

CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL

Report to:- Carlisle City Council

Date of Meeting:- 15 January 2008

Agenda Item No:-

Public

**Title:- CONSULTATION ON MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK - CHANGES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS CORE
STRATEGY**

Report of:- Director of Development Services

Report reference:- DS.07/08

Summary:-

This report sets out the details of the County Council consultation on the next stage of the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

Recommendation:-

That the decision by Executive (EX.317/07) be ratified by Council and the County Council be notified of that ratification.

C Elliot

Director of Development Services

Contact Officer: Christopher Hardman

Ext: 7190

Note: in compliance with section 100d of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 the report has been prepared in part from the following papers: Cumbria Minerals and Waste Development Framework Changes to the Core Strategy Preferred Options November 2007 Cumbria County Council

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OPTIONS

- 1.1 Executive Report DS 116.07 (attached to this report – Appendix 1) sets out the details of the County Council consultation on the Changes to the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for Cumbria.
- 1.2 It also sets out the intended Council's response subject to the Executive Decision as attached at Appendix 2.

2.0 CONSULTATION

2.1 Consultation to Date

The County Council consultation on the Proposed Changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy finished on the 14th December 2007. This was a statutory 6 week consultation period. The Executive Decision EX.317/07 has been referred to the County Council to ensure Carlisle City Council had a response within the time period albeit that this is done subject to ratification at this meeting.

2.2 Consultation Proposed

A final "Core Strategy" document will be prepared by February 2008. Further consultations on this, and the Generic Development Control Policies, are scheduled for March/April/May 2008.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That the decision by Executive (EX.317/07) be ratified by Council and the County Council be notified of that ratification.

4.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 To formalise Carlisle City Council's response to the statutory development plan consultation.

5.0 IMPLICATIONS

As set out in Executive Report DS.116/07 (See pages 6,7 Appendix 2)

Executive Report DS.116/07



REPORT TO EXECUTIVE

PORTFOLIO AREA: INFRASTRUCTURE ENVIRONMENT

Date of Meeting: 10th December 2007

Public

Key Decision: Yes

Recorded in Forward Plan: No

Inside Policy Framework

Title: CONSULTATION ON MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK - CHANGES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS
CORE STRATEGY

Report of: Director of Development Services

Report reference: DS. 116/07

Summary:

This report sets out the response to the County Council's consultation on the Development Plan for dealing with Minerals and Waste throughout Cumbria. The consultation concentrates on the strategic policy background and a separate consultation will be undertaken on detailed site policies.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the comments in Section 2 of this report are returned to the County Council as comments of the City Council subject to ratification at Council.

Catherine Elliot
Director of Development Services

Contact Officer: Chris Hardman

Ext: 7190

Note: in compliance with section 100d of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 the report has been prepared in part from the following papers: Cumbria Minerals and Waste Development Framework Changes to the Core Strategy Preferred Options November 2007 Cumbria County Council

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OPTIONS

- 1.1 Consultation was undertaken jointly on the Issues and Options for the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Policies in July 2006. (Executive Report DS 50.06 refers). A consultation on the Preferred Options was undertaken in March 2007. Members were consulted although the short timescale did not allow sufficient time for a full report and a response was returned to the County Council in agreement with the Portfolio Holder. As a consequence of all the responses to that consultation the County Council has separated the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Policy documents and are taking them forward at two different stages. The Core Strategy is required to set the context for the site allocation policies and is produced first for consultation.
- 1.2 This consultation documents sets out the County Council's broad proposals for the minerals and waste management developments that will be needed in Cumbria by 2020. These proposals are coupled with policies about the amounts of waste that will need to be managed, the amounts of minerals that will need to be dug and for mitigating impacts on climate change. It does not identify sites; they will be in the Site Allocations Policies that will be published for consultation next year. The greatest challenges are seen to be in making sure that the new waste management facilities can be built, that are necessary to increase recycling and composting and reduce the amounts of waste that are landfilled.
- 1.3 It is estimated there is a need for eleven sites of around 2 hectare for waste treatment facilities and for an additional 2 million cubic metres of landfill space. It is considered that we should also plan for two "Energy from Waste" plants although, at the present time, there are doubts about whether they will be needed. The eleven sites include two Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants and three Transfer Stations that are needed for the wastes collected by refuse vehicles. Broad locations are identified for these.
- 1.4 The Strategy includes policies for storing and disposing of radioactive wastes.

