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1. Introduction

1.1 The four boroughs of Croydon, Kingston, Merton and Sutton are submitting the South London Waste Plan, a joint Development Plan Document, to the Secretary of State. It is intended that the South London Waste Plan will form part of each borough’s Local Development Framework.

1.2 This Statement of Consultation sets out details of the public consultations undertaken during the preparation of the South London Waste Plan. These comprised:
   (a) Stage 1: Issues and Options (19 September to 31 October 2008)
   (b) Stage 2: Potential Sites and Policies (20 July to 16 October 2009)
   (c) Stage 2a: Additional Sites (8 February to 22 March 2010)

1.3 Since the South London Waste Plan is a joint DPD, the consultations have been arranged so as to comply with the four partner boroughs’ Statements of Community Involvement (SCIs). These are:
   - The Croydon Statement of Community Involvement (LBC, 2007);
   - The Kingston Statement of Community Involvement (RBK, 2009);
   - The Merton Statement of Community Involvement (LBM, 2006); and,
   - The Sutton Statement of Community Involvement (LBS, 2006)

1.4 In cases where SCIs have differed in requirements, the SCI with the most rigorous requirements has taken precedent. For example, the Sutton SCI has a greater number of specific consultees than the other SCIs so the requirements of the Sutton SCI have been followed. Similarly, the Kingston SCI requires more re-consultation of previously consulted consultees than the other SCIs and so, in this instance, the Kingston requirements have been followed.

1.5 In addition, this Statement of Consultation shows that the South London Waste Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development (Amendment) Regulations 2008. This Statement of Consultation meets the requirements of Regulation 30(d) by setting out:
   (i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under Regulation 25;
   (ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under the regulation;
   (iii) a summary of the main issues raised by representations made pursuant to the regulation; and,
   (iv) how any representations made pursuant to the regulation have been taken into account.
2. Who Was Consulted

Specific Consultees Consolidated for All Boroughs,
(for some boroughs these may only be General Consultees)

British Geological Survey
British Waterways
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
Church Commissioners
Civic Voice (formerly Civic Society Initiative)
Civil Aviation Authority
Claygate Parish Council
Coal Authority (replaced Countryside Agency – 2008 Regs)
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
Crown Estate Office
Department of Constitutional Affairs
Department of Culture Media and Sport
Department of Transport Rail Group
Department of Work and Pensions
Diocesan Board of Finance (The South London Church Fund & Southwark Diocesan Board of Finance)
Elmbridge Borough Council
English Heritage (officially the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)
Environment Agency
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Equalities and Human Rights Commission
(formerly the Commission for Racial Equality, the Disability Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission)
First Capital Connect (taken over franchise from Thameslink)
Forestry Commission
Friends of the Earth
Department of Communities and Local Government/Government Office for London
Greater London Authority/Mayor of London (including Metropolitan Police Assembly)
Health and Safety Executive
Highways Agency
Homes and Communities Agency (formerly English Partnerships and Housing Corporation)
Home Builders’ Federation (formerly House Builders’ Federation)
Learning and Skills Council
Local Agenda 21
London Borough of Bromley
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Richmond
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Development Agency
Go-Ahead Group (formerly London General)
London Wildlife Trust
Metropolitan Police Authority
Ministry of Defence
Mole Valley District Council
National Trust
Natural England (formerly English Nature)
Network Rail
NHS Croydon (formerly, Croydon PCT, replacing London Strategic Health Authority – 2008 Regs)
NHS Kingston (formerly, Kingston PCT, replacing South West London Strategic Health Authority – 2008 Regs)
NHS Sutton and Merton (formerly Sutton and Merton PCT, replacing South West London Strategic Health Authority – 2008 Regs)
Office of Government Commerce
Parish Council of Chaldon
Parish Council of Caterham on the Hill
Parish Council of Warlingham
Parish Council of Whyteleafe
Post Office Property Holdings
Rail Freight Group
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Secretary of State for Transport (replacing Strategic Rail Authority – 2008 Regs)
South East England Development Agency
Southern Trains
South West Trains
Sport England
Surrey County Council
Sutton Chamber of Commerce
Tandridge District Council
Transport for London (incorporating London Buses)
Women’s National Commission
British Gas
Croydon General Consultees, Businesses and Other Organisations

3D Change CIC
Ability Housing
Ability Housing, Cycle Forum
Adams Holmes Associates
Addington Good Neighbours and Autumn Club
Addington Green Belt Action Group
Addington Residents’ Association
Addington Road Association
Addington Village Residents’ Association
Addiscombe & Rylands Residents’ Association
Addiscombe Woodside & Ashburton Neighbourhood Partnership
Adjaye Associates
Adrian Salt and Pang
Adrienne Hill - Development Planning Consultancy Services
Advisory Board of Churches
Age Concern Croydon
Age Concern Croydon/Croydon Disability Forum
Alabi Associates
All Saints with Saint Margaret Upper Norwood
Alders Croydon Ltd
Allplans Limited
Alsop Verrill Town Planning Consultancy
Ambulance Service
Amicus Horizon
AMS Opticians
ANA Architecture
Anchor Housing Trust
Ancient Monuments Society
Anerley Bicycle Club
ARC Architects
Arcadia
Arriva London
Arriva London South
Arrowcroft Group plc
Arup
Ashburton Branch Labour Party
Ashburton Community Association
Ashburton Library
Aspinall plc
Asra Greater London Housing Association
ASSA ABLOY Door Solutions
Association of Croydon Conservation Societies
Association of Environmentally Conscious Builders
ATIS Weatherall
Atkins
Auckland Ridge Residents' Association
Austin Mackie Associates Ltd
BAA plc
Babs Enterprise
Barbados Overseas Women’s Link
Barratt Homes
Barton Willmore
Beanos Records
Beazer Strategic Land
Becondale Road Residents' Association
Belgrave and Grosvenor Road Residents' Association
Bell Cornwell Partnership
Bellway Homes
Berkeley Homes
Beulah Christian Library & Centre
Biggin Hill Airport Limited
Bill Dunster Architects BedZED Factory Ltd
Bingham Hire Centre Limited
Birchfield and Southlands Residents' Association
Bishops Walk Residents' Association
BKG Insurance
Blackhorse Residents' Association
Bond & Sherwill
Boots Properties plc
Bourne Housing Society
Bourne Park Residents' Association
Bourne Society
Boyer Planning Limited
Boylan & James Ltd T/A Whichers Boylan & James
Bradmore Green Library
Brian Madge Ltd
British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
British Land Development Limited
British Transport Police Office
Broad Green & West Thornton Residents' Association
Broad Green Library
Broad Green Residents Association
Broadway Malyan
Broomleigh Housing Association
Bruges-Tozer Architects
Buddhist Centre Croydon
Burgess Boys Pet Care Centre
Business Focus
Butchers
C B Richard Ellis Ltd
C S J Brooke Smith
John Sharkey and Co
CALAT
Campaign for Real Ale - Croydon & Sutton Branch
Campaign to Protect Rural England (Surrey)
Canehill Christian Foundation Limited
Canning and Clyde Road Residents' Association
Canterbury & Stanley Road Residents' Association
Cara Irish Housing Association
Carr Gomm Society
Carter Jonas
Cass Associates
Caterham Litho
CB Richard Ellis
Central & Cecil Housing Care Support
Central Library
Central Norbury Residents' Association
Centre for Accessible Environments
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
Centre for the Retired
CentrePoint Community Interest Company
CgMs Consulting
CgMs consulting - representing Royal Mail
Charles Planning
Chart Plan Ltd
Chelverton Properties
Cherry Trees Residents' Association
Chesterston Planning and Economics
Chris Thomas Limited
Church Street Trade Association
Churches Together in Coulsdon
Citiscapes Residents' Association
City of London Corporation
Civil Aviation Authority
Cliff Walsingham & Company
Clockhouse Residents' Association
Clover Hill Properties Limited
Cluttons LLP
Colliers CRE
Continental Shutters Limited
Co-op Supermarket
Cooperative Group
Corporation of London
Coughlans Bakery
Coulsdon Auto
Coulsdon Chamber of Commerce
Coulsdon College
Coulsdon East & Coulsdon West Neighbourhood Partnership
Coulsdon Green Belt Action Group
Coulsdon Forum
Coulsdon Labour Party
Coulsdon Library
Coulsdon Millennium New Projects, East
Coulsdon Residents' Association
Coulsdon Opticians
Coulsdon Pets
Coulson Post Office
Coulson Rotary
Coulson West Residents' Association
Coulson Wood Management Limited
Coulson Woods Residents' Association
Council for British Archaeology
Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd
CoverSure
Crest Nicholson
Croham Heights Residents' Covenant Committee
Croham Valley Residents' Association
Cromlech Designs
Crown Housing Association
Croydon & District Synagogue
Croydon Accessible Transport
Croydon Airport Society
Croydon Airport Visitor Centre
Croydon Asian Dance Forum and APSARA Arts
Croydon Borough Neighbourhood Watch Association
Croydon Building Control
Croydon Bus Garage
Croydon Business
Croydon Business Improvement District
Croydon Chamber of Commerce
Croydon Churches Housing Association
Croydon College
Croydon Community
Croydon Cycling Campaign
Croydon Deaf Club, Cycle Forum
Croydon Disability Forum
Croydon District Council of the United Reform Church
Croydon Economic Development Company Ltd
Croydon Energy Network
Croydon Federation of Allotments
Croydon Fire Brigade
Croydon Friends of the Earth
Croydon Gateway Limited Partnership
Croydon Green Party
Croydon HF Rambling Club
Croydon Housing Associations Group, Tower Homes
Croydon Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Forum
Croydon Meeting Room Trust
Croydon Mosque & Islamic Centre
Croydon Natural History and Scientific Society Limited
Croydon Older People's Network
Croydon People First
Croydon People's Housing Association
Croydon Pharmaceutical Committee
Croydon Playing Fields Association
Croydon Police
Croydon Police Licensing Unit
Croydon Police Station
Croydon Ramblers Group
Croydon Recorded Music Society
Croydon Road Users Group
Croydon RSPB
Croydon South Conservation Advisory Panel
Croydon South Conservatives Association
Croydon South Labour Party
Croydon Townswomen's Guild
Croydon Trade Union Council
Croydon Voluntary Action
Croydon Youth Theatre Organisation
Crusaders
Crystal Palace and Norwood Chamber of Commerce
Crystal Palace Community Association
Crystal Palace Triangle Planning Group
CSJ Brooke Smith
Cultural Services Department
Cunnane Town Planning
Curzon House
Cycle Forum
Cycle Forum, Croydon Mobility Forum
Cyclists' Touring Club - Right to Ride Network
CYPL
D P 9
D&M Transport
Dalton Warner Davies
Dampness Diagnosis Consultancy
DC UK Ltd
De-Charles Resources Ltd
Decodream
Department for Education and Skills
Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
Department for Transport
Department of Civic Design
Department of Health
Department of Trade and Industry
Department of Transport
Department of Work and Pensions
Design Lighting Specialists
Dev Plan UK
DHP Southern Limited
Dialogue
Diocese of Southwark
Disability Croydon
Disabled Parents Network
Doble Motor Cycles
Door & Shutter Manufacturers Association
Downlands Countryside Management Project
Downside Pharmacy
DP9
DPU
Drivers Jonas
DSMA/BBSA
DTZ
DTZ Pieda Consulting
Duppas Hill Lane Residents’ Association
East Coulsdon Residents’ Association
East Croydon Station Office
Education Department
Ekaya Housing Association
Eldon Housing Association
Elm Park Residents’ Association
Emmanuel Inspirational Church of God
Empty Homes Agency
English Churches Housing Association
Environment, Culture and Public Protection
Epsom Coaches
Erinaceous Group
Express Copy
Fairfield Halls
Fairfield Partnership
Fairfield, Heathfield & Shirley Neighbourhood Partnership / Community Network Rep
Fairview New Homes Limited
Family Housing Association
Farm Drive Residents' Association
Federation of Master Builders for London
FFC Property Asset Management plc
Fibbens Fox Associates
Fieldway Residents’ Association
FirstGroup plc
Firstplan
Fisher Close Residents’ Association
Flora Associates
Focus (DIY) Limited
FPD Savills
Freight Transport Association
Freshwater
Friends of Foxley
Friends of Spa Hill Allotment Site
Friends of the County of Surrey
Friends of the Earth (Croydon)
Friends, Families & Travellers
Fuller Peiser
Fusion Online Limited
Garden History Society
Gatwick Airport
George Wimpey UK Limited
Georgian Group
Geraghty Taylor Architects
Gerald Eve
GG Property
Girlguiding UK
GL Hearn Limited
GMA Planning
Goadsley and Harding
Goddard & Jones
Goldcrest Land Plc
Government Office for the South East
Graham House Chartered Planner
Grangewood and Whitehorse Residents’ Association
Grant & Partners
Grants Entertainment Centre
Green Chain Working Party
Green Group
Greenacre Homes Limited
GVA Grimley
HADRA
Hanover Housing Association
Hartley & District Residents' Association
Harvest Partnership
Hastings and Warren Road Residents’ Association
Head of Stakeholder Engagement
Health and Safety Executive
Heathfield Gardens Residents’ Association
Heathhurst Road Residents’ Association
Heathrow Airport
Helicopter Medical Emergency Services HEMS
Help the Aged
Hestia Housing and Support
Hexagon Housing Association
Holmesdale Residents’ Association
Home Office
Home Residents Association
House of Commons
Household
Housing 21
Howard Holdings plc
Howard Sharp & Partners
Huggins Edwards & Sharp
Hyde Housing Association
Mayfield Road Residents Association
McCarthys & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd
Metrobus Limited
Metropolis Planning and Design LLP
Metropolitan Housing Trust
Metropolitan Police - Town Centre Operations Group
Metropolitan Public Gardens Association
MHK Architects
Michael Brown Bakers
Michael Burroughs Associates
Michael Parkes
Michael Sparks Associates
Mid Croydon Conservation Area Advisory Panel
Mind in Croydon
Minerva plc
Mitcham Common Conservators
Mitchells Estate Agency
Moat Homes Ltd
Moat Housing Society
Mobility Forum
Monk Hill Residents Association
Monks Orchard Residents’ Association
Montagu-Evans on behalf of Fairview Homes
Morland Park Residents’ Association
Motorcycle Action Group
Mott MacDonald Limited
Mr C O’Shaughnessy Consultant
Mr J Mathieson Consultant
Mulberry Court (Management) Ltd
N Harris & Co
Nanak Community Centre
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Association of Shopfitters
National Playing Fields Association
National Soc of Allotment & Leisure Gardeners Limited
Neighbourhood Partnership
Nestle UK Limited
New Addington & Fieldway Neighbourhood Partnership / New Addington Baptist Church / CFP
New Addington Citizens Advice Bureau
New Addington Jehovah’s Witnesses
New Addington Library
New Addington Residents’ Association
New Addington Time Bank
NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit
Norbury & Upper Norwood Neighbourhood Partnership/Road Users Forum/Community Housing Panel
Norbury Allotment Society
Norbury Business Partnership
Norbury Library
North Area Conservation Area Advisory Panel
North Croydon Conservation Area Advisory Panel
North Downs Korfball Club
Norwood Society
Norwood Triangle Residents’ Association
Notting Hill Housing
O2 PLC
Office of Communications
Office of Rail Regulation
Office of Water Services
Old Coulsdon Bowling Club Limited
Old Coulsdon Residents’ Association
Oldfield King Planning
O’Neill Associates
Open Spaces Society
Optimum Housing Group
Orbit Housing Association
OYBike Systems Limited
Park Edge Residents’ Association
Park Hill Allotment Society
Park Hill Residents’ Association
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Partnership Group for Physically Disabled Adults and Sensory Impaired (via the Head of Qualities and Community Partnerships at LB Croydon)
Partridge Knoll Residents’ Association
Pathfinders Inspirational Croydon Community Project (PICCP)
Pawsons Road Baptist Church
PDA
PDP
Peabody Design Group
Peabody Trust
Peacock & Smith Limited
Pegasus Planning Group
Pentecostal City Mission Church
People for Portland Road
Peter Pendleton & Associates Limited
Pinewood Motor Group
Pirbright & Dunley Action Group
Plan Shop Limited
Planning Aid for London
Planning Bureau Limited
Planning Perspectives
Planning Potential
Poets Anonymous
Pollards Hill Residents Association
Polycarp Journals/PJ Barefoot World Ltd
Potential Croham Residents’ Association
Presentation Social Investment Agency
Princes Trust
Property Market Analysis
PRP Architects
PumpHouse Designs
Purley & Kenley Neighbourhood Partnership
Purley and Woodcote Residents’ Association
Purley Bourne Residents’ Association
Purley Business Association
Purley John Fisher RFC
Purley Library
Purpsace Limited
Q-Park Limited
QVS Electrical Wholesale
R J Witt Associates
Radcliffe Housing Society
Raglan Housing Association
Rail Estate Consultancy
Railtrack (Southern Zone)
Rapleys LLP
Realm Consultancy
Rectangle Residents’ Association
Reed Public Relations
Refugee Housing Association
Remys
Residents of Chatsworth Road
RIBA (Croydon and District Branch)
Riddlesdown Conservation Committee
Riddlesdown Residents’ Association
Ridge Design
Riverhaven
Road Haulage Association
Road User Forum
Robert J B Dorin Chartered Surveyor
Robert Shaw Planning
Robinson Escott Planning
Roger Tym & Partners
Rolfe Judd Limited
Rose Walk Road Committee
Ross Gardens Estate / Meadows Community Ass.
Royal Institute of British Architects
Royal Mail Group plc
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (SE Reg)
RPS Planning and Development Ltd
Rydon Commercial Limited
Ryecroft Road Residents’ Association
Safer Croydon Partnership
Safer Neighbourhoods Team
Saint James Homes Limited
Saint Martins Property Corporation Limited
Sanderson Weatherall
Sanderstead Library
Sanderstead Residents’ Associations
Sanderstead United Reformed Church
Sanderstead, Croham, Selsdon & Ballards Neighbourhood Partnership
Savills Plc
Scoot Electric UK Limited
Scott-Brown Partnership
Selhurst and South Norwood Allotment Society
Seltrans
Shine Hairdressers
Shirley Hills Residents’ Association
Shirley Library
Shirley Oaks Management Limited
Shirley Park Residents Association
Shree Sakthy Ghanapathy Temple
Shrublands Residents’ Association
Silverlink
Sivaskanthagiri Murugan Kovil
Slemba
SLFHA Limited
SO15 Counter Terrorism Command
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Solum Regeneration
South Central Limited
South Croydon Conservation Area Consultation Panel
South London and Maudsley NHS Trust
South London Buses
South London Business
South London Partnership
South London Trams
South Norwood & Selhurst Neighbourhood Partnership
South Norwood Library
South Norwood Residents’ Association
South Road Safety Committee, Tramwatch, Sense with Roads
South West London Health Authority
South Woodcote Residents' Association
Southern Housing Group
Southern Railway
Spa Hill Allotment Society
Space Design Consultants
Spring Park Residents' Association
Spurgeon's College
St Aidan Group
St George Developments Limited
St John's Church PCC
St John's Church Shirley
St Martins Property Corporation Ltd.
Stagecoach Selkent
Standford Properties
Stanley Technical High School
Stansted Airport
Station Approach Residents' Association
Stijl Consultancy
Stiles Harold Williams
Stimpson Willis, Chartered Qty Surveyors
Strategic Health Authority South East London
Striders of Croydon
Stuart Edwards Fuller Moon
Surrey Archaeological Society
Surrey Badger Protection Society
Surrey Street Car Parks
Surrey Street Traders
Sustainable Development Commission
Sustrans
Sutton Mears
Sweltrac
Sylvan Estate Management Company Limited
Tamworth Road Residents' Association
Taylor's Toys
Teachers' Housing Association
Terence O'Rourke plc
Tesco Stores Limited
Tetlow King Planning
TGWU Croydon
Thameslink
The Ancient Monuments Society
The BRIT School
The British Home and Hospital
The British Horse Society
The British Wind Energy Association
The Cause - A Caribbean Community
The Croydon Society
The Development Planning Partnership
The Environment Agency
The Georgian Group
The Glory Mission

