



Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

# Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

July 2015

## Introduction

The Issues and Options consultation for the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan took place between 14<sup>th</sup> February 2014 and 11<sup>th</sup> April 2014, from this 2084 comments were received from 332 respondents.

Included in the comments were suggested changes or proposed alternatives to the wording of various sections of the document, including the Vision and Objectives and various Options presented in the document.

Appendix 1 contains a table of all the suggested changes and proposed alternatives submitted by respondents as part of the consultation. Each change and alternative has been assessed and a decision taken whether they are to be taken forward to help the development of the Preferred Options document and this is recorded with a reason for the decision in the table.

Appendix 2 is a follow on from the table in Appendix 1 and contains tables Option box. The change or alternative which has been assessed as suitable for taking forward into the Preferred Options stage has been worked up in the relevant table; these have been assessed, alongside the original text, through the sustainability appraisal process and the new assessment summaries and revised recommendations included in the tables. This information has been subsequently fed into the development of the Preferred Options for the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan by being added to the Policy Option proformas for the relevant id boxes. The proformas provide the audit trail of moving the issues from issues and option stage to preferred options and the development of the preferred policy wording.

Index to first 6 questions and subsequent option boxes

Questions 1 to 6 covered a chapter on key issues and well as the vision and objectives

- Question 1: Are these the key issues that the Joint Plan should be addressing?  
 Question 2: Are there any additional strategic issues that should be addressed?  
 Question 3: Do you have any comments on the draft vision presented above?  
 Question 4: Is there an alternative vision we should pursue?  
 Question 5: Do you have any comments on the objective presented above?  
 Question 6: Are there any alternative objectives we should consider?

The remaining questions related to specific options and these are listed below.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Option Box Title</b>	<b>Question numbers</b>
id01	Broad geographical approach to supply of aggregates	Question 7, Question 8
id02	Locational approach to new sources of supply of aggregates	Question 9, Question 10
id03	Calculating sand and gravel Provision	Question 11, Question 12
id04	Overall distribution of sand and gravel provision	Question 13, Question 14
id05	Landbanks for sand and gravel	Question 15, Question 16
id06	Safeguarding sand and gravel	Question 17, Question 18
id07	Provision of crushed rock	Question 19, Question 20, Question 21
id08	Maintenance of landbanks for crushed rock	Question 22, Question 23
id09	Safeguarding crushed rock	Question 24, Question 25
id10	Concreting sand and gravel delivery	Question 26, Question 27, Question 28
id11	Building sand delivery	Question 29, Question 30
id12	Magnesian limestone delivery	Question 31, Question 32
id13	Unallocated extension to existing aggregates quarries	Question 33, Question 34, Question 35
id14	Supply of alternatives to land won primary aggregates	Question 36, Question 37, Question 38, Question 39
id15	Continuity of supply of silica sand	Question 40, Question 41
id16	Safeguarding silica sand	Question 42, Question 43
id17	Continuity of supply of clay	Question 44, Question 45
id18	Incidental working of clay in association with other minerals	Question 46, Question 47
id19	Safeguarding clay	Question 48, Question 49
id20	Continuity of supply of building stone	Question 50, Question 51, Question 52
id21	Use of building stone	Question 53, Question 54
id22	Safeguarding building stone	Question 55, Question 56, Question 57, Question 58
id23	Overall spatial options for oil and gas	Question 59, Question 60
id24	Co-ordination of gas extraction and processing	Question 61, Question 62
id25	Gas developments (exploration and appraisal)	Question 63, Question 64, Question 65
id26	Gas developments (production and processing)	Question 66, Question 67
id27	Coal Mine Methane	Question 68, Question 69
id28	Coal Bed Methane, Underground Coal Gasification, Shale gas and Carbon and Gas Storage	Question 70, Question 71
	Safeguarding oil and Gas	Question 72, Question 73
id29	Continuity of supply of deep coal	Question 74, Question 75
id30	Shallow coal	Question 76, Question 77
id31	Safeguarding shallow coal	Question 78, Question 79, Question 80
id32	Safeguarding deep coal	Question 81, Question 82,

		Question 83
id33	Disposal of colliery spoil	Question 84, Question 85
id34	Potash supply	Question 86, Question 87
id35	Safeguarding potash	Question 88, Question 89
id36	Supply of gypsum	Question 90, Question 91
id37	Safeguarding gypsum	Question 92, Question 93
id38	Safeguarding deep mineral resources	Question 94, Question 95, Question 96
id39	Supply of vein minerals	Question 97, Question 98
id40	Safeguarding vein minerals	Question 99, Question 100
id41	Borrow pits	Question 101, Question 102
id42	Overall approach to the waste hierarchy	Question 103, Question 104
id43	Strategic role of the Plan area in the management of waste	Question 105, Question 106
	Future waste scenarios	Question 107
id44	Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Local Authority Collected Waste	Question 108, Question 109
id45	Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Commercial and Industrial waste (including hazardous C&I waste)	Question 110, Question 111
id46	Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste (including CD&E waste)	Question 112, Question 113
id47	Managing Agricultural Waste	Question 114, Question 115
id48	Managing Low Level (Non-Nuclear) Radioactive Waste	Question 116, Question 117
id49	Managing Waste Water (Sewage Sludge)	Question 118, Question 119
id50	Managing Power Station Ash	Question 120, Question 121
id51	Overall locational principles for provision of new waste capacity	Question 122, Question 123, Question 124, Question 125
id52	Waste site identification principles	Question 126, Question 127
id53	Waste management facility safeguarding	Question 128, Question 129, Question 130
id54	Transport infrastructure	Question 131, Question 132
id55	Transport infrastructure safeguarding	Question 133, Question 134, Question 135
id56	Locations for ancillary minerals infrastructure	Question 136, Question 137
id57	Minerals ancillary infrastructure safeguarding	Question 138, Question 139, Question 140
id58	Presumption in favour of sustainable minerals and waste development	Question 141, Question 142
id59	Local amenity and cumulative impacts	Question 143, Question 144, Question 145
id60	Transport of minerals and waste and associated traffic impacts	Question 146, Question 147, Question 148
id61	North York Moor National Park and the AONBs	Question 149, Question 150
id62	Minerals and waste development in the Green Belt	Question 151, Question 152, Question 153, Question 154

id63	Landscape	Question 155, Question 156
id64	Biodiversity and geodiversity	Question 157, Question 158, Question 159
id65	Historic environment	Question 160, Question 161, Question 162, Question 163
id66	Water environment	Question 164, Question 165, Question 166
	Environmental information requirements for planning applications	Question 167
id67	Strategic approach to reclamation and afteruse	Question 168, Question 169, Question 170
id68	Sustainable design, construction and operation of development	Question 171, Question 172, Question 173, Question 174
id69	Other key criteria for minerals and waste development	Question 175, Question 176, Question 177
id70	Developments proposed within Mineral Safeguarding Areas	Question 178, Question 179, Question 180, Question 181, Question 182
id71	Consideration of applications in Mineral Consultation Areas	Question 183, Question 184
id72	Coal mining legacy	Question 185, Question 186
	Monitoring	Question 187, Question 188
	Sites submitted in response to 'call for sites'	Question 189, Question 190

