

**Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit
Joint Minerals and Waste Development
Framework
Core Strategy Submission**

**Sustainability Appraisal Final Report
Appendices**

September 2008

If you would like help understanding this document or would like to receive the Document in a different format then please ask an English speaking person to Telephone 01628 796518

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਲਿਖਤ ਸਮਝਣ ਲਈ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ ਜਾਂ ਇਸਨੂੰ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦੇ ਹੋ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਅੰਗਰੇਜ਼ੀ ਬੋਲਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਨੂੰ 01628 796518 ਤੇ ਫੋਨ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਕਹੋ। (Punjabi)

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کو سمجھنے کیلئے مدد درکار ہو یا آپ یہ دستاویز کسی اور شکل میں حاصل کرنا چاہیں تو براہ مہربانی کسی انگریزی بولنے والے شخص کو 01628 796518 پر ٹیلیفون کرنے کیلئے کہیں۔ (Urdu)

Joint Strategic Planning Unit
St Mary's House
c/o Town Hall
St Ives Road
Maidenhead SL6 1RF

Email : minerals.waste@rbwm.gov.uk
Tel: 01628 796518
Fax: 01628 796739

Appendix A Consultation

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Consultation	2
APPENDIX B	Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Responses Report	7
APPENDIX C	Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Report and Detailed Mineral and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report Consultation Responses	39
APPENDIX D	Baseline Information	61
APPENDIX E	Compatibility of SA objectives with Core Strategy Preferred Options Objectives	81
APPENDIX F	Forecasting the effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Submitted Policies	84
APPENDIX G	Forecasting the effect of the Core Strategy Waste Submitted Policies	111

Appendix A Consultation

Appendix A Consultation

The following organisations were amongst those consulted on the SA Scoping Report and SA Report. A full list can be obtained on request from the JSPU.

Statutory Environmental Bodies

Countryside Agency (Now Natural England)
English Nature (Now Natural England)
English Heritage
The Environment Agency

Government (National/Regional/Local)

Communities and Local Government (CLG)
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
Government Office of the South East (GOSE)
Ministry of Defence
Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Reading Borough Council
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Slough Borough Council
Wokingham Borough Council
West Berkshire District Council
Buckinghamshire County Council
Hampshire County Council
London Borough of Hillingdon
Oxfordshire County Council
Surrey County Council
Wiltshire County Council
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
Hart District Council
Kennet District Council
Runnymede District Council
S Bucks District Council
S Oxfordshire District Council
Spelthorne District Council
Surrey Heath District Council
Swindon Bough Council
Test Valley District Council
Vale of White Horse District Council
Wycombe District Council

Appendix A Consultation

Berkshire Parish Councils:

Aldermaston	East Ilsley	Sonning	Wasing
Aldworth	Enborne	Speen	West Woodhay
Arborfield & Newland	Englefield	Stanford Dingley	Winterbourne
Ashampstead	Eton	Stratfield Mortimer	Wokefield
Barkham	Finchampstead	Streatley	Caversham
Basildon	Frilsham	Sulham	Battle
Beech Hill	Grazeley	Sulhamstead	Tilehurst
Beedon	Great Shefford	Sunningdale	Southcote
Beenham	Greenham	Sunninghill	Tilehurst
Binfield	Hamstead Marshall	Swallowfield	Newtown
Bisham	Hampstead Norreys	Thatcham	Southcote
Boxford	Hermitage	Theale	Katesgrove
Bracknell	Holybrook	Tidmarsh With Sulham	Newtown
Bradfield	Horton	Tilehurst	
Bray	Hungerford	Twyford	
Brightwalton	Hurley	Ufton Nervet	
Brimpton	Inkpen	Waltham St Lawrence	
Britwell	Kintbury	Warfield	
Bucklebury	Lambourne	Wargrave	
Burghfield	Leckhampstead	Welford	
Chaddleworth	Midgham	West Ilsley	
Charvil	Newbury	Wexham Court	
Chieveley	<u>Old Windsor</u>	White Waltham	
Cold Ash	Padworth	Winkfield	
Colnebrooke With Poyle	Pangbourne	Winnersh	
Combe	Peasemore	Wokingham	
Compton	Purley On Thames	Wokingham Without	
Cookham	Remenham	Woodley	
Cox Green	Ruscombe	Woolhampton	
Crowthorne	St Nicholas Hurst	Wraysbury	
Datchet	Sandhurst	Yattendon	
Earley	Shaw Cum Donnington	Catmore	
East Garston	Shinfield	Farnborough & Fawley	
		Shottesbrooke	

Appendix A Consultation

Parish councils adjoining Berkshire

Ardington and Lockhinge Parish Council	and Bishops Green Parish Council	Moulsford Parish Council
Ashbury Parish Council	Eversley Parish Council	Newtown Parish Council
Ashford Hill with Headley Parish Council	Eye & Dunsden Parish Council	Pamber Parish Council
Aston Tirrold Parish Council	Facombe Parish Meeting	Ramsbury Parish Council
Aston Upthorpe Parish Council	Farnham Royal Parish Council	Shalbourne Parish Council
Baughurst Parish Council	Fawley Parish Council	Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council
Baydon Parish Council	Froxfield Parish Council	Shiplake Parish Council
Bix & Assendon Parish Council	Goring Parish Council	South Stoke Parish Council
Blackwater & Hawley Town Council	Great Marlow Parish Council	Sparsholt Parish Council
Blewbury Parish Council	Ham Parish Council	Stoke Poges Parish Council
Bramshill Parish Council	Hambleden Parish Council	Stratfield Saye Parish Council
Britwell Parish Council	Harpsden Parish Council	Tadley Town Council
Burghclere Parish Council	Heckfield Parish Council	Taplow Parish Council
Burnham Parish Council	Hedsor Parish Council	Uffington Parish Council
Buttermere Parish Council	Henley-on-Thames Town Council	Upton Parish Council
Childrey Parish Council	Highclere Parish Council	Wantage Parish Council
Chilton Foliat Parish Council	Iver Parish Councils	West Hendred Parish Council
Chilton Parish Council	Kidmore End Parish Council,	Wexham Parish Council
Chobham Parish Council	Kingston Lisle and Fawler Parish Council	Whitchurch-On-Thames Parish Council
Cholsey Parish Council	Letcome Bassett Parish Council	Windlesham Parish Council
Clerk to Burghfield Parish Council	Linkenholt Parish Council	Wooburn Parish Council
Compton Beauchamp Parish Council	Little Marlow Parish Council	Woolstone Parish Meeting
Dorney Parish Councils	Mapledurham Parish Council,	Yateley Town Council
East Hendred Parish Council	Marlow Town Parish Council	
East Woodhay Parish Council	Medmenham Parish Council	
Ecchinswell, Sydmonton	Mortimer West End Parish Council	

Regional Organisations

South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)
South East Economic Development Agency (SEEDA)

Local Organisations

Thames Valley Economic Records Centre (TVERC)
Berkshire, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
Friends of the Earth (FOE)
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

Appendix A Consultation

Main Libraries where the documents were available

Bracknell Central Library	Town Square Bracknell RG12 1BH 01344 423149	Mon 9.30 -5.00 Tues 9.30 -7.00 Wed 9.30 -5.00 Thurs 9.30 -7.00 Fri 9.30 -7.00 Sat 9.30 -4.00
Maidenhead	St Ives Road, Maidenhead SL6 1QU 01628 796 969	Mon 9.30 -5.00 Tues 9.30 -8.00 Wed 9.30 -5.00 Thurs 9.30 - 8.00 Fri 9.30 -7.00 Sat 9.30 - 4.00
Newbury	The Wharf Newbury RG14 5AU 01635 519900	Mon 9.00 -7.00 Tues 9.00 -7.00 Wed 9.00 -5.00 Thurs 9.00 -7.00 Fri 9.00 -5.00 Sat 9.00 -4.30
Reading Central	Abbey Square Kings Road Reading RG1 3BQ 0118 901 5950	Mon 9.30 -5.30 Tues 9.30 -7.00 Wed 9.30 -5.00 Thurs 9.30 -7.00 Fri 9.30 -5.30 Sat 9.30 -5.00
Slough	High Street Slough SL1 1EA 01753 535166	Mon 9.00 -5.00 Tues 9.00 -7.00 Wed 9.30 -7.00 Thurs 9.00 - 5.00 Fri 9.00 -7.00 Sat 9.00 - 4.00
Wokingham	Denmark St Wokingham RG40 2BB 0118 9781368	Mon 9.30 -7.00 Tues 9.30 -5.00 Wed 9.30 -1.00 Thurs 9.30 - 8.00 Fri 9.30 -5.00 Sat 9.30 - 4.00

**Appendix B
Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit
Minerals and Waste Development Documents
Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental
Assessment Scoping Responses Report**

May 2006

JMW 200C

Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report Analysis of Consultation Responses

The objective of this report is to provide an analysis of the responses received to the Scoping Report Consultation.

Responses to Consultation

The purpose of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to ensure that sustainability issues are considered during the preparation and adoption of Local Development Documents.

The Joint Minerals and Waste Development Document Core Strategy Issues and Options is the first document in the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework (JMWLDF) to be subjected to an SA.

The first stage of the SA is to produce a Scoping Report. The Scoping Report is an opportunity to agree the scope and overall level of detail of the SA. The Scoping Report was completed in January 2006 and the consultation period on the Report extended from 16th January 2006 – 20th February 2006.

238 organisations were consulted during this period and of these organisations 36 responded. (15%)

The SA Scoping Report invited comments on 10 questions.

For an analysis of the responses please see Appendix 1.

The table overelaf summarises the responses made by the 36 organisations and provides a commentary from the JSPU on how the responses have or have not influenced subsequent changes to the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Appendix 3 shows how the Scoping Report has been amended.

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Name of Organisation	Comments
Newbury Town Council	Questionnaire returned no comments made
Dorney Parish Council	Questionnaire returned no comments made

Question 1 Do you think any plans or programmes should be added or deleted from the list in Scoping Report Appendix 1? If so please give the name of the Plan, who wrote it and why you think it should be included / deleted.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Wokingham District Council	No		Noted	No change
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No		Noted	No change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	No		Noted	No change
Swallowfield Parish Council	No		Noted	No change
Countryside Agency	Yes	Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland April 2002 (CAX 84) should be taken into consideration	The Scoping Report considers the findings of the Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment 2003. The Report states 'that necessary developments are sensitively designed and located to reflect local character and that decisions will be informed by an understanding of that character of the landscape.'	No Change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	Government Code for Sustainable Homes Legislation Dec 2005	The JMWLDF has no control over the sustainability of homes.	No change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	Government Consultation on Sustainable Homes Feb 2006	The JMWLDF has no control over the sustainability of homes.	No change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	Yvette Cooper letter to Richard Benyon MP about Marley's predicament on 27/7/2005. 'It makes good sense in sustainability terms to secure local supplies of aggregate if environmental circumstances permit. That is one of the matters considered by MPAs when developing and implementing policy,	PPS 10 removes the proximity principle. However, sustainability in relation to minerals and waste operations is one of the key considerations of the JMWLDF already and greater clarity of this issue will be made in subsequent documents.	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 1 (Cont) Do you think any plans or programmes should be added or deleted from the list in Scoping Report Appendix 1? If so please give the name of the Plan, who wrote it and why you think it should be included / deleted.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Marley Building Materials	Yes	Regional Minerals Strategy Policy M1 (on sustainable construction) refers to identifying sustainable supply routes and seeking to reduce delivery distances. Policy M3 refers to the proximity principle in relation to recycling and re-use of minerals or mineral substitutes.	The policies in RPG9 and the emerging SE Plan have been fully included in the preparation of the JMWLDF	No change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	West Berkshire Local Plan Para 4.5.5 which states that 'the Council is prepared, however, to acknowledge the special nature of Marley's operation and the particular value of its employment base and treat reasonable proposals for its own operational needs and expansion both within and adjacent to the defined area sympathetically.'	This is a site specific comment and is best addressed by the Minerals Preferred Areas and DC Policies DPD.	No change
English Nature	Yes	<p>European Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and Birds Directive (79/09/EEC), which protect this site. These two European Directives are transposed into UK legislation in the form of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (often referred to as the 'Habitats Regulations'). We would suggest that this piece of legislation also be included.</p> <p>Of particular note is the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. This SPA comprises 13 SSSIs and potentially affects plans in Bracknell Forest, Wokingham and Windsor and Maidenhead. The Habitats Regulations require that any plan or project that is likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the SPA would require an appropriate assessment of the effects of that plan or project on the conservation objectives of the site. That said, it is not presently Government policy to consider Development Plans as such plans or projects in the context of regulation 48 of the Habitats Regulations. However, we would also refer you to the recent ruling of the European Court of Justice in <i>Commission v United Kingdom, Case C-6/04(20/10/05)</i> confirming that land use plans fall within the scope of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, and thus within regulation 48 of the Habitats Regulations.</p>	<p>The Habitats Regulations legislation should be taken into consideration in the SA Report as it affects a large part of the area covered by the DPD.</p> <p>A separate scoping exercise on the need for a Habitats Appropriate Assessment (AA), will be carried out during the site selection process if required. This will be considered for both the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and the Thatcham Reed Beds Special Area of Conservation.</p>	Yes

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

**Question 2 Do you agree that the baseline data collected/suggested in Scoping Report Appendix 2 is appropriate?
If no please give reasons**

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No	Objective 3: Lack of information may lead to expensive errors	The data used throughout the Scoping Report is the most up to date currently available from the Environment Agency and others. The difficult of accessing more accurate data has been documented in the Joint Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report Dec 2005.	No change
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No	Objective 6: Net contribution of wind	The JMWLDF has no control over the net contribution of wind.	No change
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No	Objective 20: Flytipping and litter is increasing very fast. No data – should estates report to authorities?	Comment is not relevant for inclusion in the Scoping Report. By its very nature fly tipping will have an adverse effect on the environment. The JMWLDF seeks to provide the planning framework by which sufficient facilities can be provided to eliminate fly tipping. However, in the meantime, all incidents of fly tipping should be reported to the relevant local authority waste team.	No change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

**Question 2 (Cont) Do you agree that the baseline data collected/suggested in Appendix 2 is appropriate?
If no please give reasons**

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Marley Building Materials	No	<p>The data collected on mineral availability relates primarily to historic production rates rather than current availability. MPG6 (para 80) says: <i>"Authorities should have regard to the balance of real need and real supply"</i>.</p> <p>Para 83 says that :</p> <p><i>"In considering the extent to which the landbank requirement and the actual landbank represent real need and real supply the MPA should consider</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>actual levels of production in recent years</i> 2. <i>local apportionment</i> 3. <i>whether the particular nature and qualities of the aggregate concerned, such as sustainability for particular end use not met by other available resources in the area or region justifies granting permission</i> 4. <i>whether there are known constraints in the availability of permitted reserves."</i> <p>In short there are four sets of data required.</p> <p>The letter from The Minister, Yvette Cooper, referred to earlier, also makes clear that a deficit of available material of a particular type or quality would be a reason for additional planning permissions.</p> <p>All of these provisions make excellent sense since there is little point in planning to produce materials sustainably, if the flow of such materials fails and forces imports from other less sustainable sources.</p> <p>Therefore a key indicator of sustainability is constancy of supply, and data collection should be capable of ensuring that the MPA can manage this. As is also clear, real need relates to the operational requirements of the user. In construction manufacturing long term supplies are necessary in order to justify investment – for example in waste recycling strategies. The MPA should survey users to establish a database of need and make sure that real supplies align with this real need.</p>	<p>The data used throughout the Scoping Report is the most up to date currently available from the Environment Agency and others. The difficulty of accessing more accurate data has been documented in the Joint Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report Dec 2005.</p> <p>The issues relating to sustainability of materials refers to more site specific policies and is more appropriately dealt with under the Joint Minerals Preferred Areas and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	No change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

**Question 2 (Cont) Do you agree that the baseline data collected/suggested in Scoping Report Appendix 2 is appropriate?
If no please give reasons**

