

**Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit  
Joint Minerals and Waste Development  
Framework  
Core Strategy Preferred Options  
(Regulation 26)**

**Sustainability Appraisal Final Report**

**July 2007**

**JMW 203**



## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>YOUR COMMENTS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>BACKGROUND TO THE SA REPORT</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>BACKGROUND TO DEVELOPING AND REFINING OPTIONS AND ASSESSING EFFECTS</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS ON THE OVERALL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE JOINT MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS</b>	<b>44</b>



**Glossary**

Acronym	Term	Definition
	<b>Aggregates</b>	Sand, gravel and crushed rock (known as primary aggregates) and other mineral waste such as colliery spoil, industry wastes and recycled materials (known as secondary aggregates). Aggregates are used in the construction industry to produce concrete, mortar, asphalt, etc.
	<b>Alternatives</b>	Different ways of achieving the Plan objectives. Sometimes referred to as Options.
<b>AMR</b>	<b>Annual Monitoring Report</b>	A report that presents an analysis of existing ('saved') policies, progress on the Local Development Scheme (see below) and note if any adjustments to the scheme are needed.
<b>AONB</b>	<b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</b>	Areas of land designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, where the primary purpose is the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty, which includes protecting flora, fauna, geology and landscape features. Natural England is responsible for formally designated AONBs and advising on policies for their protection. Much of western Berkshire is within North Wessex Downs AONB.
	<b>Area of Search</b>	Mineral bearing areas within which planning permission for mineral extraction may be granted – subject to specific planning considerations, or a geographical area in which there may be one or more sites suitable for waste management related development
	<b>Apportionment Rate</b>	The specified rate of extraction of aggregates to be provided for in the mineral landbank
<b>AQMA</b>	<b>Air Quality Management Area</b>	Area designated (under the Environment Act) by local authorities following local assessment of air quality where individual pollutants are forecast to exceed standards defined in the National Air Quality Strategy.
	<b>Biodegradable</b>	Waste that is capable of undergoing anaerobic or aerobic decomposition, such as food and garden waste, and paper and paperboard
<b>BMW</b>	<b>Biodegradable Municipal Waste</b>	Waste from households, that is capable of undergoing anaerobic or aerobic decomposition, such as food and garden waste, and paper and paperboard
	<b>Borrow pit</b>	Temporary mineral workings opened locally to supply material for a specific construction project
<b>C &amp; D</b>	<b>Construction and Demolition Waste</b>	<p>Waste arising from construction and demolition activity and often referred to as inert. It forms a sub-group of Industrial Waste.</p> <p>Although often described as inert, that can be misleading as C &amp; D waste may include material such as timber, paper and paint, which need to be separated out if the waste is to be re-used, e.g. as inert fill, or if disposed of at a site licensed only for inert waste.</p>

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>C &amp; I</b>	<b>Commercial and Industrial Waste</b>	Waste arising from premises used for industry, trade or business, and hence may include a wide range of waste material. – Commercial waste does not include sewage..
	<b>Conservation Area</b>	Area of special architectural or historical interest
	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>	Effects that result from changes caused by a project, plan, programme or policy in association with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future plans and actions.
<b>CWI</b>	<b>Clinical Waste Incinerator</b>	A facility that can burn medical waste from hospitals and similar institutions.
<b>DCLG</b>	<b>Department for Communities and Local Government</b>	Replaces the ODPM (see below). The job of the Department for Communities and Local Government is to help create sustainable communities, working with other Government departments, local councils, businesses, the voluntary sector, and communities themselves.
<b>DPD</b>	<b>Development Plan Document</b>	A Local Development Document which forms part of the statutory development plan, including the Core Strategy, Proposals Map and Area Action Plans.
<b>EA</b>	<b>Environment Agency</b>	Public body for protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales.
	<b>Indicator</b>	Measurement of change to a system or objective
<b>GOSE</b>	<b>Government Office South East</b>	The Government Office for the South East represents central Government in the South East, particularly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister; the Departments for Education and Skills; Trade and Industry; Transport; Culture, Media and Sport; Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; the Home Office. GOSE works to influence contract and develop government programmes and initiatives at a regional and local level, by working in partnership with relevant organisations to meet local needs.
<b>JMWDF</b>	<b>Joint Minerals and Waste Development Framework</b>	A collection of LDDs (see below) relating to mineral and waste issues for all six Berkshire Unitary Authorities.
<b>JMWLDS</b>	<b>Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme</b>	A timetable and project plan for the production of all the LDDs (see below) relating to mineral and waste issues for all six Berkshire Unitary Authorities.
<b>JSPU</b>	<b>Joint Strategic Planning Unit</b>	Organisation set up to produce the structure plan and the minerals and waste local plans for the Berkshire area
	<b>Landbank</b>	A stock of mineral reserves with planning permission for extraction.
	<b>Landfill</b>	The disposal of waste material by tipping into voids in the ground. All landfills are classified as one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazardous;</li> <li>• Non-hazardous;</li> <li>• Non-hazardous with Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste Cell (SNHRC); or</li> <li>• Inert.</li> </ul>

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>LDD</b>	<b>Local Development Documents</b>	The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states, Local Development Documents will comprise both statutory development plan documents and non-statutory Supplementary Planning Documents. LDDs are likely to include core policies, area action plans, proposal map, site-specific policies and a Statement of Community Involvement.
<b>LDF</b>	<b>Local Development Framework</b>	A folder containing a number of documents including LDDs setting out a local authority's policies for meeting the economic, environmental and social aims of its area.
<b>LDS</b>	<b>Local Development Scheme</b>	A timetable and project plan for the production of all the LDDs relating to a LDF.
	<b>Listed Building</b>	Building included on a list of buildings of architectural or historic interest
	<b>Mineral Deposits and Mineral Resources</b>	Defined in planning terms as rock, or sand and gravel, or other material which has a commercial value for which it may be extracted
	<b>Monitoring</b>	Check of effectiveness of policies
<b>MPA</b>	<b>Mineral Planning Authority</b>	A local authority with responsibility for processing mineral applications.
<b>MPG</b>	<b>Minerals Planning Guidance</b>	Guidance setting out the Government's policy on mineral planning issues
<b>MPS</b>	<b>Minerals Planning Statements</b>	New format for guidance setting out the Government's policy on mineral planning issues. These will in time replace all MPGs.
<b>MRF</b>	<b>Material Recycling Facility</b>	A special sorting 'factory' where mixed recyclables are separated into individual materials prior to despatch to reprocessors who wash and prepare the materials for manufacturing into new recycled products.
<b>MSA</b>	<b>Mineral Safeguarding Area</b>	An area identified in order to ensure due consideration of the possibility of mineral extraction prior to development, or of the compatibility with current or future mineral operations is undertaken in the determination of certain non mineral planning applications.
	<b>Mitigation</b>	Measures to avoid, reduce or offset the adverse effects of the plan on sustainability
<b>MSW</b>	<b>Municipal Solid Waste</b>	More commonly known as rubbish, trash or garbage — consists of everyday items such as product packaging, grass clippings, furniture, clothing, bottles, food scraps, newspapers, appliances, paint, and batteries.
	<b>mt (pa)</b>	Million Tonnes (per annum)
	<b>Objective</b>	Statement of what is intended, specifying the desired direction of change
<b>ODPM</b>	<b>Office Deputy Prime Minister</b>	Now replaced by the DCLG
<b>PDL</b>		Previously Developed Land
<b>PPG</b>	<b>Planning Policy Guidance</b>	Guidance issued by ODPM, setting out the Governments policy on planning issues.