## Appendix 1

### New options and additional text arising from Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Environment Agency	1261	Para 2.14	<p>Suggest rewording</p> <p>'Large parts of the lower lying areas of the Joint Plan area are at risk from flooding, particularly around the York, Selby and Vale of Pickering areas. Parts of the Plan area lie on Principal Aquifer designations, which usually provide a high level of groundwater storage. They may support water supply and/or river base flow on a strategic scale, and therefore need additional protection. In addition to this, areas of land around Northallerton, the area to the west of York, the area to the south of Selby and the southern parts of the North York Moors National Park in particular are classified as Groundwater Source Protection Zones and most of the lower lying parts of the Plan area are classified as Nitrate Vulnerable Zones, where water quality also needs to be protected'</p> <p><i>(implies adding reworded text for paragraph 2.14) – not a new option or objective, just a change in supporting text.</i></p>	<p><i>(implies adding reworded text for paragraph 2.14) – not a new option or objective, just a change in supporting text.</i></p>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Dart Energy	0837	Para 2.20	Add hydrocarbons to the list of minerals of national and local importance, as these also referenced in NPPF. <i>(Implies need to add hydrocarbons to the list of minerals of minerals of local and national importance.) – Not a new option, addition to existing text.)</i>	<i>(Implies need to add hydrocarbons to the list of minerals of minerals of local and national importance.) – Not a new option, addition to existing text.)</i>	No
York Potash	1038	Para 2.20 – 2.29	This section needs to be amended to incorporate recent changes in national planning policy, as currently would not meet tests of soundness. 1) no mention of the requirement for LPAs to give 'great weight' to the benefits of mineral extraction, including the economy. 2) no mention is made of the clear recognition in the NPPF that minerals are 'essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life' 3) no mention is made on how the 'major development test' will be applied in accordance with paragraph 116 of the NPPF. 4) no mention is made of the need for the planning system to ensure a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals. <i>(Implies the text in the National Policy section should be amended to incorporate changes in national policy to make sure the plan satisfies the tests of soundness.) - not a new option but extra supporting text to make sure the changes to national policy are all included.</i>	<i>(Implies the text in the National Policy section should be amended to incorporate changes in national policy to make sure the plan satisfies the tests of soundness.) - not a new option but extra supporting text to make sure the changes to national policy are all included.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Howardain Hills AONB	1619	Para 2.25	Clarification is required about the 'Major Development Test' <i>(Implies adding extra text which provides clarification about the Major Development Test) - Not a new option, explanation about the Major Development Test is provided in the glossary, and this is already referenced in the text.</i>	<i>(Implies adding extra text which provides clarification about the Major Development Test) - Not a new option, explanation about the Major Development Test is provided in the glossary, and this is already referenced in the text.</i>	No
3006	2219	Para 2.61 – Figure 5	Figure 5 - the map is too vague in terms of unconventional gas, need to include - areas underlain by the Bowland Shale formations - areas underlain by deep coal at 50m - 1200m below the surface. - present estimations of extractable gas reserves in the above - the extent of new PEDL licence areas likely to be offered in summer 2014 <i>(implies that the map for underground minerals resources needs to be more detailed and include areas relevant to unconventional gas) – not a new option but could consider adding additional layers to the map which relate to unconventional gas especially since government are pushing for unconventional gas development)</i>	<i>(implies that the map for underground minerals resources needs to be more detailed and include areas relevant to unconventional gas) – not a new option but could consider adding additional layers to the map which relate to unconventional gas especially since government are pushing for unconventional gas development)</i>	No
Cunnane Town Planning	1562	2.72 – Figure 7: Minerals Spatial Map	Include underlying aquifers on minerals spatial map <i>(Implies should add underlying aquifers to minerals spatial map) – not a new option, many other environmental designations are not included so would need a good reason to include these</i>	<i>(Implies should add underlying aquifers to minerals spatial map) – not a new option, many other environmental designations are not included so would need a good reason to include these and not others, more appropriate place</i>	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>and not others, more appropriate place maybe adding map into the environmental evidence base paper where other water related maps are.</i>	<i>maybe adding map into the environmental evidence base paper where other water related maps are.</i>	
Cunnane Town Planning	1563	2.85 – Figure 9 – Waste Spatial Map	Include underlying aquifers on waste spatial map <i>(Implies should add underlying aquifers to minerals spatial map) – not a new option, many other environmental designations are not included so would need a good reason to include these and not others, more appropriate place maybe adding map into the environmental evidence base paper where other water related maps are.</i>	<i>(Implies should add underlying aquifers to minerals spatial map) – not a new option, many other environmental designations are not included so would need a good reason to include these and not others, more appropriate place maybe adding map into the environmental evidence base paper where other water related maps are.</i>	No
Environment Agency	1278	2.87	Change ‘unlicensed facilities’ to ‘facilities which are not controlled by an Environment Agency permit.’ <i>(Implies changing terminology from ‘unlicensed facilities’ to ‘facilities which are not controlled by an Environment Agency permit’) – not a new option but should include revised text as is from the Environment Agency who issue waste permits.</i>	<i>(Implies changing terminology from ‘unlicensed facilities’ to ‘facilities which are not controlled by an Environment Agency permit’) – not a new option but should include revised text as is from the Environment Agency who issue waste permits.</i>	No
Sibelco	1694	3.05	Minerals – 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point – insert ‘where possible’ after the word ‘but’ <i>(implies should add in ‘where possible’ after ‘but’ to change the emphasis of the sentence so that landbanks of minerals can also include resources in the National Park and AONBs if required) – NPPF states that should aim to maintain the landbanks for non-energy minerals from outside the</i>	<i>(implies should add in ‘where possible’ after ‘but’ to change the emphasis of the sentence so that landbanks of minerals can also include resources in the National Park and AONBs if required) – NPPF states that should aim to maintain the landbanks for non-energy minerals from outside the National Parks and AONBs where</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>National Parks and AONBs where practical so adding extra text in supports this.</i>	<i>practical so adding extra text in supports this.</i>	
Cunnane Town Planning	1564	3.05	General – 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point – include green belt and aquifers in list <i>(Implies should add green belt and aquifers to 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of general section) – would these both be covered under ‘non-designated assets’ detailed in the bullet point?</i>	<i>(Implies should add green belt and aquifers to 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of general section) – would these both be covered under ‘non-designated assets’ detailed in the bullet point?</i>	No
Cromwell Wood Estate	1648	3.05	Minerals – 6 <sup>th</sup> bullet point – add ‘ whilst acknowledging the variability of the specification of the product ’ <i>(implies need to add extra text ‘ whilst acknowledging the variability of the product’ ) – not a new option but new text changes the emphasis of bullet point so that it does not imply that all secondary and recycled minerals are suitable to replace primary minerals.</i>	<i>(implies need to add extra text ‘ whilst acknowledging the variability of the product’ ) – not a new option but new text changes the emphasis of bullet point so that it does not imply that all secondary and recycled minerals are suitable to replace primary minerals.</i>	No
Minerals Product Association	1047	Q01	Where states 'Maintaining the required land banks for sand and gravel, crushed rock, silica sand and clay, but providing for these outside of the National Park and AONBs' should have 'as far as practicable' in the case of National Parks and AONBs. <i>(Implies should add in ‘as far as practicable’ after ‘but’ to change the emphasis of the sentence so that landbanks of minerals can also include resources in the National Park and AONBs if required) – NPPF states that should aim to maintain the landbanks for non-energy minerals from outside</i>	<i>(Implies should add in ‘as far as practicable’ after ‘but’ to change the emphasis of the sentence so that landbanks of minerals can also include resources in the National Park and AONBs if required) – NPPF states that should aim to maintain the landbanks for non-energy minerals from outside the National Parks and AONBs where practical so adding extra text in supports this.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>the National Parks and AONBs where practical so adding extra text in supports this.</i>		
Minerals Product Association	1047	Q01	Where states 'Providing for a range of enhancements, particularly through reclamation of workings' reference should be made to the value mineral workings may have for mitigating the effects of climate change and enhancing ecological services. <i>(Implies that the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point under minerals should include a reference to the value mineral workings may have for mitigating the effects of climate change and enhancing ecological services' - not a new option but highlights the positive effects mineral workings may have on climate change and ecological services.</i>	<i>(Implies that the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point under minerals should include a reference to the value mineral workings may have for mitigating the effects of climate change and enhancing ecological services' - not a new option but highlights the positive effects mineral workings may have on climate change and ecological services.</i>	No
NYWAG	1013	Q01	Waste issues are incorrect and incomplete. - add minimising greenhouse gas emissions - Providing additional capacity is not a key issue - no need for safeguarding 'strategic waste management infrastructure' to be treated as a key issue - sustainability along with minimising adverse effects on local communities, human health and the environment should be a key issue <i>(implies that the list of waste key issues needs expanding to include or exclude the above ones.) – Not an option</i>	<i>(implies that the list of waste key issues needs expanding to include or exclude the above ones.) – Not an option NYWAG has a different objective and so want to change issues to fit with this, need to consider carefully whether to follow their suggestion.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>NYWAG has a different objective and so want to change issues to fit with this, need to consider carefully whether to follow their suggestion.</i>		
Lafargetarmac	0952	Q01	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point under minerals should have 'as far as practicable' added (implies should add in 'where possible' after 'but' to change the emphasis of the sentence so that landbanks of minerals can also include resources in the National Park and AONBs if required) – NPPF states that should aim to maintain the landbanks for non-energy minerals from outside the National Parks and AONBs where practical so adding extra text in supports this.</i>	<i>(implies should add in 'where possible' after 'but' to change the emphasis of the sentence so that landbanks of minerals can also include resources in the National Park and AONBs if required) – NPPF states that should aim to maintain the landbanks for non-energy minerals from outside the National Parks and AONBs where practical so adding extra text in supports this.</i>	No
RSPB North	1695	Q01	<i>In bullet point 'Sites of Special Scientific Importance' should be 'Sites of Special Scientific Interest' (Implies the text is incorrect and should be corrected) – not an option just a correction</i>	<i>(Implies the text is incorrect and should be corrected) – not an option just a correction</i>	No
Lightwater Quarries	0937	Q02	<i>Propose additional key issues - include policies to encourage the prior extraction of minerals where practical and environmentally feasible when non mineral developments are envisaged in MSA. - ensure that the landbank is not bound up in any one large site or company to stifle competition - ensure that developers make the most possible use of the extracted minerals through the use of appropriate</i>	<i>(Implies that additional key issues should be added to the minerals section of the chapter.) Need to consider each issue in turn to assess whether important enough to add to the list.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<p>processing technology.</p> <p>Under waste or general matters recognition should be made of how waste materials can be used as a recovery activity in the provision of sustainable restoration scheme of mineral workings.</p> <p><i>(Implies that additional key issues should be added to the minerals section of the chapter.) Need to consider each issue in turn to assess whether important enough to add to the list.</i></p>		
York Environment Forum	2196	Q02	<p>Include additional key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The sustainable use of precious and finite resources, both mined and arising from waste, need to take place within a circular economy model.</li> <li>- include an overarching strategy for a progressive reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from minerals and waste activities.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Implies that additional key issues should be added to the minerals section of the chapter.) Need to consider each issue in turn to assess whether important enough to add to the list.</i></p>	<i>(Implies that additional key issues should be added to the minerals section of the chapter.) Need to consider each issue in turn to assess whether important enough to add to the list.</i>	No
3006	2229	Q02	<p>Alternative wording in relation to unconventional gas 'Consider in detail how to address the potential benefits, harmful impacts and possible regulation of unconventional gas and oil development.'</p> <p><i>(Implies should change the wording of the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point under the minerals section to 'Consider in detail how to</i></p>	<i>(Implies should change the wording of the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point under the minerals section to 'Consider in detail how to address the potential benefits, harmful impacts and possible regulation of unconventional gas and oil development.' - not a new option but put more focus on both potential</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>address the potential benefits, harmful impacts and possible regulation of unconventional gas and oil development.' - not a new option but put more focus on both potential benefits and harmful impacts of unconventional gas, need to consider if the suggested wording is more suitable and if so incorporate it.</i>	<i>benefits and harmful impacts of unconventional gas, need to consider if the suggested wording is more suitable and if so incorporate it.</i>	
1174	2071	Q02	Key issues for minerals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long term sustainability</li> <li>- Reducing flooding and 'enhancing' nature conservation through extraction in the Ure/Swale interfluvium</li> </ul> <i>(Implies that need to add the above key issues to the list under minerals) – Not a new Option, need to consider each issue separately as to whether should be added to the list.</i>	<i>(Implies that need to add the above key issues to the list under minerals) – Not a new Option, need to consider each issue separately as to whether should be added to the list.</i>	No
York Potash	1040	Q02	Key issues should include the need to provide a secure and steady supply of industrial minerals that occur in the plan area. <i>(Implies that need to add an additional key issue which states that the Plan should deal with the need to provide a secure and steady supply of industrial minerals in the Plan area.) – Not an additional option but need to consider if this issue is important enough to be included in the list.</i>	<i>(Implies that need to add an additional key issue which states that the Plan should deal with the need to provide a secure and steady supply of industrial minerals in the Plan area.) – Not an additional option but need to consider if this issue is important enough to be included in the list.</i>	No
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0507	Q02	Add following to waste key issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimising carbon and greenhouse gases</li> </ul>	<i>(Implies need to add above bullet points to the waste key issues) - Not an additional option but need to</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimising transport mileage</li> <li>- Cost</li> </ul> <p><i>(Implies need to add above bullet points to the waste key issues) - Not an additional option but need to consider if these issues are important enough to be included in the list.</i></p>	<i>consider if these issues are important enough to be included in the list.</i>	
Kirby Hall, Little Ouseburn & Thorpe Underwood Parish Council	1443	Q03	<p>AWRP is not in keeping with the vision presented, especially 'attention to a careful balance' or 'protecting and enhancing the environment'.</p> <p><i>Implies that AWRP is not compatible with the Vision</i></p>	Implies AWRP not compatible with the vision, but not suggesting an alternative – no action to be taken	No
2800	0027	Q03	<p>Allowing fracking in North Yorkshire would not conform with the aims of the vision and objectives</p> <p><i>Implies that fracking does not conform with the vision</i></p>	Implies Fracking not compatible with the vision, but not suggesting an alternative – no action to be taken	No
3006	2230	Q03	<p>Vision is acceptable but the development of unconventional gas will not fit in the vision unless there is rigorous regulation and limitation.</p> <p><i>Implies that fracking does not conform with the vision</i></p>	Implies fracking not compatible with the vision, but not suggesting an alternative – no action to be taken	No
York Potash	1041	Q03	<p>The Vision should recognise the national importance of the potash reserves and economic contribution which minerals can make to the economy.</p> <p><i>Implies that the vision should include specific reference to potash and its economic importance.</i></p>	Implies that the vision should include specific reference to potash and its economic importance. Do not need to refer to potash specifically but could add the word 'and economy' after 'area's built environment in ii	Yes
RSPB North	1714/1715	Q03/Q04	<p>Additional suggested wording for the vision is</p>	<i>( Implies should add extra points in to the vision) – not a new option but</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<p>- A restoration led approach to the location, operation and restoration of mineral development will have resulted in the delivery of strategic restoration objectives.</p> <p>- Minerals development will have made a significant contribution to delivering a net-gain in biodiversity - and establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network - primarily through the landscape-scale creation of priority habitat.</p> <p><i>( Implies should add extra points in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the points need to be added to the vision.</i></p>	<p><i>proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the points need to be added to the vision.</i></p>	
Highways Agency	0411	Q03	<p>Parts I and ii of vision could be strengthened by listing the infrastructure.</p> <p>Part iv could be strengthened further by stating a modal shift to sustainable methods of transport such as rail or water.</p> <p><i>( Implies should add extra points in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the points need to be added to the vision.</i></p>	<p><i>( Implies should add extra points in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the points need to be added to the vision.</i></p>	No
Natural England	0903	Q03	<p>The vision would benefit from specific reference in part vi to protecting and enhancing the network of nature conservation sites and priority habitats.</p> <p><i>( Implies should add an extra point in to the vision) – not a new option but</i></p>	<p><i>( Implies should add an extra point in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the point needs to be added to the vision.</i></p>	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the point needs to be added to the vision.</i>		
Lightwater Quarries Ltd	0938	Q03	Point ii of the vision should include a reference to mineral operators making best use of the extracted material. <i>( Implies should add an extra point in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the point needs to be added to the vision.</i>	<i>( Implies should add an extra point in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the point needs to be added to the vision.</i>	No
Environment Agency	1280	Q03	Para iii – would like to see ‘environmental’ considerations added, e.g. ‘where geological, environmental and infrastructure considerations allow...’ <i>( Implies should add extra text in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the text needs to be added to the vision.</i>	<i>( Implies should add extra text in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the text needs to be added to the vision.</i>	No
NYWAG	1016	Q04	Need to implement the vision and sustainability objectives and reassess AWRP. This would lead to AWRP being cancelled <i>Implies AWRP not compatible with the vision and objectives, and so if vision and objectives implemented AWRP would not be allowed</i>	<i>Implies AWRP not compatible with the vision and objectives, and so if vision and objectives implemented AWRP would not be allowed</i>	No
Frack Free York	2355	Q04	The Vision should include reducing dependence on fossil fuels and limiting their extraction due to their impact upon climate change <i>Implies that the vision should include that the Plan should reduce the areas</i>	<i>Implies that the vision should include that the Plan should reduce the areas dependence on fossil fuels as they have a significant impact on climate change</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>dependence on fossil fuels as they have a significant impact on climate change</i>		
0157	0129	Q04	An alternative option would be to set aside AWRP and implement the plan based on the vision and objectives identified. <i>Implies AWRP not compatible with the vision and objectives, and so if vision and objectives implemented AWRP would not be allowed</i>	<i>Implies AWRP not compatible with the vision and objectives, and so if vision and objectives implemented AWRP would not be allowed</i>	
1174	2073	Q04	Liaison with communities will be key to delivering the Vision. <i>Implies need to include reference about liaising with communities through the development of the Plan</i>	<i>Implies need to include reference about liaising with communities through the development of the Plan</i>	No
English Heritage	0292	Q04	In terms of amendments to the suggested vision consideration should be given to the following - Criterion iii - in trying to identify a good match between locations of minerals supply and demand account should be taken of environmental factors. It is suggested that Criterion iii is amended as follows "Where geological, environmental and infrastructure considerations allow, opportunities to ensure..." Criterion vi - In view of the fact the World Heritage site at Fountains Abbey/Studley Royal is recognised as being of international importance and is, clearly, one of the 'special' landscapes of the Joint Plan area,	<i>( Implies should add an extra points/text in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the points/text needs to be added to the vision.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			reference should be made to it within this Criterion. It is suggested that the end of Criterion vi is amended along the following lines "...North York Moors National Park, the historic City of York and the World Heritage Site at Fountains Abbey/Studley Royal" <i>( Implies should add an extra points/text in to the vision) – not a new option but proposes adding to the vision, need to assess whether the points/text needs to be added to the vision.</i>		
Lightwater Quarries Ltd	0939	Q05	Objective 1 – should recognise the recovery aspect of the restoration of mineral workings <i>(Implies that the background explanation for objective 1 should recognise the recovery aspect of the restoration of mineral workings)</i>	<i>(Implies that the background explanation for objective 1 should recognise the recovery aspect of the restoration of mineral workings)</i>	No
Lightwater Quarries Ltd	0939	Q05	Objective 4 – Could be modified to make reference to the best possible use of extracted materials. <i>(Implies adding in reference to making the best possible use of extracted minerals to the background explanation)</i>	<i>(Implies adding in reference to making the best possible use of extracted minerals to the background explanation)</i>	No
Lightwater Quarries Ltd	0939	Q05	Objective 10 – could make reference to funding opportunities that mineral and waste development can generate. <i>(Implies adding in a reference to funding opportunities that minerals and waste development can generate for use in communities)</i>	<i>(Implies adding in a reference to funding opportunities that minerals and waste development can generate for use in communities)</i>	No
Lightwater Quarries	0939	Q05	Objective 11 – could include a	<i>(Implies adding a sentence into the</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Ltd			prioritisation in the site selection methodology for site with close access to Strategic Road Networks <i>(Implies adding a sentence into the background information which promotes prioritisation of sites with good access to Strategic Road Network in the site selection methodology.)</i>	<i>background information which promotes prioritisation of sites with good access to Strategic Road Network in the site selection methodology.)</i>	
Zurich Assurance Ltd	1584	Q05	Objective 10 – should mention the opportunities for long term gains in quality of life and the economy from mineral workings. <i>(Implies adding a reference in the background information for objective 10 about opportunities for long term gains in quality of life and the economy from mineral workings.)</i>	<i>(Implies adding a reference in the background information for objective 10 about opportunities for long term gains in quality of life and the economy from mineral workings.)</i>	No
Zurich Assurance Ltd	1583	Q05	Objective 9 should include a reference to the potential opportunity for long term improvements to the environment from mineral workings restoration. <i>(Implies adding a reference into the background information for Objective 9 about the potential opportunity for long term improvements to the environment from mineral workings restoration.)</i>	<i>(Implies adding a reference into the background information for Objective 9 about the potential opportunity for long term improvements to the environment from mineral workings restoration.)</i>	No
Natural England	0904	Q05	Objective 9 – should refer to protecting and enhancing the network of internationally, nationally and locally designated nature conservation sites. <i>(Implies adding reference in to the background text of objective 9 about protecting and enhancing the network of internationally, nationally and locally designated nature conservation sites.)</i>	<i>(Implies adding reference in to the background text of objective 9 about protecting and enhancing the network of internationally, nationally and locally designated nature conservation sites.)</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
RSPB North	1716/1717	Q05/Q06	Objective 12 – should specifically promote a restoration-led approach, reword to ‘implementing a strategic, landscape-scale, restoration –led approach, which maximises benefits for biodiversity, recreation opportunities and climate change adaptation through reclamation of mineral workings.’ <i>(Implies should change the text in the last sentence of the background information for Objective 12 to ‘implementing a strategic, landscape-scale, restoration –led approach, which maximises benefits for biodiversity, recreation opportunities and climate change adaptation through reclamation of mineral workings.’)</i>	<i>(Implies should change the text in the last sentence of the background information for Objective 12 to ‘implementing a strategic, landscape-scale, restoration –led approach, which maximises benefits for biodiversity, recreation opportunities and climate change adaptation through reclamation of mineral workings.’)</i>	No
York Environment Forum	2197	Q05	Objective 10 - reword to read ‘ This includes promoting high standards of <b>safety</b> , design.... <i>(Implies should change the text of the first sentence of the background information as above and add in the word ‘safety’ ‘</i>	<i>(Implies should change the text of the first sentence of the background information as above and add in the word ‘safety’ ‘</i>	No
3006	2232	Q06	Develop policies which will increasingly lead to the restriction of fossil fuels. <i>Implies need to include reducing reliance on fossil fuels in the Objectives.</i>	<i>Implies need to include reducing reliance on fossil fuels in the Objectives.</i>	No
1174	2075	006	The objectives do not appear to include ‘joining up’ the matters of land-use and landscape character. <i>Implies that the objectives should include linking land-use and landscape character.</i>	<i>Implies that the objectives should include linking land-use and landscape character.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
157, Green Hammerton PC, Biklton in Ainsty with Bickerton PC, NYWAG	0131, 0536, 0712, 1018	Q06	A financial objective should be included which seeks to achieve best value for money. <i>(Implies that a 13<sup>th</sup> Objective should be added which would aim to get the best value for money.)</i>	<i>(Implies that a 13<sup>th</sup> Objective should be added which would aim to get the best value for money.)</i>	No
York Potash	1059	Q06	Should be an additional economic objective that seeks to realise the potential of potash/mineral reserves and maximise their contribution to the economy of the area and local communities. <i>(Implies adding a 13<sup>th</sup> Objective that seeks to realise the potential of potash/minerals reserves and maximise their contribution to the economy of the area and local communities.)</i>	<i>(Implies adding a 13<sup>th</sup> Objective that seeks to realise the potential of potash/minerals reserves and maximise their contribution to the economy of the area and local communities.)</i>	No
English Heritage	0294	Q06	Objective 9 – opportunities should be taken to maximise any opportunities that minerals or waste developments could provide to enhance the significance of environmental assets, suggest amending the objective to ‘Protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing the natural and historic environment, landscapes and tranquil areas of the Joint Plan area.’ <i>(Implies changing the wording in Objective 9 to maximise any opportunities that minerals or waste developments could provide to enhance the significance of environmental assets, suggest amending the objective to ‘Protecting and, where appropriate,</i>	<i>(Implies changing the wording in Objective 9 to maximise any opportunities that minerals or waste developments could provide to enhance the significance of environmental assets, suggest amending the objective to ‘Protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing the natural and historic environment, landscapes and tranquil areas of the Joint Plan area.’) – condenses down the wording which is already there.</i>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>enhancing the natural and historic environment, landscapes and tranquil areas of the Joint Plan area.) – condenses down the wording which is already there.</i>		
Durham County Council	1785	Id01 Q07	Option 1, add ‘as far as practical’ in relation to National Park and AONBs <i>(Implies an alternative to option 1 which would meet requirements from outside these areas only if practicable to do so)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0193	Id01 Q07	Consider restricting workings in option 2 to small scale and for very local market. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby supply from York is supported provided this is only used within the CYC area)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council	1405	Id01 Q07	There should be no restrictions as to where aggregates are taken from. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> ‘or’ option which would not place any geographical restriction on the location of aggregates extraction)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Envireau Water	1543	Id01 Q07	Preference should be given to sites close to markets and good transport networks. Sometimes need to have sites in less ideal areas and this should not be actively discouraged. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> ‘or’ option where the focus is on supporting aggregates extraction in locations close to markets and main transport networks).</i>	Promotes a 3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative ‘or’ option for id01 whereby the focus should be on extracting aggregate close to markets and main transport routes. <i>This approach is covered under id02 – Locational approach to new sources of supply of aggregates, so do not need an alternative option under id01</i>	No
1174	2076	Id01 Q07	Extraction of sand and gravel should not continue between the Moors and the Dales unless landscape can be restored to its previous landform. <i>(Implies there should be an option that</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>is more restrictive in the area between the Moors and the Dales and is restoration led).</i>		
Minerals Product Association	1465	Id01 Q07	Should modify Option 2 so that all parts of the plan area should play their part in minerals provision subject to local geology and the market. Include resources in York. National policy will prevent development in the National Park except in exceptional circumstances. Consideration should be given to retaining some mineral production in the AONBs if it can be justified on the grounds of scarcity and value to the local economy. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where there is no presumption against aggregates extraction from any part of the Plan area)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Highways Agency	0418	Id01 Q07	Sites should be located as close to markets as possible. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where the focus is on supporting aggregates extraction in locations close to markets)</i>	This approach is covered under id02 – Locational approach to new sources of supply of aggregates, so do not need an alternative option under id01	No
W Clifford Watts and Co Ltd	0612	Id01 Q08	An alternative would be to allow the supply of new aggregate from existing quarries in the North York Moors National Park. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where extensions to existing (former?) quarries in the National Park are supported)</i>	There are no existing quarries in the National Park so essentially this option would result in no change to the options presented. Should the respondent be referring to former quarries then this could appropriately be considered as a new option.	Yes
1174	2109	Id01 Q08	Marine aggregate <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option which would</i>	Consideration of the contribution to be made from marine sand and	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>aim to increase reliance on marine aggregate)</i>	gravel is set out in Id03.	
Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council	1406	Id01 Q08	(Comment possibly more relevant to id03 and id07) Need to ensure reuse and recycling of aggregate material occurs. Where redevelopment occurs this should be made part of the planning approval. <i>(Implies alternative options to id03 and id07 where more reliance is placed on sourcing recycled aggregate)</i>	Promotes 7 <sup>th</sup> alternative 'and' option for id03 whereby more reliance is placed on sourcing recycled aggregate. <i>Use of recycled material is already covered under id14 so not a new alternative option</i>	No
Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council	1406	Id01 Q08	(Comment possibly more relevant to id07) Need to ensure reuse and recycling of aggregate material occurs. Where redevelopment occurs this should be made part of the planning approval. <i>(Implies alternative options to Id07 where more reliance is placed on sourcing recycled aggregate)</i>	Options under Id07 consider the potential for increased used of secondary and recycled materials. The requirement for minerals and waste developments themselves to make use of secondary and recycled materials is contained in Option 2 of Id68	No
Selby District Council	1306	Id01 Q08	Sand and Gravel extraction should occur at the most suitable location, existing extraction sites may be extended and extract in York. Do not allow extraction in National Park and AONBs. <i>(Implies alternative to option 2 which would specifically support extensions to existing sites)</i>	This suggestion would result in the same policy approach as Option 2 and therefore should not be considered as a new option.	No
CPRE (Harrogate)	1066	Id01 Q08	Sustainable restoration needs to be considered. Look into using rail lines at night for freight. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would focus</i>	Restoration is considered under Id67 and transport modes are considered under Id54. These considerations are too detailed to	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>aggregates extraction to locations where there are good transport links including rail and be restoration led)</i>	consider under options relating to broad overall approach to aggregates extraction.	
RSPB (North)	1718	Id01 Q08	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	These designations are considered under Id64. In terms of looking at the broad geographical approach to aggregates supply it is not considered necessary to consider the whole range of constraints that may apply, but instead options for large, distinct parts of the Plan area have been presented.	No
2842	0249	Id01 Q08	Expanding existing quarries could meet requirements without encroaching on agricultural or greenfield land. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option under Id02 whereby the Plan would only support expansion of existing quarries)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
English Heritage	0295	Id01 Q08	Supply from York should not harm those elements which contribute to the special historic character and setting. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would support extraction from York provided this does not harm the setting)</i>	Option 2 supports extraction from York and options under Id65 consider the protection of the setting of York.	No
204	0021	Id02	Local quarries should be used to provide for the local area. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where the focus would be on proximity to local markets)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Envireau Water	1544	Id02 Q09	Preference should be given to sites close to markets and good transport networks. Sometimes need to have sites in less ideal areas and this should not be actively discouraged	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where the focus would be on proximity to markets and road networks – but extraction should also be allowed in less ideal areas possibly a bit of a combination of options 1, 2 and 3?)</i>		
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0194	Id02 Q09	Climate change and food supply should be the overriding considerations, within options 1 and 2. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option which would act alongside options 1 or 2 but would make impacts on climate change and food supply the key considerations)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Durham County Council	1787	Id03 Q11	Combination of options 1 and 3 <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> option which is a combination of the two options)</i>	Option 1 is incorporated within Option 3 so it is not clear how the two could be combined.	No
Minerals Products Association	1466	Id02 Q09	Develop a spatial policy which will recognise the importance of the existing supply pattern supplying respective markets. Could favour extensions to existing sites followed by new sites as replacements or for increased capacity. If this approach is taken the SA will need to be amended <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which focuses on continuation of existing supply pattern)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option. The suggestion relating to extensions is relevant to Id01.	Yes
RSPB (North)	1730	Id02 Q10	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby the</i>	These designations are considered under Id64. In terms of looking at the broad geographical approach to aggregates supply it is not considered necessary to consider the whole range of constraints that may apply, but instead options for large, distinct parts of the Plan area	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>focus would be on areas outside of these designations – possibly more relevant to id01 and same comment has been made there)</i>	have been presented.	
RSPB (North)	1730	Id02 Q10	Recommends that the Joint Plan identifies Areas of Search that incorporate the potential strategic restoration objectives into identifying where mineral development should be located. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby the focus would be on areas outside of these designations)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Lafarge Tarmac	0955	id02 Q10	A justified spatial policy would recognise the pre-eminence of the existing pattern of supply to respective markets, i.e. by favouring extensions to established units, followed by new sites as replacements or for increased capacity. This suggested new policy option would take account for the economic rationale for the aggregate supply system with location of sites being determined by a combination of geology, markets, access and investment decisions. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option where the focus is on extensions to existing sites)</i>	Promotes a 4 <sup>th</sup> alternative 'or' option which focuses on continuing the existing supply pattern, favouring extensions to existing sites before new site development and on distance to markets. It is a pre-requisite that geology needs to be suitable and therefore it is not necessary to include reference to this within the options. In addition, it is presumed that investment decisions are made outwith the planning system and these are not a material planning consideration.	Yes
Selby District Council	1307	Id02 Q10	Existing sites should be explored for additional extraction prior to new sites. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where the main considerations would relate to avoiding amenity impacts and on the location of workforce)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Selby District	1307	Id02 Q10	Existing sites should assessed for	This is not considered to be an	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Council			impacts upon landscape, noise, dust, vibration, traffic and location of workforce. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where the main considerations would relate to avoiding amenity impacts and on the location of workforce)</i>	alternative strategic approach but are considerations that are identified in the Development Management options and would therefore be considered as part of a planning application for an extension.	
RSPB North	1750	Id66 Q166	In relation to biodiversity, minerals development needs to be carried out at a landscape scale to deliver strategic restoration benefits. <i>(Relevant to overarching minerals policies, possibly Id02. Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option to Id02 which would be a restoration-led approach to aggregates development)</i>	This is considered a different approach so should be taken forward under id02	Yes
Aggregate Industries	0486	Id03	Aggregates could be delivered to railheads by train from Bardon Hill or to ports by ship from Glensanda <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> alternative 'or' option for id03 which would rely more on the importation of sand and gravel by rail or water)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as new options under Id03 and Id07.	Yes
Lafarge Tarmac	0957	Id03 Q11	Sand and Gravel provision should be calculated with a forecast of demand in mind and not just be an average of last 10 years sales data. Should also include other relevant local information such as housing completions <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby future growth would also be factored in)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Ryedale District Council	1165	Id03 Q11	If Option 1 taken forward needs commitment to monitoring. <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> option which would be the</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>same as option 1 but include a requirement for monitoring)</i>		
Ryedale District Council	1165	Id03 Q11	If Option 4 taken forward the review trigger needs to be capable of taking into account supply which may arise from external sources. <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> option which would be a further option which is the same as option 4 but also requires consideration to be made of external sources of supply)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
English Heritage	0297	Id03 Q11	Favour a variation on Option 4, the 10 year average sales should be used as the basis for the calculation of future supply but review sand and gravel sales and alternative sources of supply in 2019 and if necessary revise the figures accordingly. <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> option whereby a review would also consider external sources of supply of sand and gravel)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but is a factor which has been taken forward and incorporated in alternative option 10	Yes
2842	0229	Id03 Q11	Using marine aggregates should be further explored before supporting extraction on greenfield sites <i>(Implies an alternative 'or' option which aims to increase reliance on marine aggregate)</i>	Increasing reliance of marine aggregates is covered under Option 5 based on projections of the likely contribution from the marine area (which is outside of the Joint Plan area and therefore beyond the remit of the Plan). Reliance on any greater increase is unlikely to be realistic.	No
Minerals Products Association	1467	Id03 Q11	Sand and gravel provision should not just be based on the 10 year average sales data, need to look for a proxy of demand, such as taking into	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			account future proposed housing completion rates and likely changes to supply patterns. This would provide a more robust approach. <i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby future growth would also be factored in)</i>		
3001	1826	Id03 Q12	Consider carbon emissions of exporting sand and gravel out of the area <i>(Implies an alternative option whereby consideration is given to the method of transportation and associated carbon emissions)</i>	The impact of carbon emissions is considered in option 1 of id59 and option 1 of id68, and it is therefore not necessary to repeat this here. These options consider the overall approach to calculating sand and gravel provision rather than the full range of issues which may be considered when planning applications are assessed.	No
Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council	1409	Id03 Q12	Encourage recycling of aggregates <i>(Implies an alternative option which places greater reliance on use of alternatives sources)</i>	Use of alternative sources of aggregate is covered in id14 – supply of alternatives to land won primary aggregates, so does not need to be included here as a separate option. As stated in relation to options on alternatives sources of supply (id14) it is not realistic to expect a significantly greater amount of secondary and recycled aggregates to become available.	No
English Heritage	0298	Id03 Q12	The review of sand and gravel sales in 2019, which is proposed in Option 4, should also factor in the amount of aggregate that could come from sources outside the Joint Plan area such as marine sourced aggregate.	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies a 7<sup>th</sup> option whereby a review would also consider external sources of supply of sand and gravel)</i>		
English Heritage	0299	Id04 Q13	Shouldn't divide the Plan area into distribution areas to avoid potential pressure in specific locations which could have been addressed elsewhere in the Plan area	This approach is already covered by Option 4.	No
Wintringham Estate	0825	Id04 Q13	Option 1 - consideration also should be given to the site's proximity to the strategic highway network. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'and' option where consideration of proximity to the strategic highway network is also a factor)</i>	As the comment relates specifically to the delivery of Option 1, it should be noted that proximity to the main transport routes is considered under ID60 and this level of detail does therefore not need to be considered under this set of options.	No
English Heritage	0300	Id04 Q14	If the landbank for sand and gravel is sub-divided into two areas provision should be included so that where sufficient allocations cannot be identified from within each distribution area the total allocations for sand and gravel will be identified from across the whole of the plan area. This would help to ensure that there is not pressure for extraction from areas likely to harm the environmental assets of the County. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby the Plan area is considered as a whole should there be a shortfall of supply in one area)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Selby District Council	1308	Id03 Q14	Consider an increase in supply in the latter part of the plan period to facilitate HS2.	The potential for increased demand compared to the past ten years has been factored into options 2, 3 and	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies an alternative option which factors in demand related to significant developments – could be more relevant to id03)</i>	4 of Id03.	
3001	1828	Id04 Q14	Consider transportation and carbon emission implications. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby distribution is based upon minimising carbon emission and transportation)</i>	At the strategic level the carbon emission implications are addressed through options relating to distribution areas which seek to direct extraction towards markets. The impact of carbon emissions is considered in option 1 of id59 and option 1 of id68. It is therefore not necessary to consider this as an alternative option.	No
RSPB (North)	1719	Id05 Q16	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option which would also state that landbanks would not be within these designated areas)</i>	The strategic approaches set out under Id01 relate to broad, distinct parts of the plan area. Where extraction would be supported in principle proposals would still need to comply with Development Management policies. It is therefore not necessary to consider this as a new option.	No
RSPB (North)	1719	Id05 Q16	Recommends that the Joint Plan identifies Areas of Search that incorporate the potential strategic restoration objectives into identifying where mineral development should be located. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> alternative option under ID02 whereby the Plan identifies Areas of Search for mineral development identification which incorporates the potential strategic restoration)</i>	This has been Identified as a new alternative option under Id02.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>objectives)</i>		
RSPB (North)	1731	Id06 Q17	Include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation (SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs, NNRs) in the environmental criteria outlined in Option 3. <i>(Implies a 6<sup>th</sup> option where safeguarding would not take place within these designations)</i>	Whilst an option was included relating to National Parks and AONBs, consultation responses have indicated that this would be contrary to national guidance and therefore it is considered that the suggestion put forward would also be contrary to national policy.	No
Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council	1412	Id06 Q17	Option 1 – increase the buffer zone <i>(Implies a 6<sup>th</sup> option the same as option 1 but with a larger buffer zone than 250m)</i>	This is considered to represent a distinctively different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
RSPB (North)	1720	Id06 Q18	Extend the presumption against extraction to SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs, NNRs <i>(More relevant to Id01 where the point was also made)</i>	This is more applicable to id01 and has been addressed there.	No
RSPB (North)	1732	Id06 Q18	Include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation (SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs, NNRs) in the environmental criteria outlined in Option 3. <i>(Implies a 6<sup>th</sup> option where safeguarding would not take place within these designations)</i>	Whilst an option was included relating to National Parks and AONBs, consultation responses have indicated that this would be contrary to national guidance and therefore it is considered that the suggestion put forward would also be contrary to national policy.	No
Ryedale District Council	1167	Id07 Q19	Potential exists for secondary and recycled materials to act as alternatives to Magnesian limestone and this should be reflected in any policy to be taken forward. <i>(Implies an option whereby the potential for secondary and recycled materials to contribute to supply would be</i>	This is already considered under Option 3 and is therefore not a new alternative option.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>encouraged)</i>		
White Quarry Farm	0819	Id07 Q19	Option 2 – the figure for future provision should include an additional allowance of 20% to take account of a return to more normal market conditions in the construction industry. <i>(Implies an alternative 'or' option which is the same as option 2 but with an additional 20%)</i>	An alternative option which also factors in likely future growth will be considered.	Yes
W Clifford Watts and Co Ltd	0614	Id07 Q20	Another option which should be considered is allowing for the calculated requirement over the plan period plus a contingency to allow for an increase in sales of crushed rock due to an increase in demand if the economy grows. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which has an element of flexibility should there be an increase in demand)</i>	An alternative option which also factors in likely future growth will be considered.	Yes
Minerals Product Association	1472	Id07 Q20	It will be prudent for the Plan to identify Areas of Search for new crushed rock sites to take up towards the end of the Plan period. The AoS should be drawn up with industry involvement to achieve realistic areas. <i>(Implies an 'and' option whereby areas of search would be identified)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Minerals Product Association	1473	Id07 Q21	Should include a policy allowing local building stone extraction from crushed rock sites if it is needed. <i>(Implies an 'and' option which would support the extraction of building stone from crushed rock sites – probably more relevant to id20)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach to the options initially presented under Id20 and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Minerals Product	1474	Id08 Q22	Consideration should be given to	New options put forward under Id01	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Association			maintaining productive capacity in the plan area so that irrespective of reserve levels there is sufficient means to continue to supply markets, this may mean continuing production from a sensitive designated area as more sustainable. <i>(Implies 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option to ensure continuity of supply for markets through extraction in designated areas)</i>	consider the potential for allowing extraction in designated areas where it is not practical to meet demand from outwith these areas.	
W Clifford Watts and Co Ltd	0616	Id08 Q23	In addition to the 10 year landbank consideration should be given to providing a contingency to allow for the possibility that sales of crushed rock may increase as a result of economic growth. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which has an element of flexibility should there be an increase in demand)</i>	An alternative option which also factors in likely future growth will be considered under Id07.	Yes
RSPB North	1721	Id08 Q23	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	The options set out strategic approaches towards landbanks in relation to broad parts of the Plan area and based on policy contained in the NPPF. Where extraction would be supported in principle proposals would still need to comply with Development Management policies. It is therefore not necessary to consider this as a new option.	No
RSPB North	1722	Id09 Q25	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs,	Safeguarding does not create any presumption in favour of extraction and therefore it is not necessary to consider this as a new option. Whilst an option was included	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	relating to National Parks and AONBs, consultation responses have indicated that this would be contrary to national guidance and therefore it is considered that the suggestion put forward would also be contrary to national policy.	
Stubbs Raine and Dennison	0158	Id10 Q27	Option 2 – use lower criteria of 3mt and 0.1mtpa rather than 5mt and 0.25mtpa <i>(Implies adding 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option with lower criteria in than option 2)</i>	As option 2 is based upon figures this is a distinctly different approach and should therefore be assessed as a new option.	Yes
Lafarge Tarmac	0967	Id11 Q29	Consideration should be given to whether a separate landbank for building sand should be maintained in accordance with National Planning Guidance and in recognition of its strategic importance <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby there will be a separate landbank for building sand)</i>	The NPPG states that separate landbanks for specific types of aggregate such as building sand should be allowed if they cater for specific markets. Landbanks for building sand are covered in ID04 along with sand and gravel so does not also need to be considered here.	No
Minerals Products Association	1478	Id11 Q29	If possible should seek to maintain a separate landbank for building sand based on advice in the NPPG <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby there will be a separate landbank for building sand)</i>	The NPPG states that separate landbanks for specific types of aggregate such as building sand should be allowed if they cater for specific markets. . Landbanks for building sand covered in ID04 along with sand and gravel so does not also need to be considered here	No
Lafarge Tarmac	0968	Id11 Q30	Preferable to combine options 1 and 2, i.e. allocate specific sites if put forward and also areas of search for any shortfall <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> option combining option 1 and 2 whereby allocate specific sites if put forward but use areas of</i>	Provide a 3 <sup>rd</sup> option which combines Option 1 and 2, which would include site allocations plus criteria in the first instance followed by Areas of Search if specific sites are not identified. This is considered to be a distinctly different approach	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>search for any shortfall)</i>	and will be considered as a new option.	
Minerals Products Association	1479	Id11 Q30	Combine options 1 and 2 and have specific sites if put forward, and also areas of search for any shortfall. Criteria on their own should be avoided if not supported by AoS <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option combining option 1 and 2 whereby allocate specific sites if put forward but use areas of search for any shortfall)</i>	Provide a 3 <sup>rd</sup> option which combines Option 1 and 2, which would include site allocations plus criteria in the first instance followed by Areas of Search if specific sites are not identified. This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will be considered as a new option.	Yes
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0748	Id12 Q31	A policy to ensure restoration of Magnesian limestone quarries to grassland could be effective as is valuable grassland. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option whereby Magnesian limestone quarries will be restored to grassland)</i>	Reclamation and afteruse are considered in Id67. Restoration to BMVL and agriculture covered here so not a new option.	No
CPRE (Hambleton)	0107	Id13	Development should not take place on 'greenfield' sites where existing 'brownfield' sites can be used. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and/or' option whereby new sites would only be permitted where there are no opportunities for extensions)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option. (It is assumed in the context of quarrying that by brownfield the respondent is referring to extensions to existing quarries)	Yes
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0749	Id13 Q33	Extensions should only be allowed where there would be major gains for biodiversity and security of long term management. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where extensions would only be supported if there would be major gains for biodiversity)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Minerals Products Association	1481	Id13 Q33	Any extension, whether allocated or not, should be permitted if it meets the	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			broad sustainability criteria of the NPPF and this should form the basis of a policy. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby extensions that meet the broad sustainability criteria of the NPPF should be permitted)</i>	considered as a new option	
Lafarge Tarmac	0970	Id13 Q33	Any extension, whether allocated or not, should be permitted if it meets the broad sustainability criteria of the NPPF and this should form the basis of a policy. <i>(implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby extensions that meet the broad sustainability criteria of the NPPF should be permitted)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option	Yes
W Clifford Watts	0618	Id13 Q34	Object to parts of options 1 and 2 which state it would not apply in the National Park and AONBs <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1 and 2 which would apply across the Plan area)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option	Yes
Selby District Council	1315	Id13 Q34	Clearly set out where extraction is and is not appropriate, phasing and 'Plan B' sites should be incorporated into policy. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> Option whereby 'Plan B' sites and phasing of sites should be included)</i> <i>(Provide more background evidence about where extraction should be allowed)</i>	These options relate to unallocated sites and it is therefore not possible to provide more specific details about where such development would take place.	No
English Heritage	0307	Id13 Q34	If Option 3 is selected, then the plan might consider allowing small-scale extensions to existing	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			quarries (using clearly-defined parameters for what might constitute “small scale”) along the lines of the existing policy in the North Yorkshire Minerals Plan. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> ‘and’ option linked to option 3 whereby small scale extensions may be allowed to existing quarries)</i>		
English Heritage	0307	Id13 Q34	If policy included which allows extension of existing quarries outside the National Park and AONBs then one of the considerations should be that permission will only be granted if the extension would not compromise the plan’s objectives for the protection of the environment and the amenities of local communities. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> ‘and’ option linked to options 1 and 2 which would ensure that the environment, amenities and communities are protected)</i>	This is a Development Management consideration rather than something to be addressed through the strategic options.	No
Minerals Products Association	1539	Id13 Q34	Should support extensions which are as good as an allocated site and meet the sustainability criteria in the NPPF <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> ‘or’ option whereby proposed extensions would be supported if as good as an allocated site and meet the sustainability criteria in the NPPF)</i>	This is a distinctly different option so will be considered as a new option.	Yes
RSPB North	1783	Id13 Q34	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for	The options set out strategic approaches towards landbanks in relation to broad parts of the Plan area and based on policy contained	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	in the NPPF. Where extraction would be supported in principle proposals would still need to comply with Development Management policies. It is therefore not necessary to consider this as a new option.	
Lafarge Tarmac	0971	Id13 Q34	Should support extensions which are as good as an allocated site and meet the sustainability criteria in the NPPF <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby proposed extensions would be supported if as good as an allocated site and meet the sustainability criteria in the NPPF)</i>	This is a distinctly different option so will be considered as a new option.	Yes
2955/ 2953/ 2956/ 2954/ Womersley PC/ Cridling Stubbs PC	1947/ 1961/ 1976/ 1935/ 0733/1356	Id14	Support the use of colliery spoil as a secondary aggregate but do not support the reworking of colliery spoil tips. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby the use of colliery spoil as a secondary aggregate would be supported provided it was not obtained from restored colliery spoil tips.)</i>	This is a distinctly different option so will be considered as a new option or part of an option under id14.	Yes
Scottish and Southern Plc	0896	Id14 Q39	A stable energy policy which generates an environment for investment in the existing energy plant should be developed to increase supply of secondary and recycled aggregate. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby investment in existing energy plants is encouraged)</i>	This is beyond the remit of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan and relates more to national energy policy.	No
English Heritage	0308	Id14 Q36	Any proposals for reworking sites restored by mineral waste in the National Park need to be carefully examined against the potential impact	This is considered to be a more specific Development Management issue which can be considered when drafting detailed policies,	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			the reworking may have on elements which contribute to the special qualities of the National Park. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option whereby any reworking of restored sites in the National Park will need to be assessed on their potential impact on the special qualities of the National Park, and if detrimental should not be allowed)</i>	consider when progressing id67.	
UK Coal Operations	1986	Id14 Q37	Link the use of spoil to engineering projects at the planning stage. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option or a 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point in Option 1 whereby support engineering projects identifying the intention to use spoil at the planning stage.)</i>	This is a process issue and is therefore not relevant to the policy options.	No
3001	1830	Id15 Q41	The Blubberhouses Quarry should not be allowed to increase operations as the only means of transport is by road through scenic areas. The Burythorpe quarry should utilise the rail line, reducing carbon emissions, and should not be allowed to encroach on valued agricultural land.	Option 2 allows extraction at Burythorpe only, the use of the rail line is covered under ID54 – Transport infrastructure so does not need to be repeated here. Therefore this is not considered to represent a new option.	No
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0753	Id17 Q45	Consider locating new sites close to former clay extraction sites which are now ponds <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1 and 2 whereby sites would be supported where restoration would contribute towards improving habitat connectivity, particularly in relation to ponds)</i>	A restoration led approach for clay has not been considered elsewhere and so should be considered as a new option.	Yes
RSPB North	1723	Id19 Q49	Should extend the presumption against	It is considered that this would not	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	represent a sufficiently different direction of approach as consideration of such designations is presented in the Development Management chapter. The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	
Minerals Products Association	1487	Id20 Q50	Building stone should not just be reserves for the repair market. New build is just as important and the historic market only accounts for 10% of sales, need should not be limited. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby building stone can be extracted for the new build market where feasible – I don't think the current options would prevent this – perhaps the option they are suggesting is option 2 but with clarification in the option that it is for repair and new build)</i>	New build is not discounted from the existing options and the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies, to be considered when developing policy for id21.	No
Minerals Products Association	1488	Id20 Q52	Option 3 should not require consideration to be given to the availability of stone at alternative sites <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option as an alternative to option 3 which excludes the consideration of alternative sources)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Ryedale District Council	1094	Id21 Q53	Options too limited, a combination would be favoured. Stone extracted from the area should only be used in the area (except in exceptional circumstances), in protected landscapes extraction should be	Combining 2 existing options produces a new option so needs to be assessed.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			supported where it is to be used within the designated area it is extracted from unless required for repair of historic assets elsewhere. <i>(Implies adding a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby options 1 and 2 are combined)</i>		
Howardian Hills AONB	1601	Id21 Q53	If option 2 chosen wording needs to be revised to ' support applications for extraction of building stone from within the Joint Plan area for use only within the Joint Plan area, unless for repair of important designated or undesignated structures elsewhere which rely on this stone. Stone extracted in the National Parks and AONBs would only be used within the designated area from where it is extracted, "unless for the repair of important designated or undesignated structures elsewhere which rely on this stone." <i>(Implies Option 2 should be expanded to include "unless for the repair of important designated or undesignated structures elsewhere which rely on this stone.")</i>	The added words are repeated earlier in the option but if included after the NP and AONBs changes context of sentence so may need to be reassessed.	Yes
English Heritage	0310	Id21 Q53	There should be an option whereby stone for the open market could be sourced from anywhere except the National Park and AONBs. The reopening of former quarries anywhere should be supported where 1) the stone is required for repair and restoration of heritage assets, 2) it can be demonstrated that the quarry is the original source of stone and 3) the scale	Is a revised option with new elements included so needs reassessing	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			of extraction is commensurate with the expected requirements of the development. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would be fairly similar to option 1 but would include criteria 2 and 3 suggested in the comment)</i>		
Cromwell Wood Estate Co Ltd	1670	Id21 Q53	Should consider allowing some crushed stone from building stone sites in the National Park to ensure development in the towns and villages in the park are not placed at a disadvantage due to cost of haulage and carbon footprint. <i>( Implies an alternative option under Id01 whereby aggregates extraction from building stone quarries in the National Park and AONBs would be supported)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and has not been considered as an option under id01 and so should be assessed.	Yes
RSPB North	1724	Id21 Q54	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies adding a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	It is considered that this would not represent a sufficiently different direction of approach as consideration of such designations is presented in the Development Management chapter. The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	No
English Heritage	0312	Id22 Q56	Where development is proposed that may affect a building stone quarry it should be demonstrated that the stone is no longer viable to quarry or not likely to be needed in the foreseeable future <i>(This is relevant to Id70. The</i>	This addition to Option 1 for id70, provides an alternative and so needs to be assessed.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>consideration of whether the mineral is likely to be needed would be an addition to option 1 of ID70 and represent an alternative to this)</i>		
Ryedale District Council	1154	ld23 Q59	All processing and generating facilities located in designated landscapes should be addressed through the Major Development Test <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby the Major Development Test would be the determining factor as to whether development would be acceptable in designated areas)</i>	The Major Development Test is set out within other options and therefore the approach suggested is consistent with Option 2. In drafting the policies consideration could be given to including cross-reference to the policy on the Major Development Test – id61.	No
2876	0488	ld23	Oppose the extraction of oil and gas <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil and gas developments within the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2797	0012	ld23	There should be a blanket ban on hydraulic fracturing and conventional gas extraction <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil and gas developments within the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2981	2282	ld23	Halt the extraction of further fossil fuels <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil and gas developments within the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
The Coal Authority	0866	ld23	Paragraphs 116 and 147 of the NPPF should form the basis of the policy. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which relies on policies in the NPPF)</i>	The NPPF does not contain any spatial policies for oil and gas developments. Its requirements relating to specific types of gas extraction are covered in subsequent options and paragraph	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				116 is covered under the Major Development Test options. It is therefore not considered appropriate to consider this as a separate option.	
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	1690	Id23 Q59	Support options 2 and 3 <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which is a combination of options 2 and 3)</i>	The combining of options provides an alternative option which needs to be considered as a new option	Yes
Dart Energy (Europe) Ltd	0840	Id23 Q59	The options should be amended to include the exploration phase and an understanding that development is environmentally acceptable <i>(Implies an 'and' option which states that developments should be environmentally acceptable. Exploration is covered already in the options)</i>	Exploration is already covered in other options and so does not need to be specifically considered here	No
922	0004	Id23 Q59	Objects to extraction of shale gas <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option to Id28 which would not support any shale gas extraction)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1620 / 1288 / 1360	Id23 Q59	Shouldn't allow further oil and gas development <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2876	0490	Id23 Q59	Would prefer no operations to be allowed <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
3006	2234	Id23 Q60	Proposed further option : Only permit unconventional gas exploration and development in any location : - if an agreed pattern of development,	These considerations relate largely to the planning application process or to other Development Management issues and regulatory	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<p>number and spacing of wells compatible with a particular location can be agreed in advance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if there is a real solution to the treatment and disposal of the predicted volume of contaminated waste water.</li> <li>- if full disclosure or negotiation of chemicals used has been agreed.</li> <li>- if road use and maintenance and financial bond has been agreed</li> <li>- if a financial bond has been agreed for negative effects like acid spills, impact on farms, drop in house prices etc.</li> <li>- if full reclamation is agreed, with a financial bond</li> </ul> <p><i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option as above for extraction of unconventional gas – possibly more relevant to Id28.)</i></p>	<p>regimes rather than the principle of oil and gas development and it are therefore not appropriate to consider this as a new option.</p>	
York Environment Forum	2199	Id23 Q60	<p>Would prefer an option which rejects oil and gas exploration and extraction in the Plan area.</p> <p><i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i></p>	<p>This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.</p>	No
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	0323 / 1621 / 1361	Id23 Q60	<p>The Authorities should consider whether there should be a presumption against additional oil and gas exploration licenses.</p> <p><i>(Although refers to licenses, implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i></p>	<p>This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.</p>	No
RSPB North	1725	Id23 Q60	<p>Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national</p>	<p>It is considered that this would not represent a sufficiently different direction of approach as</p>	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	consideration of such designations is presented in the Development Management chapter. The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	
Selby District Council	1320	Id23 Q60	Include sequential policy to ensure plant infrastructure has minimal visual, social and environmental impact. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' sequential policy whereby it is ensured that plant infrastructure has a minimal visual, social and environmental impact.)</i>	Preventing such impacts are included in id25, id26 and id28	No
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0208	Id23 Q60	Could the Plan rule out any new gas wells or processing facilities? <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
The Coal Authority	0865	Id23 Q60	Should consider an option which allows exploration, appraisal and production across the plan area without restrictions from the National Park and AONB designations. <i>(implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby exploration, appraisal and production is allowed without restriction throughout the Plan area)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
2797	0013	Id24 Q61	There should be a blanket ban on hydraulic fracturing and conventional gas development <i>(More relevant to Id23 – implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1362	Id24 Q61	Stronger wording is required as the words 'support' and 'encourage' are weak. <i>(Implies changing the words 'support' and 'encourage' to stronger terms to promote co-location)</i>	It is considered this would not represent an overall different strategic approach but the comment will be considered when drafting policies.	No
Friends of the Earth	0324 / 1622	Id24 Q61	Stronger wording is required as the words 'support' and 'encourage' are weak. <i>(Implies changing the words 'support' and 'encourage' to stronger terms to promote co-location)</i>	It is considered this would not represent an overall different strategic approach but the comment will be considered when drafting policies.	No
The Coal Authority	0867	Id24 Q61	Add flexibility into the policy to take account of potential new PEDL licence areas being granted and an expansion of both conventional and unconventional extraction. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would take a less prescribed approach to co-ordination – possibly supporting but not requiring consideration to be given?)</i>	Potential new PEDL areas to be considered in supporting information when developing policies	No
2876	0493	Id24 Q61	No new gas extraction should be allowed <i>(More relevant to Id23 - implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Harrogate Friends of the Earth/Friends of the Earth	1363/0325/1623	Id24 Q62	Should include a policy which considers a presumption against gas extraction in the Plan area. <i>(More relevant to Id23 - implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Howardian Hills AONB	1604	Id25	Contradicts option 1 of Id23 <i>(Implies an amendment to the option which acknowledges that this would be</i>	This does not represent an alternative option, but should this option be taken forward it would	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>considered alongside overall options for oil and gas which may preclude development in the National Park and AONBs)</i>	need to be consistent with any other policies for oil and gas. As the option relates to 'within or in close proximity to the National Park or AONBs' it could apply to some extent under any of the options under Id23.	
231	2144	Id25 Q63	Gas exploration should be granted only if this complies with a halt in unconventional gas extraction <i>(Implies that the Plan should support exploration but not production of unconventional gas)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2797	0014	Id25 Q63	There should be a blanket ban on hydraulic fracturing <i>(More relevant to Id28 - implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support hydraulic fracturing in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1625 / 1365	Id25 Q64	High standards of siting, design and mitigation should be applied across the Plan area <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option whereby high standards of siting, design and mitigation are required across the Plan area) To be considered under Id68</i>	This comment is more applicable to id68, but is not a new option but should be borne in mind when developing policy.	No
Dart Energy	0842	Id25 Q63	Suggest removing the words ....'or in close proximity'....from the last sentence as current wording identifies an unnecessary buffer zone around National Parks and AONBs. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> option whereby particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation are only required within National Parks and AONBs)</i>	This issue has been covered under option 3 of id61, the approach they suggested is to proceed with id61 but without Option 3 so moved to DM section	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
2876	0495	Id24 Q61	No gas extraction should be allowed <i>(More relevant to Id23 - implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any oil or gas development in the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources also Third Energy	1242/1251	Id25 Q64	In the wording of the policy 'minimise' should be replaced with replaced with 'mitigate' <i>(Implies an 'or' option where adverse impacts are mitigated rather than minimised)</i>	This does not represent an overall different approach but the specific wording can be considered when drafting policies.	No
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources also Third Energy	1242/1251	Id25 Q64	Unnecessary to require high standards of siting and design in National Park and AONBs as this is covered by the NPPF <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option which does not place any specific requirements on development in National Parks and AONBs)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources also Third Energy	1242/1251	Id25 Q64	Option implies that the visual impact of development outside, but close to, the boundary of the National Park is a material consideration, however this is only relevant if the development is actually visible from the park, so is ambiguous and needs to be clarified. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option where impact on the setting of the National Park is clarified)</i>	Clarification can be provided when drafting the policies.	No
RSPB North	1726	Id25 Q64	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be	It is considered that this would not represent a sufficiently different direction of approach as consideration of such designations is presented in the Development Management chapter. The options	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			consistent with the NPPF. <i>(More relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	
Frack Free York	2357	Id25 Q64	Consider a presumption against exploration and appraisal for unconventional sources of gas. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option where exploration and appraisal for unconventional forms of gas would not be supported. Also relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction of unconventional gas)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Frack Free York	2357	Id25 Q64	Consider a presumption against exploration and appraisal for unconventional sources of gas. <i>Also relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction of unconventional gas)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
3006	2236	Id25 Q64	Treat conventional and unconventional gas separately. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option which would contain criteria specific to exploration and appraisal for unconventional forms</i>	Promotes a 2 <sup>nd</sup> alternative 'or' option for id25 which would contain criteria specific to exploration and appraisal for unconventional forms of gas.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>of gas)</i>	<i>Is not a realistic approach so should be discounted</i>	
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0210	Id25 Q64	Rule out new fossil fuel developments <i>(More relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2981	2285	Id25 Q64	No exploration and appraisal of fossil fuels <i>(More relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be no support for oil and gas developments)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
York Environment Forum	2202	Id25 Q64	Need to add an option that rejects exploration and appraisal of gas development, so it is consistent with id28 where Option 2 does not express support in principle for development of unconventional gas. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option whereby exploration and appraisal would not be supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Friends of the Earth	0327	Id25 Q64	Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation should apply across the Plan area <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option where high standards of siting, design and mitigation would apply across the Plan area) applies to id68</i>	This comment is more applicable to id68, but is not a new option but should be borne in mind when developing policy.	No
3006	2237	Id25 Q65	Should be options not to support conventional/unconventional gas and oil developments <i>(More relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be no support for oil and gas</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>developments)</i>		
York Environment Forum	2203	Id25 Q65	Additional specific criteria should include safety to public health, livestock and wildlife, this should overrule 'economic benefits'. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option where greater weight is given to environmental effects than economic effects)</i>	This option gives greater weight to environmental matters anyway so not distinctly different so not an alternative	No
Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth Harrogate	0328/1626/ 1366	Id25 Q65	The option should be consistent with the definition of 'sustainable development' in the NPPF <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option where there would be no specific criteria within the Plan but instead the NPPF would be relied upon to determine exploration and appraisal proposals)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
2797	0015	Id26	There should be a blanket ban on hydraulic fracturing and conventional gas development <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which does not support any production and processing facilities for hydraulic fracturing and conventional gas development More relevant to id23)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Dart Energy Ltd	0843	Id26 Q66	Option 1 - The policy should be re-worded to state that 'new gas, including hydrocarbons , production and processing facilities' <i>(Implies an alternative option which also refers to hydrocarbons more generally)</i>	This is not considered to represent a distinctly different approach. The options were titled 'gas' as oil is not known to exist within the Plan area, however when drafting the policies consideration can be given to using the term 'hydrocarbons' instead. Consider using the term hydrocarbons in policies id23 to id28	No
Dart Energy Ltd	0843	Id26 Q66	Option 1 – The phrase '...or in close	This issue has been covered under	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			proximity to...' should be removed (Implies a 3 <sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would not consider the impact on the setting of the National Park or AONBs)	option 3 of id61, the approach they suggested is to proceed with id61 but without Option 3, so moved to DM section	
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1627 / 0329 / 1367	Id26 Q66	Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation should apply across the Plan area (Implies a 3 <sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where high standards of siting, design and mitigation would apply across the Plan area)to be considered under id68	This comment is more applicable to id68, but is not a new option but should be borne in mind when developing policy.	No
3006	2238	Id26 Q66	Unconventional and conventional gas production and processing should be treated separately (Implies 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> options in order to consider unconventional and conventional separately, or an 'and' option which sets out specific considerations relating to unconventional production and processing)	From the response it is not clear what specific differences are being sought. A separate set of options covering unconventional gas extraction was also presented and a policy deriving from this would provide additional specific considerations relating to such developments. It is therefore not considered necessary or possible to consider this as a separate option.	No
RSPB North	1727	Id26 Q66	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. (More relevant to Id23 - Implies adding a 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)	It is considered that this would not represent a sufficiently different direction of approach as consideration of such designations is presented in the Development Management chapter. The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Third Energy Ltd/Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources	1252/1243	Id26 Q66	Replace 'minimise' with 'mitigate' <i>(Implies an 'or' option where adverse impacts are mitigated rather than minimised)</i>	This does not represent an overall different approach but the specific wording can be considered when drafting policies.	No
Envireau Water	1548	Id26 Q66	Greenfield sites should be considered on a site by site basis <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where no preference is given to brownfield sites)</i>	This approach is the same as Option 2 of id26 so not a new option	No
3006	2239	Id26 Q66	CCS should be treated separately as could be useful for climate mitigation <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option which sets out specific considerations relating to CCS)</i>	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	Yes
3006	2239	Id26 Q66	Should be option not to support development <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where production and processing developments are not supported More relevant to id23)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0212	Id26 Q67	Would prefer no fossil fuel extraction <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where production and processing developments are not supported. Possibly more relevant to Id23 as would imply a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where oil and gas developments are not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2876	0498	Id26 Q67	Alternative would be to not support any development at all. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where production and processing developments are not supported. Possibly more relevant to Id23 as would</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>imply a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where oil and gas developments are not supported)</i>		
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1628 / 1368 / 0330	ld26 Q67	The resources should be left in the ground <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where production and processing developments are not supported. Possibly more relevant to ld23 as would imply a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where oil and gas developments are not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2797	0016	ld27	There should be a blanket ban on hydraulic fracturing and conventional gas extraction <i>(More relevant to ld 23 - implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any hydraulic fracturing or conventional gas developments within the Plan area)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Petroleum Safety Services Ltd	0789	ld27	No consideration has been given to greenfield sites <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which does not specifically support brownfield locations)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
2798	0024	ld28	The Plan should not allow extraction of shale gas (comments made in relation to oil and gas chapter, not this specific option) <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support extraction of shale gas)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2938 / Frack Free York / York Environment Forum / Frack Free North Yorkshire	2365 / 2361 / 2210 / 0641	ld28	The Plan should not support unconventional gas extraction <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby unconventional gas extraction is not supported by the Plan)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2917 / 2788 / 2805 / 2861 / 2964 / 2804 /	0538 / 0007 / 0057 / 0089 /	ld28	The Plan should not support shale gas extraction	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
2857 / 2855	0634 / 0056 / 0284 / 0285		<i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby hydraulic fracturing is not supported by the Plan)</i>	Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	
2802	0030	Id28 Q70	Fracking, UCG and coal mining should be rejected <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby shale gas extraction and UCG would be rejected and a 3<sup>rd</sup> option under Id29 which would not support any further extraction of coal)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2802	0030	Id28 Q70	Fracking, UCG and coal mining should be rejected <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby shale gas extraction and UCG would be rejected and a 3<sup>rd</sup> option under Id29 which would not support any further extraction of coal)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Harrogate Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth	1371/1630/ 0506	Id28 Q70	Should be separate options for each of the methods. <i>(Implies 3 separate sets of options relating to each form of unconventional gas extraction)</i>	The effects of each of the different types of unconventional gas extraction have been considered in undertaking the Sustainability Appraisal. It is unclear how the respondent would consider the sets of options should differ between methods and therefore it is not possible to produce alternative sets of options which would be any different to the options already presented. Separate options for carbon and gas storage will, however, be considered in response to this and other comments.	No
2808	0060	Id28 Q70	Opposes CBM, UCG and shale gas extraction <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where these</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>forms of development are not supported)</i>	this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	
2988	0862	ld28 Q70	Fossil fuels should remain underground <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option to ld23 where gas extraction would not be supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2987	2292	ld28 Q70	Until the effects are more readily understood CBM, UCG or shale gas extraction should not take place <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby in the short term there would be a restrictive approach which could be reviewed in the medium to long term)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2987	2292	ld28 Q70	Would prefer no fossil fuel exploration <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option to ld23 whereby oil and gas extraction would not be supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2952	0628	ld28 Q70	Option 3 can be improved with the insistence of a full environmental assessment. <i>(Implies adding requirement for a full environmental assessment into Option 3) – not a new option but aiming to strengthen Option 3</i>	This is not a new policy option as it is a process issue, but can be considered when drafting the policies.	No
Scarborough , Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0213	ld28 Q70	Criteria should be set to prevent most new fossil fuel extraction methods. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby criteria would be used to prevent most new fossil fuel extraction methods which would lead to adverse impacts. – Could be relevant to ld23)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Scarborough , Whitby and Ryedale	0213	ld28 Q70	CCS should not be grouped with the other technologies, as could be useful	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Green Party			in mitigating climate change. <i>(Implies a further set of options which only consider CCS)</i>	relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	
2937	1613	Id28 Q70	Should have an additional option to oppose all unconventional gas extraction in the Plan area. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby unconventional gas extraction in the Plan area would not be allowed) – this Option would not be in line with Government advice and so would not be allowed.</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2965	0635	Id28 Q70	The Plan should oppose unconventional gas extraction within the plan area. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby unconventional gas extraction in the Plan area would not be allowed) – this Option would not be in line with Government advice and so would not be allowed.</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Friends of the Earth – Yorkshire & Humber and the north east	1760	Id28 Q70	Options 1 and 3 do not go far enough. Support a precautionary approach to climate change and require EIA based on above and below ground <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option based on options 1 and 2 in which EIA is a requirement and a precautionary approach is taken)</i>	Requirements for EIA are set out in regulations and is a process issue which cannot be addressed through policy. Effects on the environment below ground would be considered as part of the EIA process where relevant. Climate change, in terms of sustainable design and transport considerations, are considered under other options sets. RS comment – not sure about this. AM	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				– agree this is probably not a new option	
3007	1867	Id28 Q70	Shale gas should not be extracted in Ryedale or the AONBs <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where shale gas extraction is not supported in Ryedale or the AONBs)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
0231	2146	Id28 Q70	Appears to be an error - Option 3 is described as 'and expansion to the precautionary principle in Option 1' but is actually Option 2 which more closely follows the precautionary principle by not supporting the principle of fracking, CBM or UCG. Assuming this is the case would support strengthening of Option 3 with the inclusion of a moratorium on these systems of unconventional gas extraction <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby unconventional gas extraction is not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2995	2112	Id28 Q70	Shale gas exploration using fracking should not go ahead. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby hydraulic fracturing is not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Hovingham and Scackleton Parish Council	0066	Id28 Q70	Do not support the principle of shale gas extraction in Ryedale <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where shale gas extraction is not supported in</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>Ryedale)</i>	NPPF to 'plan positively'.	
York Environment Forum	2206	Id28 Q70	CCS should be a separate issue with separate options. <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby CCS is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM,UCG and shale gas)</i>	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	Yes
2934	2213	Id28 Q70	There should be criteria to prevent new fossil fuel extraction. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would not support any extraction – may be more relevant to Id23)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2934	2213	Id28 Q70	CCS should not be included in the same policy as new extraction technologies, as it could mitigate climate change. <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby CCS is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM,UCG and shale gas)</i>	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	Yes
Third Energy/ Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources	1253/1244	Id28 Q70	Suggest a more criteria based policy approach is adopted and as such direct applications for energy minerals development to consult the local list and contain sufficient information to adequately assess the environmental implications of the proposal. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' Option which is more criteria based and linked to the local list so environmental implications of a proposal are assessed at the outset.)</i>	This suggestion relates to process rather than a policy approach.	No
2811	0065	Id28 Q70	Would prefer that exploitation of shale	This approach is unlikely to be	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			gas, CBM and UCG is not allowed. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where shale gas, CBM and UCG are not allowed)</i>	considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	
Dart Energy Ltd	0844	Id28 Q70	Option 1 – would welcome deletion of the phrase 'particular high standards of design' as limited opportunities to alter design in relation to plant and machinery. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which is the same as Option 1 but without the word 'design' in the last sentence.)</i>	As the respondent is suggesting removing the word design only, it is considered that the change would not significantly alter the overall approach as high standards of siting and mitigation would still apply.	No
Dart Energy Ltd	0844	Id28 Q70	The phrase '...or in close proximity to...' should be removed to prevent the outward creep of the National Park and AONB boundaries. <i>(Implies amending Option 1 by removing the words 'in close proximity to' from the last sentence to confine mitigation to development within the National Park or AONBs)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
2876	0500	Id28 Q70	Would prefer an option to oppose all CBM, UCG and shale gas operations. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby unconventional gas extraction in the Plan area would not be allowed) – This Option would not be in line with Government advice and so would not be allowed.</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Ryedale District Council	1177	Id28 Q70	Until the effects of the processes are understood the MWJP should not support the process in principle <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby a restrictive approach would be applied in the short term with the potential for</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>being less restrictive once effects can be more easily understood)</i>		
2989	1985	Id28 Q70	Do not support shale gas extraction in the three areas <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby shale extraction is not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2997	1820	Id28 Q71	Until the effects of the processes are understood the MWJP should not support CBM, UCG or shale gas extraction. A precautionary approach should be followed. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby a restrictive approach would be applied in the short term with the potential for being less restrictive once effects can be more easily understood)</i>	Not supporting such developments in the short term is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'. It is considered that options 1 and 3 set out a precautionary approach.	No
Friends of the Earth/ Harrogate Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth	1631/ 1372/ 1394	Id28 Q71	An alternative would be to invest heavily in renewables and in energy storage. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would promote the use of renewables over extraction of unconventional gas.)</i> – <i>The current MWJP does not have any say in renewable energy, it is dealt with by District/Borough Councils or if a large proposal Government.</i>	The MWJP has limited influence in these matters, as such an alternative approach is not considered realistic. The Plan represents national policy for a mix of energy sources.	No
York Green Party	2302	Id28 Q71	Unconventional gas extraction should be opposed <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby unconventional gas extraction is not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Third Energy Ltd/ Barton Willmore on behalf of Egdon	1254/ 1245	Id28 Q71	Suggest criteria based policy is adopted which seeks to ensure oil and gas and unconventional hydrocarbons activities	This represents a distinctly different approach as it would exclude the specific considerations contained in	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Resources			take place in an environmentally acceptable manner. Suggest following policy wording 'Planning permission will be granted for exploration, appraisal or production of oil and gas and unconventional hydrocarbons provided they do not result in any significant adverse impacts on local communities or the environment.' <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby planning permission will be granted for exploration, appraisal or production of oil and gas and unconventional hydrocarbons provided they do not result in any significant adverse impacts on local communities or the environment.)</i>	the options already presented. The option is more applicable to id23 and so will be added under there.	
Green Party/ Hambleton Sustainable Development	1557 / 1223	Id28 Q71	The precautionary principle should be applied but option 3 does not go far enough <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which is more restrictive than option 3)</i>	This does not represent an alternative option as Option 3 itself does not set limits on how restrictive it would be.	No
Green Party	1557	Id28 Q71	Oppose UCG within the Plan area <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option where UCG specifically is not supported)</i>	This is significantly different to the options presented. However ruling out a particular technology across the whole Plan area is not likely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the NPPF as it would not represent planning 'positively'.	No
Selby District Council	1322	Id28 Q71	Fracking policies need to consider deep coal mining legacy such as land instability <i>(implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' Option whereby coal mining legacy is taken</i>	This is not considered to be an alternative option but rather is a development management consideration which could be factored into either of the options	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>into account assessing the potential for fracking)</i>	id23 and 1d26, also link to id72	
RSPB North	1728	ld28 Q71	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	It is considered that this would not represent a sufficiently different direction of approach as consideration of such designations is presented in the Development Management chapter. The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	No
York Environment Forum	2207	ld28 Q71	The Plan should oppose unconventional gas extraction <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where any unconventional gas extraction is not supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2874/ 2951	0571/ 0626	ld28 Q71	Separate carbon storage from this policy group as CCS has potential environmental benefits whilst fracking has only negative effects. <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby CCS is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM,UCG and shale gas)</i>	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from ld28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	Yes
Friends of the Earth – Yorkshire and the Humber and the North east	1784	ld28 Q71	Proposed Policy: An applicant for planning permission for fracking or shale gas operations (including test drilling and extraction) must demonstrate by appropriate evidence and assessment that reasonable scientific doubt can be excluded as to adverse impacts of the proposed development alone or in combination	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward. Whilst the suggestions can be taken on board it is considered they could apply to either options 1 or 3 and do not in themselves represent a differing	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<p>with other developments: On the quality and quantity of water resources, including groundwater and water courses; On air quality (including through emissions of methane and sulphur); On seismic activity; On local communities; On greenhouse gas emission and climate change.</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted unless: The Council is satisfied that all reasonable scientific doubt that there is any risk of adverse impacts has been eliminated; The proposal will not compromise the Council's duties in relation to climate change mitigation, and; The proposal is environmentally acceptable, or it can be made so by planning conditions or obligations. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> criteria based 'or' Option using the above text)</i></p>	<p>approach.</p>	
3009	2130	Id28 Q71	<p>CCS should not be included with new extraction technologies. <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby CCS is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM, UCG and shale gas)</i></p>	<p>It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.</p>	Yes
3006	2242	Id28 Q71	<p>There should be an option not to support unconventional gas extraction <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where unconventional gas extraction will not</i></p>	<p>This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the</p>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>be supported)</i>	NPPF to 'plan positively'.	
3001	1864	Id28 (in AOC sheet)	Fracking should have a separate section. <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby shale gas is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM,UCG and CCS)</i>	It is not clear from the response in what way the options for fracking should be different to options for other methods and therefore it is not possible to show a different set of options for fracking. However, carbon and gas storage will be separated from the other options.	No
3001	1866	Id28 Q71	Bring on stream renewable energy sources and recycle what we have <i>(Implies an 'or' option where renewables are supported in place of unconventional gas extraction)</i>	The options reflect national policy which seeks a mix of energy generation methods. It is not considered realistic to consider this as an option.	No
2797	0017	Id28 Q71	Oppose fracking and processes resembling fracking <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where unconventional gas extraction would not be supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2797	0017	Id28 Q71	There should be a blanket ban on conventional gas development <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option under Id23 whereby any form of conventional gas extraction would not be supported)</i>	This option is unlikely to be found 'sound' as the NPPF requires planning authorities to 'plan positively' and to 'address constraints' on gas extraction.	No
2951	0626	Id28 Q71	CCS should be separated from fracking. <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby CCS is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM,UCG and shale gas)</i>	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	Yes
2810	0064	Id28 Q71	Fracking should not be allowed in the Plan area <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where fracking</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>would not be supported)</i>	subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	
UK Coal Operations Ltd	1988	ld28 Q71	The options presented appear unduly limited in exploiting unconventional gas <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby support is given and reliance is placed on other development management policies to mitigate any effects)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and will therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
3004	2116	ld28 Q71	Would like to see a precautionary approach which opposes unconventional gas extraction. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where unconventional gas extraction would not be supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2788	0025	ld28 Q71	The Plan should support renewable energy instead of shale gas. <i>(Implies an 'or' option where renewables are supported in place of unconventional gas extraction)</i>	The options reflect national policy which seeks a mix of energy generation methods. It is therefore not considered realistic to consider this as an option.	No
2917	0539	ld28 Q71	Leave in the ground <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where unconventional gas extraction would not be supported)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2809	0063	ld28 Q71	Shale gas extraction should not be allowed near to built up areas if at all <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option where shale gas extraction would not be supported and an amendment to option 3 to relate to built up areas rather than just residential areas)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Governments approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'. Amending residential to built up is not considered to be sufficiently different to warrant a separate option but is something that could be considered when developing the policy.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
2952	0629	Id28 Q71	Address the full impact of climate change <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option where the impact on climate change is a consideration of any proposal)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward. Whilst the suggestions can be taken on board it is considered they could apply to either of the options and do not in themselves represent a differing approach.	No
Hambleton Sustainable Development Officer	1223	Id28 Q71	Opposed to unconventional gas extraction <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option which does not support unconventional gas extraction)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
RSPB North	1736	Id28 Q71	This type of development should be excluded from statutory designated sites. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option which would exclude these developments in statutory designated sites)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'. Other sets of options set out approaches in relation to statutory designated sites.	No
RSPB North	1736	Id28 Q71	In addition to the proposed options impacts on climate change should be fully considered. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option where the impact on climate change is a consideration of any proposal)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward. Whilst the suggestions can be taken on board it is considered they could apply to either of the options and do not in themselves represent a differing approach. Effects on climate change have been considered through the	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				Sustainability Appraisal.	
3000	1808	Id28 Q71	Opposed to fracking <i>(Implies a 4 'or' option which does not support shale gas extraction)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2253	2103	Id28 Q71	Do not want exploitation of unconventional gas <i>(Implies a 4 'or' option which does not support unconventional gas extraction)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
2253	2103	Id28 Q71	Carbon storage should be considered separately <i>(Implies adding a new id box whereby CCS is dealt with on its own and not combined with CBM, UCG and shale gas)</i>	It is considered appropriate to identify a new option(s) which only relate to CCS and to remove CCS from Id28. Whilst the options may be similar this will particularly enable the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the different implications of storage and extraction.	Yes
Frack Free York	2360	Id28 Q71	There should be a presumption against production of unconventional gas <i>(Implies a 4 'or' option which does not support unconventional gas extraction)</i>	This approach is unlikely to be considered 'sound' in terms of the Government's approach towards this subject and the requirement in the NPPF to 'plan positively'.	No
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources / Third Energy Ltd	1246 / 1255	Q72	Safeguarding should apply to potential locations for surface development associated with gas extraction. Surface facilities do not have any bearing on the sterilisation of sub-surface resources. <i>(Implies the need for an option whereby areas with potential for surface infrastructure related to gas extraction are safeguarded)</i>	The National Planning Practise Guidance states that there is normally no need to safeguard hydrocarbons and include within the reasoning 'the small surface area requirements of well pads.' However, it is not totally precluded and for that reason it is considered that this could be presented as an 'and' option within Id57.	Yes
Third Energy Ltd /	1256	Q73	Safeguarding of other minerals should	This would reflect the temporary	Yes