The Go Ahead Group plc
The Gypsy Council
The Methodist Church Croydon Circuit
The Oakwood Group Construction Development
The Owner Drivers' Society
The Pedestrians Association
The Planning Bureau Limited
The Planning Inspectorate
The Porter and Sorter - Town Centre Operations Group
The Road Haulage Association Limited
The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Southwark
The Salvation Army
The Twentieth Century Society
The Victorian Society
The Whitgift Centre Management
The Whitgift Foundation
Thornton Heath & South Norwood Residents' Association
Thornton Heath and South Norwood CP
Thornton Heath Library
Thornton Heath Youth Forum
Thornton Heath, Bensham Manor & West
Thornton Neigh Partn
Together in Waddon Community Project
Tollers Estate Residents' Association
Tollgate Residents' Association
Tomei & Mackley
Tonbridge and Sevenoaks Residents' Association
Tony Thorpe Associates
Torrington Square Residents' Assoc./South Norwood & Selhurst NP/Selhurst & South Norwood Housing Pan
Tower Residents' Group
TPS Consult
Tramlink Croydon Limited
Tramtrack Croydon Limited
Transport 2000
Travel London Limited
Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Triangle Traders
Trim and Swim
Turley Associates
Turners Bookshops
United Women's Homes Association
University College London
University of Westminster
Upper Norwood and Norbury Neighbourhood Partnership
Upper Norwood Community Resource
Association, Crystal Palace Triangle Residents' Association
Upper Norwood Library
Upper Norwood Saint John the Evangelist Church
Upper Woodcote Village Residents’ Association
Virtual Biz Online Ltd.
Vision 21
W. R. Newland & Sons Ltd
Waddon Island Amenities Association
Waddon Ponds Residents’ Association
Waddon Residents’ Amenities Association
Waitrose
Walter and Mair
Wandle Housing Association
Wandle Industrial Museum
Wandle Trust
Wavell Court Residents’ Association
Weatherall, Green & Smith
Webb Estate Limited
Webb Estate Residents’ Association, Planning Executive Committee Purley & Woodcote Residents’ Assoc.
West & Partners Town Planning Consultants
West Beckenham Residents' Association
West Croydon Baptist Church
West Croydon Station
West Wickham Residents’ Association
Westmead Business Group
Wharfedale and Lonsdale Gardens Residents’ Association
Wharfedale Gardens & Lonsdale Gardens Residents’ Association
White & Sons
White Young Green Planning
Whitehorse Residents’ Association
Whitgift Estate Residents' Association
Whitgift - Town Centre Operations Group
Wildlife Trusts
Windsor Homes plc
Woodcraft Folk
Woods Sanders & Co
Woodside No. 1 Residents Association
Woolf Bond Planning LLP
Woolwich Building Society
Workspace Group plc
Wright Services
YMCA
Zurich Risk Services

Kingston: General Consultees, Businesses and Other Organisations

3s Architects LLP
A2 Housing Group
Abbeyfield Housing Association
ACSA (Addiction Support and Care)
Adams and Adams ltd
Addison Gardens Allotment Association
AFC Wimbledon
African Families Support Services
Agar House Residents Association
Age Concern Kingston upon Thames
Ahmadiya Muslim Association Surbiton
Alderwick James and Co
Alexandra Infant School
Alexandra Neighbours Association
All Saints Church
Allen Pyke Associates
Alliance Planning
Alpha Road Estate Residents Association
American Pie
Anchor Trust
Anglo Korean Cultural Centre
Appley Properties Limited

Archway Trust
Arnold Gilpin Associates Ltd
Asian Arts Promotion
Asra Housing Association
Assent Environmental Planning
Avenue Road Residents Association
Barnsbury Crescent Residents Association
Barton Willmore
Bedelsford School
Bell Cornwall Partnership
Bell Fischer Landscape Architects
Bentall Centre Management
Bentalls
Beverley School
Blenheim Gardens Residents Association
BMR
Bonsor Penningtons
Boots
Borders Book and Music
Bourne Housing Society
Bridger Bell
British Home Stores
First Church of Scientist
Firstplan
FirstPlus Planning
Formula Strike International Ltd
Four Communications Group PLC
FREDY Residents Association
Freight Transport Association- London and South East Region
Friends of Kingston Museum
Friends of the Earth Kingston
Fusion Arts
Fusion Ltd.
Garden History Society
Gerald Eve
GL Hearn
GL Hearn (on behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd)
Glenbucks Studios Residents Association
Greater London Motorcycle Action Group
Greater London Playing Fields Association
Green Lane School
Greenwood Park Residents Association
Groves Association
GVA Grimley (Planning Consultants)
H R Richmond Ltd
Hammerson plc
Hanover Housing Assoc.
Hawks Road Residents Association
Health and Safety Executive
Health, Disability and Sensory Impairment Partnership Board
Heaton Planning Ltd
Help the Aged
Hemmingford Properties
Her Majesty's Courts Service
Hermes Hotel
Hestia Housing (Kingston Womens Centre)
HFT
Hindi Bal Bhawan
Historic Royal Palaces
Holy Cross Preparatory School
Home Farm Trust
Hook Rise South Residents Association
Horizon Housing Group
House of Fraser
Housing 21
Housing Corporation
Howdens Joinery Co.
Hurley Palmer Flatt
Iceni Projects
Indigo Planning Ltd
Inequalities Partnership Board
Information Officer for Disabled Children
Inquilab Housing Association
Insight Services
Institute of Tamil Culture
Inventures (NHS Estates)
Invista Real Estate on behalf of Clerical Medical
Irish Traveller Movement in Britain
Islamic Resource Centre
J Sainsbury plc
J.R. Spalding Joinery
Jackson-Scott Associates Ltd
Jema Property Fund Ltd
John Lewis
John Sharkey and Co.
Jones Lang Lasalle
Kaleidoscope
Kidd Adam Ltd
King Athelstan Primary School
King Sturge
Kingston & District Welcare Association
Kingston Advocacy Group
Kingston and District Welcare Assoc.
Kingston and Surbiton District Synagogue
Kingston Area Travellers Association
Kingston Arts Council
Kingston Asian Arts Forum
Kingston Association for the Blind
Kingston Baha’is
Kingston Baptist Church
Kingston Borough Forum for Elderly People
Kingston Borough Liberal Democrats
Kingston Carers Network
Kingston Centre for Independent Living
Kingston Chamber of Commerce
Kingston Chinese Association
Kingston Churches Housing Association
Kingston Citizens Advice Bureau
Kingston College
Kingston Cycling Campaign
Kingston Debating Society
Kingston Employment Service
Kingston Fair Trade
Kingston Federation of Allotment Gardeners
Kingston Grammar School
Kingston Gurjarati School
Kingston Hospital Trust
Kingston Informer
Kingston Innovation Centre
Kingston Jobcentre
Kingston Liberal Synagogue
Kingston Magistrates Court
Kingston Mosque
Kingston Museum
Kingston Muslim Association
Kingston Muslim Women’s Association
Kingston Pensioner Forum
Kingston Quakers
Kingston Racial Equality Council
Kingston Samaritans
Kingston Sikh Association
Kingston Society
Kingston Tamil School
Kingston Theatre
Kingston Tour Guides
Kingston Town Centre CAAC
Kingston Town Centre Management Ltd
Kingston Ulster Society
Kingston University
Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society
Kingston upon Thames United Charities
Kingston Vale Residents Association
Kingston Victim Support
Kingston Voluntary Action
Kingston, Richmond and Surrey African
Positive Outlook
Kingston, Surbiton and District Synagogue
Knight Frank
Knights Park Residents Association
Knollmead Primary School
Korean Residents Association
Korean Residents Society
La Salle Investment Management
LA21 Forum
Lakeside Estates Ltd
Latchmere Junior School
LDWA London
League of Jewish Women
Learn English at Home
Learning Skills Councils- London South
Leatherhead Golf Club Ltd
Lennon Planning
Lever Faberge
Lexum Leisure (McCluskeys)
LIDL UK
Littman & Robeson
Living Streets
Lloyds TSB
LMLI
London Access Forum
London Ambulance Service
London and Quadrant Housing Trust
London Buses Network Operations
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
London Fire Brigade
London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies
London General Transport Services Ltd
London South West Chinese Community Association
London United Busway Ltd
London Walking Forum
Longford Securities and Equities Limited
Lovekyn of Kingston
Lovelace Primary School
Lower Kings Road Residents
Magic Roundabout
Malcolm Judd and Partners
Malcolm Scott Consultants Ltd
Malden Camera Club
Malden Golf Club
Malden Manor Primary
Malden Parochial Primary School
Malden Rushett Residents Association
Maldens and Coombe CAAC
Maple Antiques
Maple Infants’ School
Marcus Beale Architects
Market Traders Association
Marks & Spencer
Marlowe House Residents Association
Martin Campbell Commercial
Martineau
McDonald House Residents Association
McDonalds
Melbourne Court Residents Association
Melford Close Residents Association
Mental Aid Projects
Mental Health Partnership Board
Metropolis Planning and Design
Metropolitan Housing Trust
Milaap Centre
Mill Street Residents Association
Millat Asian Housing Association
Minima Yacht Club
MLA London
Moat Housing Society
Moliar London
MONO
Montagu Evans LLP on behalf of Hammerson Plc
Morley Fund Management
MS Society (North Surrey)
Museum of London Archaeology Department
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Playing Fields Associations
Natural History Museum
New Era Housing Association
New Malden (Beverley Ward) Resident’s Association
New Malden Methodist Church
Newquest South London
NHP Leisure Development Ltd
NHS London
NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit
North British Housing Association
Nova Distribution
Ocean
Ofcom Contact Centre
Office of Dr Jenny Tonge MP
Ofgem
Old Kingston Road Residents Association
Old London Road Traders Association
Older Peoples Partnership Board
Chessington World of Adventures
O’Neils (Mitchell and Butlers)
Osiers Court Properties Ltd
Our Lady Immaculate Primary School
Outer Space
Palmers Solicitors
Parent Link
Parent Rep Disabled Children Task Groups
Parents Forum
Parkinson’s Disease Society
Parrs Boat Hire
Patchwork Community Ltd
Paul Dickinson and Associates
PB
Peacock and Smith
Pearson Maddin
People with Learning Disabilities Partnership Board
Planning Consultancy
Planning Potential
PML Building Services Limited
Police and Community Working Group
Positive Action for Multiple Sclerosis
PRC Planning
Prim Vintage Fashion
Princes Trust- Merton College
PRP Architects
R.O.Y.A.D
Radio Jackie
Raglan Housing Assoc
Railway Heritage Trust
Rapleys LLP
RBS
Redbourn Group PLC
Refugee action Kingston
Regeneration Investments Limited
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
RHA Weybridge
Richard Challoner School
Richmond & Kingston Accessible Transport
Richmond upon Thames Churches Housing Trust
River Court Residents Association
River Thames Boat Project
River Thames Society
Riverhaven Ltd
Riverside Residents Association
Riverside Vegetaria Ltd
Robin Hood Primary School
Roehampton University
Rolfe Judd Architects
Roofwise Ltd
Rose Walk Residents Association
Rosemary Simmonds Memorial Housing Assoc.
Roses Bakery
Rotunda
Royal British Legion Institute
Royal British Legion, Malden and Coombe Branch
Royal Quarter Residents Association
RPS Planning
RPS Planning on behalf of Costco Wholesale UK Ltd
Rural Pride Limited
Saheli (Asian Womens Group)
Sarvoday Hindu Association
Save the World Club
Savills Commercial Ltd
Savills Plc
SCARA
Scope (N E Surrey) Geneva Road
Scout Association
Sensory Impairment Team
Sheperds Bush Housing Association
Shout
Shrewsbury House
Simone Kay Stained Glass
SNP Associates
Solon Wandsworth Housing
South London Business
South West Trains
Southborough Residents Association
Southborough School
Southern Gas Networks
Specialist Holidays Group
SPH Housing
Spires Sports Ltd
Spring Grove Residents Association
Spuds
St Agatha's Catholic Primary School
St Andrews and St Marks C of E Junior School
St Catherine of Siena RC Church
St George West London Ltd
St Joseph's RC Primary School
St Luke’s Primary School
St Philip's School
St. Andrews & St. Marks C of E Junior School
St. Mary’s Primary School
St. Matthew’s Primary School
St. Paul’s C of E Junior School
St. Paul’s C of E Primary School
Steadfast Sea Cadets
Stewart Ross Associates
Suna Supplies LTD
Surbiton and District Bird Watching Society
Surbiton CAAC
Surbiton Central Area Residents Association
Surbiton Community Church
Surbiton Deaf Club
Surrey Comet
Surrey Wildlife Trust
Sustrans
SW London Vietnamese Community Association
Talking Newspaper
Teachers Housing Association
Team for Disabled Children
Terry Hill Design and build
Tetlow King Planning
Thames Community Foundation

Thames Housing Association
Thames Landscape Strategy
The Garden City Movement
The Gypsy Council
The Hollyfield School and Centre for Continuing Education
The Korean Church
The Lawn Tennis Association
The Mount Primary School
The Planning Bureau Limited
The Planning Inspectorate
The Royal Parks
The Theatres Trust
The Woodland Trust
The Works Nightclub
Threshold Housing and Support
Tiffin Boys School
Tiffin Girls School
Tolworth Girls School
Tolworth Infants and Nursery School
Tolworth Junior School
Tolworth South Residents Association
Tony Miller Systems Ltd
Town and Country Housing Group
TP Bennett Architects
TPAC Ltd.
Tribal MJP
Tuffluck Buster
Turk Launches Ltd
Turley Associates
United Reformed Church
Wandle Housing Association
Warden Housing
Warner Estates
West & Partners
Wilkinson Stores
William Sutton Trust
YMCA
Young People's Forum
Youth Advisory Council

**Merton: General Consultees, Businesses and Other Organisations**

19th Wimbledon Scout Group
A2 Dominion
Abaana Bantu
Abbotsbury Primary School
Affinity Sutton
African Community Involvement Association
African Culture Promotions
African Educational Cultural and Health Organisation (A.E.C.H.O)
African Refugees Project
Age Concern Merton
AHC Associates
Ahmadiyya Muslim Association (EMC)
AIB Group (UK) PLC
All England Lawn Tennis Club
All Nations Revival Church (38)
All Saints CE Primary School
All Saints Church South Wimbledon
All Saints Pensioners Club
Alliance Property Developments Ltd
Alsop Verrill LLP
Amicus Horizon/ South London Family
Amity Grove Residents Association
Anchor
Andrew Pinchin Architects Ltd

Apostles Residents Association
Aragon Primary School
Arnhem Buses
Arriva London South (Buses)
Arthur Road Association
Arup
Ashill Developments
Asian Diabetic Support and Awareness Group
Asian Elderly Group
Asian Elderly Group of Merton
Assael Architecture
Asylum Welcome
AT. s.coop.v.
ATIS Real Weatheralls
Aubergine Art & Picture Framing Ltd
Audichya Gadhia Brahma Samaj Soc.(AGBSS)
B & D Clays & Chemicals Ltd
B & Q Plc, (Indigo Planning on behalf of).
B & Q Plc, (RPS on behalf of)
B E Manji & S B Manji
B G Transco
B Nebbett and Son Ltd
Baha’i Community of Merton
Baitul Futuh Mosque Youth Organisation
Balham Sport and Social Club
Barnfield Construction (UK) Ltd
Barton Wilmore
Bathgate Road Residents Association
Beaver
Beecholme Primary School
Bellway Homes
Belvedere Estate Residents Association
Benedict Primary School
Bengali Association of Merton
Bentley-Leek Properties Ltd
BERA
Berkeley Urban Renaissance
Berkley Strategic
Bewley Homes Plc
Bexley Council
Bishop Gilpin CE Primary School

