

**Essex Replacement Minerals Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft**

**Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment**

**Environmental Report: Annex G – Alternatives and Progress  
through SA/SEA**

**November 2012**



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background.....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Alternatives and Progress through SA/SEA</b> .....	<b>2</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Alternatives considered and Progress through SA/SEA of the MLP.....	2
----------	---	---



# **1 Introduction**

## **1.1 Background**

Essex County Council commissioned Place Services (formerly part of Essex County Council's Spatial Planning Group) to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal, incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA), on the proposed Replacement Minerals Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft.

Place Services are acting as consultants for this work; therefore the content of the SA/SEA should not be interpreted or otherwise represented as the formal view of Essex County Council.

This document is Annex B to the Environmental Report and sets out the findings of the SA/SEA through the different stages of the MLP preparation and the alternatives considered.

## 2 Alternatives and Progress through SA/SEA

**Table 1: Alternatives considered and Progress through SA/SEA of the MLP**

Policy	Issues and Options	Preferred Approach	Pre-Submission Draft (Working)	Pre-Submission Draft (Final) and summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives (at the time when they were ruled out)
Vision	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>1) Sustainable Construction Sustainable construction practices, incorporating the efficient use of minerals, will be the norm across the County, with all types of development designed and constructed using the best practicable sustainable construction materials and techniques.</p> <p>2) Efficient Mineral Use and Re-use Minerals will be considered a valuable resource to be used and re-used efficiently, to minimise waste. Re-use and recycling will be optimised.</p> <p>3) High Levels of Construction and Demolition Waste Re-use and Recycling On re-development sites, a high proportion of</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>By 2028 we will have achieved the following:</p> <p>1. Sustainable Construction Sustainable construction practices, incorporating the efficient use of minerals, will be the norm across the County, with all types of development designed and constructed using the best practicable sustainable construction materials and techniques.</p> <p>2. Efficient Mineral Use and Re-use Minerals will be considered a valuable resource to be used and re-used efficiently, to minimise waste. Re-use and recycling will be optimised.</p> <p>3. High Levels of Construction and Demolition Waste Re-use and Recycling</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>(A) Sustainable Development During the period to 2029 Minerals development will make a positive contribution to Essex by a plan-led, collaborative approach which promotes the sustainable use, re-use, recycling and extraction of minerals. Sustainable mineral and mineral-related development will be approved without delay.</p> <p>(B) Primary Mineral Provision Essex will maintain its important strategic economic role as a significant sand and gravel producer within the UK, the South East and East of England. The majority of sand and gravel extracted in Essex will be used within the</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>(A) Sustainable Development Minerals development will make a positive contribution to Essex through a plan-led, collaborative approach which promotes the sustainable use, re-use, recycling and extraction of minerals. Sustainable mineral and mineral-related development will be approved without delay when in accordance with this Plan.</p> <p>(B) Primary Mineral Provision Essex will continue to be a major producer and user of sand and gravel, with the majority of that produced being used within the County itself. This will enable the planned growth within district/ borough / city authority plans to occur and facilitate the maintenance of existing infrastructure. A steady and adequate supply of sand and</p>