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>PPS</b>	<b>Planning Policy Statements</b>	New guidance issued by ODPM, setting out the Government's policy on planning issues. These will replace PPGs.
	<b>Preferred Area</b>	Identified site where there will be a general presumption in favour of mineral extraction or waste related development being granted planning permission – subject to specific planning considerations
	<b>Primary Aggregates</b>	Naturally occurring sand, gravel and hard rock used for construction purposes
	<b>Recycled Materials</b>	Aggregate materials that are recovered from construction and demolition processes and from excavation on construction sites.
<b>RMLP</b>	<b>Replacement Minerals Local Plan</b>	Strategic Minerals Plan for Berkshire covering the period up to the 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2006. Adopted 2001.
<b>RPG</b>	<b>Regional Planning Guidance</b>	Strategic Planning Guidance for the South East (see below) produced by GOSE. The Waste and Minerals part of the plan cover the period from 2001 to 2026.
<b>RSS</b>	<b>Regional Spatial Strategies</b>	Strategy setting out the Government's planning and transport policy for each region for a 15-20 year period
<b>RWS</b>	<b>Regional Waste Strategy</b>	Strategic Strategy that sets regional targets for the diversion from landfill to recycling and composting.
	<b>Safeguarding</b>	A process introduced to a site is protected for development of a specific facility, for example a rail depot
<b>SA</b>	<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>	A single appraisal tool which provides for the systematic identification and evaluation of the economic, social and environmental impacts of a proposal
<b>SAC</b>	<b>Special Area of Conservation</b>	Site of European conservation importance as a habitat for specified species.
<b>Sand and Gravel</b>		In Berkshire there are two main types of sand and gravel: sharp sand and gravel, suitable for most types of concreting purposes, and therefore an important material for the construction industry, and soft sand, suitable either as a fill material, or in limited circumstances as building sand for use in making mortar or plaster, or in asphaltting.
	<b>Scheduled Ancient Monument</b>	Nationally important archaeological site included in the Schedule of Ancient Monuments
	<b>Scoping</b>	Process of deciding the scope and level of detail of the SEA
	<b>Screening</b>	Process of deciding if a plan or programme requires an SEA or other assessment
<b>SEA</b>	<b>Strategic Environmental Assessment</b>	A process to ensure that significant environmental effects arising from policies, plans and programmes are identified, assessed, mitigated, communicated to decision-makers, monitored and that opportunities for public involvement are provided
	<b>Secondary Aggregates</b>	Mineral wastes and industrial by-products used in the construction industry. E.g. colliery spoil, china clay waste, slate waste, power station pulverised fuel ash.
<b>SPA</b>	<b>Special Protection Area</b>	Site of European importance for bird conservation.

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Site of Specific Scientific Interest</b>	Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Areas of national nature conservation or wildlife importance protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. English Nature identifies SSSIs.
<b>UA</b>	<b>Unitary Authority</b>	Administrative unit of Great Britain. Since 1996 the two-tier structure of local government has been replaced by unitary authorities, responsible for all local government services in Scotland and Wales, and in some parts of England, including Berkshire.
	<b>Waste Hierarchy</b>	A hierarchy of approaches to waste management, with 'reduction' the most preferred approach, followed by 're-use'; 'recycling, composting or energy recovery from waste'; and finally 'disposal'.
	<b>Waste Disposal</b>	The process by which residual waste that cannot be reused, recovered or recycled is finally disposed of. The most common forms of disposal are by landfill and incineration.
<b>WLP</b>	<b>Waste Local Plan</b>	Strategic Waste Plan for Berkshire covering the period up to the 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2006. Adopted 1998.
<b>WTS</b>	<b>Waste Transfer Station</b>	A facility where waste is unloaded in order to permit its preparation for further transport for recovery, treatment or disposal elsewhere.
	<b>Waste Treatment</b>	For the purposes of the Berkshire Minerals and Waste DPDs waste treatment means activities in the processing of waste prior to disposal most commonly through, for example, recovery, recycling composting and other mechanical or biological treatment.



**1 Your Comments**

We welcome your comments particularly on the following key questions:

Have we assessed the options correctly?

Are there any potential impacts which have been overlooked?

Are there any further cumulative impacts which have not been identified?

All comments should be received by the JSPU no later than 5<sup>th</sup> November 2007.

Replies should be sent to:

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

Email : [minerals.waste@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:minerals.waste@rbwm.gov.uk)

Tel: 01628 796518

Fax: :+44 (0)1628 796739

The information that you provide will be processed by the Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, to contribute to the Berkshire Unitary Authorities' Minerals and Waste Development Framework. Personal information given on this form will be used by the JSPU (and its agents) in connection with its statutory minerals and waste planning functions.

Please note that your comments may be made available for public inspection and you may be consulted at a later stage.

## **2 Executive Non-Technical Summary**

### **2.1 Background**

The purpose of this SA Report is to ensure that sustainability issues are considered during the preparation and adoption of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. It is an iterative process that identifies the likely significant effects of the Core Strategy and the extent to which implementation of the policies it contains will achieve agreed social, environmental, economic and resource management objectives.

This SA Report has been carried out, on behalf of the six Berkshire Unitary Authorities, by the Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit.

The consultation period for this SA Report will run in parallel with that of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options (Regulation 26). The consultation period will run from 24<sup>th</sup> September to 5<sup>th</sup> November 2007.

### **2.2 Summary of the SEA process**

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

The SA Report is then prepared, which details the effects of the Core Strategy. This report is then consulted on at the same time as the Core Strategy Preferred Options. Any significant changes are then assessed and monitoring processes are set out.

### **2.3 Statement detailing the difference which the SA process has made**

Work on the SA Report and the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options Report (Regulation 25)<sup>1</sup> was carried out concurrently to allow findings from the SA process to inform the development of the Core Strategy Issues and Options.

Once the Issues and Options were set out in the Core Strategy Issues and Options report (Reg 25) they were assessed according to their potential effects on the environment, society, natural resources and economic development.

This assessment was then used to influence the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options (Regulation 26)

---

<sup>1</sup> Core Strategy Issues and Options Report Regulation 25. JLDPD 101a. Dec 2005.

At the Issues and Options stage the most sustainable options were recommended as the preferred option.<sup>2</sup> Table 3 of the Interim Sustainability Report gives more detail about how these recommendations were used.<sup>3</sup> For ease of use the results of the Interim SA have also been included in the Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD.

The iterative nature of the SA process has meant that the appraisal at the issues and options stage helped influence the preferred options. Comments made at this stage were then fed back into the process so that the cycle of draft policy, appraise potential policy impact and redraft potential policy could begin again.

Once the Preferred Options were set out these were then evaluated, The results of this are shown in the summary table overleaf.

As a result of the earlier SA work which was done during the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy, only the most sustainable options were proposed for inclusion as Preferred Policy Approaches. This has meant that without exception the Preferred Policy Approaches set out in the Core Strategy were found to be sustainable. This report recommends that these Policy Approaches are 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> Table 1 Core Strategy Interim Sustainability Report. JSPU. JMW203a. Dec 2006.

<sup>3</sup> Table 3 Core Strategy Interim Sustainability Report. JSPU. JMW203a. Dec 2006.

2.4 Summary of the likely significant effects of the Core Strategy (results of the SA). For more details see Appendix 7 and Appendix 8.

