

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

**Sustainability Appraisal Final Report
Non-Technical Summary**

September 2008

JMW 203 NTS

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)

Non-Technical Summary

This non-technical summary is also available as a separate document

Background of SA Process

The Joint Strategic Planning Unit is preparing a framework of documents to direct minerals and waste development in Berkshire. The documents are being produced on behalf of the six Berkshire Unitary Authorities.

The first document in the framework, which has been prepared, is the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy sets out the vision of how minerals and waste should be planned for over the next 20 years.

The new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be carried out for Development Plan Documents (DPDs). Both the SA and the SEA requirement can be carried out in one appraisal process. To avoid any confusion the use of SA throughout this document will refer to both SEA and SA.

The purpose of this SA Report is to ensure that sustainability issues are considered during the preparation, adoption and implementation of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

Summary of the SEA process

The first stage of the SA process was the production of a Scoping Report¹, which was an opportunity to agree the scope and overall level of detail of the SA Report. During this stage main issues were identified and the sustainability objectives were set out. This was followed by an assessment of the Core Strategy objectives.

The first of a number of SA Reports was then prepared. The first considered the effects of the Core Strategy options (different ways in which the Core Strategy objectives could be achieved)² and the second the Preferred Options (preferred ways in which the Core Strategy objectives could be achieved)³.

The SA report was then consulted on at the same time as the Core Strategy Preferred Options.

As a result of this consultation further changes were made to the Core Strategy Preferred Options and a Submission document was produced. This report evaluates the Core Strategy Final Submission document.

Contents and the main objectives of the CS

The Core Strategy provides the basic approach for the JMWDF to ensure that adequate resources for future mineral and waste development are planned for in Berkshire. It also highlights the extent and location of mineral resources needed for extraction, and the waste management capacity which needs to be provided and the potential, broad location for facilities. It sets the primary objectives for the JMWDF.

¹ Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment. Final Scoping Report JSPU June 2006.

² Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Core Strategy Interim Report following Reg 25 consultation. JSPU. JMW 203a. Dec 06

³ Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Core Strategy Preferred Options Final Report. JSPU. JMW 203. Jul 07

Objective A – To strike a balance between the demand for mineral resources, and for waste treatment and disposal facilities and the need to protect the quality of life of the community, the economy and the quality and diversity of environmental assets;

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;

Objective C – To prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of important mineral resources by other forms of development.

Objective D – To ensure an adequate and steady supply of minerals in accordance with current Government guidance by making provision for a stock of permitted reserves (a landbank) for aggregate minerals, and safeguarding facilities for the movement of minerals by rail and encouraging the use of other non road modes where these are more sustainable.

Objective E – To provide direction for the location of operations associated with the supply of minerals with due regard to geological, environmental and market considerations

Objective F – To ensure that mineral sites are progressively restored to a beneficial after-use;

Objective G – To deliver the required increase in new and expanded waste management facilities in Berkshire that will meet targets for recycling and recovery and which achieve net self-sufficiency in Berkshire;

Objective H – 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;

Objective I – To drive 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;

Objective J – To achieve a net reduction in 'waste miles' over the period of the plan and to encourage viable non road-borne forms of transport where these are more sustainable;

Objective K – To safeguard existing waste management facilities which are appropriately located from loss or unnecessary operational constraint as a result of competing forms of development.

Overview of Baseline Information

Minerals

Berkshire is a significant producer of aggregates and is underlain by three main types of minerals: sand and gravel, chalk and clay. In the south east there is a large and growing demand for these products. For example, every new house consumes between 60 – 80 t of aggregates in production. To try and meet this demand the apportionment rate for Berkshire has currently been set as 1.57 mt per year⁴.

Major challenges accompany mineral extraction in Berkshire. The concentration of development in Berkshire where minerals naturally occur and the extent of planning designations aimed at preserving the special character of the countryside all result in pressure on the environment. One of the key aims and challenges which mineral extraction in Berkshire will have to address is balancing the local, regional and national need for mineral extraction with environmental factors.

⁴ South East England Regional Assembly Panel Report on Proposed Alterations to Regional Planning Guidance South East – Regional Minerals Strategy December 2004

Waste

As the population of Berkshire grows so does the amount of waste it produces. The latest information available suggests the total amount of waste produced will increase substantially by 2016. MSW is currently forecast to rise from about 487,000 tonnes in 2007 to about 579,000 tonnes in 2015 and about 672,000 tonnes in 2025. C & I annual arisings are forecast to rise from about 814,000 tonnes in 2007 to about 956,000 tonnes in 2015 and 1.1 million tonnes in 2026.⁵

Construction and demolition wastes (C & D) 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 extended through to 2025.⁶

Hazardous waste arisings are forecast to arise from 40,000 tonnes a year in 2007 to 54,000 tonnes in 2025.

