

## Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

# Consultation Outcomes Report

*For Consultation on the Joint Minerals and Waste Sustainability Appraisal – Undertaken Summer 2013*

September 2013



## Contents

1	Introduction .....	3
2	Consultation Process .....	3
3	Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Consultation Outcomes.....	5
4	Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Workshops Outcomes .....	27
5	Outcomes of the 2011 North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Consultation ...	28
6	Conclusions .....	29
	Appendix 1: Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Consultation Outcomes .....	30
	Appendix 2: Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Workshop Session 1 Outcomes.....	78
	Appendix 3: Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Workshop Session 2 Outcomes.....	92
	Appendix 4: Updated Joint Minerals and Waste Sustainability Appraisal Framework .....	95

## 1 Introduction

North Yorkshire County Council, the City of York Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority have agreed to work together to prepare a Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (the 'Joint Plan'). This plan, to 2030, takes forward recent work on minerals and waste planning issues and evidence undertaken by the three authorities. The Joint Plan will contain the spatial framework for future minerals and waste development across the three authorities and present land use policies and allocations for future minerals and waste development. The statutory responsibility to do this is contained within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This specifically requires the authorities to prepare a local planning policy document known as a minerals and waste local plan.

The main role for the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan will be to deal with key questions such as:

- what sort of minerals and waste related development is likely to be required over the period up to 2030;
- where should minerals and waste related development take place;
- when is minerals and waste development likely to be needed, and;
- how should it be carried out?

The Joint Plan will be prepared under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012<sup>1</sup>. These Regulations set out the procedures for producing Local Plans, which include a requirement to undertake Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The preparation of the Joint Plan must also be in accordance with the requirements of European Directive 2001/42/EC (known as the Strategic Environment Assessment, or SEA Directive). The SA methodology proposed in this Scoping Report will, in accordance with Government guidance<sup>2</sup>, meet the requirements of SA and SEA through one appraisal.

## 2 Consultation Process

From 17<sup>th</sup> May, to 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2013, the Joint Plan authorities consulted on a number of documents to inform the preparation of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan. This consultation was carried out in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) and included a Minerals and Waste Joint Plan First Consultation leaflet (setting out the intention of the authorities to produce a Joint Plan) and the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (which included three volumes: a main report, the baseline information and an appendices volume). Two comments forms were also provided for consultees to respond to: the first related to the Plan consultation Summary Leaflet and preparation of the Joint Plan (which included one question on the approach to the sustainability appraisal and another question asking for additional comments), and the second sought responses on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (nine SA-specific questions and one 'other comments' question were asked as part of this questionnaire).

The documents were issued for consultation for six weeks. This outcomes report aims to document the comments received on the scoping report, setting out the nature of the response received and how those

---

<sup>1</sup> These Regulations build upon the broader system for producing plans set out in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. For instance, the arrangements for Development Plan Documents are amended and those DPDs are renamed as Local Plans.

<sup>2</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government, 2012. National Planning Policy Framework. DCLG, London [URL: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)].

responses will be used to inform future stages of the sustainability appraisal of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan.

In total, 297 representation were made from 46 interested parties in relation to the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The three statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) are included in the total number of responses from organisations. A summary of the main responses received in relation to the consultation questions is provided in Table 1, below, and more detailed information on responses to each consultation question and general comments are set out in Section 3, tables 2 to 11, together with a response from the Joint Plan authorities. In addition, comments made to the Regulation 18 Joint Minerals and Waste Plan questionnaire are detailed in tables 12 and 13 and additional comments made regarding the Sustainability Appraisal are detailed in Table 14.

**Table 1: Summary of the number of responses to each question within the JMWP Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.**

	<b>Question</b>	<b>No. of Responses</b>
1	Do you agree with the general approach we are taking towards sustainability appraisal?	30
2	Do you think the supporting assessments being carried out are sufficient for this sustainability appraisal?	22
3	Do you agree with our review of plans, policies, programmes, strategies and initiatives (PPPSIs)? Are there any PPPSIs that we have not considered?	9
4	Do you agree with the key messages from the PPPSI review?	11
5	Do you think that we have gathered baseline information appropriate to the Plan Area?	11
6	Have we identified appropriate sustainability issues? Are there any other sustainability topics or issues we should consider?	10
7	Do you agree with the sustainability objectives and sub-objectives? Can you think of any further objectives, sub-objectives or indicators that we should add to the SA framework?	9
8	Is there anything else that we should consider when we assess options and consider alternatives in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan?	9
9	Is the approach we are taking to the consideration of alternative options appropriate?	7
10	Do you have any other comments on the Scoping Report?	17

In addition to the consultation questions asked as part of the scoping report, a further 140 responses were made to the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Regulation 18 leaflet (118 In response to the SA question: Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to Sustainability Appraisal as set out in the Summary Leaflet and Scoping Report? and 22 SA-specific responses were made to: Please use the space below and/or additional sheets to provide any other comments you wish to make).

Two consultation events were held in addition to the consultation on the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan SA Scoping Report. These included a number of technical stakeholders who had the opportunity to comment on the SA objectives and Site Assessment Identification and Assessment Methodology in a workshop format. The workshop outcomes are described further in section 4 of this report.

### 3 Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Consultation Outcomes

This section describes the comments received in relation to the Joint Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The tables in the following section include a summary of the responses received (by question) and recommendations for dealing them through development of the final scoping report, including the sustainability appraisal framework and objectives. A full outline of consultation responses is included in Appendix 1.

#### 3.1 Responses to the Sustainability Appraisal Questionnaire

Tables 2-11: Summary of types of responses to questions 1-10 of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report questionnaire.

**Table 2 - Question 1: Do you agree with the general approach we are taking towards sustainability appraisal?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
Economic considerations should be considered more explicitly (with some references to Allerton Waste Recovery Park).	4	Publically funded development costs are considered alongside the SA and consultations. AWRP has already been awarded planning permissions, and minerals development is privately funded. Most minerals and waste developments are privately financed.
Forecasting of future need should be carried out.	3	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan.
Flexibility in terms of future changing need should be an integral part of the Plan.	2	This issue will be addressed within the plan, which will need to include an element of flexibility.
The appraisal should seek enhancement of the environment in addition to seeking sustainability.	2	This may be carried out through restoration plans and is assessed across a number of SA objectives.
Supports the approach.	2	Comments noted.
You are pre-empting choices for future generations.		The Sustainability Framework builds upon the Brundtland definition and sustainability issues derived from a wide range of plans and baseline data. Therefore the SA objectives and sub objectives should be seen as a more detailed set of goals to achieve sustainable development within the specific plan area. Together they aim to meet present generation's needs without constraining the ability of future generations to enjoy a similar or improved quality of life.
Supported the approach provided that the appraisal is based on current data and information and not historic commitments (e.g. Allerton Waste Recovery Park).	1	Comments noted. This sustainability appraisal is a new appraisal. Although a limited amount of information has been taken from previous sustainability appraisal work, the assessment work that will carried out will be an entirely new and original exercise,



		undertaken against a new set of SA objectives, informed by a new baseline for a new plan area. There is no obligation to repeat any historical assessment findings. The plan will not be reassessing AWRP.
Transparency should be an integral part of the appraisal and it should be indicated why a certain alternative has been chosen.	1	The SA will give a clear indication of the relative merits of different options as they pertain to sustainability.
The way in which the conclusions of the appraisal will be submitted to public consultation is not set out.	1	There will be three more rounds of consultation during appraisal of the Plan. These will be at the Issues and Options, Preferred Options and Publication stages of the Plan preparation.
Sufficient time for the sustainability appraisal has not been allowed.	1	The statutory time for consultation is five weeks, although six weeks were allowed for this consultation.
The approach is exhaustive and could be more direct, instead of the catch-all approach used.	1	This is the requirement of SEA and SA, whose approach we must follow.
The approach should use the correct tools to quantify the values of the county's assets.	1	We have used nationally available indicators where possible and also data relating to the Plan Area from the relevant authorities in order to measure the impact on these assets.
The definition of sustainability within the Plan must be more clearly considered.	1	The variety of definitions of sustainability are all relevant to this SA. It should be recognised that we must make some decisions now regarding future development of minerals and waste, taking into account the most sustainable options for future generations.
Doesn't support the general approach as previous consultation comments have not been taken into account.	1	The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in this Consultation Outcomes document. The SA builds upon recommendations made in previous SA related consultations.
The full Bruntland definition of sustainability should be used.	1	This is used in section 3.1 of the scoping report.

**Table 3 - Question 2: Do you think the supporting assessments being carried out are sufficient for this sustainability appraisal?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
There are missing data for forecasting of waste and waste treatment methods.	8	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan production. The SA will be required to include predictions of the likely evolution of

		environmental, social and economic assets with and without policies in the plan. Waste technical papers and topic papers contain information on waste treatment methods, and are available as part of the plan evidence base at: <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> .
Specific technical information on environmental conditions (such as air pollution in the Vale of York) across certain parts of the plan area have not been included.	2	Meteorological conditions and effects on air pollution in the Vale of York have not been discussed in the sustainability appraisal. However, Air Quality Management Areas are listed in the Baseline document and an indicator on the number of AQMAs is included in the SA Framework alongside the SA sub objective 'Avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality where it could result in negative impacts on the health of future occupants/users'.
The condition of heather moorland and its decline should be more clearly stressed/discussed.	2	Comments noted. SSSI condition is assessed within the baseline information.
With regard to mitigation measures, there should be support for publically accessible recreation and attractions, not to private landowners.	1	Comments noted. Specific measures for mitigation will be considered in the Sustainability Report, however it is felt that the sub objective to SA objective 10 'to improve access to, and enjoyment of, the historic environment where appropriate' should allow for consideration of any need to avoid or mitigate for any potential conflicts with public access.
The sites and areas assessment methodology has not been drafted.	1	The consultation on this was carried out in summer 2013.
Missing analyses of future potential political trends.	1	The Defra 2011 waste policy review is included, in addition to the NPPF and PPS10 which contain government policies on waste management.
Supporting assessments are sufficient.	1	Comments noted, thank you.
There is missing information on the regional context of North Yorkshire and its neighbours.	1	For reasons for the maintenance of brevity the SA scope focussed on the plan area, while the wider evidence base to the plan considers interactions with elsewhere, particularly in the context of minerals and waste. However, we accept that sustainability impacts will arise out of this regional context so improved signposting to relevant sections of the plan's evidence base documents should help make it clear that there is a regional component to sustainability. The Yorkshire Dales is not part of the plan area, but will be treated in the same way as other adjoining authorities in

		this scoping report. The evidence base for the plan can be found at: <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> .
--	--	--

**Table 4 - Question 3: Do you agree with our review of plans, policies, programmes and initiatives (PPPSIs)? Are there any PPPSIs that we have not considered?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
There is too much information.	2	The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Government guidance on Sustainability Appraisal requires that all relevant plans, policies, programmes and initiatives at an international, European, national, regional and local scale that are relevant to the plan should be included. For a plan which is outlining minerals and waste development the list is comprehensive due to the many environmental, economic and social issues that this kind of development can influence. In order to maintain transparency in the Sustainability Appraisal process, the full list of PPPSIs that have been considered and included are listed within an appendix to the main report. However, the key messages from all of the PPPSIs considered are distilled down into a relatively short list within the main scoping report document, so that members of the public and consultees can see, more easily, the key issues that the Sustainability Objectives should be taking into account.
Broadly agree.	2	Comments noted, thank you.
Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment that has been carried out to support development plans should be included.	1	HRA will be carried out on the Joint Plan. AA will be carried out if needed.
The EU Habitats Directive and the Birds Directive have not been included in addition to the England Biodiversity Strategy.	1	The Habitats Directive and Birds Directive are included within the PPPSIs and in the baseline report. The England Biodiversity Strategy is referred to by its name 'Biodiversity 2020'.
The review of PPPSIs and the analysis is unclear.	1	The assessment must address a wide range of social, economic and environmental topics including those issues defined by the SEA Directive. While this leads to a lengthy list of PPPSIs it should be noted that only relevant objectives of this policy context are drawn out in the analysis. The evidence base for the Plan focuses more closely on minerals and waste (view the evidence base at: <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> ).



**Table 5 - Question 4: Do you agree with the key messages from the PPPSI review?**

<b>Response/General Comments Summary</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>	<b>SA Team Response</b>
The NPPF states that Local Plans should be developed with other authorities.	2	The district councils are not the minerals and waste planning authorities, although proposals are discussed with these councils. In addition, relevant local authority plans are included. Discussions and consultations are taking place with adjoining, and more distant where relevant, minerals and waste planning authorities.
Broadly agree.	2	Comments noted, thank you.
Economic viability is not included.	1	Comments noted. The key messages are based on evidence gathered from all relevant PPPSIs, including a number of economic PPPSIs.
Yes.	1	Comments noted, thank you.
Full public participation is a key issue.	1	There are more opportunities for the public and stakeholders to be consulted as the plan progresses. All views will be considered alongside Government policy.
Broadly agree, although some messages relating to protecting and enhancing biodiversity have not been included.	1	Comments noted. These will be included in the finalised scoping report. In the PPPSI review the Lawton Report is not specifically mentioned as this is taken forward as policy in Biodiversity 2020.
The review is not holistic or strategic.	1	Disagree. There is a holistic view for every topic covered within this review. Many PPPSI have targets, therefore we need to take all targets into account and these are synthesised in the key messages.

**Table 6 - Question 5: Do you think that we have gathered baseline information appropriate to the Plan Area?**

<b>Response/General Comments Summary</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>	<b>SA Team Response</b>
There are no forecasts for future trends.	4	The Sustainability Appraisal provides an assessment of the effects of the Joint Plan and alternatives to the Joint Plan that will be considered. As part of the Plan production, an analysis of trends and projections on minerals and waste issues will be made. The Sustainability Appraisal will then assess the Plan's proposed strategy (and alternative options) to meeting this demand. The evidence base for the plan will be informed by assessments of waste arisings and projections. Forecasting is being carried out as part of plan preparation.
There is a lot of information and it is	3	Comments noted. A non-technical summary

hard to know which bits are relevant.		is provided as part of this Sustainability Appraisal, although it is noted that this summary could go into further detail on the report in order for a lay member of the public to provide a reasoned view on the work carried out.
There are no specific climate data for local areas.	1	Air quality, in addition to health are included within the SA objectives. Reference to local climatic conditions has been added to the air quality section of the baseline.
Several area of the baseline data and information need to be updates (for example, the National Character Areas).	1	Comments noted, these will be updated.
Landscape-scale conservation initiatives are missing from the baseline.	1	Comments noted. These will be amended and included in the finalised scoping report.

**Table 7 - Question 6: Have we identified appropriate sustainability issues? Are there any other sustainability topics or issues we should consider?**

<b>Response/General Comments Summary</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>	<b>SA Team Response</b>
Flexibility in terms of future changing need should be an integral part of the Plan.	2	There will be an element of flexibility built into the plan.
The end products of waste treatment should be considered.	1	Decisions on process options/waste treatment, etc. will be made by the Joint Plan team (rather than suggested by the Sustainability Appraisal). However, the SA will evaluate the predicted effects of any proposed option in relation to this.
The full Bruntland definition of sustainability should be used.	1	This is used and referred to in section 3.1 of the scoping report.
There is no identification of the interaction between minerals and waste policy.	1	This work will be carried out as part of preparation of the Plan. However, it is recognised that greater links between minerals and waste could be made in objective 9 by including a sub objective 'Recognise and promote the value of waste streams as alternatives to primary mineral extraction'.
The issues are appropriate.	1	Comments noted, thank you.
The data need to be synthesised into a coherent spatial and temporal model.	1	It is not for the SA to propose a spatial and temporal model at this stage. Rather it is the plan itself which will decide upon the 'how and where'. The SA will critique and challenge the approach, and may propose alternative spatial/temporal approaches based on a bringing together of datasets. However, this is not possible until the appraisal of options commences. The evidence base for the Plan focuses more

		closely on minerals and waste (view the evidence base at: <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> ).
--	--	---

**Table 8 - Question 7: Do you agree with the sustainability objectives and sub-objectives? Can you think of any further indicators we should add to the SA framework?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
There are too many, and many of them are conflicting.	2	The intention of the Scoping Report (which formed this consultation) is to outline all the key issues relevant to sustainable development of minerals and waste sites across the Plan Area. The objectives list key outcomes which we should be aiming to achieve or not compromise as part of the Joint Plan. As indicated within the Scoping Report, some of these objectives conflict. The next stages of the Sustainability Appraisal will take into account alternative options for minerals and waste development and the extent to which each objective may, or may not be achieved under alternatives, or options. Inevitably, trade-offs will need to be made between objectives.
Yes, I agree with the objectives and sub-objectives.	1	Comments noted, thank you.
Protection and enhancement of natural environments should be applied beyond just conservation sites.	1	This is taken into account under sustainability objective number 1.
Broadly agree, although objective 10 needs a further sub-objective that protects locally/sub-regionally significant non-designated assets. In addition, objective 12 should recognise the relationship of minerals and waste operations with surrounding economic uses.	1	Comments noted. This will be amended to recognise regional and local heritage assets. In addition we agree that surrounding economic uses need to be recognised in objective 12.
Especially support the objectives, sub-objectives and indicators relating to biodiversity, habitat connectivity and creation of priority habitat. There should also be a sub-objective to promote the delivery of a net-gain in biodiversity.	1	Comments noted. These will be included in the finalised scoping report.
There are too many. In addition, there is no national, or regional justification of the need for minerals and waste provision.	1	Disagree. The SA objectives taken as a whole consider the sustainability of approaches taken by the plan makers as presented, and the SA has the capacity to develop and then assess alternative approaches that may show alternative ways of provision that may be more (or less) sustainable. This may include reliance on

		facilities in different locations or at different times, or at different scales that may or may not fit better with the environmental, social and economic objectives defined. The evidence base for the plan focusses more on minerals and waste and the needs and requirements for future developments and can be viewed at <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> .
--	--	--

**Table 9 - Question 8: Is there anything else we should consider when we assess options in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
The previous consultation has been ignored.	3	Input from earlier consultations carried out as part of the separate Minerals and Waste Core Strategies have been taken into account in developing the Issues and Options document. Responses to previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes Report.
District and adjoining authorities should be represented.	3	They are not minerals and waste planning authorities, but we work with them when the plan is developed.
Local focus and knowledge is missing.	1	Minerals and waste development is a strategic issue and therefore needs to be planned at a wider than local scale. However, local knowledge will be taken account of when the results of SA of proposed sites and areas of search are published.
Table 61 shows that protection and enhancement of biodiversity and enhancement of habitat connectivity will have a major positive benefit, however, it will only be successful if long-term management is carried out, therefore securing long-term management of newly created habitat is vital.	1	Comments noted. It should be noted that the table includes only an illustrative example, not an actual assessment. The effect on biodiversity due to the amount of site restoration carried out will be monitored as the Plan is implemented.

**Table 10 - Question 9: Is the approach we are taking to the consideration of alternative options appropriate?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
We cannot understand/it isn't clear how this is being carried out.	2	Section 7.1 outlines how alternatives will be considered, although we accept that this section is not clearly demarcated in the report. Options are being generated as part of the work on the plan. The SA can generate alternative options to those

		proposed by the plan, though these must be relevant and reasonable to the options presented. If relevant and reasonable, alternative distributions of minerals and waste facilities may be proposed.
There isn't much information on the options appraisal provided and Allerton Waste Recovery Park is not included.	1	Options will be appraised at the issues and options stage. Allerton Park cannot be considered as it already has planning permission.
The method is too simplistic.	1	The scoring system used in the SA follows best practice. However, scoring will be fully explained and supported by evidence, professional judgement and the topics papers.
The options that are rules out should be included and detail should be provided about why these have been rules out.	1	This will be included in the SA as part of the preferred options stage.
The approach is appropriate.	1	Comments noted, thank you.

**Table 11 - Question 10: Do you have any other comments on the scoping report?**

<b>Response/General Comments Summary</b>	<b>No. of Representations</b>	<b>SA Team Response</b>
There hasn't been enough time to analyse the information.	2	The statutory time for consultation is five weeks, although six weeks were allowed for this consultation.
There is no flexibility built into the assessment.	2	The plan will contain an element of flexibility.
There is too much information for members of the public to provide a view on the report.	1	Comment noted. A longer non-technical summary will be included to aid understanding.
There is no commitment to pause the planning permission given to Allerton Waste Recovery Park.	1	Allerton Park has already been given planning permission and cannot be reassessed as part of this process. Other waste infrastructure that is needed for the plan area will be considered as part of the SA.
We are in agreement with the aims of the document, but a balanced assessment of affordability and environmental costs should be made.	1	Objective 12 will provide balance to other objectives to ensure that addressing other objectives does not unnecessarily jeopardise sustainable economic growth.
Forecasting of future waste volumes has not been carried out.	1	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan and additional evidence is available in topic papers.
The previous consultation exercise has been ignored and the responses to this consulted pre-empted by awarding planning permission to Allerton Waste Recovery Park.	1	The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in this Consultation Outcomes document. It should be noted that, as the Plan Area changed with



		the inclusion of CYC and NYMNP, the consultation exercise had to be carried out again. The Joint Plan will set policies for consideration of future minerals and waste applications, the AWRP already has planning permission.
There hasn't been enough time to analyse the information.	1	Five weeks is the statutory time to be allowed for consultation. However, six weeks were allowed for this consultation exercise.
You need to clarify that it is the Mineral Planning Authorities and not the Local Planning Authorities as detailed in the baseline report.	1	Comments noted. Amendments have been made.
There is too much information that does not matter to the development of the Plan.	1	Relevant evidence for minerals and waste development, which will inform the policies, is set out within the evidence base for the plan which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> . The data for the Sustainability Appraisal outlines the current conditions across the Plan area, and future monitoring will detect any deterioration or improvement in any of the sustainability objectives.

### 3.2 Other Consultation Responses

Tables 12-14: Summary of types of responses to questions 4 and 5 of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Regulation 18 questionnaire. Table 15 details all other responses that were made to the consultation.

**Table 12 – Responses to the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan comments form: Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to Sustainability Appraisal as set out in the summary leaflet and the scoping report?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
Waste incineration is not sustainable/objection to Allerton Waste Recovery Park.	18	The sustainability of site allocations will be assessed against 17 SA objectives to give a rounded view of the sustainability of different options for waste management.  Allerton Park has already been granted planning permission and will therefore not be considered as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan.
The Waste Hierarchy should be considered/waste should be minimised.	13	The waste hierarchy is taken into account within objective 9. Other objectives (e.g. on climate change) should help differentiate between more or less sustainable options that operate at the same level on the waste hierarchy.

