

## Schedule of changes to committee version of the draft NLWP

Nature of change	Change to text
Update to information since 6 <sup>th</sup> Draft	<p>Additional text to 1.7 as follows:</p> <p><u>The Greater London Authority (GLA) intend to carry out a full review of the London Plan which will commence in 2015. The North London Boroughs will monitor progress on this in order to reflect any relevant changes of policy in the NLWP.</u></p>
Clarification	<p>Additional note to reference to London Plan in 1.7 as follows:</p> <p><u>[1] At time of writing this is The Spatial Development Strategy For London Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011 (March 2015) also known as London Plan March 2015 (FALP)</u></p> <p>Other references to the London Plan in the 7<sup>th</sup> Draft also include the addition of <u>(March 2015)</u> where appropriate.</p>
Clarification	<p>Additional text to 2.23 as follows:</p> <p><u>There are no plans by any of the boroughs to review their Green Belt boundaries.</u></p>
Correction of terminology to be in line with the London Plan	<p>Change to 'Aim of NLWP' as follows:</p> <p><u>"To <del>move</del> work towards achieving net self-sufficiency in the management of North London's waste</u></p>
Correction of terminology to be in line with the London Plan	<p>Change to Strategic Object 3 as follows:</p> <p><u>To <del>achieve</del> work towards net self-sufficiency</u></p>
Correction	<p>Deletion of 4.7 which repeats 4.6</p>
Clarification	<p>Change to 6.4 as follows:</p> <p><u>In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 182) to ensure the NLWP is justified, a range of options have been tested to demonstrate that in the selection of the preferred strategy, the North London Boroughs have considered reasonable alternatives and that the Plan follows the most appropriate strategy.</u></p>
Clarification and correction	<p>Changes to 7.1 as follows:</p> <p><u>... Using this information, the North London Boroughs propose to adopt the following approach ('Provision for North London's Waste to 2032'); this sets out in broad terms how the waste management needs in North London over the plan period will be met are being planned for. While some waste</u></p>

	will continue to be exported to facilities which North London cannot accommodate, there is a surplus of provision for some management routes (shown as minus figures in Table 5) and therefore an equivalent quantity of waste can be provided within North London.
Correction	New Figure 12: Anticipated exports to landfill during the NLWP plan period
Clarification	<p>Change to 8.4 as follows:</p> <p>Allocating both sites and areas to meet the identified capacity gaps offers considerable benefits. Allocating sites <u>will provide certainty to the waste industry that these are suitable locations for future waste development in North London and will help the North London boroughs meet the London Plan apportionments</u> <del>that are available and suitable for waste management facilities will demonstrate that the North London Boroughs can meet the apportionment targets set out in the London Plan</del> – boroughs are required to meet apportionment targets as a minimum. However, care needs to be taken when allocating sites to ensure there are no immitigable constraints to future development for waste management facilities.</p>
Clarification	<p>Change to 8.5 as follows:</p> <p>Identifying areas within which waste uses would be broadly acceptable <del>will</del> <u>is also required to ensure the NLWP can meet the aim of net self-sufficiency for LACW, C&amp;I and C&amp;D waste, and</u> has sufficient flexibility to cope with any future change in circumstances.</p>
Clarification	<p>Change to title of Policy 1 as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 1: Safeguarding of existing waste management Sites and protection of allocated sites</u></p>
Clarification	<p>Change to Policy 4 as follows:</p> <p>Applications for waste development on unallocated sites outside of the sites and areas identified in Schedules 1-3 <u>will be permitted provided</u> <del>must clearly demonstrate to the satisfaction of the relevant boroughs that the proposal:</del></p>
Clarification	Change to Policy 6f as follows:

	<p>there is no significant adverse impact on the historic environment, <del>or the recreational open spaces or land in recreational use or and</del> landscape character of the area</p>
Clarification	<p>Change to Policy 6j as follows:</p> <p>the development has no <del>significant</del> adverse effect on <u>the integrity of an area designated under the Habitats Directive</u> or no significant adverse effect on local biodiversity; <del>and that there are no likely significant impacts or adverse effects affecting the integrity of an area designated under the Habitats Directive</del></p>
Clarification	<p>Changes to wording of 9.34 in line with changes to Policy 6j as follows:</p> <p>Waste developments should be designed to protect and enhance local biodiversity. No development will be allowed that will have <del>likely significant impacts</del> <u>an adverse effect</u> on any area designated under the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>Assessments undertaken for the plan have identified sites of European Community importance within and nearby the plan area. Sites at least partially within the plan boundary are the Lee Valley Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site and part of Epping Forest Special Area for Conservation (SAC). Additional sites at least partially within 10 km of the plan area boundary are Wormley-Hoddesdon Park Woods SAC and Wimbledon Common SAC<sup>3</sup>. Developers need to be able to <u>demonstrate that their proposals will not either alone or in combination, have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European site</u> <del>impacts on any of these sites are acceptable.</del></p>
Other minor grammatical changes to add clarity	Throughout plan