- 1.5 For minerals, there are policies for gypsum, brickmaking, industrial limestone, building stones and coal bed methane. The Strategy does not propose any further provision, at this time, for crushed rock quarries. Some quarries produce high skid resistance roadstones and additional provision will be needed for these before 2020. Further sites for sand and gravel quarrying will be needed within the next three or four years. These will be identified next year in the Site Allocations Policies consultation.
- 1.6 With regard to Site location a number of criteria are established in the Core Strategy. Basic requirements, such as the size and shape of a site, will be set out in the site allocations document but it is proposed that the criteria set out in Table 6.3 'Site location criteria' are used in the search for suitable sites. The County Council suggests that these criteria and characteristics will need to be ranked or scored, but this is not proposed at this stage.
- 1.7 There is one specific reference to Carlisle in the consultation document. The broad locations of Carlisle and Workington/Whitehaven and Barrow in Furness and Kendal have been identified for strategic municipal waste management facilities in Core Strategy Policy 7 'Strategic Areas For New Developments'. These facilities would be the two Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants and three Transfer Stations. Based on the March 2007 Preferred Options Site Allocations document, and the representations that have been made, the most likely choices, without prejudice to further considerations, would appear to be:-
- in the north, between sites in the Distington/ Lillyhall area or near the port at Workington and between Heathlands, Rockcliffe or Hespian Wood at Carlisle.
- 1.8 This is the first time that Heathlands at Rockcliffe has been referred to in the strategy as previous references related to Harker Industrial Estate.

Table 6.3 Site location criteria

Criteria	Characteristics
1. Close to waste arisings	Within 5 miles of the centre of a main town
2. Accessibility	Well related to existing road network, or
	Well related to proposed road network
	Potential for rail or sea transport
3. Previously developed land	Brownfield
	Part brownfield
4. Deliverable	No owner objection
5. Flood risk .	Sequential test needed for Zones 2 and 3
	Possible need for exception test
	Avoid functional floodplain (Zone 3b)
6. Development plan status	Allocated and at a town or key service centre
	Allocated but not at a town or key service centre
7. Away from houses	Further than 250 metres
	Number of houses
8. Environmental interests	Not within or affecting an international or national site
	Not within or affecting a local site
	Offering potential to enhance the environmental interest
9. Visual impact	Not affecting the setting of the National Parks or AONBs or Heritage Coast
10. Other land uses	No likely conflict
11. Economic potential	Likely to be part of, or aid, regeneration or safeguard jobs.
12. Co-location potential	Large enough to be able to accommodate more than one type of facility and complementary activities

- 1.9 Additional or alternative criteria and/or characteristics could be suggested and will be considered.

2.0 Responses to Consultation

- 2.1 At the initial Preferred Options consultation in March 2007 the main areas of objection raised by the City Council were to the choice of site selected for facilities. As this is not part of this consultation these issues are not repeated and will be considered during the site allocations consultation next year.
- 2.2 Officers have considered the report and consider that the accompanying sustainability appraisal summarises a sound reasoning for the selection of the preferred options. There are some issues of sustainability that cannot be avoided due to the geographic spread of Cumbria or in relation to Building Stone vital to ensure retention of Cumbria's distinct character.
- 2.3 Appendix 1 to this report sets out a summary of the changes to the preferred options and the possible alternatives. The following observations are to be made on the consultation document:
- 2.4 It is agreed that the Preferred Options are the most appropriate and that the City Council should support these options.
- 2.5 In relation to Core Strategy Policy 7, it is agreed that Heathlands Industrial Estate at Rockcliffe or Hespian Wood should be considered in the Site Allocations document for Mechanical or Biological Treatment Plant or transfer Station to serve north Cumbria. Without a full assessment in relation to the criteria in Table 6.3 no preference is stated at this stage.
- 2.6 Agree that the selection criteria in table 6.3 are appropriate for consideration of site selection subject to the inclusion of the reference to species as well as sites in part 8 Environmental Interests to read: "Not within or affecting an international or national site **or species**"
- 2.7 In response to Policy 10 Waste Hierarchy, agree with the preferred option as long as management of waste is in the hierarchical list.