In order to meet targets for waste recycling and recovery an extra 589,000 tonnes per year (Draft South East Plan) of composting, recycling and other recovery capacity will need to be provided to address MSW and C & I wastes. About 742,000 tonnes per year extra capacity is estimated to be needed for C & D waste in Berkshire by 2015.

A balance needs to be struck between the need for waste management facilities and the need to protect the environment and the amenity of local communities.

Section 5.2 gives more detail of the social, environmental and economic characteristics of Berkshire.

SA Objectives

The setting of SA Objectives is a means by which the environmental, social and economic effects of a plan can be considered. The objectives ensure that the DPD is consistent with the strategic aims of European, national, regional local plans and programmes.

The objectives have been derived following consultation, from the review of other plans and programmes (set out in section 5.1) and the specific social, environmental and economic issues and opportunities which have been identified in Berkshire (set out in section 5.2). More detail about their development can be found in section 5.3 and 5.4.

Sustainability Objectives	
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.

⁵ Update of the 'Model for Future Waste Management Capacity Needs in the South East', ERM for SEERA, 2005

⁶ Update of the 'Model for Future Waste Management Capacity Needs in the South East', ERM for SEERA, 2005

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 areas or sites of international, national, county or local importance, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, BAP habitats, CTAs, County Wildlife Sites, AONBs 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	To avoid negative impact on places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value

The objectives of the Core Strategy Issues and Options were tested against the original 24 SA objectives to identify both potential synergies and inconsistencies. The results can be seen in the Interim Sustainability Report Appendix 6⁷. The results indicate that the two sets of objectives were highly compatible with each other and that no potential conflict was identified between them. This information was then able to inform the development of the Core Strategy. As there were no inconsistencies identified no changes were made to the objectives of the Core Strategy Issues and Options as a result of the test.

Following consultation on the Core Strategy Issues and Options (Dec 2005) and the SA Scoping Report, the objectives of both reports were revised. These were then tested against each other. The results of this can be seen in Appendix E.

Assessment of Options

As a result of the earlier SA work, which was done during the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy, only those options, which 'accorded with the objectives of sustainable development', were proposed for inclusion as Preferred Policy Approaches. (see Section 7.1 for a summary of the assessment). This has meant that without exception the Preferred Policy Approaches set out in the Core Strategy 'accorded with the objectives of sustainable development' The Core Strategy Preferred Options SA Final Report⁸ recommended that the Policy Approaches were accepted as the Preferred Policy Approach with the proviso in certain cases that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then.

Following consultation some changes were made to the Preferred Policy Approaches before they were put forward for Submission. For clarity all the policies being put forward for submission were evaluated again.

The table below provides a summary of the significant effects of the Core Strategy Submitted Policies. (For more details see Appendix F and Appendix G).

⁷ Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Core Strategy Interim Report following Reg 25 consultation. JSPU. JMW 203a. Dec 06

⁸Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Core Strategy Preferred Options FinalReport. JSPU. JMW 203. Jul 07

Summary of the likely significant effects of the Core Strategy Submitted Policies(results of the SA).

Summary of effects	Action/ Justification
Plan Duration	
Policies, which would have a generally beneficial regard to the sustainability objectives, would have more certainty of being enforced the longer the plan duration. A plan end date of 2026 is, therefore, the most sustainable option.	Accept Plan Duration of 2026 This plan duration was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.
Overall Vision for the JMWDF	
The principles on which the vision outlined in the JMWLDD is based are highly compatible with the objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal. This vision has been assessed as generally having a major positive effect when evaluated against the SA objectives	Accept Vision This vision was found to accord with the objectives of sustainable development.
Minerals Minerals Primary 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 This would have a positive effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.	Accept Minerals Primary Objectives The objectives were found to be accord with the objectives of sustainable development.