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources			not hinder hydrocarbon exploration and production. <i>(Implies an option whereby the usual safeguarding policies would not apply where hydrocarbon development is being proposed.)</i>	nature of gas extraction and is therefore considered to be a possible option. – already considered under id70	
2917	0538	Id29	(Comment made in relation to Id29) Leave coal in the ground <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would not support any extraction of coal)</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is considered that not supporting extraction at all would not be consistent with the NPPF.	No
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0215	Id29 Q74	Policy should limit the extraction of fossil fuels. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would not support any extraction of coal) – should it also be applied to oil and gas?</i>	It is not clear that this is distinctly different to Option 2 which is supported by the respondent.	No
3001	1834	Id29 Q74	Investment should be made in the renewables industry instead	The options reflect national policy which seeks a mix of energy generation methods. It is therefore not considered realistic to consider this as an option.	No
2981	2289	Id29 Q74	The continued mining of coal is not supported. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby coal extraction is not supported)</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is considered that not supporting extraction at all would not be consistent with the NPPF.	No
3001	1835	Id29 Q75	Leave coal in the ground until environmentally friendly ways of extraction are found <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby coal extraction is not supported)</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is not considered that supporting extraction at all would be consistent with the NPPF.	No
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0757	Id30 Q76	Doesn't support open cast extraction of shallow coal <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby coal extraction is not supported)</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is not considered that supporting extraction at all would be	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				consistent with the NPPF.	
3001	1836	Id30 Q76	No further extraction of shallow coal <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby coal extraction is not supported)</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is not considered that supporting extraction at all would be consistent with the NPPF.	No
Friends of the Earth – Yorkshire & Humber and the North East	1762	Id30 Q76	Support presumption against shallow coal extraction <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby coal extraction is not supported)</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is not considered that supporting extraction at all would be consistent with the NPPF.	No
Friends of the Earth – Yorkshire & Humber and the North East	1763	Id31 Q79	Do not safeguard the coal resource <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby the coal resource is not safeguarded)</i>	This would be contrary to the NPPF and therefore would not be realistic.	No
RSPB North	1729	Id31 Q79	Should extend the presumption against extraction in protected landscapes to include international and national statutory protected sites for conservation such as SPAs, SACs, RAMSAR, SSSIs and NNRs to be consistent with the NPPF. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby there would be a presumption against extraction in these designations as well as NPs and AONBs)</i>	These options relate to safeguarding only, not extraction, and the option suggested would therefore not be appropriate within the context of safeguarding. Options relating to extraction of coal do not differentiate between the National Park and AONBs and other parts of the Plan area.	No
NYCC correction	n/a	Id31	4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option providing 250m buffer zone throughout the Plan area	(New option has been generated to rectify an inconsistency in Option 1) BGS reports recommend buffer of 250m, this was not reflected in the I&O consultation so added as an alternative to rectify this	Yes
Scarborough Borough Council	2395	Id32 Q81	Notes Coal Authority recommended approach of only safeguarding areas licenced by the Coal Authority	Whilst this is contrary to the recommendations of the safeguarding reports commissioned	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies adding a 6<sup>th</sup> 'or' Option whereby only safeguard deep coal areas which are licenced by the Coal Authority)</i>	by the authorities and is generally contrary to the overall purpose of safeguarding, there is nothing to specifically suggest this would not be acceptable and it is therefore considered to be a potential further option. Already covered under Option 4	
UK Coal Operations	1990	Id32 Q81	Option 5 – 700m buffer zone is realistic but should be varied due to depths of minerals to be worked. <i>(Implies adding a 6<sup>th</sup> alternative 'and' option whereby the buffer zone can be varied depending upon the depth of the coal resource to be worked)</i>	If this implies not applying safeguarding until it is known what depth would be worked this would be contrary to the principles of safeguarding which aim to safeguard for potential for future working. Therefore not a realistic alternative options.	No
The Coal Authority	0876	Id32 Q81	Only safeguard the licenced areas of the deep coal resource.	Whilst this is contrary to the recommendations of the safeguarding reports commissioned by the authorities the approach has been included as Option 3 in ID32 an so is not a new option	No
2990	1924	Id32 Q82	Include a policy which would restore land back to what it was before work started, and seek financial assurance by way of a bond. Should be applied id29 not id32. <i>Implies that there should be a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option to id29 whereby once extraction was complete the land would be restored back to its initial condition'</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward. Whilst the suggestions can be taken on board it is considered they could apply to either of the options and do not in themselves represent a differing approach.	No
3001	1838	Id33 Q84	Should not rely on coal for energy production <i>(Implies alternative options under Id29</i>	Whilst the NPPF sets out a fairly restrictive approach to coal extraction it is considered that not	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>and Id30 whereby any further coal extraction is not supported)</i>	supporting extraction at all would not be consistent with the NPPF.	
Selby District Council	1324	Id33 Q85	Should reach capacity at one site before new sites are developed and restoration should be tightly controlled. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' Option whereby colliery spoil sites should reach capacity before moving onto new sites.)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Cridling Stubbs Parish Council	1357	Id33 Q85	Should encourage use of secondary aggregate from source rather than extracting it once tipped. Applies more to ID14 <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby disposal would only be allowed where there is no market for direct sale as secondary aggregate)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option under id14.	Yes
Highways Agency	0835	Id33 Q85	Would support an option which disposes of colliery spoil in the most sustainably assessable location. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' Option whereby colliery spoil is to be disposed of at the most sustainable assessable site')</i>	An option which contains a set of sustainability criteria is considered to be a reasonable to consider.	Yes
Scarborough Borough Council	2396	Id34	Proposals related to potash in the National Park should be assessed against the Major Development Test <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby no specific policies for potash are identified but any proposals would be assessed against other relevant policies in the Plan).</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as an alternative option.	Yes
RSPB North	1737	Id34 Q86	Policy should reflect the potential impacts potash extraction may have on designations and should include	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			wording 'should be subject to a satisfactory outcome of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations.' <i>(Implies adding a 5<sup>th</sup> 'and' Option whereby the proposals for the extraction of potash should be subject to a satisfactory outcome of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations)</i>	should that type of development come forward. Whilst the suggestion can be taken on board it is considered it could apply to either of the options and does not in itself represent a differing approach.	
Ryedale District Council	1178	Id34 Q86	Proposals related to potash in the National Park should be assessed against the Major Development Test <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby no specific policies for potash are identified but any proposals would be assessed against other relevant policies in the Plan).</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as an alternative option.	Yes
3001	1840	Id34 Q87	Limit the amount of potash exported due to its national importance <i>Implies adding a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' Option whereby the amount of potash exported is limited due to its national importance)</i>	This is not considered to be a realistic option as limiting exports is beyond the control of the planning system.	No
RSPB North	1738	Id34 Q87	An additional option would be amended version of Option 4, only support the siting of surface infrastructure outside of European protected sites and be 'subject to a satisfactory outcome of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations'. <i>(implies adding a 5<sup>th</sup> 'or' Option whereby would only support the siting of surface infrastructure outside European protected sites and be 'subject to a satisfactory outcome of an</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations)</i>		
Selby District Council	1325	Id36 Q91	Support employment opportunities at power stations. Sustainable growth and the use of by-products	This is not considered to be a distinctly different option, is already covered by proposed Option 3 so is not considered an alternative	No
York Potash	1046	Id38 Q94	Option 1 is preferable, but should be revised on the basis of giving great weight to the mineral reserve which is scarcest and most economically significant. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby option 1 is revised so the greatest weight is given to the mineral reserve which is scarcest and most economically significant.)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as an alternative option.	Yes
RSPB North	1740	Id39 Q98	Any proposals for extraction of vein minerals should be subject to a satisfactory outcome of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby the proposals for the extraction of vein minerals should be subject to a satisfactory outcome of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply should that type of development come forward. Whilst the suggestion can be taken on board it is considered it could apply to either of the options and does not in itself represent a differing approach.	No
Minerals Products Association	1493	Id41 Q102	The Plan should consider including text relating to proposed construction of agricultural lagoons, where several of these occur sequentially could amount to a migrating quarry, industry believes this tries to circumvent landbank restrictions, and so should consider putting text in the plan which	This is not an alternative option, but comment should be considered when developing policy	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			discourages migrating quarries. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option whereby migrating quarries are discouraged.)</i>		
Green Party	1558	Q104	(Comment relates to id44) Include a plan b should AWRP not be developed <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Environment Agency	1284	Id42	(Comment relates to id42) There should be a network of facilities for sorting and segregation to ensure only residual waste is managed further down the hierarchy.	Not a new option as not significantly different to existing options but is a way of carrying them forward	No
Hambleton Sustainable Development Officer	1222	Id42	(Comments relate to id42) Adapt waste hierarchy to take account of landfilling dried, inert waste being less damaging than incineration. <i>(Implies an 'or' option which would present an alternative approach to waste hierarchy)</i>	Does not follow national policy, so would not be realistic to produce an alternative option	No
York Green Party	2298	Id42	(Comments relate to id42) Strategy should work towards a zero waste economy.	The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68)	
York Green Party	2298	Id44	(Comment relates to id44) There should be a policy which takes account of non-delivery of AWRP. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0257	Id42	(Comment relates to id42) Options should not require the applicant to consider waste hierarchy, should be addressed through the plan. <i>(Options they are suggesting would be setting out precisely what facilities are needed and where to manage waste further up the hierarchy? Meaning 3 new options?)</i>	taken that this not a realistic alternative and so is not to be taken forward	No
213	1900	Q103 / id51	(Comment relates more to id51) Waste management should take place close to sources of arisings and on multiple sites to reduce transport and congestion.	Not an alternative option, the suggested alternative is already covered in Option 2 of id51	No
213	1900	Q103 / id42	EfW should only be permitted where there are plans to use the heat generated. <i>(Implies difference to option 2 where incineration without recovery supported in certain circumstances)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes
157	0133	Q103 / id42	Should be an option covering waste prevention and minimisation. <i>(Implies that there should be alternatives to each of the 3 options which would also include waste</i>	The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>prevention and minimisation)</i>	capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	
Environment Agency	1285	Q103 id42	Strongly recommend option 2 includes the following wording. 'All energy from waste facilities must provide evidence which clearly demonstrates that either; on site sorting facilities will be provided to ensure that only residual waste will be incinerated; or waste has been segregated at source so as to render it residual; or the proposed facility will form part of a network of facilities which together allow the management of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy. Where this cannot be demonstrated proposals shall be rejected on this basis.' <i>(Implies incineration is last resort and will only deal with residual waste, not a new option but additional wording.)</i>	This is consistent with Option 2 and the detail suggested will be considered when drafting policies.	No
Tockwith & Wilstrop Parish Council	0079	Q103 / id42	Incineration, energy recovery and disposal should be discouraged. <i>(Implies an option 4 under which incineration, energy recovery and</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>disposal would not be supported)</i>		
2981	2291	Q103 / id42	Waste hierarchy should be taken further to a 'zero waste economy'. <i>(Zero waste covered by Option 2)</i>	Option 2 is in line with working towards a zero waste policy. The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	No
NYWAG	1020	Q103 / id42	Incineration should be discounted. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option which does not support incineration or alternatives to all 3 options)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes
NYWAG	1021	Q104 id42	(comment relates to id51) Alternative option should include processing waste locally. <i>(Implies this would be the main focus of an alternative option)</i>	Not a new option, processing waste locally already covered in Option 2 of id51.	No
NYWAG	1021	Q104 id42	(comment relates to id43) Should consider an option of exportation as a long term solution. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby the main priority is exportation)</i>	Not a new option, on-going exportation is covered in Option 2 of id51.	No
NYWAG	1021	Q104 id42	(possibly relates to id51) Consider a modular approach for	Promotes new alternative 'or' Option which would support the	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			greater flexibility. <i>(Implies a new 5<sup>th</sup> option whereby a modular approach is specifically supported)</i>	provision of more smaller sites around the Plan area rather than a few centralised ones. This is already covered by the second bullet point of Option 2 in id51, <i>no do not need a new option.</i>	
York Green Party	2269	Q104 / id42	The plan should include a long term strategy for a zero waste economy.	Option 2 is in line with working towards a zero waste policy. The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	No
York Green Party	2269	Q104 id44	(comment relevant to id44) There should be a plan 'b' to replace AWRP, based on zero waste. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to AWRP.</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
York Environment Forum	2209	Q104 / id42	Should consider alternative options based on zero waste and successful schemes elsewhere.	Option 2 is in line with working towards a zero waste policy. The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	
Hambleton Sustainable Development Officer	1225	Q104 / id42	Should be working towards a zero waste economy.	Option 2 is in line with working towards a zero waste policy. The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	No
3001	1842	Q104 / id42	Biodegradable waste should be dealt with by AD. <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1 and 2 or a new 4<sup>th</sup> option)</i>	Options 1 and 2 state that biodegradable waste should be landfilled only if it cannot be dealt with further up the hierarchy, AD is	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				one of the methods for dealing with waste higher up the hierarchy so does not need to be specified as a process in the options	
3001	1842	Q104 / id42	Heat from incinerated waste must always be usable. <i>(Implies alternatives to all 3 options or a new option 4)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes
3001	1842	Q104 / id42	Incineration should be the last resort. <i>(Implies alternatives to all 3 options or a new option 4)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes
York Green Party	2297/2132	Q104 / id42	Adapt waste hierarchy so that disposal of dried, inert materials is preferable to incineration. <i>(Implies an 'or' option which would present an alternative approach to waste hierarchy whereby landfill is preferable to incineration)</i>	This would imply an alternative set of options whereby landfill is considered more favourably to incineration without energy recovery. (These two methods both sit at the bottom of the waste hierarchy).	Yes
2298	0864	Q104 / id42	Biodegradable waste should not be landfilled. <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1 and 2 or a new 4<sup>th</sup> option)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0548	Q104 / id42	Energy recovery should not be permitted without heat recovery. <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1 and 2 or a new 4<sup>th</sup> option)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option	Yes
231	2148	Q104 / id42	Should be working towards a zero waste economy. <i>(Implies alternatives to all 3 options or an option 4 relating to waste prevention)</i>	Not new option as outside planning system influence	No
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0513	Q104	(comment relevant to id51) Should consider processing waste locally.	Processing waste close to source is identified in Option 2 of id51, so an alternative option is not	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies this would be the main focus of an alternative option)</i>	<i>required</i>	
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0513	Q104	(comment relevant to id43) Should consider exportation of waste as a long term solution. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby the main priority is exportation)</i>	On-going exportation of waste from the Plan area is covered in Option 2 of id43, which implies this is going to be long term <i>so is not and alternative option.</i>	No
157	0134	Q104	(comment relevant to id51) Should consider processing waste locally. <i>(Implies this would be the main focus of an alternative option)</i>	Processing waste close to source is identified in Option 2 of id51, <i>so an alternative option is not required</i>	No
157	0134	Q104	(comment relevant to id43) Should consider exportation of waste as a long term solution. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby the main priority is exportation)</i>	On-going exportation of waste from the Plan area is covered in Option 2 of id43, which implies this is going to be long term <i>so is not and alternative option.</i>	No
157	0134	Q104	(possibly relates to id51) Consider a modular approach for greater flexibility. <i>(Implies a new 5<sup>th</sup> option whereby a modular approach is specifically supported)</i>	Promotes new alternative 'or' Option which would support the provision of more smaller sites around the Plan area rather than a few centralised ones. This is already covered by the second bullet point of Option 2 in id51, <i>so do not need a new option.</i>	No
2965	0636	Q104 / id42	Should be working towards a zero waste economy. <i>(Implies alternatives to all 3 options or an option 4 relating to waste prevention)</i>	Not new option as outside planning system	No
2965	0636	Q104	(Comment relevant to id44) There should be a more fully formed plan b should AWRP not be developed. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>AWRP)</i>	progress this alternative	
Tockwith & Wilstrop Parish Council	0080	Q104 / id42	Strategy should use prevention, re-use and recycling. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option which would not support any other form of waste management)</i>	Whilst this is distinctly different to the options presented, it is not considered to be realistic as there would remain a question over how waste which cannot be dealt with through any of these methods would be managed.	No
Tockwith & Wilstrop Parish Council	0080	Q104	(Comment relevant to id43) Waste should not be imported into the Plan area. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option which would be to not plan for managing any imported waste)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but is not considered realistic so cannot take forward	No
Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Planning Panel	2296	Id51	(Comment relevant to id51) Large towns and cities and associated smaller towns and villages should each have their own disposal sites. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> option just supporting dispersed provision)</i>	Processing waste close to source is identified in Option 2 of id51, <i>so an alternative option is not required</i>	No
Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Planning Panel	2296	Id51	(Comment possibly relevant to id51?) Landfill should be compressed and be moved by rail to large dedicated facilities, possibly outside of the Plan area. <i>(Implies 5<sup>th</sup> option whereby the locational principles are determined by ability to move landfill waste by rail??)</i>	It is considered that this is covered in principle by Option 2 of Id43, although the specific suggestion is too detailed to cover in broad strategic options.	No
Tockwith & Wilstrop	0081	Q105 / id43	Import of waste into the area should be	This is distinctly different to the	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Parish Council			minimal. <i>(Implies there should be an option seeking to reduce imports of waste?)</i>	options presented and should considered, the plan should not make any allowance for imports, YDNP waste not classed as import as cannot be separated form waste from NYCC and NYMNP.A.	
Friends of the Earth - Yorkshire & Humber and the North East	1767	Q105 id43	Adopt proximity principle and ensure waste from YDNP dealt with in NYCC area <i>(Suggests possibly expanding option 3 or provide another and option stating that YDNP waste will be dealt with in NYCC area)</i>	Option 3 of id43 already states will deal with YDNP waste in the Plan area, <i>so no new option required</i>	No
Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council	0716	Q105 / id43	Facilities should not be required where waste can be exported to other areas. <i>(Implies a slightly revised option 2 which focuses more on encouraging exports?)</i>	Alternative 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' Option where exportation of waste would be considered before building new facilities, more emphasis on export than Option 2 of id43. This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
NYWAG	1022	Q105 / id43	Waste should be exported to avoid the need to build large new facilities. <i>(Implies an alternative which has the main aim of exporting waste)</i>	Alternative 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' Option where exportation of waste would be considered before building new facilities, more emphasis on export than Option 2 of id43. This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
157	0135	Q105 / id43	There should be an option which focuses on exporting to other areas close to areas of arisings. <i>(Implies an alternative which has the</i>	Alternative 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' Option where exportation of waste to areas near area of arisings would be considered before building new	Yes



