Marine Plan is completed. We would also recommend you consult the following references for further information: South East Marine Plan and Explore Marine Plans	Add reference to MMO guidance	Specific Comments - a) Comment noted. b) Comment noted The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. These are not considered necessary for soundness. However, the East London boroughs support the understanding the reasons for the proposal and consider their inclusion could improve the delivery of the Joint Waste Plan's overall objectives. Therefore, if they are further	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.	
Natural England	36/001	<p>Previous Regulation 18 comments have been considered and that the main objectives of the East London Joint Waste Plan remain unchanged, so there are currently no concerns about the plan's soundness. The plan is viewed as positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy. The inclusion of the document explaining the release of four safeguarded sites is welcomed, as the rationale aligns with the London Plan and promotes optimal use of the remaining sites.</p> <p>Encouragement is given for moving waste up the hierarchy to reduce landfill. The proposed future uses for the released sites are not expected to impact Epping Forest SAC and are anticipated to enhance their local areas. The recognition of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy in the plan's vision and objectives is also supported.</p> <p>Further general advice on the consideration of protected species and other natural environment issues is provided at Annex A. Annex 1 - Natural England's Local Plan Advice.</p>	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
Transport for London (TfL)	44/001	Modifications in the Proposed Submission Plan address previous concerns raised by TfL at the Regulation 18 stage	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
CHAPTER 2 – The Context					
EA	35/009	Strengthening the Plan to explicitly recognise tidal flood risk and the TE2100 Plan's strategic implications is essential to ensure that East London's waste infrastructure supports, rather	Strong recommendation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating policy text referencing the 	The East London borough's objective for this policy approach involves addressing and mitigating against climate change and including policy	Insert text to paragraph 2.32: The effects of

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>than hinders, the long-term resilience of the Thames Estuary.</p> <p>Embedding tidal flood risk and strategic adaptation into site assessments and policy criteria is required.</p> <p>Underrepresentation of Tidal Flood Risk Section 2.32 (Page 23) identifies fluvial and surface water flooding but does not meaningfully acknowledge tidal flood risk, which is a major concern for riverside boroughs.</p>	<p>TE2100 Plan and supporting its objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding flood defence infrastructure and ensuring compatibility with future defence raising. • Aligning with the Joint Thames Strategy (Thames Strategy East) and riverside strategy approaches. • Embedding tidal flood risk and strategic adaptation into site assessments and policy criteria. 	<p>measures towards mitigating flood risk. This includes policy criteria for the design of waste management facilities (Policy JWP4), which state that development will only be permitted where it is designed to address climate adaptation measures, such as sustainable drainage systems, flood resistance and resilience, water storage and recycling, open space design, green roofs and drought-resistant landscaping. The Plan also recognises that fluvial and surface water flooding poses the most significant risk to the plan area, particularly in areas in close proximity to the River Thames (paragraph 2.32). As part of the supporting text for Policy JWP4: 'Design of Waste Management and Waste Water Treatment Facilities' the Plan also highlights that proposals in areas prone to flooding, as shown by Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, are required to produce a site specific flood risk assessment. Also, at paragraph 6.118 of the Plan the supporting text for Policy JWP6: 'Deposit of Waste on Land' states that some inert waste (mainly excavation waste e.g. soils and subsoils) is of a nature that lends itself for use in engineering operations such as... flood defences and site restoration. The policy itself also includes criteria to support this aim by permitting the permanent deposit of inert waste where it demonstrates that the waste is deposited for beneficial</p>	<p>climate change in the ELJWP area are likely to result in extreme weather events becoming more common and more intense. Flood risk is of particular significance in this regard, alongside heatwaves and drought. Fluvial and surface water flooding poses the most significant risk to the plan area, particularly in areas in close proximity to the River Thames. There is also risk of tidal flooding within the Thames Estuary 2100 (TE2100) Barking and Dagenham and Royal Docks Policy Unit Boundaries, the objectives of the TE2100 Plan and Joint Thames Strategy (Thames Strategy East) and riverside</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>purposes or for use in engineering operations.</p> <p>Whilst the Plan does not reference TE2100 it does acknowledge the real risk of fluvial flooding in recognition of the proximity of East London waste sites to the River Thames. Tidal flooding is not mentioned but the risks identified in the Plan are based on the awareness of the Joint Thames Strategy Refresh (JTSR)/Thames Estuary 2001 Plan, which engages all London boroughs, and who are working with the EA on flood defences and local riverside improvements. East London boroughs are aware that they sit within the TE2100 Barking and Dagenham and Royal Docks Policy Unit Boundaries, where the identified areas at risk include new and established residential areas, major industrial areas, extensive and established residential and industrial areas, 3 Royal Docks, schools, care homes, underground stations, utilities, emergency services, and London City Airport. These areas are at risk to fluvial and tidal flooding from the River Roding and the Thames River; fluvial flooding from local watercourses; surface water flooding from urban drainage sources, or a combination of these.</p> <p>As stated above the Plan also includes policy measures for such areas that</p>	<p>strategy approaches will be a consideration when assessing planning applications.</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>might be prone to flooding, such as requiring site specific flood risk assessments, and the use of inert waste in engineering operations that act as flood defence mitigation. The Plan's policy commitment to flood mitigation was previously identified and supported by the Environment Agency when responding to the Regulation 18 consultation for the waste plan during 2024, with their response stating 'We agree and support the commitment to ensure that specific sites and policies will mitigate against flood risk in line with National Planning requirements, the London Plan and the Thames Estuary 2100 Plan.'</p> <p>However, the East London boroughs recognise the importance of ensuring the Plan is Positively Prepared - in this case meaning that the Plan applies a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and promotes a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to improve the environment, mitigate climate change and adapt to its effects, and therefore proposes the following wording change for the Inspector's consideration:</p>	
EA	35/002	<p>The Plan acknowledges the presence of water bodies under the Water Framework Directive (WFD), but lacks a direct policy addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the ELJWP might risk further deterioration of these water bodies. 	<p>New paragraph to be inserted as para. 2.24 "Under regulation 33 of the Water Framework</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness.</p>	<p>New paragraph to be inserted as para. 2.24 <u>"Under regulation 33 of the Water</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How such risks could be mitigated. • How the Plan could actively contribute to improving water body status. <p>We strongly recommend the inclusion of a dedicated policy or a strengthened cross-reference within existing policies to address these issues. This should include: a clear commitment to avoid deterioration of WFD water bodies; requirements for developments to assess and mitigate impacts on water quality; opportunities for waste infrastructure to contribute to WFD enhancement objectives, such as through improved drainage, pollution control, or habitat restoration. To support this, we recommend inserting a new paragraph (2.24).</p>	<p>Directive (WFD), the Boroughs have a legal responsibility to have regard for the Thames River Basin Management Plan, which in turn has a legal responsibility to ensure that there is no deterioration in the ecological status of any RBMP water body or of its associated elements. The Boroughs therefore have a legal responsibility to avoid the deterioration of RBMP water bodies and their associated elements, and to support their enhancement objectives and measures. These Borough responsibilities are reinforced by the London Plan Policy SI 5 D1 (page 356)."</p> <p>The Plan should also consider the potential impacts of uncontrolled airborne particles, leachate,</p>	<p>However, the East London boroughs support and understand the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the Plan's overall objective of making waste management in East London more sustainable. Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p>	<p><u>Framework Directive (WFD), the Boroughs have a legal responsibility to have regard for the Thames River Basin Management Plan, which in turn has a legal responsibility to ensure that there is no deterioration in the ecological status of any RBMP water body or of its associated elements. The Boroughs therefore have a legal responsibility to avoid the deterioration of RBMP water bodies and their associated elements, and to support their enhancement objectives and measures. These Borough responsibilities are reinforced by the London Plan</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			and surface water runoff on nearby watercourses and their WFD status.		Policy SI 5 D1 (page 356)."
EA	35/005	<p>We support the Plan's recognition of biodiversity but recommend stronger integration of aquatic systems and river corridors as ecological networks.</p> <p>To strengthen paragraph 2.10, we suggest an amendment</p> <p>Section 6.96–6.97 (Page 93) discusses the integration of biodiversity measures into new buildings. While we support this approach, we recommend expanding paragraph 6.97 to include specific measures for enhancing riparian and aquatic biodiversity, particularly where development is proposed near watercourses.</p> <p>These additions would ensure that the Plan more comprehensively addresses the ecological value of aquatic systems and the need for their protection and enhancement in the context of waste infrastructure development.</p>	<p>Suggested amendment to para. 2.10. "As well as green spaces, river systems run through each borough and function as crucial networks for ecological connectivity and biodiversity. Many waterbodies across the catchment are designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, and SSSIs. As rivers provide critical habitat and migration paths for multiple species, these aquatic systems are crucial to support. There is a need for continued preservation and long-term management of both green and blue areas within the Plan area,</p>	<p>Suggested amendment to para. 2.10 Comment noted.</p> <p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness. However the East London boroughs support and understand the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the Plan's overall objective of making waste management in East London more sustainable. Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to paragraph 6.97:</p> <p>The ELJWPG do not consider that it is feasible for developers to increase BNG in water bodies/courses beyond their land ownership. We also consider that the proposed measures are not appropriate for the waste plan and would be considerations for criteria within borough local plans.</p>	<p>New paragraph to follow para. 2.10: <u>As well as green spaces, river systems run through each borough and function as crucial networks for ecological connectivity and biodiversity. Many waterbodies across the catchment are designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, and SSSIs. As rivers provide critical habitat and migration paths for multiple species, these aquatic systems are crucial to support. There is</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>as well as consideration of potential effects on sites outside the Plan area boundary.”</p> <p>Suggested amendment to paragraph 6.97:</p> <p>“Measures to enhance biodiversity should be integrated into new buildings, e.g. biodiverse roofs, swift bricks or boxes, green walls and contribute to the achievement of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for London. If site boundaries fall within 10m from the top of a river bank, an uplift in BNG watercourse units should also be achieved.</p> <p>Improvements to the riparian zone include additional native aquatic planting and removing hard engineering from waterbodies.</p> <p>Depending on the location in relation to protected habitats,</p>		<p><u>a need for continued preservation and long-term management of both green and blue areas within the Plan area, as well as consideration of potential effects on sites outside the Plan area boundary.</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			and the nature of the proposal, a Habitats Regulation Assessment will need to be submitted. Baseline ecological surveying in the form of an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required to assess the risk of any new sites proposed.”		
Anglian Water	7/001	We welcome the reference to Anglian Water in terms of wastewater treatment for our Upminster water recycling centre (WRC) in Havering. We are currently working on producing the next DWMP for 2030-2055 which will be published in 2028. Anglian Water's DWMP growth demand forecast model is designed to produce growth forecasts in alignment with our Water Resources Management Plan 2025-2050 and the Water Resources East regional plan water forecasting processes.	Minor addition to wording suggested - The paragraph could explain that each Water and Sewerage Company (WaSC) has to prepare a Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) which utilises robust future forecasts of both housing and population growth in their respective regions, using the best available planning information.	The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.	None
CHAPTER 3 – Vision and Objectives					

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
National Highways	21/004	We support Strategic Objective 7 and Policy JWP2 of the ELJWP which aim to minimise the transportation of waste and improve road safety by locating facilities as close as possible to their sources and establishing alternative transport means, including utilising the River Thames and railheads. As well as supporting proposals that promote alternatives to road-based transport, we also look to site operators to investigate opportunities to further minimise potential impacts to the SRN, this could be through construction and operational management plans to support individual proposals.	No modification sought	Noted	None
PLA	26/001	The PLA supports both the Vision and Objective 7 as they recognise the important role of River Thames and the safeguarded infrastructure in providing the opportunity for sustainable and safe methods of transport. They are also in line with London Plan policy SI15 which encourages the use of the River to transport freight of all kinds.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
Essex County Council (minerals and waste planning authority)	40/001	Whilst it is noted that the Vision still makes reference to 'releasing underutilised or poorly located sites', which in principle is a sound policy approach, this cannot be to the detriment of sustainable waste management as a whole, particularly where this would increase waste miles or reduce net self-sufficiency. It is however considered that the provisions of Policy JWP2 Section B adequately place this planning principle in its appropriate context.	No modification sought	Comment noted	
Anglian Water	7/002	Anglian Water's Circular Economy Delivery team focuses on redefining our waste streams to view them as opportunities to recycle, sell, or reuse wherever possible. As a water and sewerage undertaker, our role is essentially linked to the water cycle and the circular	No modification sought	Support noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		economy is a fundamental element of how we can most efficiently and effectively treat and manage waste whilst delivering on our purpose to bring environmental and social prosperity to the region. We support the circular economy, as getting to net zero is highly reliant on a sustainable, low-carbon approach to treating and recycling our sludge through our bioresources activities.			
	CHAPTER 4 – Future Requirements for Waste Management Capacity				
Oxfordshire County Council	32/005	The ELJWP does not allocate land for additional waste management facilities, however all existing waste sites are safeguarded from non-waste development with the exception of four sites to support the wider development aims of the Boroughs. The ELJWP also identifies further sites which may be suitable for release through allocation for development in Local Plans and it is noted that compensatory capacity will need to be safeguarded to enable this release.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
EA	35/006	We note the projected shortfall of approximately 18,400 tonnes per annum (tpa) of hazardous waste capacity by 2041. While the Plan states that there is no borough-level self-sufficiency requirement and no new capacity is proposed, we are concerned that this approach, if adopted across London, could result in a lack of strategic planning for hazardous waste. London has not had a new hazardous waste strategy in over a decade, and the issue of contaminated land also requires renewed attention.	No modification sought	Comment noted.	
LBTH	30/016	Section 4 of the Proposed Submission ELJWP details the waste capacity needs and provisions for the ELJWPG area. The total waste	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>management apportionment required by 2041 is 1,497,000 tonnes per annum (tpa), while the overall available capacity is 2,619,508 tpa, resulting in a surplus of 1,122,508 tpa—a slight increase from the Regulation 18 version. Even accounting for a potential loss of Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) capacity after 2027, there remains a surplus of 680,000 tpa in HIC waste capacity by 2041. For Construction, Demolition & Excavation (C,D&E) waste, the ELJWP safeguards 3,185,500 tpa for 2041, with a surplus of 980,000 tpa.</p> <p>The London Plan (Policy SI8, para 9.8.6) requires boroughs with surplus capacity to offer it to those with shortfalls before releasing safeguarded sites, advocating for formal agreements within main planning documents. The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 reinforce the 'proximity principle', stipulating waste be managed at the nearest appropriate facility. The ELJWP's approach involves inviting neighbouring boroughs to request capacity and formalising any sharing through a Statement of Common Ground, though the criteria shared with LBTH on 28 January 2025 are not included in the ELJWP. There is concern that such statements are inadequate if safeguarded sites are being released, as formal capacity allocations should be included directly in the ELJWP.</p> <p>LB Tower Hamlets (LBTH) has requested a transfer of 34,370 tpa of HIC and 56,935 tpa of C&D waste capacity to meet its apportionment, citing a lack of industrial land for waste management and a need to prioritise logistics</p>		<p>paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>Any agreements are to be formalised through a Statement of Common Ground. This approach is effective and allows for capacity sharing agreements to be agreed through the lifetime of the plan, recognising each waste planning authority is at different stages of plan preparation. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>and manufacturing uses. Despite the ELJWPG's surplus, agreement has not been reached, and safeguarded sites are still proposed for release. LBTH's Employment Land Review highlights the critical shortage of industrial land, with the London Plan emphasising the protection of such land. The ELJWPG suggests LBTH use 'areas of search', but this conflicts with industrial land needs.</p> <p>Several safeguarded sites in LB Newham already process significant volumes of Tower Hamlets' waste, including Unit J Prologis Park (14,263 tpa), Canning Town Depot (4,800 tpa), Marshgate Sidings (S Walsh & Son: 6,781 tpa; DB Cargo: 166,577 tpa uncoded), Knights Road (2,993 tpa), 9a Cody Business Centre (56,853 tpa uncoded), and Stephenson Street (53,747 tpa uncoded). The formal safeguarding of these sites in the ELJWP is recommended to meet Tower Hamlets' needs, as collectively they can accommodate the borough's shortfall, even if precise capacities for uncoded waste are unclear.</p>		<p>opportunities. Formalising a single capacity sharing agreement through the wording of the plan would undermine this flexibility and effectiveness of the approach and may compromise east London's future ability to contribute towards London's net self-sufficiency aims.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". This approach allows for flexibility in allowing capacity sharing agreements at different points of the plan's lifecycle, while ensuring borough's planning to utilise east London's surplus capacity optimise sustainable management capacity within their boundaries. A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'.</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH is the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how east London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency. While the Greater London Authority have highlighted the need to adhere to this supporting text in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation, they have also not raised a general conformity objection to this policy approach.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not current consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/017	<p>In February 2018 the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) granted permission for the redevelopment of a safeguarded waste site within Tower Hamlets (though at that time under the planning authority of the LLDC). This loss of waste capacity in Tower Hamlets was granted on the basis that the capacity would be shifted to a site in Barking (the River Road site) within the ELJWP area (LLDC Planning Reference: 16/00451/OUT). Given this shift in waste capacity, the Waste Data Study (2023) recommends that this capacity be formally safeguarded for Tower Hamlets through the ELJWP to help ensure that LBTH can meet its apportionment. This site (known as the Hepscott Road site) had capacity for 26,353tpa of HIC waste.</p>	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is in conformity with the London Plan policy requirements. Regarding River Road, it is noted that this transfer of capacity would be allowed under the London Plan policy SI9, which does not expressly require this transfer of capacity to be formalised through the waste plan-making process. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	None
TfL	44/002	<p>Noted that the most recent waste management capacity assessment demonstrates a surplus of capacity necessary for the management of current and forecast future waste arisings and that there is no quantitative need for development of additional capacity.</p>	No modification sought	Noted	None
CHAPTER 5 – Sites for Waste Management					