Development management issues highlighted (such as site screening/landscaping, restoration plans, etc.).	8	Development management issue – this has been passed over to the plan team.
There is too much information and the documents are too long/excessive.	3	Comments noted. A non-technical summary is provided as part of this Sustainability Appraisal, although it is noted that this summary could go into further detail on the report in order for a lay member of the public to provide a reasoned view on the work carried out. It should be noted that the intention of the Scoping Report is to provide an overview of how the Sustainability Appraisal process will be carried out, but does not provide information or assessment on options, sites and policies - this will be provided within the Sustainability Report, which will be produced and consulted on in due course.
Transport (lorries) should be routed away from settlements.	2	A site assessment methodology to appraise the siting of minerals and waste development, which will include possible transport links, is currently being drafted and will be consulted upon in due course. The scoping report also includes an objective for sustainable transport and an objective for the reduction of the causes of climate change. Sites, options and policies will all be assessed against these objectives.
The Water Framework Directive should be taken into account.	2	Minerals and waste policies will be assessed on their effect on surface and groundwater, as set out in the SA framework.
The environmental sensitivity of Source Protection Zones and the public water supply is a concern.	2	The location of sites within areas of particular environmental sensitivity will be taken account of within the site assessment methodology.
The Plan will need to be flexible.	2	The Plan will contain an element of flexibility.
The approach is sound.	1	Comments noted.
Local considerations must be made.	1	The SA will be informed by published literature and professional judgement. In addition, the site assessment methodology that is currently being developed will take account of local circumstances and will feed into the wider sustainability appraisal.
Support for the enhancement or maintenance of water quality and improvement of water use efficiency objective.	1	Comments noted.
The appraisal should identify local provision of material.	1	Comments noted. All sites, options and policies within the Joint Plan will be assessed against all sustainability objectives outlined within the scoping report. Local

		provision is supported by the SA objectives.
Low carbon public transport would be valuable in a predominantly rural county.	1	The SA framework supports low carbon public transport, but this will be covered in more detail in local transport plans.
The Yorkshire Water 'Water Resource Plan' would be a suitable addition to the PPPSIs.	1	Comment noted. The Plan was included in the PPPSI but this has been updated to reflect the latest position.
Objective 2 (Prevent unsustainable levels of ground and surface water abstraction) is invalid as the Environment Agency regulate this issue.	1	This is reflecting the need to make sure that this is taken account of strategically and from the outset.
Support of objective 6 (Maximise the generation and use of renewable energy in appropriate locations).	1	Comments noted.
Support of sub-objective 'recover residual resources'.	1	Comments noted.
Suggest that a sub-objective relating to the promotion of sustainable drainage is included.	1	Promotion of SUDS for future development is included in objective 16. There is limited capacity to influence existing development.
Emphasis should be placed on re-using, reducing and recycling waste, in addition to local composting.	1	We recognise the need to move up the waste hierarchy, which is included in objective 9.
Sustainability Appraisal should take a balanced approach.	1	A balance between social, environmental and economic aspects of alternatives will be made.
Natural England's opinion should be sought on any proposed site from the outset to avoid sites with high environmental value being included in the Joint Plan.	1	Agreed and comments noted.
The Sustainability Appraisal should consider costs in addition to minimising waste produced.	1	Where developments are publically funded, costs are considered alongside the SA in addition to consultation outcomes. Most minerals and waste developments are privately financed. The waste hierarchy is taken into account in the production of the Plan, although we do have to assume a certain level of waste will be produced (this work is being carried out). Documents will all be consulted on, in due course.
Sustainable development should meet human needs and preserve the environment.	1	Comments noted. This is reflected within the SA objectives.
The Plan should aim to produce zero amount of waste.	1	The Plan can promote reductions in the volumes of waste produced, but it must also acknowledge that there must be a method in place to deal with any residual waste that arises. The SA Framework seeks to promote management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable,
The appraisal should identify local provision of material.	1	Comments noted. All sites, options and policies within the Joint Plan will be

		assessed against all sustainability objectives outlined within the scoping report. Local provision is supported by the SA objectives.
Low carbon public transport would be valuable in a predominantly rural county.	1	The SA framework supports low carbon public transport, but this will be covered in more detail in local transport plans.
The Yorkshire Water 'Water Resource Plan' would be a suitable addition to the PPPSIs.	1	Comment noted. The Plan was included in the PPPSI but this has been updated to reflect the latest position.
Objective 2 (Prevent unsustainable levels of ground and surface water abstraction) is invalid as the Environment Agency regulate this issue.	1	This is reflecting the need to make sure that this is taken account of strategically and from the outset.
Support of objective 6 (Maximise the generation and use of renewable energy in appropriate locations).	1	Comments noted.
Support of sub-objective 'recover residual resources'.	1	Comments noted.
Suggest that a sub-objective relating to the promotion of sustainable drainage is included.	1	Promotion of SUDS for future development is included in objective 16. There is limited capacity to influence existing development.
Emphasis should be placed on re-using, reducing and recycling waste, in addition to local composting.	1	We recognise the need to move up the waste hierarchy, which is included in objective 9.
Sustainability Appraisal should take a balanced approach.	1	A balance between social, environmental and economic aspects of alternatives will be made.
Natural England's opinion should be sought on any proposed site from the outset to avoid sites with high environmental value being included in the Joint Plan.	1	Agreed and comments noted.
The Sustainability Appraisal should consider costs in addition to minimising waste produced.	1	Where developments are publically funded, costs are considered alongside the SA in addition to consultation outcomes. Most minerals and waste developments are privately financed. The waste hieracrhy is taken into account in the production of the Plan, although we do have to assume a certain level of waste will be produced (this work is being carried out). Documents will all be consulted on, in due course.
Sustainable development should meet human needs and preserve the environment.	1	Comments noted. This is reflected within the SA objectives.
The Plan should aim to produce zero amount of waste.	1	The Plan can promote reductions in the volumes of waste produced, but it must also acknowledge that there must be a method in place to deal with any residual waste that arises. The SA Framework seeks to promote mangement of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable,

The production of hazardous waste should be taken into account.	1	This will be taken into account under sustainability objectives numbers 4 &15.
The Sustainability Appraisal should assess affects on the environment.	1	The sustainability objectives take all relevant environmental effects into account.
Some minerals are clearly running out. We should be looking for alternatives which are less damaging to the climate, the environment, and to human and animal life.	1	Sustainability objective number 8 covers this issue.
Supports the sub-objectives	1	Comments noted.
Objection to fracking within the County.	1	The sustainability objectives are designed to assess the effects of all types of minerals and waste development. All assessment will be evidence based, drawing on published studies and professional judgement.
The Plan should aim to enhance the environment.	1	This may be carried out through restoration plans and is considered under objective number 1.
Public engagement should be a priority of the Council.	1	Comments noted.
The Plan should make contributions to all objectives as well as conservation and renewable energy.	1	These issues are covered under the sub-objectives.
More attention should be given to the recycling of plastics.	1	This is considered as part of sustainability objective 9, and objective 17, which supports 'community led waste management schemes'.
Carbon costs of waste transport should be considered.	1	Carbon emissions are taken into account under sustainability objective number 6. In addition, this is more of a waste management issue, rather than a planning issue.
SA objectives: Number 2 - add in word 'supply' to read 'Enhance or maintain water quality and supply...'; Number 3 - add in word 'impact' to read 'Reduce transport impact and reduce...'; Number 5 - add in word 'environmental to read 'Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance environmental quality'; Number 6 - add in 'low carbon economy' to read 'Reduce the causes of climate change and move to a low carbon economy'.	1	It is felt that the additional wording to objective 5 is not necessary as other objectives seek to safeguard environmental quality. Similarly, a low carbon economy is supported by objective 12. Objective 2 - While water supply is not explicitly referred to, it is felt that 'efficiency of water use', referred to in the objective, will protect supply. However, the point does highlight that supply of water could be better protected - for instance by protecting groundwater source protection zones, which may be disrupted by inappropriate development. Therefore an additional sub objective 'protect groundwater source protection zones' should be added. Objective 3 - impact is covered under objective 15.
The economic, social and environmental priorities should be set out after	1	Comments noted. There will be three further rounds of consultation on the plan (Issues



consultation.		and Options, Preferred Options and Publication) and a Sustainability Report will be produced at each stage.
Welcome the approach to evaluating the robustness of the SA objectives.	1	Comments noted. The compatibility matrix will be reviewed as part of the finalised scoping report.
More detail should be added to the objective that seeks to use soil and land efficiently to ensure high standards of reclamation and appropriate afteruse.	1	The Plan will set out policies relating to reclamation and restoration of sites. The sub-objectives are sufficient to assess whether restoration policies will contribute to the SA objective. Restoration itself isn't a sustainability objective - though the existing sub objective 'promote good land management practices on restored land' should encompass the points made.
Habitats Regulations Assessment should be carried out in order to inform the Sustainability Appraisal.	1	Agree. Work has recently commenced on the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Joint Plan and efforts will be made to share evidence base information between the SA and HRA while keeping the two processes separate.
A BAP habitat opportunities report produced in 2009 by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust should be included.	1	Comments noted. The report will be considered during the literature review preceding assessment /appraisal work and [consider adding to PPPSI]
We are satisfied with the approach to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	1	Comments noted.
The Humber River Basin Management Plan should be specifically referred to.	1	Comments noted. The Humber River Basin management Plan is referred to within the PPPSIs.
We welcome objective 7 on enhancing biodiversity.	1	Comments noted.
General: Sustainability Appraisal Scoping - Appendix 1 – suggested amendments: 3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation. Add as sub objective: encourage beneficial use of waste near to site of production or treatment. Reason: excessive transport costs can make reuse/recovery of waste uneconomic.	1	Agree. The sub objectives already includes "Encourage proximity between minerals and waste sites and sources". However, it is accepted that it may be unclear as to what the scope of this sub objective is. Therefore, an explanatory footnote will be added to clarify the sub objective, and in particular the beneficial uses to which both traditional and non-traditional end products of waste processing can be put when users exist nearby. .
Objective 4 - Protect and improve air quality. Add as sub objective: consider potential for odour effects on existing communities. Reason: Unpleasant odours from waste facilities are one of the most common causes for public complaint, and have a detrimental effect on amenity.	1	Partly agree. The existing sub objective 'to minimise dust and odour' would cover the point made. However, it does not identify specific receptors to odour, which may result in variance in significance. Reword the sub objective to "to minimise dust and odour, particularly where communities or other receptor may be affected".
Objective 5 - Use soil and land efficiently	1	This is too detailed an action to be included

and safeguard or enhance their quality. Add as sub objective: Ensure when biodegradable waste is spread to land it has a beneficial effect. Reason: Spreading inappropriate wastes to land can cause damage to soil and water.		as a sub-objective and for assessing policies of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan and is covered more broadly by 'promote good land management practices on restored land'
Objective 8 - Minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding. Add as sub objective: Encourage sustainable construction techniques so as to reduce resource use in all building. Because: These principles can be applied to all construction.	1	Agree. The sub objective will be added as 'Encourage the utilisation of sustainable construction techniques'.
Objective 9 - Minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable. Add as sub objective: Ensure all infrastructure is designed and built so as to maximise opportunities for segregation and collection of recyclables, e.g. Adequate space for bin storage, home composting etc. Because: Ease of collection makes recycling more cost effective.	1	This suggestion is a policy rather than a sustainability objective or sub-objective.
We welcome the inclusion of objective 12 on achieving sustainable economic growth.	1	Comments noted.
15. Protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities. Suggestions: Could this be widened to include all potential detrimental impacts on amenity and wellbeing. There is no specific mention of the potential for odour which we have found to be an important factor in whether a waste facility is acceptable to its near neighbours.	1	Odour is already mentioned under SA objective 4 - however we accept that it can have impacts on quality of life, so we will include odour as an example of a nuisance impact in the first sub objective, i.e.: "To minimise the impact of nuisances associated with minerals and waste development, such as noise pollution, odour and severance'.
We welcome the approach taken to underpinning the Plan with sustainable development principles.	1	Comments noted.
The Sustainability Appraisal does not include the nature and need for sub-regional and national waste processing.	1	Comments noted/agree in part. It is not for the sustainability appraisal of this plan to favour any one particular waste management technology (or set of technologies) over any others. Rather its role is to appraise the overall approach to planning for waste management in the plan area. The Material Assets section of the baseline of the scoping report considers broad details of waste managed within the plan area and the SA Framework promotes waste as a potential resource through, for example, the SA Sub

		objective 'recover residual resources (e.g. through anaerobic digestion or energy recovery)'. However, the point made suggests that there may be merit in including some broad information on the potential of all waste types (not any particular individual waste types) as a resource for a range of usable products, accepting that data may be limited, as well as some discussion on likely sources of wastes for processing to usable products. Further consideration of the sustainability of sourcing waste for usable products at a local to sub regional / regional level should also be considered in the scope and prior to the assessment of options.
Economic viability should be considered in the sites and areas assessment methodology.	1	Comments noted. The site assessment methodology will include assessment of the viability of sites with the aim of aiding the allocation of only viable sites. As part of this a number of additional factors such as access to the road network and the potential for complementary location will be considered. It also will / does consider the need for sufficient sites to support the identified need for different waste management processes.
Economic viability is not considered.	1	This isn't relevant to the appraisal as most development will be commercially financed.
Previous comments on the Waste Core Strategy consultation have been ignored.	1	Responses to previous consultations carried out by NYCC on the Core Strategies have been considered in drawing up the Issues and Options document. The SA scoping report as presented has been informed by the sustainability appraisal work that has preceded it in all three partner planning authorities. While it is hoped that the core elements of those SA documents are retained (and appendix IV shows the headline SA objectives arrived at through consultation in previous consultation rounds which were reviewed ahead of this work), inevitably a changed plan scope and geographical area will lead to adjustments in the approach taken to this new sustainability appraisal. Previous SA consultation comments will be taken into account and this will be documented in the SA Consultation Outcomes report.
Broad support of the SA objectives, although more rigour should be applied to reducing greenhouse gases.	1	Comments noted. This is taken into account under sustainability objective 6.
A sub-objective should be added to	1	Add to sub-objective under objective 9?

assess how both the minerals and waste frameworks contribute to resource efficiency improvements and the circular economy.		(Economic gain through re-use?)
Options for job creation via Community Interest Companies and charities should be considered.		Agree. CICs and charities can play an important role in waste management and are already supported by the sub objective to 17 'to support community led waste management schemes'. The existing SA framework contains sub objectives that seek to reduce the need for transport.
Objective 5 on soil quality should encompass improving the water and carbon retention of soils (to prevent flooding and sequester carbon to prevent CO2 reaching the atmosphere) and reducing topsoil lost to wind and water erosion by ensuring particles are heavier so less easy to blow away.	1	This is too detailed an objective to be specified within the SA - we cover broad objectives and sub-objectives here and have to include only measurable indicators through which success of the Plan is measured. It should be noted that the sub objective 'conserve and enhance soil resources and quality' would cover this in a broader sense.
Waste should be dealt with close to the producers of that waste so that they can see the results of waste production.	1	For this issue, the Proximity Principle in PPS10 is used, along with consultations carried out as part of the Plan and the accompanying SA.
Impact on landscape character should be taken into account.	1	Landscape Character Assessment will inform the site assessment methodology, which will be consulted on in due course. 'Reading the Past in Today's Landscape: North Yorkshire, York and Lower Tees Valley Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC)' will be added to the PPPs
Care must be taken to ensure that acknowledge that mineral development can only take place in areas where the mineral quality and resource scale are of sufficient scale to merit development. For new workings a resource of over 1.5 million tonnes is generally required to justify the capital costs of the planning process and site development costs.	1	Will depend on outcome of site submission.
Greenhouse gas emissions should be stressed as a key element to consider.	1	Sustainability objective 6 takes this into account.
Supports the objectives.	1	Comments noted.
We should aim for a zero-carbon footprint.	1	Sustainability objective 6 takes this into account.
There is a need to ensure that the Plan does not contravene the SA.	1	The SA will inform the final Plan.
The SA should take into account the impact on rural industries.	1	?
Issues of significant air pollution exist in Knaresborough.	1	Issues of significant air pollution exist in Knaresborough.

Is the objective that seeks to encourage sustainable transport valid in terms of minerals and waste planning?	1	Comments noted. The SA and Site Identification Methodology should pick this issue up for future planned sites.
Support the objectives, yet several conflict with each other.	1	Some of the objectives will conflict, and the extent to which will become clear as the Sustainability Appraisal is taken forward. Uncertainty between competing objectives and their compatibility is also shown in the scoping report. It is recognised that not all objectives will be optimised; however, the extent to which objectives are achieved under different alternatives or options will be clearly stated within the Sustainability Report.

**Table 13 – Responses to the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan comments form: Do you have any other comments?**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
Objection to Allerton Waste Recovery Park development.	5	Allerton Park has already been given planning permission and will not be a focus of assessment in this SA.
Needless expansion is detrimental to the landscape and environment.	2	Comments noted.
Restoration of the landscape should be a priority.	2	Development management issue – this has been passed to the planning team.
The site specific details required to assess sites will be too difficult to assess in some cases.	1	Sites put forward will provide this information.
There needs to be an element of flexibility integrated into the Plan.	1	The plan will need to be flexible - this has been passed to the plan team.
Quarry sites submitting plans to extend must only be able to do so if they have exhausted the mineral deposits.	1	A certain level of mineral reserves will need to be maintained.
Objection to fracking in North Yorkshire due to the economic impact on visitor attractions.	1	Sustainability objective 12 covers economic issues. Any fracking policies would be considered by this and the wider SA Framework.

**Table 14 – All other comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.**

Response/General Comments Summary	No. of Representations	SA Team Response
The Minerals and Waste Plan team should take a strategic view of all Minerals and Waste projects across the area covered by this plan and facilitate collaborative working between the two	2	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.



streams i.e. minerals and waste.		
The Humber River Basin Management Plan should be taken into account.	2	Agree. The Humber River Basin Management Plan is explicitly referred to in the review of PPPSI.
Development management issue regarding restoration processes highlighted.	1	These are detailed development management considerations that can only be considered by the Plan and not the SA. These comments will be passed over to the Plan team.
Selection of sites should be carried out with full public involvement.	1	The public will be consulted on at all stages of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The public will also be consulted as the Plan progresses.
Re-use of products, especially by-products is of utmost importance.		The SA objective 8 should include a sub objective that recognises the value of secondary mineral resources - ie 'promote the use of secondary and recycled minerals resources where they can play a role in reducing the need for primary minerals extraction'. This is also an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
The Minerals and Waste Plan team should take a strategic view of all Minerals and Waste projects across the area covered by this plan and facilitate collaborative working between the two streams i.e. minerals and waste.	1	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
Can the Minerals and Waste Plan team influence schemes put forward by private companies where they are not in the interest of local communities?	1	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
The Minerals and Waste Plan team should take a strategic view of all Minerals and Waste projects across the area covered by this plan and facilitate collaborative working between the two streams ie minerals and waste.	1	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
There are a number of voids in the area which need to be filled and also a number of coal mines with large amounts of colliery spill that have nowhere to tip this.	1	This is an issue for the plan team to consider in planning for facilities.
We would like to be involved in further rounds of consultation.	1	Consultees who have expressed an interest in the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan will be updated as the Plan progresses.
Add the following sub-objective: 'Encourage the reuse or adaptation of existing buildings'.	1	This is generally covered by the objectives, but will also be passed to the plan team.
Add the following indicator, 'Number of existing buildings adapted or reused'.	1	Numer of buildings reused for waste purposes will be very low, this is more of a LDF/LP indicator.

<p>If the SA objective relating to the historic environment is repetitive. Change to: 'Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings'.</p>	1	Noted, will be changed.
<p>The term 'landmark' monuments should be removed from the assessment framework.</p>	1	Noted, this will be removed.
<p>A sub-objective should be added that recognises the historic importance of York.</p>	1	A sub-objective to protect the setting of York will be added to this objective.
<p>None of the indicators will monitor to impact that the policies will have on the historic environment.</p>	1	The site assessment methodology, which will assess the sustainability implications of all sites allocated as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan, will document the number of designated heritage sites that are affected by minerals and waste development. These issues will also be addressed through monitoring later in the SA process.
<p>Add the indicator: 'Number of minerals or waste developments impacting upon the elements identified as contributing to the special character or setting of York'.</p>	1	Reference to York will be included within the first sub-objective of objective number 10. The impacts on historic assets of York should be considered in line with historic assets across the rest of the Plan Area. These issues will also be addressed through monitoring later in the SA process.
<p>The indicator detailing the number of visits to historic sites should be deleted as it provides little useful information.</p>	1	This indicator can also provide information about tourism in the Plan Area, so will be included for these purposes. Indicators for monitoring the effects of the Plan will be established later in the SA process.
<p>A sub-objective relating to ensuring a steady supply of local stone should be included within the framework.</p>	1	Comments noted - the sub-objective and indicator will be added.
<p>English Heritage advises that conservation and archaeological staff at the authorities are closely involved in the SA process.</p>	1	Conservation and archaeological staff will be consulted on drafts of SA reports during drafting and through the site assessment methodology process.
<p>The Plan should take account of the Waste Hierarchy.</p>	1	Comments noted. This is reflected within SA objective 9.
<p>The approach to call for sites is welcomed, as is the sustainability appraisal.</p>	1	Comments noted.
<p>The statement, "Water quality is generally good with the main reasons for poor quality linked with agricultural farming practices" should be removed, or justification provided.</p>	1	To check.
<p>Restoration schemes should avoid infilling of quarry voids in order to protect groundwater.</p>	1	The specific types of restoration will be considered/developed by the Plan and not the SA. However the SA will help ensure that any schemes proposed are in line with

		environmental good practice.
The main documents associated with groundwater are all captured.	1	Comments noted.
The Humber River Basin Management Plan should be taken into account.	1	The Humber RBMP is taken into account specifically within the report and PPPSIs. Water bodies affected by the Plan are taken into account within sustainability objective number 2.
Issues surrounding siting of development and Groundwater Protection Zones should be taken into account.	1	These issues will be explicitly taken into account as part of the site assessment methodology, which will be consulted on in due course.
The sustainability issues identified are not relevant.	1	Comments noted. The issues that are mentioned are all sustainability issues that are relevant to the Plan area and have been identified by the SA scoping report already. The objectives are based on sustainability issues that are relevant to the Plan area and have been developed by taking into account data on the current condition across the Plan area (in the Baseline) and also any published plans, policies, programmes or initiatives. The policies in the Plan will be assessed against SA objectives but must also take forward national policy relating to waste management and facilitating the supply of minerals.

## 4 Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Workshops Outcomes

In order to provide core technical stakeholders with an early opportunity to get involved in the preparation of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan, two technical consultation events were organised to focus on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, specifically the draft sustainability appraisal objectives, sub-objectives and indicators, as well as the draft site assessment methodology.

The first event took place on Friday, 7th June, 2013 at the City Of York Council offices, and was attended by 6 stakeholders. The second event took place on Wednesday, 12<sup>th</sup> June at North Yorkshire County Council's offices and was attended by 8 stakeholders. There were 2 sessions held in each workshop. Session 1 focused on discussion of the sustainability appraisal objectives, sub-objectives and indicators in facilitated groups (the details of which are provided within appendix 3) in order to gauge whether the relevant issues had been taken into account. Different groups focussed on different sections of the social, economic, environmental and cross cutting SA objectives. Session 2 focussed on the site and areas assessment methodology. In this exercise, the delegates were split into two groups – one group focussed on the assessment of a proposed minerals site and the other the assessment of a proposed waste site. Each group used the draft site assessment methodology in order to determine whether the methodology was sufficient in order to make a comprehensive assessment of each site, and if not, additional and/or revised measures were suggested by participants.

The results of both workshop sessions from both events are detailed in appendices 2 and 3, as stated above. The outcomes of the workshops include the revised sustainability appraisal framework (please see appendix 4) and also input to the site and areas assessment methodology. The consultation of the draft site and areas assessment methodology took place from 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2013 to 16<sup>th</sup> September, 2013<sup>3</sup>. The consultation responses and workshop comments received during the consultation period and workshop events are currently being taken into account and a final Site Identification and Methodology Report will be published in due course.

---

<sup>3</sup> See the Site Identification and Assessment Methodology here: [northyorks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=25564&p=0](http://northyorks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=25564&p=0).

## **5 Outcomes of the 2011 North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Consultation**

During the summer of 2011, North Yorkshire County Council consulted on a suite of documents to inform the preparation of both the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies. The following documents related to the SA formed part of that consultation:

1. Minerals Interim Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report;
2. Waste Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report; and,
3. Waste Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment Methodology.

These documents were issued for consultation for 10 weeks from Monday 25th July to Friday 30th September, 2011. In addition to the consultation on the scoping documents, a consultation event was organised to focus on the Waste Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, specifically the draft sustainability appraisal objectives, sub-objectives and indicators on Monday, 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2011 at the North Yorkshire County Council premises at County Hall, Northallerton. There were 2 sessions held. Session 1 focused on the key issues and opportunities associated with waste, while Session 2 allowed delegates to discuss the Sustainability appraisal's objectives, sub-objectives and indicators in facilitated groups.