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>main aim of exporting waste)</i>	facilities, more emphasis on export than Option 2 of id43. This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0514	Q105 / id43	Waste should be exported to avoid the need to build large new facilities. <i>(Implies an alternative which has the main aim of exporting waste)</i>	Alternative 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' Option where exportation of waste would be considered before building new facilities, more emphasis on export than Option 2 of id43.  This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0223	Q106 id42	(Comment relevant to id42) Waste should be dealt with as high up the waste hierarchy as possible provided this does not increase total carbon emissions. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option where the main consideration is carbon emissions followed by the waste hierarchy)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0515	Q106 id42	(Possibly relevant to id42 or 51) The potential for job creation should be considered. <i>(Implies a new option where the potential for job creation would be considered alongside or in place of the waste hierarchy?)</i>	Options within the Development Management section consider impacts upon the local economy which would include job creation and it is therefore not necessary to include this within strategic approaches to waste developments.	No
157	0136	Q106 id51	(possibly relevant to id51) Consider a modular approach for greater flexibility. <i>(Implies a new 5<sup>th</sup> option whereby a</i>	Promotes new alternative 'or' Option which would support the provision of more smaller sites around the Plan area rather than a	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>modular approach is specifically supported)</i>	few centralised ones. This is already covered by the second bullet point of Option 2 in id51, so <i>do not need a new option.</i>	
157	0136	Q106 id51	(Possibly relevant to id42 or 51) The potential for job creation should be considered. <i>(Implies a new option where the potential for job creation would be considered alongside or in place of the waste hierarchy?)</i>	Options within the Development Management section consider impacts upon the local economy which would include job creation and it is therefore not necessary to include this within strategic approaches to waste developments.	No
3001	1844	Q106 id43	Waste should not be imported. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option which would aim to discourage any importation of waste)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but is not considered realistic so cannot be taken forward	No
3001	1844	Q106 id43	(Comment relevant to id42) Less waste should be produced. <i>(Implies they seek alternatives to all 3 options or an option 4 relating to waste prevention)</i>	Option 2 is in line with working towards a zero waste policy. The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	No
3001	1844	Q106	(Comment relevant to id42) There should be no landfill.	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies that there should be a 4<sup>th</sup> option under which landfill would not be permitted.)</i>	therefore be considered as a new option.	
Marion-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0549	Q106	The Plan should only support new waste facilities where there is a lack of capacity in the Plan area and adjoining areas. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby new facilities would only be supported where it is not possible to export waste to adjoining areas).</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
NYWAG	1023	Q106	(Possibly relevant to id42 or 51) The potential for job creation should be considered. <i>(Implies a new option where the potential for job creation would be considered alongside or in place of the waste hierarchy?)</i>	Options within the Development Management section consider impacts upon the local economy which would include job creation and it is therefore not necessary to include this within strategic approaches to waste developments.	No
Tockwith & Wilstrop Parish Council	0082	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Should identify an approach to dealing with LACW without AWRP. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would set out more details relating to alternatives to AWRP).</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
215	1891	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Alternatives to AWRP should be considered. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would lead to AWRP not being developed)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
NYWAG	1024	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Alternatives to AWRP should be considered. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would lead to AWRP not being developed)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				progress this alternative	
Kirby Hall, Little Ouseburn & Thorpe Underwood Parish Council	1448	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Alternatives to AWRP should be considered. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would lead to AWRP not being developed)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
157	0137	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Alternatives to AWRP should be considered. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would lead to AWRP not being developed)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0516	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Alternatives to AWRP should be considered. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would lead to AWRP not being developed)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council	0718	6.38	(Comment relevant to id44) Alternatives to AWRP should be considered. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would lead to AWRP not being developed)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Kirby Hall, Little Ouseburn & Thorpe Underwood Parish Council	1450	6.42	Why are the scenarios not options? <i>(Implies the scenarios should be treated as options)</i>	<i>Should the scenarios be treated as options?</i> Consider producing them as options in preferred options document.	No
231	2152	6.44	Include options to take forward should AWRP not be developed <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
213	1902	Q107	(Comment relevant to id42) There is no need to divert waste from landfill by the rates set out in 6.41 – it could be used for minerals restoration. <i>(Implies the need for an alternative option which is not as restrictive on landfill)</i>	Suggests using landfill waste for restoring mineral workings, this is covered in Option 3 of id42 so <i>no new option is required.</i>	No
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0541	Q107	(Comment relevant to id42) There is no need to divert waste from landfill by the rates set out in 6.41 – it could be used for minerals restoration. <i>(Implies the need for an alternative option which is not as restrictive on landfill)</i>	Suggests using landfill waste for restoring mineral workings, <i>this is covered in Option 3 of id42 so no new option is required.</i>	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0259	Q107	(Comment relevant to id44) The Plan should plan for all capacity needs to be met, including those related to AWRP in case this doesn't come forward. <i>(Implies the options should consider waste to be managed at AWRP forms part of the capacity gap and there should be options which consider how this will be planned for)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0259	Q107	C&I and C&D waste should not be Grouped - they are distinctly different and should be assessed separately.	C&I and C&D waste are assessed under separate options so <i>no new alternatives required.</i>	No
Tockwith and Wilstrop Parish Council	0084	Q107	A contingency should be incorporated into the scenarios to cater for a situation in which the AWRP is not developed.	The Plan should provide scenarios in case AWRP does not come forward, as the existing ones rely on AWRP coming forward. AWRP is being taken forward so do not need to progress this as an alternative	No
2938	2363		(Comment relevant to id42) Incineration should be seen as the last	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			resort. <i>(Implies alternatives to the 3 options or a 4<sup>th</sup> option which would place incineration at the bottom of the hierarchy)</i>	therefore be considered as a new option.	
Hambleton Sustainable Development Officer	1227	Id44	Options should take account of the possibility of AWRP not proceeding. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Hambleton Sustainable Development Officer	1227	Id51	(Comment relevant to id51) New incineration facilities should be located close to centres of population and/or commercial developments to make use of CHP. <i>(Implies inclusion of a new 'and' option which requires incineration facilities to be located close to centres of population and / or commercial developments)</i>	This is covered under Option 2 of Id52 and it is therefore not necessary to consider this as an option under Id51.	No
CPRE (Harrogate)	1114	Q108 / id44	Alternatives to AWRP should be included, including extensions to landfill sites. <i>(Implies need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which identifies specific alternatives to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0260	Q108 / id44	The Plan should be flexible should AWRP not be developed. <i>(Implies need for 3<sup>rd</sup> option providing a basis for considering alternatives to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
213	1903	Q108 / id44	Alternative strategies include using	An alternative option which would	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			multiple MBT facilities in the county and sending RDF to Ferrybridge or Teesside. <i>(Implies need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which identifies this as a specific alternative to AWRP)</i>	apply should AWRP not be developed will be provided. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	
157	0140	Q108 / id44	Option 2 should include options based on a modular approach using wider technologies and consideration of export. <i>(Implies need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> option or an alternative to option 2 which supports a modular approach and places more reliance on exports – also relevant to id43)</i>	The use of particular types of technology is not covered within the options but such an approach is considered to be consistent with Option 2. A further option will be considered under Id43 which places greater reliance on exports.	Yes
Durham County Council	1800	Q108 / id44	Combination of the options may be appropriate <i>(Implies new 3<sup>rd</sup> alternative 'or' option for id44 which will combine both of the existing options into one)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
NYWAG	1027	Q108 / id44	There should be more options based on a modular approach using wider technologies and consideration of export. <i>(Implies need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> option or an alternative to option 2 which supports a modular approach and places more reliance on exports – also relevant to id43 re exports)</i>	The use of particular types of technology is not covered within the options but such an approach is considered to be consistent with Option 2. A further option will be considered under Id43 which places greater reliance on exports.	Yes
3001	1846	Q109 id44	Should look at capacity at incinerators in neighbouring areas before building one in the Plan area. <i>(Implies need for 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby greater reliance would be placed on</i>	A further option will be considered under Id43 which places greater reliance on exports.	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>exportation. Also relevant to id43)</i>		
157	0141	Q109 / id44	Options should consider a modular approach using a range of technologies, exporting LACW to elsewhere where there is capacity, investing in modern waste treatment methods and obtaining greater value for money. <i>(Implies need for a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would support the approach suggested – also relevant to id43 re exports)</i>	A further option will be considered under Id43 which places greater reliance on exports.	Yes
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0762	Q109 / id44	Options should increase capacity for managing food waste and reduce amounts reaching landfill. <i>(Implies need for option which considers different elements of LACW)</i>	The 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Option 1 states 'support in principle for proposals which would deliver increased capacity for recycling, processing and composting...' <i>increasing capacity for dealing with food waste would be consistent with this but not an alternative strategic option.</i>	No
Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council	0722	Q109 / id44	Make better use of existing facilities. <i>(Implies need for 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby greater reliance would be placed on use of existing facilities)</i>	Options in ID51 refer to making best use of existing network	No
Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council	0722	Q109 / id44	Newer methods of waste treatment which enable recovered materials to be re-used. <i>(Implies a need for inclusion of reference to other forms of facility in an alternative to option 1)</i>	<i>Option 2 provides more flexibility for the delivery of new capacity and so the use of other forms of facility will be covered under this. So no alternative option required.</i>	No
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0520	Q109 / id44	LACW should be exported to capacity elsewhere. <i>(Implies need for 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby greater reliance would be placed on exportation. Also relevant to id43)</i>	A further option will be considered under Id43 which places greater reliance on exports.	Yes



