

Please thank the OPDC for their comments on their further responses on my Qs 6, 12, 13, 16, 24, 25 and 26, which I'm happy to accept. I'm content with the OPDC's suggested way of listing the existing Development Plan policies to be superseded. I understand (from Key document 16) that it is the OPDC's intention that the West London Waste Plan policies will not be superseded by the OPDC Local Plan; it may be helpful to plan users if the statement of those policies which are superseded also clearly stated that these Waste Policies will not be superseded.

I will finalise the Matters and Issues list shortly but, for OPDC's benefit meanwhile, my responses to their two clarification questions are as follows;

OPDC's Q1 (relating to matter 2(g)). The reference to key issue 26 at Reg 19(1) stage is as I intended. I think this may need to be discussed at a hearing session if respondents remain unhappy with the way the OPDC has assessed capacity to provide pitches. The reference to key issue 6 is my mistake and should be deleted. The reference to key issue 7 at Regulation 19(2) stage is meant to refer to table 7 on page 26 of Key document 5 (main report). The key issues are not numbered in this table but the seventh entry reads; Gypsy and traveller accommodation. Additional land should be allocated to meet outstanding need for gypsies and travellers from RBKC.

OPDC's Q2 (relating to matter 9). The reference to representations 2/HS/1 and 2/HS2 should read 2/H3/1 and 2/H3/2. My apologies.

Paul Clark
Inspector