3.0 CONSULTATION

3.1 Consultation to Date

During June to September 2006 the County Council consulted upon the issues and options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. The comments that were made then helped to identify the Preferred Options. These were published in March 2007 and were the first draft of the plan. The County Council had to incorporate changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy, which means that the consultations have to be repeated. The County Council is now asking for comments on the "Proposed Changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy".

3.2 Consultation Proposed

The final version of the Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document will be submitted to Government Office at the same time as the Core Strategy. The Preferred Options Site Allocations document and the maps that will form the basis for the Proposals Map are being revised, because additional sites need to be included and others may no longer be proposed. Consultations on these revised documents are programmed for late 2008/ early 2009. A final "Core Strategy" document will be prepared by February 2008. Further consultations on this, and the Generic Development Control Policies, are scheduled for March/April/May 2008.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 It is recommended that the comments in Section 2 of this report are returned to the County Council as comments of the City Council subject to ratification at Council.

5.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 The preferred options in the Core Strategy represent the most sustainable option for minerals and waste development for the County and Carlisle.

6.0 IMPLICATIONS

- Staffing/Resources – None. The City Council is a consultee in the process and work is undertaken within existing Local Plans and Conservation Section resources.
- Financial – None
- Legal – There is a fixed consultation period within which the City Council must make any comments.
- Corporate – The preferred options strategy put forward in this consultation is in line with the Council's "Cleaner, Greener and Safer" priority.
- Risk Management – The Core Strategy for Minerals and Waste forms part of the Development Plan system. The City Council could find that it has to have regard to policies to which it did not concur
- Equality and Disability – None
- Environmental – A sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken on the changes to the Preferred Options to the Core Strategy
- Crime and Disorder – None
- Impact on Customers – The County Council have made the document available for consultation including copies available at the City Council's customer contact centre.

Catherine Elliot
Director of Development Services

Contact Officer: Chris Hardman

Ext: 7190

**Summary of Changes
to the
Preferred Options and Alternatives**

CUMBRIA MWDF – CHANGES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS CORE STRATEGY – NOVEMBER 2007

Table of Preferred Option policies and alternatives.	
CORE STRATEGY POLICY 1: SUSTAINABLE LOCATION AND DESIGN	ALTERNATIVES
<p>The Preferred Option policy would expect all proposals for minerals and waste management developments to demonstrate that :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • energy management, environmental performance and carbon footprint have been determining design factors. 	<p>The alternatives to this policy could be :-</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • their location will minimise, as far as is practicable, the "minerals or waste road miles" involved in supplying the minerals or managing the wastes unless other environmental/sustainability considerations override this aim. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to concentrate minerals and waste developments into a small number of larger sites/facilities to serve the whole county. <p>This has not been chosen because it is not considered to suit the geographic characteristics of Cumbria and its dispersed pattern of settlements</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all developments with useful floor space of over 1000 square metres gain at least 10% of energy supply, annually or over the design life of the development, from on-site or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy supplies. Any exceptions to this should demonstrate that this would not be viable for the specific development and that the development would form part of an integrated process for reducing greenhouse gas emissions or for carbon-offsetting measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to use different thresholds of floor space for developments that would need to provide on-site renewable energy. <p><i>The figures used are those from the Planning and Climate Change consultation paper and the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. There is no experience or information about waste management and minerals developments to demonstrate that alternatives would be more appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>The RSS Examination Panel has recommended that the threshold is reduced to 500 square metres and the policy may need to be revised if this is accepted</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to use reduction in predicted carbon dioxide emissions as the criterion instead of proportion of energy supply <p>It is considered that this is less relevant to minerals and waste developments than for other types of development where there can be a choice between gas and electricity for energy needs. It would also be more difficult to monitor.</p> <p>not to take into account how a proposed building fits into an integrated process that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>It is considered that this could be counterproductive to the aim of reducing emissions.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction of buildings minimises waste production and use of primary aggregates and makes best use of products made from recycled/re-used materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not to require more sustainable construction and design. <p>This would conflict with national and regional policies.</p>
<p>The policy would also state that work will be undertaken in conjunction with stakeholders to identify appropriate energy supply/carbon emissions criteria for minerals developments.</p>	
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 2 : ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Preferred Option policy would relate to those assets that are not protected by international or national legislation. It would require all significant amenity and environmental impacts to be mitigated and would aim to protect, maintain and enhance the natural, historic and other distinctive features that contribute to the environment of Cumbria and to the character of its landscapes and places. It would seek to improve their settings and, where appropriate, the linkages between them and buffer zones around them and to realise the opportunities for expanding and increasing environmental resources, including adapting and mitigating for climate change.</p>	<p><i>It is considered that alternatives to this policy would not be in accordance with national or regional policies.</i></p>
<p>It would state that planning permission will not be granted for development that would have a significant adverse effect on Cumbria's environmental assets, on its own or in combination with other developments, unless :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is demonstrated that there is a need for the development, • that it cannot reasonably be located on any alternative site that would result in less or no harm, and then sequentially, • that the effects can be adequately mitigated, or • that the effects can be compensated for through offsetting actions. 	<p>One of the comments made about the original Preferred Option policy is that the wording of the policy should state how the biodiversity benefits of an existing site will be qualitatively evaluated against the benefits offered by a proposed development.</p>