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0520	Q109 / id44	Newer methods of waste treatment should be supported to obtain greater value from waste. <i>(Implies a need for inclusion of reference to other forms of facility in an alternative to option 1)</i>	A further option will be considered under Id43.	Yes
NYWAG	1028	Q109 / id44	Alternative options should be presented in place of AWRP including exporting to outside of the county and investing in modern facilities where more value can be obtained from the waste. <i>(Implies new option needed supporting other specific technologies in place of AWRP and placing greater reliance on exports – also relevant to id43)</i>	Consider in same way as others above which relate to alternative to AWRP A further option will be considered under Id43 which places greater reliance on exports	Yes
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0226	Q109 / id44	Consider more environmentally friendly and less costly alternatives. <i>(Implies there should be a 3<sup>d</sup> option which supports more environmentally friendly and less costly alternatives)</i>	It is unclear what it meant by 'environmentally friendly' and therefore it is not possible to provide an alternative option along these lines. Option 1 supports recycling, reprocessing and composting whilst other sets of options consider the waste hierarchy.	No
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0544	Q109 / id44	Consider an MBT facility at Allerton Park and elsewhere in the county and deliver RFD to Ferrybridge or Teesside or Kellingley EfW. <i>(Implies there should be a 3<sup>d</sup> option which specifically supports MBT facilities and exports – also relevant to id43)</i>	An MBT facility would be supported by both options as a method of reprocessing waste and therefore it is not necessary specifically refer to this particular technology within strategic options.	No
Rufforth and Knapton Parish Council	1214	Id45	(Comments relevant to id45) Importation of C&I waste should cease and capacity at Harewood Whin be restricted accordingly.	Restriction of currently permitted capacity at Harewood Whin is not a realistic option, although Option 1 actively seeks to achieve this in	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies an alternative to option 1 whereby provision is only made for managing C&amp;I waste generated in the Plan area – also relevant to id43)</i>	relation to future development.	
CPRE (Harrogate)	1115	Q110 / id45	C&I waste should only be managed in the authority area it is generated in. <i>(Implies an alternative option which would restrict imports and also require the three Joint Plan authorities to provide facilities for managing C&amp;I waste generated in their areas – also relevant to id43)</i>	It is not realistic to prevent cross boundary movements, but Option 1 would help achieve this.	No
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0521	Q110 id45	C and I waste should not be dealt with by the plan as already managed by existing waste management companies in a competitive market. <i>(Implies there should be a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would not support any new facilities for managing C&amp;I waste)</i>	Promotes 3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative 'or' Option for id45 which states that the Plan should not contain any policies relating to C&I waste.	Yes
213	1904	Q110 / id45	There should be a third option which supports local and private companies within and adjacent to the county to recycle C&I waste. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option as an alternative to option 1 which would support private businesses / recycling C&amp;I waste)</i>	This is consistent with option 1 and therefore does not need to be considered as a new option.	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0261	Q110 / id45	To be flexible the Plan should meet required capacity through a variety of options and reliance on AWRP should be removed. <i>(Implies there should be 3rd option as an alternative to option 1 which does not rely on AWRP)</i>	This is not realistic as AWRP already has permission that if built could take C & I waste	No
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0543	Q110 id45	C and I waste should not be dealt with by the Plan unless asked to do so.	Promotes 3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative 'or' Option for id45 which states that support	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies there should be a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would not support any new facilities for managing C&amp;I waste?)</i>	will not be given for any new C & I facilities. <i>This needs to be considered as an alternative</i>	
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0522	Q111 / id45	Leave disposal of C&I waste to the existing market. <i>(Implies there should be a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would not support any new facilities for managing C&amp;I waste)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0550	Q111 / id45	There should be a 3 <sup>rd</sup> option which would only support new capacity for C&I waste where there is no capacity within the county or adjacent counties. <i>(3<sup>rd</sup> option as suggested which would be an alternative to option 1)</i>	A new alternative option will be considered under Id43 under which preference would be given to exporting waste prior to developing new facilities in the Plan area.	Yes
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0763	Q114 / id47	Planning conditions should exclude the use of food crops as biogas. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would act in combination with options 1 and 2 which would exclude use of food crops)</i>	This is very specific and something that could be considered when taking the policies forward rather than as a different overall approach.	No
3001	1852	Q119 / id49	All waste water treatment works should use AD. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would act in combination with options 1 and 2 which would support / expect / encourage new facilities to use AD)</i>	This is very specific and would need to be supported by the asset management plans of the water companies. Proposals for waste water treatment plants would also be considered against other policies relating to the waste hierarchy more generally. However, in response to	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				comment 0764 a new option will not be considered but will be mentioned in supporting text	
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0764	Q119 / id49	Sewage sludge and waste water should be seen as a valuable resource. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which would act in combination with options 1 and 2 and would require consideration to be given to use as a resource first)</i>	Cannot be taken forward as an option, but will be mentioned in supporting text.	No
Womersley Parish Council	0729	Id33	(Comment relevant to id33 in chapter 5) Policies relating to disposal of colliery spoil should require applicants to look at alternative options. <i>(Implies an option that could act in combination with option 2 which would also require applicants to demonstrate they have looked at a range of options)</i>	<i>Was considered as a new option in Id33 as Options 1 and 2 are targeted at specific facilities. Not considered a realistic option.</i>	No
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0560	Q120 / id50	The planned handling of increased quantities of power station ash should be resisted. <i>(Implies an alternative option which would not support disposal of power station ash)</i>	This is not considered to be realistic as Option 1 only supports disposal where ash cannot be used as an alternative to primary aggregate. If disposal of the remainder was not supported it is not clear how the respondent is suggesting it be dealt with.	No
213	1906	Q120 / id50	The planned handling of increased quantities of power station ash should be resisted. It should undergo treatment to enable it to be used for cement, road building and landfill for restoration of minerals sites. <i>(Implies there should be an alternative option which is less favourable to</i>	This is essentially the same as Option 1 which supports disposal only where ash cannot be used as an alternative to primary aggregate.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>disposal of power station ash)</i>		
Marion-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0577	Q121 / id50	An alternative of minimising any increase in the quantity of power station ash is by recycling landfilling material with biologically inert material. <i>(Implies an option should support landfilling power station ash with inert material instead of creating ash mounds.)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach to the one presented in the option and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Kirby Hall, Little Ouseburn and Thorpe Underwood Parish Council	1457	6.79 id51	(Comments relate to id51) Use the proximity principle in every case. <i>(Implies an alternative option whereby proximity to sources of arisings should be considered)</i>	Proximity to arisings is already covered under Option 2 in Id51.	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0262	Q122 / id51	Supports a combination of option 1 and part of option 2, in relation to the part of option 2 which refers to strategic facilities being located where transport impacts can be minimised. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 which would resemble option 1 plus the final bullet point of option 2)</i>	<i>Should be assessed even though the points have been listed separately.</i>	Yes
NYWAG	1029	Q122 / id51	Options are too limited to include maximum flexibility and avoidance of environmental harm. <i>(Implies an option which provides more flexibility than existing options 1, 2 and 3 with the main focus being on environmental protection).</i>	This is a distinctly different approach to the one presented in the option and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council	0723	Q122 / id51	Use the principles of providing several smaller sites near the point of production of waste. (Do also state they support option 2 or 3 so not sure if	This point is already included in Option 2 so not an alternative	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			suggesting an alternative) <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 where the main focus is providing smaller scale sites close to sources of arisings?)</i>		
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0765	Q122 / id51	(Comment relevant to id42) Potential landfill sites such as quarries which are important for biodiversity should not be used for landfill. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 where the landfill element of the option would only support landfill at sites which are not important for biodiversity)</i>	The strategic options are not intended to cover all potential considerations. Biodiversity would be considered under the relevant Development Management policies and future uses for former quarries would be considered against policies relating to reclamation and after-use, options for which were set out (Id67) and included support for delivering enhancements for biodiversity. .	No
231	2153	Q122 / id51	There should be a preference for smaller scale facilities which can offer flexibility and are more sustainable than major infrastructure. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 whereby the focus is on smaller scale facilities)</i>	The provision of smaller facilities is covered in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point of Option 2 of id51 so an alternative option is not required.	No
231	2153	Q122 / id51	Suitably sized facilities should not automatically be unacceptable in National Parks and AONBs. <i>(Implies there should be an alternative to option 4 whereby 'suitable scale' facilities are supported in these areas)</i>	This is already covered in Option 4 of id51 and so is not an alternative.	No
York Green Party	2270	Q122 / id51	Waste sites should be located close to sources of arisings. (Although they also support option 3) <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2</i>	This point is already included in bullet point 2 of Option 2 in id51, so not an alternative Option.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>and 3 whereby the focus is on smaller scale facilities)</i>		
157	0142	Q122 / id51	Options need to provide flexibility and avoid unnecessary environmental harm. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 where the focus is on providing flexibility and reducing environmental harm).</i>	This is a distinctly different approach to the one presented in the option and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council	0724	Q123 / id51	Use of local authority facilities should be maximised. Consider use of facilities in adjacent areas. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 where more emphasis is placed on making use of the existing network and supporting new sites where capacity is not available in adjacent areas – also relevant to id43)</i>	A greater focus on exporting waste is being considered as an alternative option under Id43.	Yes
NYWAG	1030	Q123 / id51	Should work with other waste authorities and the private sector to identify locations. <i>(Implies an 'and' option where sites should be identified looking within and beyond the Plan area)</i>	A greater focus on exporting waste will be considered as an alternative option under Id43.	Yes
Green Hammerton Parish Council	0524	Q123 / id51	Should work with other waste authorities to identify locations. <i>(Implies an alternative option where consideration should be given to waste being managed outside of the Plan area)</i>	A greater focus on exporting waste will be considered as an alternative option under Id43.	Yes
English Heritage	0314	Q123 / id51	Waste developments should avoid harm to World Heritage Sites and registered battlefields. Should favour locations which can be accessed by means other than road. <i>(Implies an 'and' option which would</i>	Avoidance of damage to World Heritage Sites and registered battlefields would be covered by policies in the Development Management section of the Plan. Due to the dispersed nature of	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>contain other environmental criteria and an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 whereby use of non-road transport would be a key factor).</i>	arisings and the rural nature of much of the Plan area it is considered that it would not be realistic to expect waste to be transported by non-road methods.	
Selby District Council	1327	Q123 / id51	Expansion of existing sites should be preferential to developing new sites. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 whereby there would be a sequential approach)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach to the one presented in the option and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Selby District Council	1327	Q123 / id51	Hazardous waste should be managed at source unless it can be done in the region where it arises. <i>(Implies an alternative option in relation to hazardous waste which would support the provision of capacity at the site where waste arises)</i>	This is a distinctly different approach to the one presented in the option and should therefore be considered as a new option. Considered under id46	Yes
Selby District Council	1327	Q123 id43	(Comment relates to id43) Oppose importing waste to grow a facility. <i>(Implies an alternative option whereby facilities would only be supported where they are addressing capacity requirements related to the Plan area only)</i>	This is covered under Option 1 of Id43 which would plan for capacity under the assumption that existing levels of imports, which it is not possible to control, would continue.	No
157	0143	Q123 / id51	Work with other waste planning authorities and the private sector and consider a modular approach. <i>(Implies an 'and' option where sites should be identified looking within and beyond the Plan area? Plus alternatives to options 1, 2 and 3 whereby a</i>	A greater focus on exporting waste will be considered as an alternative option under Id43. A modular approach would be consistent with the options already presented in Id51, in particular Option 2 which considers support for a number of	Yes



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>modular approach is specifically supported).</i>	smaller facilities. - considered under id43	
157	0144	Q124 / id51	There should be a modular based strategy along with exports where appropriate. <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1, 2 and 3 whereby a modular approach is specifically supported plus not supporting new facilities where the waste could be exported – also relevant to id43)</i>	Considering the potential of capacity outside of the Plan area initially is considered to be a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option. A modular approach would be consistent with the options already presented in Id51, in particular Option 2 which considers support for a number of smaller facilities. Considered under id43.	Yes
NYWAG	1031	Q124 / id51	There should be a modular based strategy and commercial facilities along with exports where appropriate. <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1, 2 and 3 whereby a modular approach and use of private sector facilities only is specifically supported plus not supporting new facilities where the waste could be exported – also relevant to id43)</i>	Considering the potential of capacity outside of the Plan area initially is considered to be a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option. A modular approach would be consistent with the options already presented in Id51, in particular Option 2 which considers support for a number of smaller facilities. Considered under id43.	Yes
157	0146	Id52	Full account should be taken of the proximity principle, the opportunities for using rail and waterborne transport and exports should also be considered. <i>(Implies alternatives to options 1 and 2 whereby facilities should only be supported where there are no opportunities to export the waste and the proximity principle and use of water transport should be key factors – also relevant to id43)</i>	An alternative option which places greater emphasis on exporting waste has been considered under Id51. Existing options in ID51 also consider the proximity principle. Due to the dispersed nature of arisings and the rural nature of much of the Plan area it is considered that it would not be realistic to expect waste to be transported by non-road methods.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Rufforth and Knapton Parish Council	1338	Id52	Place more emphasis on dealing with waste close to its source including waste management facilities at major new industrial and commercial developments. <i>(Implies an alternative to option where co-location is given greater weight)</i>	Bullet point 1 of Option 2 gives preference to the co-location of facilities, the word preference implies increased weight so no alternative option is required	No
157	0125	Id52	Facilities should be scaled to meet local needs and be designed to be unobtrusive. <i>(Implies an alternative to option 2 which also considers the potential landscape impacts. Scaled to meet local needs more relevant to id43 – implies alternative option whereby facilities should be designed to meet capacity requirements for the Plan area only)</i>	Promotes a 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' alternative option for id43 whereby facilities should be designed to meet capacity requirements for the Plan area only. Landscape and design considerations would be guided by the relevant Development Management policies, this set of options considers only the strategic site identification principles. <i>Scaling facilities to meet local needs is not considered in the existing options so should be assessed</i>	Yes
2965	0647	Id52	(Comment relevant to id42) Strategy should work towards a zero waste economy. <i>(Implies they seek alternatives to all 3 options or an option 4 relating to waste prevention)</i>	Not new option as largely outside planning system influence - <i>moving towards a zero waste economy is in our vision and option 2 of ID42</i>	No
2965	0647	Id52	(Comment relevant to id44) There should be a more fully-formed plan B should AWRP not be developed. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which would set out specific criteria for alternative to AWRP)</i>	This is distinctly different to the options presented but based on assumption AWRP may not be developed. AWRP is going to be developed so do not need to progress this alternative	No
NYWAG	1033	Q126 / id52	Use proximity principles, minimise transport distances, make greater use of rail. <i>(Implies an alternative option</i>	Due to the dispersed nature of arisings and the rural nature of much of the Plan area it is	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>where transportation distance is the main focus)</i>	considered that it would not be realistic to expect waste to be transported by non-road methods. Minimising transport distances are a consideration under existing options in Id51 and Id52, particularly Option 2 of Id51.	
NYWAG	1033	Q126	(Comment more relevant to id43) Analyse future demand for RDF and capacity to the north and south. <i>(Implies an alternative option whereby the potential to export waste should be a key consideration)</i>	Export of waste is already covered in option 2 of Id43 so no alternative is required.	No
231	2155	Q126 id52	Option 2 should also consider non-road transport and proximity to arisings. <i>(Implies an 'and' option to option 2 which would include these factors)</i>	Due to the dispersed nature of arisings and the rural nature of much of the Plan area it is considered that it would not be realistic to expect waste to be transported by non-road methods. Proximity to arisings is considered under Option 2 of Id51.	No
York Green Party	2271	Q126 id52	Waste sites should be close to arisings. <i>(Implies an alternative option where proximity to arisings is the main consideration)</i>	Proximity to arisings is considered under Option 2 of Id51.	No
York Green Party	2271	Q126 id42	(Comment relevant to id42) Zero waste should be the aim. <i>(Implies they seek alternatives to all 3 options or an option 4 relating to waste prevention)</i>	The vision aims to work towards zero waste, however control over the amount of waste arising is largely beyond the remit of the Plan which must plan for sufficient capacity to deal with the waste that is projected to arise. It is not realistic to assume zero waste within the plan period but the	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				scenarios consider the likelihood of lower or no growth in the amount of waste produced and increases in re-use and recycling. Waste prevention is also covered under the sustainable design options (Id68).	
Environment Agency	1289	Q126 id52	Option 2 should include not supporting landfill in SPZ1, mitigation of any potential impacts on water environment from infilling quarry voids with waste and requiring EfW to use CHP and be less than 15km from potential users. <i>(Implies an 'and' option which would cover these factors)</i>	These suggestions are considered to be consistent with the overall approach in Option 2 but in themselves are particularly detailed and specific considerations. Consideration will be given to taking these suggestions forward when drafting the policies. The requirement for energy generated from EfW facilities has been considered within the new options under Id42.	No
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0766	Q127 / id52	Consider biodiversity impacts – brownfield land can be important for promoting biodiversity. <i>(Implies an alternative to option 2 whereby the biodiversity value of the land is considered rather than placing preference on previously used land)</i>	Specific considerations relating to biodiversity are set out in the Development Management options. Whilst it is considered that this may be too detailed to cover in strategic options, consideration can be given to highlighting the biodiversity value of brownfield land when drafting the policies.	No
2938	2364	Q127 id42	(Comment relevant to id42) Should state a preference for facilities which help to meet aims for zero waste. <i>Zero waste is covered under Option 2 of ID42</i>	Not new option as reducing the amount of waste produced is largely outside planning system influence.	No
157	0147	Id53	Adopt a modular approach to minimise	This is consistent with Option 2 of	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			risk. <i>(Implies an option which focuses on ensuring sufficient range and number of facilities are safeguarded)</i>	Id51 and therefore does not need to be considered under this option set.	
Rufforth and Knapton Parish Coouncil	1339	Id53	Safeguarding of a facility should not go on for ever, as may be closed and reinstated in the future, so this should be taken into account. <i>(Implies an 'and' option which allows flexibility should safeguard.)</i>	Option 1 explains that where there is an overriding justification other forms of development may be acceptable, and this may include circumstances where a facility has closed down.	No
Peel Environmental Ltd	0264	Id53	Safeguarding should not be limited to strategic sites or those for the management of LACW. <i>(Implies that wording of Option 1 should be expanded to include the above points.)</i>	Safeguarding non-strategic sites represents an alternative approach and should therefore be considered as a new option. The existing options do not limit safeguarding to facilities which manage LACW.	Yes
Peel Environmental Ltd	0264	Id53	Should consider setting a buffer zone around facilities, depending on type of facility. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option which would require safeguarding to also include buffer zones)</i>	As Option 1 refers to '...forms of development that may prejudice the operation of these facilities...' it is considered that a buffer would be consistent with Option 1 and therefore does not need to be considered as a separate strategic option.	No
Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	0566	Q128 / id53	Only safeguarding a limited number of strategically significant facilities is not consistent with the rest of the waste options. <i>(Implies a third option whereby all waste management facilities would be specifically safeguarded)</i>	Promotes a 3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative 'or' option for id53 whereby all waste management facilities would be safeguarded. <i>Is an additional option so needs to be assessed</i>	Yes
English Heritage	0316	Q128 / id53	All waste management facilities with planning permission should be safeguarded. <i>(Implies a third option whereby all waste management facilities would be specifically</i>	<i>Is an additional option so needs to be assessed</i>	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>safeguarded)</i>		
NYWAG	1034	Q128/ id53	(Possibly relevant to id51) Should have a modular approach featuring several sites. <i>(Implies a new 5<sup>th</sup> option whereby a modular approach is specifically supported)</i>	This is consistent with Option 2 of Id51 and therefore does not need to be considered under this option set.	No
NYWAG	1034	Q128/ id53	(Possibly relevant to id51) Should have a modular approach featuring several sites. <i>(Implies a new 5<sup>th</sup> option whereby a modular approach is specifically supported)</i>	This is consistent with Option 2 of Id51 and therefore does not need to be considered under this option set.	No
Amey Cespa Ltd (AWRP)	1268	Q129 / id53	Safeguarding should also incorporate buffer zones. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option which would require safeguarding to also include buffer zones)</i>	As Option 1 refers to '...forms of development that may prejudice the operation of these facilities...' it is considered that a buffer would be consistent with Option 1 and therefore does not need to be considered as a separate strategic option.	No
231	2156	Q130 / id53	Only existing sites should be safeguarded. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby only existing sites would be safeguarded – unclear from the comment whether they mean just developed sites or also those with planning permission)</i>	Promotes a 3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative 'or' option for id53 whereby only existing sites are safeguarded.	Yes
Peel Environmental Ltd	0265	Id54 Q131	Flexibility need to be added into the wording of the policy to reflect that establishing sites with non-road transport infrastructure is difficult.	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Whilst the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies it is considered it could apply to either of the options and	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
				does not in itself represent a differing approach.	
Sibelco	1702	Id58	European Parliament is clear on the fact 'Natura 2000 areas do not prohibit mineral extraction', this needs to be reflected in the options. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby for Natura 2000 areas the starting point for any decisions will be ensuring development is consistent with delivering sustainable development within the context of their statutory purposes)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Whilst the suggestion can be taken on board it is considered it could apply to either of the options and does not in itself represent a differing approach.	No
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0768	Id58 Q141	Option 3 should also protect SSSIs and other areas of high value for biodiversity outside National Parks and AONBs <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby for SSSIs and other areas of high value the starting point for any decisions will be ensuring development is consistent with delivering sustainable development within the context of their statutory purposes)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Whilst the suggestion can be taken on board it is considered it could apply to either of the options and does not in itself represent a differing approach.	No
0231	2159	Id58 Q141	Would welcome a policy statement that recognises that minerals and waste developments affect conditions outside the plan area. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby sustainable minerals and waste development should not adversely impact conditions outside the plan area')</i>	This would be a consideration through many of the Development Management topics and does not represent an approach not already covered under the options presented throughout the Issues and Options document.	No
York Green Party	2301	Id58 Q142	The policy statement should recognise and take responsibility for the wider impacts of minerals and waste	Under Id68 minimising greenhouse gas emissions is included within the options. Within Id58 it would be	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			developments. Include a target for a progressive reduction in carbon emissions from minerals extraction and waste disposal. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby targets are included to reduce carbon emissions and pollution'.)</i>	distinctly different, but would not be realistic as there is no available data on current emissions from the minerals and waste industry and it would therefore be impossible to implement.	
York Green Party / 2965 / 2937	2274 / 0643 1926	Id58 Q142	The policy statement should recognise and take responsibility for the wider impacts of minerals and waste developments. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby as part of the sustainable development of minerals and waste sites targets are included to limit carbon emissions and pollution'.)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Wider impacts on specific factors are covered within a range of Development Management options.	No
Hambleton Sustainable Development and Planning Policy	1231	Id58 Q142	The policy statement should recognise and take responsibility for the wider impacts of minerals and waste developments, including carbon emissions, pollutants and global effects. Estimate emissions of proposals and the impact this will have on climate change. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option where emissions are a consideration)</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Options in Id68 consider emissions from proposals.	No
The Coal Authority	0879	Id60 Q146	A single approach cannot apply to all proposals. Option 1 would affect flexibility whilst Option 2 could apply to non-energy minerals. <i>(Implies an alternative to options 1 and 2 which is a combination of options 1 and 2 where the option 2 element only relates to waste and non-energy minerals developments)</i>	This represents a distinctive approach and therefore an alternative option should be provided which would set out different approaches for transport related to either energy or non-energy minerals.	Yes



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Environment Agency	1303	Para 8.82 id68	<p>The following wording should be incorporated into this section:                      'At the planning application stage it should be noted that certain elements of design of waste sites may be influenced by permitting requirements. We therefore encourage tandem tracking of both planning permission and the environmental permit application, so that issues such as stack heights, for example, can be determined without the need for amendments to the planning application in the future.'</p> <p><i>(Suggests adding above wording into section, also implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option whereby, where appropriate, planning permissions and environmental permit applications should be twin tracked so joint issues can be resolved without revisiting either process)</i></p>	<p>This is a process issue rather than a policy issue and it is therefore not appropriate to consider it as a separate option.</p>	No
Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	0668/ 1634 / 1375	Id59 Q143	<p>In Option 2 replace the word 'encourage' with 'require'. There should be requirements for developers to invest in local renewable energy initiatives.                      Option 1 should state a fuller list of unacceptable effects.</p> <p><i>(Implies changing the emphasis of option 2 to be stronger by changing the word 'encourage' to 'require' and that Option 1 should include additional unacceptable effects such as increased flood risk)</i></p>	<p>The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Whilst the suggestion can be taken on board it is considered it could apply to either of the options and does not in itself represent a differing approach. Renewable energy and other issues are covered in other sets of options.</p>	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Environment Agency	1292	Id59	Text for id59 states that effects on 'local' amenity will need to be assessed; this should be broadened to 'local and surrounding' amenity. <i>(Implies should expand the text in Option 1 from 'local amenity' to 'local and surrounding amenity')</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Dart Energy Ltd	0847	Id59 Q143/144	Reword Option 1 to 'Proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that <b>following mitigation, no unacceptable effects</b> (including cumulative effects) on local amenity <b>will arise, also having regard to the benefits of the proposal.</b> ' As need to consider the benefits of development. <i>(Implies should expand the text in Option 1 to include mitigation and benefits of development)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach. The benefits of a proposal would always be taken into account as this is a fundamental part of the consideration of planning applications and would be guided by other policies in the Plan. Consideration of at which point to think about mitigation is also not seen to be distinctly different and this suggestion will be considered when drafting the policies.	No
Highways Agency	0445	Id59 Q143	Effects from traffic should also be considered. <i>(Implies an alternative to option 1 where traffic impacts are specifically mentioned)</i>	This does not represent a distinctly different approach as the effects contained in option 1 could relate to effects from traffic. Consideration will be given to including reference to traffic impacts when drafting the policies.	No
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1635 / 1376	Id59 Q144	Cumulative effects of all major development in the area should be assessed together. <i>(Implies an 'and' option where consideration would also be given to the impacts on amenity of other proposals in the area)</i>	Option 1 refers to cumulative effects. Consideration will be given to explaining how this will be applied in relation to effects from non-minerals and waste developments when drafting the policy.	No
Friends of the Earth	1342	Id59 Q144	Cumulative effects of all major	Option 1 already refers to	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			development in the area should be assessed together. Consultation should take place on the full range of proposals. <i>(Implies an 'and' option where consideration would also be given to the impacts on amenity of other proposals in the area)</i>	cumulative effects. The second suggestion is a process issue and does not represent a distinctively different approach to Option 2 but will be considered when drafting the policies.	
3001	1862	Id59 Q144	Consultation with local communities should be accompanied by an assessment of impacts on the environment and climate change <i>(Implies a further 'and' option whereby assessments are provided as part of public consultation).</i>	This is not considered to be distinctly different from Option 2 but consideration will given to addressing this issue when drafting the policies.	No
Harrogate Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth	1377/ 1636	Id59 Q145	Policies should take account of the cumulative effects of mineral extraction on wider matters. <i>(Implies should add extra possible adverse effects to Option 1 which would include cumulative impact on transport systems, of extracting more than one mineral and its transport impact)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
RSPB North	1742	Id59 Q145	The options should also seek to improve local amenity in the long term e.g. through provision of access <i>(Implies an 'and' option whereby proposals would be required to make provision for access)</i>	Whilst this represents a different approach within this set of options, it is covered in the reclamation options.	No
Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote PC	1416	Id59 Q145	Through local amenity policy developers should be encouraged to provide financial support to the local community through planning means. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' Option</i>	Whilst this represents a different approach within this set of options, it would be covered through the planning obligations process.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>whereby developers are encouraged to provide financial support to the local community)</i>		
Friends of the Earth	1343	Id59 Q145	The list of possible adverse effects should be longer. Policies should take account of the cumulative effects of mineral extraction on wider matters. <i>(Implies adding extra possible adverse effects to Option 1 which would include cumulative impact on transport systems, of extracting more than one mineral and its transport impact)</i>	Option 1 already refers to cumulative effects. This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Peel Environmental	0406	Id59 Q145	Include high standard of design and lighting as additional criteria. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option whereby a high standard of design and lighting is required)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Highways Agency	0446	Id60 Q146	Include the requirement for a transport assessment to be provided in support of the proposals. <i>(Transport assessment requirement already included in Option 3)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Lafarge Tarmac	0985	Id60 Q146	Option 2 – remove the requirement to demonstrate location to markets for minerals. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby Option 2 is repeated but without the inclusion of requiring minerals to be extracted close to market)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
Petroleum Safety Services Ltd	0798	Id60 Q146	Option 3 – text should make reference to all other equipment and materials required in connection with the development. <i>(Implies adding a 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point which</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>will include reference to all other equipment and materials required in connection with the development)</i>		
Ryedale District Council	1194	Id60 Q146	Option 3 – additional criteria should be included to mitigate transport impacts. <i>(Implies adding a 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point which will include additional criteria which will mitigate transport impacts)</i>	As mitigation is referred to in the 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point this is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
York Green Party / 2965	2275 / 0646	Id60 Q146	Carbon impacts of transport should be taken into account <i>(Implies a further 'or' option whereby the climate change implications are a key consideration)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
Minerals Products Association	1506	Id60 Q146	Under Option 2 remove the requirement to demonstrate location to markets for minerals. One alternative could be use substance of Option 2 for waste developments but take a more realistic approach to minerals development. <i>(Implies focusing the existing Option 2 on waste developments only and adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' Option whereby Option 2 is repeated but without the inclusion of requiring minerals to be extracted close to market)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
0231	2194	Id60 Q147	An additional criterion is carbon impact of transport. <i>(Implies a further 'or' option whereby the climate change implications are also considered, rather than the assumptions about which modes are more positive for climate change under Options 1 and 2)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
Dart Energy Ltd	0848	Id60 Q147	Should include gas and transportation	This is not considered to be a	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			by pipeline. <i>(Implies that transportation by pipeline should be included as a non-road method of transport in Option 1 and Option 2)</i>	distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy. However SA will need to be revisited as didn't make reference to impacts from pipelines in the SA.	
York Potash	1050	Id60 Q147	Policy should include the use of underground conveyers. <i>(Implies that transportation by underground conveyors should be included as a non-road method of transport in Option 1 and Option 2)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy. However SA will need to be revisited as didn't make reference to impacts from pipelines in the SA.	No
Hambleton Sustainable Development and Planning Policy	1230	Id60 Q147	Carbon impacts of transport should be taken into account <i>(Implies a further 'or' option whereby the climate change implications are also considered, rather than the assumptions about which modes are more positive for climate change under Options 1 and 2)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
2937	1929	Id60 Q148	Carbon impacts of transport should be taken into account <i>(Implies a further 'or' option whereby the climate change implications are also considered, rather than the assumptions about which modes are more positive for climate change under Options 1 and 2)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
RSPB North	1745	Id60 Q148	Criteria for Option 3 should include an assessment of any potential adverse effects on international and national nature conservation designations. <i>(Implies an alternative to Option 3 whereby a 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point is added to require assessment of any potential adverse effects on international and</i>	The options are strategic and are not intended to cover every consideration which may apply. Effects on international and national nature conservation designations are considered in other options.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>national nature conservation designations to be undertaken)</i>		
Option should state that high standards of siting, design and mitigation are only required in the National Park and AONBs, and not around them	0842, 0843	Id25 Q63, And id26 more relevant to id61	Suggest removing the words ....'or in close proximity'....from the last sentence as current wording identifies an unnecessary buffer zone around National Parks and AONBs. <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> option whereby high standards of siting, design and mitigation are only required within National Parks and AONBs)</i>	From exploration, appraisal, production and processing of oil and gas section, id25 and id26, Particularly high standards of siting and design and mitigation are required for oil and gas in the National Park and AONBs, but not in the surrounding area. Same as id61 but without option 3 so already covered by Option 1 and 2 of ID61 so not a new option	No
Ryedale District Council	1197	Id63 Q155	Local plan policies for landscape should be used in conjunction with national policy. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where landscape policies in Local Plans and the NPPF are specifically referred to)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach to Option 2 as the SA assumed that relevant policies in Local Plans would be considered as they form part of the Development Plan. The suggestion to specifically include reference to local designations will therefore be considered as part of drafting the policies.	No
Cunnane Town Planning (on behalf of Samuel Smith Old Brewery)	1573	Id67	The plan should provide for a presumption in favour of 'restoration' before other options are considered to be acceptable. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option whereby restoration to the previous use is considered in the first instance before moving onto the other options.)</i>	Represents a distinctly different approach and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
York Potash	1057	Id67 Q168	Items that are, or should be, considered through the EIA process should be removed from the emerging policy. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which</i>	In order to make a planning decision on the factors assessed through the EIA process policies need to be in place. In addition,	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>repeats option 2 but removes reference to National Park, AONBs and significant heritage sites as these will be considered through the EIA)</i>	there may be developments which are not subject to EIA but where the reclamation and afteruse proposals would still be relevant.	
York Potash	1057	Id67 Q168	Option 2 – reference to flooding should refer to both upstream and downstream. <i>(Implies bullet point 2 of Option 2 should be expanded to read ‘...help minimise flooding in <b>upstream</b> and <b>downstream</b> locations’)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies.	No
Petroleum Safety Services Ltd	0805	Id67 Q168	The options should not be relevant to oil and gas developments whereby reclamation should relate to returning the land to its former state under the lease agreements. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> ‘and’ option where options 1 and 2 would not apply to oil and gas developments.)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach and should be considered as a new option.	Yes
Selby District Council	1333	Id67 Q169	Encourage sustainable alternative uses alongside the criteria identified. <i>(Implies an ‘and’ option whereby new uses are also supported)</i>	<i>This represents an alternative option but to be realistic would presumably need to contain reference to supporting other uses where these are supported by policies in Local Plans as the MWJP couldn’t say anything more specific about what those other uses might be</i>	No
Environment Agency	1301	Id67 Q169	Option 2 should include a point on the protection of the water environment. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which repeats Option 2 but adds in a 10<sup>th</sup> bullet point whereby protecting the water environment is one of the objectives.)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies.	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Environment Agency	1301	Id67	A sentence should be added to this section regarding permits, possible text "Any permitted site should ensure that the requirements of its permit are met/abided by prior to the site being reused/reclaimed. It should also be noted that permitted sites may have long term monitoring requirements which could impact upon any intended future use." <i>(implies adding a sentence into the supporting text for id67. Could also consider adding it as a 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point in Option 1 whereby sites with permits should not be reused/reclaimed until the requirements of the permit have been met.)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies.	No
Hambleton Sustainable Development and Planning Policy	1219	Id68 Q173	The Plan should include a target for a progressive reduction in carbon emissions from minerals extraction and waste disposal. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> Option which repeats Option 1 but also adds in an 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point which is a target for reducing carbon emissions from minerals and waste development.)</i>	Whilst this is a distinctly different option it is not considered to be realistic as there is no data available on current emissions from the minerals and waste sectors so it would not be possible to set a target on reductions.	No
2938	2362	Id68 Q173	Include setting carbon emission reductions for waste processing/ disposal and minerals extraction operations into policy. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> Option which repeats Option 1 but also adds in an 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point which is a target for reducing carbon emissions from minerals and waste development.)</i>	Whilst this is a distinctly different option it is not considered to be realistic as there is no data available on current emissions from the minerals and waste sectors so it would not be possible to set a target on reductions.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
Dart Energy Ltd	0857	Id69 Q177	Criteria in Option 1 overlaps with a number of areas already discussed. The policy should either specifically exclude those previously discussed or include them all. <i>(Implies Option 1 should be reviewed to either exclude criteria already mentioned in other policies, or all criteria mentioned in other policies should be included)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies.	No
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1625 / 1365	Id25 Q64	High standards of siting, design and mitigation should be applied across the Plan area <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option whereby high standards of siting, design and mitigation are required across the Plan area) To be considered under id68</i>	This comment is more applicable to id68, but is not a new option but should be borne in mind when developing policy.	No
Friends of the Earth	0327	Id69 Q64	Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation should apply across the Plan area <i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option where high standards of siting, design and mitigation would apply across the Plan area) applies to id68</i>	This comment is more applicable to id69, but is not a new option but should be borne in mind when developing policy.	No
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1627 / 0329 / 1367	Id69 Q66	Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation should apply across the Plan area <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where high standards of siting, design and mitigation would apply across the Plan area)to be considered under id68</i>	This comment is more applicable to id69, but is not a new option but should be borne in mind when developing policy.	No
Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources also Third Energy	1242/1251	Id68 Q64	Unnecessary to require high standards of siting and design in National Park and AONBs as this is covered by the NPPF	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach and should therefore be considered as a new option. – moved from minerals	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'or' option which does not place any specific requirements on development in National Parks and AONBs)</i>	section	
The Coal Authority	0888	Id72 Q185	Plan should contain policy criteria on land instability arising from mining legacy in relation to mineral and waste development. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> Option whereby consideration should be given to land instability in relation to minerals and waste development)</i>	This is covered in Id69 so not relevant to this set of options.	No
Cunnane Town Planning LLP (Samuel Smith Old Brewery)	1570	Id62 Q153	There should be a negative presumption towards development in the Green Belt. <i>(Implies a fourth option whereby development in the Green Belt would not be supported)</i>	Current national policy does not support an overall presumption against minerals or waste development in the Green Belt, subject to certain criteria. An option precluding such development would not be realistic.	No
Selby District Council	1330	Id62 Q153	Could support development in the Green Belt if it requires that location. <i>(Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option where development would be permitted in the Green Belt if it could be proved it had to be located there.)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach to the three options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Petroleum Safety Services Ltd	0801	Id63 Q155	Support option 1 with reference to short term landscape impact. <i>(Implies an alternative option where reference is made to short term landscape impacts)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but the suggestion can be considered when drafting the policies.	No
213 / Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council	1913 / 0573	Id63 Q155	Development of waste treatment facilities should not be permitted where landscape impacts cannot be mitigated. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option where development would be refused if there</i>	This is already addressed in Option 1. Not considered to be a distinctly different approach.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>were any adverse impacts on the landscape)</i>		
RSPB North	1746	Id64 Q157	Options 3 and 4 – International and national statutory protected sites for conservation should be excluded from biodiversity offsetting schemes. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> option where biodiversity offsetting doesn't apply in statutory protected sites)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth / Friends of the Earth / Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1351 / 1386 / 1643 / 1387	Id64 Q158	Where there would be overall losses from a development it should not be permitted. <i>(Implies a 5<sup>th</sup> alternative option to options 1 and 2 where there should be no overall loss)</i>	This is suggesting a new approach to the weight given to biodiversity and therefore should be considered as a new option.	Yes
English Heritage	0322	Id65 Q160	It is essential that the Plan includes a framework which is specifically designed to protect elements which contribute to the special historic character and setting of the City of York. To comply with requirements of the NPPF the Plan will need to set out a policy framework for the historic environment which will 1) provide certainty about how applications on planning proposals affecting the Joint Plan area's heritage assets will be determined 2) how the presumption in favour of sustainable development insofar as it affects the historic environment will be applied locally 3) provide clear policies on what will or will not be permitted or provide a clear	Is an expansion of Option 3 providing more detail in the policy text, but does not change the approach. This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			indication of how a decision maker should react to a proposal likely to affect a heritage asset. <i>(Implies adding the above text to expand Option 3 to provide a framework for protecting the setting of York.)</i>		
Ryedale District Council	1199	ld65 Q160	The option regarding setting should be expanded to include the historic setting of historic settlements in the Plan area, not just the ones specific to York. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'or' option as an alternative to option 3 whereby the setting of all historic settlements in the Plan area are protected, not just York)</i>	This represents a distinctly different approach to the options presented and should therefore be considered as a new option.	Yes
Cunnane Town Planning (on behalf of Samuel Smith Old Brewery)	1571	ld65 Q161	The policy should also protect the historic landscape. <i>(Implies an 'and' option where historic landscape is specifically protected)</i>	This is not considered to be sufficiently distinct to be an alternative option as historic landscapes facilitate the scope of heritage assets, but will be considered when drafting the policies.	No
English Heritage	0333	ld65 Q162	Consider providing specific policy guidance for designated heritage assets where views from and into the areas are important. Assets include Fountains Abbey/Studley Royal World Heritage Site and most registered battlefields. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby the views from and into areas containing heritage assets are recognised as being important and so should look to be protected.)</i>	The options are a strategic approach and rely on the NPPF, which protects heritage assets which include the views. This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Environment Agency	1299	ld66 Q164	Suggest amended wording to Option 2	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<p>'Impacts on water quality (surface or groundwater) and water supply and flows (surface or groundwater), including effects on Nitrate Vulnerable Zones and Groundwater' Should include reference to Water Framework Directive, suggested text is</p> <p>'A significant policy area concerning water quality is the Water Framework Directive (2000) which was transposed into UK law through the Water Environment (WFD) (E&amp;W) Regulations 2003. This commits EU member states to achieving 'good' chemical and ecological status for all inland and coastal waters and will be implemented through river basin management plans. As part of this, Local Planning Authorities must have regard to the impact of any development proposal on the improvement targets set out in the River Basin Management Plan. Developments must not cause deterioration of the WFD status of any water body, or prevent any water body from reaching good ecological status, except where it can be shown that there is an overriding public interest which would outweigh WFD requirements. This is only likely to occur in exceptional circumstances.'</p>	<p>expansion of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.</p>	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>(Implies expanding bullet point 1 in Option 2 to include a reference to the Water Framework Directive and adding suggested supporting text into the chapter)</i>		
Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth/ Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1352/ 1645/ 1390/ 1647	Id66 Q164/ Q166	Option 1 – define unacceptable <i>(Implies that the term ‘unacceptable’ needs clarification in terms of applied in relation to Option 1)</i>	Defining ‘unacceptable is not an alternative, clarification can be provided during the development of the policy	No
Friends of the Earth/ Friends of the Earth/ Harrogate Friends of the Earth	1352/ 1645/ 1390/ 1647	Id66 Q164/ Q166	Option 2 – the criteria should take account of particular issues that may be applicable locally such as projected flood risks for the future, which water tables are at risk. <i>(Implies adding extra bullet points into Option 2 to include criteria such as projected flood risks for the future and water tables which are at risk.)</i>	The point about criteria taming account of particular issues is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but expansion of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
York Potash	1055	Id66 Q164	Option 2 could specify SPZs that should be avoided. <i>(Implies that the first bullet point of Option 2 should be expanded to include a list of Source Protection Zones which should be avoided in the Plan area.)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but variation of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
York Potash	1055	Id66 Q164	The third bullet point in Option 2 should be deleted. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> ‘or’ option whereby Option 2 is repeated but the third bullet point is deleted)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but expansion of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Frack Free North Yorkshire	0633	Id66 Q164	Option 2 – add that no unconventional gas extraction should take place in North Yorkshire, especially where gas will pass through aquifers..... <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> ‘and option whereby unconventional gas extraction</i>	Under Id28 this represents a distinctly different approach. However, it is considered that this would not represent a realistic option, and should therefore not be considered as an alternative option.	No