Table 1 Summary of the Effects of the Core Strategy Mineral Preferred Options				
	No Plan	No Change (Keep Existing Plans)	Preferred Policy Approach	Action/ Justification
<b>Plan Duration</b>				
<b>Results</b>	The resulting uncertainty of having no plan with no end date would make this the least sustainable option.	Policies, which would have a generally beneficial regard to the sustainability objectives, would have less certainty of being enforced with a plan end date of 2007.	Policies, which would have a generally beneficial regard to the sustainability objectives, would have more certainty of being enforced the longer the plan duration. <b>A plan end date of 2026 is, therefore, the most sustainable option.</b>	<b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach</b> This policy was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.
<b>Overall Vision for the JMWDF</b>				
<b>Results</b>	Having no plan would mean having no stated vision for minerals and waste planning in Berkshire. <b>A lack of vision stating that any development should be planned in the most sustainable way would have a major negative effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b>	Relying on the existing RMLP or WLP would mean having no stated vision for minerals and waste planning in Berkshire. <b>A lack of vision would have a negative effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b>	To summarise, the vision outlined in the JMWLDD sets out that mineral and waste development should be planned 'in locations which meet the needs of the communities in the JMWDF area, and Berkshire's economy in the most sustainable way.' <b>This vision has been assessed as generally having a major positive effect when evaluated against the SA objectives</b>	<b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach</b> This policy was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.
<b>Minerals Minerals Primary Objectives</b>				
<b>Results</b>	No plan would mean there would be no local objectives relating to the sustainability of mineral and waste development <b>This would have a negative effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b>	The RMLP does not include any objectives relating to the sustainability of mineral and waste development (and no other objectives either) <b>This would have a negative effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b>	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 <b>This would have a positive effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b>	Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach This policy was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action/ Justification</b>
<b>M1 Mineral Safeguarding Areas</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>If Minerals Safeguarding Areas are not identified then land underlain by minerals could be sterilised by non-mineral development.</p> <p>No local maps would be produced to show MSAs therefore Development Control Departments might not be alerted to the presence of minerals.</p> <p>Many sites in Berkshire which are underlain by minerals are currently being considered for non –mineral development</p> <p>Having no plan with no criteria controlling the extraction of mineral deposits is likely to lead to an increase in public nuisance and extraction close to settlements. Having no plan is also likely to lead to the development of non previously developed land and the best agricultural land.</p> <p>Minerals are often located in areas of high biodiversity. If these areas are not safeguarded for mineral development they are likely to be subject to pressure for non-mineral development. Non-mineral development will not have the same biodiversity benefits which post mineral extraction restoration could bring.</p> <p><b>In summary there is a high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Berkshire- wide</b>  <b>Very negative impact.</b></p>	<p>The boundaries of the MSA are not defined in the RMLP but policies set out the relative merits of any proposals for surface development. These conditions would act to protect reserves and contribute to Berkshire’s sub-regional apportionment</p> <p>The existing plan does not define MSAs but defines land with the strongest presumption against allowing sharp sand and gravel extraction. Amongst the criteria for this designation is land within built up areas. For this reason this option would have a positive impact on minimising public nuisance.</p> <p>Minerals can only be won where they naturally occur. The continuation of existing policies may lead to the development of non previously developed land and the best agricultural land</p> <p>MSAs are often in areas of high biodiversity. If these areas are not defined as safeguarded for mineral development, non-mineral development could have a negative effect on biodiversity. Also non-mineral development is unlikely to have the same biodiversity benefits which post mineral extraction restoration could bring.</p> <p><b>In summary there is a high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Medium to long term</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Berkshire-wide</b>  <b>Mainly positive impact.</b></p>	<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 for the extraction of 1.57mt pa. The additional conditions on non-mineral development in these areas will also assist with this.</p> <p>The definition of MSAs will have a positive effect on this objective because public nuisance will be a key element in determining the boundaries of the MSA.</p> <p>The safeguarding of mineral areas means that these areas are likely to be used eventually for mineral development. 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><b>In summary there is a high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Post plan adoption</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Berkshire –wide</b>  <b>Very positive impact.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M1</b></p> <p>This policy was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action/ Justification</b>
<b>M2 Apportionment Rate</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Provision for the 1.57mt pa apportionment rate is made by identifying Preferred Areas. If there is no plan, no preferred areas will be identified and mineral reserves may be sterilised by development as a result. This may also result in a failure to provide for the apportionment rate.</p> <p>Conversely, if there was no plan and no provision for the 1.57mt pa apportionment rate then mineral operators could submit applications with no upper limit on the level of extraction which could result in increased public nuisance.</p> <p>If there was no restriction on the level of extraction then this could result in a greater loss of best agricultural land.</p> <p>This option would place no limit on the extraction rate which could have a detrimental effect on biodiversity in the short term with no certainty of positive restoration following extraction in the long term.</p> <p>Overall, having no plan would have a very mixed effect on the sustainability objectives with over half the objectives unaffected.</p> <p><b>However, in summary there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Short to long term</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Very negative effect.</b></p>	<p>The continuation of existing RMLP Preferred Areas policies will provide for the production of the apportionment rate. Identification of the Preferred Areas could act to prevent mineral sterilisation and to provide for the production of the apportionment rate.</p> <p>Provision is currently made in the existing plan for an apportionment rate of 2.3mt 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 but nonetheless it will be a higher extraction rate than that proposed.</p> <p>The higher extraction limit in the existing plan could lead to greater loss of best agricultural land and may have a greater impact on biodiversity. However, this has to be balanced with the positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes may bring.</p> <p>Overall, keeping the existing plan would have a mixed effect on the sustainability objectives with over half the objectives unaffected.</p> <p><b>However, in summary, there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Medium to long term</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Positive effect.</b></p>	<p>Provision is made for an apportionment rate of 1.57mt pa by identifying Preferred Areas and Future Areas of Search. This will have the effect of preventing mineral sterilisation in these areas and to provide for the production of the apportionment rate.</p> <p>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>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 preferred policy approach would have no impact on almost half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>However, in summary, there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Post plan adoption</b>  <b>Berkshire Wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Very positive effect.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Preferred Policy Approach M2</b></p> <p>This policy was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action/ Justification</b>
<b>M3 Landbank</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Provision for the maintenance of a landbank is made by identifying Preferred Areas. If there is no plan, no preferred areas will be identified and mineral reserves may be sterilised by development as a result. This may also result in a failure to meet the apportionment rate. If there was no plan and no provision for a landbank, public nuisance would possibly be increased as it would not have been a consideration in alternative development. If no provision were made for a landbank then it is likely that less mineral development would take place and therefore less best agricultural land would be lost. Conversely, having no plan would also mean having no detailed mineral policies, which would set out how to make provision for the landbank. These policies would seek to avoid best agricultural land whereas alternative development might not. Other types of development on the sites may also have a detrimental effect on biodiversity, and may also lack the positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes bring. Overall, having no plan would have a mixed effect on the sustainability objectives with almost half the objectives being unaffected.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Short to long term</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Berkshire Wide</b>  <b>Negative effect.</b></p>	<p>The existing RMLP identifies Preferred Areas to provide for the maintenance of a landbank. Identification of the Preferred Areas should act to prevent mineral sterilisation and to contribute to the apportionment rate. Provision is currently made in the existing plan for the provision of a landbank. This should act to encourage mineral extraction in a few sites thus minimising public nuisance overall. The methodology in the RMLP for the selection of preferred areas to make provision for a landbank takes account of people's living conditions and environmental interests. Provision for a landbank would be achieved by the definition of Preferred Areas. The process of defining these areas would be to encourage the use of PDL and avoid best agricultural land. Making provision for a landbank is likely to encourage mineral development, which in turn is likely to have a detrimental effect on biodiversity in the short term. However, this has to be balanced with the long term, positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes bring. Overall, keeping the existing plan would have no effect on almost half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected, there would be a predominately medium likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Medium to long-term</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Mixed spatial area</b>  <b>Positive effect.</b></p>	<p>Provision is made for the maintenance of a landbank by identifying Preferred Areas and Future Areas of Search. This should have the effect of preventing mineral sterilisation and to contribute to the apportionment rate. The provision for a landbank should act to encourage mineral extraction in a few sites thus minimising public nuisance overall. The methodology for the selection of preferred areas to make provision for the landbank takes account of people's living conditions and environmental interests. And will seek to encourage the use of PDL and avoid best agricultural land. Mineral development is likely to be encouraged which in turn may have a detrimental effect on biodiversity in the short term. However, this has to be balanced with the long term, positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes bring. Overall, the Preferred Policy Approach would have no effect on almost half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there would be a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Post plan adoption</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Mixed spatial area</b>  <b>Very positive effect.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M3</b>  This policy would have a predominately positive effect on almost half the objectives and no effect on the rest.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report