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
London Borough of Lewisham	8/001	On the basis that the ELJWP is not asking other waste groups across London to accommodate their waste arisings and that they can accommodate their apportionment within the confines of London Boroughs of Barking and Dagenham, Havering, Newham and Redbridge, we support the approach taken in the ELJWP. We note that your Joint Waste Plan (in paragraph 5.1) states that there is sufficient waste management capacity in East London to meet requirements for C, D & E Waste and HIC over the plan period and that the Plan: - does not allocate specific areas of land for the development of additional waste management facilities For clarity, the London Borough of Lewisham does not have spare capacity within its waste facilities to take on additional waste arisings, beyond that already accommodated within the South East London...	No modification sought	No comment	None
Western Riverside Waste Authority	42/001	Recent and proposed reform to government waste policies and the commitment to promoting a circular economy will require more land use for a wider variety of waste management services e.g. re-use hubs. Current waste sites should not be released as there is an overall shortage of capacity across London. This cannot be readily provided by increasing the intensity of existing sites many of which are constrained by adjacent more modern mixed-use development.	Remove the list of sites proposed to be released.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy approach to be justified. It is the East London boroughs view that London Plan Policy SI 9c and paragraph 9.9.2 encourages the release of waste sites to be undertaken as part of a plan-led process, rather than on an ad hoc basis through the development management process. Requiring compensatory capacity through the plan-led process in the same way as requiring through individual planning applications would undermine the strategic approach to balancing various	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>land-use objectives that plan-making affords.</p> <p>The rationale behind each individual site release is set out in further detail in the 'Sites Identified for Release in Reg 19 ELJWP' topic paper that supports the plan. None of the capacity offered by the four sites identified for release has been counted towards the starting apportionment capacity value arrived at using 2023 data for East London as a whole of 2,619,508 tpa (reducing to 2,181,615tpa in 2041). Even with the release of capacity planned through the ELJWP, East London would still retain a significant surplus of management capacity, with between c.0.68 Mtpa (without MBT) and c.1.2Mtpa of apportioned waste surplus and 0.98 Mtpa of C,D&E waste management capacity surplus by 2041.</p> <p>Furthermore, the release of four sites from safeguarding as set out in the ELJWP will not compromise the achievement of the requirements or targets in the London Plan set out in policies SI8 and SI9. The BPP Note of clarification entitled Assessment of Impact of Releasing EWS on Achievement of London Plan Targets demonstrates this and is included as Appendix to the SoCG with the GLA.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.	
IXDS Ltd	29/001	The 'Mayer Parry, Bidder Street' site is no longer functioning as a safeguarded waste site due to the redevelopment approved under LB Newham planning permission 24/00088/FUL (granted 14/04/2025). Although this change is recognised in the Regulation 19 ELJWP Appendix 3 maps and supported by evidence (including BPP Consulting's 2025 'Safeguarded Sites for Release – Assessment Report'), the draft ELJWP does not mention the site's release in Paragraph 5.3 or Table 9, which list sites no longer safeguarded. This omission means the draft Plan does not accurately reflect the site's status and is inconsistent with the treatment of other released sites, rendering the Plan unsound. The request is for the ELJWP to explicitly acknowledge the site's release in Table 9 for clarity, repeating concerns previously raised by IXDS Ltd during the Regulation 18 consultation in 2024, which have not yet been addressed. The original IXDS Ltd representation is included as supporting material.	<p>The following entry should be added to Table 9 of the draft ELJWP (additions shown in bold underlined text):</p> <p>Table 9: Existing Waste Sites Released from Safeguarding</p> <p>> Borough: <u>Newham</u>; Site: <u>Mayer Parry, Bidder Street</u>; Permitted Use: <u>Metal Recycling Site</u>; Assessed Peak Waste Capacity (tpa): <u>c150,000</u></p>	A response to this comment was provided in the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation Report. The Council's response has not changed.	None
GLA	27/001	All Development Plan Documents in London must be in general conformity with the London Plan under section 24 (1)(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA 2004). Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None
GLA	27/002	The draft Plan identifies that East London currently has a capacity of 2,619,508 tonnes per annum (tpa) of qualifying waste capacity, based on the combined capacity of the Boroughs.	No modification sought	Support noted. Responses to the concerns raised by the GLA are provided below in relation to each individual issue raised.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		General LP2021 Policy SI8(b) requires boroughs to allocate sufficient land and identify waste management facilities to meet the waste tonnages apportioned in LP2021. Whilst it is considered that the draft Plan is in general conformity with LP2021, the Mayor has concerns in regard to the approach proposed for the implementation of Policy JWP2 and the release of waste sites within the Castle Green SIL.			
GLA	27/003	We have noted some inconsistencies in figures associated with the number of sites to be safeguarded and for the additional sites identified for potential future release, and request that they are corrected prior to the draft Plan being submitted.	Correct inconsistencies in figures associated with the number of sites to be safeguarded and for the additional sites identified for potential future release	<p>The east London boroughs recognise there is a typographical error and to ensure the clarity of the plan therefore proposes the following minor wording change to paragraph 2.36 for the Inspector's consideration:</p> <p>665 sites are safeguarded by this Plan for waste management uses and their location is shown in Figure 4 below. No other inconsistencies in figures in the plan associated with the number of additional sites identified for potential future release were identified</p>	665 sites are safeguarded by this Plan for waste management uses and their location is shown in Figure 4 below.
GLA	27/004	The draft ELJWP safeguards 66 waste sites within the Boroughs. Four sites are proposed to be released, which have a combined capacity of 38,125 apportioned waste and 425,316 Construction, Demolition, and Excavation (CDE) waste.	No modification sought	<p>Comment noted. For clarity, each site's management capacity by waste type is set out below:</p> <p>Borough: Barking & Dagenham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site: Eurohub Box Lane, Box Lane (D B Cargo); Permitted Use & Permit Details: Transfer Station taking Non Biodegradable Waste; Assessed Peak Capacity (tpa): CDE W: 313,538 Site: Eurohub, Box Lane, (Titan Waste); Permitted Use & Permit Details: Non-Haz Waste 	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>Transfer/Treatment; Assessed Peak Capacity (tpa): HIC: 15,997 CDE W: 20,173</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site: Old Bus Depot, Perry Road; Permitted Use & Permit Details: Non-Haz Waste Transfer/Treatment; Assessed Peak Capacity (tpa): HIC: 22,128 CDE W: 56,647 <p>Borough: Newham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site: Connolleys Yard, Unit 5c Thames Road; Permitted Use & Permit Details: Metal Recycling Site; Assessed Peak Capacity (tpa): CDE W: 34,958 <p>Totals: HIC: 38,125; CDE W: 425,316</p>	
GLA	27/005	It is noted that the released sites have reduced since the Regulation 18 consultation, which had identified seven sites for release and is due to three sites having been granted consent for a change of use away from waste, and as such have been removed from this list.	No modification sought	Comment noted. The rationale for releasing the four sites is explained in a separate evidence paper 'Sites Identified for Release in Reg 19 ELJWP' appended to the SoCG with the GLA.	None
GLA	27/006	While the GLA understands that the assessment of existing waste capacity of 2,619,508 tpa excludes the sites identified for release, LP2021 Policy SI9 is clear that all waste sites are safeguarded, and that an existing waste site should only be released to other land uses where waste processing capacity is re-provided elsewhere within London, based on the maximum achievable throughput achieved over the last five years. As set out in paragraph 5.3 of the draft Plan, the four identified waste sites proposed for release have been identified for non-waste uses in Borough Plans, with no specific compensatory	Delete Appendix 4	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as we consider the policy approach to be justified. It is the East London boroughs view that London Plan Policy SI 9c and paragraph 9.9.2 encourages the release of waste sites to be undertaken as part of a plan-led process, rather than on an ad hoc basis through the development management process. Requiring compensatory capacity through the plan-led process in the same way as	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		capacity proposed. The Mayor is concerned that this approach of releasing sites without reprocision elsewhere within London could impact on achieving some of the key aims of Policy SI8 and SI9.		<p>requiring through individual planning applications would undermine the strategic approach to balancing various land-use objectives that plan-making affords.</p> <p>The rationale behind each individual site release is set out in further detail in the 'Sites Identified for Release in Reg 19 ELJWP' topic paper that supports the plan. None of the capacity offered by the four sites identified for release has been counted towards the starting apportionment capacity value arrived at using 2023 data for East London as a whole of 2,619,508 tpa (reducing to 2,181,615tpa in 2041). Even with the release of capacity planned through the ELJWP, East London would still retain a significant surplus of management capacity, with between c.0.68 Mtpa (without MBT) and c.1.2Mtpa of apportioned waste surplus and 0.98 Mtpa of C,D&E waste management capacity surplus by 2041.</p> <p>Furthermore, the release of four sites from safeguarding as set out in the ELJWP will not compromise the achievement of the requirements or targets in the London Plan set out in policies SI8 and SI9. The BPP Note of clarification entitled Assessment of Impact of Releasing EWS on Achievement of London Plan Targets submitted to the GLA for Review 05.09.2024 demonstrates this.</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.	
GLA	27/007	Old Perry Bus Depot: Officers understand that the Environment Agency (EA) has advised that the permit for Old Perry Bus Depot has been revoked, that the operator will not be granted a further permit, and that due to proximity to sensitive receptors it would be difficult for new owners to obtain a permit.	No modification sought	<p>Comment noted. The EA permit for the site has been revoked. As stated in the evidence note, this site was subject to a validated planning application for change of use to non-waste. This application was subsequently withdrawn and the applicant is considering next steps to bring forward an alternate industrial use on this site.</p> <p>Redevelopment of this site will not adversely impact achievement of targets set out in policies SI8 and Si 9 of the London Plan.</p>	None
GLA	27/008	Connolleys Yard: The site allocation for this site within the Newham Local Plan (Regulation 19) is clear that the waste capacity at this site should be re-provided or compensatory capacity identified. It is noted that the draft site allocation includes the requirement to re-provide the waste site or provide compensatory capacity, however this requirement could fall away should Policy W1 of the Regulation 19 Newham Local Plan be adopted as drafted. We remain concerned about the loss of this waste site.	No modification sought	<p>Comment noted. Connolley's Yard forms part of a wider strategic site allocation within both Newham's adopted and emerging Local Plans. These allocations are not considered suitable for the re-provision of the existing waste management use.</p> <p>Redevelopment of this site will not adversely impact achievement of targets in policies SI8 and SI 9 of the London Plan.</p>	None
GLA	27/009	Eurohub sites in Barking and Dagenham: The Castle Green Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) remains a designated SIL in the very recently adopted Barking and Dagenham Local Plan (September 2024), which states that plans for its future redevelopment will be considered in a future Local Plan review. As stated in paragraph	No modification sought	Comment noted. The Plan proposes the removal of waste safeguarding of the Castle Green sites to enable the reconfiguration of the site and to align with the landowners' aspirations for the rail freight terminal. The site would remain SIL, per LBBD's recently	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		9.8.11, land in SIL will provide the main opportunities for locating waste treatment facilities. We are aware of future aspirations for the Castle Green area, with references within the supporting evidence being made to the Castle Green Masterplan.		adopted Local Plan, and would continue to be a key industrial site in the borough. Redevelopment of this site will not compromise achievement of the requirements and targets set out in policies SI8 and SI 9 of the London Plan.	
GLA	27/010	Surplus Capacity and Duty to Cooperate Paragraph 9.8.6 of LP2021 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. The GLA is aware that there are London Boroughs who cannot meet their borough apportionment targets and have a shortfall in waste capacity. For clarity, the GLA is of the view that the four sites proposed to be released from safeguarding should not be considered to be surplus to requirements until it has been confirmed that they are not needed by other boroughs within London to meet apportionment needs.	Delete Appendix 4	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>Any agreements are to be formalised through a Statement of Common Ground. This approach is effective and allows for capacity sharing agreements to be agreed through the lifetime of the plan, recognising each waste planning authority is at different stages of plan preparation. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities. Formalising a single capacity sharing agreement through the wording of the plan would undermine this flexibility and effectiveness of the approach and may compromise east London's future ability to contribute towards London's net self-sufficiency aims.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". This approach allows for flexibility in allowing capacity sharing agreements at different points of the plan's lifecycle, while ensuring borough's planning to utilise east London's surplus capacity optimise sustainable management capacity within their boundaries. A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'.</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH is the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how east London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency. While the Greater London Authority have highlighted the need to adhere to this supporting text in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation, they have also not raised a general conformity objection to this policy approach.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/021	<p>Concern regarding the coordination between the Newham Local Plan and the East London Joint Waste Plan (ELJWP) on the release of safeguarded waste sites, particularly in Beckton Riverside. Noted that while the Newham Local Plan suggests releasing certain waste sites, including Beckton Riverside, this is not clearly reflected in the ELJWP, which only identifies Conolleys Yard for release.</p> <p>This should be clarified and all proposed releases included in the ELJWP, along with an assessment of their impact on overall waste</p>	Clarify release of sites in the Newham Local Plan and ELJWP	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is justified.</p> <p>With regards to the Beckton Riverside site, this is identified as a schedule 2 site under the adopted East London Waste Plan. These are sites which do not contain existing waste sites but are safeguarded areas within which potentially available and suitable sites for waste management facilities can be</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		capacity, to ensure proper planning and evidence-based decision-making.		<p>located. The review of the Joint Waste Plan has shown a significant surplus of management capacity across East London. Therefore, it is no longer necessary or justified to continue to safeguard such land within the ELJWP or the borough's Local Plan, noting no waste facility has ever been proposed to be brought forward on such land and this additional capacity to meet apportionment requirements is no longer required.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
TfL	44/003	The Reg 19 ELJWP proposes the release of four existing waste. If sites are to be released for housing, there is a need to consider the relationship with other adjacent remaining industrial and related uses to ensure that it is a feasible and suitable location for residential development taking account of the agent of change principle. Furthermore, whether the accessibility of the site by sustainable and active travel is adequate to meet the needs of residents. We suggest that surplus sites are considered for other similar uses (e.g. bus garages, logistics) when in SIL or LSIS before release.	No modification sought	<p>Any decisions to grant planning permission for other forms of development (e.g. housing) on sites which have been released from safeguarding will be based on the Local Plan for the borough in which they are located. All Borough Local Plans in East London include policies which define suitable locations for development and promote sustainable and active travel.</p>	None
CHAPTER 6 – Policies					
LBTH	30/018	LBTH does not wish to raise any concerns regarding policies JWP1, JWP3, JWP4, JWP5, and JWP6.	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		Policy JWP 1: Circular Economy			
Oxfordshire County Council	32/006	We support the strong emphasis on circular economy principles, and the requirement to submit a Circular Economy Statement. We support the reference to reducing waste from construction and demolition and the identification of premises to keep materials out of the waste stream.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
EA	35/008	We are pleased that the Plan reflects our previous comments by lowering the threshold for requiring a Circular Economy Statement and incorporating Site Waste Management Plans. This should be referenced as the appropriate sustainability standard for civil engineering and waste infrastructure projects, ensuring consistency with best practice in sustainable construction. However, we are disappointed that there is no mention of CEEQUAL (now known as BREEAM Infrastructure).	CEEQUAL (now known as BREEAM Infrastructure) should be referenced as the appropriate sustainability standard for civil engineering and waste infrastructure projects, to ensure consistency with best practice in sustainable construction.	Development that is required to be considered under BREEAM rating will be subject to policies within borough local plans.	None
Stantec obo Barking Riverside	13/004	Supporting text at para 6.24 makes specific reference to the Envac system at Barking Riverside, including the types of waste it deals with and the number of inlets. We note that this description is based on current materials collected - it does not reference the potential collection of food waste via Envac.	This is based on the original masterplan for Barking Riverside which has been subject to various amendments, and we therefore restate our request that reference to specific figures is removed as these are no longer accurate.	Suggested changes are noted and will be recommended.	Remove specific figures quoted in 6.24: Different storage and collection systems are needed for different types of development, for example, the Barking Riverside mixed use development