<p>All proposals would also be expected to demonstrate that they include reasonable measures to secure the opportunities that they present for enhancing Cumbria's environmental assets.</p>	<p><i>It is considered that such evaluation would have to be on a case by case basis and that a Core Strategy policy could not cover all of the likely considerations</i></p>
<p>Guidance on implementing this policy will be provided by the Landscape Character and Highway Design Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>	
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 3: AFTERUSE AND RESTORATION</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Preferred Option Core Strategy policy is to expect that full advantage will be taken of the potential for mineral working and waste management site restoration and after care schemes, to help deliver sustainability objectives relating to the environment and the economy of the county.</p>	<p>to consider only the environmental acceptability of submitted restoration proposals and not to expect their full potential to be realised.</p> <p><i>This is regarded as a missed opportunity and would not help to deliver the results expected by national and regional policies.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 4: LOCAL ECONOMIC BENEFIT</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Core Strategy policy would require proposals for new minerals and waste developments to demonstrate that they would realise their potential for local economic benefit. This will include such matters as the number of jobs directly or indirectly created or safeguarded and the support that proposals give to other industries and developments. It will also be important to ensure that minerals and waste developments would not prejudice other regeneration and development initiatives.</p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal suggested that at least two basic options should be set out - a "do minimum" and a "do maximum". These alternatives would be :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. maximise the development opportunities presented by Cumbria's mineral resources and by its potential for managing wastes, or b. make as little provision as possible for mineral and waste developments. <p><i>The Preferred Option is considered to represent an approach between these extremes which incorporates elements of each of</i></p>

	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>them.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>It seeks a balance between the UK's shared principles of sustainable development (see paragraph 2.15) that is appropriate for Cumbria.</i></p>
CORE STRATEGY POLICY 5: PLANNING OBLIGATIONS	ALTERNATIVES
The Core Strategy Policy would state that where it is not possible to achieve the necessary control through the use of planning conditions, the County Council will seek to negotiate planning obligations that ensure that development proposals :-	<i>The plan is required to have policies relating to Planning Obligations, there is no alternative to this.</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet the reasonable costs of new infrastructure made necessary by the proposal including transport, utilities and community facilities; 2. Make a positive contribution to enhancing, maintaining or promoting sustainable communities; 3. Secure long term management of environmental assets; 4. Provide financial guarantees. 	Other matters that could be negotiated for inclusion within them could be suggested and will be considered.
CORE STRATEGY POLICY 6 : COMMUNITY BENEFITS	ALTERNATIVES
The Core Strategy policy would state that where large national or regional facilities are proposed, particularly for the nuclear industry, the County Council will expect that packages of community benefits will be provided to help to offset the impacts of hosting such facilities.	<p>The Preferred Option also seeks to secure community benefits that are commensurate with hosting national or regional facilities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The County Council considers that the alternative of not seeking these is not acceptable because it would not acknowledge their impacts on Cumbria.</i></p>
CORE STRATEGY POLICY 7: STRATEGIC AREAS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS	ALTERNATIVES
The Core Strategy policy and the Key Diagram would identify Carlisle and the Workington/Whitehaven area in the north, and Barrow in Furness and	<i>Any alternatives to this policy would not appear to reflect the details of the emerging Municipal Waste Management Strategy and the</i>