	No Plan	No Change (Keep Existing Plans)	Preferred Policy Approach	Action/ Justification
<b>M4 Preferred Areas Presumption in favour of sand and gravel extraction</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Non-mineral development likely to sterilise mineral deposits and no presumption in favour of sand and gravel extraction in preferred areas will detract from the sub regional apportionment. The effect on secondary and recycled materials and on best agricultural land will largely be dependent on market forces. Development, which might take place overmineral deposits, may have a detrimental effect on important environmental sites and would lack the positive effects on biodiversity, which mineral site restoration schemes can bring. Overall, having no plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on over half of the sustainability objectives. <b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Short/Medium/long term.</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Berkshire wide,</b>  <b>Negative effect</b></p>	<p>Mineral sterilisation is likely to be avoided and the policy will help to contribute to the sub-regional apportionment. The effect on secondary and recycled materials will largely be dependent on market forces. Designation of Preferred Areas may preclude the use of the land for waste facilities, however restoration may be to waste. A presumption in favour of mineral extraction in the Preferred Areas combined with the higher apportionment rate could result in more public nuisance. However, the selection of Preferred Areas would take account of people's living conditions and environmental interests. 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. Overall, keeping the existing plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on over half of the sustainability objectives. <b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Medium/Long term</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary,</b>  <b>Positive effect.</b></p>	<p>Mineral sterilisation will be avoided and this policy will make a positive contribution to the sub-regional apportionment. 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. 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. Overall, the Preferred Policy would have either no effect or a neutral effect on over half of the sustainability objectives. <b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Medium/ Long term</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Very positive effect.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M4</b>  This policy would have a predominately very positive effect on almost half the objectives and no effect on the rest.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>M5 Areas of Search</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Competing forms of development on soft sand deposits are likely to sterilise the deposits which in turn would have a negative impact on provision for the sub-regional apportionment and on biodiversity. Overall, having no plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Short/medium/long term.</b>  <b>Negative effect</b></p>	<p>Limits on extraction outside Preferred Areas could result in other forms of development sterilising mineral deposits which in turn would have a negative impact on provision for the sub-regional apportionment. Extraction will continue to be focused on the AONB with the resultant effects on the biodiversity of this area. Site restoration may bring environmental benefits.</p> <p>Overall, keeping the existing plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Medium/long term</b>  <b>Permanent,</b>  <b>Positive effect</b></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 on provision for the sub-regional apportionment. Public nuisance may be increased in the areas of extraction however; the proximity of settlements is a 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>Overall, this policy would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Permanent,</b>  <b>Post plan adoption</b>  <b>Very positive effect</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M5</b>  This policy would have a predominately very positive effect on approximately a third of the objectives and no effect on the rest.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>M6 Exceptions to Mineral Development Outside Preferred Areas</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Having no plan and no policies to control extraction will mean that there will be no regard for the majority of the sustainability objectives and there is likely to be a very negative effect on all of them. However, it is possible that a positive contribution to the sub-regional apportionment may result. In summary, there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact:</p> <p><b>Berkshire wide Immediate Permanent Very negative effect</b></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><b>In summary, there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide, Temporary Medium to long term. Very positive effect</b></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><b>In summary, there is a predominately high to medium likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide Temporary Post Plan adoption Very positive effect</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M6</b> This policy would have a predominately very positive effect on the sustainability objectives.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action/ Justification</b>
<b>M7 Processing of Recycled or Secondary Aggregates Results</b>	<p>May lead to an increase in production of recycled materials and the minimisation of waste. No restrictions on processing facilities may lead to more public nuisance. Mineral processing plants could be built on non PDL and the most versatile agricultural land, additionally no restoration policy would exist. Processing plants could be developed without regard to most sustainable transport modes or environmental issues.</p> <p><b>In summary there is a high likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide, Temporary Immediate Negative effect</b></p>	<p>Processing or manufacturing plant would be confined to material extracted at the quarry, which would not help to minimise waste. Fewer facilities with more restrictions would lead to less public nuisance. Further development of mineral processing likely to be on PDL also opportunities will arise for restoration to agriculture. Processing material where it is extracted will help to reduce mineral transport by road but may be offset by the necessity of transporting material from nearby sites to alternative processing plants. Restricting mineral processing and movements would have a positive effect on biodiversity and environmental interests.</p> <p>Overall, keeping the existing plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact: Berkshire wide Immediate Temporary, Positive effect</b></p>	<p>Lifting restrictions on material processing at quarries could lead to more material being recycled and the minimisation of waste. Less restrictions could lead to more public nuisance. Further development of mineral processing likely to be on PDL also opportunities will arise for restoration to agriculture. Processing material where it is extracted 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, additional movement of materials 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.</p> <p><b>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</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M7</b> This policy would have a predominately neutral effect on the sustainability objectives.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report

	No Plan	No Change (Keep Existing Plans)	Preferred Policy Approach	Action / Justification
<b>M8 and M9 Rail Depots</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Realistically, any waste to be recycled is unlikely to be transported by rail, from or to Berkshire, with or without the safeguarding of rail terminals. Their safeguarding is unlikely to increase recycling or the minimisation of waste. Any increase in mineral non-rail transport, though, may have a negative effect on public nuisance, important environmental areas and concerns and biodiversity.</p> <p>Overall, having no plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Short and medium/long term.</b>  <b>Neutral effect</b></p>	<p>Realistically, any additional waste to be recycled is unlikely to be transported by rail, from or to Berkshire, with or without the safeguarding of rail terminals. Any decrease in mineral non-rail transport is likely to have a beneficial effect on biodiversity and environmental concerns and reduce public nuisance.</p> <p>Overall, keeping the existing plan would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Immediate.</b>  <b>Neutral effect</b></p>	<p>Realistically, any waste to be recycled is unlikely to be transported by rail, from or to Berkshire, with or without the safeguarding of rail terminals. Any decrease in mineral non-rail transport is likely to have a beneficial effect on biodiversity and environmental concerns and reduce public nuisance.</p> <p>Overall, the Preferred Policy would have either no effect or a neutral effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Immediate.</b>  <b>Neutral effect</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M8 and M9</b></p> <p>This policy would have a predominately neutral/positive effect on the sustainability objectives.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>M 10 Borrow Pits</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Potential borrow pit sites could be developed for other purposes leading to sterilisation and a negative contribution to the sub regional apportionment. Market forces will determine how much material is extracted from borrow pits which in turn will affect the use of secondary or recycled materials. May lead to temporary public nuisance but this could be offset by overall reduction in transport of minerals. Overall, having no plan would have predominately no effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Negative effect.</b></p>	<p>Although this option 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. 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. Overall, keeping the existing plan would have predominately no effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary,</b>  <b>Medium/long term.</b>  <b>Very positive effect</b></p>	<p>Although this option 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.. 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. Overall, the Preferred Option would have predominately no effect on most of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary,</b>  <b>Medium/long term.</b>  <b>Very positive effect</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach M10</b>  Any effect which this policy would have would be predominately very positive.</p>
<b>M11 and M12 Chalk and Clay &amp; Oil and Gas</b>				
<b>Results</b>	Not considered suitable for evaluation			

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>M 13 Restoration Results</b>	<p>Sites would not necessarily be returned to the original quality of agricultural land. No provision would have to be made for restoration following mineral extraction. There would be no necessity for a restoration scheme which had regard to important places and building.</p> <p>Overall, having no plan would have predominately no effect on over half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Medium term.</b>  <b>Very negative effect</b></p>	<p>Mineral workings are a temporary use of land and policies for carefully managed restoration can return agricultural land to it's original standard or 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 and the alleviation of flooding. This option 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 option 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, keeping the existing plan would have predominately no effect on over half of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high/Medium likelihood of the following impact Site specific</b>  <b>Temporary,</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Positive/very positive effect</b></p>	<p>Mineral workings are a temporary use of land and policies for carefully managed restoration can return agricultural land to it's original standard or 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.</p> <p>This option 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 option 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><b>In summary, of those objectives which would be affected there is a predominately high/Medium likelihood of the following impact Site specific</b>  <b>Temporary,</b>  <b>Post Plan adoption</b>  <b>Very positive effect</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Preferred Policy Approach M13</b>  Any effect which this policy would have would be predominately very positive.</p>