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
English Nature	No	In terms of indicators, you have listed area and number of designated and non-designated sites as well as the quality of sites. From the point of view of targets for these, it is relevant that the area and number of designated sites is unlikely to change, as there is currently no general policy of designating further sites.	Agree, therefore since there is no policy of designating further sites then the number and area of designated sites should be removed as an indicator for Objective 15.	Yes
English Nature	No	As far as site quality is concerned, English Nature is working towards Government PSA targets of restoring 95% of the area of SSSIs to a favourable condition by 2010 and this might be a useful target to include. Data regarding the condition of designated sites is also available on English Nature's website, www.natureonthemap.org.uk .	The views of the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC) have been sought and it has been agreed that this could be a meaningful target. It should be noted that the TVERC undertake environmental monitoring on behalf of the JSPU.	Yes
English Nature	No	I also note that non-statutory sites of local nature conservation importance have been listed as indicators. Local authorities do have a duty to give appropriate consideration to this when considering any planning applications, and the majority of these sites contain habitats for which the Government has a duty of conservation under Section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and PPG9 emphasises the importance that government places on these types of site which play an essential role in sustaining the diversity of our natural heritage; one of the four cornerstones of sustainable development. The protection of these non-statutory sites is supported by Local Plan policies. Furthermore, the increasing significance that is presently being given to the protection of these sites should be taken into account. This is reflected in recently published government policy documents and in the stronger policies currently within Local Plans. As you have noted, data on these is available from the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre.	No action required as this is a statement of fact.	No change.
Wokingham District Council	Yes		Noted	No change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes		Noted	No change
Swallowfield Parish Council	Yes		Noted	No change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 3 Do you have, or know of, any additional relevant baseline data, which should be added to that already listed? (See Scoping Report Appendix 2)

If yes please list additional data sources.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No		Noted	No Change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	No		Noted	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	No		Noted	No Change
Countryside Agency	Yes	Countryside Character Series – National Project bringing together existing datasets which describe aspects of our rural areas as well as developing and measuring indicators of change in countryside and landscape quality. The next phase will see the development of the database and methods of analysing the significance of the change. www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk	Following discussions with TVERC with a view to inclusion as indicator for Objective 15 and 21, the JSPU has received advice that the Countryside Character Series of data are not currently sensitive enough at the strategic “county” level. No change is therefore proposed although the situation will be kept under review.	No Change
Countryside Agency	Yes	Landscape Character Assessment www.ccnetwork.org.uk	Greater clarity in the link with the Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment 2003 needs to be demonstrated in the text of the document.	Yes
Countryside Agency	Yes	Designated landscapes of national importance www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/lbsearch.htm	Greater clarity in the link with the Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment 2003 needs to be demonstrated in the text of the document.	Yes
Countryside Agency	Yes	Thames Path and Ridgeway National Trails www.nationaltrails.gov.uk	It is possible that mineral extraction or the provision of waste facilities could result in the loss of part of the Thames path or Ridgeway National Trail but this is very, very unlikely. Since no change is proposed these would be static indicators and would not be appropriate.	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 3 (Cont) Do you have, or know of, any additional relevant baseline data which should be added to that already listed? (See Scoping Report Appendix 2)
If yes please list additional data sources.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Countryside Agency	Yes	Open countryside and registered common land which have rights of access www.countryside.gov.uk www.openaccess.gov.uk	Quarrying should not result in the permanent loss of access routes upon restoration so this would be a negative indicator. It will be used as an indicator for Objective 22.	Yes
Countryside Agency	Yes	Annual State of the Countryside Reports www.countryside.gov.uk/EvidenceAndAnalysis/state_of_the_countryside_reports/index.asp www.countryside.gov.uk/EvidenceAndAnalysis/dataHub/2004_dataarea/index.asp	The data in these reports is only available at the regional level. If and when the data quality improves at a Berkshire or sub Berkshire level then this will be reassessed	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes	Objective 10: BVPI 106 – Percentage of homes built on previously developed land	Not applicable to Minerals and Waste LDF	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes	Objective 17: www.airquality.co.uk and www.defra.gov.uk/environment/statistics/airqual/kf/aqkf02.htm	Already listed as data source in Objective 17	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes	Objective 20: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/maps/	This will be more useful at the site selection stage.	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes	Objective 24: www.imagesofengland.org.uk	Would not be possible to use this as a measurable indicator. The site just has photos of individual historic buildings etc.	No Change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	More detailed data on employment in aggregate related industry should be gathered to illustrate the characteristics of such jobs. This would include length of employment, locality of employment and would entail a simple survey of Berkshire employers. As is made clear later in this submission, employment profiles and prospects are key factors in sustainability strategies.	The Annual Business Inquiry already provides information on the number of people employed in the aggregates industry. It provides helpful information already taken into account in producing this document.	No Change
English Nature	Yes	We would also urge that you refer to the local Habitat Action Plans (HAPs).	This is a site-specific comment and is best addressed by the Minerals Preferred Areas and DC Policies DPD.	No Change
English Nature	Yes	It may also be relevant to refer to areas of strategic opportunity (specific target areas for habitat regeneration) in the emerging South East Plan	This is a site specific comment and is best addressed by the Minerals Preferred Areas and DC Policies DPD.	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 4 Do you agree with these key issues for the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Documents? (See Scoping Report Chapter 4)

If no please list reasons.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
English Heritage	No	Maps following Para 4.2 should include elements of the historic environment e.g. conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and battlefields,	Amendments will be made to Map 2i to better reflect the historic environment although it should be noted that mineral extraction is highly unlikely to take place in a Conservation Area.	Yes
English Heritage	No	Table 3 – Cultural Heritage and Landscape Wording needs to be changed from ‘consideration’ to protection/enhancement.’	It should be noted that minerals can only be won where they are found and the governments latest advice in relation to waste PPS10 includes the principle that everyone must take responsibility for the waste they produce. However, mineral developments should upon restoration lead to a positive enhancement of the locality, while waste activities should be operated in such away as to not detract from the immediate cultural heritage and landscape and lead to positive benefits.	Yes
English Nature	No	The aftercare of minerals and waste sites is very important not only in the prevention of pollution incidents, but also in terms of sustainable development and the reuse of land. These circumstances also create substantial opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. When deciding what a site should be restored to it is important to consider what was there before and what the surrounding habitats and land-uses are. This is to ensure that restoration projects are in keeping with the surrounding area. How even when such sites are restored they can be restored into good quality wildlife habitat even if the site did not previously have any wildlife value. This may be a better use of the land than returning it to a previous land use of poor agricultural land or industrial land. By creating new wildlife sites it is a perfect opportunity for local authorities to fulfil some of their Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets in connection with their local development plans and emerging LDFs. The restoration work could also act as an opportunity to fulfil government ‘People and Wildlife’ targets. These targets relate to the benefits of accessible wild space on the quality of life and health of the population in the surrounding area.	Agreed and the issue is covered by Objective 12 and Objective 15.	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 4 (Cont) Do you agree with these key issues for the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Documents? (See Scoping Report Chapter 4)

If no please list reasons.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
English Nature	No	In considering any location for minerals and waste operations of any sort it is necessary to consider the impacts of the operations on the environment during construction, during the period of use and in the period when the site is no longer in use. When considering sensitive receptor sites it is necessary to think about the impacts of the following; the effect of extraction operations of hydrology, leachate, emissions to the air, dust, noise and disturbance especially near sites supporting wintering birds. These factors can impact on the quality of surface water and ground water, hydrology and air quality. We recommend that both direct and indirect impacts on nature conservation are considered, as impacts on groundwater, for example, can affect sites of nature conservation value some distance from the source.	This is a site-specific comment and is best addressed by the Minerals Preferred Areas and DC Policies DPD.	No Change
Marley Building Materials	No	It is not true to say that the whole of the extensive Berkshire AONB is of national landscape importance. Some parts are poor, and would benefit from improvement.	Report does not say that the whole of the AONB is of national landscape importance and it is only one of the factors to be used in site selection.	No Change
Marley Building Materials	No	More can be done to protect water resources by encouraging processing at sites with established high quality water conservation recycling processes. The Environment Agency awards certificates of excellence and this could be a valid criterion.	This is a site-specific comment and is best addressed by the Minerals Preferred Areas and DC Policies DPD.	No Change
Marley Building Materials	No	The issues of employment in use of minerals, and local use are not reflected in these proposals. Indeed if those employed in manufacture in Berkshire were assessed, they would have a status equivalent to the endangered species referred to in the first issue, and would require that their needs be paid special attention.	The purpose of the JMWLDF is to identify areas of land where mineral extraction would be suitable following the granting of planning permission in order to meet the apportionment set out in RPG9.	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 4 (Cont) Do you agree with these key issues for the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Documents? (See Scoping Report Chapter 4)

If no please list reasons.

Marley Building Materials	No	<p>The scoping report seems to underestimate some of the key conflicts, for example:</p> <p>The existence of a large area of AONB in West Berkshire has tended to concentrate housing development and employment in the narrow band of non AONB land. Some of this non AONB land provides habitat and amenity of considerable local regional and in some cases national importance.</p> <p>In contrast some areas with the AONB designation are sparsely populated, generate employment in key sectors, are not universally held to be beautiful, merit improvement, and could make a greater contribution to biodiversity.</p> <p>The elevation of AONB status in some cases above other criteria forces choices which are far more environmentally and socially damaging than temporary use of less valuable areas of AONB designation would be.</p>	<p>Minerals can only be extracted where they occur</p> <p>Levels of extraction in the AONB are considered in the JMW Core Strategy Issues and Options and this is subject to the SA.</p>	No Change
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No	Access to the country and existing lanes are causing an increase in the amount of litter in our countryside and heritage sites.	Should be covered by Objective 7 Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites and the indicator, which will measure the statistics on complaints received by the local authority.	No Change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes		Noted	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	Yes		Noted	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes		Noted	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 5 Do you agree with the listed sustainability objectives? (See Scoping Report Table 4)
If no please list those objectives which you disagree with and state why.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Countryside Agency	No	Add objective about the landscape restoration and enhancement of closing Mineral and Waste sites and when possible the creation of recreation amenities.	Amend Objective 12 to reflect the wording of this response	Yes
English Heritage	No	Objective 24 wording should be changed from 'minimising' to 'avoiding' or 'preventing' so that historic sites are offered the same degree of protection as best agricultural and wildlife sites and also in line with PPS1 para 5 and 17.	Change wording of Objective 24 to 'To avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value.'	Yes
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No	Education about waste and litter	JMWDF has no direct control over education about waste and litter. However, the JSPU would seek to encourage the 6 Unitary Authorities to increase and improve education about waste and litter	No Change
English Nature	No	Objective 15 wording should be changed from 'to promote biodiversity' to 'conserve and enhance.' Under S28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as incorporated by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, local authorities have a duty to take reasonable steps, consistent with the proper exercise of their functions, to further the conservation and enhancement of SSSIs. The provisions of section 28G and I are set out in DETR circular 04/2001, paragraph 53-57. SPAs should also be included in the list of designated sites.	Change wording of Objective 15 to 'To conserve and enhance biodiversity and avoid mineral or waste development which would impact on or damage sites of international, or national, importance, SPAs, BAP habitats, SACs, SSSIs.	Yes
Highways Agency	Yes	Objective 5 – The Agency would need to consider the impact of any waste management facilities on the Trunk Road network.	Noted for later consultation	No Change
Highways Agency	Yes	Objective 14 supported	Noted	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes		Noted	No Change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes		Noted	No Change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	The existence and survival prospects of local building material manufacturers should be added to the indicators, ways of quantifying etc column for Objective 23	The JMWDF has no direct control over the existence and survival prospects of local building material manufacturers.	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	Yes		Noted	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 6 Please list any objectives that you think should be grouped together. (See Scoping Report Table 4)

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
		No comments were received on this question	<p>Although no comments were received about combining objectives the JSPU believes that to help simplify and clarify the report, some objectives should be considered for combination.</p> <p>Appendix 2 shows the reasoning for combining the objectives.</p>	Amend as indicated in Appendix 2

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 7 Do you agree that the following objectives should be removed? (See Scoping Report Para 5.8)

Objective 8 – Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Countryside Agency	No	Welcomes Objective 23	The JMWLDF has no direct control over the achievement of this objective. This objective would be better achieved by conditions attached to the planning permission.	No Change
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No		The JMWLDF has no direct control over the achievement of these objectives. Also Objective 16 is almost impossible to monitor	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 7 (Cont) Do you agree that the following objectives should be removed? (See Scoping Report Para 5.8)

Objective 8 – Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Marley Building Materials	No	<p>Objective 8</p> <p>Employment promotion and stability have always been key objectives for sustainable development. The first objective of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy is: “Social progress which respects the need of everyone”.</p> <p>The fourth is: “Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment”</p> <p>The RICS places “respect for the workforce” second only to energy efficiency in its criteria for sustainable construction.</p> <p>The West Berkshire local plan acknowledges: “the special nature of Marleys operation and the particular value of its employment base”.</p> <p>Those employed by Marley making tiles at Beenham have jobs of a type that is increasingly rare in Berkshire. They live locally, they have worked for Marley typically for tens of years, - which makes transport objectives such as car sharing and public transport use more widely practiced than in other employment bases.</p> <p>By rejecting policies that would support local employment the scoping document is suggesting that working further away from a place of residence is more important than working locally.</p> <p>This approach also divides the local community into those whose interests are valued – who do not work with aggregates, and those who are excluded – families who depend on employment in the few local factories that manufacture for construction.</p> <p>Marley takes considerable exception to this proposal and the implied prejudice against manufacture.</p> <p>We deeply resent the fact that companies with employees affected by this provision are not on the list of those being consulted on this document.</p>	<p>The JMWLDF has no direct control over the achievement of these objectives.</p> <p>The purpose of the JMWLDF is to identify areas suitable for mineral or waste development. Site selection will not be governed by the amount or type of employment, which is likely to result but by the criteria set out in the JMWLDF Core Strategy Issues and Options Report Regulation 25.</p> <p>Also Objective 16 is almost impossible to monitor without a great deal of resources. It is more of a statement of aspiration which we wish to encourage than a tangible policy.</p>	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 7 (Cont) Do you agree that the following objectives should be removed? (See Scoping Report Para 5.8)

Objective 8 – Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Marley Building Materials		<p>Objective 16 Marley's operational processes take raw aggregate and crush it at the Beenham factory (thus reducing noise and dust at the site of extraction). In this way all the product is usable except the silt which is restored to the site. Water is recycled. Waste production materials are recrushed and used to make tiles, as is construction waste. A secure supply of raw materials would enable investment in machinery to use waste glass in tile manufacture</p> <p>Buying on the open market may involve using product that has been treated and sorted on site beyond Marley's needs thus wasting energy, resources, water, and generating unnecessary waste.</p>	<p>The JMWLDF has no direct control over the achievement of this objective. This objective would be better achieved by conditions attached to the planning permission.</p> <p>Objective 3 already aims to increase the use of secondary or recycled materials.</p>	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 7 (Cont) Do you agree that the following objectives should be removed? (See Scoping Report Para 5.8)

Objective 8 – Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Marley Building Materials		<p>Objective 23 Marley is the only major concrete tile making factory remaining in the South East, meeting the needs of a substantial market in this growing region. Concrete tiles are the roofing material of choice for most new houses, because of their quality, and environmental performance. Marley is a provider of local building materials, and the survival of the factory is key to this objective</p> <p>Can the LDF Deliver these objectives? The argument for deleting these objectives is that the LDF cannot deliver them. However if they are deleted they will not form part of the assessment of proposals. The assumption is therefore that no circumstances will arise where needs can be aligned with supply. Yet at every stage of Marley's pursuit of new sources of raw materials there has been a clear assertion by planners that Marley's needs can be met.</p> <p>It must be desirable to consider the use of proposed minerals being extracted under any application – indeed this must have implications for energy use, water use, transport impact. It should therefore be possible to consider the use of the materials in terms of local employment, waste generation and re-use, and the supply of local building materials. As the WBDLP has shown it is also possible to write policies that protect specific local users such as Marley. It is also possible to “hypothecate” part of the local supply to meet specific local needs. This is an approach already used in planning to deal with provision of housing, employment, and other development components</p> <p>There are many other measures that are possible to deliver these objectives, which clearly have a place in the delivery of a comprehensive implementation of the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>To delete them is to duck responsibility for a major area of environmental responsibility. The purpose of the Minerals Plan is to produce materials for use. To exclude use from the assessment of proposals is to loose touch with reality.</p>	<p>The JMWLDF has no direct control over the achievement of this objective.</p> <p>Objective 14 already aims to promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road.</p>	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 7 (Cont) Do you agree that the following objectives should be removed? (See Scoping Report Para 5.8)

Objective 8 – Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Wokingham District Council	Yes		Noted	No Change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes		Noted	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	Yes		Noted	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

**Question 8 Do the proposed indicators in Scoping Report Appendix 2 provide a relevant measure for the associated objective?
If no can you suggest more appropriate or additional indicators?**

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
English Heritage	No	Indicators are somewhat vague. What is meant by 'number of archaeological sites of interest.' The historic environment record/SMR contains many entries, some of national significance although not necessarily scheduled, others of regional or local significance. Settings should not be overlooked, and where available, information on locally important buildings of architectural/historic interest and historic parks and gardens should be taken into account.	All the relevant information has been collected and is being used in the site selection process.	No Change
Marley Building Materials	No	For reasons explained earlier in this response, the indicators should be refined	Noted	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes		Noted	No Change
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	Yes		Noted	No Change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes		Noted	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	Yes		Noted	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 9 Do you consider this appraisal methodology meets the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment requirements?