	<p>construction and demolition materials will be re-used and recycled, on-site wherever possible. There will be a network of strategic sites across the County to serve major centres, with a wide range of construction products for the construction industry. These facilities will be constructed and operated to a high design standard, and the image of recycled products raised, with improved quality to meet the construction industry's requirements.</p> <p>4) Mineral Re-use and Recycling Integral to all Major Construction Project Specifications</p> <p>All major construction projects will be actively seeking to use a proportion of re-used or recycled materials, or products with recycled content, to meet the project specification.</p> <p>5) Minimal Sterilisation of Mineral Resources</p> <p>The needless sterilisation of mineral resources will be avoided through the designation of Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Major developments proposed on</p>	<p>On re-development sites, a high proportion of construction and demolition materials will be re-used and recycled, on-site wherever possible. There will be a network of strategic aggregate recycling sites across the County to serve major centres, with a wide range of construction products for the construction industry. These facilities will be constructed and operated to a high design standard, and the image of recycled products raised, with improved quality to meet the construction industry's requirements.</p> <p>4. Mineral Re-use and Recycling Integral to all Major Construction Project Specifications</p> <p>All major construction projects will be actively seeking to use a proportion of re-used or recycled materials, or products with recycled content and project specifications will make provision for recycled materials.</p> <p>5. Minimal Sterilisation of Mineral Resources</p> <p>The needless sterilisation of mineral resources will be avoided through the designation of Mineral</p>	<p>County itself, enabling the planned growth within District / Borough / City Authorities plans to occur, and maintaining and improving our existing buildings and transport infrastructure . A steady and adequate supply of sand and gravel will be provided having regard to the Local Aggregate Assessment and the targets agreed in national and sub-national apportionment, whilst not over-supplying in order to protect Essex's environment and our finite mineral resources. Plan provision will also be made for brick clay and silica sand.</p> <p>(C) Co-ordinating Essex Supply of Minerals</p> <p>Sources of aggregate, whether primary, secondary or recycled, will be planned, co-ordinated, and wherever possible located in proximity to the County's main growth centres - Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester, and Harlow – and the South Essex Thames Gateway, Haven Gateway and West Essex (formerly M11 corridor) growth areas to enable a better match</p>	<p>gravel will be provided, having regard to the Local Aggregate Assessment and the targets agreed with the East of England Aggregates Working Party, whilst not over-supplying in order to protect Essex's environment and our finite mineral resources. Plan provision will also be made for silica sand and brick clay.</p> <p>(C) Co-ordinating Essex's Supply of Minerals</p> <p>Sources of aggregate, whether primary, secondary or recycled, will be planned to serve the whole of the county and wherever possible located in proximity to the County's main growth centres - Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester, and Harlow, and the South Essex Thames Gateway, Haven Gateway and West Essex Alliance (formerly M11 corridor) growth areas, to maintain an appropriate match between mineral supply and demand. The lack of primary aggregate resources in the south and west of the County will be addressed to ensure that planned urban growth can take place without unnecessarily long transport distances. The existing infrastructure of rail depots and marine landing wharves in Essex and neighbouring Thurrock, in</p>
--	---	---	--	---

	<p>land overlying potentially economic deposits will demonstrate that prior extraction has been considered. Prior extraction will be required where this can be achieved without undue harm to the environment, local amenity or the actual development, and where this is consistent with other sustainability objectives.</p> <p>6) Safeguarding of Mineral Reserves and Preferred Sites</p> <p>Existing mineral extraction sites, and Preferred sites in the MDD will be safeguarded and consultation required when developments are proposed to ensure the site and operations are protected.</p> <p>7) Safeguarding of Mineral Facilities</p> <p>Important mineral facilities, such as strategic aggregate recycling centres, rail heads, wharves and depots associated with such uses, will be safeguarded from inappropriate development to prevent their loss and to minimise impact on their continued operation.</p> <p>8) Primary Mineral Provision</p>	<p>Safeguarding Areas. Major developments proposed on land overlying potentially economic deposits will demonstrate that prior extraction has been considered. Prior extraction will be required where this can be achieved without undue harm to the environment, local amenity or the actual development, and where this is consistent with other sustainability objectives.</p> <p>6. Safeguarding of Mineral Reserves and Preferred Sites</p> <p>Existing mineral extraction sites, and Preferred Sites in the MDD will be safeguarded and consultation required when developments are proposed on or affecting these sites, to ensure the site and operations are protected.</p> <p>7. Safeguarding of Mineral Infrastructure</p> <p>Important mineral facilities, such as strategic aggregate recycling centres, rail heads, wharves and depots associated with such uses, will be safeguarded from inappropriate development to prevent their loss and to minimise impact on their</p>	<p>between mineral supply with demand. The lack of primary aggregate resources in the south and west of the County will be addressed to ensure that planned urban growth can take place without unnecessarily long transport distances. The existing infrastructure of rail depots and marine landing wharves in Essex and neighbouring Thurrock, in particular, will be important in this regard. The long distance importation of aggregates will be maintained to ensure provision of non-indigenous minerals.</p> <p>(D) Protecting Amenities and Communities</p> <p>All minerals development will be well-designed to afford protection to local communities and to enhancement of the built, natural and historic environment. Mineral developers will be encouraged to engage with communities to create the most appropriate local solutions.</p> <p>(E) Climate Change</p> <p>It is important minerals development is located,</p>	<p>particular, will be important in this regard. The long distance importation of aggregates will be maintained to ensure provision of non-indigenous minerals.</p> <p>(D) Protecting Amenities and Communities</p> <p>All minerals development will be well-designed to afford protection to local communities and to contribute to the enhancement of the built, natural and historic environment. Mineral developers will engage with communities to create the most appropriate local solutions.</p> <p>(E) Climate Change</p> <p>Ensuring all minerals development is located, operated and managed whilst having regard to climate change mitigation and adaptation, so the County plays its part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and is resilient to potentially more extreme future weather conditions.</p> <p>(F) Reduce, Re-use and Recycling of Minerals</p> <p>Minerals previously extracted from the ground will be put to better use. The recycling and reuse of construction, demolition and excavation waste will be maximised, by safeguarding</p>
--	--	---	---	--