M1 Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits	
<p>Mineral reserves would be protected from non-mineral development until 2026.</p> <p>The definition of Mineral Safeguarding Areas will help to ensure the provision of choice for the supply of minerals for the future. The additional conditions on non-mineral development in these areas will also assist with this.</p> <p>The safeguarding of mineral areas will mean greater choice for future generations and will help avoid sterilisation of deposits. This may have the effect of temporarily losing the best and most versatile agricultural land. However, providing conditions are met restoration to best agricultural land may be an option</p> <p>MSAs are often in areas of high biodiversity. 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.</p> <p>Additionally development proposals in MSAs will be assessed according to their environmental impact.</p> <p>Conversely, MSAs will not have a 'buffer' around settlement areas which, in the absence of other policies, could result in public nuisance and disturbance</p> <p>In summary there is a high likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post plan adoption Temporary Berkshire –wide Very positive impact.</p>	<p>Accept Policy M1</p> <p>This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

M2 Apportionment Rate and Landbank	
<p>Provision is made for an apportionment rate of 1.57mt pa and for a landbank by identifying Preferred Areas and Future Areas of Search. This will have the effect of preventing mineral sterilisation in these areas and to ensure the provision of choice for the supply of minerals for the future</p> <p>By setting a limit on the amount of aggregate to be extracted in Berkshire, public nuisance is more likely to be reduced to just pre-selected areas.</p> <p>Although the lower apportionment rate is likely to result in less extraction than the current plan it is still 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.</p> <p>Overall, the policy would have no impact on almost half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>However, in summary, there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post plan adoption Berkshire Wide Temporary Very positive effect.</p>	<p>Accept Policy M2 This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
M3 Preferred Areas for Sharp Sand and Gravel	
<p>Mineral sterilisation will be avoided in Preferred Areas and this policy will help ensure the provision of choice for the supply of minerals for the future. The effect on secondary and recycled materials will largely be dependent on market forces. The designation of Preferred Areas may preclude the use of land for waste facilities, however restoration may be to waste.</p> <p>Public nuisance and the proximity of settlements should be minimised, as this would be a key objective of the assessment process. The potential negative effect of mineral extraction in the Preferred Areas on important environmental sites and on biodiversity is likely to be counter balanced by the positive effects which restoration can bring. But this would have to be thoroughly appraised when the Preferred Areas are put forward.</p> <p>Overall, the Preferred Policy would have either no effect or a neutral effect on over half of the sustainability objectives. In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Medium/ Long term Berkshire wide Temporary Very positive effect.</p>	<p>Accept Policy M3 This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal Final Report

<p>M4 Extraction of sharp sand and gravel outside Preferred Areas</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In summary, there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide Temporary Post Plan adoption Very positive effect</p>	<p>Accept Policy M4 This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
<p>M5 Areas of Search for Building Sand</p> <p>A presumption in favour of building sand extraction in the Areas of Search will encourage extraction and avoid sterilisation, which in turn would have a positive impact ensuring the provision of choice for the supply of minerals for the future. Public nuisance may be increased in the areas of extraction however; the proximity of settlements is one of the criteria in permitting development in an Area of Search as is the avoidance of best agricultural land. Extraction is less likely to be confined to the AONB. Site restoration may bring environmental benefits.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This impact of this policy will have to be rigorously appraised at the site-specific stage.</p> <p>Overall, this policy would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide Permanent, Post plan adoption Very positive effect</p>	<p>Accept Policy M5 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then. This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

<p>M6 Supply of Recycled or Secondary Aggregates</p> <p>To make provision for the supply of recycled and secondary aggregates current restrictions on material processing at quarries may have to be lifted. The provision of .7mtpa of capacity could lead to more material being recycled and the minimisation of waste. Fewer restrictions could, though, lead to more public nuisance. Further development of mineral processing is likely to be on PDL also opportunities will arise for restoration to agriculture. If provision is made to process material where it is extracted this will help to reduce mineral transport by road and may also reduce the amount of road miles incurred by transporting materials for recycling from nearby sites. However, to make provision for .7mtpa may mean additional movement of materials, which may have a detrimental effect on biodiversity and environmental interests.</p> <p>Overall, this policy would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives. In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide Temporary, Post plan adoption Very positive effect</p>	<p>Accept Policy M6 This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
<p>M7 Transportation of Minerals and M8 Safeguarding Rail Depot Sites</p> <p>Crushed rock is currently transported by rail from the South West into Berkshire. Support for improvement for rail facilities could help reduce mineral and waste transport by road, which, in turn, is likely to have a beneficial effect on biodiversity and environmental concerns and reduce public nuisance.</p> <p>The network of waterways provides the greatest potential for intermodal waste transport but realistically large proportions of minerals or waste are unlikely to be transported by water to and from recycling or processing plants.</p> <p>If facilities for rail or water transport are improved then opportunities for rail or water transport will increase. The encouragement of mineral transport by conveyor belt would also result from this policy.</p> <p>Overall, the Policies would have a positive effect on most of the sustainability objectives In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide Temporary Post Plan Adoption Positive effect</p>	<p>Accept Policy M7 and M8 These policies are in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