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
					incorporates a vacuum system for collecting waste from apartments. The system processes three fractions: residual, cardboard and dry recyclables and reduces the need for storage facilities (460 collection inlets replace 19,000 traditional bins) and vehicle movements.
	Policy JWP2: Safeguarding and Provision of Waste Capacity				
Oxfordshire County Council	32/003	<p>Policy JWP2 could be strengthened to facilitate the permission of Waste Management sites for Hazardous waste where appropriate.</p> <p>Hazardous Waste. The Plan states there is an estimated capacity surplus of 0.98Mtpa for C, D & E waste however, there is a capacity deficit of approx. 18,400tpa for Hazardous waste and that additional capacity be sought in co-operation with other Plan areas.</p>	<p>Strengthen Policy JWP2 to facilitate the permission of Waste Management sites for Hazardous waste.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as there is no policy expectation that individual Plan areas should be net self sufficient for the management of hazardous produced in the area, as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the plan. Instead, existing capacity should be safeguarded and additional capacity be sought in co-operation with other Plan areas. The policy approach is therefore in conformity with the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.18. Further context around the management of hazardous</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>waste is provided in the plan at paragraph 5.52, which sets out that hazardous waste covers a wide range of waste types which each may require management at a range of specialist facilities for treatment and disposal, and given they generally arise in relatively small amounts, such facilities are developed to manage quantities greater than that arising in a single Plan area. Therefore, this waste may often travel further than non-hazardous wastes for management.</p> <p>The policy approach is therefore in conformity with the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.18.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
GLA	27/013	<p>Noted that the draft Policy includes a definition for a Waste Site. A reference to the possible update of the waste site definition within the ELJWP would be welcomed. As part of the new London Plan, the definition of a waste site will be reviewed.</p>	<p>Add reference to the possible update of the London Plan definition of a waste site.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the definition in the ELJWP is justified as per paragraph 6.32 of the plan. If the plan were to safeguard sites without planning permission this would risk legitimising sites which may be located in inappropriate areas, for example on land for which planning permission for a waste use has been refused or is subject to enforcement action against a waste use.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan is sound without</p>	<p>[Paragraph 6.32] Any revised London Plan definition of 'waste site' will be taken into account through a subsequent review of the ELJWP.</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>the proposed changes.</p> <p>However, noting the update to the London Plan which will take place over the course of the plan period, the east London boroughs recognise the importance of ensuring conformity with the London Plan and therefore proposes the following modification wording for the Inspector's consideration:</p> <p>[Paragraph 6.32] Any revised London Plan definition of 'waste site' will be taken into account through a subsequent review of the ELJWP.</p>	
West London Authorities	41/001	We are conscious that a new London Plan is being developed which will have updated apportionment targets. Given the early stage of the WLWP and future uncertainties including updated new London Plan targets, if it transpires that we are not able to secure sufficient site capacity within the WLWP area then we would like to engage with you at a future stage with regards to your potential surplus capacity. This could be when the ELJWP reaches submission and/or examination or post adoption, and at a point when the WLWP evidence is further progressed and figures can be shared to ensure that strategic cross-boundary waste management is co-ordinated and meets the collective ambition reflected in the London Plan Policy SI 8 A, for London to be self-sufficient in waste by 2026.	No modification sought	Comment noted	
Essex County Council	40/001	Whilst it is noted that the Vision still makes reference to 'releasing underutilised or poorly located sites', which in principle is a sound	No modification sought	Comment noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
(minerals and waste planning authority)		policy approach, this cannot be to the detriment of sustainable waste management as a whole, particularly where this would increase waste miles or reduce net self-sufficiency. It is however considered that the provisions of Policy JWP2 Section B adequately place this planning principle in its appropriate context.			
Essex County Council (minerals and waste planning authority)	40/002	Regarding those existing waste sites which have not been safeguarded on the basis that their re-development would achieve wider planning objectives, the clarification set out in Paragraph 6.34 that these sites will not significantly impact the achievement of the London Plan strategic objective of net self-sufficiency and the ELJWP objectives for the management of waste is welcomed.	No modification sought	Comment noted	None
ELWA	6/003	Paragraph 6.33 (page 71) notes that certain sites are only safeguarded until planning permission expires, regardless of the status of a related Environmental Permit. While ELWA support the general approach to safeguarding, it is suggested that clarity is given to paragraph 6.33	Change to paragraph 6.33 as follows: 'Some sites may have a time limited planning permission for a waste management use, or a planning permission for waste management use which is restricted by condition(s), and the temporary nature of the permission means that it has been determined that it is not desirable for the use permitted to continue beyond a	The ELBs are concerned that the proposed modification could jeopardise the safeguarding of waste sites that have Planning Permission but may fail to comply with a condition. This is a matter of planning enforcement and should not be the basis on which safeguarding ceases.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>certain date and/or by way of compliance with restrictive condition(s) criteria. For this reason, sites with time-limited planning permissions restricted by condition(s) and/or time are only safeguarded by the ELJWP up to the date on which the permission expires or no longer addresses conditional criteria. This is regardless of the status of any related Environmental Permit for the site e.g. if it has been surrendered. In addition, in cases where land on which (i) the waste use is lawful under the land use planning system and (ii) land covered by an Environmental Permit do not align, the area to which the lawful use under planning applies is</p>		

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			taken as that to be safeguarded. Finally, where a site is subject to planning enforcement action against the continued use, safeguarding will not take effect/is held in abeyance until the matter has been resolved regardless of permitted status.'		
ELWA	6/001	Recent contract reviews have highlighted potential challenges in renewing existing waste management contracts, which were not fully accounted for prior to the Regulation 19 consultation. ELWA believes that the plan's current language about waste management sites and future capacity could hinder its ability to meet statutory obligations and achieve value for money. Policy JWP2, which may restrict the provision of future waste capacity in the area. ELWA requests updates to the Joint Waste Plan to acknowledge the potential need for new waste sites and to ensure the plan remains justified, effective, and sound throughout its duration.	See below	See below	See below
ELWA	6/002	The plan does not express the requirements of ELWA in regard to procurement exercises, namely to ensure compliance with public sector spending and procurement rules. Paragraphs 1.124 – 2.130 (Pages 49 and 50) present the status of ELWA and note one of the contract review exercises that is anticipated over the plan period. The detail does not include the expectation that there will be multiple contract	It is suggested a new paragraph be noted after paragraph 2.129 as follows: 'ELWA must undertake contracts and procurement exercises in	Recognised that is preferable to avoid including supporting text which could become out of date. Changes are therefore proposed for the Inspector's consideration.	Deletion of paragraph 2.129: 2.129 ELWA has begun the procurement of new contracts to replace its long-term IWMS contract from late

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		review and/or procurement exercises over the plan period, and that changes to sites may become necessary during the life of a contract and delivered through a Deed of Variation rather than at the point of procurement.	accordance with Public Sector spending requirements. As noted within the adopted Joint Strategy (2027-57) (Pages 45 - 48), "effective future commissioning will need to consider issues such as flexibility and resilience as well as value for money, service quality, social value and environmental impacts including greenhouse gas emissions". The future of the ELWA operations will be determined with weight applied to such considerations, and particular note is made to the operations at Jenkins Lane and Frog Island.'		2027. A 'disaggregated' approach is being taken, meaning that separate contracts will be let for different types of services rather than one fully-integrated contract. The procurement process will be making sites available for bidders to use and will maintain the four existing Reuse and Recycling Centres. However, the future use of the facilities at Jenkins Lane and Frog Island, which manufacture refuse-derived fuel (RDF) from residual household and commercial waste through mechanical-biological treatment (MBT), will be determined through the

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
					<p>procurement process.</p> <p>Addition of a new paragraph 1.7 (between paragraph 1.6 and the current 1.7), is proposed to provide context concerning the role and responsibilities of the waste industry as follows:</p> <p><u>Whilst the ELJWP guides how and where waste may be managed in East London, the actual management of waste (including Local Authority Collected Waste) is undertaken by private sector waste management companies. In deciding how to manage waste, these companies take account of other regulatory</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
					and market influences, as well as customer requirements, such as the need for flexibility and resilience, value for money, service quality, social value and environmental impacts including greenhouse gas emission.
ELWA	6/004	<p>There may be many valid reasons why a waste management site needs to be brought forward on land that is not safeguarded for waste and/or allocated or in use for more general industrial uses, such as to reduce transport congestion/emissions, access power connections, to deliver best value and/or public good and other benefits to the local area.</p> <p>Considering the background provided above, Policy JWP2 appears to be too restrictive regarding potential need and likelihood for new or replacement facilities over the ELJWP period, which is extensive due to recent contract review highlighting significant public cost of maintaining the status quo.</p>	<p>Changes to JWLP2 to make less restrictive – see below.</p>	<p>In light of the fact that there is surplus capacity in East London, Clause C Policy JWP2 only supports the grant of planning permission for additional management capacity for apportioned waste in certain limited circumstances. This is in line with the following element of Plan's Vision: 'Waste will be managed efficiently by maximising existing capacity of facilities, releasing underutilised or poorly located sites, minimising transportation and using infrastructure established for alternative means of waste movement...'</p> <p>It also implements Strategic Objective 6 (Optimise Existing Waste Management Capacity) that includes the following: 'Realise the full potential</p>	<p>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</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>of existing waste management capacity in East London, using only the minimum land necessary while ensuring the capability to manage at least the apportionment in the London Plan is maintained.'</p> <p>Clause C2 is intended to allow the grant of planning permission for capacity at an existing site if it means more waste will be managed further up the waste hierarchy, the principal policy test of making waste management more sustainable. The ELBs consider that other clauses of the policy allow sufficient appropriate flexibility for additional capacity, in particular circumstances when proposals would accommodate capacity which compensates for that lost at other sites, or when capacity results in the consolidation of activities at multiple sites at a single site (which may or may not be located in East London). The ELBs recognise that there is a potentially confusing distinction made between clauses C2 and C3 and have proposed minor modifications to address this matter</p>	<p>they would:.....2. result in <u>an increase the throughput of an existing waste management facility and waste</u> being dealt with further up the hierarchy (unless a life cycle assessment demonstrates that the method of management proposed is appropriate); and, 3. <u>subject to criterion C2 above, increase the throughput of an existing waste management facility;</u></p>
ELWA	6/005	To ensure the proposed policy is efficient and justified, and ultimately sound, it is proposed that the wording of this policy is updated as follows	Policy JWP2: A. Existing waste sites safeguarded from non-waste development are listed in Appendix 2 and detailed in	See above	See above

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			Appendix 3 (hereinafter referred to as "safeguarded waste sites"). If a waste site does not have express planning permission for a waste management use, benefit from a CLEUD or has become lawful over time and is safeguarded under London Plan policy only by virtue of it having an Environmental Permit for a waste activity, the site will cease to be safeguarded if/when the Environmental Permit is surrendered/ceases to exist. Where a site benefits from a time limited planning permission or permission that is restricted by condition(s) , the site will cease to be safeguarded on the date when the planning permission expires or can no		

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>longer address conditional criteria, regardless of its permitted status.</p> <p>B. Development that would lead to the loss of capacity and/or constrain current operations of a safeguarded waste site or future committed operations subject to an active planning permission^{52A} will not be permitted unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it can be demonstrated that equivalent, suitable, and appropriate compensatory capacity is provided within the Borough catchment where the site is located, or if this is demonstrated not to be possible, elsewhere in East London, or finally, elsewhere in London; or..... <p>Overarching need for new capacity</p> <p>C. Proposals for the</p>		

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>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:</p> <p>1. Provide appropriate compensation for the loss of existing capacity which is needed for London to be net self-sufficient in waste management capacity overall (appropriate compensation should be robustly justified with regard to its overall economic, environmental and social benefit to the local community);</p>		