<b>Table 2 Summary of the Effects of the Core Strategy Waste Preferred Options</b>				
	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action/Justification</b>
<b>Waste</b>				
<b>Waste Objectives</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>No plan would mean there would be no local objectives relating to the sustainability of mineral and waste development.</p> <p><b>This would have a negative effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b></p>	<p>The WLP does not include any objectives relating to the sustainability of mineral and waste development (and no other objectives either)</p> <p><b>This would have a negative effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b></p>	<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><b>This would have a positive effect on the achievement of the sustainability objectives.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach</b></p> <p>This policy was highly sustainable when tested against all the sustainability objectives.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

<b>W1 Waste Self-Sufficiency</b>				
	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>W1 Waste Self-Sufficiency</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Provision for waste facilities for Berks waste and for an apportionment of regional waste would be entirely dependent on market forces. It is unlikely that market forces alone will ensure an adequate or sustainable network of waste management facilities.</p> <p>It is unknown whether this would lead to more or less public nuisance.</p> <p>If the market is relied on to dispose of non municipal waste from inside and outside Berkshire then this could result in more 'waste miles' as the market will look for the cheapest option.</p>	<p>Potential waste sites may be underlain by minerals, and development for some types of waste sites could sterilise the mineral deposits but this is unlikely.</p> <p>The WLP 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 option 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>Potential waste sites may be underlain by minerals. Development for some types of waste sites could sterilise the mineral deposits but this is unlikely.</p> <p>This option 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 option 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>	

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>W1 Waste Self-Sufficiency (Cont)</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Having no plan has been evaluated as having no effect on half of the objectives and a neutral effect on many of the others. However, this is largely because this option cannot be accurately evaluated until the later more detailed site-specific stage. It is expected at this later stage that having no plan is likely to have a very negative effect on the sustainability objectives.</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>Keeping the existing plan has been evaluated as having no effect on half of the objectives and a mainly positive effect on most of the others. However, this is largely because this option cannot be accurately evaluated until the later more detailed site specific stage. It is expected at this later stage that keeping the existing plan is likely to have a positive effect on the sustainability objectives</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><b>The Preferred Policy Approach has been evaluated as having no effect on half of the objectives and a mainly positive effect on most of the others. However, this is largely because this option cannot be accurately evaluated until the later more detailed site specific stage. It is expected at this later stage that keeping the existing plan is likely to have a positive effect on the sustainability objectives but this will need detailed testing at this time.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach W1 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered.</b></p> <p>This policy was found to be largely sustainable when tested against the sustainability objectives.</p>
<b>W2 Targets</b>				
<b>Results</b>	An evaluation of Preferred Policy Approach W2 is not appropriate			

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>W3 Distribution of Waste Facilities</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>The distribution of waste facilities will be dependent on market forces. Waste facilities may, therefore, be located on land underlain by minerals, which may become sterilised as a result. This could have a negative effect on Berkshire's contribution to the sub-regional apportionment.</p> <p>Waste facilities may be located without regard to the proximity of the arisings. This is likely to contribute to 'waste miles' and to have a very negative effect on the sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>The provision of an adequate network of waste management facilities will be uncertain. The use of previously developed land or the prevention of the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land will not be encouraged.</p> <p><b>Overall, having no plan 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 is a medium likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Medium to long term</b>  <b>Temporary/Permanent</b>  <b>Berkshire-wide</b>  <b>Mainly negative impact.</b></p>	<p>Mineral sterilisation is not mentioned as a consideration in the choice of waste preferred areas in the existing WLP. Continuation of the present plan could, therefore, lead to mineral sterilisation. This could have a negative effect on Berkshire's contribution to the sub-regional apportionment.</p> <p>The WLP advocates a hierarchy of sites with smaller local facilities acting as feeders to larger more central facilities. This is likely to contribute to the sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>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 which may not prevent the loss of best agricultural land.</p> <p><b>Overall, keeping the existing plan 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:</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Mixture of both positive and negative impacts.</b></p>	<p>This option is unlikely to sterilise mineral deposits as the policy states that use should be made of previously developed land where possible. This could, in turn, help contribute to Berkshire's sub regional apportionment.</p> <p>This policy has regard to the proximity of waste arisings which could act to reduce 'waste miles' and would contribute to the sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>The flexibility of the distribution pattern in this policy is likely to ensure an adequate network of waste facilities with everyone within range of both small scale and large scale options.</p> <p>The use of PDL and avoidance of best agricultural land as a result of a mid way, flexible position is evaluated as positive. This option will have to be evaluated in more detail at the site specific stage.</p> <p><b>Overall, the Preferred Policy Approach 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:</b>  <b>Post plan adoption</b>  <b>Berkshire wide,</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>very positive impact</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Proposed Preferred Policy Approach W3</b>  This policy was found to be very sustainable when tested against the sustainability objectives.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report

	No Plan	No Change (Keep Existing Plans)	Preferred Policy Approach	Justification /Action
<b>W4 Transfer of Waste</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>Waste could be moved long distances to reach the most cost effective disposal or recycling site. No attempt would be made, in a plan, to reduce the distances of waste transfer and transfer would be entirely dependent on market forces. The increase or decrease in recycling will be dependent on the prevailing economic conditions of the time. This is unlikely to contribute to the sustainable management of waste. No attempt would be made, in a plan, to make provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to change this situation. This option is, therefore, unlikely to help reduce public nuisance from waste road transport. With no plan or policy to encourage the reduction of waste transfer by road, an increase in the use of distribution nodes such as rail and river/canal is unlikely. If distribution nodes are not used then this could assist in their eventual sterilisation.</p> <p>Waste is frequently moved long distances to reach the most cost effective disposal or recycling site. No attempt would be made, in a plan, to make provision for new waste treatment and disposal capacity to change this situation. This option is, therefore, unlikely to reduce road 'waste miles' and may actively increase 'waste miles.'</p>	<p>The existing WLP recognises the potential importance of rail transport but does not include a policy. This would have limited weight in influencing the reduction of 'waste miles' and would, therefore, be unlikely to contribute to the sustainable management of waste or to reduce public nuisance from waste road transport. This would be unlikely to produce more use of the distribution nodes and would, therefore, not assist in their safeguard. The existing WLP recognises the potential importance of rail transport but does not include a policy. This option is, therefore, unlikely to reduce waste road miles which in turn is likely to increase adverse impacts on air and climate change.</p> <p><b>Overall, keeping the existing plan 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</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Negative impact.</b></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. Although this policy would not directly act to safeguard distribution nodes, it would seek to encourage more use of the distribution nodes. 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><b>Overall, the Proposed Preferred Policy Approach 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:</b>  <b>Post plan adoption</b>  <b>Berkshire wide,</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Very positive impact</b></p>	

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action / Justification</b>
<b>W4 Transfer of Waste (Cont)</b>				
	<p>This option is, therefore, likely to increase adverse impacts on air and climate change and to increase public nuisance.</p> <p><b>Overall, having no plan 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 is a high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Berkshire wide,</b>  <b>Temporary,</b>  <b>Very negative impact.</b></p>			<p><b>Accept Preferred Policy Approach W4 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered.</b>                      This policy was found to be sustainable when tested against the sustainability objectives</p>
<b>W5 Delivery of Waste Management Facilities</b>				
<b>Results</b>	This policy would be better evaluated at the site specific level			
<b>W6 Waste Management Technologies</b>				
<b>Results</b>	This policy is not suitable for evaluation			
<b>W7 Need</b>				
<b>Results</b>	This policy is not suitable for evaluation			
<b>W8 Planning for Commercial and Industrial and Construction and Demolition Waste Management</b>				
<b>Results</b>	This policy is not suitable for evaluation			
<b>W9 Planning for Specialist Waste Management</b>				
<b>Results</b>	This policy is not suitable for evaluation			