Following this consultation, all comments received on the Minerals Interim Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, the Waste Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, the Waste Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment were analysed. In addition to this, comments received during the Waste Sustainability Appraisal Workshop were also analysed and several sustainability objectives and their associated sub-objectives and indicators were altered to reflect these comments.



## 6 Conclusions

Following the period of consultation, all comments received on the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and the comments received on the sustainability appraisal framework from the two workshop events have been analysed. This has resulted in several of the sustainability objectives, sub-objectives and draft indicators being altered and/or added to, to reflect these comments, and the finalised framework can be seen within appendix 4 of this report. The amended objectives will be used during the appraisal stages to guide the assessment of each policy option.

A number of comments raised in relation to Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report documents were considered by the SA team. A number of changes have been made to the three documents that formed the Scoping Report (the main report, the baseline data and information and the appendices volume of the report) based on these comments. The SA team have taken the opportunity to update the SA document where data has been superseded since publication (for instance in the baseline data and in the list of Plans, Policies, Programmes, Strategies and Initiatives).

A final check on the wording of the consultation documents was made and minor amendments to wording to clarify grammar and wording. This check also noted any inconsistencies in wording after the changes were made, and the addition of some further information of how data in indicators is to be collated.

All changes to the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping documents have been incorporated into a revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

## Appendix 1: Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Consultation Outcomes

A response form specific to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was produced for feedback. In addition, consultees had the option to respond to a question on the Regulation 18 response questionnaire (produced by the Joint Minerals and Waste Planning Team) and could also submit general comments by other means. The statutory consultee comments are highlighted within the tables and the comments from other organisations and members of the public are coded in order to protect individuals' identities. The responses are detailed below, in order of question number. In addition, the bottom section of this table details all the comments that were not submitted as part of the questionnaires.

Respondent	Comments	SA Team Response
<b>Question 1: Do you agree with the general approach we are taking towards sustainability appraisal?</b>		
SA01	Provided that conclusions are based on current sustainability appraisal in the light of current opportunities / situations etc. and not historic commitments (e.g. AWRP incinerator at Allerton Park)	Comments noted. This sustainability appraisal is a new appraisal. Although a limited amount of information has been taken from previous sustainability appraisal work, the assessment work that will be carried out will be an entirely new and original exercise, undertaken against a new set of SA objectives, informed by a new baseline for a new plan area. There is no obligation to repeat any historical assessment findings. The plan will not be reassessing AWRP.
SA13	No. You fail to explain why the earlier NYCC exercise was abandoned in 2011. You fail to include the recommendations from the Stakeholder Meeting held in Northallerton in October 2011.	Responses will be included in consultation outcomes report.
SA13	You should use the full Brundtland definition of sustainability.	This is included in section 3.1
SA13	You omit considering the importance of not pre-empting choices for future generations.	The SA will enable informed decisions to be made in determining future provision for minerals and waste development up to 2030.
SA13	You do not consider the impact of likely demographic, behavioural and technological change on volumes of waste and rates of recycling.	This will be considered through the waste evidence work being produced for the Plan
SA13	Your assumption that NYCC already has valid waste and recycling forecasts is not substantiated.	This will be considered through the waste evidence work being produced for the Plan
SA13	You do not set out the way your conclusions will be submitted to public consultation for further consideration.	Sustainability appraisal update reports will be consulted upon prior to a consultation on the Sustainability Report
SA13	You have not allowed sufficient time for this consultation.	Five weeks is the standard period for consultation on the SA scoping report (six weeks were allowed for

		this consultation).
SA14	No. It omits an objective of getting the best value for money among the objectives.	Publically funded development costs are considered alongside the SA and consultations. In addition, most minerals and waste developments are privately financed.
SA14	In our current economic situation of austerity the cost of the Joint Plan is critical and we should choose solutions that balance sustainability objectives with pragmatism.	Publically funded development costs are considered alongside the SA and consultations. However, minerals developments are privately funded. Objective 12 will provide balance to other objectives to ensure that addressing other objectives does not unnecessarily jeopardise sustainable economic growth (a pragmatic approach).
SA14	We should choose the best options available within budget constraints.	Publically funded development costs are considered alongside the SA and consultations. AWRP has already been awarded planning permissions, and minerals development is privately funded. Most minerals and waste developments are privately financed.
SA14	If there are cheaper solutions providing equal or better outcomes they should be chosen.	Publically funded development costs are considered alongside the SA and consultations. AWRP has already been awarded planning permissions, and minerals development is privately funded. Most minerals and waste developments are privately financed.
SA14	It might be an idea to indicate in the plan what is best and what is chosen and why. The why element of the answer will usually be affordability. Then we (the stakeholders) would have a clear understanding of the choices made in the Plan.	The SA will give a clear indication of the relative merits of different options as they pertain to sustainability
SA14	Secondly we do not see anything about flexibility and the ability to respond to changing priorities and new demands.	This issue will be addressed within the plan.
SA14	It is quite possible that new environmental risks are identified, new political policies developed, new taxes imposed (e.g. a carbon tax) so whatever choices are made they should allow for change.	This issue will be addressed within the plan, which will need to include an element of flexibility.
SA14	Thirdly we believe that gaps identified in this report, particularly with respect to waste volumes, forecasts and treatment technologies should be added and issued for public scrutiny before we can be happy towards the general approach.	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan.

SA15	a. No. You have not properly explained why the earlier NYCC exercise was abandoned in 2011 or why the recommendations from the Stakeholder Meeting held in Northallerton in October 2011 were ignored by NYCC.	The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes document. The SA builds upon recommendations made in previous SA related consultations
SA15	b. You should use the full internationally accepted Brundtland Commission definition of sustainable development, as adopted in UN Resolution 42/187. This is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".	This is used in section 3.1.
SA15	c. You fail to consider the importance of not pre-empting choices for future generations, something that is clearly demanded by the Brundtland definition.	The Sustainability Framework builds upon the Brundtland definition and sustainability issues derived from a wide range of plans and baseline data. Therefore the SA objectives and sub objectives should be seen as a more detailed set of goals to achieve sustainable development within the specific plan area. Together they aim to meet present generation's needs without constraining the ability of future generations to enjoy a similar or improved quality of life.
SA15	d. You do not consider the impact of likely demographic, societal, behavioural and technological change on volumes of waste and rates of re-use and recycling.	These assessments for future waste arisings are currently being carried out.
SA15	e. You wrongly assume that NYCC already has valid waste and recycling forecasts. The reality is that they are already largely discredited. You should recognise that the future is inherently uncertain and adopt one of the established techniques for dealing with such uncertainty.	These assessments for future waste arisings are currently being carried out.
SA15	f. You do not set out the way your conclusions will be submitted to public consultation for further consideration.	There will be three more rounds of consultation during appraisal of the Plan. These will be at the Issues and Options, Preferred Options and Publication stages of the Plan preparation.
SA15	g. You have not allowed sufficient time for this consultation.	The statutory time for consultation is five weeks, although six weeks were allowed for this consultation.
SA18	The joint plan is an opportunity to aim for enhancement of environments rather than simply sustainability through appropriately directed	This may be carried out through restoration plans and is assessed across a number of SA objectives.

	coordination and management of environmental issues.	
SA19	The joint plan is an opportunity to aim for enhancement of environments rather than simply sustainability through appropriately directed coordination and management of environmental issues.	This is taken into account under sustainability objective number 1.
SA22	The Sustainability Appraisal appears to be generally consistent with the SA Regulations and requirements.	Comments noted.
SA23	Yes. In particular the RSPB supports: Draft Objective 1 (p.3) – Protect and enhance biodiversity ... and improve habitat connectivity.	Comments noted.
SA34	i. The general approach is very formulaic and follows exhaustively a set of local, national and international requirements. We think you could be more direct about the key issues that face sustainability appraisal in the context of the specific issues that surround minerals and waste, instead of a catch-all approach that seeks to assess everything.	This is the requirement of SEA and SA, whose approach we must follow.
SA34	ii. The appraisal notes in its summary that the quality of the landscape, our wildlife and historic assets are most significant. That being the case, you must ensure that you have the correct tools to quantify the value of these different assets.	We have used nationally available indicators where possible and also data relating to the Plan Area from the relevant authorities in order to measure the impact on these assets.
SA34	iii. You use, quite rightly, the World Bank definition of sustainability (then needlessly go on to recite other, more recent definitions). If this is the central plank of your approach, then you have to think harder about how you will actually define the needs of the present, and also demonstrate that by doing something today, you will not be stopping future generations making their own decisions. This is a very difficult thing to do and something that you come no-where near in the present document. You should think carefully about precisely how you are going to ensure that your Plan conforms to the preferred definition of sustainability. By the time one has read this document, the original definition has been lost.	The variety of definitions of sustainability are all relevant to this SA. It should be recognised that we must make some decisions now regarding future development of minerals and waste, taking into account the most sustainable options for future generations.
<b>Question 2: Do you think the supporting assessments being carried out are sufficient for this sustainability appraisal?</b>		
SA01	No mention that high quality farmland in Vale of York is susceptible to contamination from nanoparticles in air because of area's tendency to be misty and foggy with limited air circulation.	Meteorological conditions and effects on air pollution in the Vale of York have not been discussed in the sustainability appraisal.
SA01	No mention of routes used by mineral/waste transfer should not aggravate air quality in AQM areas.	Air Quality Management Areas are listed in the Baseline document and an indicator on the number of AQMAs is included in the SA Framework alongside the SA sub objective 'Avoid locating development in areas of existing



		poor air quality where it could result in negative impacts on the health of future occupants/users'.
SA01	Mitigation measures, improvement of support for heritage sites should be where there is reasonable public access - not just to improve private estates for private landowners who do not give public access.	Comments noted. Specific measures for mitigation will be considered in the Sustainability Report, however it is felt that the sub objective to SA objective 10 'to improve access to, and enjoyment of, the historic environment where appropriate' should allow for consideration of any need to avoid or mitigate for any potential conflicts with public access.
SA13	No, there is a lack of forecast for waste arisings and recycling volumes.	Forecasting is being carried out as part of plan preparation.
SA13	No, there is a lack of analysis of alternative waste treatment systems available to drive waste treatment up the hierarchy. The vertical segments of the hierarchy should be subdivided to show that thermal MBT and similar systems are more environmentally friendly than Incineration and EFW.	The standard EU/PPS10 waste hierarchy is used. Annex I and II of the Waste Framework Directive define disposal and recovery in detail, distinguishing between incineration on land (which is classified as disposal) and recovery of energy (defined as recovery).
SA13	No. There is a lack of analysis of predicted overcapacity of Incineration and EFW ( see Ecomia forecasts).	Forecasting is being carried out as part of plan preparation.
SA13	No. there is a lack of analysis of the future demand and benefit of RDF.	Forecasting is being carried out as part of plan preparation.
SA13	No, there is a lack of analysis of the growing demand for RDF and the growing capacity for waste treatment north and south of the plan area.	Forecasting is being carried out as part of plan preparation.
SA14	No. The Sites and Areas assessment methodology is not yet done. There seems to be little assessment work being carried out based on 3.4.	The consultation on this was carried out in summer 2013.
SA14	We cannot see information on waste volumes and their location and forecasts of waste for the future together with the assumptions made and alternative projections. We cannot see how a sustainable policy can be developed without the data.	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan production. The SA will be required to include predictions of the likely evolution of environmental, social and economic assets with and without policies in the plan.
SA14	Similarly there is no information about waste treatment methods both present and in development.	Waste technical papers and topic papers contain this information, and are available as part of the plan evidence base at <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> .
SA14	Nor is there an evaluation of the trend of political change towards waste management and pollution.	The Defra 2011 waste policy review is included, in addition to the NPPF and PPS10 which contain

		government policies on waste management.
SA15	a. No, There is a lack of forecast for waste arisings and recycling volumes – see point 'e' above.	These forecasts are currently being carried out as part of Plan production.
SA15	b. No, You do not offer adequate of analysis of alternative waste treatment systems available to drive waste treatment up the hierarchy. The vertical segments of the hierarchy should be subdivided to show that thermal MBT and similar systems are more environmentally friendly than Incineration (especially without CHP) and EFW.	These issues will be considered as part of production of the Plan, rather than the SA. The standard EU waste hierarchy has been used within this report.
SA15	c. No. You do not analyse the predicted overcapacity of Incineration and EFW (see Eunomia forecasts.) At the minimum, there should be a scenario approach, coupled with the use of regret criteria in the analysis.	Work is currently being carried out on future waste arisings across the Plan Area.
SA15	d. No. You should analyse of the future demand for and benefit of RDF and likely regional capacity both to the north and south of the plan area. Failure to do so means ignoring its sustainability credentials and opportunities to gain flexibility at relatively modest cost (this helps avoid compromising the ability of future generations to make their choices.	We can't expect other LA areas to take waste from the Plan Area, therefore we need to ensure there is enough provision across the Plan Area, which is carried out as part of the Plan preparation process.
SA18	It should be stressed that almost all of the world's heather moorland is found in the UK. This terrain contains unique species found nowhere else in the world - declines in this species could lead to global extinction. The report 'State of Nature' states that 65% of moorland species studied have declined and 35% have declined strongly [referenced link to State of Nature report].	Comments noted. SSSI condition is noted within the baseline information and SA objective 1 seeks to protect biodiversity.
SA19	It should be stressed that almost all of the world's heather moorland is found in the UK. This terrain contains unique species found nowhere else in the world - declines in this species could lead to global extinction. The report 'State of Nature' states that 65% of moorland species studied have declined and 35% have declined strongly [referenced link to State of Nature report].	Comments noted. SSSI condition is assessed within the baseline information.
SA22	The supporting assessments are sufficient.	Comments noted.
SA34	a. They do not provide any indication of the future changes expected in waste arisings and recycling volumes	Agree. Work on waste projections is being undertaken as part of the production of the Plan. While the SEA Directive requires the Environmental Report (which is yet to be written) to record 'relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof' the scoping report serves the function of deciding upon the 'scope and level of detail of the information which must be included

		<p>in the environmental report'. While in many parts of the baseline future trends are referred to in advance of the production of the Environmental Report the SA Team agree that a clearer indication of broad trends is helpful in some areas, including waste, prior to assessment taking place. So additional data will be included in the baseline on future waste arisings, accepting that much of this data is still to be gathered during plan preparation, and a general strengthening of the prominence of future trends will be included in the finalised scoping report. A comprehensive analysis of trends will be included in the Environmental Report.</p>
SA34	<p>b. They do not provide an assessment of the existing capacity for treating waste at different levels in the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>Partly agree. Work on waste projections is being undertaken as part of the production of the Plan. Information relating to the capacity of treating different waste options is included in section 14 of the Baseline where landfill, energy from waste, anaerobic digestion and recent additions to capacity for other facilities are noted. However, overall capacity for different levels of the hierarchy is not presented. The SA team agree that this should be included.</p>
SA34	<p>c. There is a near complete absence of any information regarding the regional context of North Yorkshire. It is as though the County were an island, cut-off from its neighbours. Even the Dales National park is excluded. This inevitably creates an inward looking feel to the analysis in which placing things in context is very difficult.</p>	<p>Partly agree. For reasons for the maintenance of brevity the SA scope focussed on the plan area, while the wider evidence base to the plan considers interactions with elsewhere, particularly in the context of minerals and waste. However, we accept that sustainability impacts will arise out of this regional context so improved signposting to relevant sections of the plan's evidence base documents should help make it clear that there is a regional component to sustainability. The Yorkshire Dales is not part of the plan area, but will be treated in the same way as other adjoining authorities in this scoping report. The evidence base for the plan can be found at:</p>

		www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence.
<b>Question 3: Do you agree with our review of plans, policies, programmes and initiatives (PPPSIs)? Are there any PPPSIs that we have not considered?</b>		
SA01	Too many bits and pieces to reach a conclusion. How could I possibly know? I doubt the Minister for the Environment knows!	The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Government guidance on Sustainability Appraisal requires that all relevant plans, policies, programmes and initiatives at an international, European, national, regional and local scale that are relevant to the plan should be included. For a plan which is outlining minerals and waste development the list is comprehensive due to the many environmental, economic and social issues that this kind of development can influence. In order to maintain transparency in the Sustainability Appraisal process, the full list of PPPSIs that have been considered and included are listed within an appendix to the main report. However, the key messages from all of the PPPSIs considered are distilled down into a relatively short list within the main scoping report document, so that members of the public and consultees can see, more easily, the key issues that the Sustainability Objectives should be taking into account.
SA13	There are so many documents that pieces can be extracted to reach almost any conclusion. Furthermore the new tend to contradict or overrule the old.	The SEA Directive requires us to look at all relevant PPPSIs and informs the range of objectives.
SA13	However in Waste terms the themes which keep emerging are Waste prevention, waste minimisation, recovery, recycling, separation of elements for re use, distributed treatment system located adjacent major waste producing areas, minimising waste transport distances, the importance of RDF as the final element of the treatment process. You fail to highlight this.	As part of this process, we report what is in all relevant PPPSIs. PPS10 (national planning policy) and relevant waste legislation is included and these refer to the various stages of the waste hierarchy mentioned in this response.
SA14	Broadly yes. A proper answer to this question would require a level of knowledge that encompassed not only knowledge of the plans, policies, programmes and initiatives proposed but also other possible alternatives. Our Parish Council does not have this	Comments noted.

	level of knowledge and there is not time to consult experts.	
SA15	<p>There are so many documents that pieces can be extracted to reach almost any conclusion; is that the intention? Moreover, newer documents tend to contradict or overrule the old. Even so, the themes that emerge for waste are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste prevention</li> <li>• Waste minimisation</li> <li>• Reuse and recovery, including separation of elements for re use</li> <li>• Recycling</li> <li>• Distributed treatment system located adjacent major waste producing areas (Proximity Principle)</li> </ul> <p>Minimising waste transport distances (the Proximity Principle again)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of RDF as the final element of the treatment process</li> </ul> <p>These are broadly consistent with the recommendations from the Stakeholder Meeting held in Northallerton in October 2011. You should highlight this but fail to do so.</p>	<p>The SA Framework is consistent with the Waste Hierarchy and therefore promotes the issues highlighted. In addition a transport objective is included that promotes proximity to markets. Previous consultation exercises in relation to the SA have been taken into account. The comment will also be passed on to the Plans Team. The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes document.</p>
SA22	The District Council broadly agree with the review of plans, policies, programmes and initiatives.	Comments noted.
SA22	The District Council suggests that any HRA/Appropriate Assessment work undertaken to support Development Plan preparation should be included.	HRA will be carried out on the Joint Plan. AA will be carried out if needed.
SA23	Table 3: Omits the EU Habitats Directive and the Birds Directive. Refers to the England - Biodiversity Strategy Climate Change Adaptation Principles (Defra, 2008) but not to the England Biodiversity Strategy itself.	The Habitats Directive and Birds Directive are included within the PPSIs and in the baseline report. The England Biodiversity Strategy is referred to by its name 'Biodiversity 2020'.
SA34	<p>This section clearly took a lot of time and effort, but to what end is not clear. Policies overlap and duplicate, sometimes they are contrary to each other. This review needs to be much more strategic and much less “catch-all”. What are the particular PPSIs that genuinely have traction with regard to the future minerals and waste provision in the County? The approach here is to say “everything” – but that is next to useless. What is required is a sensible approach to sift those PPSIs that actually matter to the exercise being conducted or better still, to distil from these the over-arching messages that relate to minerals and waste. For the latter there are clear message that relate to the need to prevent, reduce and re-use, to recover and recycle, to value waste as a resource, to</p>	<p>The assessment must address a wide range of social, economic and environmental topics including those issues defined by the SEA Directive. While this leads to a lengthy list of PPSIs it should be noted that only relevant objectives of this policy context are drawn out in the analysis. The evidence base for the Plan focuses more closely on minerals and waste (view the evidence base at: <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a>).</p>



	reduce waste transport distances. Indeed, reading this reminds one just how wrong the proposed AWRP is for the County.	
<b>Question 4: Do you agree with the key messages from the PPPSI review?</b>		
SA01	What's not to like? Maybe something about economic viability and effectiveness of strategies that is properly evaluated.	Comments noted. The key messages are based on evidence gathered from all relevant PPPSIs, including a number of economic PPPSIs.
SA13	Broadly yes . They are: waste prevention, waste minimisation, recovery, recycling, separation of elements for re use, distributed treatment system located adjacent major waste producing areas, minimising waste transport distances, the importance of RDF as the final element of the treatment process.	Comments noted
SA13	A key issue is full participation by the public in development of the local area BUT this must be real. Planners and Councillors must respond to local views, not just over rule them.	We aim to address all views expressed, but must also take on board all national policy and legislation.
SA14	Yes. We think this section is well laid out.	Comments noted.
SA14	We think that the all parties should be included including other authorities within the area – the District Councils – and outside the area where appropriate such as for waste disposal facilities.	The district councils are not the minerals and waste planning authorities, although proposals are discussed with these councils. In addition, relevant local authority plans are included. Discussions and consultations are taking place with adjoining, and more distant where relevant, minerals and waste planning authorities.
SA14	<p>“The National Planning Policy Framework provides that Local Plans should plan positively for the infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF and that local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and</li> <li>- take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”</li> </ul> <p>We would add not only the District Councils within the Joint Plan area but also the authorities lying just outside the boundaries particularly Teesside to the north and South Yorkshire to the South.</p>	Adjoining authorities, in addition to NY district councils have been consulted as part of the plan process.
SA15	We agree in broad terms with the key messages	Comments noted.

	which I see as those listed in the answer to the previous question (waste prevention, waste minimisation etc.	
SA15	A key issue is the need for full participation by the public in development of the local area. However, this must be real; more sham consultation simply will not do. Planners and Councillors must respond to local views, not simply over-rule them.	There are more opportunities for the public and stakeholders to be consulted as the plan progresses. All views will be considered alongside Government policy.
SA22	Agree with the key messages. However, Local Plans/Development Plans are a consistent source of information and feed into the key messages. In Table 5 - Key messages from the PPPSI review, Local Development Frameworks/Local Plans are listed in the 'main sources' column for the first eleven key messages. They should also be listed in the 'main sources' for the following key messages: promote employment, including a shift from public to private sector jobs investment; support a low carbon economy; develop strong, attractive and thriving neighbourhoods and societies (the Big Society) and encourage public participation in the development of the local area; protect and enhance geological diversity; ensure continued economic viability and access to services for rural areas; recognise the importance of protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land and fertile soils; protect coastal landscapes and biodiversity; protect open space for community benefit; ensure high quality design of built infrastructure.	Comments noted / agree.
SA23	The RSPB supports the key message to protect and enhance biodiversity (Table 5, p.25). However, Table 5 does not identify all of the key messages relating to protecting and enhancing biodiversity that should come out of the PPPSI review. In particular Table 5 should directly refer to the following key messages: Halt the loss of biodiversity (England Biodiversity Strategy (EBS)); Provide 'bigger – better – more – connected' wildlife sites (EBS / Lawton Review); Deliver a net-gain in biodiversity (NPPF para. 9 and 109); Establish coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures (EBS / Lawton Review / NPPF (para. 109); Plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries (EBS / Lawton Review / NPPF (para. 117).	Comments noted. These will be included in the finalised scoping report. In the PPPSI review the Lawton Report is not specifically mentioned as this is taken forward as policy in Biodiversity 2020.
SA34	To be honest, we are not sure what the key messages are from the PPSI. This is because although there are key messages for each section of the review, there is no holistic review of the relative merits of one set of messages over another. So, as noted above, you should be more strategic and synthetic in how you review these PPSIs.	Disagree. There is a holistic view for every topic covered within this review. Many PPPSI have targets, therefore we need to take all targets into account and these are synthesised in the key messages.