<p>Kendal in the south, as the strategic locations for major new Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer Stations, and the Penrith area for a Transfer Station for the Municipal Waste Management Strategy's preferred solution for managing municipal waste. They would identify the Kirkby Thore/Long Marton area as the only location for supplying gypsum; land next to High Greenscoe Quarry as the only location for supplying the Askam in Furness brickworks with mudstones; and the igneous rocks near Ghyll Scaur Quarry as the only location for additional very high specification roadstone resources.</p>	<p><i>long term municipal waste contract or the geological information about mineral resources.</i></p>
<p>The policy would state that supply/production areas, strategic locations and preferred sites for sand and gravel and crushed rock for general aggregate use will be identified as part of the work for the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and Proposals Map.</p>	
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 8: PROVISION FOR WASTE</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would set out that the plan will seek to make provision for all of Cumbria's wastes (net self-sufficiency). Proposals to manage wastes from outside the county would have to demonstrate that the local social and economic benefits outweigh other sustainability criteria. These other criteria include the impacts of the additional "waste miles" and the principles of managing waste as close as possible to its source, and of each community taking responsibility for its own wastes. Any proposals would have to demonstrate that their environmental impacts are acceptable.</p>	<p>a) provide for Cumbria's wastes, and as much waste as possible from elsewhere, with a focus on maximising and safeguarding job opportunities.</p> <p><i>The County Council considers that such an approach would not be sustainable, because of the distance to Cumbria from the major sources of waste arisings in the cities and the difficulties that Cumbria is likely to face in providing for its own wastes.</i></p> <p>b) provide only for Cumbria's wastes (net self-sufficiency).</p> <p><i>This is the basis of the Preferred Option, with flexibility for importing waste where this can be justified.</i></p>

	<p>c) provide for less than Cumbria's wastes, assuming that a significant proportion will be managed outside the county.</p> <p><i>It may be that facilities will be developed elsewhere, which would benefit from additional amounts of waste being available from Cumbria. However, it is considered to be unwise to assume that this will happen and that any proposals could be justified as being sustainable</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 9: WASTE CAPACITY</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Waste Core Strategy policy would state that capacity will be needed for managing and treating between 340,000 and 462,000 tonnes/year of municipal waste and between 659,000 and 750,000 tonnes/year of commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period. It would propose that the plan should provide for around 7 million cubic metres of landfill capacity, including void space remaining in sites that have planning permission. These figures will be kept under review as better and more up to date information becomes available.</p>	<p><i>This range of figures is considerably larger than that included in the original Preferred Options.</i></p> <p><i>Because of the range, it is not considered necessary to put forward alternative options.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 10: WASTE HIERARCHY</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would set out that sufficient sites will be identified to enable the wastes that remain, after waste reduction measures, to be managed as high as possible up the hierarchy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. re-use of products or materials for the same or a different purpose; ii. recovery of resources through recycling or composting; iii. recovery of value by generating electricity and using heat from energy from waste plants, (including incinerators); iv. recovery of value by generating electricity from energy from waste 	<p><i>Apart from not incorporating the refined hierarchy for energy from waste, it is not considered that there are any practicable policy alternatives to managing waste as high as possible up the hierarchy in accordance with national and regional policies.</i></p> <p><i>The consultation version of the Sellafield Integrated Waste Strategy includes additional "steps" in the hierarchy but these are</i></p>

<p>plants, (including incinerators) without using the heat; v. if none of the above are appropriate, incineration without energy recovery or disposal of waste by landfill.</p>	<p><i>considered to be relevant to that site's particular waste streams.</i></p>																
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 11: REDUCING LANDFILL</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>																
<p>The Waste Core Strategy Policy would state that the plan will identify sufficient sites for the facilities that will be needed to meet the following targets for reducing the amounts of waste that are landfilled.</p>																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2010</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2020</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Household waste - re-use, recycling and composting</td> <td>40%¹</td> <td>45%²</td> <td>55%^{3, 5}</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recovery of value from municipal waste⁶</td> <td>53%⁴</td> <td>67%²</td> <td>75%⁴</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial and industrial waste Landfilled</td> <td colspan="3">80% of 2004⁴ (i.e. of 291,500 tonnes)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2010	2015	2020	Household waste - re-use, recycling and composting	40% ¹	45% ²	55% ^{3, 5}	Recovery of value from municipal waste ⁶	53% ⁴	67% ²	75% ⁴	Commercial and industrial waste Landfilled	80% of 2004 ⁴ (i.e. of 291,500 tonnes)			
	2010	2015	2020														
Household waste - re-use, recycling and composting	40% ¹	45% ²	55% ^{3, 5}														
Recovery of value from municipal waste ⁶	53% ⁴	67% ²	75% ⁴														
Commercial and industrial waste Landfilled	80% of 2004 ⁴ (i.e. of 291,500 tonnes)																
<p>1. Waste Strategy 2007 and the stretched Local Area Agreement target. 2. Waste Strategy 2007 and the Regional Spatial Strategy target. 3. Regional Spatial Strategy target. 4. Waste Strategy 2007 target. 5. Waste Strategy 2007 also has a target to reduce the amount of household waste not re-used, recycled or composted to 225kg/person by 2020. 6. This includes recycling, composting and energy recovery.</p>	<p>Alternatives could involve higher rates of recycling, etc, and/or different timetables for achieving them.</p>																
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 12: WASTE SITES</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>																
<p>The preferred Waste Core Strategy is that the plan should seek to provide</p>	<p>An alternative would be to identify more or fewer sites.</p>																