M9 Borrow Pits	
<p>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 also contributing to the sub regional apportionment. Borrow pits can take pressure off existing Preferred Areas and may mean that additional areas will not have to be found. Borrow pits may also allow uneconomic deposits to be extracted. 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 may lead to temporary public nuisance but this could be offset by overall reduction in transport of minerals.</p> <p>Overall, the Policy would have predominately no effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Berkshire wide Temporary, Medium/long term. Very positive effect</p>	<p>Accept Policy M9 This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
M10 and M11 Chalk and Clay & 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>	

M 12 Restoration and after-use	
<p>Mineral workings are a temporary use of land and policies for carefully managed restoration can return agricultural land to it's original standard, provide improvements to the long term appearance of the local topography and landscape setting and provide new opportunities for public access and recreation. Restored mineral workings may also provide flood alleviation. 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. This policy would consider the potential effects of any restoration scheme on ground and surface water and other environmental concerns. Restored landscape would be designed to harmonise with the surroundings.</p> <p>Overall, this policy would have predominately no effect on over half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high/Medium likelihood of the following impact</p> <p>Site specific Temporary, Post Plan adoption Very positive effect</p>	<p>Accept Policy M12 This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
Summary of the Effects of the Core Strategy Waste Submitted Policies	
Waste Objectives	
<p>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 and when tested against them during the scoping phase of the SA process were found to be highly compatible.</p> <p>This would have a positive effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>Accept Waste Primary Objectives These objectives are in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal Final Report

<p>W1 Waste Self-Sufficiency</p>	
<p>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 and will help ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities. However, this Policy may also result in more 'waste miles.'</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Provision for waste from outside Berkshire is likely to have an effect on biodiversity, important environmental sites, air and water quality, climate change and important historical sites. However, this is best assessed at the site specific level.</p> <p>The Policy has been evaluated as having no effect on half of the objectives and a mainly very positive effect on most of the others. However, this Policy cannot be accurately evaluated until the later more detailed site specific stage.</p> <p>Overall, the Policy has been evaluated as having a very positive effect at this stage of the LDF process on at least half of the sustainability objectives. Of those which are affected there will be a mainly medium likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post plan adoption Berkshire wide, Temporary Very positive impact</p>	<p>Accept Policy W1 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then. This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
<p>W2 Waste Management Targets</p>	
<p>This policy will have a direct effect on increasing the use of secondary or recycled materials and will add to the sustainable management of waste and an adequate network of waste facilities.</p> <p>This policy could also assist in meeting targets for renewable energy.</p> <p>Complex market conditions will dictate if this policy this will lead to an increase or decrease in 'waste miles.'</p> <p>This Policy has been evaluated as having no effect on half of the objectives and a very positive effect on most of the others. However, this Policy cannot be accurately evaluated until the later more detailed site specific stage. It is expected at this later stage that this policy is likely to have a positive effect on the sustainability objectives but this will need detailed testing at this time.</p> <p>Overall, the Policy has been evaluated as having a very positive effect at this stage of the LDF process on at least half of the sustainability objectives. Of those which are affected there will be a mainly medium likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post plan adoption Berkshire wide, Temporary Very positive impact</p>	<p>Accept Policy W2 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then. This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