Question 5: Do you think that we have gathered baseline information appropriate to the plan area?		
SA01	Probably relevant information in there somewhere. How will you decide which bits to use? And how current and accurate is it?	The information is providing the overall picture for the state of the plan area. Minerals and waste specific evidence will inform the plan.
SA01	How can the public/non expert give a reasonable view on all this?	Comments noted. A non-technical summary is provided as part of this Sustainability Appraisal, although it is noted that this summary could go into further detail on the report in order for a lay member of the public to provide a reasoned view on the work carried out.
SA01	Would benefit from an analysis of current trends/future projections regarding, say waste minimisation and impact on rubbish generated.	The Sustainability Appraisal provides an assessment of the effects of the Joint Plan and alternatives to the Joint Plan that will be considered. As part of the Plan production, an analysis of trends and projections on minerals and waste issues will be made. The Sustainability Appraisal will then assess the Plan's proposed strategy (and alternative options) to meeting this demand. The evidence base for the plan will be informed by assessments of waste arisings and projections.
SA13	No, it lacks adequate forecasting of: -Mineral and Aggregate requirements and Waste Volumes. -Trends in Treatment systems. -Trends towards overcapacity of incineration and EFW. -Trends in export of waste to Europe. -Trends in waste treatment costs and recovered element prices.	Forecasting is being carried out as part of plan preparation.
SA14	No. There are areas that have specific climatic conditions that affect health. The Vale of York is known for fog and poor air quality.	Air quality, in addition to health are included within the SA objectives. Reference to local climatic conditions has been added to the air quality section of the baseline.
SA14	It seems that the information is that already available. We wonder if there are experts - from central government, other local government areas, universities who could give a professional view of the completeness and quality of information given to us.	
SA14	Section 5 page 33. The topics covered by the baseline have been informed by the SEA topics (as contained in Annex I(f) of the SEA Directive). These are biodiversity,	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan. The SA will be required to include predictions of the likely evolution of environmental,

	<p>population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage and landscape. We cannot see information on waste volumes and their location and forecasts of waste for the future together with the assumptions made and alternative projections. We cannot see how a sustainable policy can be developed without the data. Similarly there is no information about waste treatment methods both present and in development. Nor is there an evaluation of the trend of political change towards waste management and pollution.</p>	<p>social and economic assets with and without policies in the plan.</p>
SA15	<p>No it lacks adequate forecasting of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Societal and behavioural changes</li> <li>• Mineral and Aggregate requirements</li> <li>• Waste Volumes</li> <li>• Trends in Waste Treatment systems</li> <li>• Trends towards overcapacity of incineration and EFW</li> <li>• Trends in export of waste to Europe</li> <li>• Trends in waste treatment costs</li> <li>• Future European Directives impinging on waste management</li> <li>• Likely future recovered element prices</li> <li>• Market trends and possible saturation in demand for waste products (e.g. aggregates)</li> </ul>	<p>This work is currently being carried out as part of preparation of the Plan. A number of societal and behavioural changes are covered in the baseline.</p>
SA22	<p>The baseline information is appropriate to the Plan area. However, in “6 SEA Topic /SA Category – Air” in the Baseline report p52, the AQMA in Ryedale is “Butcher Corner”. The Natural England National Character Areas information (Baseline report p 24-25 and Appendices p64) needs to be updated. More publications (eg Howardian Hills) are now final and available on the Natural England website.</p>	<p>Comments noted, these will be updated.</p>
SA23	<p>The RSPB supports the inclusion of baseline information on international, national and local nature conservation designations in the biodiversity section of Table 6 (p.34). The RSPB is particularly pleased to see baseline information on priority habitats and reference to the fact that these habitats are fragmented and could be better connected. The table should also refer to landscape-scale conservation initiatives within the Plan area and biodiversity opportunity areas that have been identified within the Plan area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These will be amended and included in the finalised scoping report.</p>
SA34	<p>The baseline data does not consistently assess the likely needs of future generations and therefore fails the key test of sustainability. If the plan is to 2030, then there needs to be baseline information from now to then.</p>	<p>Predictions of future trends on the baseline will be clarified/enhanced in the baseline. A detailed analysis of effects on the baseline to 2030 will be required in the Environmental Report.</p>

Question 6: Have we identified appropriate sustainability issues? Are there any other sustainability topics or issues we should consider?		
SA01	End products of waste treatment should be suitable to backfill extraction of minerals.	Decisions on process options/waste treatment, etc. will be made by the Joint Plan team (rather than suggested by the Sustainability Appraisal). However, the SA will evaluate the predicted effects of any proposed option in relation to this.
SA13	You should use the Brundtland definition.	The Brundtland definition is used in section 3.1
SA13	You do not address the need for suitably treated waste to provide cover for extraction site restoration.	This is a detailed issue to be taken account of as part of the plan and is covered by objective 9.
SA14	The topics appear to be comprehensive but I do not see anything about flexibility and the ability to respond to changing priorities and new demands.	There will be an element of flexibility built into the plan.
SA14	It is quite possible that new environmental risks are identified, new political policies developed, new taxes imposed (e.g. a carbon tax) so whatever choices are made they should allow for change.	There will be an element of flexibility built into the plan.
SA15	You should use the Brundtland/UN Resolution 42/187 definition.	This is used and referred to in section 3.1 of the scoping report.
SA15	You fail to address the interaction between minerals and waste policy, e.g. the need for suitably treated waste to provide cover for extraction site restoration.	This work will be carried out as part of preparation of the Plan. However, it is recognised that greater links between minerals and waste could be made in objective 9 by including a sub objective 'Recognise and promote the value of waste streams as alternatives to primary mineral extraction'
SA22	The sustainability issues are appropriate.	Comments noted.
SA34	See comment above.	See SA Team response above.
SA34	In addition, although individual issues are identified, collective issues are not. You cannot treat the County like a set of unconnected elements – there needs to be some integration whereby you synthesise the different datasets into a coherent spatial and temporal model. This has not been done or even tried. Therefore, the document at present fails to provide the spatial and temporal data required to assess the how and the where of future minerals and waste development.	It is not for the SA to propose a spatial and temporal model at this stage. Rather it is the plan itself which will decide upon the 'how and where'. The SA will critique and challenge the approach, and may propose alternative spatial/temporal approaches based on a bringing together of datasets. However, this is not possible until the appraisal of options commences. The evidence base for the Plan focuses more closely on minerals and waste (view the evidence base at: <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> ).



Question 7: Do you agree with the sustainability objectives and sub-objectives? Can you think of any further indicators we should add to the SA framework?		
SA01	Far too many. It is impossible to cover everything. You have to choose. Should there be criteria to balance competing objectives?	The intention of the Scoping Report (which formed this consultation) is to outline all the key issues relevant to sustainable development of minerals and waste sites across the Plan Area. The objectives list key outcomes which we should be aiming to achieve or not compromise as part of the Joint Plan. As indicated within the Scoping Report, some of these objectives conflict. The next stages of the Sustainability Appraisal will take into account alternative options for minerals and waste development and the extent to which each objective may, or may not be achieved under alternatives, or options. Inevitably, trade-offs will need to be made between objectives.
SA13	These objectives are too numerous and broad . Some are mutually incompatible. They need refining.	There will always be uncertainties between conflicting objectives, but these still need to be taken into account within the SA.
SA14	The objectives and sub-objectives appear sound.	Comments noted.
SA15	These objectives need refining. As they stand they are too numerous and too broad. Worse, some are mutually incompatible.	It is recognised that some of the objectives are in competition with each other. However, an assessment of cross compatibility and areas of tension is made at section 6.6 and a number of actions proposed to reduce tensions.
SA18	Protection and enhancement of natural environments should go beyond conservation sites. It should apply wherever feasible.	This is taken into account under sustainability objective number 1.
SA19	Protection and enhancement of natural environments should go beyond conservation sites. It should apply wherever feasible.	This is taken into account under sustainability objective number 1.
SA22	Agree with the sustainability objectives and that they are appropriate. However, Sustainability Objective 10 focussed on heritage assets needs a further sub-objective to protect locally/sub-regionally significant non-designated assets of local significance e.g. medieval field systems which are important to the distinctive landscapes in certain parts of Ryedale. And Sustainability Objective 12 on economic growth needs to recognise the relationship of minerals and waste operations with surrounding economic uses - there could be potential conflicts e.g. with the horse	Comments noted. This will be amended to recognise regional and local heritage assets. In addition we agree that surrounding economic uses need to be recognised in objective 12.

	<p>encing industry, agriculture and tourist destinations.</p>	
SA23	<p>The RSPB supports the objective to “protect and enhance biodiversity ... and improve habitat connectivity” (Table 7, p.45) and the associated sub-objectives. The RSPB is particularly pleased to see sub-objectives relating to the creation of priority habitat and the increasing the connectivity between habitats. The aspiration for these sub-objectives should be that they are delivered at a landscape scale to provide coherent and resilient ecological / habitat networks (in line with NPPF, paras. 109 and 117). In addition, there should be a sub-objective that explicitly promotes the delivery of a net-gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The RSPB supports the draft indicators relating to protecting and enhancing biodiversity.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These will be included in the finalised scoping report.</p>
SA34	<p>You have listed everything you can possibly think of, instead of those that really matter. A huge missing element of this review is the regional and national need for minerals and waste provision. Because most developments cause harm, there is a need to demonstrate that there is a need that offsets this harm. Moreover, since there seems to be a preference for large-scale projects in both minerals and waste (which we note, may not be sustainable – as in Allerton Park), the need for such schemes has to be justified at the regional and, often, the national level. At present there is no rigorous comparison of the local and regional / national need under different indicators. There is therefore no easy way to assess whether the sustainability criteria will be applied in a sensible way or not. Scale matters here – development can destroy the ability of future generations in North Yorkshire to take decisions over their resources, in the name of some claimed regional or national need. These trump cards need to be defined.</p>	<p>Disagree. The SA objectives taken as a whole consider the sustainability of approaches taken by the plan makers as presented, and the SA has the capacity to develop and then assess alternative approaches that may show alternative ways of provision that may be more (or less) sustainable. This may include reliance on facilities in different locations or at different times, or at different scales that may or may not fit better with the environmental, social and economic objectives defined. The evidence base for the plan focusses more on minerals and waste and the needs and requirements for future developments and can be viewed at <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a>.</p>
<p><b>Question 8: Is there anything else we should consider when we assess options in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan?</b></p>		
SA01	<p>Try to do better than last time (2011 consultation) which seems to have been completely ignored.</p>	<p>Input from earlier consultations carried out as part of the separate Minerals and Waste Core Strategies have been taken into account in developing the Issues and Options document. Responses to previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes Report.</p>
SA01	<p>Local focus enables local residents to input about their own area which they know more about from experience. Overarching plans are rarely inspiring to encourage local comment.</p>	<p>Minerals and waste development is a strategic issue and therefore needs to be planned at a wider than local scale. However, local</p>

		knowledge will be taken account of when the results of SA of proposed sites and areas of search are published.
SA13	You should take note of the recommendations which emerged from Waste Core Strategy stakeholders workshop at Northallerton on 18 October 2011 which showed a strong emphasis to sustainability, using waste as a resource, moving waste treatment up the waste hierarchy, treating waste close to the source ( proximity principle), having distributed treatment centres rather than a single massive site, minimising distances waste is transported, supporting local economies with small local treatment centres, using treatment options outside the county boundary, minimising carbon footprint., investigating transport options other than road. In effect that consultation exercise answered the questions which you are raising again.	The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes document. Most of these issues are covered in the SA Framework. The issues of scales of development are not explicitly mentioned, however, SA objectives such as objective 10, 11 and 17 would challenge sustainability impacts that might arise from infrastructure which is out of scale, while objective 12 includes a range of economic sub objectives that should refine and challenge options that could be improved in terms of their economic benefits.
SA14	I cannot see the inclusion of representatives of District Authorities within the Joint Plan area. They represent the actual population covered by the Joint Plan. These people will have a more detailed knowledge of the issues and needs of their people rather than a purely 'helicopter' view available to North Yorkshire County Council.	They are not minerals and waste planning authorities, but we work with them when the plan is developed.
SA14	So it is important that previous work undertaken on these issues with District Councils, as well as their current views, are given proper weight and inclusion.	They are not minerals and waste planning authorities, but we work with them when the plan is developed.
SA14	“The National Planning Policy Framework provides that Local Plans should plan positively for the infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF and that local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and</li> <li>- take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.” We would add not only the District Councils within the Joint Plan area but also the authorities lying just outside the</li> </ul>	Discussions have taken place with district councils and adjoining councils.

	boundaries particularly Teesside to the north and South Yorkshire to the South.	
SA15	<p>You should take note of the recommendations which emerged from the Waste Core Strategy stakeholders' workshop at Northallerton on 18 October 2011. The public views expressed in the consultations about emerging strategy should be given very great weight. Significantly those views emphasized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A preference for maximising recycling and the reuse of materials</li> <li>• A preference for a number of treatment centres rather than one</li> <li>• A preference for waste treatment facilities to be located close to the major waste producing conurbations, rather than a single remote site</li> <li>• A desire to minimise the distance waste is carried to reduce carbon pollution.</li> <li>• A view that Energy from Waste systems should be used only where the heat output can be fully utilised</li> <li>• A recommendation that NYCC should review and take advantage of waste treatment opportunities outside its county boundaries</li> </ul>	<p>The SA builds upon recommendations made in previous SA related consultations. The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes document.</p>
SA15	<p>You should be aware that this consultation exercise answered the questions which you are raising again.</p>	<p>As the Plan area has changed since the last consultation in 2011 (with CYC and the NYMNP being involved), this means that the consultation must be carried out again. However, The SA builds upon recommendations made in previous SA related consultations</p>
SA23	<p>Table 61 (p.61) predicts that the objective to 'protect and enhance biodiversity and enhance habitat connectivity' will have major positive effects on the baseline in the long term. However, this is only likely if the long-term management of the restored sites is secured as part of the mineral planning process. Many types of habitat take considerably longer than the statutory five year aftercare period to become well established. If the longer term management of these habitats is not secured then they could easily deteriorate. In some cases the habitats could even be removed and replaced by alternative after uses such as agriculture. Therefore, securing the long term management of newly created habitat on restored mineral sites is a vital part of the mineral planning process.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It should be noted that the table includes only an illustrative example, not an actual assessment. The effect on biodiversity due to the amount of site restoration carried out will be monitored as the Plan is implemented.</p>

<b>Question 9: Is the approach we are taking to the consideration of alternative options appropriate?</b>		
SA01	Nothing much about the consideration of alternative options. Except to say they will be considered against whatever comes out of the consultation. Bit worrying that the Allerton Park planning permission is set out with no other alternatives, existing or to be discussed. Or options for varying what might be sited there in response to new existing capacity, new technologies, much lower gate prices for waste etc.	Options will be appraised at the issues and options stage. Allerton Park cannot be considered as it already has planning permission.
SA13	It is not clear how you are doing this.	Options will be assessed against the SA objectives.
SA14	The method looks simplistic and blunt edged. It is perhaps a useful top level guide but the detail needs to be available to fully understand the choices with something more like detailed percentages and written analysis supporting that percentage score rather than a couple of plus signs.	The scoring system used in the SA follows best practice. However, scoring will be fully explained and supported by evidence, professional judgement and the topics papers.
SA14	Also it would be useful to include options that were ruled out and why.	This will be included in the SA as part of the preferred options stage.
SA15	You don't make it clear how you are doing this. You should start from scratch and not rule anything in or out at this stage. Consideration must include both alternative technologies and alternative distribution of those technologies as well as making use of facilities close to the plan area (e.g. those to the north and south of it mentioned elsewhere in my response.	Section 7.1 outlines how alternatives will be considered, although we accept that this section is not clearly demarcated in the report. Options are being generated as part of the work on the plan. The SA can generate alternative options to those proposed by the plan, though these must be relevant and reasonable to the options presented. If relevant and reasonable, alternative distributions of minerals and waste facilities may be proposed.
SA22	The approach to the consideration of alternative options is appropriate.	Comments noted.
SA34	We cannot understand how you are doing this.	This will be presented at the Issues and Options stage of Plan preparation.
<b>Question 10: Do you have any other comments on the scoping report?</b>		
SA01	I do not think that residents who have tried to respond to this consultation will be keen to remain involved. It is too much information, really vague overarching questions and wholly inappropriate as a means of gaining the views of the public. I doubt a PhD on these issues would find it easy/possible.	Comment noted. A longer non-technical summary will be included to aid understanding.
SA01	The important questions seem to me likely to come later by which time the general public will have totally lost interest. And there is no commitment to pause the planning permission for a very large incinerator at Allerton Park so it is clear to all this permission will not prejudice the waste strategy.	Allerton Park has already been given planning permission and cannot be reassessed as part of this process. Other waste infrastructure that is needed for the plan area will be considered as part of the SA.
SA13	The data is massive.	Comments noted.



SA13	The credibility of this Consultation is seriously damaged by the abandonment of the previous NYCC consultation exercise in 2011 and the NYCC decision to ignore it and also to pre-empt this consultation by the December 2010 NYCC decision to award to AmeyCespa the AWRP contract for the collection and treatment off ALL North Yorkshire Municipal waste at one site at Allerton Park.	The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes document.
SA13	The amount of material presented for consideration is very large. The time allowed for response is not sufficient for most people to digest and give proper consideration to it.	The statutory time for consultation is five weeks, however, six weeks were allowed for this consultation.
SA13	The situation is worsened for bodies such as Parish Councils which need to circulate the documents before meeting to respond and may not meet more than quarterly.	The statutory time for consultation is five weeks, however, six weeks were allowed for this consultation.
SA13	The questions are broad and are likely to produce very diverse responses which will be difficult to consolidate.	Comments noted.
SA14	We think it is a very useful document but there has been little time to really analyse it.	The statutory time for consultation is five weeks, although six weeks were allowed for this consultation.
SA14	We are in agreement with the aspirations of the document subject to a balanced assessment of affordability relating to both money constraints and environmental costs.	Objective 12 will provide balance to other objectives to ensure that addressing other objectives does not unnecessarily jeopardise sustainable economic growth.
SA14	Secondly we do not see anything about flexibility and the ability to respond to changing priorities and new demands.	The plan will contain an element of flexibility.
SA14	It is quite possible that new environmental risks are identified, new political policies developed, new taxes imposed (e.g. a carbon tax) so whatever choices are made they should allow for change.	The plan will contain an element of flexibility.
SA14	Thirdly we believe that gaps identified in this report, particularly with respect to waste volumes, forecasts and treatment technologies should be added and issued for public scrutiny before we can be happy towards the general approach.	Forecasts are being carried out as part of the plan and additional evidence is available in topic papers.
SA15	This document should be read in conjunction with our comments on sustainable development in our response to the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, First Consultation Comments Form.	These will also be taken into account.
SA15	Already the credibility of this Consultation is seriously compromised by your abandonment of the previous exercise in 2011 and the NYCC decision to ignore it and also to pre-empt this consultation by the December 2010 NYCC decision to award to AmeyCespa the AWRP contract for the collection and treatment off ALL North Yorkshire Municipal waste at one site at Allerton Park. If that contract is fully entered into then this consultation would descend into	The event referred to was a plan consultation - previous plan consultations have been taken into account in drafting the Issues and Options document. Previous SA consultations are discussed in the Consultation Outcomes document. It should be noted that, as the Plan Area changed with the inclusion of



	farce.	CYC and NYMNP, the consultation exercise had to be carried out again. The Joint Plan will set policies for consideration of future minerals and waste applications, the AWRP already has planning permission.
SA15	You have presented a huge amount of material for consideration but allowed insufficient time for most people to digest and give proper consideration to it. The suspicion must be that this is a device to stifle proper public participation.	Five weeks is the statutory time to be allowed for consultation. However, six weeks were allowed for this consultation exercise.
SA22	Need to clarify that it is the Mineral Planning Authorities and not the Local Planning Authorities on p52 and in the Baseline report p31.	Comments noted. Amendments will be made.
SA34	These documents are too detailed and lack a strategic over-sight. It is not sufficient to say that you are simply collating all the evidence into one place, from which future plans and priorities will emerge. This is because if you pull everything you can think of into a single publication, then it provides infinite opportunities for future plans. The purpose of this kind of exercise is to undertake a first sift, concentrating on those issues that genuinely matter. That means discarding much that is simply not relevant or unintelligible (some of the tables in the reports are entirely unusable other than to say "we collated the data") and there is little effort to overlay, in time and space, the different indicators under consideration. The scope is, quite simply, far too broad and as such fails to deliver any clear, coherent message.	Relevant evidence for minerals and waste development, which will inform the policies, is set out within the evidence base for the plan which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence">www.northyorks.gov.uk/mwevidence</a> technical papers. The data for the Sustainability Appraisal is to outline the current conditions across the Plan area, and future monitoring will detect any deterioration or improvement in any of the sustainability objectives.
<b>Question 4 from the Regulation 18 Response Questionnaire: Do you have any other comments on the scoping report?</b>		
SA01	It seems amazingly excessive with an astonishing number of reports quoted and summarised, for a public consultation. Really off-putting and very general questions.	Comments noted. A non-technical summary is provided as part of this Sustainability Appraisal, although it is noted that this summary could go into further detail on the report in order for a lay member of the public to provide a reasoned view on the work carried out. It should be noted that the intention of the Scoping Report is to provide an overview of how the Sustainability Appraisal process will be carried out, but does not provide information or assessment on options, sites and policies - this will be provided within the Sustainability Report, which will be produced and consulted on in due course.