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>should not take place near aquifers so reduce likelihood of pollution. Mostly relevant to Id28)</i>		
York Green Party	2303	Id66 Q165	Policies should be framed using the precautionary principle as a basis. <i>(Implies an alternative option whereby where there is an element of risk to the water environment permission would be refused)</i>	It is considered that this is not sufficiently distinct from option 2 to be considered as an alternative option	No
Lafarge Tarmac/ Minerals Products Association	0993/ 1515	Id66 Q165	Add 'Consideration would be given to potential for the development to contribute to the provision of flood alleviation or other climate change mitigation benefits related to the water environment' to Option 1 <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'or' option which repeats option 1 but includes the above text)</i>	The provision of flood alleviation measures is considered in the reclamation and afteruse options (Id67) and therefore it is not necessary to consider this within the water environment options.	No
Harrogate Friends of the Earth / Friends of the Earth	1390 / 1647	Id66 Q166	Include local criteria in addition to the NPPF <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option which is a combination of options 1 and 2)</i>	The NPPF would remain a material consideration should option 2 be pursued and therefore this is not considered to be a distinctly different approach.	No
Scarborough, Whitby and Ryedale Green Party	0245	Id66 Q166	Include a policy which is stronger than either of the two options and ensures protection of drinking water in the options. <i>(Implies a 3<sup>rd</sup> option whereby effects on or risks to drinking water sources would be given great weight when considering planning applications and drinking water would be protected)</i>	Whilst this would seemingly give greater weight to protection of water than the current options, this would not be sufficiently distinct from Option 2 to be considered as a new option.	No
2253	2104	Id66 Q166	The precautionary principle should apply <i>(Implies an alternative option whereby where there is an element of</i>	It is considered that this is not sufficiently distinct from option 2 to be considered as an alternative	No



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>risk to the water environment permission would be refused)</i>	option	
RSPB North	1750	Id66 Q166	Option 2 – the last bullet point should refer to climate change adaptation as well as climate change mitigation. <i>(Implies that the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point in Option 2 should be expanded to include climate change adaptation)</i>	The point about climate change adaptation is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but expansion of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
RSPB North	1750	Id66 Q166	The criteria should refer to Water Framework Directive objectives and targets. <i>(Implies expanding bullet point 1 in Option 2 to include a reference to the Water Framework Directive)</i>	The point about the water framework directive is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but expansion of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
RSPB North	1750	Id66 Q166	In relation to biodiversity, minerals development needs to be carried out at a landscape scale to deliver strategic restoration benefits. <i>(Relevant to overarching minerals policies, possibly Id02. Implies a 4<sup>th</sup> option to Id02 which would be a restoration-led approach to aggregates development)</i>	This is considered to be a distinctly different approach under Id02 and should therefore be considered as a new option. This has been considered as a new option under Id02. Sounds like an option that should be considered. Added into minerals tables and fed through to the proformas.	Yes
Blue Lagoon Diving and Leisure Ltd	0814	Id66 (from AOC sheet)	Need to include dealing with runoff water from tip sites. <i>(Implies adding a 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to Option 2 whereby run off water from tip sites is taken into account)</i>	This is not considered to be a distinctly different approach but expansion of an existing option, so something that can be taken on board when drafting the policy.	No
Minerals Products Association	1526	Id71 Q184	Consider including mineral infrastructure and ancillary development in MCAs <i>(Implies adding a 2<sup>nd</sup> 'and' Option whereby safeguarded mineral infrastructure and ancillary development</i>	The comment is about how consultation on safeguarded infrastructure will take place – neither id57 or id71 address this which is probably an omission – could treat as a new option. –	Yes

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Respondent	Comment ID	I&O document id number	Suggested new option	Needs to be considered as a new option? (include reasons)	Need for SA (yes/no)
			<i>is included in MCAs)</i>	Taken onto DM progressing sheet	
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0748	Id12 Q31 – from minerals section	A policy to ensure restoration of Magnesian limestone quarries to grassland could be effective as is valuable grassland. <i>(Implies adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> 'and' option whereby Magnesian limestone quarries will be restored to grassland)</i>	This is already within the scope of option 2 of id67 – reference taken off progressing table	No
English Heritage	0312	Id22 Q56 – from minerals section	Where development is proposed that may affect a building stone quarry it should be demonstrated that the stone is no longer viable to quarry or not likely to be needed in the foreseeable future <i>(This is relevant to Id70. The consideration of whether the mineral is likely to be needed would be an addition to option 1 of ID70 and represent an alternative to this)</i>	This addition to Option 1 of id70 provides an alternative and so needs to be assessed.	Yes
Third Energy Ltd / Barton Wilmore on behalf of Egdon Resources	1256	Q73 – from minerals section	Safeguarding of other minerals should not hinder hydrocarbon exploration and production. <i>(Implies an option whereby the usual safeguarding policies would not apply where hydrocarbon development is being proposed – possibly relevant to Id70?)</i>	Already addressed through Option 2 of id70.exemptions for temporary development. More to be considered in drafting policy, not a new option – removed from progression table.	No

## Appendix 2

### Progression of alternative options and suggested text

Id01 Broad geographical approach to supply of aggregates				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative which enables extraction of aggregates from within National Park and AONBs if required to do so as well as from the rest of the Plan area	1785, 1474	and	Option 3 Supply from the National Park and the AONBs would be supported in circumstances where demand could not be met from locations outside protected areas.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>Option 1 would have clear benefits for the landscape and natural and historic environment whilst enabling supply of aggregates to be maintained. In particular significant positive effects would be evident in the AONBs which currently contain aggregates quarries. Option 3 would place greater uncertainty over the positive effects observed for the National Park and AONBs as a result of both Options 1 and 2, although would have positive effects in relation to supply of minerals and the economy, whilst Option 7 is likely to lead to negative effects on the National Park without necessarily benefitting the economy overall.</p> <p>Options 2 and 4 would potentially have negative effects on the environment of the City of York (with effects under Option 2 being greater than effects under Option 4) but would potentially displace such effects from elsewhere in the Plan area and enable aggregates required within York to be sourced locally, thus having a positive effect in terms of transportation impacts. Under Option 5 there would potentially be negative effects on the environment across the Plan area although it scores positively in terms of the economy and ensuring supply of aggregates.</p> <p>Acting alongside the overall strategy, Option 6 would have negative effects in the longer term as it would not support securing enhancements for the</p>
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative whereby any workings in the York area are restricted to being of a small scale and only used in the York area.	0193	or	Option 4 In addition to aggregates supply from the NYCC area, this approach could seek to deliver an element of total sand and gravel supply requirements from the City of York area by encouraging working of sand and gravel (including building sand) in appropriate locations. Extraction within the City of York area would be supported where it is on a small scale and is for use only within the City of York area.	
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative whereby there would be no specific geographical restriction in the Plan relating to the location of aggregates extraction in the Joint Plan area	1405 1465	or	Option 5 This option would allow extraction of aggregate from any geographical location in the Joint Plan area.	
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative whereby proposed extraction in the area between the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales is more restricted and is restoration led, as suggested that the landscape should be restored	2076	and	Option 6 This option would only permit future extraction in the geographical area between the North York Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks where sites were to be restored to their former use.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

to its former landform/use				landscape, biodiversity or recreation. Option 8 would provide positive effects in relation to the supply of minerals and on minimising environmental effects.
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative whereby the Plan would allow extraction of new aggregate supply from extensions to existing quarries in the National Park	0612	and	Option 7 Notwithstanding the restrictions identified in Options 1 and 2, this option would support aggregate extraction through extensions to former quarries in the National Park.	
Promoting a 3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative 'and' option for id01 whereby the excess crushed stone from building stone sites in the National Park could be used as aggregate in the local area.	1670	and	Option 8 This option could work alongside Options 1 or 2 and, notwithstanding any restrictions applied through options 1 and 2, would support the use of excess crushed rock from building stone sites in the National Park and AONBs as aggregate for use in the local area.	<b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that a combination of options 1, 2 and 3 be progressed, whereby the policy is clear that extraction should take place outside of the National Park and the AONBs as a first priority but within the rest of the NYCC area and City of York area. Option 8 should also be supported as a further means of enabling aggregates extraction with minimal environmental effects.

Id02 Locational approach to new sources of supply of aggregates				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby the location of sites should be influenced by their proximity to markets.	0021, 1544, 1466, 0955,	or	Option 4 This option would give priority to proposals which locate sites in close proximity to market and good transport networks and suitable restoration proposals. Extraction from more remote areas would be allowed if there is suitable justification for it.	<b>Summary of assessment</b> While all options display a mixture of positive, negative and uncertain effects, Options 1 and 2 exhibit more positive effects than Option 3. Negative effects are associated with land and soils and recreation to some degree under options 1, 2, 3 and 7 and 8. In broad terms, while Option 1 and 2 are considered to reduce journey lengths, there remains a risk that those journeys will run close to communities under Option 1. Similarly options 4 and 5 broadly reduce journey lengths, though there is some uncertainty over whether the more remote locations allowed by option 4 with a 'suitable justification' would work against this to a degree. Another key issue is how options may restrict the distribution of sites – with Options 1 and 4 in particular more likely to attract sites to areas that
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option which works alongside options 1 and 2 whereby the impact on climate change and food supply by aggregate sites should be key considerations.	0194	and	Option 5 Under this approach the key locational guiding principle would be to minimise impacts on climate change and food supply by aggregate sites.	
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby the Plan identifies Areas of Search for mineral	1730, 1719	or	Option 6 Under this option Areas of Search would be used to help identify future sites for	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

development identification which incorporates the potential strategic restoration objectives.			minerals development and strategic restoration proposals would be considered as part of the assessment process.	may be visible from protected landscapes, and Option 2, and to a lesser extent options 4 and 5 drawing sites closer to the best quality agricultural land.
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby the Plan would support the expansion of existing quarries over developing new sites	0249, 1466, 0955, 1307	or	Option 7 This option would give priority to extending existing quarries instead of permitting new quarries.	Some options carry some degree of economic benefit, however options 1 and 4 may have some negative effects on tourism (due to visibility of quarries from national parks) and quality of life (due to more traffic on the local road network), while some options show some degree of disbenefit for opportunities for recreation and leisure (impacting in varying degrees on recreational assets such as enjoyment of national parks or the public access network).  The assessment of Option 3 is generally more uncertain than other options as it is not known what the resultant overall spatial distribution of aggregate sites will be, though it could offer increased locational choice which may bring some benefits. There are also a number of negative effects that are particularly associated with option 8 as under that option site locations are determined to a large degree by their restoration potential rather than the impacts that they may have during their operational lifetime, and may end up clustering together displaying cumulative effects.  <b>Revised Recommendations</b> A key conclusion of this assessment is that there is merit in adopting an approach that includes aspects of both options 1 and the links to the A1 explored in 2. This would potentially balance the negative aspects of each option with the positive aspects of the other. So such an option would include the principle of proximity to markets, but would also favour proximity to the A1 (or other access to the rail / canal / strategic
4 <sup>th</sup> option to Id02 which would be a restoration-led approach to aggregates development	1750	and	Option 8 Under this option new sources of supply of aggregates would be directed to locations where strategic restoration objectives could be realised.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				road network where possible). The principle of areas of search outlined in option 6 also performs well (but is unlikely to perform as well as identifying specific sites), while giving priority to extending existing quarries (option 7) could have some significant benefits if used in conjunction with a combination of option 1 and 2.
--	--	--	--	--

Id03 Calculating sand and gravel provision				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed		And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
A 7 <sup>th</sup> alternative 'or' option which would rely more on the importation of aggregate.	0486	or	Option 7 Under this option consideration would be given to possibilities to increase imports into the Plan area which would be factored into a reduced requirement to be provided from within the Plan area itself.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>There is a significant amount of uncertainty in relation to all of these options due to uncertainty over where provision would be made. However, generally there are likely to be negative effects on climate change, resource minimisation and waste, which range in severity depending on the amount extracted varying from Option 2 (which performs least well) to Option 6 (which performs the best).</p> <p>Negative effects are also observed in other areas for individual options, with Options 2, 3, 4, 8 and 10 exhibiting the most certain negative environmental effects. Option 5 also has the potential to lead to negative effects on marine environments and Option 7 has the potential to displace negative effects outside of the plan area. Most options also have some positive effects, particularly in relation to economic growth, flood risk and changing population. This is because it is important to match supply of aggregate with demand to support the economy, and because new sand and gravel sites may open up opportunities to contribute to a range of SA objectives, including flood storage and to meet the development needs of local communities and</p>
7 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby the forecast of demand is based on 10 year average sales data along with future growth predictions.	0957, 1467	or	Option 8 This option would calculate future provision by projecting forward 10 year average sales and considering any likely changes to building rates over the Plan period compared to building rates over the past 10 years.	
7 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby Option 1 includes a commitment to monitoring	1165	or	Option 9 This option would involve projecting forward 10 year annual average sales over the period to 2030 to provide an indication of the overall scale of provision required, after allowing for a level of reserves already with planning permission. Based on the position at the end of 2011 this would result in a need for an additional 27.5mt of sand and gravel over the plan period. Monitoring should take place on a regular basis.	
7 <sup>th</sup> alternative whereby Option 4 is expanded to take account of	0298, 1165,	or	Option 10 This option would calculate future provision	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

external sources of supply	0297		<p>by projecting forward 10 year average sales with the addition of a review of sand and gravel sales at the end of 2019. In the event that sales of sand and gravel recover to a level such that short term average sales (as measured over a three year averaging period for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019) exceed the 10 year average sales figure used to define provision at the time of plan preparation by an amount exceeding 10%, then additional provision can be made in line with that referred to in Option 3 above, i.e. provision of an additional 10% leading to a total provision of 31.9mt over the plan period. When reviewing provision at the end of 2019 consideration will also be given to provision and potential provision from outside of the Plan area.</p>	<p>businesses. The exceptions to this are Options 6 and 7, which shows uncertain to negative economic and population effects as shortfalls in provision may result. These options would however be likely to have positive environmental effects (at least within the plan area) due to a lower level of land take.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b>  Option 6 performs the most positively in terms of the sustainability appraisal. However, this option does present some uncertainty in terms of meeting demand for sand and gravel. This might be addressed by allowing greater flexibility to increase supply in a similar way to Option 4 and Option 10.</p> <p>The SA Team felt that as option 6 takes account of the potential for other alternative sources of supply, final consideration of this option should also include consideration of the alternatives presented under ID14.</p>
----------------------------	------	--	---	--

Id04 Overall distribution of sand and gravel provision				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
5 <sup>th</sup> 'and' option whereby the Plan area is considered as a whole should there be a shortfall of supply in one area	0300	and	<p>Option 5  This option would enable provision for sand and gravel to be made from across the Plan area to meet either northwards or southwards demand, where there is a shortfall in either the northwards or southwards distribution area.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b>  All options display a mixture of uncertain, negative and positive effects. However, Option 1 displays the strongest positive effects largely because it matches well with current market demand, so effects on transport, air pollution and climate change as well as economic growth are all positive. There are also a number of areas where positive effects are either balanced by uncertainty or are confined to a particular period.</p> <p>Other options tend to perform less well, and effects</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>vary depending on the ratio of northern to southern division. For instance, landscape effects are both positive and negative under Options 1 to 4 though some uncertainty is noted. Similarly, the transport related benefits become negative under Options 2 and 3, or uncertain to negative for option 4. Option 4 displays significant uncertainty across most of the SA objectives as it is not clear where sand and gravel extraction will occur under this objective.</p> <p>The addition of Option 5 is considered likely to result in a number of minor positive effects as it would ensure that demand is met leading to positive economic benefits and, where a shortfall exists, it would allow a larger number of sites from which overall sand and gravel provision can be made. This means that it is less likely that the most sensitive sites will need to be developed in order to meet demand. Option 5 would lead to some minor negative impacts in relation to transport, air quality and climate change although wherever possible provision would be met within the designated distribution areas, keeping these negative effects to a minimum.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> Option 1 is associated with a clear economic, and a number of outright environmental, benefits and is seen to perform best in relation to the SA Framework. It is considered that Option 1 should be combined with Option 5 in order to ensure that demand can be met and to strengthen the economic benefits.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Id05 Landbanks for sand and gravel			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Id06 Safeguarding sand and gravel				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
6 <sup>th</sup> option the same as option 1 but with a larger buffer zone than 250m – if take forward needs adding to proforma	1412	or	Option 6 This option could safeguard all known sand and gravel resources with a 500m buffer zone	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>As safeguarding does not infer any sand and gravel development will take place there is generally no predicted effect. Were development to take place it would need to accord with other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Most of the options perform strongly in terms of minimising the use of resources as well as the economic growth objective as future sterilisation is avoided, thus conserving resources for future economic benefit. Options 1 and 6 perform better than Options 2 and 3 in relation to the economy, whilst Options 1, 2, 3 and 6 all perform strongly in relation to resource efficiency and addressing the needs of a changing population. There are indirect negative effects associated with the reduced buffer size under Option 2 as problems such as proximity of receptors to noise and dust may limit the extent of area which could be worked. The positive effects under option 6 are likely to be greater than those resulting from the other options due to the presence of a larger buffer. Option 4 may be subject to the cumulative effects of more concentrated areas of development if smaller sand and gravel resource areas are sterilised through lack of safeguarding and thus possible future development. Option 5 would strengthen the performance of other options in relation to the economy and resource efficiency where used together with them.</p> <p>Under each option, effects from displacement of development which would have taken place are</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>uncertain as this will depend upon the stringency of any policy approach applied. This will need to be considered when assessing policies at the Preferred Options stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>The SA does not show a strong preference for one particular option, though options 2 and 4 are considered less sustainable than options 1 and 6. Option 5 can add some beneficial effects to other options when used together with them.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id07 Provision of crushed rock				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
A 4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' option which would rely more on the importation of aggregate	0486	or	Option 4 Under this option consideration would be given to possibilities to increase imports into the Plan area which would mean a reduced requirement to be provided from within the Plan area itself.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>The assessment has revealed that Option 2 is likely to result in negative effects on the environment, including biodiversity / geodiversity, water and air quality, the historic environment and landscape, but would act particularly positively in relation to ensuring sufficient minerals are available. Under Option 3 there are likely to be positive effects on environmental objectives, although overall these may be slight as the option represents only a small decrease in crushed rock provision. Option 1 has limited effects as further provision of crushed rock would not be required.</p> <p>Under Option 4, relying more on imports produces more negative effects in terms of environmental impacts from increased traffic and less support for jobs and the economy but positive effects in terms of less direct impact on habitats and landscape.</p>
4 <sup>th</sup> option which also considers likely future growth.	0819, 0614, 0616	or	Option 5 This option would calculate future provision by projecting forward 10 year average sales and considering any likely changes to building rates over the Plan period compared to building rates over the past 10 years.	
4 <sup>th</sup> Option which would identify Areas of Search for new crushed rock sites to take up towards the end of the Plan period.	1472	and	Option 6 This option would identify Areas of Search for crushed rock extraction towards the end of the Plan period.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>Option 5 has more negative effects arising from the potential for greater extraction requirements.</p> <p>The effects of option 6 are mostly the same as other options in the short and most of the medium term (as the option is additional to other options). In the longer term effects are mostly negative as the option allows the opportunity for further extraction over and above the extraction rates in other options. However, there would be positive economic effects as this option creates greater certainty that demand for crushed rock can be met.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that Option 3 be pursued as this would enable sufficient provision of Magnesian limestone whilst limiting negative effects and encouraging of use of secondary and recycled aggregates</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id08 Maintenance of landbanks for crushed rock				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id09 Safeguarding of crushed rock				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id10 Concreting sand and gravel delivery				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

<p>4<sup>th</sup> alternative option which is same as option 2 but figures are changed from 5mt total reserve and output of 0.25mtpa output to 3mt total reserve and 0.1mtpa output.</p>	<p>0158</p>	<p>or</p>	<p><b>Option 4</b> This option could seek to deliver Joint Plan requirements for concreting sand and gravel through the identification of specific site allocations only for large scale sites (e.g. sites with greater than 3mt total reserve and planned output of 0.1mtpa or greater), with remaining provision being provided through preferred areas or areas of search.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Options 1, 2 and 4 all perform well against most sustainability appraisal objectives (other than in relation to minimising the use of resources and managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy). This is because allocating sites helps to plan for constraints and opportunities in advance so the most sustainable sites are utilised. Of these options, however, Option 1 performs the best as this seeks to alleviate uncertainty through allocating the most sites.</p> <p>Option 3 performs more negatively as only areas of search are utilised, and these have only considered the most major environmental constraints in their definition, leaving localised effects to be addressed through mitigation at the planning application stage. However, there are economic benefits with this approach through allowing flexibility in site selection for developers.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> Option 1 is considered the most sustainable option.</p>
--	-------------	-----------	---	---