If no, why.

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No		Noted	No Change
Marley Building Materials	No	As presented earlier, the methodology needs refining if it is to accord with key sustainability objectives.	Noted	No Change
Wokingham District Council	Yes		Noted	No Change
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes		Noted	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	Yes		Noted	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

**Question 10 Do you have any further comments on the methodology for the SA/SEA process or the content of this scoping report?
If yes please list**

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
West Woodhay Estates and Farms	No		Noted	No Change
Swallowfield Parish Council	No		Noted	No Change
Countryside Agency	Yes	Details of the frequency of monitoring and assessment of the indicators is required.	The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the submission of an Annual Monitoring Report to the Secretary of State by the end of December each year. The monitoring regime that is in place to assist the AMR process will be refined to provide an early warning of any changes that need to be made with regards to the indicators used.	Yes
Wokingham District Council	Yes	It may be prudent to check Map 2F and the Green Belt Layer for Wokingham District.	A revised map will be included.	Yes
Wokingham District Council	Yes	Important to remember social, environmental and economic issues to satisfy SA/SEA requirements.	Social, environmental and economic issues relevant to the JMWLDF have been included.	No change
Wokingham District Council	Yes	The more objectives you have the more appraisal work has to be produced – time constraints etc.	Noted	Yes
English Heritage	Yes	Executive Non-Technical Summary at (v) should refer to the built and historic environment and area's rich historic heritage etc (as Structure Plan para 5.01)	Noted	Yes
English Heritage	Yes	Appendix 1 page 41 IRF 14 not listed correctly	Noted	Yes
English Heritage	Yes	Archaeological sites of interest is too imprecise	All the relevant information has been collected and is being used in the site selection process. This is a strategic level study and takes account of all designated archaeological sites. More details will be given at the individual site selection stage when it is appropriate to define precisely the nature of interest.	No Change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 10 (Cont) Do you have any further comments on the methodology for the SA/SEA process or the content of this scoping report? If yes please list

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
English Heritage	Yes	Page 71 – 72 refer to objectives contained in the draft Issues and Options Report of May 2005. EH has already expressed concern over objectives M1 and W11. Archaeology needs to be taken into account in the former and 'adequate' protection falls short of government guidance in the latter as it suggests a bare minimum.	Production of the SA Scoping Report is intentionally an independent exercise from the production of the Issues and Options Report. At the time of the Scoping Report production revisions to the pre Regulation 25 Issues and Options had not been updated in the Regulation 25 Issues and Options Report.	No change
Wokingham Town Council	Yes	Regarding sites within Wokingham Town and on the boundary, we are concerned about the access to mineral extraction sites in terms of vehicular traffic, as heavy lorries would add to already congested traffic conditions at peak times during rush hours.	Preferred Areas have not been selected in this report.	No change
Wokingham Town Council	Yes	Concerned about the ability to put in access roads to take mineral bearing lorries compared to the existing lightweight cars using the areas at the moment.	Preferred Areas have not been selected in this report.	No change
Wokingham Town Council	Yes	Concern about long-term effect on the water table in a relatively flat area, particularly the effects of changing the nature and density of the land where material is extracted and filling material inserted.	Preferred Areas have not been selected in this report.	No change
Wokingham Town Council	Yes	Have concerns over the flood plain been explored and what were the conclusions?	Preferred Areas have not been selected in this report.	No change

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Question 10 (Cont) Do you have any further comments on the methodology for the SA/SEA process or the content of this scoping report? If yes please list

Name of Organisation	Yes / No	Comments Made	JSPU Comments	Amend Scoping Report
Eye and Dunsden Parish	Yes	Amend App1 'have regard to' with 'are consistent with.'	These strategies are not formal landuse planning documents and often do not deal with mineral and waste issues. The correct legal position therefore means that the JMWLDF would have precedence over any management plan. However, the importance of the AONB and the aims of the management plan are recognised and thus it is only right that the JMWLDF has regard to it.	No change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	Part of a comprehensive sustainability strategy for the South East that respects resource use, energy conservation, avoidance of unnecessary freight movements, and waste minimisation must include protection for regional manufacturers that supply essential materials for housing construction and construction in general. MPAs are expected to consider local supplies for local manufacturers.	The JMWLDF has no direct control over the achievement of this objective. Objective 14 already aims to promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road.	No Change
Marley Building Materials	Yes	Users – notably those employing local people in manufacture should have been formally consulted, and should be fully involved in subsequent stages.	Consultation has been wide and procedures set out in an agreed protocol between all six Berkshire Unitary Authorities.	No Change

Appendix 1

Analysis of Responses

Question 1 Do you think any plans or programmes should be added or deleted from the list in Scoping Report Appendix 1? If so please give the name of the Plan, who wrote it and why you think it should be included / deleted.

7 organisations responded. Of these, 4 organisations did not think any plans or programmes should be added or deleted. 3 organisations suggested changes 1 of which resulted in changes to the Scoping Report.

Question 2 Do you agree that the baseline data collected/suggested in Scoping Report Appendix 2 is appropriate? If no please give reasons

6 organisations responded. Of these, 3 organisations agreed that the baseline data was appropriate. 3 organisations suggested changes 1 of which resulted in changes to the Scoping Report.

Question 3 Do you have, or know of, any additional relevant baseline data, which should be added to that already listed? (See Scoping Report Appendix 2) If yes please list additional data sources.

7 organisations responded. Of these 3 organisations did not know of any additional relevant baseline data. 4 organisations suggested additional baseline data 1 of which resulted in changes to the Scoping Report.

Question 4 Do you agree with these key issues for the Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Documents? (See Scoping Report Chapter 4) If no please list reasons.

7 organisations responded. Of these 3 agreed with the listed key issues. 4 organisations suggested additional issues 1 of which resulted in changes to the Scoping Report.

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

**Question 5 Do you agree with the listed sustainability objectives? (See Scoping Report Table 4)
If no please list those objectives which you disagree with and state why.**

9 organisations responded. Of these 5 agreed with the listed sustainability objectives. 4 organisations suggested changes of which 3 resulted in changes to the Scoping Report.

Question 6 Please list any objectives that you think should be grouped together. (See Scoping Report Table 4)

No comments were received on this question but Wokingham did suggest that having too many objectives could prove difficult to monitor.

**Question 7 (Cont) Do you agree that the following objectives should be removed? (See Scoping Report Para 5.8)
Objective 8 – Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials.**

6 organisations responded. Of these 3 agreed that the objectives should be removed. 3 organisations did not agree that they should be removed. No changes to the scoping report were made as a result.

**Question 8 Do the proposed indicators in Scoping Report Appendix 2 provide a relevant measure for the associated objective?
If no can you suggest more appropriate or additional indicators?**

6 organisations responded. Of these 4 agreed that the proposed indicators did provide a relevant measure. 2 organisations did not agree. No changes to the scoping report were made as a result.

**Question 9 Do you consider this appraisal methodology meets the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment requirements?
If no, why.**

5 organisations responded. Of these 3 agreed that the appraisal methodology meets the requirements. 2 organisations did not agree. No changes to the scoping report were made as a result.

**Question 10 Do you have any further comments on the methodology for the SA/SEA process or the content of this scoping report?
If yes please list**

8 organisations commented on the methodology. 4 changes resulted in the Scoping Report.

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Appendix 2

Revised SA Objectives

Following the consultation exercise, in response to Question 7, it was generally agreed that 3 of the objectives should be removed. These were Objective 8 - Promote stable employment and employment diversity, Objective 16 - Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral and Objective 23 - Encourage the use of local building materials. It was also suggested that the number of SA objectives should be reduced to a more manageable number. This would ease the monitoring requirements and also avoid overlapping objectives.

Existing Objectives	Keep/ Combine /Remove	Reason
1. Protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development	Keep	
2. Contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	Keep	
3. Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	Keep	
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	Keep	
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	Keep	
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Keep	
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	Keep	
8. Promote stable employment and employment diversity	Remove	Local Authorities cannot directly influence these objectives through the LDF process
9. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	Keep	

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Existing Objectives	Keep/ Combine /Remove	Reason
10. Encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent the loss of the best agricultural land	Keep	
11. Minimise the area of land take per tonne of mineral (aggregate produced)	Remove	Local Authorities cannot directly influence these objectives through the LDF process
12. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration and ensure land is restored to an appropriate standard for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	Combine	Combine with 21 and 22 to ease monitoring and prevent overlapping.
13. Safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	Keep	
14. Promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	Keep	
15. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage sites of international, national, county or local importance, BAP habitats, SACs, SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites etc	Keep	Already amended as result of consultation
16. Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable mineral	Remove	Local Authorities cannot directly influence these objectives through the LDF process
17. Take effective measures to control emissions to air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils	Combine	Combine with 18 and 20
18. Minimise any adverse effect on climate change as a result of greenhouse gas emissions	Combine	Combine with 17 and 20 to ease monitoring and prevent overlapping.
19. Minimise risk of flooding	Keep	
20. Minimise adverse impacts on water resources at all stages of mineral and waste development and where possible	Combine	Combine with 17 and 18 to ease monitoring and prevent overlapping.

Appendix B Scoping Responses Report

Existing Objectives	Keep/ Combine /Remove	Reason
improve surface, groundwater and drinking water quality		
21. Avoid Mineral and Waste development that will have a long term adverse impact on the visual landscape in areas of landscape importance	Combine	Combine with 12 and 22 to ease monitoring and prevent overlapping.
22. Maintain access and overall amenity of the countryside to visitors and residents	Combine	Combine with 12 and 21 to ease monitoring and prevent overlapping.
23. Encourage the use of local building materials	Remove	Local Authorities cannot directly influence these objectives through the LDF process
24. Minimise impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	Keep	

Proposed Revised SA Objectives

1. Protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.
2. Contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional mineral apportionment
3. Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties
9. Encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management
11. Safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities
12. Promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage sites of international, national, county or local importance, BAP habitats, SACs, SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites etc
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change.
15. Minimise risk of flooding
16. Minimise impact on Places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Appendix 3

Amendments to the Scoping Report (and other documents) following consultation

Page/Para No	Original Text	Deleted, revised or new text
N/A	None existing	New Text: A separate scoping exercise on the need for a Habitats Appropriate Assessment (AA), will be carried out during the site selection process if required. This will be considered for the Thatcham Reed Beds SPA / Ramsar site, Thames Basin Heaths SAC / SPA and London Reservoirs SPA. This is in consideration of Regulation 48 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (SI 1994 No.2716) on Natura 2000 sites in relation to both Mineral and Waste Facilities.
Appendix 2 Objective 15	Number & area of designated sites (& non –statutory local designations)	Text deleted: 'Number & area of designated sites (& non –statutory local designations)'
Appendix 2 Objective 15	None Existing	Text added: '95% of SSSIs to be in favourable condition by 2010.'
Table 3	None Existing	New text: 'Consideration should be given to the protection of areas of landscape importance'.
Appendix 2 Objective 22	None Existing	Added as indicators: www.countryside.gov.uk www.openaccess.gov.uk
Map 2i		Changes to Map 2i Map 2i changed to better reflect the historic environment

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Page/Para No	Original Text	Deleted, revised or new text
Table 3	None Existing	New Text: Mineral developments should upon restoration lead to a positive enhancement of the locality, while waste activities should be operated in such a way as to not detract from the immediate cultural heritage and landscape and lead to positive benefits.
Appendix 2 Objective 15	'To promote biodiversity'	Revised text: 'To conserve and enhance biodiversity'
Appendix 2	None Existing	New Text Details of the frequency of monitoring and assessment of the indicators will be included in the AMR.
Map 2f	Map 2f	Revised Map 2f will be revised to include the Green Belt layer for Wokingham
Table 5	List of Objectives	New Text See Appendix 2 for proposed revised list of objectives
Executive Non-Technical Summary Para V	None Existing	New text 'In addition, the area has a rich historic heritage.'
Appendix 1 Integrated Regional Framework	'To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the region's biodiversity.'	Revised Text 'To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the region's countryside and historic environment'.

Appendix C Consultation Responses

**Appendix C
Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit**

Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Report and Detailed Mineral and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report

**Consultation Responses
January 2008**

JMW 203c/200d

Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Report and Detailed Mineral and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report Analysis of Consultation Responses

The purpose of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to ensure that sustainability issues are considered during the preparation and adoption of Local Development Documents.

The objective of this report is to provide an analysis of the responses received to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability/Strategic Environmental Assessment Report and Detailed Mineral and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report (MW SA Scoping Report) which were both consulted on at the same time.

The two Sustainability Reports were consulted on between 24th September – 5th November 2007.

- The Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment
- The Detailed Mineral and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report (MW DPD SA Scoping Report).

Other documents, which were consulted on during this period, were:

Core Strategy Documents

The Core Strategy Preferred Options, setting out our preferred options for the general policies on Minerals and Waste (in accordance with Regulation 26 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004);

A Strategic Transport Assessment, (in accordance with Department for Transport Circular 2/2007 *Planning and the Strategic Road Network and Guidance on Transport Assessments*)

Detailed Minerals and Waste Site Documents

Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control and Preferred Areas Issues and Options (setting out the choices of sites for minerals and waste development, the options for detailed development control policies for them, and the issues raised by these choices, (in accordance with Regulation 25 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004);

Other Documents

A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, (in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 25);

In excess of 600 organisations and individuals were consulted during this period and of these organisations 9 responded with comments, which were relevant for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy SA Final report and the MW DPD SA Scoping Report.

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Although some of the respondents were not commenting directly on the Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Report or the M&W DPD SA Scoping document, some of the points raised were believed to be relevant. These responses have, therefore, been considered below and any necessary amendments to the Core Strategy SA Report and MW DPD SA Scoping Report have been made.

Other responses, which were received during the consultation, contained comments, which will be very useful at the next stage of the MW DPD SA Report. These comments will be considered at the next stage.

Table 1 summarises the responses made and provides a commentary from the JSPU on how the responses have or have not influenced subsequent changes to the Core Strategy Submission SA Report and the M & W DPD SA Report and other documents.

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Table 1 Summary of Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
Alliance Planning / Berkeley Strategic	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal has not assessed all of the potential implications of the approach of M1 and the corresponding blanket approach to MSA designation as it is currently proposed. The impact on other LDF commitments has not been adequately considered and the policy does not adequately address the economic viability of extracting the MSAs and the practical and environmental acceptability of their future working. As such, it imposes an unnecessary constraint that puts the onus of disproving the viability of the deposit on the landowner. This may adversely impact on the timing, design and content of development proposals for the reasons outlined in the above and our comments on Appendix C (i)</p>	<p>Disagree Mineral resources are finite and they need to be safeguarded for future generations. This is particularly important in view of the pressure for non-mineral development in Berkshire and the resultant often unnecessary sterilisation.</p> <p>Safeguarding helps to ensure that the planning system retains the flexibility to identify areas which have the least impact on the environment.</p> <p>The presence of an MSA does not preclude other forms of development but simply provides an alert to the fact that minerals may be sterilised by the proposed development and this should be taken into account by the planning process.</p> <p>The proposed MSAs do include areas where extraction has taken place and also areas which may be uneconomically viable to extract. The information available from the BGS is the best, existing, source of information for determining the extent of the MSAs.</p> <p>Action – No Change</p>
Berkshire, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	<p>Issue 7 The Environment and Biodiversity considerations in the current list (Table 4.1) do not conform to national and regional policy obligations. There are also some factual inaccuracies, which will require amendment. South West London Waterbodies is a SPA, not a SAC. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation are actually called Wildlife Heritage Sites in Berkshire, and should be referred to as such in order to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Agree Produce new list of Environmental and Biodiversity considerations and ensure that these are incorporated into the M&W DPD. See Appendix 1 Action Change</p>
BBOWT	<p>Issue 7 There are three significant omissions from the current list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Habitats and species of importance for the conservation of biodiversity in the UK – given policy protection in PPS9, and referenced as Section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (soon to be superseded by Section 41 	<p>Agree Change SA objective 13 to include CTAs and add maps and information about CTAs to baseline information in Core Strategy SA and M & W DPD SA . Action Change</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006). These are also commonly referred to as BAP priority habitats and species, and the Berkshire BAP (in which the Unitary Authorities are partners) includes targets for their protection, maintenance and restoration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conservation Target Areas – these are evidenced-based, mapped areas which incorporate significant amounts of Berkshire’s biodiversity and encompass the best opportunities for restoring, buffering and extending these habitats. These correspond to the areas of opportunity referred to in paragraph 5 (LDFs) of PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, and should be considered a refinement of map NRM4 in the draft South East Plan. These areas represent both a constraint and an opportunity and future work towards BAP targets will be concentrated within these areas. ▪ Networks of Habitats – PPS9 clearly states that “<i>Local authorities should aim to maintain networks by avoiding or repairing the fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats through policies in plans.</i>” BBOWT believes that this more than justifies the inclusion of networks of habitats within the detailed matters for consideration. 	
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>English Heritage recommends that scoping reports are tailored to the type, purpose, and level of plan under consideration. The Scoping Report should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review the objectives of other relevant policies, plans and programmes, with information on synergies or inconsistencies • establish the historic environment baseline including trends and gaps in data with notes on sources and any problems encountered • identify environmental/sustainability problems, issues and opportunities for the historic environment • set out the sustainability appraisal framework and SEA objectives, indicators (and targets where proposed) for the historic environment • provide sufficient information on the proposed methodology for the appraisal in order to assess whether effects upon the historic environment will be properly addressed • consider cross-boundary issues. 	<p>Agree The SA will include all of these considerations Action None Required</p>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>Relevant Plans, Programmes and Policies English Heritage recommends that SEA and SA should include the review of the plans, programmes and policies listed below. This is not an exhaustive list, but</p>	<p>Agree International, European, National, Regional, County and Local plans programmes and policies which were not previously included in the</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>includes plans and programmes which have a direct bearing on the historic environment. The review of these documents should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarise the contents highlighting historic environment aspects (direct and indirect)• Draw out implications for developing SEA/SA objectives <p>This review, often in tabular form, may be included as an Appendix; however it is also important to include within the main body of the report a summary of the review and its implications.</p>	<p>list in the M & W DPD SA Report, and the Core Strategy SA Final Report, have been added</p> <p>Action Change</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="450 276 696 300">• Relevant SPG /SPD	