- eleven sites of around 2ha for waste treatment facilities, (these could include Materials Recovery Facilities, Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer/bulking stations), and
- two sites of between 2 and 4.5ha for Energy from Waste gasification plants or incinerators, and
- an additional 2 million cubic metres of landfill capacity in addition to the void space remaining in existing permitted sites, and
- nine new or enlarged Household Waste Recycling Centres, with innovative solutions or alternative sites kept under review for smaller communities

CORE STRATEGY POLICY 13: INTEGRATED NETWORK

The Preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would state that the Framework will identify sufficient sites for an integrated network of a range of appropriate and necessary waste management facilities across the county, and that preference will be given to sites that can accommodate more than one type of facility.

ALTERNATIVES

The fuller range of options, which could be considered, is to identify sites :-

a) for a decentralised network with a range of waste management facilities in each district council area;

It is not considered that the quantities of wastes arising within Cumbria would enable such a network to be efficient and effective. It is considered more appropriate to provide facilities for more than one administrative area.

b) for a centralised network of two sites serving the north and the south of the county with a full range of waste management facilities;

this does not seem realistic unless it is led by the provision of facilities for the municipal waste management contract, but is an option that should be left open.

c) a decentralised network, but with sites large enough and suitable for co-locating more than one type of waste management facility;

	<p style="text-align: right;"><i>This is the basis of the Preferred Option.</i></p> <p>d) not to identify sites but to rely on criteria based development control policies for any proposals that may be submitted;</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>This would not be in accordance with the requirements and intentions of the new development plan system. Criteria based policies will be needed for considering sites that may be proposed that are not identified in this Framework.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 14: HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES STORAGE</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>This Policy would set out that developments involving the interim storage of these wastes at Sellafield will only be permitted where criteria are satisfied relating to benefit clearly outweighing the detrimental effects, compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security, which, if appropriate, is independently reviewed; reasons are explained for rejecting alternative locations and methods that have been considered and that there are no overall adverse impacts on the local economy.</p>	<p>An alternative could be to not have any policies at all for these higher level wastes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The County Council's view is that some form of policy is likely to be necessary, because proposals are likely to come forward for storing wastes that are already within the Sellafield/ Windscale complex.</i></p>
<p>It would also state that permission will be granted only if all possible measures are taken to minimise the adverse effects of development and associated infrastructure; and, where appropriate, provision is made to meet local community needs; acceptable measures are secured for decommissioning and site restoration, and arrangements are made for suitable local community involvement during the development, decommissioning and restoration.</p>	