SA01	Ultimately, some kind of balance between sustainability and economic viability should be considered.	Agreed. The intention of the Scoping Report (which formed this consultation) is to outline all the key issues relevant to sustainable development of minerals and waste sites across the Plan Area. The objectives list key issues which we should be aiming to achieve as part of the Joint Plan. As indicated within the Scoping Report, some of these objectives, which include economic and environmental / social sustainability objectives, conflict. The next stages of the Sustainability Appraisal will take into account alternative options for minerals and waste development and the extent to which each objective may, or may not be achieved under alternatives, or options. Inevitability, trade-offs will need to be made between objectives.
SA01	I believe that NYCC already knows that previous consultations supported the waste hierarchy on page 9 of the consultation document. Why has this strategy development ignored existing information that is not, I think, even in the massive list of relevant data?	Input from earlier consultations carried out as part of the separate Minerals and Waste Core Strategies has been taken into account.
SA02	Where possible sites should be away from settlements.	A site assessment methodology to appraise the siting of minerals and waste development is currently being drafted and will be consulted upon in due course.
SA02	Transport - most will be by road, lorries must be routed away from settlements. Where possible rail should be used and if appropriate conveyor/pipeline.	A site assessment methodology to appraise the siting of minerals and waste development, which will include possible transport links, is currently being drafted and will be consulted upon in due course. The scoping report also includes an objective for sustainable transport and an objective for the reduction of the causes of climate change. Sites, options and policies will all be assessed against these objectives.
SA02	Where sites are recognised for future development - screening etc. should begin long before site working so vegetation etc. used in screening has grown.	Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.
SA02	Restoration must be built in to any mineral development and when appropriate phased in with working.	Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.
SA03	The approach appears to be sound as it identifies that sustainability principles and their	Comments noted.

	application/interpretation will vary widely between different areas.	
SA03	It is important that sound judgements can be made based on local consideration of environmental, social and economic effects.	The SA will be informed by published literature and professional judgement. In addition, the site assessment methodology that is currently being developed will take account of local circumstances and will feed into the wider sustainability appraisal.
SA04	It is not sustainable to burn waste in the middle of the countryside.	The sustainability of site allocations will be assessed against 17 SA objectives to give a rounded view of the sustainability of different options for waste management.
SA04	Incineration will divert recyclable and re-usable material into the incineration stream.	Comments noted. The sustainability effects of all waste spatial options will be considered.
SA04	Given that the incinerator is in the middle of the countryside it will not even have the side benefit of providing district heating.	The incinerator will generate electricity to be fed into the national grid.
SA04	In continental Europe countries like Germany and Holland now recognise that they have over capacity in incineration and NYCC, having failed to develop a coherent plan in built contingencies, are now falling into the same trap despite the Government having told them that their proposed incinerator is excess to requirements.	Although EU targets on waste recovery have been met nationally, there is still a need to move waste management up the waste hierarchy.
SA05	In 'Table 7 - Sustainability Appraisal Framework ' of the Scoping Report we support the proposed objective 2 - 'Enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use'.	Comments noted.
SA05	We look forward to seeing further detail on how sub-objective 'Ensure that Water Framework Directive status objectives for surface and groundwater are not compromised by maintaining or improving upon ecological and chemical status' will provide assurances against the issues raised above.	Minerals and waste policies will be assessed on their effect on surface and groundwater, as set out in the SA framework.
SA06	The first focus of the Sustainability Appraisal should be to identify local provision of material wherever possible as the costs (both financial and environmental) of transportation are significant.	Comments noted. All sites, options and policies within the Joint Plan will be assessed against all sustainability objectives outlined within the scoping report. Local provision is supported by the SA objectives.
SA06	In a predominantly rural area covered by the authorities, the biggest contribution would be a network of low carbon public transport with incentive for its usage to ensure that the frequency of service is adequate.	The SA framework supports low carbon public transport, but this will be covered in more detail in local transport plans.
SA07	Yorkshire Water produces a Water Resource Plan every 5 years, this looks forward over a 25 year	Comment noted. The Plan was included in the PPPSI but this has

	<p>period and is agreed with the Environment Agency. We are currently consulting on our new plan due to be published in spring 2014. This would be a suitable addition to the PPPSI review table. A summary and link to the full plan can be found here:  <a href="http://www.yorkshirewater.com/our-environment/water-resources/managing-water-resources.aspx">http://www.yorkshirewater.com/our-environment/water-resources/managing-water-resources.aspx</a>.</p>	<p>been updated to reflect the latest position.</p>
SA07	<p>Table 6 - there are a number of Source Protection Zones (SPZ) as defined by the Environment Agency within North Yorkshire that protect the groundwater from which Yorkshire Water supplies parts of North Yorkshire and the surrounding areas. An SPZ1 is the inner catchment zone in which water at the water table will reach the abstraction point for water supply in 50 days or less; SPZ2 represents a travel time of 400 days for contaminants at the water table reaching the adit. Areas designates as SPZ1 are therefore of particular concern and certain types of land use are therefore wholly inappropriate within SPZ 1 and to a lesser extent SPZ2.</p>	<p>The location of sites within areas of particular environmental sensitivity will be taken account of within the site assessment methodology.</p>
SA07	<p>If development is permitted in SPZ1, Yorkshire Water would expect mitigation measures to be implemented that are appropriate to the particular development.</p>	<p>Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.</p>
SA07	<p>SPZ3 are of less concern and very few types of development would be unacceptable, although mitigation may still be required.</p>	<p>Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.</p>
SA07	<p>Yorkshire Water will object to any development that it believes poses an unacceptable risk to the public water supply.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
SA07	<p>Foundations or other groundworks must not penetrate the natural drift cover that protects the aquifer.</p>	<p>Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.</p>
SA07	<p>Foul drainage should be to foul sewer and in SPZ1, foul drainage proposals should include provision of a suitable lined system for the sewers and an appropriate means of ensuring that associated foul water infrastructure (e.g. a pumping station) is sealed such that there will be no discharge of foul water to ground.</p>	<p>Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.</p>
SA07	<p>In SPZ1 Yorkshire Water would generally expect a developer to provide, as part of a planning application, a detailed risk assessment to include a detailed conceptual model of the groundwater regime, including cross sections across the area and which takes into account seasonal variations.</p>	<p>Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.</p>
SA07	<p>Consideration of existing, construction and post-construction risks and mitigation should be detailed with some quantitative as well as qualitative assessment.</p>	<p>Development management issue - will be passed over to the plan team.</p>
SA07	<p>Table 7, objective 2 - We would question the legitimacy of the sub-objective 'Prevent</p>	<p>This is reflecting the need to make sure that this is taken account of</p>

	unsustainable levels of ground and surface water abstraction' in this context. Yorkshire Water's abstractions, as with all abstractions, are governed and agreed by the Environment Agency and they would be unlikely to grant an abstraction licence if they felt it was unsustainable.	strategically and from the outset.
SA07	Table 7, objective 6 - Yorkshire Water support the inclusion of sub-objective 'Maximise the generation and use of renewable energy in appropriate locations'. Some processes related to the production of clean water and the treatment of waste water are energy intensive and Yorkshire Water is committed to exploring new ways of meeting that energy demand through renewable sources.	Comments noted.
SA07	Table 7, objective 9 - Yorkshire Water supports the inclusion of the sub-objective 'Recover residual resources', particularly related to anaerobic digestion and similar processes.	Comments noted.
SA07	Table 7, objective 16 - Yorkshire Water would suggest the inclusion of a sub-objective specifically linked to the promotion of sustainable methods of drainage in new development and retrofitted to existing development. Surface water flooding should be highlighted as a potential cause of flooding.	Promotion of SUDS for future development is included in objective 16. There is limited capacity to influence existing development.
SA08	More emphasis on plans to reduce, re-use, recycle and local composting, alongside exploring safe and sustainable new technologies to reach the ideal of zero waste.	We recognise the need to move up the waste hierarchy, which is included in objective 9.
SA09	Incineration is not a sustainable long term solution to waste treatment given the rapid changes already apparent in the waste in treatment industry.	The sustainability of incineration is determined by the waste hierarchy.
SA10	The Sustainability Appraisal should be approached in line with point 4 in question 3 (which is: In regard to minerals extraction an overall view should be taken towards the economic and environmental aspects).	A balance between social, environmental and economic aspects of alternatives will be made.
SA11	Natural England's opinion should be sought on any proposed site from the outset to avoid sites with high environmental value being included in the Joint Plan.	Agreed and comments noted.
SA14	<p>The definition of SD is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs":</p> <p>This means that the approach and scoping should look for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A flexible approach that is able to respond to changes in technology, costs and other priorities.</li> <li>• A low cost approach.</li> <li>• Using existing facilities within and outside the Joint Plan Area.</li> <li>• Minimise environmental impact.</li> <li>• Start with Prevention, Reuse and Recycling.</li> <li>• Work with Joint Plan District Councils.</li> </ul>	<p>Where developments are publically funded, costs are considered alongside the SA in addition to consultation outcomes. Most minerals and waste developments are privately financed. The waste hierarchy is taken into account in the production of the Plan, although we do have to assume a certain level of waste will be produced (this work is being carried out).</p> <p>Documents will all be consulted on, in due course.</p>



SA15	<p>There is a great deal of material in the documents mentioned in this question and it is unreasonable to expect people to respond in detail to this voluminous material on a short timescale. Instead, we set out below what we think needs to be taken into account, starting from first principles. However, it is clear that these documents fail to use the Brundtland definition of sustainability which is both internationally recognised and a crucial part of the National Planning Policy Framework. Sustainable development (SD) is a pattern of resource use that aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only in the present, but also for generations to come. The Brundtland Commission and UN Resolution 42/187 definition of SD is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".</p>	<p>The Brundtland definition is used in section 3.1 of the scoping report.</p>
SA15	<p>1. As with Question 3 above, the decision by NYCC to grant planning permission for the AWRP must cloud any discussion of sustainability.</p>	<p>Allerton Park has already been granted planning permission and will therefore not be considered as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan.</p>
SA15	<p>2. The Brundtland Commission and UN Resolution 42/187 defined Sustainable Development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". The AWRP would not meet this definition. The 25 to 30 year contract will fundamentally compromise the ability of future generations to meet their needs and lead to the destruction of valuable resources that could have been reused or recycled, necessitating the exploitation of virgin resources. The incinerator dominates the facility in cost and treatment volumes and, once built, cannot be reduced in size and its capital-intensive nature forces the operator to run it at full capacity even where there is no need within the county to do so. Its' use would cause harm by emitting substances harmful to man, wildlife or the environment and damage the Council's ability to increase recycling to anywhere even near to best practice.</p>	<p>Allerton Park has already been granted planning permission and will therefore not be considered as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan. In addition, incineration will only be carried out for residual waste that would ordinarily be sent to landfill.</p>
SA15	<p>3. Accordingly, no strategy for waste management that includes incineration can meet any reasonable sustainability criteria.</p>	<p>Incineration of residual waste where a useful product is recovered (e.g. energy) is considered to be more sustainable than landfill within the EU's Waste Hierarchy (included within the scoping report).</p>
SA15	<p>4. The NPPF states that authorities should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future</p>	<p>Landscape impact is carried out as part of the SA. However, it should be noted that this is one consideration of the SA and there</p>



	generations. This must apply equally to waste and to minerals extraction. In particular even AmeyCespa has admitted that the proposed AWRP development would cause harm to the landscape that cannot be adequately screened or mitigated. This further demonstrates that the proposed development fails the sustainability test.	are many other sustainability issues to take into account.
SA15	5. Sustainable development (SD) is a pattern of resource use that aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only in the present, but also for generations to come (this is something taught as ELF - Environment, Local People, Future.	Comments noted. This is reflected within the SA objectives.
SA15	6. The production of waste represents a failure of sustainability but waste management can overcome this to a certain extent. DEFRA's Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011 (WR) was published in June 2011 along with a series of supporting documents. It contains actions and commitments for government and other key players. Together, these seek to set a direction towards a 'zero waste economy' – defined as one where “material resources are re-used, recycled or recovered wherever possible, and only disposed of as the option of very last resort” (WR para 28). The Government envisages that amongst others, in a zero waste economy resources will be fully valued, financially and environmentally. This sees one person's waste as another's resource so that over time we get as close as possible to zero landfill and a new public consciousness in our attitude to waste.	The Plan can promote reductions in the volumes of waste produced, but it must also acknowledge that there must be a method in place to deal with any residual waste that arises. The SA Framework seeks to promote management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable.
SA15	7. The Waste Hierarchy reflects sustainability issues. Thus a key to judging whether a strategy even approximates to such a vision (essentially a vision of sustainable waste management) is the extent to which a given strategy complies with the Waste Hierarchy. This has to be interpreted with care, something that the consultation documents fail to do.	This is taken into account within objective 9.
SA15	8. The Waste Hierarchy is set out in Article 4 of the revised EU Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/98/EC) - see DEFRA and EA. It comprises five steps for dealing with waste, ranked according to environmental impact – the 'waste hierarchy' (illustrated in Table 1 and Figure 1). Prevention, which offers the best outcomes for the environment, is at the top of the priority order, followed by preparing for re-use, recycling, other recovery and disposal, in descending order of environmental preference, as illustrated in the table below. However, there is considerable difference between the environmental impact of the various technologies under “other recovery”, both in terms of the climate change and other emissions.	The waste hierarchy is taken into account within objective 9. Other objectives (e.g. on climate change) should help differentiate between more or less sustainable options that operate at the same level on the waste hierarchy.

SA15	9. As the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency, SEPA say “The Directive shifts the focus away from waste as an unwanted burden towards being a valued resource, which can provide opportunities for sustainable growth in a low carbon economy”.	This is taken into account within objective 9.
SA15	10. The waste hierarchy has been transposed into UK law through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. The Regulations came into force on 29 March 2011. The provisions relating to the hierarchy (set out at in Regulations 12, 15 and 35) came into force on 28 September 2011.	This is taken into account within objective 9.
SA15	11. The further up the hierarchy, the greater the contribution that is made to sustainability. Disposal is not a sustainable option. [Included diagram and description of the waste hierarchy.]	This is taken into account within objective 9.
SA15	12. The picture with AWRP is, of course, complex and illustrates the need for a careful approach when comparing waste management strategies. For example, AWRP’s AD plant with its electricity generation can properly be classified as “other recovery”. However, the EfW (incinerator) plant is electricity generation only rather than CHP and is therefore at the lowest level of “other recovery”, only just above disposal at the bottom of the waste hierarchy.	Allerton Park has already been granted planning permission. Objective number 9 will assess the sustainability of options for future waste developments in the Issues and Options document.
SA15	13. To illustrate the care needed in looking at the sustainability of different waste management strategies, one must consider the Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/98/EC) which set new standards in the waste management field, including ambitious recycling targets all over the EU and a requirement to develop national waste prevention programs. It also clarified the “recovery” and “disposal” definitions. According to the new waste hierarchy, incineration can be qualified as a recovery operation rather than a disposal one, when the energy recovery efficiency is higher than a designated threshold. The threshold for MSW incineration facilities to be classified is that the energy recovery efficiency calculated according to the “R1 formula” . According to Grosso et al. [reference included in comments form], about 40% of European incinerators do not meet the 0.6 threshold for plant existing before end 2008 and are thus classified as “disposal”. In general the “disposal” plants produce only electricity or, when CHP, they treat less than 200,000 t/y. Thus EfW (incinerator) facilities that do not supply CHP may not meet the criterion for being regarded as a recovery facility.	Comments noted. This will be assessed as part of the SA under objective number 9. However, further detail of the definitions of levels on the waste hierarchy will be added in footnotes in the baseline report.
SA15	14. According to Art 4(2) of the WFD, Member States should encourage those waste management options that deliver the best overall environmental outcome.	The WFD and its objectives are taken into account within the SA framework. Different Plan options

	For waste streams where recycling is the preferable option, this should include appropriate measures such as introduction of separate collection schemes and other measures supporting recycling, implementing recycling targets and avoiding overcapacities for waste incinerators in waste management plans [references guidelines in Waste Framework Directive].	will be assessed based on their impacts on water bodies.
SA15	15. Chapter 7 of the UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy (Cm 6467) states that “The overall objective of government policy on waste is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. Through more sustainable waste management – reduction, re-use, recycling, composting and using waste as a source of energy – the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste.”	This will be taken into account under sustainability objective number 9.
SA15	16. Achieving the Coalition’s ambition of “working towards a zero waste economy, encouraging paying people to recycle and working to reduce littering” as set out by DEFRA’s Secretary of State [includes reference of speech to SoS] means action at all stages of the waste hierarchy to achieve optimal waste management which reduces waste, ensures maximum re-use and recycling and deals with the residual wastes in an environmentally responsible manner that takes full and proper account of health risks. In addition, DEFRA will be working with the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) “to send a much greater volume of our biodegradable waste through anaerobic digestion – generating renewable energy and bringing down levels of greenhouse gases from landfill”. A natural extension of this would be to avoid waste management options that are unusually bad for climate change.	This will be taken into account under sustainability objectives numbers 6 & 9.
SA15	17. The clear implication is that any acceptable waste management strategy can and must comply with the waste hierarchy. Crucially, this means treating each item of waste as far up the waste hierarchy as possible. It is not acceptable for waste that could be recycled to enter the “other recovery” tier. Within “other recovery” waste should be treated as far up the hierarchy of technologies in that tier as is possible.	This will be taken into account under sustainability objective number 9.
SA15	18. An obvious corollary of the Brundtland definition (as used in the NPPF) is that the waste management system should not produce hazardous waste where none existed within the waste feedstock, Examples of such unacceptable production of hazardous waste are fly ash and air pollution control residues from incineration. This is not acceptable within a sustainable waste management system since there	This will be taken into account under sustainability objectives numbers 4 & 15.

	are cleaner and more environmentally friendly alternatives that do not produce hazardous waste streams as a result of their operation.	
SA15	19. It is essential to compare different waste management strategies on the basis of sustainability, taking a holistic view of the entire system. This will take strong account of the waste hierarchy and any system that does not comply with it cannot be regarded as a sustainable development and should therefore be ruled out. It will include comparison of the extent to which different systems treat waste as far up the waste hierarchy as possible, for example a system such as that in San Francisco in which over 70% of residual waste is recycled would be greatly superior in terms on sustainability than the proposed NYCC/CYC system at AWRP.	Allerton Park has already been granted planning permission. Objective number 9 will assess the sustainability of different waste disposal options.
SA15	20. However, compliance with the waste hierarchy is not the entire story since sustainability also means minimising harm to the environment and human health. The latter means accepting that some technologies cause fear and resentment among sections of the population and that this is a form of harm and therefore a counter-indicator to using that technology.	The consultation outcome and the SA will both inform the final Plan.
SA15	21. Selecting an optimum strategy further means compliance with the proximity principle and seeking to minimise transport impacts, in particular road traffic.	This is taken into account within objective 3.
SA15	22. Selecting an optimal strategy, particularly one that is future-proof and will not tie the people of the area to a particular choice for a generation is not an easy task. The waste hierarchy coupled with considerations such as financial flexibility, effect on employment in the wider economy in the area (particularly on important industries locally such as agriculture, leisure and tourism), and minimising adverse impacts on human health and the environment all need to be taken into account.	The sustainability objectives taken together cover this range of effects.
SA15	23. A choice has to be made between all available technology choices and different geographical patterns of waste facilities. It is no good selecting an expensive and obsolescent technology which limits choice for a generation simply because planning permission has been granted. The need now is for an honest choice of waste management systems to be made untrammelled by the errors of the past.	Planning permission for Allerton park has now been granted . The Joint Minerals and Waste Plan considers minerals and waste planning into the future. The plan production process must begin from the start to meet legislative requirements as it covers a new area.
SA15	24. Assessing sustainability fairly and honestly means challenging existing pre-conceptions and assumptions. Unlike the proposed appraisal, it also means paying full regard to cost, economics and affordability. Given that most respected economists see much of the plan period, especially the first part,	Most elements of sites that come forward for development will be privately funded commercial projects.

	as one of low growth, escalating cost and shortage of funds, the effects of excessively expensive or inflexible waste plans on other council services and the people employed in them and who use them must be taken into account. The plan cannot be formulated in isolation.	
SA15	25. A good starting point is the recommendations arising from the Waste Core Strategy stakeholders workshop at Northallerton on 18 October 2011 which showed a strong emphasis to sustainability, using waste as a resource, moving waste treatment up the waste hierarchy, treating waste close to the source (proximity principle), having distributed treatment centres rather than a single massive site, minimising distances waste is transported, supporting local economies with small local treatment centres, using treatment options outside the county boundary, minimising carbon footprint.	The SA builds upon recommendations made in previous SA related consultations. The impact of waste development will be assessed under objective 9.
SA15	26. Failure to take these points on board would suggest that you did not like the answers from the previous consultation exercise and have abandoned the earlier consultation in the hope of achieving a new consultation which validates the NYCC decision to enter into a contract with AmeyCespa for the AWRP.	Planning permission for Allerton park has now been granted and cannot be removed. The Joint Minerals and Waste Plan considers minerals and waste planning into the future. The SA builds upon recommendations made in previous SA related consultations.
SA16	The sustainability Appraisal should approach the issue of impact of sites for minerals and waste on the environment.	The sustainability objectives take all relevant environmental effects into account.
SA17	The definition of sustainable development may be too narrow if it is allowed to be interpreted as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Some minerals are clearly running out. We should be looking for alternatives which are less damaging to the climate, the environment, and to human and animal life.	Sustainability objective number 8 covers this issue.
SA17	The draft sustainability objectives, however, are laudable, and should not be diminished.	Comments noted.
SA17	There should be some assessment of the dangers of hydraulic fracturing to release hydrocarbons, considering the international literature of effects on water pollution and health.	The sustainability objectives are designed to assess the effects of all types of minerals and waste development. All assessment will be evidence based, drawing on published studies and professional judgement.
SA17	There should be an assessment of the desirability and lower cost of a zero waste strategy compared to the expense of either incineration or landfill.	The Joint Minerals and Waste Plan must account for residual waste produced across the Plan Area in the future.
SA18	The joint plan is an opportunity to aim for enhancement of environments rather than simply	This may be carried out through restoration plans and is considered



	sustainability through appropriately directed coordination and management of environmental issues.	under objective number 1.
SA19	The joint plan is an opportunity to aim for enhancement of environments rather than simply sustainability through appropriately directed coordination and management of environmental issues.	This is taken into account under sustainability objectives number 1.
SA24	Only that I think lots of residents of NY are keen to do their bit and engaging the public in adopting sustainable practices should be a priority – at least making it easy for people to recycle as much as possible with minimum effort.	Comments noted.
SA25	How to make those positive contributions to wider objectives such as those mentioned, but also conservation and renewable energy.	These issues are covered under the sub-objectives.
SA25	Plastics are a notable component of landfill or incineration that should be given more attention for recycling. Most recyclable containers identify the plastic by code, and more attention could be given to local sorting close to source, e.g. by volunteer groups.	This is considered as part of sustainability objective 9, and objective 17, which supports 'community led waste management schemes'.
SA25	The carbon cost of disposal of household waste at waste transfer stations needs to be considered. This is particularly galling in relation to local authority boundaries. If I wish to use a trailer to move waste to a transfer station, I cannot go to the nearest because it is in the York district, but have to more than twice as far, to Malton. Border issues should not exist for households.	Carbon emissions are taken into account under sustainability objective number 6. In addition, this is more of a waste management issue, rather than a planning issue.
SA25	Local recycling of biomass and waste timber card and paper should be encouraged, including companies that convert such materials into energy products, such as wood pellets. Such considerations should be part of the planning framework in relation to housing and business developments. Why exclude small businesses from waste recycling by not including them in household collection cycles?	This is taken into account under sustainability objective number 9. The definition of what is and is not commercial waste is also more of a waste management issues, rather than a planning issue.
SA26	SA objectives: Number 2 - add in word 'supply' to read 'Enhance or maintain water quality and supply...'; Number 3 - add in word 'impact' to read 'Reduce transport impact and reduce...'; Number 5 - add in word 'environmental to read 'Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance environmental quality'; Number 6 - add in 'low carbon economy' to read 'Reduce the causes of climate change and move to a low carbon economy'.	It is felt that the additional wording to objective 5 is not necessary as other objectives seek to safeguard environmental quality. Similarly, a low carbon economy is supported by objective 12. Objective 2 - While water supply is not explicitly referred to, it is felt that 'efficiency of water use', referred to in the objective, will protect supply. However, the point does highlight that supply of water could be better protected - for instance by protecting groundwater source protection zones, which may



		be disrupted by inappropriate development. Therefore an additional sub objective 'protect groundwater source protection zones' should be added. Objective 3 - impact is covered under objective 15.
SA27	As set out in the leaflet: economic, social and environmental priorities - to be set after consultation with local communities, businesses and residents, etc.	Comments noted. There will be three further rounds of consultation on the plan (Issues and Options, Preferred Options and Publication) and a Sustainability Report will be produced at each stage.
Natural England	In general Natural England welcomes the approach to evaluating the robustness of the SA objectives and considers the matrix in figure 5 to be very useful in highlighting area of incompatibility and uncertainty. It is extremely important that the areas of incompatibility and uncertainty are resolved as much as possible; otherwise it is likely that incompatibility/uncertainty will continue forward to the next draft of the SA. Rewording/amendment to objective/sub objective wording and any associated objective explanation can help to minimise conflict and uncertainty.	Comments noted. The compatibility matrix will be reviewed as part of the finalised scoping report.
Natural England	With respect to the SA objective on soil, Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality", Natural England considers that more detail should be added to ensure reclamation is adequately considered when appraising the effects of the Joint Plan. The plan should seek to require high standards of reclamation to appropriate after-uses that are demonstrated to be technically achievable, financially viable and sustainable in the longer-term (i.e. well beyond the completion of the statutory aftercare period).	The Plan will set out policies relating to reclamation and restoration of sites. The sub-objectives are sufficient to assess whether restoration policies will contribute to the SA objective. Restoration itself isn't a sustainability objective - though the existing sub objective 'promote good land management practices on restored land' should encompass the points made.
Natural England	Natural England would also expect the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) to inform the SA and its objectives. Whilst SEA and HRA are two separate processes and should be reported upon separately there are a number of linkages between the two processes. For example, evidence gathered for the HRA on European Sites can be fed into the SA process. The HRA of The Joint Plan does not appear to have commenced and therefore should be started as soon as possible to ensure any evidence can be fed into the SA process.	Agree. Work has recently commenced on the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Joint Plan and efforts will be made to share evidence base information between the SA and HRA while keeping the two processes separate.
SA29	My comments from the workshop in York will be relevant. Unfortunately I don't have enough time to look through the document in sufficient detail to provide helpful comments.	Comments noted. Unfortunately it is not possible to disaggregate and ascribe comments made during the workshops to individuals due to the open discussion format of the