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>Baseline Information Baseline information should describe the current state of the historic environment, providing the basis for identifying sustainability problems, predicting and monitoring effects and alternative ways of dealing with them. It can use both quantitative and qualitative information, and should be kept up to date.</p> <p>Any gaps in information on the historic environment should be highlighted as part of the baseline description. Not all information may be available immediately. Ways of improving the availability of information can be included in proposals for monitoring implementation of the plan.</p> <p>It is important that meaningful conclusions can be drawn from interpreting the baseline information, what does it mean for the plan and how the historic environment is dealt with.</p> <p>When collecting baseline information it is important that the historic environment is broadly defined. All designated historic assets should be considered together with potential impacts on non-designated features of local historic or architectural interest and value since these can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity. This covers buildings and other structures and features, archaeological remains, historic open spaces and the wider historic landscape/townscape.</p> <p>Statutory designations cover: World Heritage Sites, Listed Buildings (all grades), Scheduled Monuments plus other nationally important archaeological sites, areas of archaeological importance, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, Conservation Areas - and their settings.</p> <p>Other important considerations include: SMR /HER sites; local list buildings, parks, and features; the character of the wider historic landscape / townscape and other valued historic landscapes; and the potential for unrecorded archaeology.</p> <p>It is not easy to represent the historic environment spatially in an appropriate way. Point data alone from individual designations does not provide a full overview. Historic (cont) landscape characterisation and urban characterisation can supplement this, broadening the understanding of the historic environment by describing the evolution</p>	<p>Agree Some Data sets which were not already included in the M & W DPD SA Scoping Report or the Core Strategy SA Final Report have now been included as Baseline information</p> <p>Action Change</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>of the present day landscape / townscape. Through this an understanding about what gives a place its distinctive character and sense of place can be gained. Data is available from the county Historic Landscape Characterisation projects, Extensive Urban Surveys and other urban characterisation projects. In addition Countryside Quality Counts will provide some measure of the erosion of historic landscape features.</p> <p>The condition of the historic environment is an important consideration. Existing data sources include the English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register which includes Grade I and II* listed buildings and structural Scheduled Monuments. In 2008 English Heritage will launch its Heritage at Risk project which will cover all designated heritage assets. Developments in this work should be taken into account in updating baseline and monitoring frameworks. Local authorities may have their own buildings at risk surveys for Grade II listed buildings and other buildings of local historic or architectural interest.</p> <p>Local Authority Conservation Officers and County Archaeologists hold useful sets of information and should be contacted at the earliest stage. It is likely that different regions may hold more detailed data sets than others, for example, the extent of characterisation studies.</p> <p>Information Sources The list below serves as a <u>menu</u> of possible information sources and is not exhaustive.</p> <p>Core data sets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General information, national and regional data sets, on the annual state of the historic environment is given in Heritage Counts: • www.heritagecounts.org.uk • National Monuments Record Centre, Swindon: www.pastscape.org.uk • Images of England – comprises more than 240,000 photographs of listed buildings <p>(cont)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • alongside the statutory list description providing a possible photographic 	

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tool: www.imagesofengland.org.uk • Heritage Gateway: www.heritagegateway.org.uk • Magic website: www.magic.gov.uk • English Heritage annual Buildings at Risk register (Grade I and II* listed buildings only) and structural Scheduled Monuments) [NB the National Register does not cover Grade II listed buildings, the vast majority of listed buildings]: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1424 • Countryside Quality Counts: http://www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk <p><u>Regional / County / Local Data sets</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Historic Environment Records / Sites and Monuments Record • County/Unitary Historic Landscape Characterisation and or integrated landscape characterisation (HLC and Landscape Character Assessment) • Local Authority: BAR for grade II listed buildings and buildings of local historic/architectural interest; Conservation Areas and relevant appraisals and management plans; other characterisation initiatives; local lists (buildings, parks and gardens) • Extensive and Intensive Urban Surveys (Urban Archaeological Databases), refer to local authority and HER/SMR, or English Heritage: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1294 • Urban characterisation (including extensive and intensive assessments of historical significance / rapid/ whirlwind e.g. HMRA, Suburbs) • Parkland loss data: regional Heritage Counts • Traditional farm buildings regional summaries: www.helm.gov.uk • County traditional farm building mapping projects • English Heritage Scheduled Monuments At Risk Surveys • Traditional building and craft skills - National Heritage Training Group Report • National and Regional skills report: http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/ConWebDoc.4625 <p>(cont)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident satisfaction surveys. 	

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HELM - www.helm.org.uk • Archaeological Data Service (ADS) provides a gateway to a range of historic environment information sources e.g. HEIRPORT Portal to SMRs. http://ads.ahds.ac.uk • Aerial photographs: National Mapping Programme Aerial Photographs: www.english-heritage.org.uk/nmr • National and Regional skills report: http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/ConWebDoc.4625 • Quality of Life Assessment: http://www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/Quality/index.asp 	
English Heritage	<p>Sustainability Issues</p> <p>Analysis of the baseline information for the historic environment and early consultation with local authority conservation officers and archaeologists who understand local issues and opportunities, other key stakeholders and local communities will help identify sustainability issues relating to the historic environment.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Unitary Authorities, archaeologists and other key stakeholders have been consulted and responses received from them</p> <p>Action None Required</p>
English Heritage	<p>SEA/SA Objectives</p> <p>Whilst a specific objective for the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment will always be necessary, it may also be appropriate to address historic environment matters under other objectives such as those covering regeneration, tourism, access to services, quality of life, landscape and townscape.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Objective 16 will be reworded in line with other comments from English Heritage to 'To avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value.'</p> <p>It is considered that this objective will suffice to cover the historic environment.</p> <p>Action Change</p>
English Heritage	<p>Turning to the Scoping Report itself. Glossary references need to be amended in line with the response to the Core Strategy above.</p> <p>The Glossary reference to conservation areas would be more meaningful if it drew upon the 1990 Act, section 69a. With regard to listed buildings, it's their 'special' interest that needs to be emphasised.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Change glossary entry in M & W DPD and the Core Strategy Final Report, to 'Area of special architectural or historical interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.'</p> <p>Action Change</p>
English Heritage	<p>Table 2 SA Objective 16 is pitched at too high a level (places and buildings) and could miss significant features of importance to the historic environment. It compares unfavourably with Objective 13 which is much more in line with Government guidance highlighting the need to protect and enhance and give priority to designations of national importance.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Reword text of objective 'To avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value.'</p> <p>Change in all SA documents which include Objective 16.</p> <p>Action Change</p>
English Heritage	<p>The indicator could be in terms of no loss of nationally important heritage assets or significant damage to their settings. This is of relevance to the Core Strategy too.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Indicator already included which states</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
		<p>Number of new mineral or waste planning permissions which would negatively impact on designated historic assets and non-designated features of local historic or architectural interest or value.</p> <p>Action No Change</p>
English Heritage	<p>In terms of the environmental criteria set out in Tables 3 & 4, account should be taken of all nationally important archaeological remains (not just scheduled); settings; and locally important historic environment features eg Local List of Buildings of Historic & Archaeological Importance, Historic Parks & Gardens etc.</p>	<p>Agree Produce new list of heritage considerations and ensure that these are incorporated into the M&W DPD. See Appendix 1</p> <p>Action Change</p>
Environment Agency	<p><u>Question 1</u></p> <p>The suggested list of policy topics in paragraph 3.9, whilst not exhaustive, is appropriate. However, it is requested the Environment section also cover the protection of both hydrogeological and hydrological environments. The potential harm to groundwater should be included in the Air, Soil and Water section. There should also be an extra category for flood risk, which should consider both surface water and groundwater.</p>	<p>Agree These issues are already considered in the Core Strategy SA Report and will also be considered in the M&W DPD SA</p> <p>Action None Required</p>
Environment Agency	<p><u>Question 16</u></p> <p>The suggested priority approach to identifying Preferred Areas is appropriate as long as environmental risk is taken into account for each site. The use of previously developed/industrial/contaminated land should be given priority as long as contamination issues are addressed appropriately.</p> <p>The considerations listed in Table 6.2 are appropriate. In assessment of the water environment, impact on groundwater users nearby should also be taken into account.</p>	<p>Agree These issues are already considered in the Core Strategy SA Report and will also be considered in the M&W DPD SA</p> <p>Action None Required</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Other comments</p> <p>SFRA Paragraph 1.2. Issues regarding restoration to lakes and infill materials are recognised. It is stated that restoration to lakes will reduce flood risk by increasing flood storage capacity. However, it needs to be recognise that restoration to large lakes can increase flood risk from groundwater by changing the groundwater gradients. In line with PPS25 the FRA must consider all sources of flooding e.g. groundwater flooding.</p>	<p>Agree This issue will be considered in both the SA and FRA of the Minerals and Waste Sites</p> <p>Action None Required</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
Environment Agency	Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZ): SPZ's present a constraint on the restoration of mineral sites. If the landfilling requires a PPC permit, please note that the EA will object to any proposed landfill site in a groundwater source protection zone 1 (SPZ1). This policy is outlined in Regulatory Guidance Note 3 (RGN3), which is available on the EA webpage. Some mineral sites will be able to infill for restoration under an exemption, the EA may object to this in an SPZ 1.	Agree This issue will be considered in both the SA and FRA of the Minerals and Waste Sites Action None Required
Environment Agency	Comments on appropriate assessment for designated sites (SAC, SSSI etc) in relation to site selection. When considering the impact of mineral workings on a designated site with a sensitive water environment we would look for the following assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two years monitoring data to establish the baseline surface water and groundwater conditions. ▪ Hydrological, hydrogeological and ecological assessment, determining the baseline conditions and assessment of possible impacts from the workings. In particular the effect of lowering groundwater levels by dewatering should be considered against the needs of the water dependant site. (cont) Based on the above assessments mineral workings near designated sites may be acceptable with one or more of the following: Wet working near the designated site. Trigger levels based on changes to groundwater and surface water levels. Mitigation techniques derived on a site by site basis.	Agree An AA screening of the proposed Minerals and Waste Preferred Areas will be carried out to check if further work is needed Action None Required
Environment Agency	Important Policies, Plans or Programmes Guidance on Hydrological Best Practice for Mineral Development in the Cotswold Water Park is a document prepared by the Environment Agency for adoption by Wiltshire County Council. It outlines the best practice for mineral operators in terms of environmental protection and requirements of the Environment Agency at mineral workings. This document may be useful for the development of the Mineral Documents in subsequent stages of assessment, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Useful in determining appropriate assessment for designated sites. ▪ In assessing suitable mitigation measures to allow mineral workings in areas that are environmentally constrained in order to meet objectives relating to biodiversity and the water environment. 	Noted Action None Required

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>Dewatering is currently exempt from abstraction licence procedures, but there are provisions for the exemption to be lifted in April 2008. This will mean that an abstraction licence will need to be applied for and determined before dewatering can take place after the exemption is lifted.</p>	
<p>Government Office of South East (GOSE)</p>	<p>GOSE has not reviewed in detail any of your SA/SEA/AA work, but we trust that the other consultees who have a formal responsibility to comment on such work have had the opportunity to do so. In general it is assumed that all authorities will be able to demonstrate that they have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ produced their documents (and updated them) based upon the latest published national guidance ➤ assessed within their SA/SEA all reasonable alternatives such that an Inspector will be able to confirm the soundness of their DPDs and/or make binding recommendations based upon their SA/SEA. ➤ Consulted, and amended their documents in light of the comments from, the key SA consultees, and others as appropriate, and ➤ completed a full quality assurance self-assessment that will be circulated at the time of Submission. <p>It is also assumed that all authorities have liaised with Natural England, to determine whether an Appropriate Assessment is necessary based upon the location of protected species or sites within or in the vicinity of the area covered by the DPD, and acted accordingly.</p> <p>You may also wish to liaise with those authorities who are slightly further advanced in their LDF preparation (the statutory SA consultees should be able to assist in identifying such authorities). However, as always you are advised to obtain expert legal and other advice in order to ensure that you meet all your obligations in connection with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633.</p>	<p>Agree This has been done Natural England have been consulted and an Appropriate Assessment has been produced. Action No Change</p>
<p>GOSE</p>	<p>We note that on several occasions you have concluded that the <i>"options were not suitable for evaluation in the SA"</i>. We are unclear why this should be the case. You should seek specific acceptance of this position from the statutory consultees in order to avoid any risk of procedural unsoundness at examination.</p>	<p>Agree The SA will be amended to explain further why the 'options were not suitable for evaluation.' Change</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
GOSE	Please forward to GOSE the responses received from Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage regarding your SA work to-date, including any received as part of the current consultation exercise.	Agree GOSE letter re statutory consultees 20.12.07.doc Responses sent 20.12.07 Action Documents sent
Highways Agency	The HA is generally satisfied that the SA/SEA will ensure the sustainable development of minerals and waste sites, although suggests an additional objective in the Transport Topic to read as follows: 'Promote a reduction in sites immediately adjacent to the Strategic Road Network.' The SA indicator should read as follows: 'Number of new developments on the Strategic Road Network.'	Disagree Minerals can only be worked where they are found even if this is close to or adjacent to the Strategic Road Network. Also Minerals and Waste are likely, at some stage, to have to be transported onto the SRN so the further away they are from the network more overall 'mineral and waste miles' may be incurred. However, this consideration will be very important and will form part of the SA of the M&W DPD SA. The SA already includes Objective 12 To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road. The indicator for this objective is 'The number of new mineral or waste developments where transport will be primarily by road.' Action No Change
Highways Agency	The HA is satisfied that the SA soundly proves the sustainability of the Core Strategy	Noted Action None Required
Highways Agency	Forecasted traffic generation associated with the minerals and waste apportionment rate has been assessed in the 'Strategic Transport Assessment' report (June 2007). The HA has previously reviewed this report and was satisfied that residual trips, should the apportionment of 1.57 mtpa be reached in the future, would not adversely impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.	Noted Action None Required
Natural England	Natural England considers that a 'sieve map approach' involving the assessment of economically viable sand and gravel deposits against environmental constraints, should be applied by the relevant unitary authorities in identifying suitable locations for sand & gravel extraction. This is in line with similar recommendations that Natural England have already made, in consultations with other authorities.	Agree Produce new list of environmental and biodiversity considerations and ensure that these are incorporated into the M&W DPD. These will then, in effect, be used as a 'sieve map approach' in the selection of sites See Appendix 1 Action Change