CORE STRATEGY POLICY 15: HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL	ALTERNATIVES
<p>This policy would state that, if an area within Cumbria is volunteered as a potential repository site, separate planning applications may be expected to be submitted at three stages of developing a possible geological disposal facility :-</p>	<p>- not to have a policy relating to disposal.</p> <p><i>This was the approach that the County Council adopted in the original Preferred Options document. However, since the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely consultation paper was published (June 2007), more details are available about such a disposal facility and the processes that would be undertaken for site selection. The Government's intention is to commence the site finding process in 2008. The County Council considers that consultation and discussion about these first draft ideas for local policies could assist communities decide whether to participate in the process for finding a site.</i></p> <p>Other stages of the process and other planning criteria could be suggested.</p> <p><i>These will be considered.</i></p>
<p>Proposals for surface based site investigation including boreholes. At this stage, the planning criteria would be similar to those for exploratory works for other types of development. These would relate to the usual environmental impact considerations including traffic, working hours, noise, visual impact, period of operations, water resources and wildlife.</p>	
<p>Proposals for underground rock characterisation shafts and tunnels and an underground research laboratory. Planning considerations at this stage would need to include not just the environmental impacts of the proposed operations themselves, but also the details of a generic design for a disposal facility and of its likely impacts. The planning criteria would relate to the inventory of wastes; environmental impacts; benefits clearly outweighing detrimental impacts; compliance with best international standards and best practice for the environment, safety and security; the final offsetting benefits package; impacts on the local economy; and community needs.</p>	
<p>Proposals for a disposal facility and transport links, monitoring, site closure and restoration. At this stage, there could be a reasonable expectation that planning permission would be granted, unless new information or material considerations demonstrate otherwise, or there are material differences from the scheme that had been developed over a considerable period of time up to this stage. Planning criteria would relate to the environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the facility; the inventory of wastes to be brought to the facility; to</p>	

<p>transport matters; arrangements for local community involvement; monitoring and reporting; contingency and emergency planning issues; the offset benefits package; site decommissioning, clean-up and closure proposals; and restoration/afteruse of the site.</p>	
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 16: LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The policy would state that, if possible, further capacity should be identified for those Low Level Wastes that arise at Sellafield/Windscale and for the estimated 9% of total arisings of Low Level Waste that are generated by small users of the existing Repository, such as hospitals, the healthcare technology industry and research establishments. In the short term, capacity may also be provided for Low Level Waste from larger users such as nuclear power stations, Ministry of Defence sites and other British Nuclear Group facilities, where it is demonstrated that the waste cannot be managed elsewhere.</p>	<p>The alternatives are to regard the Repository near Drigg as a National facility, beyond the short term, for the storage, or disposal, of all of the country's Low Level Wastes, including those from Ministry of Defence sites and nuclear power stations. This national role could be either :-</p> <p>a) in the medium term, say 5 to 10 years, or b) in the long term, say 30 to 50 years.</p> <p><i>These alternatives are not considered to represent sustainable development and the County Council's policy is that Cumbria should not be regarded as the disposal route for all of the UK's radioactive wastes.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 17: SUPPLY OF MINERALS</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy Policy would set out that the plan will seek to :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meet the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment to Cumbria of crushed rock and sand and gravel production, but • further apply that apportionment to take account of Cumbria's pattern of quarries and the areas they supply, and its dispersed 	<p>- Continue to grant planning permissions for additional crushed rock quarrying, irrespective of the size of the landbank,</p> <p><i>This would lead to further overprovision and inefficient use of resources and is not considered to be sustainable.</i></p>

<p>settlement pattern and transport routes,</p>	<p>For aggregates there could also be alternatives to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue basically with the present dispersed patterns of quarries, or 2. Seek to concentrate production at a smaller number of larger quarries <p><i>The existing pattern of planning permissions for hard rock quarries, and the life of those permissions, give little practicable scope for considering alternatives. Sand and gravel quarries have much smaller reserves and much shorter life planning permissions. Concentrating into a few large production units would not suit the dispersed pattern of demand in Cumbria, and parts of the county already have issues relating to the volume of quarry lorry traffic, which could be exacerbated. The Sustainability Appraisal favours the dispersed pattern and its consequent reduction in "minerals miles".</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify areas sufficient to maintain landbanks of permitted reserves for supply/production areas equivalent to seven years annual average sales for sand and gravel and ten years for crushed rock for general aggregate use, throughout the plan period, and 	<p>Alternative figures could be suggested for the "landbank" periods of seven and ten years.</p> <p><i>Those periods accord with Mineral Policy Statement 1. National policy suggests that longer periods may be appropriate for other minerals but does not specify what these should be</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognise that the high and very high skid resistance roadstone quarries, gypsum resources and High Greenscoe brick making mudstone quarry are regionally or nationally important, 	<p>For gypsum and the brickmaking mudstones an alternative would be to not recognize their importance and not make any provision at all for them.</p>