	<p>Essex will maintain its important role as the largest supplier of sand and gravel in the region. It will plan for the majority of extracted aggregate to be used within the County, accepting most will be transported by road. It will meet national, regional and sub-regional apportionment, whilst not over supplying in order to protect the Essex environment and the mineral resource.</p> <p>The lack of aggregate resources in the south west of the County will have been addressed, to ensure planned urban growth can take place without unnecessary long distance transportation of mineral. Sources of aggregate, both primary, secondary and recycled, will be planned, co-ordinated, and where possible located in proximity to growth areas, particularly Chelmsford, Basildon, Colchester, Harlow, the Harwich Haven and Thames Gateways and the M11 corridor, as well as maintaining the existing rail depots and marine wharves for importing aggregates to</p>	<p>continued operation.</p> <p>8. Primary Mineral Provision</p> <p>Essex will maintain its important role as a significant supplier of sand and gravel within the region. It will plan for the majority of extracted aggregate to be used within the County, accepting most will be transported by road. It will meet national, regional and sub-regional apportionment, whilst not over supplying in order to protect the Essex environment and the mineral resource.</p> <p>The lack of aggregate resources in the south west of the County will have been addressed, to ensure planned urban growth can take place without unnecessary long mineral transportation distances. Sources of aggregate, both primary, secondary and recycled, will be planned, co-ordinated, and where possible located in proximity to growth areas, particularly Chelmsford, Basildon, Colchester, Harlow, the Harwich Haven, the Thames Gateway and the M11 corridor, as well as maintaining the existing infrastructure of rail depots and marine wharves for importing aggregates to these</p>	<p>operated and managed having regard to climate change mitigation and adaptation, so the County plays its part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and is resilient to future, more extreme weather conditions.</p> <p>(F) Reduce, Re-use and Recycling of Minerals</p> <p>Minerals previously extracted from the ground will be put to better use. The recycling and reuse of construction, demolition and excavation waste will be maximised, by safeguarding existing strategic aggregate recycling sites (SARS) and locating new facilities in proximity to the key centres of Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester and Harlow. The Council will actively encourage sustainable procurement and construction techniques and the use of alternative building materials in accordance with national, regional and local policies.</p> <p>(G) Protecting Mineral Resources and Facilities</p> <p>The needless sterilisation of mineral resources by development will be avoided</p>	<p>existing Strategic Aggregate Recycling Sites (SARS) and locating new facilities in proximity to the key centres of Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester and Harlow. The Council promotes sustainable procurement and construction techniques and the use of alternative building materials in accordance with national and local policies.</p> <p>(G) Protecting Mineral Resources and Facilities</p> <p>The needless sterilisation of mineral resources by development will be avoided by designating 'Minerals Safeguarding Areas' (MSA's) for sand and gravel, chalk, brick clay and brickearth. Existing, permitted and preferred mineral sites and mineral supply infrastructure will be safeguarded to ensure the effective operation of these sites is not compromised, and to prevent incompatible development taking place close to existing or planned minerals development to the potential detriment of existing or future occupants.</p> <p>(H) Restoration and After-use</p> <p>Mineral workings are temporary in nature. Restoration and after-use schemes will continue to be integral to site selection and the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>these areas.</p> <p>Primary extraction sites will have regard to important sites of cultural, historic or biodiversity value and will have good transport connections. Consideration will be given to the cumulative impacts of extraction on the landscape and local communities. Essex residents will have certainty of where Preferred sites are located, how applications for 'windfall' sites will be determined, and how their standard of amenity will be protected.</p> <p>Brick clay, brickearth and silica sand sites will continue to be protected and planned for.</p> <p>9) Restoration and After-use</p> <p>Restoration and after-use will continue to be integral to site selection and to the consideration of mineral extraction proposals, to ensure proposals have regard to existing landscape character and the need to enhance biodiversity. The focus of after-use will shift from purely agricultural use to enhancement of the local environment by means of</p>	<p>areas.</p> <p>Primary extraction sites will have regard to important sites of cultural, historic or biodiversity value and will have good transport connections. Consideration will be given to the cumulative impacts of extraction on the local communities, landscape and flood risk. Essex residents will have certainty of where Preferred Sites are located, how applications for 'windfall' sites will be determined, and how their standard of amenity will be protected. Brick clay, brickearth and silica sand sites will continue to be protected and planned for.</p> <p>9. Restoration and After-use</p> <p>Restoration and after-use will continue to be integral to site selection and to the consideration of mineral extraction proposals, to ensure proposals have regard to existing landscape character and the need to enhance biodiversity. The focus of after-use will shift from purely agricultural use to enhancement of the local environment by means of increased provision for biodiversity, climate change</p>	<p>within designated 'Minerals Safeguarding Areas' (MSA's) for sand and gravel, chalk, brickclay and brickearth. Existing, permitted and preferred mineral sites and mineral supply infrastructure will be safeguarded to ensure the effective operation of these sites is not compromised, and to prevent incompatible development taking place close by, to the detriment of future occupants.</p> <p>(H) Restoration and After-use</p> <p>Most mineral development is temporary in nature and restoration and after-use schemes will continue to be integral to the site selection and to the consideration of planning applications with progressive working and restoration. The focus of after-use will shift from purely agricultural use – important though that remains - towards enhancement of the local environment by means of increased provision for biodiversity, geodiversity, climate change adaptation, and outdoor recreation, particularly public rights of</p>	<p>consideration of planning applications, with progressive working and restoration schemes expected. The focus of after-use will shift from purely agricultural uses, important though they remain, towards enhancement of the local environment by means of increased provision for biodiversity, geodiversity, climate change adaptation and outdoor recreation, including Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>(I) Communities</p> <p>Collaborative working arrangements will forge stronger links with communities, stakeholders and local planning authorities, as well as neighbouring and more distant planning authorities on whom we rely for non-indigenous minerals. Collectively we will address the sustainable long-term supply of primary aggregates and the protection of public amenity.</p> <p>(J) Economy and Long Term High Quality Environment and Landscape</p> <p>As well as bringing economic advantage, effective collaborative working will ensure minerals development makes a positive contribution to our environment and biodiversity, through the protection and creation of high</p>
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>increased provision for woodland, amenity use, biodiversity and public rights of way. This change in emphasis will result in improvements to the environment, and re-connection of de-graded or fragmented habitats, with sensitivity to surrounding land uses.</p> <p>10) Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</p> <p>Minerals Transportation, sites and facilities for mineral development will be planned, located and operated having regard to the need to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>(including providing storage for surface water) and public rights of way. This change in emphasis will result in improvements to the environment, and re-connection of de-graded or fragmented habitats, with sensitivity to surrounding land uses.</p> <p>10. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</p> <p>Minerals Transportation, sites and facilities for mineral development will be planned, located and operated having regard to the need to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>way.</p> <p>(I) Communities</p> <p>Collaborative working arrangements will forge stronger links with communities, stakeholders and local planning authorities, as well as neighbouring and more distant planning authorities on whom we rely for non-indigenous minerals. Collectively we will address the sustainable long-term supply of primary aggregates and the protection of public amenity.</p> <p>(J) Economy and Long Term High Quality Environment and Landscape</p> <p>As well as bringing economic advantage, effective collaborative working will ensure minerals development makes a positive contribution to our environment and biodiversity, through the protection and creation of high quality habitats and landscapes that contribute to a high quality of life for present and future generations.</p>	<p>quality habitats and landscapes that contribute to a high quality of life for present and future generations.</p>
--	---	---	---	--