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action /Justification</b>
<b>W10 Safeguarding of Waste Management Facilities</b>				
<b>Results</b>	<p>With no policy to safeguard sites for waste management purposes sites are likely to be developed for uses with the greatest returns to the developer. This will rarely be a waste use which would mean that sites are not so likely to be available for recycling which, in turn, could have a very negative impact on recycling rates.</p> <p>Sites, which have previously been assessed as sustainable, will not be available for the sustainable management of waste this would not help to ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities nor would sites be available for EFW or other similar facilities.</p> <p><b>Overall, having no plan 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 high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Immediate,</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Permanent</b>  <b>Very negative impact.</b></p>	<p>The WLP seeks to safeguard a number of sites for waste management purposes, however, no policy is included to strengthen this aim. The safeguarding of sites will not, therefore, be as certain. This could mean that sites are not so likely to be available for recycling which, in turn, may have a negative impact on recycling rates.</p> <p>Sites which have previously been assessed as sustainable will not be available for the sustainable management of waste  This would do little to help ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities nor would sites be available for EFW or other similar facilities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Overall, keeping the existing plan 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:</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Neutral impact.</b></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 which could increase recycling 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.  This could help safeguard sites, which could potentially be used for EFW or other similar facilities.</p> <p>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.  Further evaluation of the sustainability of this Preferred Option would be better carried out at the site specific level.</p> <p><b>Overall, the Preferred Policy Approach 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:</b>  <b>Post Plan Adoption</b>  <b>Berkshire wide,</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Very positive impact.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept Preferred Policy Approach W6 with proviso that detailed testing will be needed at later stages of the LDF process and mitigation may need to be considered.</b></p> <p>This policy was found to be sustainable when tested against the sustainability objectives</p>

## Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report

W11 Waste Reduction and New Development			
	<p>If there are no policies which require new developments to provide facilities to encourage recycling then recycling rates are unlikely to increase. A contribution to the sustainable management of waste is unlikely.</p> <p>If waste facilities in new developments are not encouraged then this will not contribute to a network of waste management facilities</p> <p>No policy guidance would be given for waste facilities that seek to separate out reusable and recyclables from collected waste streams. Thus landfill is likely to remain the preferred disposal route.</p> <p>If no policies exist to make provision for the storage and separation of waste then individual road travel to recycling and waste disposal centres will not be reduced.</p> <p><b>Overall, having no plan 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 high likelihood of the following impact:</b>  <b>Immediate</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Very negative impact.</b></p>	<p>The WLP includes policies for developments to include provision for minimising, separation, storage, reusing and recycling waste. This is likely to help increase recycling rates and also, therefore, the use of recycled materials. This is likely to help reduce waste disposal and assist the sustainable management of waste</p> <p>In seeking to provide for waste facilities in new developments, this policy will directly contribute to ensuring an adequate network of waste management facilities.</p> <p>The current policy could assist in providing more facilities for the separation of materials for reuse, recycling and recovery but it is limited in its scope.</p> <p>By reducing waste arisings the need for additional waste facilities is reduced thus helping to minimise public nuisance from waste sites. In addition, by positive planning at the design stage of new developments other issues such as odour and visual impact can be mitigated. Provision for storage and separation of waste is likely to be part of new developments. The negative impact of the provision of these facilities is likely to be mitigated at the development stage and offset by the convenience of having waste facilities close to, or as part, of the development.</p>	<p>If more facilities are provided in new developments for waste separation and storage This is likely to help increase recycling rates and also, therefore, the use of recycled materials. This is likely to help reduce waste disposal and assist the sustainable management of waste.</p> <p>By seeking to provide for waste facilities in new developments, this policy will directly contribute to ensuring an adequate network of waste management facilities.</p> <p>The preferred policy approach promotes the need for recycling and implies the separation of reusable; recyclable and recoverable waste streams from collections. As such this would have an active role in encouraging the reuse of materials/goods before disposal, the recycling of materials/goods after disposal and the recovery of any residual wastes prior to final disposal</p> <p>By reducing waste arisings the need for additional waste facilities is reduced thus helping to minimise public nuisance from waste sites. In addition, by positive planning at the design stage of new developments other issues such as odour and visual impact can be mitigated.</p>

**Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Final Report**

	<b>No Plan</b>	<b>No Change (Keep Existing Plans)</b>	<b>Preferred Policy Approach</b>	<b>Action /Justification</b>
<b>W11 Waste Reduction and New Development (cont)</b>				
<b>Results</b>		<p>Provision for storage and separation of waste is likely to reduce individual travel by road to recycling and waste disposal centres.</p> <p><b>Overall, keeping the existing plan 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 mixed likelihood of the following impact</b>  <b>Medium/long term</b>  <b>Berkshire wide</b>  <b>Temporary</b>  <b>Positive/very positive impact.</b></p>	<p>Provision for storage and separation of waste is likely to be part of new developments. The negative impact of the provision of these facilities is likely to be mitigated at the development stage and offset by the convenience of having waste facilities close to, or as part, of the development.</p>	<p><b>Accept Preferred Policy Approach W11</b>                      This policy was found to be highly sustainable when tested against the sustainability objectives</p>

### 3 Introduction

#### 3.1 The Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Development Framework and Sustainability Report

Under the provision of the Planning and Compulsory Planning Act 2004, the Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU) is in the process of preparing the Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Development Framework (JMWDF) on behalf of the six Berkshire Unitary Authorities:

- Bracknell Forest Borough Council
- Reading Borough Council
- The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
- Slough Borough Council
- West Berkshire Council
- Wokingham Borough Council

When adopted the JMWDF will replace the Replacement Minerals Plan for Berkshire<sup>4</sup> and the Waste Local Plan<sup>5</sup>.

Two Development Plan Documents (DPDs) together comprise the JMWDF:

- The Core Strategy which deals jointly with waste and minerals, including a country-wide vision, measurable objectives and an overall strategy for minerals and for waste planning
- A Detailed Minerals and Waste Development Control Policies and Preferred Areas DPD (Minerals DPD and Waste DPD). This document will provide development control policies against which proposals for minerals and waste development will be judged and site-specific allocations.

Each of these documents will require a Sustainability Appraisal. This report will be appraising the Core Strategy document.

### 4 Appraisal Methodology

#### 4.1 What is the SA Report and what is its purpose?

The purpose of an SA Report is to ensure that sustainability issues are considered during the preparation and adoption of Local Development Documents. It is an iterative process that identifies the likely significant effects of each DPD and the extent to which implementation of the policies it contains will achieve agreed social, environmental, economic and resource management

---

<sup>4</sup> Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire Incorporating the Alterations adopted in December 1997 and May 2001. Babtie.

<sup>5</sup> Waste Local Plan for Berkshire. Babtie. 1998

objectives.

Sustainable development is central to the new, reformed planning system. The DEFRA Report Securing the Future<sup>6</sup> places sustainable development at the heart of the land use planning system and at the core of new planning guidance. Sustainable development is development that improves the quality of life, both now and in the future, but not at the expense of the environment. The purpose of the Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to ensure that sustainability is considered and integrated into the preparation of Development Plan Documents. This will ensure that the results and consultation responses can then feed into and influence the document.

This SA Report provides an environmental assessment of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options.

#### **4.2 At what stage of the LDF process was the Report produced?**

Work on the SA Report and the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options Report (Regulation 25) both started at the same time (December 2004). This was to allow findings from the SA process to inform the development of the Core Strategy Issues and Options.

Once the Issues and Options were set out in the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report<sup>7</sup> the options were assessed according to their potential effects on the environment, society, natural resources and economic development. The results of this can be seen in the Interim SA Report<sup>8</sup>

This assessment was then used to help select the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options (Regulation 26 Sept 2007).

When the Preferred Options were initially produced for consultation they were then evaluated against the existing plan (business as usual) and having no plan.

It is possible that, following consultation on, and possible changes to, the Core Strategy Preferred Options, that a further appraisal will have to be carried out prior to submission of the Core Strategy.