Bishopsford Community School
Black Ethnic Cultural & Welfare Organisation (BECWO)
Blossom House Special School
Blue Sky Planning
BME TVFM Charitable Foundation
Bond Primary School
Bourne
Breaking Free
Bree Day Partnership
British Motorcyclists Federation
British Muslim Association of Merton
Brixton Plc
Buddhapadipa Temple
Burgess Mean Architects
Bus Priority Team
Byrne Group PLC
Commonside Luncheon Club
Cadogan Developments Ltd
Campaign for Real Ale
Cantos Bailey
Carers Support Merton
Carpenter Planning Consultants
Casson Conder Partnership
Catholic Children Society
CDC2020
Central and Cecil
Centre Court Shopping Centre
Centric Telecom Ltd
Chancerygate (Mitcham) Ltd
Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development
Chartered Institute of Waste Management
Chase Hospice Care For Children
Cherwell Land and Homes Ltd
Children and Parents Carnival Association
Chris Thomas Ltd - Outdoor Advertising Consultants
Christopher St James PLC
City Bridge Trust
Civil Aviation Authority
Cluttons LLP
Collierbridge Properties
Colliers CRE
Colliers Wood Community Association
Colliers Wood Little League Football
Colliers Wood Residents’ Association
Colliers Wood Youth and Play Working Party
Colliersbridge Properties Ltd
Commonside Trust
Community & Partnership Inspector - Wimbledon Police Station
Community Home Care Provider
Community of Woodside Area Residents' Association
Community of Woodside Res Assoc (CWARA)
Compact Group
Connexions – Prospects
Conservative Group of the London Borough of Merton
Consultation & Communications Team
Contact a Family Sutton and Merton
Cottenham Park Allotments
Countryside Properties Plc
Cranbourne Ltd
Cranmer Primary School
Crest Nicholson (South) Ltd
Cricket Green School
Crossrail
Croydon Churches
Croydon Peoples
Croydon People's Housing Association
Date Valley (2.5 - 11)
Date Valley School
David Wilson Homes Ltd
Deen City Farm
Defence Estates
Design for London
Development Planning Partnership
Dialogue
Disability Alliance Merton (DAM)
Dominion
Donhead Preparatory School
Donhead Primary School
Dons Trust
DPDS Consulting Group
DPP
Drakesfield Management Ltd
Drax Avenue Road Committee
Drivers Jonas
Dundonald Congregational Church
Dundonald Primary School
Dunward Properties Ltd
Eagle House School Special School
East Thames Buses
Edco Design
Elim Pentecostal Church
Elliott Wood Partnership
Empire Estates (GB) Ltd
Energis Communications Ltd
English Churches
English Sports Council
Environment Road Table
Environmental Services Association
Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust
ESA Planning
Ethnic Minority Centre
Ethnic Minority Drugs Awareness Project
Ethnic Minority Housing Strategy Team
Euroworld Developments Ltd
Extended Schools
F and C Property Asset Management
Fairview New Homes Ltd.
Faith in Action Homeslessness Project
Faithfull Architects
Family
Farm Road Church
Firstplan
Firstplus Planning
Fitness First
Flight Centre
Floyd Slaski Partnership
FND Group
Founder Friends of New Wimbledon Theatre
Freight Transport Association
Friends in St.Helier (FISH)
Friends of Cannizaro Park
Friends of Cannon Hill Common
Friends of Cherry Wood Lane
Friends of Cottenham Park
Friends of Dundonald Park
Friends of Durnsford Recreation Ground
Friends of Haydons Road Recreation
Friends of Holland Gardens
Friends of Ravensbury Park
Friends of Sir Joseph Hood MPF
Friends of South Park Gardens
Friends of the County of Surrey
Functional Intelligent Training
Garden Primary School
Garfield Primary School
Garth Residents' Association
General Aviation Awareness Council
Genesis
George Wimpey UK Ltd
Gerald Eve
Gina's Nannies
GL Hearn
Glebe Court Residents Association
Glenroy Estates Ltd
Go Forum
Little League Mitcham
Little League Wimbledon
Living Streets
Local Government Association
London & Quadrant
London Ambulance Service
London and Quadrant Housing Trust
London Bus Initiative
London Bus Services Ltd
London Cycling Campaign
London Dial-a-Ride
London Energy
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
London Fire Brigade
London General (Buses)
London General Transport
London General Transport Services
London Housing Federation
London Interspace Ltd
London Oriel Cultural & Social Club
London School of Economics
London South West Chinese Community Association
London Underground
London United Busways
London Wildlife Trust Merton Group
Lonesome Primary School
Longthornton & Tamworth Working Party
Lower Edge Hill & Darlaston Road Residents Association
M & M Architectural Services
Majorlink Ltd
Malcolm Scott Consultants Ltd
Malmesbury Primary School
Manuplastics Ltd
Marcus Beale Architects Ltd
Maurice Cox
Mayer Brown Ltd
McCabe Travel
McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd
McDonalds Mitcham
Melrose School
Melrose Special School
MeMu (Merton Multicultural Cooperative Ltd)
Merton Abbey Primary School
Merton African Organisation
Merton Allotments and Gardens Society
Merton Association of Pensioners
Merton CAB
Merton Carers Partnership

Merton Churches Asylum Seekers’ Support Group
Merton College
Merton Cycling Campaign
Merton Division Girlguides
Merton Executive Committee
Merton Goan Senior Citizens Association
Merton Governors Council
Merton Green Party
Merton Hall FC
Merton Hard of Hearing Group
Merton Historical Society
Merton Liberal Democrats
Merton Mental Health Users Forum
Merton Older People’s Housing Forum
Merton Park (East) Residents Association
Merton Park Primary School
Merton Park Ward R.A.
Merton Park Ward Residents Association
Merton Partnership (Sustainable Communities and Transport Thematic Partnership)
Merton Partnership / Wimbledon Town Centre Partnership
Merton Pre-School Learning Alliance
Merton Priory Trust
Merton Racial Equality Partnership
Merton Seniros Forum
Merton Sickle Cell and Thalassaemia Group
Merton Somali Community (MESCO)
Merton Town Trails Association
Merton Tree Warden Group
Merton Unity Network
Merton Vision
Merton Voluntary Service Council
Merton Volunteer Bureau
Merton Welcare
Merton Womens’ Drop-In
Merton YMCA
Merton Youth Awareness Programme
Merton Youth Forum
Merton Youth Offending Service
Met Police/Wimbledon
Methodist Church
Metrobus
Metropolitan Public Gardens Association
Millat Asian Housing Association
Mitcham Baptist Church
Mitcham Common Conservators
Mitcham Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses
Mitcham Cricket Green Community & Heritage Trust
Mitcham Golf Club
Mitcham Parish Church
Mitcham Partnerships
Mitcham Police Station
Mitcham Society
Mitcham Vale School
Mitcham Village Residents' Association
Mitcham Working Group
Moat
Mono Consultants
Montessori Children's House
Morden Cricket Club
Morden Little League
Morden Park Baptist Church
Morden Park Planing Fields Association
Morden Primary School
Morden Town Centre Partnership
Morden VW
Morrision Supermarkets Plc
Murray Denham RIBA
Murray Road (North) Residents Association
Nathaniel Lichfield & Ptnrs
National Trust, Thames and Solent Region
Navalmar (UK) Ltd
Neighbourhood & Prim. Care Development
Netproject
New Bera
New Bridges Club
New Wimbledon Theatre
NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit
Norland Conservation Society
Norman Road Haulage (Wimbledon) Ltd
North West Wimbledon Residents Association
Notting Hill Housing Group
NTL
Older People's Housing Forum
Open Age Charity - South Office
Orbit
PAG Limited
Pakistan Cultural Association of Wandsworth and Merton
Pakistan Welfare Association
Palace Gate Properties Ltd
Pathway
Paul Brookes Architects
Paul Kentish & Co
Peacock and Smith
Pearl of Africa Foundation (PAF)
Pedestrians Association
Pelham Primary School
Peter Pendleton & Associates Ltd
Phipps Bridge MAG (Multi-Agency Group)
Planning & Regeneration Ltd
Planning Aid for London
Planning Perspectives
Planning Potential
Poplar Primary School
Port of London Authority
Portland Road /Lewis Road Residents Association
Possfund Custodian Trustee Ltd
Presentation Housing Association
Princes, Dudley & Kings Road Association
Priory CE Primary School
Project Design Partnership
Quality Line
Radio Jackie Ltd
Rail Freight Group
Rapleys (Agents for Morrison Stores Plc)
Ravensbury Lanes & Avenues Residents Association
Raynes Park & West Barnes R A
Raynes Park High School
Raynes Park Secondary School
Rectory Estates Ltd
Reed Employment
Regional Housing Boards
Residents' Association of West Wimbledon
Ricards Lodge Secondary School
Rowans Surgery
Royal Institute of British Architects
Royal Mail Property Holdings
RPS Planning
Rutlish High School
Rutlish Secondary School
Rydon Construction Ltd
Sacred Heart RC Primary School
Sadler Close Residents' Association
Sainsburys
Salvation Army Wimbledon Corp
Sanctuary
Savills
SDS (London) Ltd
Secondsite Property
Service Improvement Manager
SHA Estates - London
Shaftesbury
Shauket Hussein & Amtul W Hussien
Shaw Trust (Employment)
Shelbourne Desmond Ltd Liability Partnership
Sherwood Primary School
Simon Charles Hanks
Singlegate Primary School
Sita UK
Smart Centre School
Smart Planning Ltd
SOAS
Somerfield
Somerfield Stores Ltd
South East England Partnership Board
South London African Klomen Organisation (SLAKIO)
South London African Women Organisation
South London Crematorium / Dignity Funerals Ltd
South London Irish Welfare Society
South London Refugee Association
South London Refugee Association-SLRA
South London Tamil Welfare Group
South Mitcham Community Association
South Mitcham Residents Association
South Park Estate Residents' Association (SPERA)
South Ridgway Residents Association
South West London and St George’s Mental Health NHS Trust
South West London Health Partnership
South West Trains
South Wimbledon Business Area Group
Southern (Trains)
Special Educational Needs Support Group
SS Peter and Paul Primary School
St Anns Special School
St Barnabas Church - Mitcham
St Christopher’s Fellowship
St George’s Healthcare - Voluntary Services Dept.
St Helier Congregational Church
St John Fisher RC Primary School
St Johns Area Residents Association
St Mark’s Primary School
St Mark’s Church of England Academy
St Mark’s Primary School
St Mary's RC Primary School
St Matthews CE Primary School

St Pancras & Humanist Housing
St Teresa’s RC Primary School
St Thomas of Canterbury RC Primary School
St. Ann's School
St. George South London Ltd.
St. John Fisher RC Primary School
St. Mark's Primary School
St. Mary’s RC Primary School
St. Matthews CE Primary School
St. Peters & St. Paul's Drop-In Club
St. Teresa's RC Primary School
Stable and Able, Zen Aura
Stanford Primary School
Sterling Insurance Group
Stewart Ross Associates
Study Preparatory School
Surrey County Council Spatial Policy Group
Sustrans
Sustainable Merton
Sutton & Merton Primary Care Trust
Sutton and Merton Traveller Education Service
SW London SSP
SWELTRAC
Sycamore Residents Association
Tamil Housing
Tamworth Manor Secondary School
TCL (Tramtrack Croydon)
Terry Pawson Architects Ltd
Tesco Stores Limited
Tetlow King Planning
TG21 plc
Thames Valley (Housing)
The Bereavement Service
The Development Planning Partnership
The Gypsy Council
The Hards Partnership
The Harris Academy Merton
The Hon. Soc. of the Inner Temple
The John Innes Society
The Lawn Tennis Association
The Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum
The Mill House Brewers Fayre
The Norwegian School
The Planning Bureau Limited
The Raynes Park Association
The Rowans School
The Rowans School (3-9)
The Unite Group plc
The Watershed
The Wimbledon Almshouses R. A.
The Wimbledon Guild
Thorne & Thorne Architects
Threshold Housing and Support
Tooting & Mitcham Sports & Leisure Ltd
Tower Homes
Transport & Travel Research Ltd
Travel London
Travellers/Gypsies Advisor
Trees for Cities
Tribal MJP
Trinity Church Wimbledon
Turley Associates
United Response
Up-Town Dance Club & Learning Centre
Ursuline High School
Ursuline Preparatory School
Victim Support
Viridor Waste (Thames) Ltd
Viscount Cricket Club
Waitrose
Walliam Morris Primary School
Wandle
Wandle Housing Association
Wandle Industrial Museum
Wandle Park Residents Association
Warden
West Wimbledon Primary School
West Wimbledon Residents' Association
White Young Green
William Morris Primary School
Willington School
Willmore End Residents Association
Willow Lane Action Group
Wilton Crescent Residents' Association
Wimbledon and Putney Commons
Conservators
Wimbledon Chase Primary School
Wimbledon Civic Forum
Wimbledon College
Wimbledon College RC High School
Wimbledon Common Preparatory School
(Squirrels)
Wimbledon Common West Residents Association
Wimbledon Community Association
Wimbledon District Philatelic Society
Wimbledon E. Hillside Residents’ Association
(WEHRA)
Wimbledon Fire Brigade/Station Commander
Wimbledon Football Club Supporter since 1974
Wimbledon High School (Girls)
Wimbledon House Residents’ Association
Wimbledon Independent Supporters Association (WISA)
Wimbledon International 7th Day Adventist Church
Wimbledon Labour Party
Wimbledon Literary & Scientific Society
Wimbledon Park Heritage Group
Wimbledon Park Primary School
Wimbledon Park Residents Association
Wimbledon Police Station
Wimbledon Society
Wimbledon Taxi Drivers
Wimbledon Town Centre Co-Ordinator Group
Wimbledon Town Centre Management
Wimbledon Union of Res Ass (WURA)
Wimbledon YMCA
Windsor Stebbing Marsh
Wrenshaw Court Freeholders
WS Atkins plc
Youth Culture Television (YCTV)

Sutton: General Consultees, Businesses and Other Organisations

11th Wallington (St Elpheges) Scout Group
1st Cheam Scout Group
8th Cheam Scout Group
A.W. Champion Ltd
Academy for Sustainable Communities
Access Self Storage
Affinity Sutton
Ahmadiyya Muslim Community
Aitch Group
Albion Road Residents Association

All Saints’ Benhilton C of E Primary School
All Saints Church, Hackbridge
Alliance Planning
Amazon Properties plc
Amicus Horizon
ANA Architecture
Antler Homes Southern Plc
Apeldoorn Residents’ Association
Arlesville Estates Limited
Arlesville Estates Ltd
Arriva London South Ltd
Audit Commission
Baha’s of Sutton
Barclays Bank plc
Barrow Hedges Primary
Barton Willmore
Beddington Park Primary School
Beddington Park Residents Association
Beddington Village Hall
Beddingtons Infants School
Belmont Allotment Society
Belmont and South Cheam Residents Association
Benhilton Court Residents Association
BioRegional
Blue Sky Planning Consultancy Ltd
BNP Paribas Real Estate
Boots the Chemist
Borough Partnerships-Transport for London
British Medical Association - Merton and Sutton
British Transport Police - London South Area
British Wind Energy Association (BWEA)
Broadway Malyan
Broomleigh Housing Association
Bryant Homes/George Wimpey South West Thames
Campaign for Real Ale
Cantium (Beddington House) Ltd
Capital On Site
Capital On Site Ltd
Capital on Site/VOSA
Cappagh
Carew Manor School
Carshalton Boys Sports College
Carr Gomm Society
Carshalton & District History & Archaeology Society
Carshalton Beeches Residents’ Association
Carshalton College
Carshalton Darby and Joan Club
Carshalton Fields Residents’ Association
Carshalton High School for Girls
Carshalton on the Hill Residents’ Association
Caterham Barracks Community Trust
Caterpillar Pre-School
Centre for Advance Spatial Analysis
Centre for Environmental Initiatives
CGMS Consulting
Chair London Climate Change Partnership
Changing Places Initiative
Cheam Baptist Church
Cheam Chamber of Trade
Cheam Common Infants'
Cheam High School
Cheam Park Paddock Allotments
Cheam Sports Club
Chris Thomas Ltd
Christ Church, Sutton
Churches Together in Wallington and Beddington
Churches Uniting in Central Sutton
Citrus Group
City and Provincial Plc
City Computing
Cluttons LLP
CMA Planning
Coast & Capital (Portfolio) LLP
Colliers CRE
Collins Planning Services Ltd
Community Transport (Sutton)
Companions of the Mosque
Conservation Area Advisory Group
Constituency Office - Mr T Brake
Constituency Office - Mr P Burstow
Costco Wholesales UK Ltd
Country Land Limited
Creative Environmental Networks
Crown Housing Association Ltd
Cyclism / London Cycling Campaign Sutton
Cyclists’ Touring Club (CTC)
D Weis Trust
David A Lewis Associates
David Lane Associates
Department for Trade and Industry
Department of Health
Design for London
DevPlan UK
DP9
DPP
Drivers Jonas
East Cheam Householders Organisation
EcoLocal
Elm Grove Centre
Energie-Cites
Epsom and St. Helier NHS Trust
Epsom Coaches
Erskine Village and Benhill Community Association
Fairview New Homes Ltd
Family Mosaic
St Mary's RC Infants'
St Mary's RC Junior
St Nicholas Church - Church of England
St Nicholas pcc
St Oswalds, Cheam
St Patrick's Church, Wallington
St Philomena's School
St Raphael's Hospice
St. Philomena's School
Stanley Park Evangelical Church
Stanley Park Infants'
Star Planning & Development
Sterecycle
Stonham Housing Association
Surrey County FA
Surrey Indians
Surrey Primary Care Trust
Surrey Somali Community Group
Sutton & Croydon Green Party
Sutton Amateur Dramatic Club
Sutton and Cheam Society
Sutton and Croydon Borough Fire Brigade Team
Sutton and East Surrey Water Plc
Sutton Babylon Association / Sutton Minority Ethnic Forum
Sutton Black & Minority Ethnic Group
Sutton Centre for the Voluntary Sector
Sutton Christian Centre
Sutton Cricket Club
Sutton Cycling for Young People
Sutton Environment Network
Sutton Garden Suburb Residents Association
Sutton Group Wildlife Trust
Sutton Housing Partnership
Sutton Humanist Group
Sutton Living Streets
Sutton LSP
Sutton MENCAP
Sutton Mental Health Carers' Action Group
Sutton Mental Health Foundation
Sutton Nature Conservation Volunteers
Sutton Police
Sutton Police Station
Sutton Racial Equality Council
Sutton Rail Users' Forum
Sutton Rotary Club
Sutton Seniors Forum
Sutton Subrang
Sutton Tennis and Squash Club
Sutton Town Centre Partnership
Sutton Traveller Forum
Sutton United FC
Sutton United Supporters' Trust (SUST)
Sutton Vineyard Church
Sutton Volunteer Bureau
Sutton Youth Parliament
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Telecom Plus
Telewest Communications PLC
Tesco Stores Ltd
Thames Valley Housing Association
Thameslink Rail Ltd
Acorn Project
Arts Council of the London Borough of Sutton
Benhill Gospel Trust
Carshalton Society
Coal Authority
Crown Estate
Department for Education and Skills
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Gypsy Council for Heath, Education and Welfare
Home Office
Institute of Cancer Research
Link Day School Limited
Montessori Children's House
Planning Inspectorate
Theatres Trust
Woodland Trust
Thomas Wall Nursery
Threshold Housing Association
Thursday Fellowship + 21CC
Town Planning Consultant
Tram Operations Limited (Tramlink)
Travis Perkins Plc
Trees for Cited
Tribal M J P
Trinity Church Sutton
Turley Associates
Tweedale
UCB/Group House
Uk Asset Management Ltd
Vinci Construction
Volunteer Centre Sutton
Wallington Baptist Church
Wallington County Grammar School
Wallington Forum
Wallington High School for Girls
Wallington North and District Residents' Association
Wallington Police Station
Wandle Forum
Wandle Group
Wandle Housing Association Ltd
Wandle Road Allotments
Wandle Valley Community Centre
Wandsworth Society
Westbourne Primary

Wilding Hudson
Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Woodcote Avenue Area Residents Group
Woodcote Green Residents' Association
Woodstock Road Residents' Association
Worcester Park Residents' Association
YRM Architects
Youth Parliament
3. Consultation Methods

The partner boroughs engaged with a large number and wide range of consultees including:

- Statutory bodies;
- Community groups and interest groups;
- Businesses, international, national and local;
- Residents;
- Landowners and occupiers of proposed sites.
- Householders and businesses in the vicinity of proposed sites.