	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The Vision Statements will have an overall positive impact with each statement supporting one or more of the Sustainability Objectives. Secondary positive impacts may also arise through the efficient use of minerals and the stipulation of specific standards in construction.</p> <p>There are however a number of uncertainties relating largely to the location of additional recycled aggregate facilities, minerals reserves and preferred sites. The avoidance of mineral sterilisation through the designation of Minerals Safeguarding Area may be at the expense of alternative development depending on its location. Similarly the location of future recycled aggregate facilities would determine what impact they have on the countryside, human health, nuisance and air quality.</p> <p>Negative impacts are associated with the possibility that development of primary extraction may have a detrimental effect on air quality and that worked</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The majority of Vision Statements within the MDD accord with a small proportion of the Sustainability Objectives, but holistically they collectively accord with the Sustainability Framework. The Vision proposed by the MDD is primarily concerned with ensuring a sustainable use of minerals in the first instance, and those Sustainability Objectives directly according with sustainable mineral use are strongly represented across the Vision, as is the sustainable use of land.</p> <p>However, there is one area within which there is inherent tension between the Vision and the Sustainability Framework. As well as ensuring the sustainable use of land, SO4 seeks to ensure the protection of the most valuable agricultural soil. Within the Vision, the commitment is made to shift from purely agricultural based restoration proposals to ones which take a more comprehensive look at the wider environment. This could by definition reduce the amount of agricultural soil available over the lifespan of</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.</p> <p>One area of clarification raised in regards to (H) Restoration and After-use. Where 'climate change adaptation' is referenced, it would be useful to offer a definition of what this means, especially as a term alongside other criteria of biodiversity, geodiversity, outdoor recreation and public rights of way.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At the Further Issues and Options stage, The Vision looked at the direction of the plan under the following ten headings; Sustainable Construction, Efficient Mineral Use and Re-use, High Levels of Construction and Demolition Waste Re-use and Recycling, Mineral Re-use and Recycling Integral to all Major Construction Project Specifications, Minimal Sterilisation of Mineral Resources, Safeguarding of Mineral Reserves and Preferred Sites, Safeguarding of Mineral Facilities, Primary Mineral Provision, Restoration and After-use, and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage the Preferred Approach was to reiterate the Vision from the Further Issues and Options stage, with no amendments. It is stated that the Vision is affected by the options/alternatives of other policies progressed throughout the plan making process.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p>
--	---	---	---	--