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
Natural England	<p>This approach should reflect the guidance given in Minerals Policy Statement 1 (MPS 1) including the Government objective to protect internationally and nationally designated areas of landscape value and nature conservation importance. Within Berkshire these will comprise Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) & the South West London Waterbodies RAMSAR site.</p> <p>(cont)</p> <p>In addition, in accordance with MPS 1 & Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS 9) account should be taken of non-statutory sites of regional and local importance for biodiversity (e.g. County Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves), geological interest (Regionally Important Geological Sites) and landscape and also develop criteria to assess potential impacts of new mineral workings on these sites.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>To ensure that internationally designated areas of landscape value and nature conservation will be protected an AA has been undertaken.</p> <p>Detailed consultation with BBOWT and TVERC has and will be undertaken to ensure that account is taken of non- statutory sites of regional and local importance.</p> <p>Action Ongoing Consultation</p>
Natural England	<p>During site selection, consideration should be given to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. This SPA comprises 13 SSSIs and potentially affects plans in Bracknell Forest, Wokingham & Windsor and Maidenhead. As you will be aware the Habitats Regulations require that any plan or project that is likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of a European site would require an appropriate assessment (AA) of the effects of that plan or project on the conservation objectives of the site. If an appropriate assessment under Regulation 48 of the Habitats Regulations demonstrates that a development proposal is likely to have a negative effect upon the integrity of a European site then the development can only go ahead if there are no alternative solutions and there are imperative reasons of over-riding public interest. Natural England are very keen to engage with this process and would actively encourage the convening of a meeting with other environmental stakeholder consultees in order to agree the most appropriate methodology applicable when undertaking the AA.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Natural England have been consulted during the production of the AA and any comments on the appropriate methodology have been considered.</p> <p>Action None Required</p>
Natural England	<p>Specific sites that should be highlighted within your Minerals and Waste Development Documents, as locations unsuitable for waste related development are statutory designated sites such as SPA's, SAC's, AONBs & SSSI's (as alluded to above). Other sites which should be considered as sensitive to this kind of development should include Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Ancient Woodland, Wildlife Heritage Sites (WHS), areas of Biodiversity Action Pan (BAP) habitat and areas known to support</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>The SA of the M & W DPD Preferred Areas will consider these issues</p> <p>Action None Required</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	protected species. These sites all have some features of wildlife interest that have been formally recognised, that are potentially sensitive to the effects of waste developments. SA Objective 13 in your "Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Document " covers this.	
Natural England	<p><u>PROTECTED SPECIES</u></p> <p>The presence of protected species when determining appropriate minerals & waste sites needs to be given appropriate consideration. It is essential, in accordance with PPS 9, that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by a proposed development, is established before a planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the final decision. A list of all protected species (both animals & plants) can be found in <i>Annex A of Circular 06/2005</i> accompanying <i>PPS9</i>.</p> <p>In order for Natural England to make a substantive response to any subsequent consultation on a detailed planning application, we would need ecological survey reports undertaken by experienced and appropriately trained/licensed persons. These should include the survey methodology, known history of protected species on the site, species populations present and those which would be affected by the proposal. Details should also be given of proposed mitigation for any impacts, opportunities for enhancement and recommendations for licensing for protected species.</p> <p>In addition to the species which receive statutory protection under a range of legislative provisions, other species have been identified as requiring conservation action as species of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England (Section 74 of the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 refers). As stated in PPS9, planning authorities should ensure that these species are protected from the adverse effects of development and should refuse permission where harm to the species or their habitats would result unless the needs for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh that harm.</p>	Noted Action None Required
Natural England	<p><u>AFTERCARE OF MINERAL & WASTE SITES</u></p> <p>In considering any location for mineral extraction or waste disposal of any sort it is necessary to consider the impacts of the minerals or waste site on the environment during construction, during the period of use and in the period when the site is no longer in use. When considering sensitive receptor sites it is necessary to think</p>	Noted Action None Required

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>about the impacts of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leachate ; 2. Airborne emissions ; 3. Dust ; 4. Noise ; 5. Disturbance (especially near sites supporting wintering birds); 6. Light emissions; 7. Impact of pest species predating on waste sites <p>These factors can impact, amongst other things, upon the quality of surface water and ground water, hydrology and air quality. Natural England recommend that both direct and indirect impacts on nature conservation are considered, as impacts on groundwater, for example, can affect sites of nature conservation value some distance from the source. We are encouraged to see that this important objective has been recognised in your "Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Document " (SA Objective 14).</p>	
<p>Natural England</p>	<p><u>POINTS OF CLARIFICATION</u></p> <p>Your 'Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Document' refers – Under the glossary section of this document there are two inaccuracies which I would draw to your attention :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AONB - The following wording needs to replace that as shown in your document...<i>"Natural England is responsible for formally designating AONBs and advising on policies for their protection. The day to day responsibility for management & protection is led by local AONB partnerships/Conservation Board (Local Authorities & key organisational management)"</i> • SSSI – The reference to English Nature should now be amended to read Natural England. 	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Change glossary entry for AONB to: Natural England is responsible for formally designating AONBs and advising on policies for their protection. The day to day responsibility for management & protection is led by local AONB partnerships/Conservation Board (Local Authorities & key organisational management)" Change reference in glossary for SSSI from English Nature to Natural England Action Change</p>

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
RBWM	SA The title talks about SEA but only SA is mentioned in the paragraph. This could lead to confusion.	Agreed Include the data from para 5.2 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report in the opening section of the Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy SA Final Report indicating that SA refers to SA and SEA Action Change
RBWM	The legal requirements for SA and SEA are complex and the reader would benefit from a summary.	Noted The Core Strategy SA Report includes a Quality Assurance Checklist (Table 1) which sets out how the requirements of the SEA Directive are met, if there are any problems with the SA Report and to show how efficiently the appraisal has integrated sustainability considerations into the plan-making process. Action None Required
RBWM	For the submission document, it will not be enough just to refer to the SA Baseline data. A monitoring framework will need to be set up to establish exactly what will be measured, at what point remedial action will be taken and what sort of remedial action will be taken.	Agreed Publish a monitoring framework with the submission document. Action Change
RBWM	Requirements of SEA directive.	Noted The Core Strategy SA Report includes a Quality Assurance Checklist (Table 1) which sets out how the requirements of the SEA Directive are met, if there are any problems with the SA Report and to show how efficiently the appraisal has integrated sustainability considerations into the plan-making process. Action None Required
Stephen Bowley Raymond Brown	<u>M6 Areas of Search for Building Sand</u> The company does not disagree with an approach to identifying future reserves of soft sand which is based on Areas of Search. However: 1. The Areas of Search identified in Appendix Ciii of the 'Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas' Issues & Options Consultation excludes Areas of Search within the AONB. This approach is fundamentally flawed since historically most (if not all) good quality soft sand (cont) has been extracted from within the AONB, and the two current quarries at Chieveley and Copyhold are both within the AONB. It should not be	Agree The SA does consider the question of supply by including 2 objectives, which aim to protect mineral reserves from sterilisation and to contribute to Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment. An addition will be made to the evaluation of Polciy M6 to include reference to the question of maintaining a supply of building sand and the consequences of not doing so. Policy M5 and M6 will be renumbered Action Change

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comments made	JSPU Comments
	<p>forgotten that the overall objective of the plan is to make provision for minerals to meet planned requirements. There is no evidence that suitable reserves exist outside of the AONB and limiting working outside of the AONB will simply curtail current supply. The approach taken in the currently adopted Minerals Local Plan is considered appropriate and should therefore be carried forward.</p> <p>2. The Area of Search approach has evolved due to the lack of detailed geological information. In the case of Copyhold Farm quarry the proposed extension area has been evaluated and contains an estimated 500,000 tonnes of soft sand. In these circumstances it is considered appropriate for the area to be considered as a Preferred Area for soft sand, notwithstanding the general Area of Search approach proposed.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (which refers to Policy M5 not M6) is also fundamentally flawed since it does not even consider the question of maintaining a supply or recognise that minerals can only be worked where they occur. Nor does it recognise that Copyhold Quarry is a major supplier to the local tile manufacturing industry, whereas previously sand had to be imported from outside of the area.</p>	

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Appendix 1

Table 1 Environmental criteria to be used to evaluate potential sites and locations for mineral sites and landfill activities

Criteria	Mineral Site Assessment Criteria
Environment and Biodiversity	European and Ramsar sites within Berkshire
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC; • Kennett and Lambourn Floodplain SAC • Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC • River Lambourn SAC • Thames Basin Heaths SPA
	European and Ramsar Sites within 5km of Berkshire
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chilterns Beechwoods • Hartslock Wood • Hackpen Hill • Burnham Beeches SAC • South West London Waterbodies SPA/Ramsar • Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC
	• Sites of Special Scientific Interest
	• National and Local Nature Reserves
	• Regionally Important Geological Sites
	• Wildlife Heritage Sites
	• BAP priority habitats and species
	• Conservation Target Areas
	• Non- Statutory Sites of regional and local importance for
	• Networks of Habitats
	• Ancient woodland
Landscape/Visual issues and other strategic constraints	• Landscape and townscape character
	• North Wessex Downs AONB
	• Metropolitan Green Belt
	• Local landscape designations
Historic Environment	• Listed buildings
	• Conservation Areas
	• Nationally Important archaeological remains and Scheduled Ancient Monuments
	• Local List of Buildings of Historic and Archaeological Importance

Appendix C Consultation Responses

Criteria	Mineral Site Assessment Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic parks and gardens • Archaeological resources including historic landscapes and environments
Environmental Health and Public Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, dust, smell, light, vibration, air quality (including relationship to any designated AQMA, etc) • Impact on residents and neighbouring land-uses • Impact on recreation and other users of the countryside
Water Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk zones, e.g. Thames valley, Kennet valley, Colne Valley. • Flood risk from surface water and groundwater • Movement of surface and groundwater, e.g. through valley gravel deposits • Surface and groundwater pollution prevention • Impact on hydrogeological and hydrological environments.
Agricultural land and Soil Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best and most versatile land (grades 1, 2, and 3a) • Pollution prevention
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the site in detail • Network capacity in the vicinity • Lorry routing • Modes of transport – opportunities for alternatives
Public Rights of Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on users of Public Rights of Way • impacts on the PRoW network
Restoration opportunities	Any restoration opportunities which would impact positively on the above.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Appendix D Baseline Information

In order to make analysis of the baseline information more manageable the suggested SEA topics were divided into the sub – headings below. Following each sub-heading, each of the JMWDF objectives is shown together with its full title. Below this is a short summary of the current situation with regard to Berkshire. This summary puts into words the information contained in the table underneath.

Indicators and data used to monitor the objectives have been refined following consultation with stakeholders throughout the SA process.

Much of the data has not yet been collated in the right format or has not yet been collected. Some of the data may not be collected until the monitoring process begins.

With regards to the columns in the table, information for each objective is divided into 5 sections;

Indicator	This shows how the JSPU believes the objective referred to above can be monitored. Each indicator should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable Realistic and Time-Bound
Quantified Data	This is split into a further 3 sub-sections for greater clarity. Each shows the availability of data at the local (Berkshire), regional (South East England) and National (England or England and Wales depending on data sources) level. If the information required is not available or not considered to be relevant, an abbreviation N/A is shown
Target	This is a goal to be reached, although recognition is given that some targets are aspirational in nature
Trend and Comments	An indication as to whether or not the indicator is improving or declining in relation to the target together with a short explanation/comment on the quantified data
Data Source	A list showing where the quantified data originated and the data source which will be used to monitor the indicators

Appendix D Baseline Information

Mineral Resources

Objective 1 To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.

The six Unitary Authorities spatially record all planning applications submitted to them. This information when compared with the known mineral deposits (see Maps 2a and 2b of the Core Strategy Submission SA Final Report Appendix 4) will enable this objective to be monitored. Historical data is not currently available since monitoring systems have lacked the degree of sophistication to accurately record applications and mineral deposits. As part of the LDF process a review of monitoring requirements is currently being undertaken. Further details are included in the JMW AMR 2007.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend & Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
New planning permissions granted on known mineral deposits	Data not currently available in correct format	N/A	N/A	100% of identified mineral resources to be protected from sterilisation	Insufficient data available at the moment to establish trend.	Local Development Control records G.I.S.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 2 To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment

RPG 9¹ states that the Berkshire Unitary Authorities' apportionment should be 1.57 mtpa. Berkshire produced 645,000t of primary land won aggregates in 2006 but no information exists to provide an estimate of secondary/ recycled aggregates.

It is also reasonable to assume that any shortfall between actual production and anticipated demand is met by a variety of factors including an increased use of recycled construction and demolition waste and a reduced utilisation of aggregates in construction generally with the greater use of steel and glass in new buildings.²

In the South East the recommended apportionment target for the use of secondary and recycled aggregates has been increased to at least 7.7 Mt in 2016³. The apportionment figure for Berkshire is recommended to be 0.69 Mt in 2016.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend & Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Annual production of primary won aggregates & secondary/recycled aggregates	Berkshire produced 645,000t of primary land won aggregates in 2006. No figures available for secondary/ recycled aggregates.	In 2006 South East produced 9.6 mt of primary land won aggregates and 6.6 mt secondary/ recycled aggregates	65 mtpa of aggregates used each year in the UK are from recycled or secondary aggregates.	Provision for supply of 1.57 mt per annum ⁴ RMS– proportion of total aggregates from recycled and secondary aggregates to be 34% by 2016. Emerging SEP Plan 0.7mtpa of capacity for recycled and secondary aggregates should be provided by 2016 in Berkshire.	Production of sand and gravel in Berkshire in 2006 was 39% less than in 2005 and fell well below the apportionment figure of 1.57mt for Berkshire. However, the figure for 2005 was 1.1mt which is more representative of the 5 year trend. Failure to meet the apportionment rate target could indicate that other targets are being met e.g. recycling of C & D resulting in less demand for virgin aggregates. Primary aggregate data good. Secondary & recycled no data source identified. Survey is done on calendar year and not on financial	Annual Quarry Products Association Survey www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/ Mineral Strategy and Regional Monitoring Report 2006. www.aggregain.org.uk/sustainable.html Berkshire Minerals and Waste AMR

¹ Regional Planning Guidance for the South East – Waste and Minerals. June 2006.

² Joint Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report. JSPU. JLDF 003

³ Contained in Proposed Changes to Regional Policy Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals. GOSE. 19th August 2005

⁴ Regional Planning Guidance for the South East – Waste and Minerals. June 2006.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend & Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number of years supply in landbank	At the end of 2006, the landbank was just under 10 mt equivalent to 6.3 years production at 1.57 mt per year	N/A	N/A	To maintain a landbank of permitted reserves for at least 7 years of supply.	At the end of 2005 the landbank in Berkshire stood at just over 11 million tonnes, equivalent to 7 years production at 1.57 mt/year. At the end of 2006 the landbank had reduced to just under 10 mt, equivalent to 6.3 years production at 1.57mt per year.	Berkshire Minerals and Waste AMR

Appendix D Baseline Information

Waste

Objective 3 To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials

Berkshire achieved an average of 29% MSW recycled/composted in 2006/7. The regional target is 40% by 2010. An increase of 11% is therefore needed over the next three years and then a further 10% in the following five years. Limited information exists on waste streams other than MSW so the indicator has been restricted to MSW.. In future years the indicator will be broadened to include other waste streams as data becomes available.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Proportion of MSW arisings which are recycled or composted.	29% of MSW in Berkshire was recycled or composted in 2006-2007.	Some data exists but surveys are not conducted on a regular basis e.g. National Waste Products Survey	Some data exists but surveys are not conducted on a regular basis e.g. National Waste Products Survey	The Regional Waste Management Strategy (RWMS) contained in RPG9 sets the following targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recycle or compost 40% by 2010 - 50% by 2015 - 55% by 2020 and on to 60% by 2025 	Limited information on waste streams other than MSW. The % of MSW recycled or composted has increased from 2005-2006 to 2006 –2007. Data poor quality Information has not been collected in a consistent and comprehensive manner. Data likely to improve in 2008 particularly for C & I. Recovering value from MSW is likely to increase and will assist in meeting targets when the Colnbrook incinerator is scheduled to open mid 2008.	Waste Data Flow (MSW only) Environment Agency SEERA LATS DEFRA Regional Waste Management Strategy Berkshire Minerals and Waste AMR

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 4 To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste.

No reliable figure is currently available for total waste arisings in Berkshire in individual recent years. The EA Strategic Waste Management Assessment of the total estimated waste arisings in Berkshire in 2002 – 2003 was 2.6mt. However, it must be stressed that these figures lack reliability. A significant increase in arisings is forecast. Limited information exists on waste streams other than MSW so the indicator has been restricted to MSW..

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Proportion of MSW arisings, which are recycled or composted.	Total Estimated waste arisings for 2002 – 2003 was 2.6 mt	N/A	N/A	The Regional Waste Management Strategy (RWMS) contained in RPG9 sets the following targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recycle or compost 40% by 2010 - 50% by 2015 - 55% by 2020 and on to 60% by 2025 	No reliable figure is currently available for total waste arisings in Berkshire in individual recent years. Approx 420,000 more tonnes of municipal and commercial/industrial waste is forecast to arise in 2016 than in the base year of 2001/2 (2002/3 for municipal waste). Information has not been collected in a consistent and comprehensive manner. Between 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 there has been an increase in recycling and composting and a corresponding reduction in municipal waste going to landfill.	The EA Strategic Waste Management Assessment Environment Agency SEERA LATS DEFRA Regional Waste Management Strategy Berkshire Minerals and Waste AMR

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 5 To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements

Currently, approximately 100 medium to large waste management facilities have been identified as operating within the six Unitary Authorities. These facilities cover a wide variety of waste management operations and cater for a whole range of waste arisings relating to MSW, C & D and C & I waste streams.