The following engagement methods were used at the following stages of plan preparation.

Stage 1: Issues and Options (19 September to 31 October 2008)

Consultation Documents:

- Issues and Options Document
- A questionnaire entitled “Issues and Options Consultation”
- A leaflet entitled “Consultation on Moving Away From Landfill”

Publication:

- Partner borough websites updated to include documents and methods of responding (www.croydon.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.kingston.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.merton.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.sutton.gov.uk/wasteplan)
- On-line consultation system set up so that stakeholders can comment electronically
- Public notices in local newspapers
- Press release to local newspapers and radio stations
- Articles in borough magazines: My Merton, Sutton Scene and Croydon. (Kingston does not have a borough magazine.)
- Posters and leaflets displayed at Council receptions, libraries and household recycling centres

Correspondence:

- Direct mail to all contacts on each of the borough’s Local Development Framework database, informing them of the consultation and inviting them to a meeting
- Hotline number established so that the South London Waste Plan Project Manager could any questions

Public Workshops:

- Merton, Civic Centre, 29 September
- Croydon, The Clocktower, 1 October
- Sutton, Civic Offices, 6 October
- Kingston, Rose Theatre, 16 October

Meetings with Local Groups:

- The Mitcham Society, Merton
- Ecofootprint Group, Kingston
- Hawkes Road Residents Association, Kingston
- Chessington District Residents Association, Kingston
Stage 2: Potential Sites and Policies (20 July to 16 October 2009)

Consultation Documents:
- Preferred Sites and Policies Document
- The Stage 2 Interim Sustainability Appraisal
- A questionnaire entitled “Consultation on Moving Away From Landfill”
- A leaflet entitled “Consultation on Moving Away From Landfill”
- The South London Waste Plan Technical Report

Publication:
- Partner borough websites updated to include documents and methods of responding (www.croydon.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.kingston.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.merton.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.sutton.gov.uk/wasteplan)
- On-line consultation system set up so that stakeholders can comment electronically
- Public notices in local newspapers (which and when?)
- Press release to local newspapers and radio stations
- Articles in borough magazines: My Merton, Sutton Scene and Croydon. (Kingston does not have a borough magazine.)
- Posters and leaflets displayed at Council receptions and libraries

Correspondence:
- Direct mail to all contacts on each of the borough’s Local Development Framework database, informing them of the consultation and inviting them to a meeting
- Direct mail to those contacts who responded to the Stage 1 consultation, informing them of the consultation and inviting them to a meeting
- Direct mail to all those businesses and and residents on or surrounding potential sites
- Hotline number established so that the South London Waste Plan Project Manager could any questions

Drop-In Meetings:
- Croydon, The Clocktower, 7 September
- Merton, Civic Centre, 9 September
- Kingston, The Guildhall, 16 September
- Sutton, Civic Offices, 28 September

Meetings with Local Groups:

Croydon:
- Selsdon Residents Association
- Sanderstead, Croham, Selsdon and Ballards Neighbourhood Meeting
- Addiscombe, Woodside and Ashburton Neighbourhood Meeting
- Broad Green and Waddon Neighbourhood Meeting
- Addington Residents’ Association Committee

Kingston:
- Chessington District Residents Association
- Hawkes Road Residents Association
• Maldens and Coombes Neighbourhood Meeting
• Surbiton Neighbourhood Meeting
• Kingston Town Centre Neighbourhood Meeting
• South of the Borough Neighbourhood Forum
• Transition Town Kingston
• Malden Rushett Residents Association
• Three meetings with local residents in the south of the borough in Tolworth and Chessington

Merton:
• Willow Lane Industrial Estate BID group,
• Wimbledon Park Residents Association
• Mitcham Society
• Morden Community Forum
• Raynes Park Community Forum
• Wimbledon Community Forum
• Mitcham Community Forum
• Colliers Wood Community Forum
• Mitcham Partnership
• Wimbledon Society
• Raynes Park Association
• Merton Sustainable Communities and Transport Partnership and the Environment subgroup of this Partnership
• Morden Industrial Area (South Wimbledon Business Area BID Group)
• Longthornton Redevelopment Working Party

Sutton:
• Information provided at the Carshalton Environment Fair
• KIPPA BID (Business group on the Kimpton Industrial Estate)
• Beddington and Wallington Local Committee
• Local Authorities Along the Wandle
• Beddington Farm Bird Group

Stage 2a: Additional Sites (8 February to 22 March 2010)
Consultation Documents:
• Additional Sites Document
• Stage 2a Interim Sustainability Appraisal
• Questionnaire

Publication:
• Partner borough websites updated to include documents and methods of responding (www.croydon.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.kingston.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.merton.gov.uk/wasteplan; www.sutton.gov.uk/wasteplan)
• On-line consultation system set up so that stakeholders can comment electronically
• Public notices in local newspapers
• Press release to local newspapers and radio stations
• Articles in borough magazine: My Merton. (Sutton and Croydon were unable to publish an article due to purdah. Kingston does not have a borough magazine.)
- Article on the “Talk2Croydon” website
- Documents displayed at Council receptions and libraries

**Correspondence:**
- Direct mail to all contacts on each of the borough’s Local Development Framework database, informing them of the consultation
- Direct mail to those contacts who responded to the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations, informing them of the consultation
- Direct mail to all those businesses and residents surrounding sites (not on???): 1003 Hogsmill Valley, 1004 Beddington Farmlands, 1006 Wandle Valley Trading Estate, 1007 Jessop’s Way, Beddington
- Hotline number established so that the South London Waste Plan Project Manager could answer any questions
Comparison of SCI Requirements and Consultation Methods Used

Key:
- **C-R**: Croydon Requirement
- **M-R**: Merton Requirement
- **C-O**: Croydon Optional
- **M-O**: Merton Optional
- **K-R**: Kingston Requirement
- **S-R**: Sutton Requirement
- **K-O**: Kingston Optional
- **S-O**: Sutton Optional

### Stage 1: Issues and Options (19 September to 31 October 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Technique</th>
<th>SCI Reference</th>
<th>Technique Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, M-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to Database Consultees</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails to Database Consultees</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Website</td>
<td>C-R, K-O, M-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents in Public Places</td>
<td>C-R, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notices</td>
<td>C-R, K-O, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets/Newsletters</td>
<td>C-O, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in Borough Magazine</td>
<td>C-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hotline</td>
<td>M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable Discussions</td>
<td>C-O, K-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Discussions</td>
<td>C-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Meetings of Existing Groups</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise Public Exhibitions/Meetings</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Discussions</td>
<td>K-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles for Specific Groups</td>
<td>S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Real</td>
<td>C-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry by Design</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events in Schools</td>
<td>S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage 2: Preferred Sites and Policies (20 July to 16 October 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Technique</th>
<th>SCI Reference</th>
<th>Technique Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>M-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to Database Consultees</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails to Database Consultees</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Those Involved in Previous Stage</td>
<td>M-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Website</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents in Public Places</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets/Newsletters</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Those Affected by Site Proposals</td>
<td>K-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in Council Magazine</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicise on Notice Boards</td>
<td>K-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Versions</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hotline</td>
<td>M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable Discussions</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Discussions</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Meetings of Existing Groups</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise Public Exhibitions/Meetings</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Discussions</td>
<td>K-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles for Specific Groups</td>
<td>S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>C-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Real</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry by Design</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2a: Additional Sites (8 February to 22 March 2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Technique</th>
<th>SCI Reference</th>
<th>Technique Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>M-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to Database Consultees</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails to Database Consultees</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Those Involved in Previous Stage</td>
<td>M-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Website</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents in Public Places</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-R, S-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets/Newsletters</td>
<td>C-R, K-R, M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Those Affected by Site Proposals</td>
<td>K-R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in Council Magazine</td>
<td>C-Q, K-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes, but some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicise on Notice Boards</td>
<td>K-O</td>
<td>boroughs in purdah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Versions</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hotline</td>
<td>M-O, S-O</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable Discussions</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Discussions</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Meetings of Existing Groups</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, M-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise Public Exhibitions/Meetings</td>
<td>C-O, K-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Discussions</td>
<td>K-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles for Specific Groups</td>
<td>S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>C-O, S-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Real</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry by Design</td>
<td>C-O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary of the Main Issues Raised and How They Have Been Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Consultation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>The Boroughs’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1/Q2:</strong></td>
<td>There was general support for the draft Vision and Objectives. However, the following changes or additions were suggested:</td>
<td>Reference to waste minimisation is now included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include reference to supporting waste minimisation</td>
<td>The objectives now contain the sentence: “Where waste cannot be recycled or composted, the maximum value will be recovered from that residual waste”. This signals support to Energy from Waste but does not conflict with the aim of managing waste as far up the waste hierarchy as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include reference to supporting waste-derived renewable energy generation</td>
<td>These phrases have been replaced by “suitable locations” and “best available technologies”. What constitutes a suitable location is set out in the policies, the Waste Plan is technology neutral and the best available technology is dependent on site factors and the type of waste being processed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify “best place” and “best technology”/ Promote modern waste management facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include methane-capture from any landfill</td>
<td>The South London Waste Plan is trying to replace landfill with more sustainable waste processing and so this is not an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include reference to looking for sites outside the Plan’s borders</td>
<td>The management of waste outside the Plan’s borders has been considered but the boroughs consider it is not a suitable matter for the objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include reference to reducing climate change</td>
<td>The objectives now refer to how the plan should mitigate the causes of climate change and how the plan should consider the need to adapt to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include reference to health and well-being</td>
<td>future climate change</td>
<td>This is included in the phrase “minimise adverse impacts on people and the local environment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include reference to the sustainable transport of waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>A reference to sustainable transport is now included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make objectives more locally distinctive</td>
<td></td>
<td>The boroughs consider that this is addressed in the “Key Issues” section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Q3:** The majority of respondents wanted the Waste Plan to exceed the London Plan apportionment and achieve self sufficiency | Policy WP1 states “the boroughs will seek to exceed the apportionment target and strive to attain self-sufficiency” |

| **Q4/Q5:** There were mixed responses on how the Waste Plan should approach Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste and Hazardous Waste with roughly 40% wanting them dealt with through policies and 40% not addressed through policies. | Policy WP2 examines the current arrangements for dealing with these wastes and sets out how planning applications for these streams will be considered |

| **Q6:** There was strong support that the Plan should address the issue of agricultural waste | Policy WP2 examines the current arrangements for dealing with this waste and sets out how planning applications for this stream will be considered |

| **Q7:** There was strong support for waste facilities being clustered as opposed to a de-centralised approach | The ability to select a distribution type for waste management facilities has not proved possible, given the need to safeguard existing sites and the fact that the deliverability of sites has proved to be such a crucial factor in site selection. |

<p>| <strong>Q8:</strong> There was strong support for the co-location of complementary facilities | The ability to co-locate complementary waste management facilities has not proved possible, given the need to safeguard existing sites and the fact that the deliverability of sites has proved to be such a crucial factor in site selection. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q9:</strong> Most respondents thought the draft criteria for assessing sites/locations needed to be expanded</th>
<th>During the site search (conducted between Issues and Options and Preferred Options), a set of criteria was used and the set has been re-used to assess windfall sites in Policy WP5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following suggestions were made:</td>
<td>This was a constraint in site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on regionally/locally important nature conservation areas</td>
<td>This was a constraint in site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Metropolitan Open Land/Green Belt</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that sites below 0.2ha are generally too small to be able to manage significant throughput tonnage and have therefore been excluded from consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site size</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that since all the sites and areas identified are either waste facilities or industrial areas. The number of jobs created will depend on the number of jobs currently located on site and what type of waste management facility is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impacts such as the provision of jobs</td>
<td>The deliverability of a site was a key criterion in the identification of industrial areas that may sites suitable for waste management facilities. Please refer to “Evidence Base Study 4: Deliverability of Sites” for the methodology the boroughs have used for assessing deliverability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverability of the site, including potential conflict with others seeking land requirements</td>
<td>The proximity to residential areas, schools and hospitals, the routing of vehicles to the site, visual intrusion, existing ambient air quality and traffic generation were all considerations in the site search. Policy WP7 states that “developments for waste management facilities will be required to demonstrate that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people and the environment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on local townscapes</td>
<td>This was a consideration in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to energy users</td>
<td>This was a consideration in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>This was a consideration in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Assessments</td>
<td>The likely need for a Transport Assessment is stated in Policy WP7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Assessments</td>
<td>The likely need for a Noise Assessment is stated in Policy WP7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential drop in house prices</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that the policies of the South London Waste Plan will ensure that future waste management developments will not significantly adversely affect the amenity of residents and so the development of a waste management facility should not affect the value of nearby property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of facility</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that in order not to be prescriptive, to allow for new technologies to come forward and be used, it is prudent not to state the type of facility on each site. The suitability of a proposal on a particular site will be assessed at the planning application stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenly spread throughout the boroughs</td>
<td>The ability to select a distribution type for waste management facilities has not proved possible, given the need to safeguard existing sites and the fact that the deliverability of sites has proved to be such a crucial factor in site selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define what is meant by previously developed land</td>
<td>The definition of Previously Developed Land can be found in PPS3. Local planning authorities are advised not to repeat national guidance unnecessarily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site flexibility to adapt to future changing circumstance, eg adaptation, expansion, co-locations, supply of heat and power</td>
<td>This was a consideration in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q10:** When asked to consider what were the three most important criteria...
when assessing locations for waste management, the following criteria all achieved a “most important” ranking for a respondent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Boroughs Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to where the waste is produced</td>
<td>The boroughs consider this criterion is preferable but given the relatively small area covered by the Plan and the developed nature of the Plan, it is difficult to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to sustainable transport</td>
<td>This was an opportunity in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to the Strategic Road Network</td>
<td>This was an opportunity in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and environmental constraints</td>
<td>These were constraints in the site search and are criteria in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk</td>
<td>This was a constraint in the site search and is a criterion in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social impact</td>
<td>This was a constraint in the site search and is covered in Policy WP7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>The boroughs have safeguarded existing waste facilities and the areas which may have sites suitable for waste management development are all existing industrial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverability</td>
<td>This was a key factor in considering the areas which may have sites suitable for waste management development. Please refer to “Evidence Base Study 4: Deliverability of Sites”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q11a: The following sites were suggested as suitable for waste management facilities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Sutton</td>
<td>Considered and most suitable parts, following the site evaluation, are included in Schedule 2 (ref: 5312, 532, 533, 534, 535, 539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddington Farmlands, Sutton</td>
<td>Considered but not included since the area is Metropolitan Open Land and safeguarded for the Wandle Valley Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict’s Wharf, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Lane, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Road, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Transfer Station, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne’s Chocolate Works, Sutton</td>
<td>Considered but not included since the site has been relatively recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>redeveloped for other industrial and commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purley Oaks, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 4) and Schedule 2 (ref: 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Industrial Estate, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because of access, traffic impact and residential amenity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selhurst Rail Depot, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subsequent site evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolworth Rail Aggregates Depot, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>due to poor deliverability prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villiers Road and Fairfield Industrial Estate, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Lane Industrial Estate, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 2 (ref: 69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q11b:** The following sites were identified as unsuitable for waste management facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coulsdon Industrial Area, Marlpit Lane and Ullswater Crescent, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subsequent site evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Road Industrial Area, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subsequent site evaluation (surveyed as Roman Industrial Estate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitcham, Merton</td>
<td>Some sites in and around Mitcham were considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the subsequent site evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear Tree Farm, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered and included as an existing site in Schedule 1 (ref: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Industrial Estate, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected because of access, traffic impact and residential amenity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Road Employment Area, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered but not included as the site was the subject of a planning application for a major redevelopment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q12:** The following additional sites were identified as suitable for waste management facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disused Sidings East and South of Norwood Junction, Croydon</td>
<td>Considered at the site evaluation stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Silverglades Business Park, Kingston</td>
<td>Not considered since, at the time, under consideration as part of Kingston’s Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area to South of Malden Rushett</td>
<td>Not considered since the site description was not specific enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A243 particularly where it crosses the B280, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the subsequent site evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old B&amp;Q and Comet Site, New Malden</td>
<td>Considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the subsequent site evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land alongside A3, Kingston</td>
<td>Not considered since site description was not specific enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government site at Tolworth, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected due to poor deliverability prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Evaluation Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments and playing fields south of Keswick Avenue, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered at the site evaluation stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of Lower Marsh Lane, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered at the site evaluation stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former BBC sports ground at Motspur Park, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected due to poor deliverability prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddington Farmlands, Sutton</td>
<td>Not considered since, at the time, under consideration as part of Sutton’s Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former landfill sites at Mitcham Common, Merton</td>
<td>Considered but not included since it did not score well enough in the subsequent site evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Olympic Village</td>
<td>Out of the Plan area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Park Lane, Godstone</td>
<td>Out of the Plan area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land near the M25</td>
<td>Out of the Plan area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q13:** The following sites were suggested as suitable for co-locating facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Open Land</td>
<td>Not considered since, at the time, under consideration as part of Kingston’s and Sutton’s Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing waste sites and Strategic Industrial Areas</td>
<td>Considered and the top scoring industrial areas from the site evaluation with deliverability prospects form Schedule 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddington Industrial Area, Sutton</td>
<td>Considered and the top scoring industrial parts of the area from the site evaluation with deliverability prospects are included Schedule 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddington Farmlands, Sutton</td>
<td>Not considered since, at the time, under consideration as part of Sutton’s Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites near existing or planned residential areas</td>
<td>Not considered since the site description was not specific enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolworth Rail Aggregates Depot, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected due to poor deliverability prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict’s Wharf, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Industrial Estate, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in the Stage 2 consultation, subsequently rejected because of deliverability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villiers Road and Fairfield Industrial Estate, Kingston</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Lane Industrial Estate, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 2 (ref: 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Road, Merton</td>
<td>Considered and included in Schedule 1 (ref: 9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q14:** There was strong support for allocating specific technologies or broad types of development to specific sites.