		workshops. However all comments were recorded and will be taken into account.
SA29	I will attach with this response a copy of a document drawn up in 2009 as part of a project to map BAP habitat opportunities and mineral sites done by YWT in partnership with NYCC. [Named Individual - the Principal Ecologist at North Yorkshire County Council] will have a copy of the report.	Comments noted. The report will be considered during the literature review preceding assessment/appraisal work and (consider adding to PPPSI).
Environment Agency	Flood Risk: We are satisfied with the approach taken, and we are pleased to see, and we support, the planned production of a specific Waste & Minerals Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to inform your decision making process.	Comments noted.
Environment Agency	Groundwater: We are pleased to see that the following documents are listed in your table of relevant plans: EU Water Framework Directive (2000), EU Directive on the Protection of Groundwater (2006); EU Nitrates Directive (1991); Groundwater Protection: Policy & Practice (Environment Agency, 2012); Regional River Basin Management Plans (Environment Agency, 2009) N.B you need to specifically refer to the Humber river Basin Management Plan.	Comments noted. The Humber River Basin management Plan is referred to within the PPPSIs.
Environment Agency	Biodiversity: We are pleased to see that the objective of 'enhancing biodiversity' is included within the SA. Table 7 of the SA Scoping Report highlights well the key factors that should be considered through the production of the SA and the plan itself.	Comments noted.
Environment Agency	General: Sustainability Appraisal Scoping - Appendix 1 – suggested amendments: 3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation. Add as sub objective: encourage beneficial use of waste near to site of production or treatment. Reason: excessive transport costs can make reuse/recovery of waste uneconomic.	Agree. The sub objectives already includes "Encourage proximity between minerals and waste sites and sources". However, it is accepted that it may be unclear as to what the scope of this sub objective is. Therefore, an explanatory footnote will be added to clarify the sub objective, and in particular the beneficial uses to which both traditional and non-traditional end products of waste processing can be put when users exist nearby. .
Environment Agency	4. Protect and improve air quality. Add as sub objective: consider potential for odour effects on existing communities. Reason: Unpleasant odours from waste facilities are one of the most common causes for public complaint, and have a detrimental effect on amenity.	Partly agree. The existing sub objective 'to minimise dust and odour' would cover the point made. However, it does not identify specific receptors to odour, which may result in variance in significance. Reword the sub objective to "to minimise dust and odour, particularly where

		communities or other receptor may be affected".
Environment Agency	5. Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality. Add as sub objective: Ensure when biodegradable waste is spread to land it has a beneficial effect. Reason: Spreading inappropriate wastes to land can cause damage to soil and water.	This is too detailed an action to be included as a sub-objective and for assessing policies of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan and is covered more broadly by 'promote good land management practices on restored land'
Environment Agency	8. Minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding. Add as sub objective: Encourage sustainable construction techniques so as to reduce resource use in all building. Because: These principles can be applied to all construction.	Agree. The sub objective will be added as 'Encourage the utilisation of sustainable construction techniques'.
Environment Agency	9. Minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable. Add as sub objective: Ensure all infrastructure is designed and built so as to maximise opportunities for segregation and collection of recyclables, e.g. Adequate space for bin storage, home composting etc. Because: Ease of collection makes recycling more cost effective.	This suggestion is a policy rather than a sustainability objective or sub-objective.
Environment Agency	12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs. Comments: We welcome the statement on capturing value from waste streams.	Comments noted.
Environment Agency	15. Protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities. Suggestions: Could this be widened to include all potential detrimental impacts on amenity and wellbeing. There is no specific mention of the potential for odour which we have found to be an important factor in whether a waste facility is acceptable to its near neighbours.	Odour is already mentioned under SA objective 4 - however we accept that it can have impacts on quality of life, so we will include odour as an example of a nuisance impact in the first sub objective, i.e.: "To minimise the impact of nuisances associated with minerals and waste development, such as noise pollution, odour and severance'.
SA32	We welcome the approach taken and the underpinning of the plan by the definition of sustainable development and the guiding principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy.	Comments noted.
SA33	Unfortunately the scope of the sustainability appraisal does not include the nature, needs, potential and sub-regional/national roles and functions of waste processing sites such as that operated by Dalkia plc. .In this aspect the appraisal could be considered to be significantly deficient.	Comments noted/agree in part. It is not for the sustainability appraisal of this plan to favour any one particular waste management technology (or set of technologies) over any others. Rather its role is to appraise the overall approach to planning for waste management in the plan area. The Material Assets section of the baseline of the scoping report considers broad details of waste managed within the plan area and the SA Framework promotes waste

		<p>as a potential resource through, for example, the SA Sub objective 'recover residual resources (e.g. through anaerobic digestion or energy recovery)'. However, the point made suggests that there may be merit in including some broad information on the potential of all waste types (not any particular individual waste types) as a resource for a range of usable products, accepting that data may be limited, as well as some discussion on likely sources of wastes for processing to usable products. Further consideration of the sustainability of sourcing waste for usable products at a local to sub regional / regional level should also be considered in the scope and prior to the assessment of options.</p>
SA33	<p>It is considered critical for the soundness of the plan that the waste sites and areas assessment methodology ( to be developed) includes consideration of the importance of maintaining the economic viability and sub-regional/national function of sites such as that operated by Dalkia.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The site assessment methodology will include assessment of the viability of sites with the aim of aiding the allocation of only viable sites. As part of this a number of additional factors such as access to the road network and the potential for complementary location will be considered. It also will / does consider the need for sufficient sites to support the identified need for different waste management processes.</p>
SA35	<p>i. The sustainability appraisal must include quantification of financial matters. At present affordability is barely mentioned.</p>	<p>This isn't relevant to the appraisal as most development will be commercially financed.</p>
SA35	<p>ii. The document fails to recognise the comments submitted by us and others to the most recent consultation on the Waste Core Strategy. This gives no confidence that any of the comments submitted to this round will be given any weight at all. You have a serious issue in terms of public trust and engagement, precisely because so many views that have been legitimately expressed in the past have been ignored.</p>	<p>Responses to previous consultations carried out by NYCC on the Core Strategies have been considered in drawing up the Issues and Options document. The SA scoping report as presented has been informed by the sustainability appraisal work that has preceded it in all three partner planning authorities. While it is hoped that the core elements of those SA documents are retained (and appendix IV shows the headline SA objectives arrived at through consultation in previous consultation</p>

		rounds which were reviewed ahead of this work), inevitably a changed plan scope and geographical area will lead to adjustments in the approach taken to this new sustainability appraisal. Previous SA consultation comments will be taken into account and this will be documented in the SA Consultation Outcomes report.
SA36	I broadly support the draft Sustainability Appraisal objectives but believe more rigour should be applied to reducing climate changing gases. Britain needs to do better on greenhouse gas reduction and local authorities need to play their part by adopting an appropriate greenhouse gas reduction target. A major climate summit will take place in 2 years' time in Paris.	Comments noted. This is taken into account under sustainability objective 6.
SA37	One overall objective should be to assess how both the minerals and waste frameworks contribute to resource efficiency improvements and the circular economy. Should be stronger than current objective 8.	Add to sub-objective under objective 9? (Economic gain through re-use?)
SA37	Options for local job creations via CICs [CICs is not defined, but is taken to mean Community Interests Companies] and charities getting involved in materials / items sorting, repair and re-use. Also reducing waste transport need.	Agree. CICs and charities can play an important role in waste management and are already supported by the sub objective to 17 'to support community led waste management schemes'. The existing SA framework contains sub objectives that seek to reduce the need for transport.
SA37	Objective 5 on soil quality should encompass improving the water and carbon retention of soils (to prevent flooding and sequester carbon to prevent CO2 reaching the atmosphere) and reducing topsoil lost to wind and water erosion by ensuring particles are heavier so less easy to blow away	This is too detailed an objective to be specified within the SA - we cover broad objectives and sub-objectives here and have to include only measurable indicators through which success of the Plan is measured. It should be noted that the sub objective 'conserve and enhance soil resources and quality' would cover this in a broader sense.
SA37	Any waste solution should be as close as possible to the producers of that waste, so they can see the results of their irresponsibility, so they can get to materials re-use / repair sites easily and by sustainable means, and so sites are close to people to use the resulting repaired items.	For this issue, the Proximity Principle in PPS10 is used, along with consultations carried out as part of the Plan and the accompanying SA.
SA38	Decisions should take into account the impact on the landscape character based on the latest landscape character assessments, including the North Yorkshire & York Landscape Character Assessment 2011 and	Landscape Character Assessment will inform the site assessment methodology, which will be consulted on in due course.



	Reading the Past in Today's Landscape: North Yorkshire, York and Lower Tees Valley Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC). Great care should be taken to ensure the landscape assets (identified within the LVIA) are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including the impact of proposals on any views that are important to the area.	'Reading the Past in Today's Landscape: North Yorkshire, York and Lower Tees Valley Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC)' will be added to the PPPs
SA39	Care must be taken to fully acknowledge that mineral development can only take place in areas where the mineral quality and resource scale are of sufficient scale to merit development. For new workings a resource of over 1.5 million tonnes is generally required to justify the capital costs of the planning process and site development costs. In relation to Home Farm Kirkby Fleetham we have a draft EIA and we would appreciate detailed discussion when you are undertaking sustainability appraisal.	Will depend on outcome of site submission (see comment to the right).
SA40	Clearly, the Sustainability Appraisal, relating to waste treatment must stress the question of greenhouse gas emissions as one of the key elements in relation to all forms of waste handling and treatment.	Sustainability objective 6 takes this into account.
SA41	The 17 points at the beginning of the report seem comprehensive	Comments noted.
SA41	In the ideal world humanity should be aiming for a Zero foot-print asap.	Sustainability objective 6 takes this into account.
SA42	I cannot fault the sustainability appraisal itself. However, there is a need to guarantee that nothing recommended in or allowed by the Minerals and Waste Joint contravenes it	The SA will inform the final Plan.
SA43	The appraisal needs to take into account: 1. Environmental Sustainability; 2. The impact on the local environment; 3. The impact on the surrounding economy; 4. The impact on the population; 5. The impact on tourism and rural industries	To draft response once actions carried out.
SA44	The volume of information contained with the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and associated Appendices makes it very difficult for the non-expert to comment.	Comments noted. A non-technical summary is provided as part of this Sustainability Appraisal, although it is noted that this summary could go into further detail on the report in order for a lay member of the public to provide a reasoned view on the work
SA44	The Parish Council refers in brief to the key messages table on page 25: "Protect and enhance historic and archaeological features" - Allerton Castle (of significant historic interest) will not be enhanced by the development of the AWRP.	Comments noted. AWRP already has planning permission so will not be assessed by the SA.
SA44	"Conserve and improve local environmental quality ..": Issues of significant air pollution already existing in Knaresborough – an AQMA with emissions exceeding acceptable limits (primarily caused by	Comments noted. AQMAs (including the one in Knaresborough) are recorded in the baseline.



	HGV movements);	
SA44	“Ensure development proposals do not result in unacceptable air, water or land pollution”: Incineration will produce toxic substances including incinerator bottom ash and air pollutants.	Comments noted. Such issues are already covered by the SA Framework, so should be taken into account where relevant to specific options or sites.
SA44	“Seek to safeguard and improve the health and wellbeing of communities ...”: See above. Additional to the actual impact on health will be the mental anguish in regards to the impact on health.	Comments noted. While the wellbeing sub objective should capture these issues, it is felt that some additional analysis of mental health issues in the plan area would enhance the baseline.
SA44	“Recognise the importance of protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land and fertile soils”; AWRP would be surrounded by prime farming land, sustaining crops and animals. Pollutants would quickly enter the food chain.	Comments noted. This is covered by the sub objective 'conserve and enhance soil resources and quality'. AWRP already has planning permission and so will not be assessed by the SA.
SA44	“Ensure that waste is managed as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable”: Incineration is at the very bottom of the waste hierarchy. It is a process which creates new hazardous waste.	Comments noted. Moving waste up the waste hierarchy is included in the SA Framework.
SA44	Table 7: Sustainability Appraisal Framework: 3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport i) reduce vehicle emissions due to mineral and waste movements ii) encourage proximity between minerals and waste sites and markets/sources - The Parish Council would question how creating a single waste treatment plant for the county sits with these objectives.	Comments noted. The SA and Site Identification Methodology should pick this issue up for future planned sites.
SA46	Please see responses to other questions. [the full response includes answers to all questions - see column K]	Comments noted.
SA46	We support the objectives, however we feel that a number of these could be seen to be in conflict with each other, perhaps these will become clearer as the consultation process progresses	Some of the objectives will conflict, and the extent to which will become clear as the Sustainability Appraisal is taken forward. Uncertainty between competing objectives and their compatibility is also shown in the scoping report. It is recognised that not all objectives will be optimised; however, the extent to which objectives are achieved under different alternatives or options will be clearly stated within the Sustainability Report.
<b>Question 5 from the Regulation 18 Response Questionnaire: Do you have any other comments?</b>		
SA06	If there is a need to identify all potential mineral extraction areas by type, tonnage, technique and duration for the period 2014-2030 then the specific details required by the form will be too difficult to assess in some cases.	Sites put forward will provide this information.

SA06	If there is still the opportunity to bring forward new proposals in that period then as economics, technologies and exploration techniques for minerals evolve, new prospects will inevitably be identified.	The plan will need to be flexible - this will be passed to the plan team.
SA11	Quarry site submitting plans to extend their existing sites should only be able to do so if they can provide evidence that they will have exhausted their mineral/aggregate deposits during this the time frame for which the current call for sites falls (i.e. 2030).	A certain level of mineral reserves will need to be maintained.
SA11	Needless expansion scars the landscape.	Comments noted.
SA11	They should also be tasked with restoring their worked areas before being permitted to expand.	Development management issue - will be passed to planning team.
SA11	Restoring the landscape to its original condition should be one of the priorities.	A range of restoration options will be considered.
SA14	The Allerton Waste Recovery Park should NOT influence the context of the Joint Plan because:	See below.
SA14	<p>1. It is unsustainable and fails objectives 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 of the sustainability objectives below. It also has a 25 year contract life making it wholly inflexible to any change be it political, tax, health or any other criteria.</p> <p>The draft Sustainability Appraisal objectives to be used when assessing the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan are listed, below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity.</li> <li>2. Enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use.</li> <li>3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation.</li> <li>4. Protect and improve air quality.</li> <li>5. Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality.</li> <li>6. Reduce the causes of climate change.</li> <li>7. Respond and adapt to the effects of climate change.</li> <li>8. Minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding.</li> <li>9. Minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable.</li> <li>10. Conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character.</li> <li>11. Protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes.</li> <li>12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs.</li> <li>13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities.</li> </ol>	Allerton Park has already been given planning permission and will not be a focus of assessment in this SA.

	<p>14. Provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning.</p> <p>15. Protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities.</p> <p>16. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding.</p> <p>17. Address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive</p>	
SA14	<p>2. It does not include resources for waste disposal beyond the boundaries of the joint plan area as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>“The National Planning Policy Framework provides that Local Plans should plan positively for the infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF and that local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and</li> <li>- take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”</li> </ul>	<p>The NPPF requires cooperation between authorities across boundaries and between authorities. However, the NPPF does not state that this means facilities for use by North Yorkshire may be placed in other authority areas.</p>
SA14	<p>3. It is uneconomic because it is too large and relies on incorrect assumptions about waste volumes and does not take into account likely demand for waste from UK and Europe.</p>	<p>Waste projections are currently being undertaken to provide details of waste arisings in the future.</p>
SA14	<p>4. There was no proper consultation despite years of opportunity.</p> <p>In September 2008 Planning inspector Jonathan King held a public examination of the council's waste core strategy. He required clear evidence that the plan being proposed was well researched and thought out. There was no such evidence and NYCC had to seek permission to withdraw its Strategy. NYCC did not draft a new policy but continued with a procurement process for waste disposal. In December 2010 NYCC voted to enter a contract with AmeyCespa. It was only AFTER this decision that NYCC looked to develop a Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>The consultation papers went out in July 2011 and said that the Strategy MUST pass three tests. It must be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified when considered against reasonable alternatives</li> <li>• Must be Effective and FLEXIBLE and</li> <li>• Must be Consistent with national policy</li> </ul>	<p>Allerton Park has already been granted planning permission. This Plan will address all impacts of minerals and waste planning into the future.</p>

	<p>It goes on to say "...involvement of the public and organisations in the preparation of Waste Core Strategy documents is a FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENT of LEGISLATION and GUIDANCE." On page 25, however, one found that the whole strategy was based around an incinerator at Allerton. Page 25 made a mockery of the 'must have' criteria and public consultation requirements stated above. A key stakeholder workshop was held by NYCC in Northallerton on 18 October 2011. It was attended by 25 people, representing Parish Councils, local interest groups, countryside and environment organisations, local authorities and the waste industry.</p> <p>Five key themes emerged prominently.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Location—the benefits of treating waste as close to source as possible</li> <li>2 Economic benefit –jobs can be created and maintained through the local management and treatment of waste</li> <li>3 Cross boundary cooperation</li> <li>4 Encourage education and behaviour change</li> <li>5 Sensitivity to landscape—to protect North Yorkshire’s heritage of quality landscape,</li> </ol> <p>It is clear that from the progress on consultation made so far that a single site large incinerator is not a desired solution. We are dismayed that the same thing seems to be happening again with the current consultation and inclusion of Allerton on page 5 of the leaflet.</p> <p><b>ALTERNATIVE</b></p> <p>The decision of DEFRA not to award PFI credits is an opportunity for NYCC to abandon the Allerton Incinerator with a reasonable excuse. The savings will far outweigh the penalties. More cash will be available for services in the county.</p>	
SA24	I don't want to see our precious landscape and environment destroyed for profit unless there is NO other source of specific minerals.	The landscape is considered under sustainability objective number 11.
SA24	I want to see a robust rejection of 'fracking' in North Yorkshire not least because of the underground cave systems much valued by cavers (both local and visitors) who contribute to the county's economy.	Sustainability objective 12 covers economic issues. Any fracking policies would be considered by this and the wider SA Framework.
<b>Additional Comments</b>		
English Heritage	The suggested sustainability appraisal objective for the historic environment is somewhat repetitive and it might be better to simply use the following: 'Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings'.	Noted, this has now been changed.

English Heritage	Proposed sub-objectives: A key part of waste minimisation in terms of construction and demolition waste is to encourage the reuse or adaptation of existing buildings. This should be included as one of the sub-objectives, perhaps along the following lines, 'Encourage the reuse or adaptation of existing buildings'.	This is generally covered by the objectives, but will also be passed to the plan team.
English Heritage	Draft indicators: Add the following indicator, 'Number of existing buildings adapted or reused'.	Number of buildings reused for waste purposes will be very low, this is more of a LDF/LP indicator.
English Heritage	Proposed sustainability indicator: The suggested sustainability appraisal objective for the historic environment is somewhat repetitive and it might be better to simply use the following, 'Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings'.	Noted, will be changed.
English Heritage	Proposed sub-objectives: It is not clear what a 'landmark monument' might be. Consequently it is suggested that this is deleted to avoid any confusion.	Noted, this will be removed.
English Heritage	The York local plan sustainability appraisal includes as specific sustainability appraisal objective relating to the protection of those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic city. In view of the importance of York, consideration should be given to a similar objective, perhaps along the following lines, 'Safeguard those elements which contribute to the special historic character and setting of York'.	A sub-objective to protect the setting of York will be added to this objective.
English Heritage	Draft indicators: None of the indicators will actually monitor the impact which the policies and proposals of the plan are having upon the historic environment. It is suggested that the following additional indicator is added, 'Number of designated heritage assets whose significance is affected either positively or negatively by minerals or waste developments'.	The site assessment methodology, which will assess the sustainability implications of all sites allocated as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan, will document the number of designated heritage sites that are affected by minerals and waste development. These issues will also be addressed though monitoring later in the SA process.
English Heritage	If an additional sub-objective relating to York is included, then the following indicator should also be included, 'Number of minerals or waste developments impacting upon the elements identified as contributing to the special character or setting of York'.	Reference to York will be included within the first sub-objective of objective number 10. The impacts on historic assets of York should be considered in line with historic assets across the rest of the Plan Area. These issues will also be addressed though monitoring later in the SA process.
English Heritage	The number of visits to historic sites provides little information about the impact of this DPD. Therefore, it might be better to delete it.	This indicator can also provide information about tourism in the Plan Area, so will be included for these purposes. Indicators for monitoring the effects of the Plan



		will be established later in the SA process.
English Heritage	One of the main ways by which this plan can assist in protecting and enhancing the character of the townscapes is by ensuring a steady supply of locally sourced building stone. This should be referred to within this sustainability appraisal objective, perhaps along the following lines: proposed sub-objective - 'To ensure a steady supply of building and roofing stone for the repair and construction of buildings and structures'; draft indicator - 'Quantity of building and roof stone extracted'.	Comments noted - the sub-objective and indicator will be added.
English Heritage	English Heritage strongly advises that the conservation and the archaeological staff of the councils are closely involved throughout the preparation of the SA of the plan. They are best placed to advise on: local historic environment issues and priorities, including access to data held in the HER (formerly SMR); how the policies or proposals can be tailored to minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of historic sites.	Conservation and archaeological staff will be consulted on drafts of SA reports during drafting and through the site assessment methodology process.
English Heritage	Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by you with your letter correspondence received on 18th May 2013. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise (either as a result of this consultation or in later versions of the Plan) where we consider that, despite the SA/SEA, these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.	Comments noted.
SA20	We welcome the recognition in the leaflets and documents that there is a need to reduce waste; move up the waste hierarchy; and the recognition that provision must be made for all waste types including low level radioactive waste. The Plan needs to move up the waste hierarchy.	Comments noted. This is reflected within SA objective 9.
SA20	The approach to a call for sites is also welcomed, as is the Sustainability Appraisal.	Comments noted.
Environment Agency	In terms of the scoping report this is very thorough and rather overfacing. There is one small bit that bothers me a little and that is section 6.6 in Volume 1 - the internal compatibility matrix (and table) for sustainability appraisal. I think it stretches credibility that so very few objectives are uncertain and none are even potentially incompatible. Quite a few are potentially incompatible I would have thought, but need not be if certain measures are taken / safeguards are put in place.	Response will depend on re-assessment of the matrix.