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>or.....</p> <p>Waste hierarchy and location</p> <p>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:....</p> <p>4. The proposal will:....</p> <p>iv. avoid creating an undue adverse amenity 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</p>		

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>situated at least 250m from sensitive receptors or be fully contained in a building.</p> <p>.....6. Where it is demonstrated that SIL and LIL is not available, and that the proposal is consistent with all other policies in the Development Plan, proposals may be permitted in the following locations.....</p> <p>....v. where composting or anaerobic digestion is proposed, farm properties where some of the resulting compost/digestate will be utilised including on adjacent land.</p>		
ELWA	6/006	<p>Policy JWP2 also includes several statements that are unrealistic to waste development, for example:</p> <p>a. under Criterion D (Waste hierarchy and location) point 4, vi, does not reference the move that modern facilities are completely contained within a building;</p> <p>b. under Criterion D (Waste hierarchy and location) point 6, v, does not acknowledge the</p>	<p>Changes to JWP2 to ensure deliverability (see above).</p>	<p>In order for the policies of the ELJWP to have desired outcomes it is important that their meaning is clear when being implemented. A number of areas where the wording of Criterion D of policy JWP2 could be refined to ensure it is interpreted as intended have been identified and these are proposed in a minor modification</p>	<p>D. Subject to criterion C above, proposals for waste management uses, including changes to the operation and layout of</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>significant size requirement of a neighbouring site to be able to utilise all compost/digestate from a large, commercial IVC or AD facility. It is noted that it is very unlikely that a neighbouring site would be large enough to be able to utilise ALL of the compost/digestate, and that there is a need to insert "some of" when referring to any neighbouring site; and,</p> <p>c. Criterion C.2 point 3 appears to be counter to the intentions of the earlier wording of the policy – it is noted that moving waste up the hierarchy would normally decrease throughput, as operations that seek to recover, recycle, repair or reuse materials will generally require more space. While this is not a hard and fast rule, Criterion C.2. appears to require further justification for its inclusion.</p>			<p>safeguarded waste sites, will be permitted where it is demonstrated that:....4. The proposal will:....iv. avoid creating an <u>unacceptable</u><u>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;</u> and,.....vi. for operations which generate bioaerosols (like composting), be situated at least 250m from sensitive receptors or be <u>fully contained</u> within a building.</p>
National	21/004	Support Strategic Objective 7 and Policy JWP2 of the ELJWP which aim to minimise the transportation of waste and improve road safety	No modification sought	Noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
Highways		by locating facilities as close as possible to their sources and establishing alternative transport means, including utilising the River Thames and railheads. As well as supporting proposals that promote alternatives to road based transport, we also look to site operators to investigate opportunities to further minimise potential impacts to the SRN. This could be through construction and operational management plans to support individual proposals.			
National Highways	21/005	Paragraph 6.44 indicates surplus waste management capacity in East London, so no new sites are proposed. There are no current comments on safeguarded site allocations, though several are near the SRN. Any future developments at these sites should include Transport Assessments evaluating SRN impacts as part of planning applications. If safeguarded sites are redeveloped, SRN impact assessments are still required. National Highways should ideally be consulted at pre-application stage, or at minimum when applications are submitted.	No modification sought	Noted	None
Thames Gateway Waste to Energy	14/001	<p>Our main objective is to continue the development of our energy from waste site - however due to financial obligations we need to consider alternative uses for the site. Our site has remained undeveloped for over 10 years and has never received waste. The LSIP has changed its primary use to B2,B8 and has rebranded as an industrial park with the new partners SEGRO.</p> <p>We will be making a definitive decision on the direction of development in Q3 2025 on whether we can definitely deliver the project or whether</p>	No modification N sought	<p>The current status of the site is noted, and the East London Boroughs will continue to monitor any proposed changes to the use of the site.</p>	one

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		we have to consider an alternative development for the site.			
Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited (Heidelberg Materials)	16/001	With the ability to use both river and rail, the 'intermodal construction materials facility' (including wharf and railhead) off Chequers Lane in the Borough of Dagenham and Barking, helps reduce HGV movements on the local road network. This facility processes marine dredged sand and gravel, which is landed at a jetty within the River Thames, and is also connected to the rail network to allow the importation and export of aggregates. As such the circular economy and climate change are linked.	No modification sought	Noted	None
Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited (Heidelberg Materials)	16/002	Support many sections in the draft Plan - pleased to see that all waste streams are addressed. Continue to support on Page 5, the summary points of: • Minimising waste produced from development, with emphasis on re-use and recycling of waste arising • Safeguarding existing capacity • Allowing development of new waste management capacity at existing sites if it allows waste to be managed more sustainably.	No modification sought	Noted	None
Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited (Heidelberg Materials)	16/003	The draft Plan states there is surplus capacity for managing CDE waste arisings, with 3,185,500 tpa capacity and a surplus of 0.98Mtpa, negating the need for more facilities except in exceptional cases. However, there are errors: Footnote 40 references an outdated evidence paper (November 2022 instead of January 2025), and projected arisings are expected to increase from 2,203,591t in 2023 to 2,644,970t in 2041, reducing the surplus from 0.98Mt to 0.54Mt. These inaccuracies cast	Correct waste data inaccuracies.	Regarding the reference to a 2022 evidence paper in footnote 40, this was deliberate as Anthesis introduced the growth forecast it its evidence base paper published in November 2022. Regarding the calculation of the surplus CDE waste management capacity, a growth forecast was modelled as a sensitivity but a static growth rate was chosen in accordance	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		doubt on the Plan's soundness. The surplus also relies on the implementation of planning permissions and the suitability of facilities in Appendix 3. Greater flexibility is needed for the Plan to be robust.		with Planning Practice Guidance on estimating CDE waste arisings. The assessment of waste capacity isn't dependent on a planning permission being implemented. All sites listed in Appendix 3 (and included in the capacity assessment) have historically accepted waste categorised using EWC codes related to waste from construction, demolition and excavation activity.	
Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited (Heidelberg Materials)	16/004	The statement that "no additional capacity is needed" is numerically justified, but concerns remain that the Plan's existing capacity figures may be distorted by businesses handling large volumes of excavation waste, potentially concealing the need for secondary aggregates. The Plan differentiates between construction, demolition, and excavation (CDE) waste types in its data, so capacity assessments should also reflect these distinctions. Flexibility in the Plan is essential to address the diverse waste streams within CDE, as different types require distinct management. Anticipated growth in the recycled and secondary aggregates sector, such as processing demolition waste (mainly concrete) and roadworks waste (RAP), is acknowledged, aligning with both the circular economy and carbon reduction goals. The draft Plan supports maximising recycling and reuse of CDE waste, and while it allows for new aggregate recycling facilities, this is typically limited to "exceptional circumstances."		There is no expectation that a Plan area be self sufficient in all types of management capacity suited to manage all types of waste materials that may be found within one of the principal waste streams i.e. HIC or C,D&E. The concept of net self sufficiency allows for provision of capacity to manage one type of waste in preference to another, as long as on balance sufficient capacity is available. Policy JWP2 allows for the development of additional capacity where it can be demonstrated that it would result in waste being managed further up the waste hierarchy.	None
Hanson Quarry	16/005	Given the positive sentiments the Plan has about the circular economy we do not see how	Simplify Policy JWP2	Comments are noted. JWP 2 has been drafted to permit new waste	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
Products Europe Limited (Heidelberg Materials)		the policy will allow any new capacity for particular waste streams (such as recycled/secondary aggregates) to come forward over the Plan period. The policy will therefore stimy development and the potential supply of recycled and secondary aggregates to developments. As such this affects the soundness of the plan and the policy should be simplified and redrafted.		<p>developments to come forward where there is a demonstrated need and where the proposal would result in waste being dealt with further up the waste hierarchy. We expect that this would be the case with the production of secondary aggregates from construction and demolition waste. This Policy has been drafted in line with the principles of a circular economy, while making sure that there is a need for new waste developments.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the Plan is sound without these proposed changes.</p>	
Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited (Heidelberg Materials)	16/006	We welcome and support the inclusion of the Dagenham site in Appendix 2 (as a safeguarded site) but we believe that the area shown in Appendix 3 is incorrect. To allow for flexibility and potential future growth at Dagenham, making beneficial use of the wharf frontage and rail connection, the plan contained in Appendix 3 needs to be updated to cover the whole site under our client's control.	Correct area of Heidelberg's Dagenham Site shown in Appendix 3	<p>Paragraph 6.32 of the Joint Waste Plan sets out that sites are safeguarded by the Plan where there is planning permission specifically for a waste use and does not safeguard sites only on the basis of an Environmental Permit. Appendix 3 of the Joint Waste Plan provides the boundary of safeguarded sites, based on the planning permission granted as a waste site. This site has permission as a waste site on the basis of 02/00862/FUL, which relates to the area extent identified in Appendix 3.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the Plan is sound without these proposed changes.</p>	None
NGET	17/002	It is acknowledged that the safeguarded sites are existing waste facilities with planning consents for their operations, and also that their	Add need for recognition of NGET	Suggested changes are noted and are recommended for consideration by the Inspector.	Add sentence to JWP 4: A. Proposals for

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		safeguarding at this stage within the ELJWP does not amount to additional proposals for redevelopment of the sites. Notwithstanding this, the interaction of NGET assets with sites which may accommodate additional capacity in the future we feel is of relevance to the purposes of Policy JWP2. Whilst we do not object to the policy and the safeguarding of sites (named in a list), we recommend that a reference to future expansion of waste capacity on safeguarded sites, and any development associated with this, needing to be cognisant of any interactions with NGET assets be included in the policy wording.	assets in policy JWP2.		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): ... <u>12. impacts to utility assets and infrastructure networks, and, (and update subsequent criterion reference number)</u>
Thames Water	23/001	As identified in paragraph 2.47 the key sewage treatment works (STW) serving East London is Beckton STW, but we also have Riverside STW in Havering and a number of strategic sewage pumping stations in these Boroughs. Beckton STW and Riverside STW will need to be periodically upgraded over the plan period to 2041 to accommodate population growth and environmental improvements.	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None
PLA	26/002	The PLA agrees with the statements made in Paragraphs 6.46 and 6.48, which support Policy JWP2, that recognise London Plan Policy SI 8 B 4(c) that requires Development Plans to identify safeguarded wharves with an existing or future	D5 ii where it is demonstrated that the use could not be located on an	The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness as all safeguarded wharves in east London are located within Strategic	Policy JWP2: Safeguarding and Provision of Waste Capacity D 5. In the