Recent research undertaken by SEERA suggests that significant additional facilities will need to be provided to meet waste management targets for the South East of England and Berkshire will not be an exception to this need.

Annual arisings of municipal solid waste are forecast to increase from about 487,000 tonnes in 2007 to about 579,000 tonnes in 2015 and about 672,000 tonnes in 2025⁵. Commercial and Industrial waste annual arisings are forecast to increase from about 487,000 tonnes in 2007 to about 579,000 tonnes in 2015 and about 1.1 million tonnes in 2026. Construction and Demolition wastes are not expected to increase over the period, due primarily to improved recycling at source, and the current arisings figure of about 1.8 million tonnes a year is expected to extend through 2025.

Additional waste management capacity of about 295,000 tpa was granted planning consent during 2006-2007.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number and capacity of new waste management facilities granted in Berkshire	Additional waste management capacity of about 295,000 tpa was granted planning consent during 2006-2007	N/A	N/A	Capacity to be greater than demand thus ensuring self-sufficiency for Berkshire's waste arisings.	Neutral to declining as existing capacity is exhausted. Data good, however, the current EA licensing system encourages waste operators to overstate their capacity rather than actual capacity in order to avoid a situation whereby they might exceed their license and thus be liable to significant fines.	Environment Agency UAs RPG9 Minerals and Waste Update June 2006 Update of the Model for Future Waste Management in the South East 2005. ERM Berkshire Minerals and Waste AMR

⁵ Update of the Model for Future Waste Management in the South East 2005. ERM 2005.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 6 To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy

Recently permission has been granted for a major energy from waste facility in the east of Berkshire. This scheme is currently the only significant renewable energy facility associated with minerals and waste activities. A number of landfill sites both existing and closed have methane gas collection units which also contribute to the renewable energy target. In addition 2 other major renewable energy schemes have either been granted permission or implemented and whilst they contribute to the target shown in Objective 6 they are not related to minerals or waste activities.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Amount of energy generated from waste facilities	Recently permission has been granted for a major energy from waste facility in the east of Berkshire.	N/A	N/A	National target of at least 10% of all energy from renewable sources by 2010 and a regional target of increasing the proportion of electricity generated from renewable sources to 8% by 2016 and 16% by 2025 ⁶ .	Renewable energy capacity installed within the South East has been increasing. But it has only reached 54% of the target for 2010. Data good but only in relation to theoretical capacity and number of sites.	Local Development Control Records Berkshire Minerals and Waste AMR 2007

⁶ Regional Monitoring Report 2006. SEERA.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Effect on Communities

Objective 7 Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites

Mineral and waste sites can be a source of complaint for both nearby residents and more removed localities that happen to be on the transport route to and from individual sites. Members of the public often complain to Local authorities about issues such as noise, dust, odour and vermin. This information is collated by either environmental health or planning enforcement officers. However, this information has not necessarily been publicised.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Statistics on noise, odour, dust, vermin, litter, accidents and illness and aggregate and waste lorry movement to and from site complaints which require a formal intervention on behalf of the local authority.	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	To be determined following collection of baseline data and in conjunction with Local Authority.	Trend not known. Data good.	Local UA records of complaints received by & enforcement action taken

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 8 Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties

The JMW AMRs for Berkshire show that 'in general the RMLP is being effective in focusing the submission of new applications on its Preferred Areas with only two out of the nine major applications for sharp sand and gravel extraction submitted since the RMLP was adopted in 1995 (other than windfall applications) being at non-Preferred sites.' Neither of the non-Preferred sites were within 250m of a settlement.

The JMW AMR 2007 gives details of all the waste-related development that was decided by the Berkshire Authorities during 2006.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Statistics on noise, odour, dust, vermin, litter, accidents and illness and aggregate and waste lorry movement to and from site complaints which require a formal intervention on behalf of the local authority.	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	To be determined following collection of baseline data and in conjunction with Local Authority.	Trend not known. Data good.	Local UA records of complaints received by & enforcement action taken

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 9 To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Potential mineral sites are most likely to be greenfield and may be the best agricultural land.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
% of new waste development on previously developed land (PDL)	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	To emerge from LDF process	Trend not known. Growth in secondary and recycled aggregates means less demand for primary aggregates. Data good.	Planning Applications G.I.S.
Amount of best agricultural land permanently lost as result of new mineral or waste development	See Map M in the main report which shows the amount of land in each Agricultural Land Classification	N/A	N/A	No Grade 1, 2, 3a or 3b agriculturally classified land to be permanently lost as a result of new mineral or waste development	Trend not known. Growth in secondary and recycled aggregates means less demand for primary aggregates. Data good.	Planning Applications G.I.S.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 10 Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management

Restoration in Berkshire has tended to be for 'wet' uses such as fishing lakes, sailing lakes and other recreational uses in the west of the county and to agriculture in the east of the county due to the danger of bird strikes associated with shallow water.

For the purposes of this report 'long term' has been defined in the case of minerals as 25 years+, and in the case of waste as 10+ years. This is subjective e.g. restoration to a lake may be acceptable to newcomers but a long term resident may consider this to have an adverse visual impact.'

It is not desirable for the general public to have access to working and washed out quarries, which could contain deep water, on health and safety grounds. However, restoration should where possible allow access or provide safe alternatives. Thus mineral and waste activity can contribute to increasing the amenity value of the countryside over a period of time

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number of sites not restored to beneficial use within timescale of planning permission	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	All sites should be restored to beneficial use within the timescale of the planning permission	No trend available. Data good.	Local Development Control Records
Loss or gain of access to rights of way etc Areas of common land as a result of new mineral or waste development	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	No net loss of access to rights of way etc as a result of new mineral or waste development	No trend available Data good	Unitary Authorities. Temporary or permanent rights of way diversions www.countryside.gov.uk www.openaccess.gov.uk
Loss or gain of land classified as Open Space of Public Value (OSPV) as a result of new mineral or waste development	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	No net loss of land classified as Open Space of Public Value as a result of new mineral or waste development	No trend available Data good	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S.

Transport

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 11 To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities

The importance of rail depots in helping to meet the county's need for aggregates is likely to increase in the future. Additionally, the rail depots of Berkshire make a significant contribution to the aggregates needs of other counties, reducing in turn the pressures for mineral extraction in the region. The transfer facility at Colnbrook has the capacity to handle 1.6 mtpa of material and has been operating at around 4,000 t per day in relation to the construction of Terminal 5 at Heathrow. The greatest value of rail aggregates depots is their regional role in supplying areas such as London which have only very limited remaining resources of sand and gravel.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Safeguarding procedure in place in all six Unitary Authorities	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	Safeguarding procedure in place in all six Unitary Authorities	Trend not applicable as the number of facilities is so few. Data good.	UA LDFs

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 12 To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road

The majority of mineral and waste transport is currently by road. However, the rail facility at Colnbrook results in only a short journey by road rather than a road journey originating in Somerset in relation to the supply of material for Terminal 5. This greatly reduces the amount of CO₂

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number of new mineral or waste developments where transport will be primarily by road	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	5% of new mineral or waste developments to be served primarily by non-road transport	Trend unknown. Data good. London continues to export large amounts of waste to the South East. Robust data is lacking but improving and is not broken down by transport mode	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S Regional Monitoring Report

Appendix D Baseline Information

Biodiversity, Landscape, Visual Intrusion and Countryside Impact

Objective 13 To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage sites and areas of international, national, county or local importance, BAP habitats, SACs, SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc

Map h of the Core Strategy Submission SA Final Report Appendix 4 shows the location of the environmentally designated sites in Berkshire at 2004. Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre analysis shows that 41% of the areas designated as SSSI are in a favourable condition while a further 53% of the areas are regarded as unfavourable but recovering. Additionally, 5% of the areas were classified as unfavourable no change in condition.

There exists an opportunity for the restoration of mineral facilities to promote bio-diversity and geo-diversity.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Site quality	41% of the area designated as SSSI is in a favourable condition while a further 53% of the area is regarded as unfavourable but recovering. Additionally, 5% of the area was classified as unfavourable no change in condition.	N/A	N/A See http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/biodiversity/biostrat/indicators/pdf/indicators031201.pdf	Following mitigation/restoration 95% of SSSIs affected by mineral and waste activities to be in favourable condition. Additional targets to emerge from LDF process	Trend not known as complete set of data has only been available this year. Data good - SSSIs will be regularly monitored by EN staff every 3 – 6 years.	TVERC (Figures from July 2005 EN data version) G.I.S
Number of European and RAMSAR sites, NNRs, LNRs WHA, BAP key habitats and RIGs lost to or adversely affected by new minerals or waste sites	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	No net loss to designated sites of international, national or strategic importance through developments (RPG9) No net loss to NNRs, LNRs, WHA, BAP key habitats and RIGS.	Trend unknown Data good	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment TVERC records
Number of new mineral or waste sites within designated landscape areas	Data has not yet been collated in correct form	N/A	N/A	No new mineral or waste sites to be located within designated landscape areas	Data good There is likely to be considerable future interest in developing mineral and waste sites in designated landscape areas. The existing 'apportionment' for extraction of building sand from the AONB has tended to focus extraction in the AONB.	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S
Number of mineral or waste restoration schemes which include biodiversity enhancement	Data not yet available	N/A	N/A	All mineral or waste restoration schemes to include biodiversity enhancement	Trend unknown Data good	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 14 Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change

It is important that minerals and waste development do not result in pollution to air, dust, water and soils and that surface water runoff is treated prior to entering the groundwater system to minimise the risk of contamination.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Emissions of greenhouse gases from energy consumption, transport and land use and waste management	Data not available for Berkshire	2004: 69,389 kilotonnes	N/A	By 2050 reduce greenhouse gas emissions from activities within the region by 60% (IRF)	No trend available. Very difficult to isolate effects which mineral and waste development in Berkshire will have on these emissions	Regional Monitoring Report 2006
Number of complaints received about air quality issues (including dust both on and off site) associated with new minerals or waste development	Data has not yet been collated in correct form	N/A	N/A	Number of complaints not to exceed current rates	Data Quality unknown. It is hard to establish the additional impact of waste and minerals activities Location to M25 M4 etc.	Local UA records of complaints received by & enforcement action taken
Number of new mineral or waste sites having an adverse effect on AQMA	Data has not yet been collated in correct form	N/A	N/A	No new mineral or waste sites to have an adverse effect on AQMAS	Trend unknown. Data good	Local Development Control Records.

Appendix D Baseline Information

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number of pollution incidents resulting from new minerals and waste developments investigated by EA	Data has not yet been collated in correct form Under investigation with EA	N/A	N/A	Number of pollution incidents resulting from minerals and waste developments investigated by EA to be less than current rates	Under investigation with EA	EA records
Fly tipping incidents reported to council	Data has not yet been collated in correct form	N/A	N/A	Number of fly tipping incidents resulting from minerals and waste developments investigated by EA to be less than current rates	The reduction in fly tipping incidents over time	Local UA records

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 15 Minimise risk of flooding

Historically there has been significant flooding in Central and Eastern Berkshire.

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number of new mineral and waste sites granted planning permission contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds.	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	No new mineral and waste sites to be granted planning permission contrary to advise of Environment Agency on flood defence grounds	Data good	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S EA
Number of new restoration schemes that involve flood protection	Data to be collected	N/A	N/A	All new restoration schemes to include consideration of flood protection	Data good	Local Development Control Records. G.I.S

Appendix D Baseline Information

Objective 16 Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value

Indicator	Quantified Data			Target	Trend and Comments	Data Source
	Local Data	Regional Data	National Data			
Number of new mineral or waste planning permissions which would negatively impact on designated historic assets and non-designated features of local historic or architectural interest or value.	Data to be collected		N/A	No new mineral or waste planning permissions to negatively impact on designated historic assets and non-designated features of local historic or architectural interest or value.	Data Good. In 2008 English Heritage will launch Heritage at Risk project, which will cover all designated heritage assets	English Heritage Local Development Control Records. UA BAR for Grade II listed buildings and buildings of local/historical/architectural interest; Conservation Areas and relevant appraisals and management plans; other characterisation initiatives; local lists (buildings, parks and gardens G.I.S

Appendix E Compatibility of Objectives

Appendix E Compatability of SA objectives with Core Strategy Preferred Options Objectives

Table 1 Compatability of SA objectives with Core Strategy Objectives

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CS OBEJECTIVES	A	-	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-
	B	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	NA	NA	-
	C	✓	✓	-	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-	-	NA	NA
	D	-	X	-	NA	NA	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	E	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA
	F	✓	✓	NA	-	X	NA	-	-	-	NA	✓	NA
	G	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA
	H	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	NA	NA	✓
	I	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	-	-	NA	NA	-
	J	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	NA	✓
	K	NA	NA	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	NA	✓	✓
	L	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	NA	-
SA OBJECTIVES		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

✓	Compatible	-	Uncertain link
X	Potential Conflict Between Objectives	N/A	Not Applicable – No Direct Link

JMWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Objectives

- **JMWDF Objective A** - To strike a balance between the demand for all mineral resources and the need to protect the quality of life of residents, the economy and the quality and diversity of environmental assets;
 - **JMWDF Objective B** - To promote the most efficient use of all mineral resources and the re-use of recycled minerals and secondary aggregates, having regard to the principles of sustainable development;
 - **JMWDF Objective C** - To make provision for a stock of permitted reserves (a landbank) for aggregate minerals, in accordance with current Government advice to ensure an adequate and steady supply of minerals;
 - **JMWDF Objective D** – to ensure that the environmental impacts caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are kept to an acceptable minimum;
 - **JMWDF Objective E** - To ensure that mineral sites are progressively restored to a beneficial after-use;
 - **JMWDF Objective F** - To prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of important mineral resources by other forms of development.
-
- **JMWDF Objective G** – To strike a balance between the need for waste treatment and disposal facilities and the need to protect the quality of life of residents, the economy, and the quality and diversity of environmental assets;
 - **JMWDF Objective H** – To create the spatial planning context within which waste treatment and disposal facilities can be delivered in order to achieve net self-sufficiency in Berkshire.
 - **JMWDF Objective I** – To facilitate regional self-sufficiency, including where this may require facilities in Berkshire to manage or dispose of more waste than equivalent to that which arises in the Berkshire area, where this is shown to be the most sustainable option;
 - **JMWDF Objective J** – To encourage waste treatment higher up the waste hierarchy and specifically an increase in re-use, recycling and recovery of materials, and energy recovery, while minimising the quantities of residual waste requiring final disposal;
 - **JMWDF Objective K** – To locate waste management facilities in order to reduce the distances by road that waste is transported for management and disposal, and to encourage alternative forms of transport where these are more sustainable;
 - **JMWDF Objective L** – To safeguard existing waste management facilities which are appropriately located from loss or unnecessary operational constraint as a result of competing forms of development;

Objectives of the JMWDF Core Strategy Final SA Report

1. Protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.
2. Contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment
3. Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste.
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties.
9. Encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration and ensure land is restored and maintained to an appropriate standard for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management
11. Safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities
12. Promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road.
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage sites of international, national, county or local importance, BAP habitats, SACs, SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites etc
14. Take effective measures to control emissions to air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effects on climate change
15. Minimise risk of flooding
16. Minimise impact on Places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value

(NB Since this table was compiled objectives in both the Core Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal have changed)

Appendix F Forecasting the effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Submitted Policies

The list of SA objectives in the table below is the new revised list (see Appendix 2 of the SA Scoping Responses Report⁷ - for further details of why and how the objectives were revised).