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Q1: Groundwater: We are pleased to note that Table 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, May 2013, has captured all the main documents of concern to the Groundwater and Contaminated Land team of the Environment Agency. The table lists the Regional River Basin Management Plans. Specifically, we recommend that the Humber River Basin Management Plan, produced by the Environment Agency, is referenced and taken into account in the Minerals and Waste Plan. It is available from the following location on our website: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/124803.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/124803.aspx</a> . The river basin plan covers the whole of the minerals and waste plan area. The river basin plan is about the pressures facing the water environment in this river basin district, and the actions that will address them. It has been prepared in consultation with a wide range of organisations and individuals and is the first of a series of six-year planning cycles. Specifically, it highlights failing water bodies in the region, dividing it into failures in water quality and failures in water quantity. In the case of minerals planning, interruptions to flow quantity or directions will be of concern, especially in already failing water bodies but also in water bodies deemed to be at good quantitative status, as we have a statutory obligation not to allow good water bodies to degenerate to poor.</p>	<p>Agree. The Humber River Basin Management Plan is explicitly referred to in the review of PPPSI.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Certain types of mining may also generate contaminative end products and this could have implications for the qualitative status of water bodies throughout the region. Table 6 of your Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, May 2013 references the Groundwater Source Protection Zones. You should be specifically aware that our most stringent restrictions are applied to Source Protection Zone 1. Our guidance document entitled Groundwater protection: Principles and practice (GP3) November 2012, Version 1 describes our approach to the management and protection of groundwater in England and Wales. It provides a framework within which we can work with others to manage and protect groundwater, and includes mining activities. It is available from the following location on our website: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/144346.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/144346.aspx</a> Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.</p>	<p>The specific types of restoration will be considered/developed by the Plan and not the SA. However the SA will help ensure that any schemes proposed are in line with environmental good practice.</p>

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Groundwater: We are pleased to note that Table 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, May 2013, has captured all the main documents of concern to the Groundwater and Contaminated Land team of the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>The table lists the Regional River Basin Management Plans. Specifically, we recommend that the Humber River Basin Management Plan, produced by the Environment Agency, is referenced and taken into account in the Minerals and Waste Plan. The river basin plan covers the whole of the minerals and waste plan area. The river basin plan is about the pressures facing the water environment in this river basin district, and the actions that will address them. It has been prepared in consultation with a wide range of organisations and individuals and is the first of a series of six-year planning cycles. Specifically, it highlights failing water bodies in the region, dividing it into failures in water quality and failures in water quantity. The main concern for new waste sites will be how they affect the quality of water bodies in the region, and whether they contribute to preventing a failing water body from achieving good status, or whether they jeopardise the status of water bodies that are currently designated as good.</p>	<p>The Humber RBMP is taken into account specifically within the report and PPPSIs. Water bodies affected by the Plan are taken into account within sustainability objective number 2.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Table 6 of your Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, May 2013 references the Groundwater Source Protection Zones. You should be specifically aware that our most stringent restrictions are applied to Source Protection Zone 1. Our guidance document entitled Groundwater protection: Principles and practice (GP3) November 2012, Version 1 describes our approach to the management and protection of groundwater in England and Wales. It provides a framework within which we can work with others to manage and protect groundwater, and includes waste activities. It is available from the following location on our website: <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/144346.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/publications/144346.aspx</a></p>	<p>These issues will be explicitly taken into account as part of the site assessment methodology, which will be consulted on in due course.</p>
<p>SA45</p>	<p>Whilst your Sustainability Appraisal is full of noble sentiments about using good science and recognising that the environment is the ultimate support for all economic activity (I welcome the revision made to the previous economics/ society/ environment Venn diagram used on the earlier Minerals and Waste Framework document!), the actual scoping seems to lose a lot of this focus. It appears to encompass sustainability, impact on the historic environment, job creation, inclusivity - even leisure opportunities. These are not the same things as sustainability, even by the broadest Brundtland definition. This document</p>	<p>Comments noted. The issues that are mentioned are all sustainability issues that are relevant to the Plan area and have been identified by the SA scoping report already. The objectives are based on sustainability issues that are relevant to the Plan area and have been developed by taking into account data on the current condition across the Plan area (in the Baseline) and also any</p>

	would perhaps be more accurately described as 'Inconvenient Secondary Considerations Document'. I do believe that the impacts on social inclusion and the historic environment are worth considering - in fact I would say that such quality of life issues, alongside an intellectually honest sustainability plan, should be placed at the heart of this process of public policymaking. Certainly I would place them more centrally when making decisions than providing a guaranteed 25 year income to AmeyCespa or a determination to facilitate the economically efficient extraction of minerals by large private interests. I look forward to re-responding at the next shifting of the goalposts.	published plans, policies, programmes or initiatives. The policies in the Plan will be assessed against SA objectives but must also take forward national policy relating to waste management and facilitating the supply of minerals.
SA46	In order to protect landscapes and the environment, rigorous systems must be established to ensure that sites worked have minimal impact on communities and in this difficult economic environment that secure finances are made available/secured to ensure that restoration of mineral and waste sites is ensured. Whether that is through planning and or legal and financial agreements. Prior to planning permission being granted for extraction of minerals, a clear strategy should be identified and agreed with the planning authority ensuring that disposal of waste is best used in line with the waste hierarchy, this must then be enforceable through the planning process.	These are detailed development management considerations that can only be considered by the Plan and not the SA. These comments will be passed over to the Plan team.
SA46	Selection of new minerals sites should be undertaken with full public involvement as these communities will have to live with the planning decisions taken for many years. Rigorous policies need to be implemented and enforced to protect the landscape and the environment and quality of life of the communities within which they exist.	The public will be consulted on at all stages of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The public will also be consulted as the Plan progresses.
SA46	Sustainability is an important area and reuse of products which are created as a by-products of mining should be of utmost importance and the creation of ways to use these products as secondary aggregates should be investigated and facilitated as part of the Minerals and Waste Strategy	The SA objective 8 should include a sub objective that recognises the value of secondary mineral resources - i.e. 'promote the use of secondary and recycled minerals resources where they can play a role in reducing the need for primary minerals extraction'. This is also an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
SA46	Joint Plan form Q2: See Q1 and 3	N/A
SA46	Is there a strategic overview of what is needed within the area of the plan? Our concern is that private companies put in planning applications for, as an example a waste incinerator at Kellingley Colliery, when potentially there is already one in the planning system the Allerton waste recovery park. It is clear that with 110 waste management facilities within the	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.

	joint plan area, further proliferation is in no one interest, presumably a needs assessment has been undertaken?	
SA46	Can the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan influence in any way the proliferation of schemes put forward by private companies which may not be in the interest of the local community and may indeed cause harm, and may be unnecessary if a needs assessment had been undertaken?	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
SA46	Joint Plan from Q3: It would be very helpful if the Minerals and Waste Authority could take a strategic view of all Minerals and Waste projects across the area covered by this plan and facilitate collaborative working between the two streams i.e. minerals and waste. Examples exist in other areas where integrated collaborative working has taken place between for example quarry operators and collieries. Such collaborative working has benefitted the community and local environment in other areas. This also ensures that waste produced from coal mining which would otherwise end up at the bottom of the waste hierarchy under "disposal" rises to second to the top of the waste hierarchy under "reuse". Again the use of planning policies should ensure that planning permission is not granted unless the operator can demonstrate they have fulfilled the requirements of the planning authority in so much as compliance with the highest level of the waste hierarchy- the level should be determined by the planning authority or the Minerals and Waste Authority for each type of waste not left to the operators discretion to choose where it fits.	This is an issue for the Plan team and so this comment will be passed to them.
SA46	There are a number of quarries around the area covered by NYCC which have voids to be filled and where material may have to be imported to fill these voids, equally there are a number of coal mines which are producing massive amounts of colliery spoil and have nowhere to tip this.	This is an issue for the plan team to consider in planning for facilities.
SA46	Joint Plan form Q5: The Parish Council would appreciate being involved in any further consultation as this plan progresses. We have a number of Minerals and Waste sites within our area which have an impact on local amenity.	Consultees who have expressed an interest in the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan will be updated as the Plan progresses.
SA47	The accompanying SA and SEA work appears to be well judged in content and appropriate for the plan.	Comments noted, thank you.



## Appendix 2: Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Workshop Session 1 Outcomes

Attendees to the workshops were asked to look through the proposed sustainability objectives, sub-objectives and indicators and provide comments on these and identify any gaps.

Sustainability Objective	Comments/suggestions	How this has been addressed in revised Scoping Report
1. Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity.	Add indicator 'no. of SSSI sites affected by the minerals and waste plan'.	Indicator added.
	Record specific impacts of each planning application.	This will be outlined in the site assessment methodology and the subsequent assessment of sites that will take place.
	Local Nature Partnerships are not fully taken into account. The targets of LNPs should be reflected in the indicators.	North Yorkshire and York LNP Upland Chain LNP - Check objectives and crossover with SA objectives/indicators
	Flytipping could have an impact on biodiversity – indicators can be drawn from flycapture/waste data flow.	We have indicators that take account of biodiversity – do we need to specifically monitor flytipping?
	BARS (Biodiversity Action Reporting System) should be referred to.	This is referred to within the baseline.
	Group noted strong links to geodiversity in minerals work.	Does this mean potential destruction in geodiversity due to minerals exploitation, or discovery and accessibility?
	Accessibility to geodiversity is important.	Comments noted, thank you.
	Would be helpful to differentiate between geodiversity and biodiversity SSSIs in the indicators.	This has now been split in the baseline and reporting.
	Would be good to add number of local geodiversity sites 'maintained and identified' to the indicators.	Work on this is currently being carried out. Further information will be added when the work is complete.
	Higher Level Stewardship is coming to an end, so indicators should refer to agri-environment schemes.	This has been highlighted in the scoping report and future monitoring will measure agri-environment schemes.
The word 'SINC' in the indicators may not	Noted – this has been changed within the scoping report.	

	cover all areas. The group suggested that SINC should be changed to 'local nature conservation or local biodiversity sites'.	
	The group suggested that the objectives should link in with green infrastructure strategies (Harrogate are currently developing a green infrastructure strategy). Minerals sites have an opportunity to contribute to green infrastructure through restoration.	Look at GI objectives and check crossover with framework/baseline – may need to add indicator or sub-objective.
	There was a suggestion that National Character Area profiles should be referred to in relation to biodiversity.	Comments noted – this has been added to the baseline.
	One comment was that the objectives and sub-objectives are pitched at about the right strategic level	Comments noted.
	It will be important to tie post-SEA monitoring in with EIAs in some way.	Comments noted. This will be considered when finalising the monitoring framework.
2. Enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use.	The 'flow' of rivers should not be impacted – this is another quality indicator in addition to those specified within the framework.	Site assessment methodology/testing? Or EIA? Site assessment may be able to assess type of use of the site and whether river flow would be impacted.
	There should be no sites located in groundwater protection zones.	Site assessment methodology/testing? Is this EA policy? Or an ideal?
	Add sub-objective supporting re-use of water.	Comments noted – this has now been added into the framework.
	Include recycling water as opposed to use of fresh water, in the sub-objectives.	Comments noted – this has now been added into the framework.
	Flood storage should be pre-planned.	Comment noted - this decided within the Plan-making.
	Sites within source protection zones should be minimised.	Site assessment methodology/testing? EA to clarify policies on this and GWPZs.
	There should be a coherent plan for site restoration within the Plan, rather than piecemeal restoration so that landowner agreement doesn't conflict pre-application.	Comments noted - this taken account of within the Plan.

	Safeguard zones could affect water extraction.	Seek clarification with EA on policy on this.
	Restore sites within source protection and safeguard zones to benefit biodiversity rather than agriculture.	Long-term indicator for monitoring, more an issue for the plan?
	Both quarrying and waste management could have an impact of nitrate levels in rivers. The EA has data available to monitor supply and nitrate concentrations available in CAMs.	Indicator? See clarification on data availability. See how often data are published to see if it would be useful for monitoring.
	Future mitigation (for consideration at later stages) included restoration for biodiversity, flood storage, open water course. Also, not to agree to type prior to development as this can result in poor restoration.	Comments noted, this will be an issue that the plan takes into account.
3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation.	Sites should be located next to existing train lines for more sustainable transportation and to minimise disturbance to local communities (i.e. having less freight transport and not having to build new roads for transportation).	This is reflected in the site assessment methodology.
	Noise and disturbance from trains, lorries, etc. needs to be taken into account/measured in the assessment process.	Noise pollution will be considered in areas where this is an issue, mitigation measures will also be set out where relevant.
	Add waste into second sub-objective	Comments noted, this has now been carried out.
	Re-word sub-objective 4 as it looks like minerals and waste sites should be close together	Comments noted, this has now been carried out.
	Minimise, rather than improve, congestion in the last sub-objective	Comments noted, this has now been carried out.
	Combine 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> sub-objective	Comments noted, this has now been carried out.
	Include waste transport in sub-objective 2.	Comments noted, this has now been carried out.
Consider transport routes.	This will be done as part of the plan and taken into account	

		in the Sustainability Appraisal.
	Travel plans should take into account Rights of Way and cycle routes.	The Sustainability Appraisal will take Rights of Way into account and cycle routes, specific travel plans will be implemented as part of individual schemes.
	Sites should be located, where possible, near to existing rail lines.	This is taken account in the SA framework; the site assessment methodology will specifically consider this also.
	Generally agreed that the objective covered the main transport themes.	Comments noted.
4. Protect and Improve Air Quality.	Links with objective 3.	Comments noted. Air quality is affected by other factors in addition to transport, so they have been kept separate.
	All minerals sites are monitored for dust so this data may be available for indicators.	To include? Need to check data availability.
	Dust and odour can be more significant at certain times of year.	Comments noted.
	The EA representatives suggested they would go away and think about air quality monitoring.	Comments noted. We will follow up this issue with the EA.
	Objectives about air quality are negatively phrased – should be framed more positively.	Comments noted – the wording has now been reviewed and revised.
	Considered that “reduce all emissions from new development” was not specific enough. Should be “compliant or improve on standards”. EA should be consulted on phrasing.	Comments noted. Will consider specific emissions connected will individual sites in the site assessment methodology/planning application stage.
5. Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality.	Add in support for use of waste-derived composts.	Comments noted, this is a specific objective, composting is supported within the SA framework.
	Overlap with objective 9.	Comments noted, we will be keeping the objectives distinct, given the wider issues associated with each objective.
	Encourage on-farm composting.	Comments noted, this is a specific objective, composting is supported within the SA framework. This will also be a planned policy.
	There should be a policy against depositing waste in particular types of quarry sites, for	Comments notes, this will be for the Plan to consider.

	example, filling sand and gravel sites with waste can result in problems with water pollution.	
	There shouldn't be permission for landfill of material that is biodegradable and has a recoverable nutrient value.	Comments notes, this will be for the Plan to consider.
	Brownfield land isn't always the preferred option for sites where there is high biodiversity.	Impacts on biodiversity will be considered in the SA framework. Where conflict may arise, this will be stated in the SA.
	The mitigation principle should be set out at an early stage – important to establish long-term viability including consideration of end use.	Comments noted, this will be considered within policies set out by the plan.
	Acknowledgement of land type and understanding what land could be used for in order to determine end use is important in site assessment.	Comments noted, this will be considered within policies set out by the Plan. Site assessment will identify land use and provide information for developers of after-use policies.
6. Reduce the causes of climate change.	An indicator to measure recycling should be added.	Included as part of objective number 9.
	An indicator to measure how many buildings are re-used should be added.	Comments noted – this is not specific enough to minerals and waste planning.
	Add a sub-objective to promote re-use of buildings.	Comments noted – this is not specific enough to minerals and waste planning.
	One point was that minerals are extracted where they are found, so there may be limited opportunity to locate close to railheads etc.	Comments noted. This will be decided within the Plan.
	A question was raised as to whether existing land use captures carbon (so it may not just be about capturing carbon through future land management).	Comments noted. This will be decided within the Plan.
	As well as the 'energy hierarchy' the 'waste hierarchy' should be considered in objective 6.	The waste hierarchy is considered in objective 9 as it is specific to waste, crossover with climate issues will be picked up in the SA assessment.



	To tackle climate change 'renewable, decentralised energy' and 'local renewable systems' should be referred to in the sub objectives.	Comments noted – this is taken into account into the SA framework.
7. Respond and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Sub-objective referring to 'not susceptible to the effects of climate change' is a bit vague.	Comments noted – wording has been reviewed and revised.
	Should refer to not increasing flooding or affecting elsewhere.	Comments noted, crossover with the objective considering flooding will be taken into account in the assessment.
	A question was asked as to whether existing sites would also be subject to SA. The group agreed they would only be considered where they are likely to change during the plan period (e.g. extensions), however, cumulative effects with existing sites will be considered.	Comments noted.
	One comment was that the merits of joining objectives 6 and 7 together should be considered. All objectives should be 'smart' and well evidenced.	Comments noted – these objectives have been kept separate as they seek to achieve different things.
8. Minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding.	There needs to be a policy on the promotion of recycling within the Joint Plan.	This will be considered as part of the plan.
	Figures for rubble and building materials from private companies would be useful in determining the market of such materials and The use of secondary aggregates and minerals. Central government are the only ones who can get information on this, local authorities will probably not be able to access this information.	Commented noted, should data become available, this will be considered as part of the plan.
	Add example to 1 <sup>st</sup> sub-objective re: not using high quality building stone for aggregates for example.	Comments noted – this is too specific for the sub-objectives.
	'Wisely' is ambiguous – need to be more specific (in 1 <sup>st</sup> sub-objective)	Comments noted – this has been changed to 'efficiently'.

	Commercial waste needs to be taken into account in re-use and recycling – much can be re-used (for example, building rubble).	Comments noted, this is supported by the objective, but will also be considered explicitly as part of the Plan.
9. Minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable.	Waste should be separated - inert from non-inert waste, which would enable more re-use and recycling. There should be a policy of separation and re-use of minerals to encourage this.	Comments noted, this is supported by the objective, but will also be considered as part of the Plan. There may be potential to monitor how these types of waste are monitored.
	Add sub-objective to re-use materials that can be recycled and avoiding using materials	This is supported as part of the objective.
	Support re-use of buildings	Comments noted – this will be considered by the plan developers.
	There should be a presumption to use recycled aggregate wherever possible and this should be separated in the waste stream.	This is supported by the objective.
	Can inert waste be processed at quarries into aggregate?	? To follow up.
10. Conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character.	Wording of objective should be re-worded along the lines of ‘conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting’.	Comments noted – this has now been changed.
	Sub-objective to protect the setting of York	This has now been added in to the bullet point list of first sub-objective.
	Focus seems to be on designated whereas 90% are non-designated.	This is supported by sub-objectives 3 and 4, and will also be assessed at the site assessment stage and development management stage.
	Sub-objectives – not clear what ‘landmark monuments’ are.	This has now been removed.
	4 <sup>th</sup> sub-objective should also refer to understanding	Comments noted – this has now been added.
	Sub-objective should support supply of building stone to preserve historic assets	This sub-objective has now been modified.
	Indicators should relate to effects of the Plan	This will be considered when we approach the monitoring

	– effects on sites, no. of new discoveries through planning applications, measure enhanced knowledge and understanding, new sites on HER, amount of building stone extracted.	stages of the Plan/SA.
	Looked broadly fine. However, there is the potential for the sub objectives to consider the potential for improvements to the wider historic townscape and landscape.	We have now added ‘enhance’ into sub-objectives 2 and 3.
	In addition, the fourth sub objective should include ‘public understanding’ – i.e. ‘To improve access to, and enjoyment of, and public understanding of, the historic environment where appropriate’.	This sub-objective has now been modified.
	The group were confused by what ‘preserve and enhance local culture’ meant	Change to cultural heritage.
	The group also agreed that the indicators were too reliant on English Heritage data, and should also consider Historic Environment Record.	This will be considered when we approach the monitoring stages of the Plan/SA.
	It will be important to also consider non designated historic assets (for instance York’s buildings of local but not national significance). In Darlington, Durham Archaeology helped identify areas of greater archaeological interest,	This will be considered when we approach the monitoring stages of the Plan/SA.
	Defining significance in relation to historic assets will be important	This will be considered at the site assessment stage via the focus groups.
	Potential for further understanding of local culture and patterns of movement in the location process?	Understanding is incorporated into this objective.
11. Protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes	Add York to 1 <sup>st</sup> sub-objective	An additional sub-objective for York has now been added.
	Include Heritage Coast in 6 <sup>th</sup> sub-objective.	This has now been changed.

	Add sub-objective about protect character and setting of York	Covered above.
	8 <sup>th</sup> sub-objective – amend along the lines of ‘to co-locate waste facilities with existing uses where possible to reduce dispersed visual impact or in a way which fits in with the landscape’ (talked about example designed as an agricultural building).	This has now been changed.
	Add sub-objective re: maintain and enhance enjoyment and understanding of the landscape and townscape.	This is covered in objective 14.
	There are indicators in York’s plan to monitor effects on setting of the Plan.	Noted – this will be considered when finalising the monitoring framework.
	The sub objective ‘to protect and enhance local landscape/townscape character.....’ should be moved to the top of the list of sub objectives.	This has now been moved.
	The group questioned why the first sub objective ‘conserve and enhance the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the North York Moors National Park’ applied just to the National Park.	Considered above – now moved.
	Traffic was seen as having a visual impact and was suggested to be considered in the sub objectives. One suggestion was to change a sub objective to ‘to protect and improve tranquillity levels and reduce sources of intrusion, such as light pollution, traffic and the visual impact of traffic’.	This has now been added.
	Indicator 3 ‘ratio of standalone minerals/waste sites to sites located next to existing buildings’ needs to be explained with a footnote.	Check with CH.

	Green belt is not a designation	Yes it is.
	Reviews of cultural heritage have been undertaken in North Wales	Comments noted.
	One suggestion was that a sub objective should state 'ensure development does not compromise the purposes of designation of National Parks and AONBs'.	AONBs have now been added into first sub-objective, as have the Dales.
	The group suggested that national parks and AONBs should be given the same weight in the objectives.	Noted in the above comments.
	There was some uncertainty over the merits of using the indicator 'ratio of standalone minerals/waste sites to sites located next to existing buildings (NYCC)' – this seemed to the group to be appropriate in some landscapes but not in others.	Check with CH. This will be taken into account when monitoring the Plan/SA.
12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs	Add consideration of the wider economy (national).	Comparisons of NY with England/GB are included in the baseline. Sub-objective 2 covers local and national levels.
	Reduced construction costs could be beneficial to economy	Comments noted.
	There needs to be markets for end products created by waste streams – are the markets there?	Comment noted, wider national initiatives support this.
	Very few re-processing facilities in North Yorkshire – paper is exported to Liverpool, glass to Barnsley and cans to Nottingham.	Comment noted.
	An indicator should be added - 'level of reserves' which can be drawn from the Local Aggregate Assessment.	This will be considered when monitoring the Plan/SA.
	The sub-objective 'to capture value from waste streams by creating saleable products from them' should have words akin to 'provide opportunities to use waste as a resource'	Comments noted – this has now been changed.



	added.	
13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities	New facilities could enhance community life.	This is covered by objective 14.
	Restoration can boost tourism.	This is covered in the first sub-objective.
	Job creation, training and volunteer opportunities should be 3 separate objectives, and should not just be related to site restoration.	Job creation is covered by objective 12.
	Offsite mitigation through S106 – provision of community infrastructure.	This will be a development management issue.
	Indicators should relate to site reclamation.	This will be thought about as part of the monitoring framework.
	In addition to comments on specific objectives, the point was made that Defra has done a waste arisings survey, which alongside the waste interrogator and an EA study of waste arisings in the north east, could be a helpful source of indicators.	Work is being undertaken as part of the evidence base for the Plan.
	The group agreed that tourism could be generated through minerals restoration. However, it will be important to be flexible in the approach to restoration. The tourism objective should be accompanied by a visitor numbers indicator – and not just the number of visits to historic sites.	This will be considered as part of the monitoring plan.
	The group agreed that the indicator 'length of public rights of way network' would be good but noted this could be good or bad – diversions would add to length and so would new footpaths created through restoration.	This will be considered as part of the monitoring plan.
	The group suggested that Natural England ANGST standard could be made into an indicator.	Number of hectares created will be considered as part of monitoring plan.
14. Provide opportunities to enable recreation,	Quarries can be turned into learning centres	This has been passed to the plan team for consideration.

leisure and learning	after extraction from them has ceased. Living landscapes should be taken into account for recreation and learning in the restoration process. Quarry sites should be restored to good quality habitats.	
	This can be linked with biodiversity and creating BAP habitat and living landscapes.	BAP habitat created will be considered for monitoring.
15. Protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities	Fly-tipping may occur when quarries are not restored to a good enough standard, in this way, it makes it easy for people to think that they can dump rubbish in them. If they are restored to a high quality and used for recreation/learning, people would be less likely to dump rubbish (as they would also be filled). Landscaping in connection with re-use of the site can also reduce fly-tipping.	Development management issue and has been passed to the Plan team.
	There was some confusion about how the indicator 'Incapacity benefit claimants as a percentage of working age population' could be linked directly to this objective.	This is a proxy indicator that gives an indication of the wellbeing of communities.
	Noise pollution isn't measured in the indicators.	This will be considered for specific sites, there are no data on levels of noise across the plan area.
	We need to enable site security and to reduce fly tipping – landscaping can reduce the incentive to fly tip and can create more bio diverse settings.	Development management issue and has been passed to the plan team.
	The group commented on the relevance of the healthcare objectives.	This is contextual information that indicates the general health and wellbeing of the plan area.
	The group discussed that there are 3 phases which need to be considered for this objective: construction, operation and restoration	This is a development management issue and has been passed to the plan team.
	It was considered that the sub-objectives	The sub-objectives are relevant to minerals and waste

	should be more specific to health related impacts from waste and minerals.	development.
	Site specific work should consider decibels acceptable on a proximity basis.	Specific sites will be considered for the potential for noise to impact on local communities. Noise from sites cannot be quantified before development.
	Future analysis should consider pollution sensitive locations particularly in connection with water contamination and biodiversity	This is taken into account in the framework.
16. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding	Areas for flood storage should be improved, disused quarries can be used for flood storage (upstream, to limit damage downstream).	This will be considered as part of plan policies.
	There are often failures with geo-engineered schemes – natural storage/alleviation is the much better option. This should be used wherever possible.	This will depend on specific sites, but these considerations will be taken into account.
	There should be a strategic use of sites for flood storage – enhance flood storage in this way.	This will be considered as part of plan policies.
17. Address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner	The footprint of water use should be taken into account.	Sub-objectives under objective 2 relate to the use of water and its conservation.
	Water butts and other water-saving schemes should be used in minerals processing in order to conserve water.	This is a development management issue and has been passed to plan team.
	The local authority should specify that local resources should be used in the Joint Plan.	This is covered by several sub-objectives.
	Sourcing of resources should be done within the county – even large companies can specify sourcing of materials from the local area.	The SA objectives support local viability and vitality.
	There should be a short supply chain and recycled materials should be used along this wherever possible.	This is supported by objective 9.