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>potential for waste and secondary material management as suitable locations to manage borough waste apportionments.</p> <p>This is not mentioned in the Policy itself, and we strongly recommend that safeguarded wharves should be mentioned in Section D 5 of Policy JWP2 (Safeguarding and Provision of Waste Capacity).</p>	<p>existing safeguarded waste site, in a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL), including a safeguarded wharf; or ...</p> <p>Amending the wording in this manner will also tie Policy JWP2 in with the Vision and Objectives of the Waste Plan.</p>	<p>Industrial Locations. However, the East London boroughs understand the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the delivery of Joint Waste Plan Strategic Objective 7 (Minimise Transportation and Establish Alternative Infrastructure).</p> <p>Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p>	<p>following priority order, the proposal is situated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. On a safeguarded existing waste site; or 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 iii. where it is demonstrated that the use could not be located in a SIL, in a Local Industrial Location (LIL) as appropriate.
GLA	27/012	<p>Draft Policy JWP2 seeks to safeguard existing wastes sites listed in Appendix 2 of the plan from non-waste development. The principle of safeguarding of waste sites through this policy is welcomed. There is a strong concern that this policy could be misinterpreted, which in turn could lead to the loss of waste sites within the draft Plan area without appropriate compensatory capacity being provided. For</p>	<p>Expand Policy JWP2 to make interpretation clearer.</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach is justified and reflects the supporting text of the London Plan at paragraph 9.9.3. This states that if capacity increased are permitted at waste sites over the Plan period, it may be possible to justify the release</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>example, it is not clear what evidence will be required by applicants to robustly demonstrate that the loss of their facility would not compromise the ability of London to meet net self-sufficiency. We cannot see how this can be achieved without a detailed assessment of all waste sites within London being undertaken for each application submitted without compensatory capacity being identified.</p>		<p>of waste sites if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient capacity available elsewhere in London at appropriate sites over the Plan period to meet apportionment and that the target of achieving net self-sufficiency is not compromised.</p> <p>The supporting text for policy JWP2 in the ELJWP sets out how the policy requirement can be demonstrated through paragraph 6.52, which states that the determination of whether the loss of capacity will compromise the ability of London to achieve net self sufficiency as a whole will take account of any information published by the GLA concerning the achievement of the London Plan net self sufficiency target. For example this could include an Annual Monitoring Report publication.</p> <p>Similar policy approaches have been accepted in decision-making in recent years, including through decision reference 21/00460/FUL in the part of Newham formerly administered by the LLDC: https://lldc-meetings.london.gov.uk/documents/s69870/05a%20Report%20of%20Legacy%20Wharf%20Phase%203%20Barbers%20Road%202021_00460_FUL%2004-06-2024.pdf</p> <p>The boroughs would be glad to receive further guidance from the GLA on how</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>it envisages this London Plan release route to take effect, which in turn would support implementation of Policy JWP2.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
LBTH	30/019	<p>Object to the implementation of Policy JWP2, which safeguards provision of waste capacity in the area and particularly does not permit the loss of safeguarded waste sites unless compensatory capacity is provided or it has been demonstrated that the capacity of the facility to be lost is not required for the wider London Plan objective for net self-sufficiency to be met. The ELJWP is proposing to remove sites from safeguarding without first offering capacity to neighbouring and other London boroughs that are unable to meet their waste planning requirements within their boundaries. Therefore, Policy JWP2 cannot be considered to be in conformity with the London Plan.</p>	<p>Offer capacity to neighbouring and other London boroughs before release of capacity</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 seek to positively and effectively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. To inform this process, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology is justified, having been primarily informed through the London Plan policy SI 8 and SI 9 requirements, while seeking to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of East London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period.</p>	<p>Any agreements are to be formalised</p> <p>None</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>through a Statement of Common Ground. This approach is effective and allows for capacity sharing agreements to be agreed through the lifetime of the plan, recognising each waste planning authority is at different stages of plan preparation. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities. Formalising a single capacity sharing agreement through the wording of the plan would undermine this flexibility and effectiveness of the approach and may compromise East London's future ability to contribute towards London's net self-sufficiency aims.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". This approach allows for flexibility in allowing capacity sharing agreements at different points of the plan's lifecycle, while ensuring borough's planning to utilise East London's surplus capacity optimise sustainable management capacity within their boundaries. A similar agreement has been utilised in south-East London through periodical updates to the 'SouthEast London joint</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>waste planning technical paper'.</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH is the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of East London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how East London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency. While the Greater London Authority have highlighted the need to adhere to this supporting text in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation, they have also not raised a general conformity objection to this policy approach.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
EA	35/010	We are disappointed that Barking Eurohub remains listed for release. We strongly oppose any future proposals to redevelop this site for housing, particularly given the potential conflict with several key policies in the London Plan 2021: • Policy T3: Transport Capacity, Connectivity and Safeguarding – which requires the safeguarding of land and infrastructure critical to the transport network, including railheads. • Policy E4: Land for Industry, Logistics and Services – which emphasises the need to retain industrial land, especially where it supports logistics and is well-connected to rail and river transport.	No modification sought	<p>The Barking Eurohub site is set to be released at landowner request as occupancy of waste uses are to cease in 2025 and permits are to be surrendered on vacation, as set out in the Sites Identified for Release paper. However, the sites will still be retained as Strategic Industrial Land (SIL).</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
PLA	26/007	It needs to be made clear throughout the document that Plaistow Wharf is included in the Peruvian Wharf Safeguarding Directions	<p>Proposed modification Table 4b – add underlined text:</p> <p>Plaistow Wharf (<u>included in</u> the Peruvian Wharf <u>safeguarding direction</u>)</p> <p>Proposed modification – add underlined text to Policy JWP 2 D5 (ii)</p> <p>Policy JWP2: Safeguarding and Provision of Waste Capacity</p> <p>D 5. In the following priority order, the proposal is situated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. On a safeguarded existing waste site; or 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 iii. where it is 	<p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness as Peruvian Wharf is referenced in Table 4b of the plan. However, the East London boroughs understand the reasons for the proposal and consider their inclusion could improve the clarity of the plan.</p> <p>Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the east London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p>	<p>Proposed modification to Table 4b: Plaistow Wharf (<u>included in</u> the Peruvian Wharf <u>safeguarding direction</u>)</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			demonstrated that the use could not be located in a SIL, in a Local Industrial Location (LIL) as appropriate.		
City of London Corporation as landowner in Dagenham Dock	15/002	The City of London Corporation own a site at Plot 64, Hindmans Way, Dagenham. The City of London Corporation have previously engaged at pre-application with the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham and intend to bring forward a non-waste related proposal. As such, the City of London Corporation support the removal of Dagenham Dock Sustainable Industries Park (and their Site at Plot 64) as a Schedule 2 area.	No modification sought	Support noted. The site has not been safeguarded in the Plan as there is no extant permission for a waste use, or waste permit.	None
Policy JWP2B: Safeguarding and Provision of Wastewater Treatment Capacity					
Anglian Water	7/003	The policy appears to provide the breadth of scope to allow a range of different wastewater treatment technologies and infrastructure to come forward, as there will also be environmental drivers for some infrastructure enhancements on site, not only additional capacity arising from growth in employment and housing in East London - for example through our Water Industry National Environment Programme (WINEP). Anglian Water supports this specific policy that clearly safeguards existing wastewater treatment works as a specific waste infrastructure typology, and provides the criteria for new capacity. This new policy ensures that such facilities are recognised for the essential infrastructure services they provide to East London.	Correction: Criterion D should reference Policy JWP3 not Policy JWP4	Comment noted. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes. Criterion D correctly references Policy JWP4.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
Thame s Water	23/002; 23/003; 23/004; 23/005; 23/006	<p>The 'Purpose of Policy' is considered to be unclear. For example, the second bullet point as drafted would risk curtailing or making difficult to consent development that might not support specific changes to wastewater treatment capacity but nonetheless forms part of critical infrastructure required within a STW. The third bullet point is considered difficult to monitor, out of step with the way in which capacity growth for wastewater treatment is developed and lacking clarity regarding 'relevant objectives', whilst the final bullet point unnecessarily references the role of other adopted policy provisions published within the Development Plan that themselves would be designed to manage development.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the purpose of the policy should be simplified to support wastewater development. An alternative form of wording for this purpose is proposed.</p>	<p>'Proposals for wastewater related development at wastewater treatment sites should be supported where demonstrated to be in accordance with the other policies in this plan and the relevant borough's development plan.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet point 1 – suggest the word 'consented' is removed as Thames Water have permitted development rights to deliver development at STWs subject to the EIA Regulations: 'existing wastewater treatment (including sludge management) facilities are safeguarded from loss to non-wastewater related treatment uses'; <p>Other suggestions to amend the policy</p>	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach is positively prepared to meet identified need for wastewater management capacity needs over the plan period. Removing reference to ensuring unnecessary capacity isn't developed would undermine the effectiveness of the plan, namely the strategic objective to realise the full potential of existing waste management capacity in East London, using only the minimum land necessary while ensuring the capability to manage at least the apportionment in the London Plan is maintained.</p> <p>Removing reference to existing waste sites maximising the management of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy and other relevant objectives would undermine the effectiveness of the plan, namely the strategic objective for all built development contributing to the achievement of a fully functioning circular economy by 2041. Relevant objectives include those set out in Joint Waste Plan and those set out in other development plan documents.</p> <p>The plan seeks to support and build upon the objectives of both national and the borough's local waste and wastewater policies. Noting each borough's plan is at a different stage of preparation, it is important that there is</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>purpose include: [...]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullet point 2 - could be updated to 'additional wastewater treatment and recycling capacity, related infrastructure and upgrades are consented to meet identified needs'; • Bullet point 3 could then be deleted as this would be covered by the above; and • Bullet point 4 is deleted, as this duplicates national and local policy which is already in place to protect the environment and communities. 	<p>up-to-date, effective policy framework providing a consistent approach to waste management application assessment across east London, while also recognising any locally specific requirements in each borough's Local Plan.</p> <p>The overarching use of these sites as wastewater treatment facilities is subject to planning permission, even though changes to the facilities under these uses may be subject to permitted development rights. The ELJWP would also only be used to assess those developments requiring planning consent</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
Thames Water	23/007	Thames Water support the need for specific wastewater treatment policy as fundamentally, waste water treatment has different geographical and technical requirements from other forms of waste management or waste treatment that form the majority of waste proposals that the HMWP (sic) is intended to provide policy guidance for. For example, wastewater treatment plants are constrained by the location of the sewerage network and need	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		to be located close to where the sewerage network terminates (which is generally low lying ground to enable flows to gravitate and avoid high energy consumption associated with unnecessary pumping) and need to be located close to a suitable receiving water course into which the treated effluent can be discharged. Hence, these are reasons why a specific wastewater policy is required.			
Thame s Water	23/008	We do not consider it necessary to identify our operational wastewater/sewage treatment works (STWs) as "safeguarded" sites. It is considered that the safeguarding of such sites is not necessary as there is no certainty that the sites would be available for alternative waste facility redevelopment.	No need to safeguard STW sites and Parts A&B.	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the safeguarding of wastewater sites helps to ensure we are in conformity with the requirements of London Plan Policy SI 5 Water infrastructure, which seeks to ensure that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is provided for in development plans. While there are no plans to redevelop current wastewater sites, it is imperative that management capacity for this waste stream to meet need is safeguarded. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.	None
Thame s Water	23/009	Part B seeks to retain safeguarded wastewater sites unless the justification criteria are met. Criterion B.2 refers to demonstrating that the capacity of the facility to be lost is not required to meet 'policy objectives and legal requirements', but does not identify what these would be and therefore this part of the policy is ambiguous and is not deliverable.	The text in B2 could be amended to, for example, 'it has been demonstrated that the capacity of the facility to be lost is no longer required'. Delete the remaining text as it duplicates other statutory and regulatory processes	The East London borough's objective for this policy approach is to ensure that planning decisions accord with the relevant strategic objectives of the development plan and the broader Asset Management Plan requirements. The policy's supporting text provides additional information around the implementation of this policy text. Paragraph 6.71 sets out that "In exceptional (and unlikely) cases it may	[Implementation text] <u>Development that would reduce capacity at wastewater sites</u> <u>With regards to the policy implementation</u>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			in place for the operation and provision of wastewater treatment facilities.	<p>be possible to demonstrate that the capacity proposed to be lost is not actually required to meet the objectives of this Plan and the London Plan.” Paragraph 6.62 sets out how “need for additional wastewater treatment capacity is determined through the ‘Asset Management Planning’ (AMP) process.” It is considered this supporting text provides further guidance on the information sources that may be used to justify a loss of capacity from a wastewater site. In turn, we consider this policy wording to be effective.</p> <p>However, the east London boroughs recognise the importance of ensuring the Plan is effective in its implementation and therefore propose a wording change for the Inspector’s consideration.</p>	<u>of JWP2B, 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 implementation of the AMP process.</u>
Thames Water	23/010	Support for Part C of Policy JWP2B, aligning with previous positions. Local and Neighbourhood Plans should ensure new development is coordinated with the necessary infrastructure and considers existing capacity, re National Planning Policy Framework. NPPF emphasises the need for sustainable development, alignment of growth with infrastructure, and joint working between authorities to determine infrastructure requirements. Regarding the integration of water and wastewater infrastructure planning within development plans, National Planning Practice Guidance includes the need to identify suitable sites, assess environmental impacts,	No modification sought	Support noted.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		and coordinate the timing of development with infrastructure delivery. Regarding the regulatory five-year planning cycles of water companies (AMPs), Thames Water is currently in AMP7 (2020–2025) and soon to enter AMP8 (2025–2030). There is a need for a specific wastewater treatment/sewage sludge policy, due to the unique locational and technical requirements of wastewater treatment compared to other waste management, such as proximity to sewerage network endpoints and suitable watercourses for effluent discharge, and the importance of maintaining river flows as regulated by the Environment Agency.			
Thames Water	23/011	It is suggested that Part D of the draft policy is deleted, as this duplicates national and local policy which is already in place to protect the environment and communities or should at least refer to the Development Plan as a whole.	Delete Part D	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is effective, noting the requirements of the plan need to be applied in accordance with the development plan as a whole. The policy wording wouldn't undermine this approach. As each of the boroughs are at different stages of plan making, it is also important design and quality considerations can be made against Joint Waste Plan policy JWP4 while also utilising any locally specific policy set out in a borough's Local Plan relevant to wastewater. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.	None
EA	35/011	We are pleased to see the introduction of Policy JWP2B which introduces a new section on sludge management, which falls within the remit	No modification sought	Support welcome. Comment noted.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		of wastewater infrastructure. It is essential that such infrastructure does not compromise environmental protection or operational resilience, particularly in areas of high population growth and increasing wastewater demand.			
National Highways	21/001	We are specifically concerned with any proposals which have the potential to impact the M25, M11, A13 and A12 which experience congestion at peak times. The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.	No modification sought	Noted	None
		Policy JWP3: Prevention of Encroachment			
Anglian Water	7/004	Anglian Water agrees with the need to have some form of encroachment policy or waste consultation zone around specific waste sites, and now wastewater treatment facilities are included in the list of safeguarded sites. The encroachment buffer for our water recycling centres (WRCs) is generally risk assessed by us according to the size of the works and the population it serves. As identified in paragraph 6.76, a 250m encroachment buffer would be considered appropriate for our Upminster WRC.	No modification sought	Support noted	None
Stantec obo Barking Riverside	13/001	The New Outline Planning Application (NOPA) for Barking Riverside is supported by an Environment Statement ('ES'), which considers all operational sites as part of the baseline for the Environmental Impact Assessment. The ES also assesses the suitability of the Site against	No modification sought	Noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		existing noise sources and provides a qualitative assessment of effects to future residents, confirming that these can be mitigated through design. In short, the NOPA is not anticipated to place constraints on existing safeguarded sites.			
Stantec obo Barking Riverside	13/002	The Agent of Change principle should also apply to new waste sites or those where intensification or changes to waste operations are proposed, to ensure no adverse impacts on the occupants of Barking Riverside or other existing / consented development in proximity to such waste sites.	Policy JWP3 should be amended to make clear that new or expanded operations should have regard to impacts on existing and future residential occupiers (where consent has been secured, or allocated as such through the LBBD Local Plan) and be designed and mitigated accordingly. The Agent of Change definition in the Glossary (Section 8) should be updated to reflect this.	The ELJWP has been developed to be in conformity with the London Plan, and its definition of Agent of Change. Policy D13 of the London Plan notes that existing nuisance generating uses and their ability to grow should not be constrained by new development. Policy JWP4 is intended to ensure that new or expanded waste operations would not cause an unacceptable impact to residential property.	None
Thames Water	23/019	Support policy JWP 3 and paragraphs 6.73-6.76 and 6.77-6.80 in relation to the 'agent of change' principle.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
Thames Water	23/020	An 800m buffer should be applied around all Thames Water sewage treatment works (STWs), including Riverside and Beckton, and a 15m buffer around sewage pumping stations. Developers or local authorities proposing development within these distances must consult Thames Water to determine if an odour	Text similar to the following should be incorporated into the Local Plan: "When considering sensitive development, such as residential uses,	The change suggested to include an 800 metre consultation distance for Riverside Sewage Treatment works has not resulted in a change. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the approach to Beckton has been agreed through the review of	[JWP3 Implementation text] When considering sensitive development, such as

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>impact assessment is required. This assessment will establish whether new residents would face adverse amenity impacts due to proximity to sewage facilities and inform suitable amenity buffers. National planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 187 and 198) and the Planning Practice Guidance both require that planning decisions consider pollution risks and the appropriateness of development near water and wastewater infrastructure, including potential odour concerns.</p>	<p>close to the Sewage Treatment Works, a technical assessment should be undertaken by the developer or by the Council. The technical assessment should be undertaken in consultation with Thames Water. The technical assessment should confirm that either: (a) there is no adverse amenity impact on future occupiers of the proposed development or; (b) the development can be conditioned and mitigated to ensure that any potential for adverse amenity impact is avoided."</p>	<p>Newham's Local Plan reflecting the significant scale of the treatment works and is reflected in draft policy W4 of Newham's Submission Local Plan. The more stringent approach is therefore justified noting the intensity of the Beckton sewage treatment works operation.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are therefore satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>However, we note the additional raised concerns regarding the implementation of policy JWP3. In light of these comments, the East London boroughs recognise the importance of ensuring the Plan is effective and therefore propose a modification for the Inspector's consideration.</p>	<p>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 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</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
					unacceptable amenity impact is avoided.
PLA	26/003	Support policy JWP3 specifically the reference to the Agent of Change principle to ensure that existing safeguarded waste management facilities are safeguarded from nearby development that may limit or hinder their operation.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
Policy JWP4: Design of Waste Management Facilities					
Natural England	36/001	The requirement to consider all proposed new sites under Policy JWP 4 should mean that any ill-conceived proposals are rejected, and protections are correctly afforded to the likes of Epping Forest SAC. The mitigation as set out within policies JWP4 and JWP5 should mean that any proposed work carried out on existing sites to make full use of their capacity is only permitted when it has met as many requirements for minimising impacts as possible.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
Anglian Water	7/005	Delivering new or upgraded wastewater capacity is partly regulated by permitting bodies such as the Environment Agency, with treated wastewater discharge parameters set and monitored via permits. The company is targeting net zero operational carbon by 2030 and aims to cut capital (embodied) carbon by 70% from 2010 levels within the same timeframe. Reducing process emissions, particularly fugitive emissions at major sites, is a focus, with larger reductions planned by 2035 and ongoing improvements to 2050 through new treatment	B. Proposals for development must be favourably considered where they demonstrate that opportunities will be provided for residents of the Borough in which the proposal is located, to access	Havering's Local Plan Policy 22 remains the default position on employment and skills requirements in Havering. Changes to policy 22 will be considered through the update of Havering's Local Plan in due course. Policy JWP4 will be used alongside the relevant borough's Local Plan to determine new waste management and wastewater treatment development.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>technologies, to minimise greenhouse gases like methane and nitrous oxide.</p> <p>Anglian Water supports efficient water use and climate adaptation measures, including sustainable drainage systems and resilient development in flood zones, aligning with Lead Local Flood Authority guidance. Water recycling centres are considered less vulnerable and can be situated in flood zones 1, 2, and 3a. Upgrades to treatment capacity are managed via Strategic Alliances with civil engineering firms, supporting a broad infrastructure programme. Active recruitment of apprentices underpins delivery of the ambitious AMP8 programme (£11 billion Business Plan), though there are concerns that policy clause B could restrict flexibility and timely infrastructure delivery, potentially limiting employment opportunities and misaligning with established operational models.</p> <p>Anglian Water suggests that Clause B is worded more positively to encourage the use of local supply chains and local employment opportunities but without tying in our capital investment delivery into a model which might not necessarily align - even though there are a range of employment opportunities across our business and alliances. When reviewing Havering's Local Plan, the equivalent policy (Policy 22 Skills and Training) refers to commercial, residential or mixed use development. Therefore, we do not agree that Policy JWP2 should broaden the remit of this policy to cover the delivery of critical wastewater treatment infrastructure, particularly when we</p>	employment in both the construction and operational stages in accordance with relevant Local Plan policy and related guidance of the development.		