The effects of each policy were assessed in the following way:

Symbol	Effect
++	Very positive
+	Positive
0	Neutral or not significant
-	Negative
--	Very negative
NA	Not applicable

Likelihood	How likely is the effect: High, Medium or Low
Permanent	Is the effect likely to be permanent: Yes or No
Scale	Will the policy affect the whole of Berkshire or just a small local area: Berkshire wide or Area Specified
Timing	How quickly will the effect be experienced: Immediately, Short Term, Medium Term, Long Term or following adoption of the DPD.
Mitigation	Mitigation will only be considered if effect of strategic level policies is negative or very negative e.g mineral movement by road causes pollution but this could be mitigated by use of a conveyor belt

⁷ Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Responses Report.. JSPU. JMW 200c. May 2006

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Plan Duration - 2026			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	Mineral reserves would be protected from non mineral development until 2026. This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	Provision of localities required to meet sub-regional apportionment will be made until 2026 This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing – Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	Policies to increase the use of secondary or recycled materials would be in place until 2026. This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	Policies to minimise waste generation and disposal and achieve the sustainable management of waste would be in place until 2026. This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	Policies to ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities would be in place until 2026. The longer the timescale of the plan the more likely that waste facilities will be constructed. This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood – Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Policy W11 and Objective J would both encourage the increase in energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy these would be in place until 2026. This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard to minimising any public nuisance This policy will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood – Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and the development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard to the proximity of settlements This policy will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood – Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and the development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard to the use of PDI and loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. This policy will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood – Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	Policies to ensure the early planning of mineral only working and restoration would be in place until 2026. This policy will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood – Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	<p>Policies to safeguard mineral distribution nodes would be in place until 2026.</p> <p>This policy will result in a very positive effect</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required</p>
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	<p>Policies to reduce road transport for minerals and waste would be in place until 2026.</p> <p>This policy will result in a positive effect</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>+ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required</p>
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	<p>Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and the development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard for important environmental and landscape areas.</p> <p>This policy will result in a very positive effect</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required</p>
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	<p>Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and the development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard for adverse effects on air, dust etc and climate change.</p> <p>This policy will result in a very positive effect</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required</p>
15. Minimise risk of flooding	<p>Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and the development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard for reducing flood risk.</p> <p>This policy will result in a very positive effect</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required</p>

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	Policies in the DPD would provide the framework, until 2026, for the selection of Preferred Areas and the development control policies in the Minerals and Waste DPD which would have regard for places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value. This policy will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Overall Vision for the JMWFDF			
Summary of all SA Objectives	To summarise, the vision outlined in the JMWLDD The principles on which the vision outlined in the JMWLDD is based are highly compatible with the objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal. This vision will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Unknown Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
Minerals Primary Objectives			
Summary of all SA Objectives	The proposed list of objectives in the JMLDF has been assessed as having a major positive effect on achieving the SA objectives. All the listed objectives have regard for sustainability considerations These objectives will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Unknown Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
Policy M1 Safeguarding of Sand and Gravel Deposits			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development	Mineral reserves would be protected from non-mineral development until 2026. This policy will result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	The definition of Mineral Safeguarding Areas will help to ensure the provision for the extraction of 1.57mt pa. The additional conditions on non-mineral development in these areas will also assist with this. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	The identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas is designed to make provision for the sub-regional apportionment. This policy will have no impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	The identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas is designed to make provision for the sub-regional apportionment and will have no direct impact on this objective. This policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	The identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas is designed to make provision for the sub-regional apportionment and will have no direct impact on this objective. This policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	The safeguarding of mineral resources will have no impact on this objective which is concerned with energy efficiency and renewable energy. This policy will have no impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	MSAs will not have a 'buffer' around settlement areas which, in the absence of other policies, could result in public nuisance and disturbance This policy could have a negative impact on this objective.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- Low Berkshire wide Yes Post plan adoption None Required
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	MSAs will not have a 'buffer' around settlement areas which, in the absence of other policies, could result in public nuisance and disturbance This policy could have a negative impact on this objective.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	The safeguarding of mineral areas means that these areas are likely to be used eventually for mineral development. This may have the effect of losing the best and most versatile agricultural land. However, restoration to agricultural land may be an option This policy could have a neutral impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required Cover in site specific docs

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	The definition of an MSA does not consider restoration issues. This policy will have no impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	These policies cannot be linked to this objective at the strategic level. The objective is better suited to evaluation at the site specific stage. This policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	Important environmental and landscape areas are situated in MSAs. If these areas are safeguarded for mineral development it will prevent non-mineral development which could have a negative effect on biodiversity and is unlikely to have the same biodiversity benefits which post mineral extraction restoration could bring. Additionally development proposals in MSAs will be assessed according to their environmental impact. This policy could have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Policy M2 Apportionment Rate and Landbank			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development	Provision is made for an apportionment rate of 1.57mt pa and landbank by identifying Preferred Areas and Future Areas of Search. This will have the effect of preventing mineral sterilisation in these areas. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	Provision is made for an apportionment rate of 1.57mt pa and landbank by identifying Preferred Areas and Future Areas of Search. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	It is hard to determine if providing for the 1.57mt pa apportionment rate and landbank would increase or decrease the use of secondary or recycled materials. The relationship is a complex one and largely dependent on market forces and has, therefore, been evaluated as neutral. This policy could result in a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing	0 Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This policy would make provision for the 1.57mt pa apportionment rate and landbank but this is unlikely to have any effect on this objective. This policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This policy would make provision for the apportionment rate and landbank but this is unlikely to have any effect on this objective. This policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	NA
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	<p>This policy provides for an apportionment rate of 1.57mt pa. By setting a limit on the amount of aggregate to be extracted in Berkshire, public nuisance will be reduced to just pre-selected areas.</p> <p>This policy could result in a negative effect.</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ High Site Specific No Post Plan Adoption None required</p>
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	<p>The methodology for the selection of preferred areas to provide for the apportionment rate and landbank will take account of people's living conditions and environmental interests. (See Detailed Minerals Preferred Areas)</p> <p>This policy could result in a very positive effect.</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ High Site Specific No Post plan adoption None required</p>
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	<p>The lower limit of extraction will result in a reduced loss of best agricultural land,</p> <p>This policy could result in a very positive effect.</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required</p>
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	<p>This policy would have no direct impact on this objective.</p>	<p>Effect</p>	<p>NA</p>
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	<p>This policy would have no direct impact on the safeguarding of mineral distribution nodes</p>	<p>Effect</p>	<p>NA</p>
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	<p>This policy would have no direct impact on this objective.</p>	<p>Effect</p>	<p>NA</p>

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	This policy would make provision for the lower apportionment rate of 1.57mt pa. This is likely to encourage less mineral extraction than the current plan. Nevertheless, this policy is likely to have a detrimental effect on biodiversity. However, this has to be balanced with the positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes may bring. This policy could have a neutral impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Site Specific No Medium/Long Term None required
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing	NA
M3 Minerals Preferred Areas for Sharp Sand and Gravel			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This policy has a presumption in favour of allowing all sand and gravel extraction in the Preferred Areas. This encourages sand and gravel extraction and so avoids mineral sterilisation. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Preferred Areas No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This policy has a presumption in favour of allowing all sand and gravel extraction in the Preferred Areas. This will encourage all sand and gravel extraction and should, therefore, contribute to the sub-regional apportionment. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	It is hard to determine if favouring sand and gravel extraction in Preferred Areas would increase or decrease the use of secondary or recycled materials. The relationship is a complex one and largely dependent on market forces and has, therefore, been evaluated as neutral. This policy could result in a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown None Required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This policy would favour sand and gravel extraction in the Preferred Areas but this is unlikely to have an impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This policy would favour sharp sand and gravel extraction in the Preferred Areas. The identification of Mineral Preferred Areas could preclude the mineral sites for waste facilities before and during mineral extraction. However, restoration of the site may be to waste. This policy could result in a neutral effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown None Required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	This policy favours sand and gravel extraction in the Preferred Areas. This should act to encourage mineral extraction in specified locations which have been chosen after an assessment process in which the minimisation of public nuisance is a key objective This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ + Unknown Site Specific No Unknown Consider at site specific level
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	This policy favours sand and gravel extraction in the Preferred Areas. This should act to encourage mineral extraction in specified locations which have been chosen after an assessment process in which the proximity of settlements is a key objective This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ + High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	This policy includes policies to define the Preferred Areas and to favour sand and gravel extraction. It also includes policies which encourage the use of PDL and avoid best agricultural land. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This policy would have no direct impact on this objective	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This policy would have no direct impact on the safeguarding of mineral distribution nodes	Effect	NA
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	This policy would have no direct impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	This policy includes policies to define the Preferred Areas and to favour sand and gravel extraction. This is likely to encourage mineral development, which in turn is likely to have a detrimental effect on biodiversity. However, this has to be balanced with the positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes may bring. This policy could have a neutral impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
M4 Extraction of sharp sand and gravel outside Minerals Preferred Areas			
Summary of all SA Objectives	The presumption against extraction outside the Preferred Areas will mean that most extraction will take place within the Preferred Areas which by definition are considered to be the least damaging potential sites for sand and gravel extraction in terms of the effects on people's living conditions and the environment. Any exceptions to mineral development outside the Preferred Areas would take account of sustainability criteria and will reduce the complexity of existing policies and guidance to a more user-friendly form. This policy will result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Unknown Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
M5 Areas of Search for Building Sand			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This policy has a presumption in favour of allowing applications for extraction in the Areas of Search. This will encourage extraction and so avoid mineral sterilisation. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Preferred Areas No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This policy has a presumption in favour of allowing applications for extraction in the Areas of Search. This will encourage extraction and so contribute to the apportionment rate. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing – Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	It is hard to determine if favouring extraction in Areas of Search would increase or decrease the use of secondary or recycled materials. The relationship is a complex one and largely dependent on market forces and has, therefore, been evaluated as neutral. This policy could result in a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown None Required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This policy would favour extraction in Areas of Search but this is unlikely to have an impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This policy would favour extraction in the Areas of Search. The identification of Areas of Search could preclude the mineral sites for waste facilities before and during mineral extraction. However, restoration of the site may be to waste. This policy could result in a neutral effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Unknown Unknown Unknown None Required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	This policy favours extraction in the Areas of Search. This should act to encourage mineral extraction, which in turn may lead to increased public nuisance in these areas. This policy could result in a negative effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- Unknown Site Specific No Unknown Consider at site specific level
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	This policy favours sand and gravel extraction in the Areas of Search. Any extraction within the Areas of Search would need to take account of the proximity of settlements. This policy could result in a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	<p>This policy includes policies to define Areas of Search and to favour extraction in those areas subject to meeting specific criteria which are set out in the Minerals DPD. The criteria include avoiding best agricultural land. Additionally, if extraction does take place on best agricultural land then this could later be restored.</p> <p>This policy could result in a very positive effect.</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None Required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	<p>This policy would have no direct impact on this objective</p>	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	<p>This policy would have no direct impact on the safeguarding of mineral distribution nodes</p>	Effect	NA
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	<p>This policy would have no direct impact on this objective.</p>	Effect	NA
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	<p>This policy includes policies to define Areas of Search and to favour extraction in them.</p> <p>The potential extraction will not result in a concentration of extraction in the AONB (as with the previous plan) It is also likely to produce positive effects on biodiversity following restoration.</p> <p>This policy could have a positive impact on this objective</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	Limiting extraction to Areas of Search could mean that a reliable and steady supply of building sand is not maintained within Berkshire and that material may need to be imported from outside the county with potential, accompanying environmental impacts. However, this objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
Policy M6 Supply of Recycled or Secondary Aggregates			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This policy would have no direct impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This policy would have no direct impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	If processing capacity is provided for 0.7 mt of recycled and secondary aggregates then this should provide opportunities for material to be recycled and processed. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire Wide No Immediate None required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This is likely to lead to more recycling and processing sites and thus an increase in recycling. This in turn will minimise waste disposal. This policy could result in a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire Wide No Immediate None required
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	Mineral reprocessing facilities would not be included in a strict definition of a waste management facility. Therefore this policy would have no impact on this objective.	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	This policy is likely to lead to more mineral recycling and processing facilities. However, these will be subject to the detailed development control considerations in the Minerals DPD. This policy could result in a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Unknown Site Specific No Unknown None Required
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	This policy is likely to lead to more mineral recycling and processing facilities. However, these will be subject to the detailed development control considerations in the Minerals DPD. This policy could result in a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Unknown Berkshire wide No Unknown None Required
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	The further development of mineral sites for mineral processing and recycling facilities is likely to be on previously developed land and is unlikely to involve the best and most versatile agricultural land. Additionally, the use as a mineral processing plant may not be permanent and may offer an opportunity for restoration to agriculture. This policy could result in a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Medium Berkshire wide No Unknown None Required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This policy is unlikely to have any effect on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	<p>This policy will have regard to the distances that materials need to be transported for processing and use, with preference given to sites located closest to the intended sources and destinations.</p> <p>This policy would have a very positive effect on this objective</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	<p>This policy would make provision for .7mtpa of recycling and secondary aggregates. This would increase the movements of minerals which could impact on important environmental areas. However, the policy will have regard to the distances that materials need to be transported for processing and use, with preference given to sites located closest to the intended sources and destinations.</p> <p>This policy could have a negative effect</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	<p>This policy would make provision for .7mtpa of recycling and secondary aggregates. This could increase the movements of minerals, which could increase emissions. However, such processing could help reduce the importation of primary aggregates from outside Berkshire.</p> <p>This policy could have a neutral effect</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing	NA
Policy M7 Transportation of Minerals and Policy M8 Safeguarding Rail Depots			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	<p>If facilities for rail or water transport are improved as a result of this policy then this could have a positive impact on the cost and ease of producing secondary or recycled materials. This, in turn, could lead to the increase in use of these materials.</p> <p>Realistically, though, large proportions of minerals or waste are unlikely to be transported by rail or water to and from recycling or processing plants</p> <p>This policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a positive effect on this objective</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>+ Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown Not Required</p>
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	<p>Realistically large proportions of minerals or waste are unlikely to be transported by rail or water to and from recycling or processing plants. However, if facilities for rail or water transport are improved as a result of this policy then this could have a positive impact on the cost and ease of producing secondary or recycled materials. This, in turn, could lead to help to minimise waste and achieve the sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>This policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a positive impact on this objective</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>+ Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown Not Required</p>
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	<p>Rail depots allow for the bulk importation and exportation of aggregates. Therefore, while this might increase local nuisance for residents near the depots, it will greatly reduce the overall disturbance in Berkshire as a whole. The movement of minerals by rail or water will also reinforce this.</p> <p>This policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a positive impact on this objective</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>+ Medium Berkshire Wide No Immediate None Required</p>

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	Rail depot capacity may be increased close to settlements This policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a negative impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption Consider at site specific level
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	Increased rail depot capacity is likely to be on PDL and not on the most versatile agricultural land. This policy is likely to have a positive impact.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	These policies would act to safeguard mineral distribution nodes This policy would have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Confined to mineral distribution nodes Yes Post Adoption None Required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	The safeguarding of rail depots and improvement in facilities for the transportation of minerals by road and rail could help reduce mineral transport by road. These policies would have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	If rail depot sites are safeguarded,, and more minerals are transported by rail, the location of the existing depots means that extra capacity is unlikely to impact on sites of environmental importance. This would need to be more fully evaluated at the site specific stage. This policy would have a neutral impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Policy M9 Borrow Pits			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	Although this policy does not safeguard potential borrow pit sites, if applications for borrow pits meet the conditions set out then minerals will be extracted before they are sterilised. This policy would have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	Although this policy does not safeguard potential borrow pit sites, if applications for borrow pits meet the conditions set out then minerals will be extracted before they are sterilised. This will contribute to Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment. This policy would have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing – Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	Borrow pits allow for minerals to be extracted prior to development to prevent sterilisation and to reduce the need for the importation of primary aggregates. If more scope for exploiting windfall opportunities is allowed then this may lead to a decline in the use of secondary and recycled materials. This policy could have a negative impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- Medium Berkshire Wide No Medium/Long Term Ensure that extraction from borrow pits is balanced with increases in provision for recycling
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	The development of Borrow Pits may lead to a local, temporary increase in public nuisance but this could be offset by the overall reduction in public nuisance resulting from the reduced transportation of minerals. This policy could have a neutral impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown Consider at site specific level
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	The development of Borrow Pits may be close to settlements. This policy could have a negative impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	- Unknown Berkshire Wide No Post plan adoption Site Specific
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect n	NA
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	If minerals are extracted and used where they occur then there will be less movement by road. This policy could have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	NA
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
Policy M10 Chalk and Clay and M11 Oil and Gas			
<p>These policies would have a general positive effect of including a policy for chalk and clay is that supplies for local building materials could be maintained which would have a positive impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value which may require the use of local building materials.</p> <p>These policies specify that proposals for extraction of all non-aggregate minerals will be judged on their merits at the time of the application. For this reason it is not possible to make a full evaluation of all the effects of this policy at this stage. This will be better evaluated at the application stage.</p> <p>This decision was made as a result of guidance contained in Para 1.10 in the Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM Nov 2005) and the Report on Examination of the Surrey Waste Plan which states that 'the level of detail of an SA need not exceed what is useful for the purpose of appraising significant sustainability effects of the DPD in question and to consider alternatives, taking into account the level of detail of the DPD itself and the extent to which it would be more appropriate to assess certain matters elsewhere in the decision-making process.'</p>			
Policy M12 Restoration			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	Mineral workings are a temporary use of land and policies for carefully managed restoration can return agricultural land to it's original standard. This policy is likely to have a very positive impact on this objective	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This policy would encourage wider public and environmental benefits such as improvements to the long term appearance of the local topography and landscape setting, provision of new opportunities for public access and recreation. It would also provide alleviation of flooding at the start of the process rather than towards the end of a site's active extraction phase.. This would have a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Site Specific Yes Post Plan Adoption None Required
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix F Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Minerals Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	This policy would have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	This policy could encourage the creation of greater diversity of habitats for wildlife and prevent extraction from a site where due regard was not paid to the restoration and or improvement of habitats.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Site Specific No Post Adoption None Required
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This policy would consider the potential effects of any restoration scheme on ground and surface water and other environmental concerns. This would have a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Site Specific No Post Adoption None Required
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This policy would have regard to the alleviation of flooding at every stage right from site identification, through mineral extraction to restoration of the site This would have a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Site Specific No Post Adoption None Required
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This policy would ensure that the restored landscape was designed to harmonise with the surroundings This would have a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing	++ High Site Specific No Immediate

Appendix G Forecasting the effect of the Core Strategy Waste Submitted Policies

The list of SA objectives in the table below is the new revised list (see Appendix 2 of the SA Scoping Responses Report⁸ - for further details of why and how these objectives were revised).

