

From: Le Clerc. B

I refer to your email dated 3 January 2012 and I wish to respond on behalf the Cappagh Group.

The Company proposed that site Nos. 7, 8 and 12 Waterside Way (Site Proposal 50) should be identified as being suitable for waste related use. However, the document entitled "Potential Sites for Development Part II" rejects the proposal and instead identifies the Council's preferred use as B2 and B8.

The principal reason given for not including waste related uses in the Council's preferred use was; *"The whole of the industrial area south of Plough Lane was assessed for its potential for waste management uses as part of the South London Waste Plan but it was not included as it was considered to be unsuitable for waste management uses."*

Policy WP5 [of the SLWP]: **Windfall Sites and Non MSW and C&I Waste Location Criteria** sets out locational criteria for windfall sites and non MSW and C&I waste sites. This clearly identifies areas suitable for industrial development as being suitable for windfall sites and C&I waste sites subject to the other criteria being met.

The Company's waste business focuses principally on C&I waste and they therefore request that Site Proposal 50 be amended to reflect the Adopted South London Waste Plan policy WP5 so that it acknowledges the sites are suitable for windfall and non-MSW and C&I waste sites subject to meeting the locational criteria set out in this policy.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you should wish to discuss the above.