STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND 6

BETWEEN

THE BOROUGHS OF THE SOUTH LONDON WASTE PLAN

AND

MR KEITH MILLAR,

REPRESENTING THE BEDDINGTON FARM BIRD GROUP

Summary:
The Boroughs of the South London Waste Plan have proposed some amendments to Policies WP5 and WP7 of the South London Waste Plan in light of representations from the Beddington Farm Bird Group and Sutton Wildlife. Beddington Farm Bird Group considers the proposed amendments acceptable.
This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared to identify an area of agreement between Mr Keith Millar, representing the Beddington Farm Bird Group, and the Boroughs of the South London Waste Plan on matters relating to the South London Waste Plan Proposed Submission DPD and the representation by Mr Millar.

**Background**

This Statement of Common Ground relates to two representations (No. 97 and 98) made by Mr Millar to the South London Waste Plan Proposed Submission DPD.

In summary, Mr Millar considered Policies WP5 and WP7 of the South London Waste Plan were inconsistent since they did not give the same level of protection to regional nature conservation areas as national and local nature conservation areas. The boroughs of the South London Waste Plan have proposed two amendments to the policies which Mr Millar considers acceptable. The proposed amendment to Policy WP5 is consistent with the proposed amendment that the boroughs of the South London Waste Plan have agreed with English Heritage.

**Matter of Agreement**

Mr Millar agrees to the amendments proposed by the boroughs of the South London Waste Plan set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Minor Change No - Suggested By</th>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Background to Change</th>
<th>Wording of Proposed Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMC 92 Beddington Farm Bird Group</td>
<td>Page 43 Policy WP5 Ninth bullet point</td>
<td>The Beddington Farm Bird Group argues the proposed amendment provides consistency across the types of nature conservation areas and eliminates repetition</td>
<td>Delete: “● do not adversely affect local conservation areas, nature conservation areas, archaeologically sites or strategic views;” Replace with: “● do not adversely affect regional and local nature conservation areas, conservation areas and locally designated areas of special character, archaeological sites or strategic views;”</td>
<td>To provide consistency, clarity and to eliminate repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC 94 Beddington Farm Bird Group</td>
<td>Page 46 Policy WP7 Part (b)</td>
<td>The Beddington Farm Bird Group argues the proposed amendment</td>
<td>Add the following to the end of the clause: “as well as ensuring regional and local nature conservation areas are not adversely</td>
<td>To provide consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides consistency across the types of nature conservation areas</td>
<td>affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duncan Clarke (Waste)

From:  [Redacted]
Sent:  01 April 2011 13:44
To:  Duncan Clarke (Waste)
Subject:  Response to representation on South London Waste Plan

Duncan,

Thank you for contacting me on these proposed amendments, which I am happy to accept on behalf of the Beddington Farm Bird Group.

I look forward to hearing from you again with a full response to the questions we raised in our representation of 14th February.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Millar

From: Duncan Clarke (Waste) [mailto:duncan.clarke@rbk.kingston.gov.uk]
Sent: 31 March 2011 14:06
To:  [Redacted] (Millar, Keith)
Subject:  Response to representation on South London Waste Plan

Dear Mr Millar

Thank you for your representation on the South London Waste Plan.

I am intending to write to you later this month to give a full response to the questions you raise in your representation. However, in the short term, I was wondering whether the following suggested amendments to Policies WP5 and WP7 would be acceptable to you.

In your representation, you pointed out that regional nature conservation areas may not be adequately covered in the policies. The officers of the South London Waste Plan agree that references to the various levels of nature conservation areas are not consistent.

I attach a document outlining the changes we are proposing to the Policies WP5 and WP7 of the South London Waste Plan.

I would appreciate it if you would consider the attached proposed amendments to the South London Waste Plan and, if you consider them acceptable in resolving the nature conservation designation issues you have raised, could you let me know.

Unfortunately, we are rather pressed for time and I would be extremely grateful if you could give me your response by Tuesday, 5 April.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Duncan Clarke
South London Waste Plan Project Manager
Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POLICY WORDING

(Amendments are in bold)

WP5: Windfall Sites for Waste Management Facility Development

Proposals for waste facilities on windfall sites will be considered and planning permission granted, provided the proposed development meets all of the following criteria:

(a) It can be demonstrated that the proposed facility is not deliverable on one of the sites safeguarded in Policy WP3 or in one of the areas identified in Policy WP4;

(b) It can be demonstrated that there is a need for the development, in accordance with Policy WP1;

(c) The other policies of the relevant borough’s Development Plan are met; and,

(d) The following locational criteria are met:

(i) The site is not within, or will have an adverse effect on, nature conservation areas protected by international and national regulations;

(ii) The site does not contain features, or will have an adverse effect on features, identified as being of international and national historic importance; and,

(iii) The site has no adverse effect on on-site or off-site flood risk, meets the Sequential Test for flood risk as set out in Planning Policy Statement 25 “Development and Flood Risk” and, where appropriate, the criteria for the PPS25 Exception Test. Proposals involving hazardous waste will not be permitted with Flood Zones 3a or 3b.

Priority will be given to sites which:

• are designated by the Waste Plan area’s local authorities as suitable for industrial development in the planning policy documents or within extensive areas of despoiled, contaminated, previously developed or derelict land or areas with a history of a waste-related use other than restored landfill or to be restored landfill;

• do not adversely affect the openness of strategic open land (eg the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land);

• are located more than 100 metres or more from open space;

• are identified as having a low risk of flooding;

• are located outside Groundwater Source Protection Zones (ie sites farthest from protected groundwater sources);

• have access to sustainable modes of transport for incoming and outgoing materials, particularly rail and water, and which provide easy access for staff to cycle or walk;

• have direct access to the strategic road network;
• have no Public Rights of Way;

• do not adversely affect local conservation areas, nature conservation areas, locally important conservation areas, archaeological sites or strategic views;

• do not adversely affect regional and local nature conservation areas, conservation areas and locally designated areas of special character, archaeological sites or strategic views;

• are close to existing or planned decentralised energy networks, potential users of combined heat and power (and combined cooling heat and power) and areas of growth, regeneration and mixed use development; and,

• offer opportunities to accommodate various related facilities on a single site.

**WP7: Protecting and Enhancing Amenity**

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.

A waste management facility should be within a fully enclosed covered building.

Particular regard will be paid to the impact of the development in terms of:

(a) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, recreation land or similar;

(b) Biodiversity, including ensuring that development does not harm nature conservation areas protected by international and national regulations **as well as ensuring regional and local nature conservation areas are not adversely affected**

(c) Archaeological sites, the historic environment and sensitive receptors, such as schools, hospitals and residential areas;

(d) Ground water, surface water and watercourses;

(e) Air emissions arising from the plant and traffic generated;

(f) Noise and vibration from the plant and traffic generated;

(g) Traffic generation, access and the suitability of the highway network in the vicinity, including access to and from the strategic road network;

(h) Odour, litter, vermin and birds; and

(i) The design of the waste management facility, particularly:

• complementing or improving the character of an area;
• limiting the visual impact of the development by employing hard and soft landscaping and minimising glare;
• being of a scale, massing or height appropriate to the townscape or landscape;
• using good quality materials;
• minimising the requirement for exterior lighting; and,
• utilising high-quality boundary treatments.

The information in Schedule 3 will provide the basis for the assessment of the impact of a development.