	<p>safeguarded minerals sites may disturb local communities.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> If primary extraction sites are placed a sufficient distance away from public or publically used areas, the impact can be reduced. (negligible / no impact)</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Suitable measures in place at primary extraction sites will reduce levels of dust and so prevent any adverse impacts on air quality (negligible / no impact)</p>	<p>the MDD should land used previously for agriculture be restored to a different use. This inherent tension is considered to be acceptable however as whilst there could be a reduction in the protection of soils, there will be wider benefits that will be accrued by following this change in emphasis. As such the overall contribution to the notion of sustainability would be greater.</p>	<p>In reflection of the above, the Submission stage Vision changed to reflect the direction of the plan as it progressed, to become more aligned with Essex and the function of the MLP, and to reflect the NPPF. As such, the issues covered in the Vision are; Sustainable Development, Primary Mineral Provision, Co-ordinating Essex Supply of Minerals, Protecting Amenities and Communities, Climate Change, Reduce, Re-use and Recycling of Minerals, Protecting Minerals resources and Facilities, Restoration and After-use, Communities, and Economy and Long Term High Quality Environment and Landscape.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted an overall positive impact with each statement supporting one or more of the Sustainability Objectives. There were however a number of uncertainties relating largely to the location of additional recycled aggregate facilities, minerals reserves and preferred sites and their potential impacts on the countryside, human health, nuisance and air quality. A negative impact was assessed due to the possibility that development of primary extraction</p>
--	---	---	---