	<i>This would conflict with the overall Core Strategy of optimising local economic benefits from minerals developments and promoting sustainable minerals developments that are needed.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make provision for one quarter of the aggregates used within Cumbria to be met by secondary or recycled aggregates. 	
CORE STRATEGY POLICY 18: MINERALS SAFEGUARDING	ALTERNATIVES
<p>The Core Strategy policy would state that mineral resources will be safeguarded by identifying :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred Areas and Mineral Safeguarding Areas, to enable a landbank of seven years sales at the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment level for sand and gravel to be maintained throughout the plan period; • A Preferred Area or Area of Search for extending the very high specification roadstone Ghyll Scaur quarry; • An Area of Search for extending the brickmaking mudstones at High Greenscoe quarry; • An Area of Search or Preferred Area for working additional gypsum and a Mineral Safeguarding Area for the remaining gypsum resources; • Mineral Safeguarding Areas, for the indicative sand and gravel and hard rock resources identified by the British Geological Survey; • Mineral Consultation Areas which will include buffer zones around the Preferred Areas, Areas of Search and Mineral Safeguarding Areas. 	<p>- not seeking to safeguard mineral resources</p> <p><i>This would conflict with national policy.</i></p> <p>Alternative or additional sites and/or minerals could be suggested</p> <p><i>These will be considered.</i></p>
<p>The need to safeguard other mineral resources, secondary aggregate resources and potential railheads and wharves, will be considered in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.</p>	
CORE STRATEGY POLICY 19: MARINE DREDGED AGGREGATES	ALTERNATIVES
<p>The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy would set out that planning</p>	<p>- not to encourage increases in landings of marine dredged</p>

<p>permission will be granted for developments at appropriate locations, and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts, that would enable the increased use of marine dredged aggregates as substitutes for land won ones.</p>	<p>aggregates.</p> <p><i>The County Council considers there is potential for increases to help to reduce the amount of primary land won aggregate that needs to be quarried, in accordance with national policy.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 20: INDUSTRIAL LIMESTONES</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Preferred Option policy would state that proposals for the extraction of high purity limestone will only be permitted if it is primarily for non-aggregate uses, and national or regional need has been demonstrated, or where significant benefits would accrue to local communities and/or the environment.</p>	<p>- not including criteria</p> <p><i>This is not considered to be sustainable. It would be likely to lead to the limited resources of these high purity limestones being used inefficiently.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 21: BUILDING STONES</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Core Strategy policy would state that the plan will seek to identify and protect sources of the full range of local building stones that help to maintain Cumbria's local distinctiveness.</p>	<p>- not to have a specific policy for building stones and to rely on the Generic Development Control Policies.</p> <p><i>That was the approach proposed in the original Preferred Options, but would not be in accordance with Regional policy.</i></p>
<p>CORE STRATEGY POLICY 22: COAL BED METHANE</p>	<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>
<p>The Core Strategy Policy would state that planning permission will be granted for proposals to exploit and use coal bed methane in appropriate locations, and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts.</p>	<p>- not having a policy,</p> <p><i>This would not recognise the potential importance of these resources in Cumbria.</i></p> <p>- a more detailed policy</p> <p><i>It is not considered that this can be put forward in this Core Strategy.</i></p>

Executive Decision EX.317/07

Decision Ref No: EX.317/07

Subject Matter:

CONSULTATION ON MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CHANGES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS CORE STRATEGY

The Director of Development Services submitted Report DS.116/07 setting out a proposed response to the County Council's consultation on the Development Plan for dealing with Minerals and Waste throughout Cumbria. The consultation concentrated on the strategic policy background and a separate consultation would be undertaken on detailed site policies.

The Environment and Infrastructure Portfolio holder emphasised that a further consultation identifying sites would be undertaken at a later stage. He then referred to the statement in paragraph 1.3 - "It is considered that we should also plan for two "Energy from Waste" plants, although, at the present time, there are doubts about whether they will be needed". Executive Members believed that Energy from Waste should be investigated and pursued as there was a real need.

Decision:

That the comments set out in section 2 of report DS.116/07, with the addition of a statement that "The Executive believes that Energy from Waste should still be investigated and pursued as it is an important need", be returned to Cumbria County Council as the comments of the City Council, subject to ratification at City Council.

Reasons for Decision:

The preferred options in the Core Strategy represent the most sustainable option for minerals and waste development for the County and Carlisle.

Summary of Options rejected:

None