The boroughs considered the results in the light of PPS10 which states that although waste planning authorities should identify the type or types of waste management facility that would be appropriately located on a site or in an area, waste planning authorities should avoid stifling innovation in line with the waste hierarchy. From further analysis of the responses to this question, it became clear that the waste industry was strongly opposed to defining types of facility. The operators argued that there was a process involved in the development of waste facilities continuing to the planning application process. The level of detail becomes more certain and specific throughout the process and the industry generally felt that the type of development is best dealt with at the planning application stage when the impacts of a proposal can be properly assessed, together with potential mitigation measures and public consultation on specific proposals can be undertaken. In order to give the waste industry some flexibility and stifle neither technological innovation nor deliverability, the boroughs consider it
is preferable to not specific types of facility in the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15: A majority of respondents approved of the idea for a specific Energy from Waste policy in the Plan</th>
<th>Policy WP8 covers Energy from Waste proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16: A majority of respondents agreed with the draft monitoring indicators</td>
<td>During the course of the Plan preparation, the monitoring indicators have been linked to policies and been refined. Therefore, although the basic indicators remain much the same as the draft indicators in the Issues and Options document, the boroughs consider the monitoring framework has been improved as the plan has developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17: The following monitoring indicators were suggested:</td>
<td>This is difficult to monitor because the amount of Commercial and Industrial Waste going into landfill is not measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of waste from the Plan area disposed of to landfill</td>
<td>These are difficult to monitor because the Plan areas does not have complete coverage of Air Quality Monitoring Stations and traffic counting is costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of waste recovered and recycled</td>
<td>This is included in the monitoring framework for Policy WP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy generated from facilities</td>
<td>This is included in the monitoring framework for Policy WP8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon impact of the facility</td>
<td>Carbon performance will be assessed at the planning application stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts of household recycling</td>
<td>The amount of household waste recycled is included in the monitoring framework for Policy WP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance waste is being transported</td>
<td>This is difficult to monitor because of the lack of detailed information on Commercial and Industrial Waste and that waste transporters can change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of trips by non-road</td>
<td>waste treatment facilities at very short notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of types of facility within the Plan area</td>
<td>This is difficult to monitor because of the lack of detailed information on Commercial and Industrial Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of facilities granted planning permission</td>
<td>This is included in the monitoring framework for Policy WP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth</td>
<td>This is included in the monitoring framework for Policies WP3, WP4 and WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is likely to continue to be available as part of each boroughs’ general monitoring activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q18: Other issues raised were**

- Information about the types of waste management facilities is contained within Key Issue 3
- The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy has objectives to encourage the recycling of Commercial and Industrial Waste
- Policy WP7 and the supporting text provide criteria and advice on the design of waste management facilities
- Information about the landfill site at Beddington is contained within Key Issue 1
- The boroughs consider this is a matter for the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
- Policy WP6 covers the sustainable design and construction of waste facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Plan should contain policies to guide the development of “windfall sites”</th>
<th>Policy WP5 covers the criteria which windfall sites need to meet in order to be granted planning permission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Plan should consider the movement of waste across the Plan boundaries</td>
<td>This matter is considered in Key Issue 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of other future uses of land on industrial sites</td>
<td>The boroughs consider this is a matter for their own Core Strategies and not the South London Waste Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of whether the Plan is the appropriate Plan to support waste water and sewage treatment infrastructure</td>
<td>This issue of waste water is discussed in the supporting text to Policy WP2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Stage 2 Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>The Boroughs’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy WP1: The Strategic Approach</strong></td>
<td>The corresponding policies in the Proposed Submission version are WP1 and WP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of Government Bodies</td>
<td>The policy is now specific about the amount of waste in the area to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the policy more locally distinctive, robust and measurable (this</td>
<td>managed by 2021 and more specific in terms of what is to be achieved. The monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies to all policies and is not repeated throughout the report)</td>
<td>framework has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the accompanying evidence base, identify the sites which currently</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that since the amount of hazardous waste is small and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage hazardous waste in the partner boroughs and their current capacity</td>
<td>number of hazardous waste handlers are numerous (many are high street chemists) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contracts for the management of hazardous waste frequently change, the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would quickly become out of date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the waste forecasts for all waste streams</td>
<td>The boroughs are continuing to work to the forecasts in the 2008 London Plan since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the boroughs consider the employment forecasts in the Draft Replacement London Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are too low and so the C&amp;I Waste forecasts, which are based on the employment forecasts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are similarly too low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the existing capacity to treat waste within the Plan area</td>
<td>The Plan uses the latest figures for capacity at the time of going to press.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the existing landfill capacity within the Plan area in the</td>
<td>This is done in Paragraph 3.15 of the Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompanying evidence base</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that the permitting review is likely to lead to more sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the implications of the EA’s current permitting review on the</td>
<td>being identified rather than fewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan area’s existing capacity</td>
<td>This is done in Paragraphs 3.4-3.18 of the Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give greater consideration to the cross boundary movement of waste</td>
<td>This is done in Paragraphs 4.29-4.32 of the Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify what currently occurs with the treatment of clinical waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of Residents and Local Businesses</td>
<td>The issue of re-used and reduction are addressed by reference to the waste hierarchy. The issue of Energy from Waste’s place in the waste hierarchy is addressed in the third paragraph of Policy WP1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-use and the reduction of waste should be a key component of the Plan – linked to questioning the Plan’s current Vision and Objectives view, “waste as a resource”</td>
<td>Policy WP1 makes reference to changing targets and the aim to meet self-sufficiency and exceed the appointment figures of the 2008 London Plan “or any subsequent target” allows for a decrease in the amount of waste produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome the Plan’s flexible approach. However, the Plan must be sufficiently flexible to respond to decreasing levels of waste production</td>
<td>This remains in Policy WP1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome the wording around “safeguarding communities and the environment”</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that the reference in the third paragraph of Policy WP1 is sufficiently strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for stronger controls in this policy to ensure that waste is managed as high up the waste hierarchy as possible</td>
<td>The boroughs consider that the throughput of facilities cannot be maximised in all cases and other considerations, such as site characteristics and access, must be taken into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure the most efficient facilities possible are built</td>
<td>The language has been amended to be neutral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question the language used which is very positive. Request that consideration should be given to moderating the language of the policies e.g. favourably consider proposals for this additional waste management capacity…” (this applies to all policies and is not repeated throughout this report)</td>
<td>This is done in Paragraph 4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to clarify what agricultural waste means</td>
<td>The link to other policies in the Plan and the policies within a borough’s LDF is made in the third paragraph of Policy WP1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to make links to other policies and particularly highlight the need for proposals to also satisfy proposed policies WP4, WP6 and if the facility is a thermal treatment facility, WP7</td>
<td>As Paragraphs 3.12 and 3.14 point out, it is difficult to track waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about where the waste will be coming from; don’t want to import</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
waste from long distances.

Croydon should seek to have the principles on waste which it set out in its Croydon Environment and Climate Change Strategy 2009-11

Views from the Industry
Support the ambition of going beyond the apportionment and aiming for self-sufficiency. However, this needs to be further clarified in the policy and supporting text.

The issue of the cross-boundary movement of waste (which is inevitable) needs to be clarified

Request to remove the word, ‘sufficient’ from the beginning of policy which currently reads, “Sufficient planning permissions to meet the apportionment requirements of the London Plan and go beyond this and seek to maximise self-sufficiency in managing the waste generated by the four boroughs.” (on the basis that more applications need to be lodged and not all will get permission).

Specifically identify wood as a waste stream which is identified as a priority material for action in the Waste Strategy for England 2007

Review the assumed land requirements identified in Table 1.3 of the consultation document which is used in the calculation to identify how much land needs to be allocated to waste management facilities

The policy states that development will be encouraged on the most suitable sites which will be eventually identified in proposed policy WP4. However, this precludes existing waste sites which will be identified in proposed policy WP3. This needs clarification.

movements precisely.

The Croydon Environment and Climate Change Strategy 2009-2011 is no longer a relevant document.

The policy has been reworded and figures are given pointing to the difference meeting the apportionment and self-sufficiency.

As Paragraphs 3.12 and 3.14 point out, it is difficult to track waste movements precisely.

The wording of Policy WP1 has been amended and this phrase no longer appears

The boroughs consider it is difficult to identify wood as a stand alone waste stream since it occurs in so many other waste streams (municipal, C&I, C, D & E and agricultural)

This has been done and the replacement tables are on Page 21

The amended wording of Policy WP1 clarifies the relationship between Policies WP3 and WP4.
The phrase “manage waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practically possible” may inhibit the development of otherwise accepted waste treatment facilities and it should be reviewed

If this comment alludes to the place of Energy from Waste facilities in the waste hierarchy, the issue has been addressed in the third paragraph of Policy WP1 where net carbon emissions and the waste hierarchy are considered together.

**Policy WP2: Waste Minimisation**

**Views from Government Bodies**
Welcome the reference to movements of construction materials and wastes by non-road (e.g. rail or water) and this should be a key selection criteria

Note that the policy focuses on the construction industry, but there are also other initiatives to support waste reduction e.g. the London Mayor’s Green Procurement Code and the Waste Resources Action Programme’s (WRAP’s) ‘Love food, hate waste’ consumer campaign.

The corresponding policy in the Proposed Submission version is WP6

**Views of Residents and Local Businesses**
The policy is weak on promoting waste minimisation and should actively encourage greater waste minimisation. More consideration should be given to this policy and its monitoring regime

The policy should make it clear whether all 7 criteria listed need to be satisfied by any proposal (this applies to all policies and is not repeated throughout this report)

The same standards should apply as for other construction projects

While the comment is welcome, on reflection, the boroughs consider the requirement was too restrictive, especially in an area where freight transport by water is non-existent and rail minimal. Significant carbon emission savings on the movement of construction materials and waste can also be made by: sourcing materials close to the site, disposing of waste at the nearest facility, having an efficient logistic plan and partnership working.

The policy has been substantially amended and the boroughs consider that these issues could be included in a BREEAM scheme or the Municipal Waste Strategy

The policy has been substantially amended and has been amended accordingly. Waste minimisation is being pursued through other local, regional and national strategies.

The policy has been substantially amended.

The policy has been substantially amended and, while in conformity with the boroughs’ individual policies, contains specific information for the waste management industry.
The re-use of existing buildings and its fixtures and fittings, rather than their demolition and scrap should be an initial priority

Request that consideration is given to conserving the use of water in construction projects and in whichever process is used.

Request that the point made (in the text of the consultation document) to secure space in new dwellings for storage of recyclables is picked up in the policies

No mention of asbestos in construction wastes

Strengthen the language e.g. phrases like “wherever possible” are too vague should be more positive. There ought to be more “sticks” and less “carrots” in the policies (general point to be applied to all policies and is not repeated throughout this report)

**Views from the Industry**

The requirement to meet BREEAM ‘excellent’ rating proposed in Policy WP2 is unduly stringent and may be unrealistic for all waste facilities. The proposed policy already requires developers to meet the London Mayor’s Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance which requires a design and access statement which is considered sufficient. Meeting BREEAM will lead to additional costs and care must be taken not to stifle the development of new facilities (and to encourage their use).

The ‘waste minimisation’ policy deals with other aspects (e.g. movement of waste by non-road means) which is confusing.

Bullet 1) refers to a development meeting ‘best practice’ guidance. This is considered too ambiguous and needs clarifying.

This is covered in the Mayor of London’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPG and repetition is unnecessary.

This may be included in any BREEAM scheme.

The boroughs consider that this is not a matter for this Plan and is covered in Category 5 of the 2010 Code for Sustainable Homes.

The boroughs consider that this is not a matter for the Plan. The Health and Safety Executive is the primary source for information on asbestos.

This policy has been substantially amended.

The BREEAM requirements have been amended following this representation and the boroughs consider that a rating of “excellent” under a bespoke BREEAM scheme is appropriate. There is also now a viability test in Policy WP6.

This policy has been substantially amended.

This policy has been substantially amended.
The points made at bullets 3), 4) and 5) are very similar (all support the minimisation and sustainable management of waste during construction) and could be condensed.

At bullet point 7) it is identified that it may not be possible for all resources in the development of waste management facilities to be used efficiently for their lifecycle impacts to be reduced. It will depend on the material and it is suggested that the words, “wherever practicable” are added.

Clarification is needed on what ‘major developments’ are (identified in the justifying text)

This policy has been substantially amended.

The boroughs consider that issues of efficiency and lifecycle impacts would be considered in the formulation of a BREEAM bespoke scheme

This policy has been substantially amended.

### Policy WP3: Existing Waste Management Sites

**Views from Government Bodies**

A plan of existing waste sites will is needed in the next version of the Plan

Identify that any compensatory site will be required to deal with at least the equivalent quantity of waste, to ensure conformity with the Mayor’s London Plan

The NHS suggests that a specific reference should be made to the need to safeguard clinical waste facilities

The EA comments that understanding throughput of facilities is extremely difficult, and suggests that in monitoring the Plan, there may be opportunities to improve data collection and understanding of existing treatment throughput

**Views of Residents and Local Businesses**

The policy should identify that any development on compensatory sites must meet the policies within the Plan

The corresponding policy in the Proposed Submission version is Policy WP3

A plan of the existing sites to be safeguarded is included on Page 38.

This is now included in the second paragraph of Policy WP3.

As paragraph 4.32 of the Plan explains, there are no disposal facilities within the Plan area.

The boroughs consider that the issue of throughput has been examined in detail in Evidence Base Study 3: Technical Report. The boroughs do not wish to commit to monitoring that they may not be able to conduct in the future.

This is now included in the second paragraph of Policy WP3.
By safeguarding existing waste sites and requiring compensatory provision if any are lost, the policy does not cater for any reduction in waste arisings and a reduction in the number of waste sites actually needed to manage the Plan area’s waste. The boroughs consider that it is highly unlikely that waste arisings will fall to such an extent, over the Plan period, that existing sites will no longer be required.

Some existing waste sites are not suitably located in modern society and should not be safeguarded.

The wording seems to allow uncontrolled development on the sites which will be listed. The language should be altered to reflect the fact that policy tests will need to be met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views from the Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For clarity, a list of existing sites and a plan of these should be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification is needed on whether these sites are preferred for development ahead of new sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity is needed on the suitability of existing sites to contribute to the sustainable waste management strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification is needed on what is meant by ‘existing permitted level of use’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration should be given in this policy to the London Plan requirement to ensure that sites are not prejudiced by nearby development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2008 London Plan requires boroughs to safeguard existing waste sites. However, the Proposed Submission version of the South London Waste Plan introduces a minimum site area of 0.2ha for safeguarding sites which eliminates unsuitably located existing waste sites.

This is now included in the second paragraph of Policy WP3.

A list of sites to be safeguarded is on Page 37 and a plan is on Page 38.

Policies WP3 and WP4 states that development can occur on the sites and identified areas.

Regional Policy requires the Plan to safeguard sites.

This phrase has been omitted from the Plan.

The boroughs consider this will be a matter that will be considered at the planning application stage for any neighbouring development and can be dealt with through the policies of individual boroughs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy WP4: Proposed New/Enhanced Waste Management Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The corresponding policy in the Proposed Submission version is WP4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views from Government Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| | | |
A plan of allocated waste sites will is needed in the next version of the Plan. If wider areas of search are also included in the final plan, these should also be shown on a map base.

The GLA would support these criteria identified in Policy WP5 being reiterated in Policy WP4 to identify that the proposed sites which will eventually be identified in this policy have already been considered against a broad range of criteria.

Suggestion that the policy also refers to ensuring that existing recovery rates are not compromised when an existing waste site is re-developed for waste management use.

Suggestion that the policy may benefit from clarification on how compensatory sites will be provided if an existing waste facility use is lost.

Suggestion that the policy would benefit from identifying that any proposals must also meet tests within the other policies within the Plan.

The EA identify that in some cases, the redevelopment of existing waste sites (where waste is treated further up the waste hierarchy) will result in a lower throughput onsite. The EA suggests this needs consideration.

The EA suggests that further clarification is needed in respect to flood risk, groundwater protection and local nature conservation.

Views of Residents and Local Businesses
The justifying text should identify the process by which sites have been selected.

Clarification is needed on where the compensatory site provision would be.

A plan of industrial areas which may have sites suitable for waste management development is on Page 42.

This is set out in Paragraphs 4.50-4.53.

The boroughs consider that this is too prescriptive as a site may be redeveloped to manage waste further up the waste hierarchy but this may result in a lower throughput.

This is covered in the policy on existing safeguarded waste sites (Policy WP3).

This is included in the second paragraph of the policy.

The boroughs consider this is best evaluated at the planning application stage on a case-by-case basis.

The identified areas have been subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test, see Evidence Base Study 1. Analysis of Source Protection Zones is contained in Evidence Base Study 2 and Nature Conservation Issues are covered in Evidence Base Study 7.