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		have one WRC within the ELJWP area and its catchment extends wider into Brentwood and Thurrock.			
Thames Water	23/021; 23/020; 23/040	<p>It is considered that the policy duplicates local policy that is already in place, and more thoroughly covered, in the relevant borough Development Plan, as well as in the overarching London Plan (2021), the NPPF and various environmental/building regulations. Examples provided.</p> <p>Further, as local plans are updated, the policy within JWP4 may become out of date and conflict with future local plan policy and is likely to create uncertainty when being applied alongside existing borough and London Plan policies that cover the same topics.</p>	Delete Policy JWP4	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is effective, noting the requirements of the plan need to be applied in accordance with the development plan as a whole. As each of the boroughs are at different stages of plan making, it is also important design and quality considerations can be made against Joint Waste Plan policy JWP4 while also utilising any locally specific policy set out in a borough's Local Plan relevant to wastewater development. It is also noted that the London Plan is currently undergoing review, and therefore key clauses considered important to the delivery of well-designed waste and wastewater management sites need to be included in the plan, in the event these are removed through the review of the London Plan.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	None
Thames Water	23/023	Part C unnecessarily duplicates the protections for designated habitats and species of European importance afforded under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). It is also important to note that as many environmental protections are likely to be changing soon, it	Delete Policy JWP4	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach is justified and effective.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		could lead to confusion for developers and decision-makers at the application stage if there are different regulations in place to that referred to within the design policy		<p>that supports the plan sets out that the safeguards provided by Policy JWP4 and Policy JWP5, along with environmental permitting requirements for industrial emissions and water abstraction, will avoid adverse effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites. Natural England have also not objected to these requirements. It is therefore important these safeguards are maintained within the plan. While there may be changes to legislative requirements over the course of the plan period, these will be a material consideration in the decision-making process.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan is sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
PLA	26/004	In principle support, including part A11 which states that proposals for waste management development will only be permitted where preference is given to non-road transport where practicable.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
PLA	26/005	<p>The wording for paragraph 6.99 is confusing, therefore a suggested reworking of the paragraph is provided to separate out the requirements of the Transport Assessment and ensure that the assessment of the waste transportation occurs separately from the assessment of persons accessing the site.</p> <p>This would then ensure that an assessment of rail/river transportation opportunities are included in the Transport Assessment discussed in paragraphs 6.98 and 6.99, which</p>	<p>- Suggested re-wording/reorganisation of Paragraph 6.99, supporting text for Policy JWP4 Design of Waste Management Facilities, additional text is underlined:</p> <p>Paragraph 6.99</p>	<p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness, however the reasons for the proposal are understood and it is considered their inclusion could improve the clarity of the policy and the delivery of Joint Waste Plan Strategic Objective 7 (Minimise Transportation and Establish Alternative Infrastructure).</p> <p>Therefore, if they are further proposed</p>	See suggested wording in representation

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		would ensure that the Transport Assessment is consistent with the intent of Policy JWP4 and other aspects of the Waste Plan.	<p>The Transport Assessment should illustrate <u>the following</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. accessibility to the site by all modes <u>for the waste being delivered to and/or exiting the site; including the opportunities for the waste to be transported by river and rail; and</u> ii. <u>accessibility for persons accessing the site, such as staff and visitors</u>, proposed measures to improve access or mitigate transport impacts using public transport, walking and cycling; <u>and</u> iii. <u>for the site as whole</u>; the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site, impacts to the transport network, as well as demonstrate compliance with other transport policies, including the London Plan (2021) 	by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			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.		
Historic England	33/001	Welcome and support the amendments made to the draft Plan since the previous consultation.	No modification sought	Support noted.	None
EA	35/001	<p>We are satisfied that our previous comments have been incorporated.</p> <p>For clarity on development types that we would object to in areas of groundwater sensitivity (e.g. Source Protection Zones), we recommend that the Plan refers to Position Statements E1 and F1 of the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection, as previously outlined in our Regulation 18 response.</p> <p>However, for clarity on development types that we would object to in areas of groundwater sensitivity (e.g. Source Protection Zones)</p>	Recommend that the Plan refers to Position Statements E1 and F1 of the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness. However the East London boroughs support and understands the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the Plan's assessment of planning applications for new waste facilities. Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p>	<p>Add new sentence at the end of paragraph 2.24: <u>The Environment Agency has prepared guidance setting out the types of development that it would object to in areas of groundwater sensitivity (e.g. Source Protection Zones).</u> Add footnote: See Environment Agency's Position Statements E1</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
					and F1 on the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection.
EA	35/004	Welcome the inclusion of climate adaptation measures such as SuDS, green roofs, and drought-resistant landscaping. Planning approvals must align with EA permit requirements e.g. water-reliant dust suppression systems should be supported by adequate on-site water storage and pressure to reduce reliance on public water supply.	See below	Support noted.	None
EA	35/012	We note that there have been no changes to the wording of Policy JWP4 since the previous consultation. The "Purpose of Policy" section refers to protecting and enhancing the "local environment." However, this term is not defined. We expect that groundwater is explicitly included within the scope of the "local environment," given the sensitivity of the area and the potential risks posed by waste management activities. Policy JWP4 discusses the use of SuDS at waste sites. We reiterate our advice that the Plan should reference 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	Plan should reference Section G of the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection, particularly: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• G11 Discharges of surface water run-off to ground at sites affected by land contamination, or from sites used for the storage of potential pollutants, are likely to require an environmental permit. This is especially relevant for sites handling hazardous	Definition of "Local Environment" Text to Policy JWP4 has been updated to mention the 'water environment', and a definition of 'water environment' was also added to the glossary after the Reg. 18 response from the Environment Agency. See paragraph 6.82 and criteria 2 of Policy JWP4 in the Reg. 19 ELJWP document. Groundwater will be added to the scope of 'Local Environment' within the 'Purpose of Policy' section for Policy JWP4. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and Groundwater Protection The previous comments made by the Environment Agency for the Reg. 18 consultation states: 'Whilst we are pleased to see reference to sustainable drainage	Add new paragraph to follow paragraph 6.96: <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</u>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		drainage, a hydrogeological risk assessment must be undertaken to ensure no unacceptable risk to groundwater sources.	<p>substances (e.g., garage forecourts, lorry parks, metal recycling facilities). These sites must be subject to risk assessment and appropriate effluent treatment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G13 <p>The Government expects SuDS to be implemented in new developments wherever appropriate. The Environment Agency supports this expectation. Where infiltration SuDS are used for surface run-off from roads, car parks, or public areas, they should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Be suitably designed; o Meet the Government's non-statutory technical standards for SuDS, used alongside the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance; o Use a SuDS management 	<p>systems, in line with Policy SI 13 of the London Plan, please take note of the following with regard to risk to groundwater: Part A5 of Policy JWP4 discusses use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) at waste sites. Please see section G of the Environment Agency's approach to Groundwater Protection for our position statements with respect to drainage. Appendix B of this response outlines those position statements of particular relevance.'</p> <p>The response did not state that the Plan should reference Section G of the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection and therefore no such action was taken.</p> <p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification/s. These are not considered necessary for soundness. However the East London boroughs understands the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the delivery of waste management facilities that are sustainably designed, and Joint Waste Plan Strategic Objective 2: 'All Built Development Will Contribute to the Achievement of a Fully Functioning Circular Economy by 2041.'</p> <p>Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p>	<p><u>hydrogeological risk assessment must be undertaken to ensure no unacceptable risk to groundwater sources.</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			treatment train to ensure robust pollution control. 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.		
EA	35/013	We welcome the inclusion of water efficiency, climate adaptation, BNG and SuDS in Policy JWP4. Recommend additions to ensure alignment with RBMP objectives align with permitting requirements We advise the application of CEEQUAL standards (now BREEAM Infrastructure) for the development or redevelopment of waste sites, as BREEAM 'Excellent' is often not applicable to such facilities.	The Plan should include a reference to EA permitting stipulations when considering site design and drainage strategies. Recommend the following additions to ensure alignment with RBMP objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Avoiding any deterioration in the ecological status of RBMP water bodies or of their associated elements, and contributing to RBMP water body	Alignment with EA Permitting Requirements As noted in para. 1.17 EA permitting requirements are a separate regime - para. 1.17 states that under the NPPF and the NPPW local planning authorities are expected to focus on determining if a proposed development is a suitable use of land, and the consequences of the use, rather than managing any related processes or emissions regulated under separate pollution control regimes. Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should assume that these regimes will be applied effectively by pollution control authorities e.g. the Environment Agency. With regard to dust suppression and	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>enhancement objectives and measures; and,"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Ensuring development of new waste management facilities shall sit well outside of the 8m buffer zone measured between the top of a riverbank and the development red line boundary, with no materials stored within the buffer zone; and," • "Avoiding fragmentation of ecological corridors between open green spaces, between waterbodies and of rivers and their floodplains." 	<p>airbourne particles during droughts the East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness. However the East London boroughs support understands the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the overall sustainability of the Joint Waste Plan. Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p> <p>Sustainability Standards and Environmental Permits</p> <p>The previous comment from the Environment Agency at Reg. 18 stage regarding the onerous nature of BREEAM excellent and the inclusion of CEEQUAL was responded to by the ELJWPG as follows:</p> <p>'The clause [criteria 9 policy JWP4] states: 'achievement of a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating or its equivalent unless it is demonstrated that this isn't practical;' In light of the caveat included it is considered that this recognises that in certain circumstances waste facilities may not be able to achieve an excellent rating.'</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) Objectives</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				Regarding the suggested modifications to text relating to BNG and the RBMP objectives, the ELJWPG consider that these issues would be a consideration for environmental permits issued by the Environment Agency and not the focus of the waste plan.	
EA	35/005	<p>Support the Plan's recognition of biodiversity but recommend stronger integration of aquatic systems and river corridors as ecological networks.</p> <p>Recommend expanding paragraph 6.97 to include specific measures for enhancing riparian and aquatic biodiversity, particularly where development is proposed near watercourses.</p> <p>Amendments suggested to strengthen paragraph 2.10.</p>	<p>Suggested amendment to para. 2.10. "As well as green spaces, river systems run through each borough and function as crucial networks for ecological connectivity and biodiversity. Many waterbodies across the catchment are designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, and SSSIs. As rivers provide critical habitat and migration paths for multiple species, these aquatic systems are crucial to support. There is a need for continued preservation and long-term</p>	<p>Suggested amendment to para. 2.10 Comment noted.</p> <p>The East London boroughs note the proposed modification. This is not considered necessary for soundness. However the East London boroughs support and understands the reasons for the proposal and considers their inclusion could improve the Plan's overall objective of making waste management in East London more sustainable. Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to paragraph 6.97:</p> <p>The ELJWPG do not consider that it is feasible for developers to increase BNG in water bodies/courses beyond their land ownership. We also consider that the proposed measures are not appropriate for the waste plan and would be considerations for criteria within borough local plans.</p>	<p>New paragraph to follow para. 2.10: <u>As well as green spaces, river systems run through each borough and function as crucial networks for ecological connectivity and biodiversity. Many waterbodies across the catchment are designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, and SSSIs. As rivers provide critical habitat and migration paths for multiple species, these</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>management of both green and blue areas within the Plan area, as well as consideration of potential effects on sites outside the Plan area boundary.”</p> <p>Suggested amendment to paragraph 6.97: “Measures to enhance biodiversity should be integrated into new buildings, e.g. biodiverse roofs, swift bricks or boxes, green walls and contribute to the achievement of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for London. If site boundaries fall within 10m from the top of a river bank, an uplift in BNG watercourse units should also be achieved.</p> <p>Improvements to the riparian zone include additional native aquatic planting and removing hard engineering from waterbodies.</p>		<p><u>aquatic systems are crucial to support. There is a need for continued preservation and long-term management of both green and blue areas within the Plan area, as well as consideration of potential effects on sites outside the Plan area boundary.</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>Depending on the location in relation to protected habitats, and the nature of the proposal, a Habitats Regulation Assessment will need to be submitted. Baseline ecological surveying in the form of an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required to assess the risk of any new sites proposed.”</p> <p>These additions would ensure that the Plan more comprehensively addresses the ecological value of aquatic systems and the need for their protection and enhancement in the context of waste infrastructure development.</p>		
London Cycling Campaign - Tom	38/001	The Plan statements on road safety should be clearer regarding what site owners and contractors must do, and should, in addition to specifying FORS (Silver grade rather than just registration) as a requirement, and DVS (which is mandatory across all of Greater London	Make references to road safety clearer.	<p>Policy JWP4 in the waste plan states that:</p> <p><i>'Proposals for waste management and wastewater treatment development will only be permitted which have been</i></p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
Bogdanowicz		anyway), require that all waste operations and sites meet the Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) standard notably with regard to marshalling at entrances and agreed road access routes to sites.		<p><i>designed to address the following during their construction and operation (including associated vehicle movements):...</i></p> <p><i>2. measures to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts arising from noise, dust, litter, vermin, vibration, odour, bioaerosols, external lighting, visual intrusion, traffic or associated risks to the environment</i></p> <p><i>12. measures to control and reduce vehicle impacts including:</i></p> <p><i>i. emissions, through the use of low emission vehicles, installation of vehicle charging points and scheduling and management of vehicle routing; and,</i></p> <p><i>ii. impacts on the safety of other road users including pedestrians.'</i></p> <p>We also consider that references to Transport for London's (TfL) Direct Vision Standard (DVS), which enhances road safety, will increase safety measures with regard to traffic around waste sites.</p> <p>No change.</p>	
London Cycling Campaign - Andy Brooke	39/001	The CLOCS Standard includes requirements around logistics planning, risk assessments, route planning, traffic marshals, vehicle checks and much more, all of which complement the efforts made by operators. Waste operators have these same responsibilities and should be asked to look at their own site operations.	Make references to road safety clearer.	The Direct Vision Standard (DVS) applies to vehicles over 12 tonnes in weight (gross) and is a progressive standard rated in stars. The Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) has different levels within the standard, however DVS is an earned recognition	6.100 Proposals should reference the use of Direct Vision Lorries for waste vehicles or the use freight operators who