General comments on Sustainability Objectives (e.g. missing themes)

Comment	How this has been addressed in revised draft methodology?
There is nothing about the managed aggregate supply system in the framework – this includes the requirement for steady aggregates supply	This is covered in objective 12.
There should be an explanation as to what the purpose of indicator is in the Framework is.	A more thorough explanation has now been added.
There needs to be some objectives/indicators for safeguards around sewage works.	This is a development management issue, although the implication of sewage works are covered by a number of SA objectives.
Some additional indicators could be drawn from district level LDFs	This will be reviewed for monitoring.

## Appendix 3: Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Workshop Session 2 Outcomes

This task involved discussion around a ‘mock’ site allocation – each group had either a waste site or a minerals site with a brief description of the site and surroundings and the type and scale of the development proposed. The sites were highlighted on a map showing constraints. Attendees were asked to list the types of constraints that they felt would be relevant to consider and these were then compared against the draft questions in the Site Selection Methodology. Comments are in relation to the questions presented in the draft methodology against each sustainability objective rather than on the sustainability objectives.

Sustainability Objective	Comments on questions/suggested questions
1. Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity.	De-watering could affect all land and habitats surrounding the site.
2. Enhance or maintain water quality and improve efficiency of water use.	Is the site likely to affect any water body (regardless of proximity)?
	Would it affect groundwater?
	Is the land sloping? Would it lead to run-off and where to?
	What is the capacity of drainage facilities?
	How high are current groundwater levels and what would the effects of de-watering be?
	Does the site slope towards receptors?
	Contamination of groundwater could affect nearby watercourses.
	Watercourses connected to the site could affect groundwater quality
	Groundwater quality is also affected by the underlying strata and the run-through rate of the groundwater (this would be the case at this site as it is located on a slope).
	Could Nitrate Vulnerable Zones be affected by a combination of nearby waste sites, plus potential deposition of farm waste at these sites (i.e. extra nitrates)?
	A potential showstopper is whether the site removes or diverts water from a groundwater Source Protection Zone.
What is the geology under the site? Is it a Source Protection Zone? Where are the abstraction licenses?	
3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation.	How close is the site to any village/town – would traffic go through this?
	Consider transport routes and the method of transport in addition to the effect on the communities that they pass through.
4. Protect and Improve Air Quality.	Perception of dust as well as reality should be considered.
	Is it windy? (Prevailing wind.)
	The group noted that <b>objective 4</b> in the site assessment document should refer to ‘bio-aerosol’ exclusion zones. This is a potential showstopper for composting sites (if a house is within 300m of a site it is thought that Environment Agency policy is to object).
	Smell should be in the air quality objectives .
5. Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality.	<i>No comments made</i>
6. Reduce the causes of climate change.	<i>No comments made</i>

7. Respond and adapt to the effects of climate change.	<i>No comments made</i>
8. Minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding.	Is the site greenfield or brownfield?
9. Minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable.	<i>No comments made</i>
10. Conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character.	Consider visual impact of all buildings associated with the development.
11. Protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes.	Is the site screened?
	Is it in a high or prominent location?
	Is the site is on a slope can it be viewed?
12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs.	What is the market for the end product (waste treatment)?
	What is the feedstock?
	Potential for job creation in nearby area.
13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities.	First question under Objective 13 covers too many things and needs to be separated out.
	Second question should also cover reducing use of materials.
14. Provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning.	<i>No comments made</i>
15. Protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities.	Objective 15 should also consider visual effects of transport.
	Litter from waste sites – would need to take into account waste blowing from sites and lorries and the topography of the site (i.e. where the litter would fall) and the impact that it might have on nearby towns or villages.
	Could trees provide adequate protection from strong winds that may blow waste from the site and also from the smell that could descend on nearby towns?
	Dust produced from the quarry could blow-off and affect the quality of surrounding water bodies and also affect groundwater and towns/villages.
16. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding.	Objective 16 should include 'Is the development water compatible?' (E.g. sand and gravel.)
	Flash flooding and the impact on waste sites and also the local community where waste and pollutants from the flood may be deposited should be taken into account.
17. Address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner.	<i>No comments made</i>



Other comments on the site assessment methodology:

<b>Comments/questions</b>
In Table 2 of the methodology, flood storage should be added as an opportunity.
Include the question – ‘Is the site/type of development needed?’
Include the question – ‘Are there existing sites that could meet the requirement?’ There should be a check that the site is needed in the local area – can other nearby sites already established do the job?
Include the question – ‘How can public opinion be taken into account in site selection?’
Include question – ‘Where is the market from which the waste will be brought in?’ There is a need to check that what the developer is proposing can actually take place/is viable.
Include question – ‘Is it already an industrial area?’
Development Management-type considerations that should be taken into account: Dust, odour, use of netting to avoid waste flying around, how run-off will be managed, how will public be engaged with?
How will scoring or weighting be applied? What is positive and what is negative?
Public engagement and acceptance is a big issue with siting of waste centres – we will need to engage with the public very early in the process to get ‘buy-in’ from community members.
Is the technology proven (in the case of energy technologies for waste)?
When allocating sites there will need to be a consideration of housing growth areas as this will exert additional pressure on land.
‘Should site assessment process discussion learn from the past?’ (I.e. assessments that took place in earlier iterations of minerals allocations work).
Public acceptability of the technology is important.
Mitigation measures should consider enhancements and opportunities for the sites in the long-term.

## Appendix 4: Updated Joint Minerals and Waste Sustainability Appraisal Framework

Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
<p>1. Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Protect and enhance designated nature conservation sites and protected species;</li> <li>-To contribute to the suitable protection of trees, woodlands and forests</li> <li>-Avoid damage to designated geological assets and create new areas of geodiversity value;</li> <li>-Seek to contribute to national targets for biodiversity, including for national and local priority species and habitats;</li> <li>-Seek to contribute to local targets for geodiversity;</li> <li>-Preserve the integrity of habitat networks and increase the connectivity between habitats;</li> <li>-Maximise the potential for the creation of new habitats;</li> <li>-Minimise the spread of invasive species;</li> <li>-Provide opportunities for people to access the natural environment;</li> <li>-Protect and manage ancient woodland;</li> <li>-Appropriately manage and enhance PAWS;</li> <li>-Promote improvements for biodiversity at the landscape scale;</li> <li>-Achieve a net gain for biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Percentage of SSSIs in favourable condition (Natural England).</li> <li>2. Total area of SSSI (Natural England).</li> <li>3. Total area of UK BAP Priority Habitat (Natural England).</li> <li>4. Area of ancient and semi natural woodland (Natural England).</li> <li>5. Area of ancient replanted woodland (PAWS) (Natural England).</li> <li>6. Area of land in Higher Level Stewardship (Natural England).</li> <li>7. Area of SINC land (NYCC).</li> <li>8. Number of alerts for invasive species relevant to North Yorkshire (Defra)<sup>4</sup>.</li> <li>9. Number of alien species on UKTAG List found in North Yorkshire<sup>5</sup>.</li> </ol>
<p>2. Enhance or maintain water quality and supply and improve efficiency of water use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ensure that Water Framework Directive status objectives for surface and groundwater are not compromised by maintaining or improving upon ecological and chemical status;</li> <li>-Prevent unsustainable levels of ground and surface water abstraction;</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Percentage of water bodies achieving overall good status in River Basin Management Plans (Environment Agency).</li> <li>2. Water resource availability at low flows as reported in CAMS (Environment Agency).</li> <li>3. Groundwater resource availability as reported in CAMS</li> </ol>

<sup>4</sup> Species distribution to be taken from the National Biodiversity Network.

<sup>5</sup> Species distribution to be taken from the National Biodiversity Network.

Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Avoid wasting water;</li> <li>-Protect groundwater source protection zones.</li> </ul>	(Environment Agency).
<p>3. Reduce transport miles and associated emissions from transport and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Encourage more sustainable transport modes;</li> <li>-Reduce the impact of transporting minerals by road on local communities;</li> <li>-Reduce vehicle emissions due to mineral and waste movements;</li> <li>-Encourage proximity between minerals and waste sites and markets / sources;</li> <li>-Safeguard or deliver valuable infrastructure that may contribute to modal shift;</li> <li>-Promote active travel and sustainable commuting;</li> <li>-Improve congestion.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motor vehicle traffic (Vehicle miles) by local authority (DfT).</li> <li>2. Proportion of residents who walk or cycle, at least one per month, for utility purposes (for reasons other than recreation, health, training or competition) by local authority<sup>6</sup> (DfT).</li> <li>3. Road transport energy consumption at local authority level (DfT/NAEI).</li> </ol>
<p>4. Protect and improve air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reduce all emissions to air from new development;</li> <li>-To reduce the causes and levels of air pollution in Air Quality Management Areas and seek to avoid new designations;</li> <li>-To minimise dust and odour, particularly where communities or other receptors may be affected;</li> <li>-Support cleaner technology for minerals and waste development;</li> <li>-Avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality where it could result in negative impacts on the health of present and future occupants / users;</li> <li>-Seek to avoid adding to pollutant deposition at sensitive habitats.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of Air Quality Management Areas.</li> <li>2. Number of SAC and SPAs exceeding critical loads for deposition of either N or S (APIS).</li> <li>3. Mapped distribution of NOX, NO2, PM10 and PM2.5 (Defra LAQM).</li> </ol>
<p>5. Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reduce the permanent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land;</li> <li>-Conserve and enhance soil resources and quality;</li> <li>-Promote good land management practices on restored land;</li> <li>-Reduce the amount of derelict, contaminated, degraded and</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of minerals and waste applications which are located within areas of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (NYCC).</li> <li>2. Land use change: previous use of land changing to developed use</li> </ol>

<sup>6</sup> Department for Transport/Sport England, 2012. Local Area Walking and Cycling Statistics: England 2010/11 [URL: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/9105/local-area-walking-and-cycling-2010-11.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/9105/local-area-walking-and-cycling-2010-11.pdf) ].

Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
	vacant / underused land; -Recover nutrient value from biodegradable wastes (e.g. compost, biodigestate); -Minimise land taken up by minerals and waste development; -Seek to utilise brownfield land for waste development where possible.	annual average by region <sup>7</sup> (DCLG).
6. Reduce the causes of climate change.	-Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases; -Reduce CO2 from minerals and waste development through use of energy efficient and low and zero carbon design and adoption of efficient plant and processes; -Maximise the generation and use of renewable energy in appropriate locations; -Prevent the loss of embodied energy by promoting the use of recycled, recyclable and secondary resources; -Promote carbon storage through appropriate land management; -Adhere to the principles of the energy hierarchy <sup>8</sup> .	1. Emissions of CO <sub>2</sub> per capita by Local Authority (excluding LULUCF <sup>9</sup> ) (DECC). 2. Industrial and commercial per capita CO <sub>2</sub> emissions by Local Authority (DECC). 3. Road transport CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per capita by Local Authority (DECC). 4. Land use change CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per capita by Local Authority (DECC) <sup>10</sup> .
7. Respond and adapt to the effects of climate change.	-To plan and implement adaptation measures for the likely effects of climate change; -Ensure 'sustainable adaptation' is planned for <sup>11</sup> ;	1. UKCP climate change scenarios <sup>12</sup> (UKCP). 2. Mapped extent of Flood Zones under Climate Change as reported in available Strategic Flood Risk Assessments <sup>13</sup> (NYCC, CYC,

<sup>7</sup> Derived from the Department for Communities and Local Government 'Live Tables on Land Use Change Statistics' which are collated by Government Office Region [gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-land-use-change-statistics ].

<sup>8</sup> The energy hierarchy is analogous to the waste hierarchy in that it shows a sequence of preferred approaches to obtaining energy. Broadly this can be shown as three steps, in order of preference: 'Reduce' the amount of energy required in the first place (for instance through good design); 'Re-use' waste energy such as heat (e.g. through combined heat and power technology); and 'recycling' (which means the provision of energy that has some processing applied – e.g. renewable energy to meet demand or the extracting of energy from waste). CABE, 2011. Thinking Differently – The Energy Hierarchy.

<sup>9</sup> LULUCF relates to emissions from Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry.

<sup>10</sup> There is a time lag between publication of the DECC carbon statistics at a local authority level and the present year, such that 2010 figures were published in 2012.

<sup>11</sup> Sustainable Adaptation has been defined by Natural England. According to Natural England 'It is important that any adaptation action is sustainable. This means that any response by society should not actually add to climate change, cause detrimental impacts or limit the ability or other parts of the natural environment society or business to carry out adaptation elsewhere' (Natural England, undated. Sustainable Adaptation [URL: [naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/climateandenergy/climatechange/adaptation/sustainable.aspx](http://naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/climateandenergy/climatechange/adaptation/sustainable.aspx)].

Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
	<p>Ensure that minerals and waste developments are not susceptible to effects of climate change;                      -Ensure that minerals and waste developments do not hinder adaptation to climate change.</p>	<p>NYMNPAs).                      3. Allocations requiring exception testing in North Yorkshire SFRA (NYCC).</p>
<p>8. Minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding.</p>	<p>-To safeguard and use minerals resources wisely;                      -Safeguard infrastructure that may support more sustainable minerals and waste development                      -To encourage the re-use of primary materials;                      -To promote the efficient use of resources throughout the lifecycle of a development, including construction, operation and decommissioning of minerals and waste infrastructure;                      Encourage the utilisation of sustainable construction techniques;                      -Promote the use of secondary and recycled minerals resources where they can play a role in reducing the need for more primary minerals extraction.</p>	<p>1. Number / type / area of safeguarding areas defined in Plan.                      2. Reserves of primary land won aggregate and crushed rock (LAA).                      3. Sales of secondary aggregate in the North Yorkshire sub region (LAA).</p>
<p>9. Minimise waste generation and prioritise management of waste as high up the waste hierarchy as practicable.</p>	<p>-Use less materials through design and processing;                      -Re-use materials where possible;                      -Encourage recycling;                      -Recover residual resources (e.g. through anaerobic digestion or energy recovery);                      -Support 'recycling on the go';<sup>14</sup>                      -Recognise and promote the value of waste streams as alternatives to primary mineral extraction;                      -Promote economic gain through re-use.</p>	<p>1. Total waste received by waste facilities by category ('household, industrial and commercial', 'inert / construction and demolition', 'hazardous', 'unknown') (Environment Agency).                      2. Waste management method of household waste arisings in North Yorkshire (NYCC).                      3. Anaerobic digestion plants in the plan area<sup>15</sup>.</p>
<p>10. Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	<p>-To protect and enhance those elements, including setting, which contribute to the significance of:                      ➤ World Heritage Sites</p>	<p>1. Buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields 'at risk' as defined by the Heritage at Risk Register (English Heritage).</p>

<sup>12</sup> Changes to precipitation and temperature to be recorded in line with latest available data.

<sup>13</sup> As further SFRA work becomes available the spatial extent of increased flood risk from rivers will become clearer.

<sup>14</sup> 'Recycling on the go' is promoted by the Government's Waste Policy Review. It represents recycling on the street and in public places.

<sup>15</sup> As shown on the official biogas plant map produced by 'Anaerobic Digestion' [URL: <http://www.biogas-info.co.uk/>].

Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Scheduled Monuments</li> <li>➤ Archaeological Features</li> <li>➤ Listed buildings</li> <li>➤ Historic parks and gardens</li> <li>➤ Historic battlefields</li> <li>➤ Conservation Areas;</li> <li>➤ The City of York.</li> </ul> <p>-To provide appropriate protection for archaeological features in areas of potential development;</p> <p>-To protect the wider historic environment from the potential impacts of proposed development and the cumulative impacts;</p> <p>-To improve access to, and enjoyment of, the historic environment where appropriate;</p> <p>-Preserve and enhance local culture</p> <p>-Safeguard those elements which contribute to the special historic character and setting of York.</p> <p>-To ensure a steady supply of building and roofing stone for the repair and construction of buildings and structures;</p> <p>-Protect and enhance important non-designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>2. Number of visits to historic sites (Yorkshire and the Humber) (English Heritage).</p>
<p>11. Protect and enhance the quality and character of landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>-Conserve and enhance the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the North York Moors National Park;</p> <p>- To conserve and enhance the setting of designated landscapes, including those outside of the Plan area;</p> <p>- To protect and enhance the natural beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty-To protect and enhance local landscape / townscape character and quality, local distinctiveness and sense of place;</p> <p>-To protect the setting of important townscapes;</p> <p>-To protect the purposes and 'positive use'<sup>16</sup> of the Green Belt;</p>	<p>1. Number of minerals and waste planning applications in the green belt / designated landscapes / conservation areas (NYCC, CYC, NYMNPA);</p> <p>2. Number of planning conditions related to visual amenity / noise / lighting for minerals and waste sites (NYCC, CYC, NYMNPA);</p> <p>3. Ratio of standalone minerals / waste sites to sites located next to existing buildings (NYCC).</p>

<sup>16</sup> The National Planning Policy Framework defined 5 purposes to the Green Belt and also recommends that local planning authorities should 'plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt'.



Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-To protect coastal landscape and seascape character;</li> <li>-To protect and improve tranquillity levels and reduce sources of intrusion, such as light pollution;</li> <li>-To co-locate waste facilities with complementary industrial facilities where possible to reduce dispersed visual intrusion;</li> <li>-Preserve, enhance and complement architectural character and complexity.</li> </ul>	
<p>12. Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-To increase the level and range of employment opportunities, particularly in deprived areas;</li> <li>-To encourage stable economic growth through provision of an adequate, sustainable and steady supply of minerals;</li> <li>-To promote conditions which enable sustainable local economic activity and regeneration and encourage creativity and innovation;</li> <li>-To capture value from waste streams by creating saleable products from them;</li> <li>-Promote a low carbon economy;</li> <li>-Support existing employment drivers and create new ones;</li> <li>-Support existing businesses and the local economy outside of the minerals and waste sectors.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economically Active Rate of 16 to 64 year olds.</li> <li>2. Number of new bank accounts (first current accounts from a small business banking range) (LEP).</li> <li>3. Unemployment rate (Annualised Population Survey Rate).</li> <li>4. Gross median weekly earnings of residents and people who work within the area (NYCC).</li> <li>5. Number of minerals and waste planning applications (NYCC).</li> </ol>
<p>13. Maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of local communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide opportunities to boost tourism;</li> <li>-To promote job creation, training and volunteer opportunities through sustainable site restoration;</li> <li>-Contribute to sustainable and affordable housing through the provision of locally sourced and recycled construction materials.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings (NYCC Stream).</li> <li>2. Economically Active Rate of 16 to 64 year olds.</li> <li>4. Number of visits to historic sites (Yorkshire and the Humber) (English Heritage).</li> </ol>
<p>14. Provide opportunities to enable recreation, leisure and learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide opportunities to enable the enjoyment and understanding of the special qualities of the National Park;</li> <li>-Promote recreation in the countryside and AONBs, consistent with the wider social, economic and environmental facets;</li> <li>-Provide opportunities for lifelong learning;</li> <li>-To contribute to networks of multifunctional green infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Length of Public Rights of Way Network (NYCC/CYC/NYMNP).</li> <li>2. People qualified to at least level 4 who are economically active (NYCC Stream).</li> <li>3. Visits to places out of doors (as measured in Natural England's MENE programme) (Natural England).</li> </ol>

Proposed Sustainability Objective	Proposed sub objectives	Draft Indicators
<p>15. Protect and improve the wellbeing, health and safety of local communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-To minimise the impact of nuisances associated with minerals and waste development, such as noise pollution, odour and severance;</li> <li>-Reduce traffic accidents;</li> <li>-To reduce health inequalities;</li> <li>-To promote healthy living, offer opportunities for more healthy lifestyles and improve life expectancy;</li> <li>-To improve levels of wellbeing;</li> <li>-To increase access to the public rights of way network and the wider countryside;</li> <li>-To ensure the safety and security of local people and visitors;</li> <li>-To ensure that pollution does not pose unacceptable risks to health.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incapacity benefit claimants as percentage of working age population (NYCC Steam).</li> <li>2. Mortality rate from coronary heart disease (NYCC Stream).</li> <li>3. Road accident Casualties – Killed and Seriously Injured (NYCC Stream).</li> <li>4. Life expectancy at birth (ONS).</li> <li>5. Fly tipping incidents reported by Local Authorities (by waste source) (NYCC Stream).</li> <li>6. Anti-social behaviour (all categories) number (NYCC Stream).</li> <li>7. All age respiratory disease mortality (Public Health England).</li> </ol>
<p>16. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-To ensure that the location and design of new development has regard to the potential risk, causes and consequences of flooding;</li> <li>-To promote opportunities for sustainable flood alleviation;</li> <li>-To reduce the number of people and properties at risk of flooding.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allocations requiring exception testing in North Yorkshire SFRA (NYCC).</li> <li>2. Number of planning conditions relating to SUDS (NYCC, CYC, NYMNPA).</li> </ol>
<p>17. Address the needs of a changing population in a sustainable and inclusive manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-To support the development of resource efficient housing;</li> <li>-To support shortened supply chains for building materials;</li> <li>-To enable the community to contribute to and have influence in decision making;</li> <li>-To improve public access to facilities enabling sustainable waste management;</li> <li>-To support community led waste management schemes;</li> <li>-Reduce social exclusion.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of consultation responses to Joint Plan and Sustainability Appraisal (NYCC).</li> <li>2. Number of Household Waste Recycling Centres (NYCC, CYC).</li> <li>3. Indices of Deprivation Average Rank (NYCC Stream).</li> </ol>