The effects of each policy option were assessed in the following way:

Symbol	Effect
++	Very positive
+	Positive
0	Neutral or not significant
-	Negative
--	Very negative
NA	Not applicable

Likelihood	How likely is the effect: High, Medium or Low
Permanent	Is the effect likely to be permanent: Yes or No
Scale	Will the option affect the whole of Berkshire or just a small local area: Berkshire wide or Area Specified
Timing	How quickly will the effect be experienced: Immediately, Short Term, Medium Term, Long Term or post plan adoption
Mitigation	Mitigation will only be considered if effect of strategic level policies is negative or very negative e.g mineral movement by road causes pollution but this could be mitigated by use of a conveyor belt

⁸ Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Responses Report.. JSPU. JMW 200c. May 2006

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Policy W1 Waste Self-Sufficiency			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management needs of Berks and to meet regional apportionment waste management needs. Minerals may underlie potential waste sites. Development for some types of waste use could sterilise the mineral deposits but this is unlikely if Mineral Safeguarding Policies are in place. This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Low Berkshire wide Yes Medium/Long Term None Required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management needs of Berks and to meet regional apportionment waste management needs. Minerals may underlie potential waste sites. Development for some types of waste use instead of mineral extraction could have a detrimental effect on the contribution to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment but this is unlikely if Mineral Safeguarding Policies are in place. This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Low Berkshire wide Yes Medium/Long Term None Required
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management needs of Berks and to meet regional apportionment waste management needs. Some of the provision will result in an increase in recycling facilities and therefore the use of recycled materials. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Medium/Long Term None Required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management needs of Berks and to meet regional apportionment waste management needs. Some of the provision will result in an increase in recycling facilities, which in turn will contribute to waste minimisation and the sustainable management of waste. However, this Policy may also result in more 'waste miles.' This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management needs of Berks and to meet regional apportionment waste management needs. This provision would help ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire Wide No Post plan Adoption None required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	It is possible that in managing all waste arisings in Berkshire and some from outside, future residual waste, following recycling, could be used in the production of energy at a renewable energy plant instead of being disposed of in landfill. This Policy could result in a positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Low Berkshire Wide No Immediate None required
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	Provision to be made for meeting the waste management needs of the county, and outside could lead to increased public nuisance. However, the potential decrease in fly tipping may counteract the public nuisance and lead to an overall neutral effect. This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown None required
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This Policy will have no impact on this objective.	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This Policy will have no direct impact on this objective.	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
<p>12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road</p>	<p>This Policy makes provision to meet the waste management needs of the county area and to seek to make a contribution to meeting regional waste management needs. This could result in more 'waste miles' as waste is transferred to Berkshire from outside the county.</p> <p>This Policy could result in a negative effect</p>	<p>Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation</p>	<p>- Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption Site Specific</p>
<p>13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc</p>	<p>The provision of any waste facilities has the potential to have a negative impact on important environmental or landscape areas and the movement and provision for waste from outside Berkshire could exacerbate this. The Waste Primary Areas of Search indicate that these areas will be avoided but this will need careful evaluation to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	<p>Effect</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change</p>	<p>The provision of any waste facilities has the potential to have a negative impact on air, dust, groundwater, surface water, soils and climate change and the movement and provision for waste from outside Berkshire could exacerbate this. This will need careful evaluation to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	<p>Effect</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>15. Minimise risk of flooding</p>	<p>It is unlikely that the provision of waste facilities would either increase or decrease the risk of flooding because of their location. This will need careful evaluation to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	<p>Effect</p>	<p>NA</p>

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	<p>The provision of any waste facilities has the potential to have a negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value and the movement and provision for waste from outside Berkshire could exacerbate this. This will need careful evaluation to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	Effect	NA
Policy W2 Waste Management Targets			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	<p>This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management targets for Berks as set out in RPG9. Potential waste sites may be underlain by minerals. Development for some types of waste use could sterilise the mineral deposits underneath but this is unlikely if Mineral Safeguarding Policies are in place.</p> <p>This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a neutral effect.</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide Yes Medium/Long Term Site Specific
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	<p>This Policy makes provision for meeting the waste management targets for Berks as set out in RPG9. Minerals may underlie potential waste sites. Development for some types of waste use could sterilise the mineral deposits underneath which could in turn have an impact on provision for the sub-regional apportionment but this is unlikely if Mineral Safeguarding Policies are in place.</p> <p>This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a neutral effect.</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide Yes Medium/Long Term None Required
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	<p>A range of waste management facilities will be required to meet the recycling and recovery targets set out in this policy. This will lead to a direct increase in recycling and the use of secondary or recycled materials.</p> <p>This Policy could result in a very positive effect</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Medium/Long Term None Required

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	A range of waste management facilities will be required to meet the recycling and recovery targets set out in this policy. This will help achieve the sustainable management of waste. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	A range of waste management facilities will be required to meet the targets set out in this policy. This will help ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire Wide No Post plan Adoption None required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Provision for the targets set out in this policy could result in a substantial increase in recycling and composting which depending on methods used could also result in an increase in the production of renewable energy. This Policy could result in a positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Low Berkshire Wide No Immediate None required
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	Increases in recycling and recovery facilities, resulting from the provision for these targets, could lead to an increase in public nuisance. However, the potential decrease in fly-tipping may counteract the public nuisance and lead to an overall neutral effect. This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as having a neutral effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown None required
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	The provision of any waste facilities resulting from the provision for these targets, has the potential to have a negative impact on nearby settlements. The Waste Area of Search is located where most arisings already take place and where development is expected. This will need careful evaluation will need to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected. This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
<p>9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>	<p>The provision of any waste facilities resulting from the provision for these targets could be located on Greenfield land. This will need careful evaluation will need to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	Effect	NA
<p>10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management</p>	<p>Potential restoration will depend on the waste use resulting from the provision for these targets. This will need careful evaluation before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This Policy will have no impact on this objective.</p>	Effect	NA
<p>11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities</p>	<p>This Policy will have no impact on this objective.</p>	Effect	NA
<p>12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road</p>	<p>Provision for the waste management and disposal facilities to meet these targets should result in more facilities. Complex market conditions will dictate if this will lead to an increase or decrease in 'waste miles.' This policy needs to be further appraised at the site specific level</p> <p>This Policy has therefore been evaluated as having a neutral effect</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption Site Specific
<p>13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc</p>	<p>The provision of waste facilities to meet these targets has the potential to have a negative impact on important environmental or landscape areas. The Waste Area of Search indicates that these areas will be avoided but this will need careful evaluation to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	The provision of any waste facilities to meet these targets has the potential to have a negative impact on air, dust, groundwater, surface water, soils and climate change. Careful evaluation will need to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected. This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	It is unlikely that the provision of waste facilities to meet these targets would either increase or decrease the risk of flooding because of their location. This will need careful evaluation will need to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected. This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	The provision of any waste facilities to meet these targets has the potential to have a negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value This will need careful evaluation to take place before the Preferred Areas are selected. This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
Policy W3 The Spatial Distribution of Waste Facilities			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	The Waste Area of Search are largely underlain by mineral deposits. However, these have been designated as Mineral Safeguarding Areas and so minerals are likely to be extracted prior to any use for waste facilities. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	The Waste Primary Areas of Focus are largely underlain by mineral deposits. However, these have been designated as Mineral Safeguarding Areas and so minerals are likely to be extracted prior to any use for waste facilities. This could, in turn, help contribute to Berkshire's sub regional apportionment. This Policy could result in a positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	Small scale facilities for recycling, recovery and transfer of waste would be located close to waste arisings. This could assist in increasing recycling and recovery rates. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire wide Yes Post Plan Adoption None Required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	This policy has regard to the proximity of waste arisings and will encourage provision close to them. This could contribute to the sustainable management of waste. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	The flexibility of the distribution pattern in this policy is likely to ensure an adequate network of waste facilities with people and businesses within range of both small scale and large-scale options. This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This Policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown None Required
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	The smaller local facilities which this option advocates are likely to be on PDL whereas the larger sites are less likely to be on PDL and this may not prevent the loss of best agricultural land. More smaller sites may lead to the use of more land for waste facilities than fewer larger facilities. This Policy has, therefore, been evaluated as neutral	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Berkshire wide No Post Plan Adoption None Required
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	The flexibility of the distribution pattern in this policy which has regard to the proximity to the sources of arisings should help to promote the best use of transport and help reduce the number of waste miles. Large scale facilities will be well located for access by rail and water This Policy could result in a very positive effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post Adoption None Required
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	The supporting text of this policy states that Green Belt and AONB designations should not be excluded from consideration as locations for waste facilities therefore more detailed appraisal will need to be carried out at the Site Specific stage This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Policy W4 The Transfer of Waste			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	In reality, waste transfer is likely to be subject to market forces. However, attempts to reduce the distances of transfer by road, particularly for specialist waste streams could increase the amount of recycling as waste is collected and stored more locally for bulking up prior to moving to a recycling centre or as a new resources – plastics, waste paper, glass bottles. This policy will have a positive impact if the market chooses to follow. This policy is, therefore, evaluated as a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Medium Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	In reality, waste transfer is likely to be subject to market forces. However, attempts to reduce the distances of transfer by road, particularly for specialist waste streams could increase the amount of recycling as waste is collected and stored more locally for bulking up prior to moving to a recycling centre or as a new resources – plastics, waste paper, glass bottles. This policy will have a positive impact if the market chooses to follow This policy is, therefore, evaluated as a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Unknown Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	The provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to encourage a reduction in waste miles by road should assist an adequate network of waste facilities to be set up. This policy is, therefore, evaluated as a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	<p>The provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to encourage a reduction in waste miles by road should help to reduce public nuisance caused by waste road transport. However, this policy could also result in waste facilities being located closer to waste arisings, which in turn could increase public nuisance.</p> <p>This policy is, therefore, evaluated as a neutral effect.</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Medium Berkshire wide No Post plan adoption None required
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	<p>This policy could result in waste facilities being located closer to waste arisings and settlements but it would need to be further evaluated at the site level.</p> <p>This policy is, therefore, evaluated as a neutral effect.</p>	Effect	NA
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	<p>Although this policy would not directly act to safeguard mineral distribution nodes, it would seek to encourage more use of the distribution nodes, which would lend weight to efforts made to safeguard distribution nodes.</p> <p>This policy is likely to have a very positive effect</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Confined to mineral distribution nodes No Post Adoption None Required
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	<p>This policy is concerned with the provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to encourage a reduction in waste miles by road</p> <p>This policy is likely to have a very positive effect.</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ High Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
<p>13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc</p>	<p>Reductions on 'waste miles' and road transport are likely to have a positive impact on important environmental or landscape areas but much will depend on where the Preferred Areas are located.</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	Effect	NA
<p>14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change</p>	<p>This policy is concerned with the provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to encourage a reduction in waste miles by road. This is likely to decrease adverse impacts on air and climate change.</p> <p>This policy is likely to have a very positive effect.</p>	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required
<p>15. Minimise risk of flooding</p>	<p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	Effect	NA
<p>16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value</p>	<p>This policy is concerned with the provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to encourage a reduction in waste miles by road. This is likely to decrease adverse impacts on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value but</p> <p>This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level</p>	Effect	NA
<p>Policy – W6 Need</p>			

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect
	<p>Generally this Preferred Policy is likely to drive waste treatment up the waste hierarchy. Waste disposal facilities outside Preferred Areas will have to demonstrate need which should avoid over-provision of waste disposal facilities and force the market to consider alternative treatment facilities for waste. This is likely to encourage the sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>As and when Preferred Areas are identified in the Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control and Preferred Areas DPD, then the impact of each area not having to demonstrate need will be assessed in a Sustainability Appraisal This is a more appropriate stage to assess this Policy. The impact of non Preferred Areas needing to demonstrate need will also be assessed. (See the Sustainability Appraisal of the Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control and Preferred Areas DPD).</p> <p>This decision was made as a result of guidance contained in Para 1.10 in the Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM Nov 2005) and the Report on Examination of the Surrey Waste Plan which states that 'the level of detail of an SA need not exceed what is useful for the purpose of appraising significant sustainability effects of the DPD in question and to consider alternatives, taking into account the level of detail of the DPD itself and the extent to which it would be more appropriate to assess certain matters elsewhere in the decision-making process.'</p>
	<p>Policy – W7 Planning for Specialist Waste Management Facilities</p> <p>Generally this Preferred Policy will encourage the recovery and processing of specialist waste streams so moving this type of waste up the waste hierarchy and having a positive effect on the sustainable management of waste. If regional or local need is established then the provision of these facilities could lead to the reduction in 'waste miles.' As and when Preferred Areas are identified in the Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control and Preferred Areas DPD, then if the profile of each individual area suggests that it is suitable for developing specialist waste management facilities (including hazardous waste) then this will be assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal. This is a more appropriate stage to assess this Policy. (See the Sustainability Appraisal of the Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control and Preferred Areas DPD).</p> <p>This decision was made as a result of guidance contained in Para 1.10 in the Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM Nov 2005) and the Report on Examination of the Surrey Waste Plan which states that 'the level of detail of an SA need not exceed what is useful for the purpose of appraising significant sustainability effects of the DPD in question and to consider alternatives, taking into account the level of detail of the DPD itself and the extent to which it would be more appropriate to assess certain matters elsewhere in the decision-making process.'</p>

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
Policy W8 – Safeguarding of Waste Management Facilities			
1. To protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
2. To contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
3. To Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials	Existing facilities, sites with planning permission for waste management or disposal and Preferred Areas will be safeguarded. Sites are, therefore, more likely to be available for recycling which could increase recycling rates and the use of recycled materials. This policy is likely to have a positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	+ Medium Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required
4. To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	Existing facilities, sites with planning permission for waste management or disposal and Preferred Areas will be safeguarded. Sites which have previously been assessed as sustainable will, therefore, be available for the sustainable management of waste This policy is likely to have a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required
5. To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements	Existing facilities, sites with planning permission for waste management or disposal and Preferred Areas will be safeguarded. This will help to ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities. This policy is likely to have a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required
6. To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy	Existing facilities, sites with planning permission for waste management or disposal and Preferred Areas will be safeguarded. This could help safeguard sites, which could potentially be used for EFW or other similar facilities. This policy is likely to have a very positive effect.	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	++ Medium Berkshire Wide No Post Adoption None Required
7. Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
8. Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties	The safeguarding of sites would not include a consideration of the proximity of settlements. Some existing sites may be close to settlements and others not. This policy is likely to have a neutral effect	Effect Likelihood Scale Permanent Timing Mitigation	0 Unknown Berkshire Wide No Unknown None Required
9. To encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
10. Consider the early planning of mineral working and waste site restoration to ensure land is accessible to visitors and restored and maintained to an appropriate standard (including long term visual effect) for use as e.g. recreational facilities, nature reserves, agricultural use, water storage or flood management	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
11. To safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
12. To promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
13. To conserve and enhance biodiversity (and if possible geodiversity) and avoid minerals or waste development which would impact on or damage areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs etc	This Policy will have no impact on this objective	Effect	NA
14. Take effective measures to control adverse impacts on air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effect on climate change	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA
15. Minimise risk of flooding	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA

Appendix G Forecasting the Effect of the Core Strategy Waste Policies

SA Objectives	Effect		
16. Avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value	This objective is more appropriately evaluated at the site specific level	Effect	NA