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>scheme equivalent to FORS, both standards should be achievable as part of daily routine activities and should not be onerous for operators, hence their inclusion in the Plan. FORS silver accreditation covers Construction Logistics and Community Safety standards (CLOCS) compliance and could not be required within the Plan for daily operations, although this might be expected on active construction/building sites.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to adding text to paragraph 6.100 stating that we expect all operators to achieve at least 4 out of 5 stars within the DVS standard.</p> <p>Construction Logistics and Community Safety standards (CLOCS) is generally introduced for construction sites where there is much more activity than the daily activities at a waste site. In order to introduce this standard for operators it would need to be as a progressive roll out, as requiring this standard from an immediate start date would not be possible. A roll out of the standard could take several years to achieve, and might be difficult for small operators, and difficult to enforce with third party freight services.</p> <p>However, the East London boroughs note the proposed modifications. These are not considered necessary for soundness. However, we</p>	<p>can demonstrate their commitment to TfL's Freight Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) or similar. 6.101</p> <p>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</u></p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				understand the reasons for the proposal and consider their partial inclusion could improve the delivery of the Joint Waste Plan's overall strategic objective. Therefore, if they are further proposed by the Inspector, the East London boroughs would be supportive of these modifications being made.	<u>achieve at least 4 out of 5 stars within the DVS standard.</u>
Policy JWP5: Energy from Waste					
Stantec obo Barking Riverside	13/003	Policy JWP5 should make it clear that the restrictions set out would apply only to new EfW facilities, and not to existing permissions or operations.	Clarify that Policy JWP5 would apply only to new EfW facilities.	Chapter 6 of the ELJWP sets out that the policies will be applied when making decisions on the suitability of proposals in East London. Policies would not be applied retrospectively to development with existing permission. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the Plan is sound without these proposed changes.	None
EA	35/014	<p>Surprised by the assertion that there is no need for additional Energy from Waste (EfW) capacity in the area. While the strategic direction of waste disposal is primarily the responsibility of the disposal authority, we believe the ELJWP should play a role in encouraging consistency in carbon performance criteria for waste treated outside of London.</p> <p>We recommend that the policy be strengthened.</p> <p>While point 5 of the policy stipulates operation as a 'heat and energy' plant, it does not require applicants to explain how this will be achieved.</p>	<p>Explicitly require EfW proposals to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how they will deliver combined heat and power (CHP) or equivalent energy recovery; • Minimise emissions and environmental impacts in line with Best Available Techniques (BAT). <p>We suggest that an additional criterion be</p>	<p>Policy JWP5: Energy from Waste (Page 95)</p> <p>ELWA have now agreed a contract with the Cory Belvedere facility and EfW/RDF is not being exported to the continent.</p> <p>With regard to the other suggested modifications, including to require EfW proposals to '<i>Minimise emissions and environmental impacts in line with Best Available Techniques (BAT)</i>', the policy already states that:</p> <p>'Proposals for waste sites that use waste as a fuel source to produce</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		These enhancements would ensure that EfW developments contribute meaningfully to the circular economy and climate resilience goals of the Plan.	added to section 6.7 requiring EfW proposals to clearly set out their energy recovery strategy, including how heat and/or power will be utilised and distributed.	<p>energy will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that:</p> <p>4. the use will be consistent with the proximity principle and not result in long distance vehicle movements;...</p> <p>6. the release of non-biogenic gaseous carbon emissions will be minimised, with mechanisms to capture for use and/or storage if use is not viable.</p> <p>It is also considered that other matters suggested for modifications to the plan policy would be addressed through the EA permit process.</p> <p>With regard to the suggested additional criterion to be added to section 6.7 requiring EfW proposals to clearly set out their energy recovery strategy, including how heat and/or power will be utilised and distributed, this comment was submitted by the EA at Reg. 18 stage and the ELJWPG responded by adding supporting text to address this concern.</p>	
Oxfordshire County Council	32/007	<p>Support the policy in that it seeks to only permit EfW sites where they qualify as recovery and where the waste cannot be managed further up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>We suggest the policy and supporting text could go further to ensure that any future waste source material required for use as fuel does not require regional imports.</p>	Add wording policy to ensure waste material required for use as fuel does not require regional imports.	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy is effective in this regard. JWP5 requires developments of energy from waste facilities to be consistent with the proximity principle and not result in long distance vehicle movements. This matter is addressed further in the SoCG. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		JWP6: Deposit of Waste on Land			
Oxfordshire County Council	32/004	<p>The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Core Strategy (2017) makes provision for the disposal of Oxfordshire's non-hazardous waste (under Policy W6 at existing facilities, whilst also recognising those other areas export waste to these facilities). As there is sufficient capacity to manage Oxfordshire's arisings over our Plan period, Policy W6 sets out that further provision for the disposal of non-hazardous waste by means of landfill will not be made. Oxfordshire already receives levels of non-hazardous waste considered to be strategic (movements over 5,000tpa as agreed by the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group) from the East London Authorities, all of which, in 2021, 2022, and 2023 according to the WDI, went to one non-hazardous landfill facility in Oxfordshire, Sutton Courtenay. Planning permissions for Oxfordshire's non-hazardous landfill sites expire by 2031 and so we would expect the ELJWP to demonstrate how it is going to manage their future non hazardous waste arisings over their Plan period, and preferably within their own Plan area.</p>	No modification sought	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the plan is justified. The overarching policy objectives of the plan seek to reduce the area's non-hazardous landfill requirement to an absolute minimum. Policy JWP6 also sets out a policy framework under which proposals for non-inert and inert waste disposal on land will be assessed if further capacity is proposed over the plan period. It should be noted that an extension of landfill and composting operations at Rainham landfill until 31 December 2029 was agreed by Havering's Strategic Planning Committee on 10.07.2025. The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	None
Brett Aggregates Ltd	1/001	<p>While the ELJWP recognises the benefits of using inert excavation waste to restore mineral workings, it fails to safeguard such sites, as it says there is no need for additional capacity.</p> <p>The Plan follows The London Plan in exempting excavation waste from the self-sufficiency principle, despite East London's inability to manage its excavation waste internally.</p>	The Plan needs to safeguard suitable mineral working sites for the disposal of soft inert excavation material	<p>The East London Joint Waste Plan is not a minerals plan. The East London Joint Waste Plan has to be in general conformity with the London Plan, and therefore follows Policy SI8 in its approach to planning for net self sufficiency which excludes excavation waste. Minerals and aggregate safeguarding is covered in the London</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>Brett Aggregates Limited's ongoing and proposed projects in Havering demonstrate the practical use of excavation waste in mineral restoration. Safeguarding mineral workings offer environmental, landscape, biodiversity, and anti-fly-tipping benefits, and also support recycling of hard materials.</p> <p>The Plan is unclear about the classification of soft inert excavation material as waste, with differing definitions under Environmental Permits and the CL:AIRE Protocol. The majority of such material is regulated as waste, and specific provisions for its disposal via safeguarded mineral workings are needed.</p>		Plan and individual borough Local Plans were relevant.	
EA	35/015	<p>Section 6.77 should include flood defences as a valid engineering use for inert waste.</p> <p>The Plan should follow the Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection, particularly Position Statement E1, which outlines objections to landfill in SPZ1 and criteria for risk assessments in other areas.</p>	<p>6.77 should include flood defences as a valid engineering use for inert waste.</p> <p>Add reference to EA Approach to Groundwater Protection</p>	<p>The suggested change was proposed by the EA at Reg. 18 stage and the ELJWPG responded by adding supporting text to address this concern at paragraph 6.118 in the Reg. 19 ELJWP.</p>	None
EA	35/003	<p>Section 6.118 (Page 100) discusses the use of inert waste for flood defences. This is acceptable from a flood risk perspective, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facility and flood defence are safe for their lifetime. • There is no increase in flood risk elsewhere. <p>In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, paragraph 170),</p>	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>inappropriate development in flood-prone areas should be avoided. Where development is necessary, it must be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a Flood Risk Activity Permit for any activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal). • Within 8 metres of a flood defence or culvert (16 metres if tidal). • Within 16 metres of a sea defence. • Involving excavation or quarrying within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence, or culvert. • In a floodplain more than 8 metres from the riverbank, culvert, or flood defence (16 metres if tidal), where planning permission is not already in place. 			
Karla Ndoma hina	12/001	<p>Risk associated with extraction of Landfilled waste would have to be weighed against the risks of leaving such wastes where they are. There is a 'Growth Area' under development stretching from the West Boundary of Barking just South of A13 stretching alongside the River Thames to Rainham station. There are ten thousands of units planned. There are two landfill sites close to those sites.</p> <p>The emissions of the landfill site will add to the existing emissions. Risk associated with extraction of landfilled waste would have to be weighed against the risks of leaving such wastes where they are.</p>	<p>The landfill site should be located further away from ambitious planned new Growth Areas.</p>	<p>The ELJWP does not identify any additional sites to be allocated for the use as a landfill. Existing waste sites are located in areas allocated for waste or industrial uses. Any new residential development must consider measures to mitigate against adverse impacts from these waste uses.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the Plan is sound without proposed changes.</p>	None
Appendix 1 - Monitoring Framework					