The justifying text has been amended to include this (see Paragraphs 4.50-4.53 of the Proposed Submission version).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is suggested that the Plan should allocate sufficient sites that additional compensatory sites are not needed.</th>
<th>Compensatory site provision is covered in Policy WP3. Due to deliverability constraints, sites have not been allocated instead broad locations have been identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The plan should identify constraints for each site</td>
<td>This is done in Section 5 (Pages 53-82).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wording seems to allow uncontrolled development on the sites which will be listed. The language should be altered to reflect the fact that policy tests will need to be met.</td>
<td>A reference to proposals needing to meet other policies within a borough’s Development Plan is included in the second paragraph of Policy WP4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views from the Industry</strong></td>
<td>The boroughs consider that there should be a presumption against inappropriate development in Metropolitan Open Land. Developers will need to demonstrate that there are very special circumstances related to what would normally be deemed inappropriate development and that these very special circumstances outweigh the harm that will be done to the Metropolitan Open Land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add reference in this policy to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Planning Policy Statement 10 which states that in developing waste plans, local authorities should: “protect green belts but recognise the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities when defining detailed green belt boundaries and, in determining planning applications, that these locational needs, together with the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be given planning permission”</td>
<td>The re-titling of policies clarifies the differences between WP3 and WP4. The potential for developing existing sites is set out in Schedule 1 on Page 37 and in Section 5 (Pages 53-82).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Waste management” is defined in the 2008 London Plan and this definition is repeated in Paragraph 3.32.</td>
<td>“Waste management” is defined in the 2008 London Plan and this definition is repeated in Paragraph 3.32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since waste transfer stations do not contribute to the Plan area’s existing capacity, any conversion of a Waste Transfer Station to a Waste Management Facility will result in an increase in the Plan area’s capacity.</td>
<td>Since waste transfer stations do not contribute to the Plan area’s existing capacity, any conversion of a Waste Transfer Station to a Waste Management Facility will result in an increase in the Plan area’s capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy WP5: Waste Related Development on Unallocated Sites</strong></td>
<td><strong>The corresponding policy in the Proposed Submission version is Policy WP5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views from Government Bodies</strong></td>
<td>This remains in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL welcome the priority given to sites where materials entering / leaving the site can be transported by rail or other sustainable means</td>
<td>This remains in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL and the HA recommend the inclusion of a criteria which supports sites which staff can easily access by cycling and walking</td>
<td>The “adverse impact” clause has been moved from this policy to new Policy WP7 so that it covers all waste developments and not just windfall sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NHS welcomes the supporting text which states that the development of waste facilities should not endanger human health and encourage strengthening the wording in bullet 3) of this policy</td>
<td>This is included in Paragraph (b) of Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NHS recommend ensuring that all development are based on need</td>
<td>Protection to these areas is given in the ninth bullet point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views from Residents and Local Businesses</strong></td>
<td>Protection to these locations is given in bullet points (d)(i) and the ninth bullet point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection should be given to sites of metropolitan importance and other locally important nature conservation areas</td>
<td>The boroughs are reluctant to commit to monitoring that is difficult to quantify and that the boroughs may not be able to conduct in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection should also be extended to protect any location which supports locally, nationally or internationally protected species (e.g. land around nature conservation areas which is often very important to species).</td>
<td>Policy WP5 primarily deals with the criteria that were used in the “desktop” element of the site search. Policy WP7 covers the site inspection criteria that were used in the site search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More detailed monitoring indicators are needed to assess impacts of development of people, the environment and natural resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The list of criteria within this policy needs to be extended to cover all the issues which have been considered in identifying suitable sites e.g. include proximity to residential areas, impact on visual amenity, distance from local nature conservation areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy should state that the views of local people will be taken into consideration</td>
<td>Public notification and consultation will occur as part of the planning application procedure. A developer may also undertake his/her own consultation exercise prior to the submission of a planning application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy should ensure that development is not close to where people live and work</td>
<td>The adverse impact on people is covered in Policy WP7 in order to all locations for waste management development, i.e., on safeguarded sites, in industrial areas or on windfall sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy should give greater protection for green belt, open land</td>
<td>Development on the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and open space is covered in national and regional guidance and so is briefly referred to in Policy WP5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater consideration is needed about traffic impacts; the suitability of the roads / road safety issues as well as the proximity to the strategic road network</td>
<td>The proximity of the Strategic Road Network was a “desktop” criterion in the site search and so is a criterion in Policy WP5 for windfall sites. Traffic generation issues are issues for all locations of waste management development, i.e., on safeguarded sites, in industrial areas or on windfall sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy should consider the risk of flooding in future as well as current flood risk</td>
<td>Policy WP6 (b) requires waste management facilities to be adapted and resilient to climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of the term “sustainable transport” is needed</td>
<td>Policy WP5 sixth bullet point names the two most-likely-to-be-used forms of sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views from the Industry</td>
<td>The policy is based on the site search criteria and so provides a level playing field for all developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome the flexibility which this policy provides</td>
<td>The reason for identifying areas in Policy WP4 is to provide a degree of certainty about the location of future waste management facilities for both developers and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request that the policy should be amended to require developers to demonstrate that existing sites are not available / suitable for redevelopment, but not to extend this to new ‘preferred’ sites. It is not considered necessary as long as the site being proposed meets the development criteria in the policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy WP6: Development Criteria

#### Views from Government Bodies

- **TfL** welcome the priority given to sites where materials entering / leaving the site can be transported by rail or other sustainable means.

- TfL and the HA recommend the inclusion of a criteria which supports sites which staff can easily access by cycling and walking.

- TfL requests that the highways impacts of proposals must be fully modelled in line with TfL guidance and should include a Construction Logistics Plan and a Delivery Servicing Plan to help reduce the impacts on the TLRN and SRN.

- Suggestion that monitoring indicators around vehicle movements / numbers should be expanded and applied throughout the policies.

- It will be important to consider the impact of proposed sites and policies on existing UDP policies and emerging LDFs which, for example, may not allow development in particular locations or may require consideration of particular issues. This is likely to be particularly important for sites which are located near to sites of importance for nature conservation.

- The NHS welcomes the reference to protecting human health and recommends this is strengthened in the policies.

- The EA also welcome greater recognition of the impacts of particulate

#### The corresponding policy in the Proposed Submission version is WP7

- The original policy did not refer to this. However, the matter is covered in the Policy WP7 of the Proposed Submission version under the topic of traffic generation and in Schedule 3 where it is stated that a Transport Assessment is likely to be required. This would include details about mode splits and may incorporate a Travel Plan to alter the basic modal splits.

- A Construction Logistics Plan and a Delivery Servicing Plan are included in Schedule 3 which lists the information that is likely to be required to evaluate a planning application.

- The boroughs are reluctant to commit to monitoring that they may not be able to conduct in the future.

- The strategic policy of the document, WP1, requires that “all development should safeguard existing communities and the environment by meeting other policies within the relevant borough's Development Plan” Therefore, an application would have to be considered with regard to policies in existing UDPs and LDFs.

- This remains in the policy.

- The policy still refers to air emissions but the brackets to referring to dust.
matter and bio-aerosols in this policy.

The EA requests that this policy is strengthened to recognise the role of consulting with the local community, deliver environmental enhancements (e.g. green roofs, river and watercourse restoration/improvements, sustainable drainage, sustainable construction) as well as greater environmental protection. They suggest the following wording should be added, “Development will be expected to improve the local environment and early consultation with local communities is essential.”

The EA would welcome strengthening the wording around encouraging developers to engage with relevant authorities before submitting an application. They suggest adding the following wording, “Developers are encouraged to contact the appropriate partner borough and the Environment Agency prior to submission of a planning application to discuss all relevant matters.” Local communities should be central to the decision making process and consulted early where any new waste sites or upgrades to existing facilities are proposed.”

Views from Residents and Local Businesses
Protection should be given to sites of metropolitan importance and other locally important nature conservation areas

Protection should also be extended to protect any location which supports locally, nationally or internationally protected species (e.g. land around nature conservation areas which is often very important to species).

Additional consideration should be given to the impact of waste development on the proposed Wandle Regional Park. Consideration of the environmental impacts, particularly noise, visual impact, emissions and odour on the proposed Wandle Park must be ensured.

have been deleted. Schedule 3, item 22, provides information on how to conduct an Air Quality Impact Assessment.

Consultation with the community is referred to in Paragraph 4.69. Environmental enhancements are covered in Policy WP6 and WP9.

Consultation with relevant authorities and local communities is referred to in Paragraph 4.69.

This will be covered by the policies contained within each borough’s UDP and/or LDF.

The document has undergone a Habitats Regulations (Appropriate Assessment) Screening Report and the policies have been amended accordingly. Other species protection is covered by the policies contained within each borough’s UDP and/or LDF.

References to the proposed Wandle Valley Regional Park are made in relation to the sites contained in Schedule 1 and in the site description for Site 18.
The consideration around air quality impact should be strengthened.

The consideration of impacts of habitats should not be limited to land adjoining sites. Impact assessments must recognise that different species use landscapes in different ways and it may not just be the adjacent land which is important to their survival.

The Wandle Trust request that this policy should include an assessment of the development on heat and evapo-transpiration from the site, which is related to the urban heat island effect.

Consideration is needed in this policy of the impacts of hours of operation, particularly night working, 24/7 working which will disturb local residents.

Request to improve the monitoring indicators for this policy to identify the numbers of permissions granted contrary to advice from statutory stakeholders (and identify who those are)

Under the issue of design, consideration needs to be given to the layout of the site to ensure that impacts on residents (particularly noise) are reduced as much as possible.

The policy should state that proper engagement with local people is needed in the planning process.

Concerns about how local authorities will monitor the impacts of development, particularly air quality (when most boroughs have few air quality monitoring stations) and health impacts

Policy WP7 states that particular regard will be paid to the impact of air emissions, arising from the plant and traffic generated. Schedule 3 provides information on the Air Quality Impact Assessment that is likely to be required.

The boroughs consider that Biodiversity Assessments should be conducted in accordance with European and national regulations, legislation and guidance.

Policy WP6 (b) requires that waste management facilities will be required to be fully adapted and resilient to the urban heat island/heatwaves and impacts on biodiversity.

This is covered in Policy WP7 and the requirement to consider the impact on sensitive receptors, such as residential areas, and in Schedule 3, item 8.

This is included in the monitoring framework for Policy WP7.

The issue of noise is considered in bullet point (f) of Policy WP7. The design of waste management facilities is considered in bullet point (i) in Policy WP7.

This is referred to in Paragraph 4.69.

The monitoring framework includes an indicator to monitor air quality according to Environment Agency advice rather than using Air Quality Management Stations. Policy WP9 also considers the possibility of funding for monitoring. Health impacts are difficult and costly to monitor.
Consequences of exceeding permitted levels of traffic, air quality etc need to be stated.

The policy needs to address impacts from increased traffic; not just air quality, but also residential amenity, road safety, the suitability of the roads themselves, leakage from vehicles travelling to/from the site, mud spray, damage to cars.

In terms of monitoring, it is suggested that this identifies compensatory measures to be taken if monitoring demonstrates levels of pollution etc in excess of permitted levels.

Concerns about loss of employment.

Views from the Industry
Welcome the flexibility which this policy provides.

Request that the policy should be amended to require developers to demonstrate that existing sites are not available / suitable for redevelopment, but that this should not be extended new sites.

Clarification is needed on the term, “for the entire operation of the facility.” Does this refer to the process from beginning to end, or to the cumulative effects of additional development, for example, where facilities are being extended / intensified?

The boroughs are reluctant to commit to monitoring that they may not be able to conduct in the future.

The boroughs consider this is an enforcement matter and so covered by Circular 10/97, PPS18 and an individual borough’s enforcement policies and protocols.

These issues are addressed under traffic generation in Policy WP7. Furthermore, the Transport Assessment will provide the authority with details of how a development will affect amenity and environment.

Proposals on sites which have a history of poor environmental standards, such as Site 17, will be closely examined to ensure there is an improvement in standards.

The boroughs consider this is an enforcement matter and so covered by Circular 10/97, PPS18 and an individual borough’s enforcement policies and protocols.

Schedule 3, item 8, asks developers to provide details of proposed employment levels. This can be judged against existing employment levels on the site at the time of application.

Noted.

The issue of types of sites and sequential selection are covered in Policies WP3, WP4 and WP5.

This phase has been deleted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion that the monitoring role identified in the justifying text is a duplication of the role of the Environment Agency and should not be required</th>
<th>The boroughs work in partnership with the Environment Agency on a number of waste-related matters and so the boroughs consider monitoring an extension of this partnership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition should be given to the fact that in redeveloping a site, traffic could be reduced</td>
<td>The policy refers to traffic generation which could be positive, neutral or negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition should be given to the benefits of providing renewable energy and heat</td>
<td>Energy from Waste is now covered in Policy WP8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirement for developments to provide renewable energy in its design is not referenced</td>
<td>Not all waste developments will produce renewable energy, a Materials Recovery Facility for example. Therefore, it is not appropriate to make renewable energy a requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification is needed on what would be needed to satisfy criteria 4, “an assessment of the impact of greenhouse gases produced.”</td>
<td>This criterion has been deleted. Schedule 3 indicates that an Energy Assessment may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification is needed on what constitutes, “the best design standards” available; this is considered vague and reference should be made to policy governing design (design issues are also raised in proposed policy WP2 and this could be confusing)</td>
<td>This criterion has been amended. The boroughs will evaluate good design in terms of point (i) in Policy WP7 which is a more comprehensive guide. Since Policy WP2 has been substantially amended, duplication does not now occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 5), “the impact of development the biological diversity of flora and fauna” is open to interpretation and needs to be clarified. Does this apply to all sites or just those which are of recognised nature conservation importance?</td>
<td>This has been amended. Schedule 3, item 16, sets out what the boroughs would expect to be included in a Biodiversity Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy WP7: Sustainable Modern Energy Recovery**

**Views from Government Bodies**

The NHS supports the encouragement of cleaner technologies, and would support this policy as long as it represents no additional adverse health

The corresponding policy in the Proposed Submission version is Policy WP8

Policy WP8 contains a link to Policy WP7 which covers amenity issues and sensitive receptors.
impacts when compared to other technologies.

The EA notes the preference for gasification, pyrolysis and anaerobic digestion and recommends that consideration is also given to energy from waste, where it can meet all waste hierarchy criteria and the proposed efficiency criteria which may require the production of both electricity as well as heat output via high quality steam use or district heating and cooling.

**Views from Residents and Local Businesses**
Thermal treatment must ensure that combined heat and power are provided for the local community to have maximum benefit

Ensure that recyclables / biodegradable material isn’t thermally treated (concern that thermal treatment discourages recycling)

Ensure that material is sourced locally

The policy should only encourage modern technologies

Concerns about emissions and pollution from thermal treatment facilities

Reference needs to be made to the reuse of materials in the first instance

The policy must ensure that waste treatment has a neutral carbon footprint, or better

Opposition to incineration of waste

Views from the Industry

The policy has been amended to incorporate Energy from Waste.

Decentralised energy networks are not always feasible and not always viable. Therefore, the boroughs consider they should not be made a requirement.

This is covered in Policy WP8, point (a).

The boroughs consider this would be too prescriptive and not allow sufficient flexibility of supply for operators. However, due to transport costs, materials will usually be locally sourced.

The policy states a preference for advanced conversion technologies.

This matter is covered in Policy WP7.

This is covered in Policy WP8, point (a).

Issues concerning carbon emissions are covered in Policy WP6.

The boroughs consider that if the policies of the Plan and the policies of the relevant borough’s Development Plan are applied, the impacts of waste management facilities can be limited considerably.
Support the preference for proposals with a lower carbon output to ensure the best environmental outcomes and believe this should be strengthened. Request that specific technologies should not be mentioned in the policies since the DPD is technology neutral in all other respects and the focus should be on outcomes. One respondent identifies that the first criterion, which states that planning permission will be granted where ‘the waste identified for treatment cannot practically or reasonably be managed further up the waste hierarchy’ is already set out in national policy (PPS10) and is therefore unnecessary to repeat it as part of the DPD.

The policy now refers to positive carbon outcomes.

The boroughs consider that, since thermal treatment technologies are controversial, the borough’s wish for modern thermal technologies should be stated. The Plan remains neutral in terms of technologies on sites. The Plan has tried to avoid the repetition of national and regional policy. However, this phrase is repeated for clarity and the assurance of readers (see comments in the Views from Residents and Local Businesses section).

An assessment of waste streams will be needed since this type of waste management is relatively low down the waste hierarchy and the Plan requires waste to be treated as high up the waste hierarchy as practically possible.

The policy has been amended but an Energy from Waste facility will, by definition, produce power and heat or power, heat and cooling.

The reference to local users has been amended to read “deliver renewable heat and power (or heat, power and cooling) for local users, where feasible.”

Sites at Beddington Lane/Farmlands – General Comments

No new sites have been identified to the west of Beddington Lane. However, parts of the industrial area to the east have been identified as having sites that may be suitable for waste management development.
**Objections:** Beddington and Mitcham Area of Opportunity document identifies this area as needing more lakes. Concerns about: water and air pollution, traffic increases on already congested roads when the wider area by primarily residential. Further points made were that Beddington has become a dumping ground and that Beddington Lane is already suffering from congestion and air pollution (residents note that it went over the WHO safe limits on 288 days in 2008). There were also concerns about: the increase of respiratory problems over recent years (and this would be exacerbated), noise, traffic impacts (Beddington Lane itself is not suitable for heavy vehicles, is damaged and was never designed as a major road), the volume of traffic (which is a danger for cyclists and pedestrians), odour increase (there is already odour from the sewage works), impact on local ecology, impact on an area of national importance for Tree Sparrows and at least 150 bird species (including migrating raptors and nationally scarce species such as Honey Buzzards), sea rise putting all low lying areas (including Wandle Valley) at risk of flooding in future, the negative impact on existing businesses in the area.

**Support:** The area is suitable but the road systems needs attention, redevelopment is an opportunity to create a very pleasant area for the people of Beddington rather than the awful condition that much of the area is in at the moment; no housing nearby.

**Sites 1/105/125 Factory Lane, Croydon**

**Objections:** Concerned about water and air pollution, traffic increases on already congested roads, road safety issues, close proximity to residents, noise pollution, the site is also next to the Wandle Park and there would be negative impacts for local wildlife and people enjoying the park.

**Site 1 is allocated as a safeguarded site. Sites 105 and 125 have been identified as industrial areas that may have sites suitable for waste management development**

Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: water pollution, air pollution, traffic generation, noise pollution and the effect of the development on sensitive receptors. The site description also...
**Industry Support (for Site 1):** In existing waste use, preliminary studies (on utilities, ecology, transport opportunities and constraints, contaminated land, visual intrusion, air quality and bio-aerosol risk and flood risk) have show there to be no barriers to the development of this site. They are an established part of the local environment.

**Other Support (for Site 1):** Existing industrial site, has a high score and shows potential for redevelopment, little housing or recreation areas within the immediate vicinity, proximity to waste arisings, good access to the strategic road network, the fact that it is in existing waste use and is available and consistent with London Plan Policy 4A.23 which describes the broad locations suitable for the development waste facilities on London.

**Other Support (for Site 105):** Suitable because it has a high score and shows potential for redevelopment, potential for expansion from Site 1, suitably wide access roads (though some residential nearby), it is a large site.