During the stage of preparing the Core Strategy Preferred Options work also started on the sustainability appraisal of the Issues and Options stage of the Minerals and Waste Site Specific DPDs.

#### **4.3 Who is producing the Report**

This SA Report has been carried out, on behalf of the six Berkshire Unitary Authorities, by the Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit.

---

<sup>6</sup> Securing the Future. DEFRA. Mar 2005.

<sup>7</sup> Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Issues and Options.Reg 25. JSPU. Dec 2005

<sup>8</sup> Sustainability Appraisal Core Strategy Interim Report. JSPU. JMW 203a . Dec 2006

#### 4.4 Consultation

The consultation period for this SA Report will run in parallel with that of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options (Regulation 26). The consultation period will run from 24<sup>th</sup> September – 5<sup>th</sup> November 2007.

In accordance with the Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM Nov 2005) and PPS12 the Report was sent to the statutory SEA consultation bodies with environmental responsibilities:

- The Environment Agency
- Natural England<sup>9</sup>
- English Heritage

Letters and/or reports were also sent to the list of consultees at Appendix 1. The letter advised the consultees of the consultation period for the SA Report and invited their comments. Consultees were advised that they could apply for an electronic or hard copy of the Report and/or response form by letter, phone, email or by downloading from the website.

During the consultation period the Report and response form was available from the Unitary Authority's reception areas, main libraries in Berkshire, on the JSPU website ([www.berks-jspu.gov.uk](http://www.berks-jspu.gov.uk)) and hard or electronic copies were available on request from the JSPU.

Appendix 1 provides a list of organisations who were consulted on the SA Report. This includes all statutory consultees, MPs and MEPs, district and parish councils in and adjoining Berkshire, neighbouring minerals and waste planning authorities, operators, consultants and interest groups and any other person or group who expressed an interest in taking part in the JMWDF consultation. It also gives the addresses of the main libraries in Berkshire.

A full list of consultees can be obtained on request from the JSPU.

#### 4.5 Difficulties encountered in compiling information or carrying out the assessment

Some of the baseline data which was used to identify issues and to monitor the SA objectives was either not in the correct format or was unreliable. This appraisal reflects the level of detail available at this stage. For more information see Appendix 5.

Many gaps in the baseline data for minerals and waste have been identified and future trends at the local level are therefore difficult to forecast with the usual degree of accuracy.

Many of the options proved difficult to evaluate against the sustainability objectives. Frequently the options would have no impact on the sustainability

---

<sup>9</sup> Natural England was set up in Oct 2006 following a merger of the Countryside Agency and English Nature.

objectives. Also, during the evaluation it became clear that many of the Preferred Options would be more appropriately tested at the site specific stage.

It is acknowledged and accepted that further development and appraisal of options will be necessary following the Preferred Options consultation.

**5 Background to the SA Report**

**5.1 Stages of the SA**

The first stage of the SA Report was the production of a Scoping Report<sup>10</sup>. This was an opportunity to agree the scope and overall level of detail of the SA Report. The Scoping Report was completed in January 2006 and the consultation period on the Report extended from 16<sup>th</sup> January 2006 – 20<sup>th</sup> February 2006.

The Scoping Report also set out a list of sustainability objectives. These were later used to assess the Issues and Options in the MWLDF. These objectives were derived from the review of other plans and programmes, analysis of the baseline information and of the specific environmental issues and opportunities which have been identified in Berkshire.

Table 1 sets out the stages of the SA. Stage A has been completed and incorporates the consultation responses received during the consultation period.

Comments received during the consultation period for the Scoping Report are reported in the SA Scoping Responses Report.<sup>11</sup> As a result of the consultation a revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report<sup>12</sup> has been produced. Both of these reports are available to download from the JSPU website.

**Table 3 Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal**

Plan Stage	SA/SEA Stage	
<b>complete</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</b>
	A1	Other plans, programmes and objectives
	A2	Collect baseline information
	A3	Identify sustainability issues and problems
	A4	Develop SA Objectives
	A5	Consulting on the scope of SA

<sup>10</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report. JSPU. JMW 200a .. Jan 2006

<sup>11</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Responses Report.. JSPU. JMW 200c. May 2006

<sup>12</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Final Scoping Report. . JSPU. JMW 200 June 2006

Plan Stage	SA/SEA Stage	
<b>Production</b>  <i><b>in progress</b></i>	<b>B</b>	<b>Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects</b>
	B1	Testing the DPD objectives against the SA Objectives
	B2	Develop DPD Options
	B3	Predict effects of DPD
	B4	Evaluate effects of DPD
	B5	Consider mitigating measures
	B6	Propose monitoring of significant effects of DPD implementation
	<b>C</b>	<b>Preparing the Report</b>
	C1	Prepare the SA Report
	<b>D</b>	<b>Consulting on the preferred options of the DPD and the Sustainability Report</b>
	D1	Public participation on preferred options of the DPD and the SA Report
	D2 (i)	Assessing significant changes
	<b>Examination</b>	D2(ii)
<b>Adoption and Monitoring</b>	D3	Making decisions and providing information
	<b>E</b>	<b>Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Plan</b>
	E1	Develop aims and methods for monitoring. Publish results of monitoring in annual monitoring reports
	E2	Respond to adverse effects

## 5.2 Requirement for the Issues and Options Sustainability Appraisal

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. This report follows guidance on how to apply the SA set out by the then ODPM<sup>13</sup> which in turn incorporates the requirements of the European directive on the SEA<sup>14</sup>.

The Core Strategy Preferred Options paper includes basic information about the requirements for minerals and waste management capacity over the period of the JMWDF for Berkshire. The report presents preferred options (policy approaches) for different courses of action and offers an opportunity for comments on the options. In accordance with the SEA directive<sup>15</sup> it is essential that these preferred options are subjected to an environmental appraisal

Regulation 12 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations sets out a statutory requirement to assess alternatives in the Environmental Report.

## 5.3 JMW Core Strategy Preferred Options Objectives and Outline of Contents

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

Appendix 2 lists the JMW Core Strategy Preferred Options Objectives and outline of contents

---

<sup>13</sup> Guidance is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks published in November 2005 (ODPM).

<sup>14</sup> European Parliament. (2001) "The Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment", Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament, Luxembourg, 2001

<sup>15</sup> European Parliament. (2001) "The Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment", Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament, Luxembourg, 2001

## **6 Sustainability objectives, baseline and context**

### **6.1 Links to other policies, plans and programmes and sustainability objectives and how these have been taken into account**

The SA must outline the DPD's relationship with other relevant national, regional or local plans and programmes and also outline how international, community or member state level environmental protection objectives have been taken into account during the report's preparation. Appendix 3 sets out how other policies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives which have been taken into account in this report.

A separate screening exercise is being carried out, by independent consultants, on the need for Habitats Appropriate Assessments (AA). 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.

Additionally, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has been undertaken.

### **6.2 Environmental, social and economic issues and opportunities**

The key environmental, social and economic issues in Berkshire were identified by reviewing the baseline data collected, by reviewing background information collected for the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report and professional expert opinion.

In summary 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. Additionally, because of the low silt content of the aggregate deposits in Berkshire the mineral is very high quality for the construction industry. To try and meet this demand the apportionment rate for Berkshire has currently been set as 1.57 mt per year<sup>16</sup>.

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. The maps on the following pages highlight the location of mineral deposits in Berkshire along with the extent of environmentally sensitive areas.

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

---

<sup>16</sup> Regional Planning Guidance for The South East. Alterations to Chapter 10 and 11. DCLG. June 2006.

will increase substantially by 2016. About 450,000 more tonnes of waste is forecast to arise in 2016 than in the base year of 2001/2 (2002/3 for MSW)<sup>17</sup>, which equates to an additional 45,000 dustbin lorry movements every year. 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.

Appendix 4 gives more detail of the environmental issues and opportunities facing Berkshire.