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
LBTH	30/020	<p>Table 9 lists four sites to be released from safeguarding, with a total capacity of 462,500tpa (though the table does not specify, except for Old Bus Depot, whether this is HIC waste capacity, C,D&E waste capacity or other types of waste capacity).</p> <p>Six total sites have been identified as having potential for release from safeguarding, with a total reduction in apportioned HIC waste capacity of 176,279tpa and a reduction in C,D&E waste capacity of 128,576tpa.</p> <p>The supporting text of London Plan Policy SI8 is clear that boroughs with surplus waste capacity should share this with boroughs facing a shortfall before releasing sites from safeguarding.</p>	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is justified.</p> <p>The capacity and waste management steam of sites identified for release from safeguarding is set out in Table 1 of the Sites Identified for Release in Reg 19 ELJWP topic paper.</p> <p>Appendix 4 sites are additional existing waste management sites which might make good candidates for redevelopment for non-waste uses in future. Noting each of the East London boroughs are at different stages of the plan-making process (through which industrial land boundary changes could be made), the appendix signposts those sites the boroughs may plan for the release of through the allocation of sites in updated Local Plans. This approach seeks to reflect paragraph 22 of the NPPF, which states that "Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities." It also reflects the London Plan supporting paragraph 9.8.10, which states that "Plans or agreements safeguarding waste sites should take a flexible approach. They should be regularly reviewed and updated to take account of</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>development that may lead to the integration of waste sites or appropriate relocation of lost waste sites."</p> <p>This capacity will also need to be considered in discussions with other London boroughs around sharing capacity, noting the need to ensure we do not undermine future strategic planning aspirations alongside maintaining East London's management capacity surplus. The Plan fully acknowledges that Appendix 4 sites would only be released if a surplus of capacity to compensate for the site's loss exists at the time the site(s) is/are allocated for non-waste use at the Local Plan stage.</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH is the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of East London's</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how East London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
Elliott Day	6/003	The ELJWP has followed the required process and statutory consultation duties but concerned that its effectiveness may be undermined in	The Plan should be amended to include:	A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>practice. In my local area, persistent fly-tipping and limited enforcement activity suggest that current waste infrastructure and operational strategies are insufficient. If the Plan does not include realistic measures to address these on-the-ground issues or lacks adequate mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement, it may not be effective in delivering its objectives.</p> <p>To ensure the ELJWP is both sound and effective, I recommend a clear and measurable policy commitment to proactive local enforcement and infrastructure delivery to tackle fly-tipping and unauthorised waste disposal.</p> <p>This addition would enhance the effectiveness of the Plan (per NPPF para. 35(c)) and provide transparency and accountability at borough level, where implementation gaps currently risk undermining the Plan's delivery. While the Joint Waste Plan sets strategic direction, real-world impact will depend on local execution—an area currently under-addressed in the submission draft.</p> <p>Without a measurable mechanism for addressing visible waste and fly-tipping in public spaces, the Plan risks being disconnected from the on-the-ground reality for residents and failing to secure public confidence.</p>	<p>"Each borough shall set out and publish an annual enforcement strategy aligned to the objectives of the Joint Waste Plan, including performance metrics on fly-tipping response times, prosecutions or penalties issued, and public awareness campaigns."</p>	<p>plan is primarily concerned with the use of land. While the plan is positively prepared to ensure that there is sufficient waste management facilities to manage waste produced in the borough, policies to reduce and enforce fly tipping issues is carried out separately by the individual Council's waste and recycling teams and/or law enforcement officers. While we could introduce a monitoring criteria on reports of fly tipping incidents and actions taken, its ability to measure the effectiveness of the plan would be limited, noting the multiple factors that influence rates of fly tipping outside of land-use related issues.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
Appendix 2 - List of Safeguarded Sites					
Network Rail	28/003; 28/004; 28/005	Bow Goods Yard is a 12.3-hectare brownfield industrial site in East London, split into Bow East (8.9ha) and Bow West (3.4ha), primarily used for rail freight and aggregate processing.	Remove the S Walsh & Son site from safeguarded sites.	The change you have suggested has not resulted in a change. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the proposed parameter plan	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>An Outline Planning Application for up to 190,000sqm of industrial, employment, and leisure uses was submitted to the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) in April 2024, with a resolution to grant planning permission secured in October 2024. From December 2024, planning powers reverted to the London Boroughs of Newham (Bow East) and Tower Hamlets (Bow West). Newham's planning committee also resolved to grant permission in May 2025, pending determination from Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>Bow East is subject to two waste licences: DB Cargo (UK) Limited and S Walsh & Son Limited.</p> <p>The draft East London Joint Waste Plan (ELJWP) identifies sufficient waste management capacity in the region, does not allocate new sites for waste facilities, and selectively releases existing sites from safeguarding where this supports broader development aims. Four sites have already been released, and surplus waste capacity (approx. 310,000 tpa) will be safeguarded to compensate for future site releases. Appendix 4 of the Plan outlines longer-term redevelopment opportunities for certain waste sites.</p> <p>The LLDC Local Plan designates Bow Goods Yard for consolidation and intensification of rail, industrial, and employment uses, with the potential for partial land release at Bow East for alternative uses, while maintaining strategic industrial land (SIL) capacity and providing biodiversity buffers. The current safeguarding of the entire site for waste use is considered a</p>		<p>associated with permission 24/00122/OUT does not currently benefit from full planning permission (with only a resolution to grant for outline consent). Therefore, reflecting the suggested boundary would undermine the effectiveness of the existing safeguarding, noting the proposal does not yet benefit from detailed planning permission and has not yet been commenced. The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p> <p>Bow Goods Yard received a resolution to grant planning permission from Newham's Strategic Development Committee on 20th May 2025 under reference 24/00122/OUT. The application's heads of terms included a requirement for Waste Capacity which required:</p> <p>“The developer to ensure that existing waste capacity of 1.05 million tonnes of waste capacity for C, D and E waste is retained on site through the masterplan delivery unless the Site is removed from the East London Waste Plan through the plan led process.”</p> <p>This level of re-provision reflects the safeguarded capacity at each site, as per each site's environmental permit throughput limit.</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>constraint on wider development, and it is recommended that safeguarding be amended to better reflect operational waste areas, specifically within certain development plots in Newham.</p> <p>Of the two waste licences, DB Cargo (UK) Limited remains active and its waste capacity will be re-provided within the new development. S Walsh & Son Limited, however, has vacated Bow Goods Yard due to operational and cost inefficiencies, relocating to Tilbury; their waste capacity is now delivered elsewhere and has not been lost. The recommendation is to remove the S Walsh & Son licence and associated safeguarding, as it no longer serves its original purpose and hinders broader planning objectives.</p>		<p>The 'Sites Identified for Release in Reg 19 ELJWP' paper that supports the plan sets out the methodology the boroughs used to consider whether the release of existing waste sites was justified. Namely, each site identified for release needed to be identified in Local Plan allocations for other uses. In the case of Marshgate sidings, the site is located within the Bow Goods Yard site allocation in the LLDC Local Plan (SA4.5) and is allocated as Strategic Industrial Land. The allocation requires any redevelopment to provide "at least an equivalent amount of SIL function capacity as the current land area". This approach, and the adopted London Plan policy SI 9 (Safeguarded Waste Sites), therefore informed both the application decision process, and the subsequent safeguarding of the existing capacity in the emerging ELJWP.</p> <p>Noting the provisions in the section 106 heads of terms to re-provide the existing management capacity of site, we do not consider it is appropriate to release the capacity associated with the S Walsh & Son site.</p> <p>We note the site does not benefit from permanent planning permission. However, having looked into the site history it appears the use is lawful by time, and has therefore been considered as per paragraph 6.30 of</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>the ELJWP, which includes such sites in the definition of existing waste sites.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
EA	35/007	<p>We draw attention to the categorisation of 'safeguarded sites' listed on pages 120–124.</p> <p>In particular, we highlight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biffa (formerly Renewi) – Jenkins Lane • Frog Island <p>These sites are currently out for tender, with permits required by Summer 2027.</p> <p>The procurement process will be making sites available for bidders to use and will maintain the four existing Reuse and Recycling Centres.</p>	No modification sought	Comment noted.	None
Brett Aggregates Limited	1/002	The inclusion of HV05 Rainham Recycling Facility (RRF) in the ELJWP is supported. RRF is also an active and long-established mineral processing site which is well positioned to receive locally generated inert materials. The existing established facility provides an important point for the management of C, D & E waste.	No modification sought	Support noted	None
NGET	17/001	One or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets. A plan showing details of the site locations and details of NGET assets is attached to this letter	No modification sought	Noted	None
Legal & General Investment Management	18/001	The Box Lane site is currently occupied by a range of tenants, including two who process waste. Whilst LGIM plans to redevelop the site substantially, it is not yet in a position to commit to those plans nor is it yet able to give any firm indication as to when that redevelopment might start. Accordingly it wishes to preserve the site's	No modification sought	Noted. The East London boroughs will engage with L&G with an intent to produce a SOCG.	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
(Box Lane)		designation as existing, pending a clear direction and timescale for redevelopment.			
		Appendix 3 - Maps of Safeguarded Sites			
PLA	26/006; 26/008	<p>Several of the maps depicting Safeguarded Wharves are incorrect and therefore not legally compliant as the wharves are safeguarded under Town And Country Planning Act 1990 the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 Direction Under Article 18(4).</p> <p>The previous response to the Regulation 18 consultation by the PLA listed a number of wharves that should have been included in the then Appendix 2 now Appendix 3 while the Appendix has been updated further modification is needed.</p>	<p>Proposed modifications - Appendix 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pinns Wharf 18 River Rd., Barking IG11 0DH in Barking and Dagenham should be included in Appendix 3. - Plaistow Wharf is part of the Peruvian Wharf Safeguarding Direction please add the following text to the information provided regarding the wharf <p><u>Included in the Peruvian Wharf safeguarding direction</u></p> <p>Also please check that the wharves identified as safeguarded sites in Appendix 3 match in area / extent to the GLA Safeguarding</p>	<p>Pinns Wharf was not included at Regulation 19 as the use allowed by the permit was outside of the lawful use. The unlawful use has now ceased, and the site is not proposed to be included in Appendix 3 as a safeguarded site for scrap metal operations.</p> <p>Text is included in the Submission Draft to indicate that Plaistow Wharf is part of the Peruvian Wharf but not part of the Safeguarding Direction; Appendix 3 does not include Royal Primrose Wharf; Appendix 3 does not include Rippleway Wharf;</p> <p>The text relating to the area of site B&D 14 in Appendix 3 is proposed to be updated to ensure consistency with the safeguarding direction</p>	<p>The text relating to the area of site B&D 14 in Appendix 3 is proposed to be updated to ensure consistency with the safeguarding direction</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
			<p>Directions.</p> <p>Discrepancies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Royal Primrose Wharf also in Newham which is 1.49ha is the Safeguarding Direction and 1.35ha in Appendix 3. - Rippleway Wharf in Barking and Dagenham which 4.13ha in the Safeguarding Direction and 4.08ha in Appendix 3. - Alexander Wharf which is 0.65ha in the Safeguarding Direction and 0.67 in Appendix 3. 		
Appendix 4 - Longer Term Development Options					
LBTH	30/020	Table 9 lists four sites to be released from safeguarding, with a total capacity of 462,500tpa (though the table does not specify, except for Old Bus Depot, whether this is HIC waste capacity, C,D&E waste capacity or other types of waste capacity).	Acknowledgement of LBTH capacity requirement	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is justified.</p> <p>The capacity and waste management</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		<p>Appendix 4 includes six total sites have been identified as having potential for release from safeguarding, with a total reduction in apportioned HIC waste capacity of 176,279tpa and a reduction in C,D&E waste capacity of 128,576tpa.</p> <p>The supporting text of London Plan Policy SI8 is clear that boroughs with surplus waste capacity should share this with boroughs facing a shortfall before releasing sites from safeguarding.</p>		<p>steam of sites identified for release from safeguarding is set out in Table 1 of the Sites Identified for Release in Reg 19 ELJWP topic paper.</p> <p>Appendix 4 sites are additional existing waste management sites which might make good candidates for redevelopment for non-waste uses in future. Noting each of the East London boroughs are at different stages of the plan-making process (through which industrial land boundary changes could be made), the appendix signposts those sites the boroughs may plan for the release of through the allocation of sites in updated Local Plans. This approach seeks to reflect paragraph 22 of the NPPF, which states that "Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities." It also reflects the London Plan supporting paragraph 9.8.10, which states that "Plans or agreements safeguarding waste sites should take a flexible approach. They should be regularly reviewed and updated to take account of development that may lead to the integration of waste sites or appropriate relocation of lost waste sites."</p> <p>This capacity will also need to be considered in discussions with other</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>London boroughs around sharing capacity, noting the need to ensure we do not undermine future strategic planning aspirations alongside maintaining East London's management capacity surplus. The Plan fully acknowledges that Appendix 4 sites would only be released if a surplus of capacity to compensate for the site's loss exists at the time the site(s) is/are allocated for non-waste use at the Local Plan stage.</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH is the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of East London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how East London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>sufficiency.</p> <p>Currently, the East London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>The East London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
GLA	27/011	LP2021 Policy SI9 is clear that all waste sites are safeguarded, and that an existing waste site should only be released to other land uses where waste processing capacity is re-provided elsewhere within London. The draft Plan states that the assessed capacity of the sites identified within this appendix is circa 230,397tpa (154,148 apportioned waste, 71,929 CDE waste and 4,320 hazardous waste). Given the policy requirements and evidence required for	Delete Appendix 4	<p>A change to this policy approach has not been made. We did not consider this change to be necessary as the policy approach in the Submission ELJWP is justified.</p> <p>Appendix 4 sites are additional existing waste management sites which might make good candidates for redevelopment for non-waste uses in</p>	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		consideration of the release of existing waste sites from safeguarding, it is suggested that Appendix 4, and references to the potential for future release of these sites, are removed from the Plan.		<p>future. Noting each of the east London boroughs are at different stages of the plan-making process (through which industrial land boundary changes could be made), the appendix signposts those sites the boroughs may plan for the release of through the allocation of sites in updated Local Plans. This approach seeks to reflect paragraph 22 of the NPPF, which states that "Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities." It also reflects the London Plan supporting paragraph 9.8.10, which states that "Plans or agreements safeguarding waste sites should take a flexible approach. They should be regularly reviewed and updated to take account of development that may lead to the integration of waste sites or appropriate relocation of lost waste sites."</p> <p>This capacity will also need to be considered in discussions with other London boroughs around sharing capacity, noting the need to ensure we do not undermine future strategic planning aspirations alongside maintaining east London's management capacity surplus. The Plan fully acknowledges that Appendix 4 sites would only be released if a surplus of capacity to compensate for</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>the site's loss exists at the time the site(s) is/are allocated for non-waste use at the Local Plan stage.</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH is the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how east London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>With regards to sourcing compensatory capacity for plan-led release of sites, it is the east London boroughs view that London Plan Policy SI 9c and paragraph 9.9.2 encourages the release of waste sites to be undertaken as part of a plan-led process, rather than on an ad hoc basis through the development management process. Requiring compensatory capacity through the plan-led process in the same way as requiring through individual planning applications would undermine the strategic approach to balancing various land-use objectives that plan-making affords. It also risks hindering the delivery of wider planning objectives and the efficient use of appropriate land/sites.</p> <p>Even with the release of capacity planned through the ELJWP, east</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>London would still retain a significant surplus of management capacity, with between c.0.68 Mtpa (without MBT) and c.1.2Mtpa of apportioned waste surplus and 0.98 Mtpa of C,D&E waste management capacity surplus by 2041. This would allow the boroughs to comfortably meet Tower Hamlets unmet needs (if proven), alongside the release of sites identified in the plan and those sites identified in Appendix 4 through the plan-led process.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	
Appendix 5 - Replacement of Policies in the ELWP					
City of London Corporation as landowner in Dagenham Dock	15/001	The most recent waste management capacity assessments demonstrates that there is a surplus of capacity needed for the management of current and forecast future waste arisings in East London. The City of London Corporation supports the removal of the current adopted policy W2 (ELWP, 2012) and the associated removal of the designation of the Dagenham Dock Sustainable Industries Park (and their Site at Plot 64) as a Schedule 2 area (broad locations identified for waste management facilities) in the emerging Reg 19 ELJWP (2025). The City of London Corporation supports the replacement of adopted policy W2 (ELWP, 2012) with JWP2, JWP2B and JWP3 (Reg 19 ELJWP, 2025).	No modification sought	Support noted	None

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
		Integrated Impact Assessment			
LBTH	30/014	<p>The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the ELJWP considered an alternative (Need Alternative 1) involving capacity assistance to LBTH and other authorities. However, as the ELJWPG already invites such requests and plans for surplus capacity above the London Plan apportionment, this alternative does not differ substantially from the current policy. While the IIA notes that Need Alternative 1 could cause waste to travel further, Tower Hamlets already both exports and imports significant waste with the ELJWP, making longer waste trips unlikely. Additionally, without ELJWP support, Tower Hamlets would face even longer journeys to alternative authorities. The IIA also suggests negative environmental and community impacts from allocating less suitable sites, but the ELJWPG's surplus capacity means no new sites are needed to meet LBTH's shortfall.</p>	<p>No modification sought to ELJWP</p>	<p>We do not consider assessing inclusion of a waste sharing agreement with LBTH in Policy JWP2 is a reasonable alternative that needs to be assessed in the IIA. The plan already includes provisions to assess requests to share capacity under paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12, which seek to positively meet the needs of other London boroughs unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate process. The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'.</p> <p>To inform the process of sharing east London's surplus management capacity, a methodology for assessing requests to share surplus capacity is set out in Appendix 2 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement (Proposed criteria for assessing surplus capacity requests). This methodology seeks to ensure that boroughs optimise their ability to manage waste within their own</p>	<p>None</p>

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>boundaries, supporting the proximity principle. This also means that the maximum amount of east London's surplus waste management capacity can be retained to meet other areas of London's management needs as required over the course of the plan period. This accords with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that plans should anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities.</p> <p>The agreement of capacity sharing through Statements of Common Ground accords with the London Plan's supporting text, which states that boroughs may pool apportionment requirements through "bilateral agreements". A similar agreement has been utilised in south-east London through periodical updates to the 'Southeast London joint waste planning technical paper'. [o]</p> <p>We note the London Plan at paragraph 9.8.6 states that boroughs with a surplus of waste sites should offer to share these sites with those boroughs facing a shortfall in capacity before considering site release. We consider our approach is in general conformity with the principle of this supporting text. As per the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance, we have contacted all London Boroughs with an offer to request reliance on surplus</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>capacity in East London for meeting waste management requirements in their areas. LBTH are the only borough who have directly requested a proportion of east London's management capacity surplus. While the plan does propose site release, the plan wording provides guidance for how east London proposes to share capacity with other London boroughs, contributing to the London Plan objective of delivering net self-sufficiency. While the Greater London Authority have highlighted the need to adhere to this supporting text in their response to the Regulation 19 consultation, they have also not raised a general conformity objection to this policy approach.</p> <p>Currently, the east London boroughs retain concerns with regards to Tower Hamlet's response to the methodology criteria, namely their prioritisation of their Strategic and Local Industrial designations for uses other than waste in their Regulation 19 Local Plan, as well as their lack of duty to cooperate engagement with other London boroughs with which they share established waste management flows. We do not currently consider that LBTH have adequately demonstrated that there is an unmet need for waste management capacity in their area. Therefore, we are not currently in a position to agree sharing our capacity</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
				<p>surplus, although we have agreed to continue attempting to resolve these matters through duty to cooperate discussions.</p> <p>We also consider that the alternative suggested by LBTH would not require the alteration of any of the policy requirements currently included in the plan.</p> <p>To clarify the Integrated Impact Assessment undertakes an assessment of the making provision for further additional waste management capacity above the London Plan apportionment. This approach would provide a less restrictive alternative to the policy JWP2 part C, which limits new waste capacity provision to a series of exceptional circumstances. This reasonable alternative is not intended to amend east London's approach to safeguarding existing waste sites in the plan area, which could be used to help meet other area's management capacity shortfalls.</p> <p>We also consider that the alternative suggested by LBTH would not require the alteration of any of the policy requirements currently included in the plan.</p> <p>The east London boroughs are satisfied that the plan remains sound without the proposed changes.</p>	

Name	Ref.	Comment (summary)	Mod sought	Response	Mod proposed
Habitats Regulations Assessment					
Natural England	36/002	<p>The HRA takes account of the designated sites and their associated impacts that we would deem needed screening in and takes account of these in relation to plan policies. The mitigation as set out within policies JWP4 and JWP5 should mean that any proposed work carried out on existing sites to make full use of their capacity is only permitted when it has met as many requirements for minimising impacts as possible. The conclusion of the HRA, having looked at the appropriate assessment, is acceptable and would not be an issue.</p> <p>The requirement to consider all proposed new sites under Policy JWP 4 should mean that any ill-conceived proposals are rejected, and protections are correctly afforded to the likes of Epping Forest SAC.</p>	No modification sought	Comment noted	None