<p>W3 The Spatial Distribution of Waste Facilities</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 and contributing to the sustainable management of waste and an adequate network of waste facilities.</p> <p>Smaller local facilities are more likely to be on PDL but may use more land than fewer larger facilities.</p> <p>Proximity to 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.</p> <p>Co-location at suitable waste sites can also bring about benefits in terms of reduced road travel, shared infrastructure and shared mitigation and locational benefits in terms of distances from sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Both Green Belt and AONB are not excluded from consideration as locations for waste facilities. This will need very detailed appraisal at the site specific stage.</p> <p>Overall, the Policy has been evaluated as having no effect at this stage of the LDF process on at least half of the sustainability objectives. Of those which are affected there will be a mainly medium likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post plan adoption Berkshire wide, Permanent Very Positive Impact</p>	<p>Accept Policy W3 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then.</p> <p>This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>
<p>W4 Transfer of Waste</p> <p>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 and will act to reduce public nuisance from waste road transport.</p> <p>Although this policy would not directly act to safeguard distribution nodes, it would seek to encourage more use of the distribution nodes.</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 which in turn is likely to decrease adverse impacts on air and climate change.</p> <p>Overall, this Policy has been evaluated as having no effect at this stage of the LDF process on at least half of the sustainability objectives. Of those, which are affected, there will be a medium likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post plan adoption Berkshire wide, Temporary Very positive impact</p>	<p>Accept Policy W4 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then. This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

W5 Delivery of Waste Management Facilities

Generally this Policy will aim to provide certainty of the delivery of waste facilities by the identification of Preferred Areas. This is likely to encourage the sustainable management of waste.

As and when Preferred Areas are identified in the Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control and Preferred Areas DPD, then the ability of each area to deliver the type, scale, tonnage capacity and location of waste management and disposal capacity required will be subject to a sustainability appraisal. An assessment will also be made, at this stage, of not having any Preferred Areas and exporting waste instead. 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)

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.'

W6 Need

Generally this 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.

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).

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>W7 Planning for Specialist Waste Management</p>	
<p>Generally this 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.'</p> <p>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>	
<p>W8 Safeguarding of Waste Management Facilities</p>	
<p>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 and other waste management activities which should secure and increase recycling and recovery rates.</p> <p>Sites which have previously been assessed as sustainable will, therefore, be available for the sustainable management of waste This will help to ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities.</p> <p>This could help safeguard sites, which could potentially be used for EFW or other similar facilities.</p> <p>The safeguarding of sites would apply to sites identified as appropriate for protection. This would include consideration of the relationship to other land uses.</p> <p>Further evaluation of the sustainability of this Policy would be better carried out at the site-specific level.</p> <p>Overall, the Policy has been evaluated as having no effect at this stage of the LDF process on at least half of the sustainability objectives. Of those which are affected there will be a medium likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p>Post Plan Adoption Berkshire wide, Temporary Very positive impact.</p>	<p>Accept Policy W8 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered then. This policy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development.</p>

Mitigation

Where policies in the Core Strategy have been evaluated as having a negative impact mitigation measures have been suggested. To summarise these are:

- Amendments to existing policy wording
- Adjustments to the explanatory text surrounding the policy
- Mitigation deferred to the Minerals and Waste DPD or the Project level

Monitoring

The key indicators will be monitored every year and any relevant conclusions included as part of the Joint Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). However, all the indicators should be reviewed and published before each review of the Core Strategy or every five years whichever is soonest. Levels of avoidance and mitigation will be increased if targets are not being met. (For more details see Section 10)

Future Stages

The Core Strategy will now be published and then submitted to the Secretary of State for an Independent Examination. The Final Sustainability Appraisal Report (Submission version) provides part of the evidence base and will be used to assess the soundness of the Core Strategy.

Following the examination, the Inspector will produce a report with recommendations, which will be binding upon the JSPU. Where the Inspector suggests significant changes in the binding report, the SA must be amended by the JSPU to show these changes have been appraised.

The information in the SA Report, and responses to the final consultation, must be taken into account during the preparation of the Core Strategy and before it is finally adopted. Then, an adoption statement will be produced to accompany the adopted Core Strategy, outlining:

- How the findings of the SA have been taken into account
- How sustainability in general has been integrated into the Core Strategy
- Changes to the Core Strategy as a result of the SA process
- Responses to the consultation
- How monitoring will be carried out

Overall Evaluation

PPS12 states that 'the potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of different policy options need to be identified and appraised in order to integrate sustainable development objectives in the formulation of policy and to inform decisions on which options should be promoted in local development documents.'

The policies in the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy make provision for the distribution of future mineral workings and waste development. The Strategy achieves a fine balance between making sufficient provision to contribute to the

sub-regional apportionment rate, making provision for a network of sustainable waste facilities to meet Berkshire's needs and taking into account the extensive environmental constraints of the area.

This report confirms that the decisions, which have been made on the selection of, the submitted policies 'accord with the objectives of sustainable development.' However, detailed delivery of these policies will need to be tested at later stages of the LDF process and may require further mitigation measures to be introduced.