### **6.3 Description of the social, environmental and economic baseline characteristics and the predicted future baseline**

The SEA Directive sets out the topics which need to be covered by baseline data. The collected and suggested baseline data was consulted on during the SA Scoping consultation. As a result of the consultation changes were made to the baseline data. Further information about the changes that were made can be found in the SA Scoping Responses Report.<sup>18</sup>

Appendix 5 sets out the baseline characteristics of the area which will be relevant when assessing the MWLDDs options against sustainability objectives. This Appendix also gives details of whether the baseline condition is improving or declining.

### **6.4 The SA Framework, including objectives, targets, indicators, limitations of the information and assumptions made.**

The setting of SA Objectives is a means by which the environmental 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 SA objectives have been developed separately from the objectives of the JMWLDP but may sometimes overlap.

The objectives have been derived following consultation, from the review of other plans and programmes (shown in Appendix 3), the specific environmental issues and opportunities which have been identified in Berkshire (shown in Appendix 4) and the analysis of the baseline information (shown in Appendix 5).

The SA Scoping Report originally set out 24 SA objectives. Three of these objectives were subsequently removed. (Objective 8 – To Promote Stable Employment and Employment Diversity, Objective 16 – To Minimise the amount of waste produced per tonne of saleable material and Objective 23 – To encourage the use of local building materials). These objectives were removed because it was considered that they could not be directly influenced or monitored through the Minerals and Waste LDF process. Additionally, following consultation, some of the objectives were combined so reducing the

---

<sup>17</sup> The Berkshire Unitary Authorities Joint Minerals and Waste Development Framework – Waste Issues and Options Report. May 2005.

<sup>18</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Responses Report.. JSPU. JMW 200c. May 2006

list from the original 24 to 16. Full details of this process can be found in the SA Scoping Responses Report.<sup>19</sup>

Table 4 below lists the SA objectives and shows which SEA topics listed in the EC SEA directive<sup>20</sup> they have been derived from.

**Table 4 SEA Topics and SA Objectives**

<b>SEA Topic<sup>21</sup></b>		<b>SA Objectives for the JMWLDP</b>
<b>Mineral Resources</b>		
MA	1	Protect important mineral reserves and minimise sterilisation by non-mineral development.
MA	2	Contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment
MA	3	Increase the use of secondary or recycled materials
<b>Waste Facilities</b>		
PHH	4	To minimise waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste.
PHH, WSA	5	To ensure an adequate network of waste management facilities to meet Berkshire's waste requirements
CC	6	To increase energy efficiency and the production of renewable energy
<b>Effects on Communities</b>		
PHH	7	Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites
PHH	8	Give thorough consideration to proximity of mineral workings and waste management facilities or ancillary development to settlements and individual properties.
<b>Land Use and Restoration</b>		
MA, WSA	9	Encourage the use of previously developed land and prevent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
MA, PHH, WSA, BFF	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
<b>Transport</b>		
CF	11	Safeguard mineral distribution nodes such as rail facilities
CF	12	Promote the best use of available transport mode options for mineral supply and movement of waste, reducing where possible mineral transport by road.
<b>Biodiversity, Landscape, Visual Intrusion and Countryside Impact</b>		
BFF	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

<sup>19</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Responses Report.. JSPU. JMW 200c. May 2006

<sup>20</sup> European Parliament. (2001) "The Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment", Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament, Luxembourg, 2001

<sup>21</sup> European Parliament. (2001) "The Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment", Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament, Luxembourg, 2001

<b>Waste and Pollution</b>		
WSA	14	Take effective measures to control emissions to air, dust, groundwater, surface water and soils and minimise adverse effects on climate change
<b>Flooding and Water and Pollution</b>		
WSA	15	Minimise risk of flooding
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>		
CHL	16	Minimise impact on Places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value

### **Key to Abbreviations**

BFF	Bio –diversity, fauna and flora	CF	Climatic Factors
PHH	Population and Human Health	MA	Material Assets
WSA	Water, Soil, Air	CHL	Cultural, Heritage and Landscape

Appendix 5 gives more details of the objectives and sets out:

- The revised SA objectives
- Targets
- Indicators - how the SA objective can be monitored
- 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 (OSouth 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
- Limitations of the information and assumptions made.
- 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

## **7 Background to Developing and refining options and assessing effects**

### **7.1 Testing the Core Strategy objectives against the Sustainability Framework**

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 6<sup>22</sup> 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

---

<sup>22</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Core Strategy Interim Report following Reg 25 consultation. JSPU. JMW 203a. Dec 06

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 6.

To summarise, the objectives were highly compatible with one another. Some were not applicable to evaluate against each other and some had no direct link. A more stringent definition of Not Applicable was made this time. Out of 192 possible outcomes only 2 were found to conflict:

- Core Strategy 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 with Sustainability Objective 7 Minimise public nuisance from mineral workings and waste sites
- Core Strategy Objective D to ensure that the environmental impacts caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are kept to an acceptable minimum with Sustainability Objective 2 Contribute to meeting Berkshire's sub-regional apportionment

## **7.2 Developing Options**

The Core Strategy Issues and Options Report set out a number of options for fulfilling its objectives. As part of the process of selecting the Preferred Options the likely significant environmental effects of each option was evaluated. The effects of each of the options was tested against the SA objectives and the results can be seen in the Interim Sustainability Report<sup>23</sup> Appendix 7. The effects of keeping the existing plan (business as usual) or having no plan were also tested at the same time.

Due to the iterative nature of the Sustainability Appraisal, some of the Sustainability objectives have since been combined and reduced in number, however, the full list was evaluated in the Interim Sustainability Report Appendix 7.

As a result of consultation and the Interim SA on the Core Strategy Issues and Options a set of Core Strategy Preferred Options was selected. Appendix 7 sets out, in detail, the effects of the Minerals Preferred Options on achieving the revised sustainability objectives. This appendix also provides a summary of the effects. Appendix 8 sets out, in detail, the effects of the Waste Preferred Options on achieving the revised sustainability objectives. This appendix also provides a summary of the effects

---

<sup>23</sup> Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Core Strategy Interim Report following Reg 25 consultation. JSPU. JMW 203a. Dec 06

Many of the options proved difficult to evaluate against the sustainability objectives and frequently the options would have no impact on the sustainability objectives. Additionally, many of the options would be more appropriately tested at the site-specific stage. The table also lists any proposed mitigation measures. Generally many of the mitigation measures are proposed at the site-specific stage

The scoring was based on available information about the options and professional expert opinion. The appraisal does not consider the practicable aspects of the economic or technical viability of the preferred options. Therefore, for example, an option could score highly for sustainability but might not be economically viable.

### **7.3 Summary of the effects of the Preferred Options**

Appendices 7 and 8 provide a summary of the effects of the Preferred Options being considered in the minerals and waste core strategy on achieving the sustainability objectives.

As a result of the earlier SA work which was done during the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy, only the most sustainable options have been proposed for inclusion as Preferred Policy Approaches. This has meant that without exception the Preferred Policy Approaches set out in the Core Strategy were found to be sustainable. This report recommends that these Policy Approaches are 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.

## **8 Implementation**

### **8.1 Proposals for Monitoring**

The significant effects of the Core Strategy and any mitigation measures which were identified during the SA will be monitored using the targets and indicators set out in Appendix 5.

In particular, in line with the guidance, monitoring will be focused on significant environmental effects e.g. those

- That indicate a likely breach of international, national or local legislation, recognised guidelines or standards
- That may give rise to irreversible damage with a view to identifying trends before such damage is caused
- Where there was uncertainty over possible adverse effects, and where monitoring would enable mitigation measures to be taken

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

### **8.2 Proposed Mitigation Measures**

Any need for mitigation which has been suggested as part of this Core Strategy SA will be considered at the site specific level.

## **9 Conclusions on the Overall Sustainability of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options**

The Preferred Minerals and Waste Preferred Policy Approaches 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.

The Preferred Policy Approaches represent the best available options, which have been considered, to achieve the sustainability objectives.