Id11 Building sand delivery				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
<p>3<sup>rd</sup> alternative option, combine options 1 and 2</p>	<p>0968, 1479</p>	<p>or</p>	<p><b>Option 3</b> This option would seek to deliver Joint Plan requirements for building sand through specific allocations and via criteria supporting new sites, and would also support the identification of Areas of Search if specific sites are not identified.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Option 1, when compared to the sustainability appraisal objectives, performs very well. It includes strong positive effects for all or part of the short to long term time period considered for biodiversity and geo-diversity, water quality and supply, air quality, climate change, climate adaptation, heritage, landscapes and town and cityscapes, community vitality, recreation and leisure, health and wellbeing</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>and flooding. This is because, through allocating sites and considering criteria, the most sustainable locations can be chosen.</p> <p>Option 2 also reports a number of (albeit less strong) positive effects as strategic sustainability issues can be considered when deciding upon areas of search and preferred areas. However, there is greater uncertainty as specific locations are unknown.</p> <p>Option 3 retains many of the positive benefits of option 1, though where it is not possible to allocate specific sites those benefits would be lessened in the same way as option 2.</p> <p>All options report negative effects for the resource efficiency objective as these options will inevitably, if applications are approved under them, lead to significant non-renewable resource consumption.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> Option 1 performs significantly more strongly against the sustainability appraisal objectives.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id12 Magnesian limestone delivery				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id13 Unallocated extension to existing aggregates quarries				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby new sites would only be permitted where there are no	0107	and	Option 4 This option would prioritise extensions to existing sites over extraction at new	<b>Summary of assessment</b> The assessment revealed that Option 3 would provide greater protection for the environment and

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

opportunities for extensions to existing quarries			locations.	<p>communities than Options 1 or 2 yet would raise questions over the deliverability of minerals, although this would depend on whether or not there was a sufficient landbank maintained at other permitted sites throughout the plan period. It is possible that an indirect result of the option would be to encourage other sites to come forward, with associated sustainability effects</p> <p>Option 4 has some benefits that largely arise from the fact that less supporting infrastructure, such as access routes, would be required at existing sites. However, there are concerns that prolonged negative effects could occur around existing sites. Option 5 performs well for biodiversity in the longer term, though more than most other options (and to a degree all options that restrict extensions do this) may have the indirect effect of encouraging new allocated or unallocated and potentially less sustainable sites to come forward to meet demand,</p> <p>Option 6 scored well, but generally minor positive effects were at the lower end of the positive scale as the NPPF tends to encourage local issues to be dealt with through the local plan.</p> <p>When considered in combination with other relevant options, option 7 had a broad range of effects, though negative impacts were recorded where objectives correlate with the special qualities of local AONBs. Option 8 had a range of effects that mostly were either insignificant or minor negative, though recorded some low level economic benefits.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that either Option 2 or 3 would be the most sustainable to follow, although Option 3 is</p>
4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' option where extensions would only be supported if there would be major gains for biodiversity	0749	or	Option 5 Unallocated extensions would only be permitted where there would be major gains for biodiversity.	
4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' option whereby extensions that meet the broad sustainability criteria of the NPPF should be permitted	1481, 0970, 1539, 0971	or	Option 6 Under this option unallocated extensions would be permitted where they meet the broad sustainability criteria of the NPPF.	
4th alternative option whereby unallocated extensions would be considered across the whole of the Plan area, including National Park and AONBs	0618	or	Option 7 This option would act in combination with either Option 1 or Option 2 and would remove the requirements in these options for the site to be located outside of the National Park or an AONB.	
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option , if Option 3 selected add a 4 <sup>th</sup> option whereby 'small scale' extensions (similar to the North Yorkshire Minerals Plan) would be allowed.	0307	and	Option 8 In combination with Option 3, this option would however allow small scale extensions to existing quarries.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				possibly a little inflexible and could lead to negative effects should insufficient landbanks be maintained and /or new unallocated sites come forward. The chosen option should be combined with the element of Option 1 which requires consideration to be given to implications for increasing the contribution that secondary and recycled aggregates make to aggregates supply. There may also be some merit in considering the preference for extending existing sites rather than developing new sites, though it as yet unclear how this could work outside of the allocations process, and the issues of prolonged local effects resulting from extensions to permission for working at a site would need strong mitigation.
--	--	--	--	---

Id14 Supply of alternatives to land won primary aggregates				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
3 <sup>rd</sup> option whereby the use of colliery spoil as secondary aggregate would be supported provided it was not obtained from restored colliery spoil tips.	1947, 1961, 1976, 1935, 0733, 1356	and	Option 3 This option supports the use of colliery spoil as secondary aggregate in principle, provided it is not obtained from restored colliery spoil tips.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>All of these options will result in largely positive effects, with particularly strong positive effects associated with sustainability objectives relating to biodiversity, soil / land, climate change, resource use and minimising waste generation.</p> <p>Minor areas of negative effects or uncertainty occur for a number of SA objectives and minor negative effects occur under the health and wellbeing SA objective under options 1, 2 and 3, and under the community vitality objective under options 1 and 3 due to the potential for local transport or amenity impacts around secondary or recycled aggregates facilities. Many of the positive effects associated with option 3 are amplified for option 4, which effectively reduces the steps in the secondary aggregate supply chain.</p>
3 <sup>rd</sup> option whereby secondary aggregate is used from source rather than extracting it once tipped	1357	and	Option 4 This option would give preference to using supplies of secondary aggregate direct from source rather than extracting from tip sites.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p><b>Recommendations</b> The SA recommends that all options have merits and elements of each could be pursued.</p> <p>The SA Team felt that as these options take account of the potential for other alternative sources of aggregates to primary aggregates, final consideration of ID03 (particularly option 6) should also consider this option when calculating sand and gravel provision.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Id15 Continuity of supply of silica sand			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id16 Safeguarding of silica sand			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id17 Continuity of supply of clay				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative option whereby sites would be supported where restoration would contribute to improving habitat connectivity, especially in relation to ponds	0753	or	Option 4 This option would support the development of clay extraction sites adjacent to former sites where the restoration of the site would contribute to improving habitat connectivity.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Options 1 to 3 are likely to have uncertain or negative environmental impacts in relation to biodiversity, land take and landscape, given the nature of clay working. However, option 1 is likely to have fewer significant impacts by predominantly locating additional capacity near to existing extraction or processing locations thus reducing transport</p>



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>implications (minimising the number and length of trips) as well as impacts on new locations elsewhere. Although it is characterised by a number of uncertainties, option 2 offers more flexibility to maximise the use of clay in other locations where it could be viable and help to maximise economic benefits from extraction.</p> <p>Option 3, when considered alongside the other options, would support the wider economy given that the extraction of clay would be for a broader range of uses not necessarily associated with current manufacturing facilities. However, adverse effects in relation to exportation and transportation outside of the plan area as well as cumulative negative environmental impacts as result of further extraction are identified. These are, however moderated by the support the option offers for secondary and recycled uses.</p> <p>Option 4 offers the opportunity to support longer term benefits for biodiversity, water, climate adaptation, recreation and wellbeing. However, most other impacts are uncertain as they would be dependent on location.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> Assuming that any proposals would also be subject to alternative policies within the plan, it is considered that option 1 in relation to supporting existing production should be pursued. The long term restoration benefits of option 4 could also be captured by incorporating it into other policies, particularly option 1.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id18 Incidental working of clay in association with other minerals

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id19 Safeguarding of clay			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id20 Continuity of supply of building stone				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option which would support the extraction of building stone from crushed rock sites if required	1473	and	Option 4 This option would, where appropriate, support the sourcing and provision of building stone from sites which are primarily extracting crushed rock.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>The assessment has revealed that all options are likely to result in mostly minor negative effects on the environment to some degree although Option 2 could in particular have potentially more significant negative effects on landscape, biodiversity, recreation, the historic environment, water, soil, air and amenity. Whilst Option 1 would have some positive impact on the environment, particularly in relation to land use and minimising use of resources, it could also fail to deliver a sufficient supply of the right types of building stone to support development consistent with landscape / townscape character and the historic environment.</p> <p>Although Option 3 does not provide specific support for the continuation of supply of building stone, it is considered that this criteria based approach would allow new sites to come forward where required. Option 3 is considered more favourable in terms of sustainability effects than Option 5 as it results in more positive effects in relation to minimising the use of resources.</p>
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option which is the same as Option 3 but it excludes the consideration of alternative sources	1488	or	Option 5 This option would not express support in principle for continued supply of building stone but would identify a range of criteria to be applied to any proposals which come forward for development of building stone resources. In addition to the general criteria included in the Development Management policies, indicative criteria for building stone development could include adequate demonstration of the nature, quality and quantity of resource and the market to be served.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>The addition of Option 4 where appropriate is considered to result in a number of positive effects, particularly should it result in the need for less new building stone quarries and the associated impacts that these would have upon biodiversity, water, cultural heritage, landscape, air quality and amenity.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that Option 3 would enable new sites to come forward where required whilst having minimal detrimental effects on the environment. As a number of positive effects were also recorded in relation to Option 4, it is considered that Option 3 should be adopted alongside Option 4 recognising that in most cases extracting building stone from an existing crushed rock quarry is likely to have a lower order impact than developing a new quarry.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id21 Use of building stone				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
5 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby Options 1 and 2 are combined	1094, 1601	or	<p>Option 5 This option would support applications for the extraction of building stone with in the Joint Plan area for use only within the Joint Plan area, and building stone extracted within the National Park and AONB would only be used in the designated area from which it is extracted. In both cases the building stone will only be used elsewhere if it is for the repair of important designated or undesignated structures which rely on this stone.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> The assessment has revealed that Options 1 and 2 would be beneficial in terms of protecting the environment. However, Option 2 may result in negative effects on the local economy should there be less extraction across the area (though this is uncertain).</p> <p>Option 3 would result in no additional effects from building stone extraction.</p> <p>Option 4 is likely to have positive effects in terms of supply of building stone and reducing the effects of transportation, and any negative effects are likely to</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> alternative option which is	0310	or	Option 6	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

<p>similar to Option 1 but would include criteria that the quarry is the original source of stone and the scale of extraction is commensurate with the expected requirements of the development</p>			<p>This option would support the extraction of building stone from within the National Park and AONBs only where the stone would be used within the designated area it is extracted from, unless for repair of important designated or undesignated structures elsewhere which rely on this stone where the quarry is the original source of stone and the scale of extraction is commensurate with the expected requirements of the development. Elsewhere in the Joint Plan area there would be no restriction placed on the use of the stone extracted.</p>	<p>be minor and very temporary.</p> <p>Option 5 would have positive effects on the landscape and historic environment but gives less support to new jobs and providing for needs outside the Plan area.</p> <p>Option 6 will have positive effects on the historic environment outside the Plan area where the original source of stone for a historic asset is from a quarry within the National Park or AONB and the scale of extraction is to meet the specific requirements of the historic asset.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that a combination of Options 1 and 4 would be the most sustainable approach</p>
---	--	--	--	---

Id22 Safeguarding of building stone			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id23 Overall spatial options for oil and gas				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
<p>4<sup>th</sup> alternative option which is a combination of options 2 and 3</p>	1690	or	<p>Option 4 This option supports the principle of gas developments (including production and processing) across the whole of the Joint Plan area provided that, within the National Park and AONBs, and in locations which may impact on the townscape and setting of the historic City of York, particularly high</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> The assessment has revealed that Option 1 is likely to provide the most benefits in terms of both protecting the natural environment and landscapes and also supporting local economies, although this option could potentially direct gas developments to areas of highest agricultural land quality and areas where water sources are protected as well as having negative effects in terms of meeting the energy needs</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			standards of siting, design and mitigation are applied, but aim to direct the siting of any processing or electricity generating facilities to locations outside the National Park and AONBs where viable alternatives to these exist.	
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative 'or' option whereby exploration, appraisal and production are allowed without restriction throughout the Plan area.	0865	or	Option 5 This option supports the principle of gas developments (including production and processing) across the whole of the Joint Plan area	of the population. Under Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 there may be negative effects on the landscape, natural and historic environment and recreation, with Option 2 also predicted to have uncertain to positive effects for the historic environment, whilst Option 5 would potentially have negative effects on a range of environmental objectives. Effects under Option 6 often show positive aspects due to the requirement that they do not result in any significant adverse impacts on local communities or the environment. However, there is significant uncertainty in this assessment as factors such as the threshold of significant impacts is not known.
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option which is criteria based.	1254, 1245	or	Option 6 Under this option Planning permission will be granted for exploration, appraisal or production of oil and gas and unconventional hydrocarbons provided they do not result in any significant adverse impacts on local communities or the environment.	<p>All options are considered to be negative in relation to minimising resource use due to the support they offer to the extraction of a non-renewable resource. Option 6 performs the worst in this respect as its support the extraction of a wider range of hydrocarbons,</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is acknowledged that whilst Option 1 performs best overall, Options 2 and 3 would provide a better framework for ensuing sufficient gas developments can come forward. A combination of options whereby license holders, whose license(s) cover land both within and outside National Parks and AONBs, must investigate possibilities outside of these areas first and all operators must aim to locate processing facilities outside of these areas and apply particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation within these areas is recommended, though option 6's requirement for avoidance of 'significant adverse impacts on local communities or the environment' provides a broader scope for mitigation (provided it is coupled with the 'particularly high standard' mentioned in some of the options).</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

--	--	--	--	--

Id24 Co-ordination of gas extraction and processing				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Id25 Gas developments (exploration and appraisal)				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
2 <sup>nd</sup> alternative option where there would be no specific criteria within the Plan but instead the NPPF would be relied upon to determine exploration and appraisal proposals	0328, 1626, 1366	or	This option would not set out specific support for exploration and appraisal for oil and gas but would instead rely on policy contained in the NPPF. Specifically in relation to oil and gas exploration and appraisal, the NPPF requires constraints to be addressed on production and processing within licensed areas.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>Option 1 requires the consideration of environmental, amenity and transport effects in relation to gas exploration and appraisal. This, when considered alongside the regulatory regime, is likely to have predominantly positive effects in ensuring that any adverse impacts as a result of this are minimised and locations are chosen which are not significantly affected, though some residual effects may remain. However, due to the nature of exploration, development may be proposed in locations which conflict with landscape or other designations. This would need to be balanced against the potential economic benefits from exploration as well as other social and environmental effects.</p> <p>Option 2 would result in the absence of a specific framework within the plan for assessing the effects relating to gas exploration and appraisal and guiding the location of such development and it is considered that this may result in negative impacts on a number of the SA objectives. In the medium and longer term there is much uncertainty in relation to Option 2 as national policy in relation to gas exploration and appraisal is evolving fairly rapidly and effects would</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>depend upon the national policy that is in place at the time.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b>                  Option 1 should be pursued as this criteria based approach provides guidance and standards specific to gas exploration and appraisal and provides greater certainty in the medium to long term. It is recommended that Option 1 is extended to include more detail as to social factors to be considered, such as effects on safety and local economy.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id26 Gas developments (production and processing)				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Id27 Coal Mine Methane				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative option similar to Option 2 but does not specifically support brownfield locations	0789	or	This option would support the extraction and utilisation of CMM at other locations as well as existing sites, with a preference that any new plant and equipment is located where the choice of location would enable the efficient utilisation of the energy produced.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b>                  All options exhibit broadly positive effects on the sustainability objectives, though there remains some potential for minor negative effects on biodiversity / geodiversity, historic environment, landscape / townscape in all cases. Some limited uncertainty with effects on land / soil is observed under Options 1 and 3 as it is not clear whether the option would result in a preference for brownfield land.</p> <p>However, notwithstanding these issues, both options, and especially Options 2 and 3, will result in benefits for air quality, climate change, resource use, waste minimisation, jobs and safety. There is a greater degree of flexibility with option 3.</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p><b>Recommendations</b> Due to the magnitude of positive effects, and the positive utilisation of brownfield land, the SA notes a preference for Option 2.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id28 Coal bed methane, Underground coal gasification, Shale gas and Carbon and gas storage				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option which is same as Option 1 but without the phrase '...or in close proximity to...' so mitigation is confined to within the National Park and AONBs	0844	or	<p><b>Id28 Option 4:</b> This option would support the principle of development of CBM, UCG and shale gas resources subject, where relevant, to the other gas policies in the Joint Plan but would also in particular require robust assessment of, and the prevention of potential impacts on, a range of other matters including in relation to the integrity of geological or hydrogeological resources and processes (including groundwater and land stability), availability of water resources and local amenity and public safety issues. Transport of gas would be expected to be via pipeline, with the routing of pipelines selected to give rise to the least environmental or amenity impact.</p> <p>This option would involve a precautionary approach, with support to specific proposals only being provided where a high level of assurance in relation to impacts and benefits, including community benefits, can be demonstrated. Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation would be required where any development is proposed</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> The assessment has revealed that under Options 1 and 4 there is potential for negative effects on the environment, and communities of the Joint Plan area yet more potential for wider gains including reduced CO2 emissions. Option 1 performs slightly better than Option 4 in terms of protection of the landscape. Option 2 would create greater uncertainties in the medium and long term as the approach would largely be controlled by national policy rather than a local approach.</p> <p>The assessment of Option 5 also revealed uncertainties although this could be resolved through the inclusion of relevant policies elsewhere in the Plan, albeit that this may not address effects specific to unconventional gas extraction. Option 5 does however have positive effects on the economy and minerals supply. In combination with Option 1 or 4, Option 3 would lead to positive effects on the environment and communities but may have negative effects in relation to the provision of minerals to meet the needs of the population.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that Option 1 would provide a more certain approach for the Joint Plan area</p>



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

		<p>within the National Park or AONBs and in locations which may impact on the townscape and setting of the historic City of York.</p> <p>Id28a: This option would support the principle of development of the underground storage of carbon and gas subject, where relevant, to the other gas policies in the Joint Plan but would also in particular require robust assessment of, and the prevention of potential impacts on, a range of other matters including in relation to the integrity of geological or hydrogeological resources and processes (including groundwater and land stability), local amenity and public safety issues. Transport of gas or carbon would be expected to be via pipeline, with the routing of pipelines selected to give rise to the least environmental or amenity impact.</p> <p>This option would involve a precautionary approach, with support to specific proposals only being provided where a high level of assurance in relation to impacts and benefits, including community benefits, can be demonstrated. Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation would be required where any development is proposed within the National Park or AONBs and in locations which may impact on the townscape and setting of the historic City of York.</p>	<p>provided that the precautionary approach underlies the support in principle. It is considered that incorporating Option 3 may be beneficial but careful consideration would need to be given to defining the terms used.</p>
--	--	---	---



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

		<p><b>Option 2:</b> This option would not express support in principle for the development of CBM, UCG and shale gas resources due to the uncertain nature of the impacts and risks involved within the Plan area. Any proposals which come forward would be considered against other relevant policies in the Plan and relevant national policy. The NPPF states that minerals planning authorities should encourage extraction of Coal Mine Methane.</p> <p><b>Option 3:</b> This option would represent an extension to the precautionary principle in Option 1 by requiring applications for permission for the development of CBM, UCG and shale gas resources to demonstrate that the proposed site has been identified so as to avoid sensitive locations and designations, including residential areas, important environmental designations and other important assets which require protection under the planning system.</p> <p><b>New Id28a:</b></p> <p><b>Option 1:</b> This option would support the principle of development of the underground storage of carbon and gas subject, where relevant, to the other gas policies in the Joint Plan but would also in particular require robust assessment of, and the prevention of potential impacts on, a range of other</p>	<p>carbon or gas storage. Depending on the degree of support this is expected to bring greater or lesser economic and jobs benefits, with options 1 and 4 performing particularly well here. Similarly all options have some degree of benefit to climate change, with supporting options 1,3 and 4 performing particularly well. This is because carbon capture underpins the large potential for greenhouse gas emission reductions from the broader carbon capture and storage process.</p> <p>As industrial features with a significant development footprint however, options report negative impacts across many of the other environmental and social SA objectives. These impacts are relatively minor impacts as all options offer some degree of protection from them. Option 3 in particular avoids residential areas and important environmental designations, building on the protection of option 1. This emphasis on the protection of key receptors makes a neutral to positive contribution to several objectives in option 3 (e.g. health and safety and climate adaptation) as they would allow maintenance of the status of receptors covered by these objectives, while for other options the protection offered is weaker, meaning that low level negative effects remain possible or likely.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> There are strong benefits to climate change and the economy, particularly from options 1 and 3 (although it is accepted that option 4 would, through its less controlled approach perhaps offered the greatest potential). As option 3 offers the greater level of protection, when used in conjunction with option 1, though still supports carbon and gas storage, the SA recommends that this option should be taken forward.</p>
--	--	---	--

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

		<p>matters including in relation to the integrity of geological or hydrogeological resources and processes (including groundwater and land stability), local amenity and public safety issues. Transport of gas or carbon would be expected to be via pipeline, with the routing of pipelines selected to give rise to the least environmental or amenity impact.</p> <p>This option would involve a precautionary approach, with support to specific proposals only being provided where a high level of assurance in relation to impacts and benefits, including community benefits, can be demonstrated. Particularly high standards of siting, design and mitigation would be required where any development is proposed within or in close proximity to the National Park or AONBs and in locations which may impact on the townscape and setting of the historic City of York.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would not express support in principle for the underground storage of carbon or gas due to the uncertain nature of the impacts and risks involved within the Plan area. Any proposals which come forward would be considered against other relevant policies in the Plan and relevant national policy. The NPPF states that minerals planning authorities should encourage underground gas and carbon storage, taking into account the integrity and safety of such facilities.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>Option 3: This option would represent an extension to the precautionary principle in Option 1 by requiring applications for permission for the development of underground storage of carbon and gas to demonstrate that the proposed site has been identified so as to avoid sensitive locations and designations, including residential areas, important environmental designations and other important assets which require protection under the planning system.</p>	
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option where support is given and reliance is placed on the development management policies of the Plan to mitigate any effects	1988	or	<p>Id28 This option would support the principle of development for CBM, UCG and shale gas provided proposals comply with other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>For SA purposes listed as option 5 in ID28 assessment</p> <p>Id28a: This option would support the principle of development for carbon and gas storage provided proposals comply with other policies in the Plan.</p>	

ID29 - Safeguarding oil and gas				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Id29 Continuity of supply of deep coal				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Id30 Shallow Coal				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id31 Safeguarding of shallow coal				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> alternative option providing 250m buffer zone throughout the Plan area	NYCC (New option has been generated to rectify an inconsistency in Option 1)	or	This option would safeguard the whole of the known shallow coal resource, with a 250m buffer zone to help ensure maximum protection of the resource from proximal sterilisation.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>As safeguarding does not infer shallow coal extraction will take place there is generally no predicted direct effect. Were development to take place it would need to accord with other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Safeguarding contributes positively, however, to the SA objective 'to minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding'. In other ways positive indirect effects are noted for all options, such as benefits for the economy.</p> <p>Options 1 and 4, as they safeguard land with a buffer zone, show additional positive effects through avoiding proximal sterilisation of the resource (Option 1 more so than Option 4 as the buffer zone is larger).</p> <p>Option 3 shows some additional indirect positive</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>effects as it prevents land with little prospect of development being safeguarded. This is likely to positively contribute to the needs of the population and community vitality sub objectives.</p> <p>Under the options which support safeguarding, effects from displacement of development which would have taken place are uncertain as this will depend upon the stringency of any policy approach applied.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> The SA shows a mild preference for option 3, though it should be noted that this preference is based on an assumption that development is less likely outside of safeguarded areas. Option 1 and 4's 'buffer zones' show some limited benefit when contrasted with option 2. Generally, however, sustainability effects of all options are fairly weak.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id32 Safeguarding of deep coal				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Id33 Disposal of Colliery Spoil				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
3rd alternative option whereby colliery spoil sites should reach capacity before moving onto new sites	1324	or	This option would support new colliery spoil tips where existing facilities have reached capacity.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> There is significant uncertainty around all four options. Overall the most major negative effects are reported under Option 2 and 3 where new sites in particular may affect biodiversity, water, soil and land, waste generation, heritage, landscape, community vitality, recreation and leisure and health</p>
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative option whereby colliery spoil is to be disposed of at the most sustainable	0835	and	This option will support the disposal of colliery spoil at locations which are accessible by non-road transport methods	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

<p>accessible site</p>			<p>or are close to the strategic road network.</p>	<p>and wellbeing depending on future site location; though a number of negative effects are recorded under each of options 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>Positive effects are generally minor (for instance job creation under the first three options, shortened supply chains for aggregates (option 1) or possible transport reductions under option 2), however, utilisation of available capacity under option 1 may, to a degree, incentivise the extraction of secondary aggregate from existing sites, though where a new site comes on stream (options 2 and 3) this may lessen such incentives if disposal remains economically attractive due to an increase in available space for disposal.</p> <p>Option 4 works in addition to other options and, although often uncertain, includes a number of benefits across the environmental objectives and strong positive effects for the health and wellbeing sustainability objective.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b>  Option 1 performs better than option 2 and 3. However, it should be noted that there is significant uncertainty around this assessment as the outcome of a major planning application at the Womersley site is still to be determined and the location of a new site or new sites under options 2 and 3 is unknown . There is some potential to mitigate some negative effects for option 2 and 3, particularly through detailed criteria and if a new facility is developed to encourage the utilisation of secondary aggregates. Options 2 and 3 will also offer the chance to reduce sustainability effects at communities that are currently adversely affected by existing sites (though effects may be displaced to</p>
------------------------	--	--	--	---



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				other communities). .
--	--	--	--	-----------------------

Id34 Potash supply				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
5 <sup>th</sup> alternative option whereby proposals for the extraction of potash should be assessed against the Major Development Test	2396, 1178	or	Option 5 This option would support the supply of potash from new sites. Within the National Park and AONBs the requirements of the Major Development Test would need to be met.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>Option 1 would enable the economic and minerals supply benefits associated with having a potash mine in the Plan area to be maintained, whilst limiting the environmental and social effects. However, the scale of potential negative environmental, community and recreational effects in the longer term may vary depending on whether the option would lead to the development of a new mine. The environmental effects include effects on landscape, biodiversity / geodiversity, the historic environment, water and air quality. The other options all display increased negative impacts as they potentially support more than one potash mine. Of all the options, Option 2 would have the most significant negative effects on the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 would offer protection to the environment and recreational assets of the National Park, though negative effects may still occur outside of the National Park, particularly where potash mining may intersect with important aspects of the Plan area, such as the seascape.</p> <p>Option 5 would provide a robust approach to considering proposals in the National Park, though the Major Development Test does allow development in exceptional circumstances. So in relation to most of the environmental and</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>community objectives the SA considers that there may be negative effects, but that this is uncertain as it depends on whether development meets the requirements of the Test. Elsewhere in the potash resource area negative effects are more likely to occur as new sites are supported</p> <p>Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 all have positive economic effects as they potentially support more than one potash site which would help bring new jobs to the area, though facilities in some locations may have negative impacts on levels of tourism.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that option 1 be pursued, though failing that a next best option, at least in terms for protecting the most nationally significant environmental assets, would be option 4.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id35 Safeguarding potash				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id36 Supply of gypsum				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id37 Safeguarding gypsum				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			No alternative options	
--	--	--	------------------------	--