**Other Support (for Site 125):** Existing industrial area, has a high score and shows potential for redevelopment, rail access potentially possible (though near a park).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 5 Pear Tree Farm, Croydon</th>
<th>Site 6 Villiers Road, Kingston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Current operations are outside current permissions and causing nuisance, unsuitable access road.</td>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Concerns about: water pollution (on Hogsmill), air pollution, traffic impact on residential streets, noise impact, local road are unsuitable for heavy vehicles and are too narrow; Villiers Road is already being damaged, vibrations from vehicles damaging homes, traffic safety, smell, asks developers to protect the amenity of those people using Wandle Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.

Since the site is an existing waste site, the site has been safeguarded. The plan does not deal with enforcement as this is a matter for individual boroughs.

Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: water pollution, air pollution, traffic generation, vibration, odour, sensitive...
close proximity to residents, site is small, in the heart of a residential area, close to two primary schools and a secondary school, bordered by Metropolitan Open Land, considered unsuitable even for its existing use.

**Industry Support:** In existing waste use, consistent with London Plan policies, good access to the strategic road network, consistent with London Plan policies, preliminary studies (on utilities, ecology, transport opportunities and constraints, contaminated land, visual intrusion, air quality and bio-aerosol risk and flood risk) have show there to be no barriers to the development of this site. They are an established part of the local environment.

**Other Support:** Existing waste site, though only suitable if there is no increase in traffic, feel that its location near to the busiest economic hub of the borough will encourage responsible disposal of recycling materials and residual waste, might be more appropriate (than Chessington Industrial Estate), proximity to waste arisings, good access to the strategic road network, the fact that it is in existing waste use and is available and consistent with London Plan Policy 4A.23 which describes the broad locations suitable for the development waste facilities on London.

**Site 9 Garth Road Recycling Centre, Merton**

**Objections:** Additional traffic on already congested roads, access road is narrow and not designed for heavy vehicles, vibrations in homes from passing heavy traffic, concerned about pollution, it is a residential area, query the scoring on proximity to the strategic road network.

**Industry Support:** In existing waste use, consistent with London Plan policies, preliminary studies (on utilities, ecology, transport opportunities and constraints, contaminated land, visual intrusion, air quality and bio-aerosol risk and flood risk) have show there to be no barriers to the development of this site. They are an established part of the local

receptors and Metropolitan Open Land.

The site description states that traffic impact on surrounding residential roads must be minimised and increase in traffic must be avoided.

The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.

Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: traffic generation, vibration, air pollution and the amenity of residential areas. The site has good access to the A24.
environment.

**Other Support:** Extending the existing Garth Road facility which is a true industrial estate is a better option (than Rainbow Park), it is away from residential areas, existing waste site/industrial land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 17 Country Skip Hire, Sutton</th>
<th>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> The Beddington Lane area is already over industrialised. There are too many heavy goods vehicles accessing this area on a daily basis. The area is filthy and the smell from the existing landfill site and the sewage treatment works that can travel quite far is horrendous. Also see the notes for all Beddington Lane / Farmland sites. This site was also raised by a numerous residents in the Sutton workshop held in September 09 as being unsuitable.</td>
<td>A redevelopment of the Country Waste site offers an opportunity to reduce the environmental and amenity impact that site is already making. Policy WP7 states that a waste management facility should be within a fully enclosed building and highlights other issues with regard to amenity and the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> It is already used, seems well-run, not much residential nearby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 18 Viridor, Beddington Lane, Sutton</th>
<th>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> This is an area of wet grassland, Metropolitan Open Land and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance, although it is recognised that some of this land has already been built on. These designations should be respected and their review should be undertaken through biodiversity planning procedures and not degraded by proposed development through other planning mechanisms. In addition, there is a very real possibility that future development of Beddington Sewage Treatment Works will be necessary to better process effluent to comply with new water quality standards which will be required under the Water Framework Directive and so, as part of a strategic and holistic approach to planning in this area, Site 18 should not be included amongst the proposed waste sites.</td>
<td>There are planning permissions for waste uses on Beddington Farmlands until 2023. Therefore, the boroughs are limited in how they can uphold the designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Support:</strong> In existing waste use, close to the A236, potential</td>
<td>The Sutton Core Strategy states that the Beddington Sewage Treatment Works is likely to be modernised to deal with increased throughput. This is subject to OFWAT agreement and is planned for some time before 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 21 777 Demolition, Coomber Way, Sutton</td>
<td>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> but no reasons provided</td>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Not much residential nearby, already in waste use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites 22/69 B Nebbett &amp; Son/Willow Lane Industrial Estate, Merton</th>
<th>B Nebbett and Son is safeguarded as an existing waste site. Willow Lane Industrial Estate is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA Objection:</strong> The site is in flood zone 3b</td>
<td><strong>Support (for Site 22):</strong> Existing waste site, existing waste site/industrial land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> Adjacent to residential properties on Carshalton Road, gardens back onto the site, Environmental Health are already in dispute with Nebbett &amp; Sons due to relentless high levels of noise from the onsite crusher, traffic is already heavily congested particularly on Carshalton and Goat Roads, safety issue (accidents are already an issue), access roads are unsuitable for HGVs and recently on Drake Road, an HGV knocked down a lamppost, large number of elderly residents, only 0.5 miles from the Hackbridge landfill site which smells in warm weather, this is a deprived area of Merton.</td>
<td><strong>Support (for Site 69):</strong> Not close to residents, existing waste site/industrial land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Adjacent to residential properties on Carshalton Road, gardens back onto the site, Environmental Health are already in dispute with Nebbett &amp; Sons due to relentless high levels of noise from the onsite crusher, traffic is already heavily congested particularly on Carshalton and Goat Roads, safety issue (accidents are already an issue), access roads are unsuitable for HGVs and recently on Drake Road, an HGV knocked down a lamppost, large number of elderly residents, only 0.5 miles from the Hackbridge landfill site which smells in warm weather, this is a deprived area of Merton.</td>
<td><strong>Support (for Site 69):</strong> Not close to residents, existing waste site/industrial land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 36 Silverglades Business Park, Leatherhead Road, Kingston</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Surrey CC does not support a loss of Green Belt or</td>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Surrey CC does not support a loss of Green Belt or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support:** Existing waste use, not much residential nearby, close to strategic road network, the potential to be connected by rail
encroachment into the Chessington/Epsom/Leatherhead/Oxshott Gap. Also concerned about increased HGVs through Epsom Town Centre, proximity to Epsom Common SSSI and Local Nature Reserve in Surrey, and more importantly the Ashtead Common SSSI and National Nature Reserve in Surrey which contains over 2,300 rare pollarded oaks which are of great conservation importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 41 Tolworth Aggregates, Kingston Road, Kingston</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrey County Council Objection:</strong> This rail aggregate depot serves an important function for the import of construction materials into London and parts of Surrey. The continuation of the site as an aggregates depot is supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> This is an important site for the import of aggregates into London and Surrey (note: this is identified as having deliverability constraints in the consultation document because the borough acknowledges that the site is not available: the existing occupiers are on long leases).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 45 Barwell Business Park, Kingston</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Surrey CC concerned about increased traffic through Epsom Town Centre where HGV traffic is already an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 46 Coal Depot, Garrison Lane, Kingston</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Concerns about traffic problems in Malden Rushett, congestion on already congested roads (e.g. Leatherhead Road already congested, site is next to 2 primary schools and a secondary school, close to residential properties, access road is narrow, safety concerns from increased HGVs, planning permission has already recently been given to three schemes on Leatherhead Road which will increase congestion, concerned about impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(smells, pollution and traffic) on the adjacent open space and Sir Francis Barker Ground (used by the Chessington cricket and sports club), concerned about the additional noise of rail if waste were to be moved by rail, Residents in Chessington, Hook, Malden Rushett already suffer from extremely poor air quality caused by excessive traffic on the A243 and resident notes that it is documented that Chessington and Malden Rushett has one of the highest instances of asthma, chest complaints and breathing problems caused by pollution. Concerned about more pollution and damaging health effects, site is directly opposite Chessington South Railway Station and adjacent to the newly constructed Chessington Community College and densely populated housing estate in Garrison Lane, memories of illegal landfill and high volumes of trucks going into Rushett Farm, driving at dangerous speeds, spraying mud all up over the verges and parked vehicles, concerned about the monitoring and control of such facilities, highly congested roads in the summer because of Chessington World of Adventures; people might be put off visiting this theme park because of waste development, plants may be affected in the Chessington Garden centre.

**Support:** Not too close to residential areas, better access than Villiers Road, is the furthest site from residents, only suitable if there is no increase in traffic, might be more appropriate than Chessington Industrial Estate

**Site 47 Land at Junction of Kingston Road/Jubilee Way, Kingston**

**GLA Objection:** The borough’s Unitary Development Plan (UDP) identifies this as suitable for hotel or recreation use and the consideration of this site is contrary to London Plan Policy 4A.27 (Broad locations suitable for recycling and waste treatment facilities)

**Other Objections:** Concerns about creating traffic problems in Malden Rushett, concerns about the loss of the community bike project (a unique facility for local young people), next to a nature reserve, next to a new play

**This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)**
area which the Council has built (encouraging young people to play there), problems with air pollution (caused by traffic on the A3) would be made worse, recent Tesco application highlighted traffic congestion problems here, it’s not a previously developed site, it’s a small area of land, at weekends during football season there is parking all along the roads and will create problems for access, concerns about smells in summer from the facility, a school has just been built at Garrison lane, site is identified in the UDP as suitable for hotel and recreation

**Support:** Not close to resident, better access than Villiers Road, is the furthest site from residents, only suitable if there is no increase in traffic, it would lead to loss of a community bike facility (negative comment), entry could be in Jubilee Way

### Site 57 Land West of Beddington Lane, Sutton

**GLA Objection:** It is designated Metropolitan Open Land which is protected by London Plan policies 3D.10 (‘Metropolitan Open Land’) which states that boroughs should maintain a presumption against inappropriate development of MOL and that essential facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they do not have an adverse impact on the openness of MOL; and Policy 3D.14 (‘Biodiversity and nature conservation’) which expects London boroughs to give strong protection to Sites of Metropolitan importance (SMI) for nature conservation). The GLA states that further reasoning and justification demonstrating why this is required will be needed if it is to be considered further

**Other Objections:** As for Site 18, development of site 57 (land west of Beddington Lane) would be wholly unacceptable. This area also includes Metropolitan Open Land and Site of Nature Conservation Importance designations (which are protected by the London Plan) and which we strongly think should be respected and reviewed through biodiversity planning procedures and not degraded by proposed development through

| This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version) |  |
other planning mechanisms. Again, there is a very real possibility that future development of Beddington Sewage Treatment Works will be necessary to better process effluent to comply with new water quality standards which will be required under the Water Framework Directive and so, as part of a strategic and holistic approach to planning in this area, this site should not be included amongst the proposed waste sites.

**Industry Support:** Suitably large site size, single ownership, support from the site owner, central location

**Support:** Not much residential nearby, already in waste use, there is interest from developers (it is deliverable), The site forms a natural extension of the existing developed area to the south, the proposed use with associated landscaping would form an appropriate transition from the existing industrial development to the south and the MOL land to the north; the existing appearance of the site, which is contained within a palisade fence and has the appearance of an industrial site awaiting development; the importance of the proposed use in helping meet the Government’s aims for sustainable use of natural resources and energy generation; the site is bounded by busy Beddington Lane to the east, an access road to the north and an existing commercial property on the south. Development of this site would enable a landscaped screen to be planted on the north and west boundaries that would provide a more appropriate border for the rest of the MOL, synergies with waste water treatment sites.

**Site 60 Rainbow Park Industrial Estate, Merton**

**Objections:** Close proximity to residential areas, primary school, playing fields, mainline station (Raynes Park), site is within a town centre and residential area. Concerns about: visual intrusion, sound vibrations, traffic impact on already congested area and town centre, access to the station, road safety, air quality, health impacts, loss of jobs onsite, Residents feel it is a small site with poor vehicle access. It is viewed as a negative development

This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)
which would impair efforts to improve the town centre which the council has recently invested in (e.g. the Lantern Theatre, improvements to the station, several plans for new housing in the town centre, new housing development/supermarket on the other side of the rail tracks from the site)

**Industry Support:** The site is suitable and is supported in principle by key stakeholders

**Other Support:** Suitable and appropriate within this urban area (on amenity, health & safety and highways grounds), benefits include energy, heat and hot water provided directly to the local network, redevelopment will be an improvement on the existing site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites 69/127 Willow Lane Industrial Area, Merton</th>
<th>Site 69 is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development. Site 127 does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version). However, part of it is the safeguarded site named Vertal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Objections:** Concerned about loss of employment on this site which must be safeguarded, the site is in flood zone 3b (the functional floodplain)

**Support (for Site 129):** Not many houses nearby

The number of jobs will depend on the number of jobs currently located on site and what type of waste management facility is proposed.

The Environment Agency suggests that buffer zones should be applied along the River Wandle at this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 73 Bushey Road Industrial Area, Merton</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Objections:** This site is identified in the consultation document as having deliverability constraints. The respondents agree with deliverability constraints identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 75 Burlington Road, West Side of Junction with A3, Merton</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 96 George Killoughery Ltd, Merton</td>
<td>Submission version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Site is too close to homes, congestion is already an issue and concern about potential noise and litter.</td>
<td>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Not much residential nearby, already in waste use, it is a large site.</td>
<td>Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: residential amenity, traffic generation, noise and litter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 97 Severnside Paper, Beddington Lane, Sutton</th>
<th>Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Concerns about water and air pollution, traffic increases on already congested roads, the wider area is primarily residential, Purley Way sites are all contaminated.</td>
<td>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Not much residential nearby, already in waste use, it is a large site.</td>
<td>Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: water pollution air pollution, traffic generation and residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 98 Croydon Waste Transfer Station, Endeavour Way, Sutton</th>
<th>Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Support:</strong> Site is in existing waste use and is within the Beddington Industrial Area</td>
<td>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> In existing waste use and in the Beddington Industrial Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 99 Purley Oaks Highways Depot, Croydon</th>
<th>Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA Objection:</strong> The site has a large pond and recorded populations of stag</td>
<td>This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: water pollution air pollution, traffic generation and residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Objections: Want to retain the site’s current use to enable residents to bring their waste and recyclables, high density residential area, the existing site has dangerous traffic access problems at peak times, too small for redevelopment and constrained by high ground to the east, the large pond onsite has recorded populations of stag beetle (protected species), Kingfisher and common frog.

Support: Some parts appear to have potential, not much residential nearby, perhaps a possibility to access the site by rail?

Site 100 European Metal Recycling, Therapia Way, Sutton

Objections: Concerns about water and air pollution, traffic increases on already congested roads, the wider area is primarily residential, Purley Way sites are all contaminated,

Support: not much residential nearby, already in waste use

Site 102 Purley Way, Croydon

Objections: Concerns about: water pollution, air pollution, traffic increases on already congested roads, close proximity to residents

Support: It is important not to take land that is currently recreational open space; this site follows this principle. Sites seem reasonable as its already used for industry or waste disposal, site is located away from residents, site is large.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 104 Purley Park, Lombard Business Park, Croydon</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Being used to a good purpose already - agree with deliverability constraints identified, Purley way sites are all contaminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 116 Factory Lane Highways Depot, Croydon</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Part of the Factory Lane industrial estate and adjacent to a larger site being considered (site no. 125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 123 Kingston Water Treatment Works, Kingston</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Potential synergies with the waste water treatment site, this site together with the existing waste site would provide an opportunity to treat the waste collected at the Villiers Road site next door without additional vehicle movements (Chessington resident)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 124 Former Government Offices, Hook Rise South, Kingston</th>
<th>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Objection:</strong> The borough’s UDP identifies this as suitable for housing and is acknowledged by the GLA to be an important housing site for the borough. Consideration of this site is also contrary to London Plan Policy 4A.27 (Broad locations suitable for recycling and waste treatment facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> This is an important site for housing (note: this is identified as having deliverability constraints in the consultation document because the borough acknowledges its importance as a site for new housing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 126 Benedict Wharf, Merton</th>
<th>The site is safeguarded as an existing waste site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections:</strong> Concerns about traffic, conservation areas surrounding the site,</td>
<td>Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
too close to residential areas

**Industry Support:** In existing waste use, not being used to its maximum potential, consistent with London Plan policies, adjacent to a proposed low carbon zone which will provide 1000 dwellings, potential to provide heat and power.

**Other Support:** Already a waste site, the site is not being used to its maximum potential, it can be redeveloped to use the land more efficiently, move the management of wastes up the waste hierarchy and has sufficient area to allow for the co-location of different types of waste facilities, development can reduce the traffic flows to a site, it is understood that a low carbon zone is to be established adjacent to the site (approximately 1,000 buildings). The proximity of this to the site should be considered positively in terms of regeneration because of the potential for renewable energy and heat off take from more sustainable waste management proposals.

**Site 136 Deer Park Road Industrial Estate, Merton**

**Objections:** Visual intrusion, traffic congestion, next to Dean City Farm (a facility for children), concerned about loss of employment - this site currently provides c. 50-80 jobs, too close to housing, too close to a school, the area has really improved and this will harm the area, close to morden park, traffic calming was needed on Liberty avenue, concerned about noise and additional traffic, concerned about increase noise for the animals of Dean City Farm, increased vehicles in surrounding residential roads, health concerns, adjacent to the River Wandle which should be an asset to the area and improved as a nature / scenic walk; Objection from CTL Components PLC (an occupier) who state that the site encompasses live businesses with surrounding roads being heavily used by the existing traffic. Additional traffic with large rubbish trucks would congest the area even further, observation that Merton Council has been engaged in improving the area

strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: traffic generation and the impacts on the historic environment and on sensitive receptors such as residential areas.

This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)
(e.g. “Lombard Road – Streets for People” project) and the idea of a waste site seems to go against these efforts

**Support:** Few houses in close proximity

### Site 351/352/353 Chessington Industrial Area, Kingston

**Objections:** Concerns about creating traffic problems in Malden Rushett, this is an industrial estate not compatible with heavier uses, close to residents, close to a school, close to playgrounds, close to health clinic, close to shops, Tolworth roundabout is already gridlocked, the health hazards to the local community, highly residential area, recent Tesco application highlighted traffic congestion problems here, concerns about vermin, substantial increase in HGVs, HGVs getting lost/stuck on unsuitable roads, additional housing on the former government site (which is considered inevitable) will increase traffic further, residential roads and schools surround the estate and would suffer from increased noise, smell, pollution and traffic, concerns about the loss of employment on the site (which currently employs several hundred people), already high levels of pollution at the Tolworth roundabout and Hook Rise South, Hook Rise South is very narrow and unsuitable for HGVs, site occupier (Eskmuir Properties Ltd) objects

**Support:** Show some potential in parts, better access than Villiers Road

### Site 491 Kimpton Industrial Estate, North of Mindern Road, Sutton

**Objections:** Schools are nearby, screening would be needed

**Industry Support:** The site is zoned for industrial use and may have potential. Valad has identified that some parts of this site would not be

---

This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development.

Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to: traffic generation, the location of sensitive receptors (such as schools and residential areas), air emissions, and odour.
suitable because of existing premises onsite.

**Support:** Some parts appear to have potential, it is largely undeveloped and meets the following criteria: Minimum site area of 2Ha (5 acres), suitable planning use, good road access and proximity to trunk road network; absence of (or adequate separation from) sensitive receptors (in particular residential housing), adjacent land uses offering opportunities for CHP off-take management facility, including limiting the visual impact of the development by employing hard and soft landscaping and minimising glare.

| Site 492 Kimpton Industrial Estate, East of Kimpton Road, Sutton | This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version) |
| Site 512: Wandle Valley Trading Estate, Sutton | This site was included in the Stage 2a: Additional Sites consultation and so the responses will be considered there. |
| **Industry Support:** Site is currently designated for employment uses in the Adopted Sutton UDP, a number of the existing buildings are coming towards the end of their economic life and a significant amount of floorspace is vacant or only suitable for ad hoc storage, proposed facility (pyrolysis) would supply low carbon electricity (and heat) in a manner that would fully respond to guidance contained in the recently published draft London Plan (October 2009) by achieving 'self-sufficiency' in the South London Waste Plan area, whilst also offering a significant opportunity to realise the vision of Hackbridge becoming a 'zero-carbon' suburb. |
| Site 534/535/539/5312 Beddington Lane Industrial Area | This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development. |
| **Support:** Some parts appear to have potential |
| Site 641 Dunsford Road Industrial Area, Merton | This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development. |
| **Objections:** Concerns about development resulting in unacceptable traffic |
| Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been |
congestion in the area, too close to residential areas, inconsistent with Merton’s strategic aim to develop the Wandle Valley Park and the existing wildlife and recreational sanctuary around the River Wandle. Plough Lane (B235) and Durnsford Road (A218) already suffer from heavy traffic volumes, except at certain times of the day, resulting in lengthy tailbacks. This heavy traffic was central to the rejection of the Safeway application for a superstore on the old Plough Lane football ground site and the subsequent approval for high density housing was conditional on the junction being widened; something that cannot be repeated.

Support: Not many houses nearby, develop existing facilities on this site, existing waste site/industrial land.

| Site 642 Dunsford Road Industrial Area, Merton | This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development. |
| Objections: Mostly occupied, residential properties close by, roads are already congested | Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to the impact on sensitive receptors, such as residential areas, and traffic generation. |
| Support: Partly suitable (the northern half: the southern half is too close to residential properties) | |

| Site 651 Part of the Plough Lane Industrial Area, Merton | This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development. |
| EA Objection: Site is in flood zone 3b | According to Evidence Base Study 1, the site is in Zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b. The boroughs consider that issues relating to flood risk are best considered through the decision-making frameworks set out in PPS25 “Development and Flood Risk” and to reproduce them in the Plan would be repeating national guidance. |
| Other Objections: Low score, traffic impact, visual intrusion, very close to | There do appear to be some errors in the scoring relating to the site |
new buildings on corner of Weir Road and Plough Lane, concerns about loss of employment - this site currently provides c. 50-80 jobs, <100m from residents on Chaucer Way, Plough Lane, Kingsley Road, Kohat Road and Havelock Road technical report is incorrect on the scoring for proximity to residential properties), site is within 200m of Garfield Primary School and Priory School in Queens Road is close by, concerns about potential smells, concerns about additional noise, within 40m of Wandle Meadows Nature Park, the Wandle River and Wandle Trail which have been designated a Local Nature Reserve and would be compromised, Technical report is incorrect to state that it is not close to open areas (it is close to the allotments at Havelock Rd and Garfield Rec, Lambeth cemetery is close by, site is within 400m of St. George's hospital, surrounding roads already suffer from extreme congestion at almost all times of the day and especially at peak hours, the Council has spent a lot of money improving the wider area (Abbey Mills, Dean City Farm etc), surely this is contrary to that? Herons and Kingfisher now live by the river and fish stocks have improved, have had problems in the past with chemicals being washed into the river, close proximity of a waste site to the river would surely increase the risk of river pollution, health impacts (also compounding existing problems such as allergies, asthma ), site occupier (Manheim Auctions Limited - car auctions co) objects to the site being considered since it would negatively impact on the amenity of their business, which is attended by the public, possible noise from the facility disrupting teaching in the school during the day, possible odours, dust and other waste being distributed from the facility across the open space and coming into the school grounds, concerns about increased traffic, Plough Lane is already a very busy road and junction, and could not easily sustain more traffic. Moreover, the knock-on effect of more traffic and congestion in Plough Lane would mean more traffic diverting nearer the school, the Wandle Trail is a major cycle route (National Cycle Network 20) and amenity of this would be negatively affected by waste development, the NCN route has a crossing at Plough Lane which already is a risk to cyclists. More heavy vehicles would make this worse and is not consistent with national policy on increasing accessibility and safety of cycling, the site is in assessment – the borough planning officers apologise for not identifying and rectifying these mistakes earlier. The errors are concerned with the proximity of residential areas and open areas.

With regard to the other issues, any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to the impact on biodiversity, sensitive receptors (such as schools, hospitals and residential areas), watercourses, air emissions, noise, traffic generation, odour and the design of any facility.

Loss of employment is dependent on the existing uses and the level of employment already existing. Low vacancy rates at the Willow Lane and Beddington Industrial Areas suggest that other businesses xan co-exist with other business in one industrial area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Objections</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 702 Garth Road Industrial Area, Merton</td>
<td>Residential properties close by,</td>
<td>Not many houses nearby, existing waste site/industrial land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 751 Burlington Road, Merton</td>
<td>This site is identified in the consultation document as having deliverability constraints. The respondents agree with deliverability constraints identified</td>
<td>This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development. Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to the impact on sensitive receptors, such as residential areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)
## Stage 2a Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>The Boroughs’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 1000 Land West of Hawkhurst Road, Croydon</strong></td>
<td>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Objection:</strong> Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 <em>(Metropolitan Open Land)</em> states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <em>Biodiversity and nature conservation</em> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <em>Biodiversity and Access to nature</em>. Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Objection:</strong> Sensitive zone for groundwater and located in a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrey County Council Objection:</strong> Green Belt, nature conservation and local access constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> Green Belt designation, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, Destruction of woodland, Greenfield site, Impact upon traffic, Poor accessibility, Loss of biodiversity, Located in source protection zone 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Only suitable if compensation is paid to local residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Support:</strong> Landowner proposes support for the development of an underground water reservoir and overground nature park as part of an exchange proposal for a part of the site 1003.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites 1000a and 100b Open areas adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Objection:</strong> Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
London Plan Policy 7.17 *(Metropolitan Open Land)* states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 *Biodiversity and nature conservation* and draft London Plan policy 7.19 *Biodiversity and Access to nature*. Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.

**Environment Agency Objection:** Located in Greenfield land. Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and contains important nature habitats.

**Surrey County Council Objection:** Green Belt constraints and visual impact. They are located on or near the busy A243 Leatherhead Road close to the county boundary with Surrey. It forms part of the primary route network linking Kingston and the M25. Potential Impact of waste traffic on Epsom town centre if lorries travel via the B280.

**Other Objections:** Green Belt designation, Intrusion of the green Belt, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, Poor access, Loss of biodiversity, Loss of visual amenity, Impact on traffic – already busy during peak period sue to Chessington World of Adventures.

**Support:** If waste plant is properly screened, If good access is provided, Access to road network and opportunity to manage traffic to and from the site via the M25.

Sites 1002 Land to the South of Silverglade Business Park

**GLA Objection:** Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 *(Metropolitan Open Land)* states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development.

**Surrey County Council Objection:** Green Belt constraints and visual impact.

This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)
They are located on or near the busy A243 Leatherhead Road close to the county boundary with Surrey. It forms part of the primary route network linking Kingston and the M25. Potential Impact of waste traffic on Epsom town centre if lorries travel via the B280.

**Other Objections:** Green Belt, designation, Loss of biodiversity, Poor access, Loss of visual amenity, Impact upon traffic – already busy during peak periods due to Chessington World of Adventures, Inadequate size, Odour.

**Support:** Good size, Reasonable access.

### Site 1003 Land at the Hogsmill Valley

**GLA Objection:** Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 *(Metropolitan Open Land)* states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 *Biodiversity and nature conservation* and draft London Plan policy 7.19 *Biodiversity and Access to nature*. Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.

**Environment Agency Objection:** Located in flood zone 3a and contains important nature habitats.

**Other Objections:** Pollution, Poor accessibility, Already suffering from Thames Water Sewage Works, Residential area, Flood risk, Impact on health, Traffic, Too close to local schools, Already suffering from an existing waste facility, Located in Flood Zone 3a.

**Support:** Development would be an improvement, If full screening is provided, Adequate access, Adequate size, Existing use is similar to proposed use.

This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Industry Support:</strong></th>
<th>Thames Water supports this site as suitable for waste management development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 1004 Former Gravel Works (Cemex), Beddington Farmlands</strong></td>
<td><strong>GLA Objection:</strong> Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 <em>(Metropolitan Open Land)</em> states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <em>Biodiversity and nature conservation</em> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <em>Biodiversity and Access to nature</em>. Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Objection:</strong> Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and location of watercourses on site and to the south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> Impact on traffic, Pollution, Loss of biodiversity, Existing odour problems from waste facility in local area, Located in the centre of the proposed Wandle Valley Regional Park, Proposals for a bird nature reserve, Metropolitan Open Land, Impact on health, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Already used to traffic, Existing industrial use, Located away from residential areas, Good access, Nearer to other boroughs so will have less of an impact on Kingston, Minimum changes needed, Good size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Industry Support:</strong> The owner is willing to undertake mitigation measure to compensate any impact on MOL. The proposed facility would be able to treat waste wood and other materials from construction and demolition activities. A gasification facility would produce decentralised, renewable energy. The site is of sufficient size, the access road serves an industrial area and is located away from residential property. Surface drainage can be addressed plus the site has no significant wildlife or archaeological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1005 Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium</td>
<td>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Objection:</strong> This site is not within a strategic Industrial or Employment Area and is at risk from flooding. Contrary to London Plan policy 4A.23 and draft London Plan policy 5.17 requires sites located in industrial locations, employment areas or existing waste management locations to be selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Objection:</strong> Located in functional floodplain zone 3b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> Flood risk, Pollution, Impact on traffic, Poor accessibility, Existing use for local community, Opportunity for nature reserve, Residential area, Opportunity for social infrastructure, Located next to the Wandle Valley Park, Suitable for mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Area in need of regeneration, Good location to serve all boroughs, Located away from residential areas, Development would be an improvement for the area, No visual impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 1006 Wandle Valley Trading Estate, Hackbridge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Objection:</strong> Located in flood zone 3 (but mitigation possible)</td>
<td>This site is identified as an industrial area with some sites which may be suitable for waste management development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> Pollution, Greenfield site, Inconsistent with Sutton’s plan for a sustainable Hackbridge, Loss of residential amenity, Odour, Pollution, Nearby residential area, Located close to the Wandle Trail which is used by local residents, Traffic, Loss of biodiversity, Already suffering from existing waste facilities and landfill, Effect on property values, Suitable for mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Support:</strong> Supports site due to its designation as a Preferred Location for Industry. However flood risk would need to be mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any application would need to be judged against Policy WP7 which has been strengthened in comparison with previous iterations of the comparable policy. Policy WP7 highlights that boroughs will pay particular regard to pollution, the impact on sensitive receptors (such as residential areas), odour, traffic generation and biodiversity. The boroughs consider that waste management (as opposed to landfill) would be appropriate within the Hackbridge sustainable suburb plans and would deal with the current amenity and environmental issues of the landfill facility at Beddington.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support: Preferred location for industry, Flood risk could be mitigated, Located away from residential areas</th>
<th>Farlmands.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 1007 Land North of Jessop’s Way, Beddington</strong></td>
<td>This site does not appear in the South London Waste Plan (Proposed Submission version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLA Objection:</strong> Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 (<em>Metropolitan Open Land</em>) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <em>Biodiversity and nature conservation</em> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <em>Biodiversity and Access to nature</em>. Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency Objection:</strong> Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Objections:</strong> Traffic, Inconsistent with Sutton’s plan for a sustainable Hackbridge, Already suffering from existing facilities and landfill, Metropolitan Open Land, Loss of biodiversity, Visual impact, Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, odour, Located in the centre of the proposed Wandle Valley Regional Park and Beddington Farmlands Nature Reserve, Croydon Rifle and Pistol Club uses the area Suitable for mixed use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Potential to treat and other materials from construction and demolition activities, Potential for decentralised energy, Adequate size, Access road serves industrial area, If accessibility is addressed properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Support:</strong> The owner is willing to undertake mitigation measure to compensate any impact on MOL. The proposed facility would be able to treat waste wood and other materials from construction and demolition activities. A gasification facility would produce decentralised, renewable energy. The site is of sufficient size, the access road serves an industrial area and is located away from residential property. Surface drainage can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addressed plus the site has no significant wildlife or archaeological value.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Specific Consultees According to Partner Boroughs’ SCIs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Geological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign to Protect Rural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Ecology and Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Voice (formerly Civic Society Initiative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Aviation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claygate Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Authority (replaced Countryside Agency – 2008 Regs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Estate Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Constitutional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Culture Media and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport Rail Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Work and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Board of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The South London Church Fund &amp; Diocesan Board of Finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage (officially the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom and Ewell Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities and Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly the Commission for Racial Equality, the Disability Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Capital Connect (taken over franchise from Thameslink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Communities and Local Government/ Government Office for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority/Mayor of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including Metropolitan Police Assembly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly English Partnerships and Housing Corporation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Builders’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly House Builders’ Federation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Skills Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agenda 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Bromley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go-Ahead Group (formerly London General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England (formerly English Nature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Croydon (formerly PCT, replacing London Strategic Health Authority – 2008 Regs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Kingston (formerly PCT, replacing South West London Strategic Health Authority – 2008 Regs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Sutton and Merton (formerly PCT, replacing South West London Strategic Health Authority – 2008 Regs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Government Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council of Chaldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council of Chelsham and Farleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council of Caterham on the Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council of Warlingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council of Whyteleafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Property Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State for Transport (replacing Strategic Rail Authority – 2008 Regs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East England Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London (incorporating London Buses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s National Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and Electric Companies (named in other boroughs’ SCIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Companies (named in other boroughs’ SCIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewage Undertakers (named in other boroughs’ SCIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Conservation Associations (not named – see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Officers (not named – see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Design Advisors (not named – see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Architecture Liaison Officers (not named – see Metropolitan Police Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Hospitals (not named – see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Social Care Trusts (not named – see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Rescue Services (not named- see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sports Forums for the Regions (not named – see Sutton General Consultees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable and Wireless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countrywide Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF Energy (incorporating Basic Power and Seeboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-On (formerly Powergen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson 3G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds TSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Operators Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid (Transco and Electricity Transmission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 (Airwave or (UK) Limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFGEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish and Southern Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky (also BSKYB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton and East Surrey Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Utility Warehouse (formerly Telecom Plus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Mobile (incorporating Mercury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Media (incorporating NTL, Virgin Mobile and Telewest )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vodafone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## General Consultee Guidelines According to Partner Boroughs’ SCIs

### Croydon

Croydon Voluntary Action, Community Networks, Neighbourhood Partnerships, Residents & Tenants Associations

**Bodies which represent interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups:**
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- Women's National Commission
- Commission for Racial Equality
- Gypsy Council
- Friends Families and Travellers
- Age Concern
- Help the Aged

**Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups:**
- Church Commissioners
- The Church of England Diocese of Southwark
- Parochial Church Councils
- The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Southwark
- The Methodist Church
- Croydon Circuit
- London Baptist Association
- East Surrey District
- Croydon District Council of the United Reform Church
- Buddhist Centre Croydon
- Nanak Community Centre
- The Sikh Temple
- Croydon Mosque and Islamic Centre
- Shree Sakthy Ghanapathy Temple
- Sivaskanthagiri Murugan Kovil
- Croydon & District Synagogue

**Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons:**
- Croydon Disability Forum
- Partnership Group for Physical Disabled Adults & the Sensory Impaired
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
- Disability Rights Commission

**Business and Development Industry groups:**
- Croydon Business
- Local CBI & local branches of Institute of Directors
- Chamber of Commerce
- Croydon Trade Union Council

### Kingston

Voluntary bodies, some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the authority’s area

**Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the authority’s area**

**Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the authority’s area**

**Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the authority’s area**

**Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the authority’s area**

### Merton

**Government Departments, e.g:**
- Home Office
- Cabinet Office
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- Department for Education and Skills
- Department for Transport
- Department for Trade and Industry
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport
- Department of Works and Pensions

(Consultation with the government departments listed above can be carried out via the Government Office for London on request)

Ministry of Defence
- Department of Constitutional Affairs
- Office of Government Commerce

(Property Advisers to the Civil Estate)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodies which represent the business community in Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies which represent the interests of disabled people in Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies which represent the interests of difference racial, ethnic or national groups in Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, property and regeneration professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational organisations (including both Primary and Secondary Schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Police Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents and Housing Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and travel organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House builders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sutton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General bodies that represent the interests of various racial, ethnic or national groups in Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General bodies that represent the interests of various religious groups in Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General bodies that represent the interests of various voluntary or disability people or groups in Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Bodies which represent the interest of businesses in Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Bodies which represent the interest of young people in Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal London Borough of Sutton Department and Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Consultation Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Groups/MP’s/EEBC Councillor’s in Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Social Landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ Associations and Amenity Societies in Sutton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sutton’s area and issue based forums (see list at end of Appendix 4)

Sutton’s Local Strategic Partnership (see Board Members below)

Various residents/individuals who wish to be involved

**Sutton Council’s Local Strategic Partnership Board (external members)**

Epsom & St Helier Trust, Jobcentre Plus, London Wildlife Hospital, Mental Health Trusts, Metropolitan Police, Northern Wards Forum, Sutton Environment Network, Sutton Race Equalities Council, Sutton Schools, Sutton Centre for Voluntary Services, Sutton & Merton PCT, Sutton Town Centre Management Group, SW London & St Georges Mental Health Trust, Threshold Housing & Support, Training & Colleges, Youth Parliament