Id38 Safeguarding deep mineral resources				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
3 <sup>rd</sup> alternative option whereby Option 1 is revised so greatest weight is given to the mineral reserve which is scarcest and most economically significant	1046	or	This option would expand Option 1 to state that the greatest weight should be given to the mineral reserve which is scarcest and most economically significant.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>As safeguarding does not infer deep minerals extraction will take place there is generally no predicted direct effect. Were development to take place it would need to accord with other policies in the plan.</p> <p>All options may indirectly provide protection for the environment and communities through potentially limiting the amount of extraction of deep minerals, although these benefits would be more certain and potentially greater under Option 2 whereby such development would definitely not be supported in certain locations. Whilst Option 2 may robustly safeguard existing extraction processes, it may unnecessarily lead to preclusion of extraction which could have been undertaken alongside existing extraction.</p> <p>Option 3 (which would expand Option 1 to give weight to the scarcest and most economically significant resources) would lead to greater positive impacts in relation to economic growth and addressing the needs of a changing population by ensuring a continuity of supply.</p> <p>Under each option, effects from displacement of development which would have taken place are uncertain as this will depend upon the stringency of any policy approach applied.</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that option 3 be pursued provided clarity is provided on how these issues will be considered through the planning application process and in what circumstances the policy may apply.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Id39 Supply of Vein Minerals				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id40 Safeguarding vein minerals				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id41 Borrow pits				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id42 Overall approach to the waste hierarchy				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Comment ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
Alternatives to both options 1 and 2 where incineration without recovery would not be supported	0548, 1900, 1842	or	Options 4 and 5 This approach would provide a variation on Options 1 and 2, hence providing 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> Options which replaces the text 'Incineration of waste without energy recovery would only be supported for the small scale incineration of specialised wastes	<p><b>Summary of assessment – Option 6 still to be assessed</b> Most of the options put forward would encourage more sustainable waste management, to varying degrees, by managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy. This tends to result in a range of positive effects on the climate change, material resources and</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			arising in the area and where the scale of the development would mean that energy recovery is not viable.’ In options 1 and 2 with ‘Incineration of waste would only be supported if there are plans to use the heat generated.’	<p>waste hierarchy objectives. There are also potential economic benefits, particularly where waste is managed higher up the waste hierarchy as this promotes a more ‘circular economy’ where waste is used as an economic resource. Other objectives often display more uncertain effects, as the waste facilities that might come on stream as a result of different options being pursued have effects that are dependent on location.</p> <p>Key exceptions to this pattern of impacts include options 3, 12 and 14, which although they seek to avoid landfilling waste, do not offer specific support for higher levels of the waste hierarchy (option 9 is similar, though this includes a steer against incineration). As such it is felt that some of the benefits associated with other options, such as the promotion of a more circular materials economy, become more uncertain, and the capacity for amenity impacts becomes greater.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> The SA considers that the most sustainable approach would be to pursue option 5. Option 13 could also be combined with option 5 or other options to maximise sustainability.</p>
Option 4 under which incineration, energy recovery and disposal would not be supported.	0079, 1020	or	Option 6 This option would provide support in principle for facilities which enable re-use, recycling and composting of waste however facilities for incineration, energy recovery and disposal would not be supported.	
<i>Alternatives to all 3 options or a new option 4 whereby incineration is the last resort</i>	2363, 1842, 2297, 2312	or	<p>Option 7: This option would help move waste up the waste hierarchy by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting in principle proposals which enable the re-use, recycling and composting of waste and supporting the principle of recovery of waste where it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable to manage the waste further up the hierarchy.</li> <li>• Supporting provision of new capacity for the landfill of biodegradable waste only where it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable to manage the waste further up the hierarchy and there is insufficient landfill capacity in the area to meet identified needs. Incineration of waste would only be supported where no other methods are possible.</li> <li>• In relation to inert waste, landfill would only be supported where it would facilitate a high standard of quarry reclamation in accordance with agreed reclamation objectives, or the substantial</li> </ul>	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>improvement of derelict or degraded land to a condition where it can be returned to agricultural productivity or other beneficial use.</p> <p>Option 8: This option would be similar to Option 4 but would give stronger encouragement to dealing with waste further up the hierarchy by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting in principle proposals which can demonstrate that the waste to be managed at the facility would be managed at the highest practicable level of the hierarchy appropriate to the type/s of waste to be dealt with.</li> <li>• Supporting provision of new capacity for the landfill of biodegradable waste only in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that it is the only practicable management option for the waste to be managed and there is insufficient capacity available within or outside the Plan area which could reasonably meet the need. Incineration of waste would only be supported where no other methods are possible.</li> <li>• In relation to inert waste, landfill would only be supported where it would facilitate a high standard of quarry reclamation in accordance with agreed reclamation objectives, or the substantial improvement of derelict or degraded land to a condition where it can be returned to agricultural productivity or other beneficial use.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>Option 9: This option would provide support in principle for proposals for a range of waste management methods where it can be demonstrated that the facility would help reduce reliance on landfill as a means of waste management. Incineration of waste would only be supported where no other methods are possible.</p> <p>Support in principle would also be provided for new landfill of waste where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would meet a need for additional landfill capacity not identified at the time of preparation of the Plan, or it would facilitate a high standard of quarry reclamation in accordance with agreed reclamation objectives, or the substantial improvement of derelict or degraded land to a condition where it can be returned to agricultural productivity or other beneficial use.</p>	
Alternatives to options 1 and 2 where landfill of biodegradable waste is not supported	0864	or	<p>Option 10: This option would help move waste up the waste hierarchy by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting in principle proposals which enable the re-use, recycling and composting of waste and supporting the principle of recovery of waste where it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable to manage the waste further up the hierarchy.</li> <li>• Landfill of biodegradable waste would not be supported. Incineration of waste without energy recovery would only be supported for the small scale incineration of specialised wastes arising in the area</li> </ul>	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>and where the scale of the development would mean that energy recovery is not viable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to inert waste, landfill would only be supported where it would facilitate a high standard of quarry reclamation in accordance with agreed reclamation objectives, or the substantial improvement of derelict or degraded land to a condition where it can be returned to agricultural productivity or other beneficial use.</li> </ul> <p>Option 11: This option would be similar to Option 4 but would give stronger encouragement to dealing with waste further up the hierarchy by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting in principle proposals which can demonstrate that the waste to be managed at the facility would be managed at the highest practicable level of the hierarchy appropriate to the type/s of waste to be dealt with.</li> <li>• Landfill of biodegradable waste would not be supported. Incineration of waste without energy recovery would only be supported for the small scale incineration of specialised wastes arising in the area and where the planning authority can be satisfied that the scale of the development would mean that energy recovery is not viable.</li> <li>• In relation to inert waste, landfill would only be supported where it would facilitate a high standard of quarry reclamation in accordance with agreed</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>reclamation objectives, or the substantial improvement of derelict or degraded land to a condition where it can be returned to agricultural productivity or other beneficial use.</p> <p>Option 12: This option would provide support in principle for proposals for a range of waste management methods where it can be demonstrated that the facility would help reduce reliance on landfill as a means of waste management. Landfill of biodegradable waste would not be supported.</p> <p>Support in principle would also be provided for new landfill of waste where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would meet a need for additional landfill capacity not identified at the time of preparation of the Plan, or it would facilitate a high standard of quarry reclamation in accordance with agreed reclamation objectives, or the substantial improvement of derelict or degraded land to a condition where it can be returned to agricultural productivity or other beneficial use.</p>	
4 <sup>th</sup> option where the main consideration is carbon emissions followed by the waste hierarchy	0223	or	<p>Option 13 Under this option the level of carbon emissions expected to be produced would be a key consideration, whilst also aiming to manage waste as far up the waste hierarchy as possible</p>	
4 <sup>th</sup> option under which landfill would not be permitted.	1844	or	<p>Option 14 This option would support diverting all waste away from landfill to be dealt with by other</p>	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			waste management methods.	
--	--	--	---------------------------	--

Id43 Strategic role of the Plan area in the management of waste				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed		And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
<i>An alternative which has the main aim of exporting waste</i>	1022, 0514, 0724, 1030, 0524, 0143, 0144, 1031, 0549, 0125, 0716, 0135, 0520, 1846, 1027, 0141, 0140, 0550	or	Option 4 This option would seek to increase the amount of waste exported and would only support the development of new facilities in the Plan area where it can be shown that the waste cannot be managed at facilities elsewhere and where the facility is of a scale to meet local needs.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>Whilst Option 1 would have positive effects in the Plan Area in terms of reducing transport miles and associated emissions (particularly in comparison to Option 2) and in supporting the economy and jobs, it is likely to have negative effects on most of the environment and community SA objectives. This is because it may require additional facilities with additional impacts. Option 2 essentially would maintain the status quo in terms of how waste is dealt with in the Plan Area as it would assume that exports and imports would continue in line with current levels. This would largely result in neutral effects on the Plan area and would derive a greater benefit from achieving economies of scale in waste management than would be achieved under option 1.</p> <p>Option 3 would largely maintain the status quo in terms of how waste is managed from the National Park, and this would have mainly neutral effects on the Plan Area and modest benefits for the Yorkshire Dales as it will allow the special qualities of the National Park to be maintained. .</p> <p>Option 4 would have some benefits for the Plan Area in the short and medium term, but would also export a range of negative impacts to areas outside of the</p>
<i>An alternative which minimises importation of waste</i>	0081	or	Option 5 – This option would be similar to Option 2 but, with the exception of waste from the Yorkshire Dales National Park, would not make any allowance for imports to the plan area.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>Plan Area. Some benefits in terms of resource use might be achieved through greater economies of scale through this option, while effects of major negative significance would be likely to occur in relation to transport, air pollution and climate change. The option would also export jobs to other areas.</p> <p>Option 5 may result in some benefits for the plan area in terms of the environmental and community SA objectives due to the reduced requirement for waste management facilities in the plan area. These impacts may however be displaced to authorities outside of the plan area.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that a combination of Options 1 and 2 which would enable facilities to be provided for in the plan area where this would lead to sustainability benefits such as reduced transportation distances) be followed along with Option 3.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Id44 Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Local Authority Collected Waste				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
Combine existing options	1800	Or	<p>Option 3 This option would combine Options 1 and 2 to give support to permitted facilities but also provide an element of flexibility if some of the permitted facilities were not operational.</p> <p>Wording: This option would support provision of adequate capacity for, and promote community responsibility in, management of LACW through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying the Allerton Park and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> There is some uncertainty as to the sustainability effects of all 3 options. This is largely because it is not known where all local authority collected waste management facilities will be located under the options.</p> <p>Although uncertain, there is potential for minor negative effects in relation to biodiversity, water, soils, air, the historic environment, landscape and community vitality under all options. In some cases, however, Options 2 and 3 may slightly lessen</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>Harewood Whin sites as strategic locations over the plan period for the management of LACW, including supporting the principle of an extension of time for disposal of waste via landfill in order to ensure utilisation of remaining capacity. In the case of the Harewood Whin site any proposals for new capacity involving built development would need to be judged against any relevant national and local green belt policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting the delivery of additional transfer station capacity for LACW to serve the needs of the City of York, Selby and Ryedale districts and, in addition, for Harrogate Borough if the Allerton Waste Recovery Park permission is not implemented.</li> <li>• Providing support in principle for proposals which would deliver increased capacity for the recycling, reprocessing and composting of LACW where this would reduce reliance on export of waste from the Plan area for recycling or reprocessing and subject to compliance with locational and other relevant policies to be identified in the Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting improvements to the Household Waste Recycling Centre network subject to compliance with locational and other relevant policies to be identified in the Plan.</p> <p>Support in principle would also be given for the development of other new capacity identified as necessary by the relevant</p>	<p>negative effects as they will potentially result in lower transport impacts as there is potentially more locational flexibility.</p> <p>There are also a number of positive effects. In particular, all options make a strong positive contribution to sustainable waste management and achieving sustainable economic growth, and there are climate change benefits associated with providing the supporting capacity to move waste up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>The sustainability appraisal has observed a slight preference for Option 3 as this combines the benefits of Option 1 and Option 2.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			Waste Management Authorities. It would need to be demonstrated that any such capacity is consistent with relevant national policy as well as any relevant policies in the Plan relating to moving waste up the hierarchy and the strategic role of the Plan in the management of waste, as well as relevant locational and development control policies in the Plan.	
--	--	--	--	--

Id45 Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Commercial and Industrial Waste (including hazardous C&I waste)				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
There should be a 3 <sup>rd</sup> option which would not support any new facilities for managing C&I waste.	0521, 0543, 0522	Or	Option 3 Under this option new facilities for managing C&I waste would not be supported.	<b>Summary of assessment</b> Options 1 and 2 would both provide significant benefits for the effective and sustainable management of Commercial and Industrial waste in line with the waste hierarchy and minimising waste to landfill. Both would also be positive for minimising the use of resources and creating positive effects for the economy in line with reducing costs associated with landfill, provision of energy from waste and the production of recycled materials. Option 2, is likely to have more positive implications in relation to transportation of waste given that it would support management of C&I arising from outside of the Plan area where it can be demonstrated that the location proposed would present the nearest appropriate installation for the waste to be dealt with. Overall, this would help to minimise journeys/mileage in relation to waste processing. The majority of other environmental and social effects are uncertain given that they would depend upon the scale, location and type of waste facility to be implemented, although negative effects may potentially be greater under Option 2 as more waste would be being managed in
An alternative option in relation to hazardous waste which would be restrictive in relation to provision of any new facilities	1327	and	Option 4 This option supports the management of hazardous waste at source unless it can be done in the region where it arises.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>the Plan area.</p> <p>Option 3 has a number of negative effects, particularly for areas adjacent to the plan area as environmental, social and economic effects are transplanted to other areas, particularly in the long term. Meanwhile, objectives related to transport, air pollution and climate change and the economy also show heightened longer term effects, though these apply for the Plan Area. Option 4 also has largely negative effects (with a few exceptions, such as the mixed positive and negative effects associated with the economy and community vitality SA objectives) caused mainly because self-sufficiency in managing hazardous waste would bring impacts that were previously exported back into the Plan Area, albeit at a relatively low level.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> On balance, and assuming that it can be effectively demonstrated to be consistent with other proposals within the plan, it is considered that Option 2 could be the most sustainable.</p>
--	--	--	--

Id46 Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste (including CD&E waste)				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
An alternative option in relation to hazardous waste which would be restrictive in relation to provision of any new facilities	1327	and	Option 3 This option supports the management of hazardous waste at source unless it is necessary to do otherwise	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Under both options 1 and 2 it is possible, although uncertain, that there could be negative effects on the environment and communities through provision of new facilities, whilst positive effects would be realised in relation to managing waste further up the waste hierarchy and using resources efficiently.</p> <p>Option 2 would potentially increase negative effects</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>relating to transport through importing wastes from elsewhere but in turn this may result in greater positives through facilitating high quality reclamation of former quarries.</p> <p>Option 3 would, in addition to the effects of other options, have a number of uncertain or minor negative effects. This is generally due to the effect that creating capacity to deal with hazardous construction materials would have on the plan area, for instance if a new specialist landfill facility is needed to be built, which through its use of land and its potential to generate negative public perceptions, would have a range of environmental, social and economic effects depending on location.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that on balance Option 2 would be more sustainable as it would provide greater opportunity for securing enhancements to former quarries. There is considerable uncertainty over the effects of climate change on option 3, which if pursued should be considered</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Id47 Managing Agricultural waste				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id48 Managing Low Level (Non-Nuclear) Radioactive waste				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Id49 Managing Waste Water (Sewage Sludge)				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id50 Managing Power Station Ash				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
An option should support landfilling power station ash with inert material.	0577	or	Option 2 This option would support the disposal of power station ash along with inert material in landfill.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>There are some minor negative effects of option 1 on biodiversity, water, local air quality and the historic environment, as well as less certain minor negative effects on landscape, community vitality (for which there are also some positive effects associated with employment) and health and wellbeing associated with this option, arising out of localised problems such as dust generation, possible runoff / leachate and traffic. These may however be offset to a degree by positive environmental and social effects, particularly in relation to reduced land take, resulting from lower levels of primary minerals extraction should support for use of power station ash result in less demand / need for this. There are some major positive effects associated with climate change, minimising the use of resources and minimising waste generation resulting from the potential for power station ash to reduce demand for primary aggregates, and minor positive effects associated with the economy and meeting the needs of the population.</p> <p>Option 2 supports disposal of power station ash in landfill. Although there is considerable uncertainty in the assessment, as much depends on the location of landfill sites chosen, this option displays a broad range of social, environmental and economic negative effects. In particular the Sustainability</p>



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>Appraisal highlights concerns over the potential costs and effects of transporting potentially large volumes to landfill sites, which could also make landfill sites more quickly reach capacity. At the same time power station ash, which could potentially be utilised as a saleable product in the future, will be lost from the economy forever when mixed with landfill.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> If option 1 is pursued, mitigation measures around dust, water pollution and traffic can be strengthened through policies in the plan. Option 2 is not recommended as it is seen as broadly unsustainable.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id51 Overall locational principles for provision of new waste capacity				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
<p>Supports a combination of Option 1 and part of Option 2 in relation to the part of Option 2 which refers to strategic facilities being located where transport impacts can be minimised</p> <p>An alternative to options 1, 2 and 3 which would resemble option 1 plus the final bullet point of option 2</p>	0262	or	<p>Option 5 This option would combine Option 1 with the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Option 2</p> <p>Wording This option would seek to ensure that sufficient waste management capacity is provided through a combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making best use of the existing facility network, for example by supporting provision of increased capacity at existing waste management facilities unless there would be unacceptable environmental or local amenity impacts.</li> <li>• Supporting the provision of capacity at new sites (i.e. sites not currently in use for waste management purposes) where the facility would contribute to meeting needs identified in the Plan</li> </ul>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Options 1, 2, 3, and 5 have a number of similarities and are likely to result in a number of positive effects associated with the minimisation of the land and associated infrastructure footprint through maximising use of existing sites and the reduction of transport miles, which is significantly better for Options 2, 3 and 5 than Option 1.</p> <p>Option 6 has the potential to result in a number of positive effects due to its emphasis on minimising effects on the environment however it is noted that this could detract from economic benefits.</p> <p>Options 4 and 7 are considered alongside other options and so cannot be directly compared to them. Option 4 would have overall positive effects on landscape, biodiversity, cultural heritage and on recreational opportunities through protecting the</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			<p>and the site meets any more detailed waste site identification criteria contained in the Plan (see subsequent options).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For facilities expected to play a wider strategic role (i.e. serving catchments covering a substantial part of the Plan area) these should be located where overall transportation impacts would be minimised taking into account the market area expected to be served by the facility.</li> </ul>	<p>National Park and AONBs. However, it also shows some potential for minor negative effects in relation to transport generated and where it would displace major development to other parts of the Plan area. Option 7 has broadly positive effects particularly in relation to the efficient use of land (objective 5). Some potential for negative effects in relation to the extension/intensification of activity at existing sites has also been noted.</p> <p>Uncertainty is noted with several objectives as the extent of impacts is often dependent on the other detailed waste site identification criteria contained in the Plan / the final location of sites, which is uncertain until options for this have been decided upon.</p>
An option which provides more flexibility than existing options 1, 2 and 3 with the main focus being on environmental protection.	1029, 0142	or	<p>Option 6 This option would seek to ensure that sufficient waste management capacity is provided through directing facilities to locations where impacts on the environment can be minimised, as determined by consideration against Development Management policies.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b> Broadly options 2 and 3 and 5 perform best against the SA framework, as Option 2 performs well in terms of supporting a more even spread of economic benefits whilst Options 3 and 5 perform better in terms of effects on communities. The SA would support any of these options being taken forward.</p>
Expansion of existing sites should be preferable to development of new sites.	1327	and	<p>Option 7 This option would work alongside either of options 1, 2 or 3 and would require proposals for new facilities to demonstrate that it is not possible or feasible to provide for additional capacity at existing sites.</p>	

Id52 Waste site identification principles				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id53 Waste management facility safeguarding				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

assessed	ID			
<p>An option which focuses on ensuring both strategic and non-strategic facilities are safeguarded.</p>	<p>0566, 0264, 0316</p>	<p>or</p>	<p>Option 3 Under this option all waste management facilities would be safeguarded. Other forms of development that may prejudice the operation of these facilities would not be supported without overriding justification.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> It is not possible to identify effects against a number of environmental sustainability objectives without knowing the nature of any proposed development or alternative locations for either this or displaced waste management facilities. Option 1 would provide positive effects against waste management objectives by providing certainty over safeguarding these facilities throughout the Plan period however Option 2 may perform better against wider economic objectives by providing a greater element of flexibility in decision making. Relying on national policies provides uncertainties in the longer term should national policy be amended or replaced (further to the existing proposed updated national waste planning policy).</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 would have similar uncertain effects arising out of the fact that other development would be displaced by safeguarded existing or planned waste development although option 4 would apply to a slightly broader range of sites than option 3. Slightly more certainty is observed in relation to transport and climate change which have uncertain to positive affects arising out of the fact that these safeguarded sites, having already had to operate as commercial concerns are slightly more likely than not to be reasonably well placed in terms of accessibility to sources / markets. They would also have mixed economic effects because if so many sites, large and small, operational and closed, were safeguarded there would be less flexibility over the locational choices made by other development.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that Option 1 be adopted as this</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

			would support the overall approach to provision of waste management facilities in the Plan area in line with other policies in this Plan.
--	--	--	---

Id54 Transport infrastructure			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id55 Transport infrastructure safeguarding			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id56 Locations for ancillary minerals infrastructure			
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
		No alternative options	

Id57 Minerals ancillary infrastructure safeguarding				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Respondent ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
Need an option where areas with potential for surface infrastructure which is related to gas extraction should be safeguarded.	1246, 1255	and	This option would safeguard the surface infrastructure for oil and gas developments.	<p><b>Summary of Assessment</b></p> <p>Option 1 is likely to have economic benefits through enabling choice for minerals operators. However, it is possible that pursuing this option may result in the creation of vacant sites with associated effects on landscape and community safety and wellbeing. Option 2 has similar effects, though at a lower scale. Options 3 and, most significantly, 4 are likely to create more flexibility around future alternative uses</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>for these sites than Option 1, with Option 4 providing the most economic benefits in this respect.</p> <p>The addition of Option 5 is likely to result in some minor positive effects in relation to encouraging safeguarding, achieving sustainable economic growth and efficient land use.</p> <p>All of the options are likely to have uncertain social and environmental impacts, dependent upon the nature of any displaced development.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> On balance, it is considered that Option 4 combined with Option 5 would have the most sustainability benefits. However, Option 4 (or a combined option 4 /5) would benefit from considering which sites have the most potential for continuing use in the future.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id58 Presumption in favour of sustainable minerals and waste development				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id59 Local amenity and cumulative impacts				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id60 Transport of minerals and waste and associated traffic impacts				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
An alternative to options 1 and	0879	or	Option 4	<b>Summary of assessment</b>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

<p>2 which is a combination of options 1 and 2 where the option 2 element only relates to waste and non-energy minerals developments.</p>			<p>This option would give priority to proposals for minerals and waste development which would enable transport of minerals and waste via a sustainable (non-road) transport mode. Proposals for waste and non-energy minerals developments should demonstrate that the development would, taking into account minerals resource constraints where relevant, be well located in relation to sources of arisings or markets and in relation to suitable road networks.</p>	<p>Option 1 is likely to have a number of positive environmental and social effects through reducing use of road vehicles, though for some objectives there may also be some local negative impacts if the option requires new infrastructure (such as pipelines) to be built. Option 1 could also have implications for minerals supply due to relatively low availability of alternative modes of transport across the Plan area. Option 2 is likely to have greater positive economic effects through providing a more flexible approach although may result in effects on air quality, noise and vibration on local communities. Option 3 would result in additional positive effects for the local environment, climate change and communities where used in conjunction with Option 1 or 2.</p> <p>Option 4 would have impacts that are broadly similar to a combination of options 1 and 2 and potentially has greater benefits in terms of an overall reduction in traffic and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as it presents opportunities for both sustainable location and sustainable mode, though like many other options there is considerable uncertainty in the assessment. It may also be more restrictive than some other options generating possible negative effect on the economy SA objective.</p> <p>Option 5 is much more negative than other options, as this will broadly allow a continuation of current trends in transport which will work against several of the SA objectives (e.g. climate change / air pollution / wellbeing).</p> <p>Option 6 is broadly positive in relation to most SA objectives, and particularly the climate change</p>
<p>A 4<sup>th</sup> option whereby there is no requirement for minerals to be extracted close to markets.</p>	<p>0985, 1506</p>	<p>or</p>	<p>Option 5 This option would not seek to give preferential consideration to proposals which would include non-road modes of transport.</p>	
<p>A further 'or' option whereby greenhouse gas emissions from transport are a key consideration</p>	<p>2275, 0646, 2194, 1230, 1929</p>	<p>or</p>	<p>Option 6 This option would support proposals where the proposed transportation method is that which would result in the lowest greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>objective, though may also lead to some negative effects, e.g. if future improvements in alternative fuels allow high levels of low carbon vehicles to continue to be used.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> Option4 combined with option 3 are considered to be most sustainable. .</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id61 North York Moors National Park and AONBs

Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box

Id62 Minerals and waste development in the Green Belt

Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> option where national policy would be followed but also development would be permitted in the Green Belt if it could be proved it had to be located there.	1330	or	<p>Option 4 This option would support development within the Green Belt where it can be demonstrated that the location is required for operational reasons.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Option 1 is likely to have positive effects on the landscape and historic environment as they are part of the reason for local Green Belt designation. However, this may result in effects on the economy and minerals supply through potentially restricting extraction in the Green Belt. Under Option 2 there would be no local policy basis for the consideration of minerals proposals in the Green Belt so effects would, by default, be the same as option 1, although with greater uncertainty as to what the policy framework would be.</p> <p>Option 1 may have implications for provision of sufficient waste management facilities around York and the southern part of the Plan area. However, Option 2 would enable a more flexible approach which would deal with these issues, although could</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>result in effects similar to Option 1 on the landscape and historic character and setting of the historic towns and cities. Similarly, Option 3 would have a flexible approach to location using existing sites in the greenbelt. This option may have positive implications for land use efficiency and potentially minimise additional adverse effects on the landscape and historic environment although it is acknowledged that it may also reduce opportunities where alternative locations in the Green Belt may be preferable.</p> <p>Option 4 has the potential to result in negative impacts upon cultural heritage and landscape as it would support development that would conflict with the purpose and beneficial use of the Green Belt designation where it can be shown that development is required in that location for operational purposes. This may however lead to some positive effects in relation to the economy, transport and addressing the needs of a changing population as it would enable necessary development.</p> <p><b>Revised Recommendations</b> It is recommended that option 1 is pursued for minerals and option 3 pursued for waste. However, to minimise the effects on the green belt, more specific criteria could be developed, particularly in relation to waste sites in option 3, to address outstanding concerns regarding the historic character and landscape setting.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Id63 Landscape				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	



Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Id64 Biodiversity and geodiversity				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
5 <sup>th</sup> option where biodiversity offsetting doesn't apply in statutory protected sites	1746	and	Option 5 Under this option biodiversity offsetting would not be applied where harm relates to international and national statutory protected sites.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>Whilst Option 1 would enable a level of protection and enhancement to be afforded to biodiversity and geodiversity, it would not provide direct links with meeting the objectives or local priorities established for example through the Local Nature Partnership and the local Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans. Option 2 would have greater benefits for biodiversity in the Joint Plan by linking with local objectives. In the longer term effects under Option 1 would be uncertain as the implications of any future changes to national policy are unknown</p> <p>Both Option 3 and Option 4, where considered together with earlier options, would enable gains to be made for biodiversity which are not currently realised, yet option 3 would have greater benefits in terms of contributing to biodiversity objectives in the Joint Plan area on the basis that offsetting is not considered to be a means of making the development itself acceptable.</p> <p>Option 5 would reduce the benefits provided by either Option 3 or 4.</p> <p>Whilst Option 6 would provide the greatest benefits for biodiversity within the Plan area, it could reduce the availability of minerals and the possibilities for providing waste facilities, and possibly displace effects to elsewhere.</p> <p><b>Revised Recommendations</b></p> <p>It is recommended that options 2 and 3 be followed but that reference is included to ensuring that any</p>
5 <sup>th</sup> alternative option to options 1 and 2 where there should be no overall loss to biodiversity	1351 / 1386 / 1643 / 1387	or	Option 6 Under this option development would not be permitted where there would be overall losses to biodiversity.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				offsetting includes consideration of replacing the community and climate regulation value attached to the biodiversity of the site to be developed.
--	--	--	--	---

Id65 Historic environment				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
4 <sup>th</sup> 'or' option as an alternative to option 3 whereby the setting of all historic settlements in the Plan area are protected, not just York	1199	or	Option 4 In conjunction with either Option 1 or Option 2, this option would seek to protect the setting of the City of York and other historic settlements in the Plan area by supporting proposals which do not compromise their settings.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>All of the options would provide positive effects for both the historic environment and landscape of the Plan area. Option 1 would present an element of uncertainty as the implications of any future revisions to national policy are unknown. Option 2 would have greater positive effects through the requirement for enhancements. Options 3 and 4, where used together with earlier options, would have significant positive effects for the setting of the City of York (option 3 and 4) and other historic settlements (option 4).</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>In order to maximise the protection of the historic environment but also balance the economic needs of providing flexible choices, the SA recommends that option 1 and option 4 are taken forward. However, there would need to be further work undertaken on this latter option to define 'historic settlement'.</p>

Id66 Water environment				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

Id67 Strategic approach to reclamation and afteruse				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
Alternative option whereby there is a presumption in favour of 'restoration' before other options are considered to be acceptable.	1573,	or	Option 3 This option would require restoration of a site to its previous use and condition. Only where this is not possible consideration would be given to alternative reclamation and afteruse proposals as set out under Options 1 and 2.	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b></p> <p>Option 1 is likely to lead to a range of positive environmental and social effects, including in relation to biodiversity, air and water quality, soils and agricultural land, landscape and reusing materials, with particularly strong positive effects recorded in relation to mitigating and adapting to climate change and engaging with communities. Uncertain effects are recorded in relation to sustainable waste management as the option provides less scope for wastes other than those generated on site to be used in reclamation with uncertain implications for the management of other wastes.</p> <p>Acting in combination with Option 1, Option 2 is likely to result in stronger positive effects for biodiversity, agricultural land and soils, climate change adaptation (specifically reducing potential for flooding), the historic environment, landscape and opportunities for recreation. Minor negative effects may be observed in relation to impacts from transport should new areas for recreation in National Parks and AONBs be created, as these are generally distant from populations. However, these effects are unlikely to be significant due to the low level of extraction activity in these areas.</p> <p>Option 3 would have a range of largely minor positive and negative effects on the environment and society. For instance, restoration to, what would usually be farmed land, would be likely to miss some of the associated features of farmed land such as historic field patterns. It may also have</p>
3 <sup>rd</sup> 'and' option where options 1 and 2 would not apply to oil and gas developments.	0805	or	Option 4 This option would require restoration of oil and gas sites to their previous use and condition.	

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				<p>benefits, such as a benefit to food security highlighted under the climate change adaptation objective.</p> <p>Option 4 would have similar effects to option 3, only at a smaller scale for oil and gas sites. It would also have uncertain effect related to which option it would work alongside.</p> <p><b>Revised Recommendations</b> It is recommended that both options 1 and 2 be followed. .</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Id68 Sustainable design, construction and operation of development				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id69 Other key criteria for minerals and waste development				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

Id70 Developments proposed within Mineral Safeguarding Areas				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
Promotes an additional bullet point to option 1 of id70 which states that 'consideration should be given to whether the mineral is likely to be needed' <i>(This addition to Option 1 provides an alternative and so</i>	0312	or	<p>Option 5 This option is the same as Option 1 but with an additional bullet point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given to whether the mineral is likely to be needed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> It is difficult to predict the effects with any certainty as this would depend on the particular circumstances of each case as to whether the development would or would not cause unacceptable sterilisation of the mineral. Potential negative effects from each of the</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

<p><i>needs to be assessed.)</i></p>				<p>options include effects on the economy of potentially precluding certain developments from taking place, although effects under Option 5 would be likely to be less significant than under Option 1. However the exemptions provided under Option 2 would help to ensure that certain developments could still take place. Considered together with either Option 1, Option 2 or Option 5, Option 3 is considered to be more beneficial in terms of the SA's resource safeguarding objective than Option 4, as it provides more certainty over the types of development where safeguarding deep mineral resources would be relevant and it also refers to safeguarding potash.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that a combination of Options 5, 2 and 3 are pursued.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Id71 Consideration of applications in Mineral Consultation Areas				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
<p>2<sup>nd</sup> 'and' Option whereby safeguarded mineral infrastructure and ancillary development is included in MCAs</p>	<p>1526</p>	<p>and</p>	<p>Option 2 Under this option minerals infrastructure and ancillary development would be included within Mineral Consultation Areas.</p>	<p><b>Summary of assessment</b> Both options score positively by adding additional certainty over the process of operating the Minerals Safeguarding Areas policy, thus ensuring minerals are not sterilised by development being given permission by district or borough councils.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> It is recommended that the combination of both options be pursued to ensure that the Minerals Safeguarding Area policy and</p>

Identification of alternative options and progression to preferred options

				safeguarding of infrastructure and ancillary development is applied consistently across the Joint Plan area.
--	--	--	--	--

Id72 Coal mining legacy				
Proposed alternatives to be assessed	Response ID	And/or	Option wording	Revised SA summary for id box
			No alternative options	

## Contact us

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Team Planning Services, North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AH

Tel: **01609 780780** Email: **[mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk)**