				<p>may have a detrimental effect on air quality and that worked safeguarded minerals sites may disturb local communities.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted that the majority of Vision Statements within the MDD accord with the Sustainability Framework. One area however, within which there was assessed an inherent tension between the Vision and the Sustainability Framework, regarded agricultural land and soils where a shift from purely agricultural based restoration proposals could reduce the amount of agricultural soil. This was however considered to be acceptable as whilst there could be a reduction in the protection of soils, there will be wider benefits that will be accrued by following this change in emphasis.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the progression to a Pre-Submission working draft was assessed as having positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. One area of clarification was raised in regards to (H) Restoration and After-use; where 'climate change adaptation' is referenced, it would be useful to offer a definition of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				what this means, especially as a term alongside other criteria of biodiversity, geodiversity, outdoor recreation and public rights of way. This was clarified as a reference to those measures included in the specific climate change policy (S3) in the MLP, and as such this was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.				
Aims and Strategic Objectives	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The core objectives proposed by ECC for consultation are as follows:</p> <p>1) Promote the Minerals Supply Hierarchy</p> <p>To actively promote the Minerals Supply Hierarchy in Essex, and so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduce the quantity of material used and waste generated</li> <li>- increase the production and use of recycled and secondary material</li> <li>- ensure remaining needs are appropriately met though primary extraction, and to facilitate the importation of minerals not indigenous to Essex</li> </ul> <p>2) Safeguard Minerals</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>OBJECTIVE 1: That reliance on primary mineral resources in Essex will be reduced, firstly through the more efficient use of the primary resource and reducing the amount of mineral waste; then via the use of recycled aggregates.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 2: To identify and safeguard the following resources in Essex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sand and gravel, chalk, silica sand, brickearth and brick clay which have potential future economic and/ or conservation value. Unnecessary sterilisation should be avoided;</li> <li>- Existing and potential secondary processing and aggregate recycling facilities that are of strategic importance for future mineral supply, to ensure these are not</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>See Final Draft wording...</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1. To promote sustainable development.</td> <td>1. To ensure sustainable minerals development can be approved without delay in accordance with the presumption in the National Planning Policy Framework.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2. To ensure minerals development supports the proposals for sustainable economic growth, regeneration, and</td> </tr> </table>	1. To promote sustainable development.	1. To ensure sustainable minerals development can be approved without delay in accordance with the presumption in the National Planning Policy Framework.		2. To ensure minerals development supports the proposals for sustainable economic growth, regeneration, and
1. To promote sustainable development.	1. To ensure sustainable minerals development can be approved without delay in accordance with the presumption in the National Planning Policy Framework.							
	2. To ensure minerals development supports the proposals for sustainable economic growth, regeneration, and							

	<p>Resources</p> <p>To identify and safeguard mineral resources in Essex which have potential future economic or conservation value, and so avoid unnecessary mineral sterilisation.</p> <p>3) Safeguard Secondary processing/Recycling Facilities</p> <p>To identify and safeguard existing and potential secondary processing and aggregate recycling facilities of strategic importance for future mineral supply, to ensure these are not compromised by new development which might impact upon their effective operation.</p> <p>4) Efficient Use of Minerals</p> <p>To require the efficient use of minerals, through appropriate processing of primary reserves and the re-use and recycling of construction and demolition wastes arising from development sites.</p> <p>5) Appropriate Primary Mineral Supply</p> <p>To identify sites and policy criteria to facilitate an</p>	<p>compromised by new development.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 3: To identify sites and policy criteria for a steady and adequate supply of minerals to assist in the economic growth of Essex and to meet the agreed sub-regional aggregate apportionment.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 4: To afford protection to designated sites of landscape, wildlife, geodiversity, cultural and heritage importance, commensurate with their importance;</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 5: To achieve more sustainable minerals transportation by giving preference to local sources of aggregate, optimise how sites access the strategic highway network and enable the long haul movement of minerals by rail and water.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 6: To secure high quality restoration of extraction sites with appropriate aftercare to achieve appropriate and beneficial after-uses.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 7: To maintain and / or enhance local residential amenity for people living in proximity to minerals</p>		<p>2. To promote a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions including carbon, and to ensure that new development is adaptable</p>	<p>development outlined in adopted Local Plans/ LDFs prepared by Essex district/ borough/city councils.</p> <p>3. To ensure that minerals development in the County fully promotes sustainable development.</p> <p>4. To ensure certainty for both developers and the public.</p> <p>(economic, social, and environmental)</p> <p>5. To ensure that minerals and associated development provides for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The minimisation of greenhouse gas emissions during the winning, working and</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--	--	---

<p>appropriate level of primary mineral supply, consistent with the chosen spatial strategy and from the most sustainable and environmentally acceptable sources, in accordance with national, regional and local requirements.</p> <p>6) Sustainable Short Haul Transportation</p> <p>To achieve the most sustainable transportation of minerals by road over short distances.</p> <p>7) Sustainable Long Haul Transportation</p> <p>To identify and safeguard rail head and wharf facilities which enable the long haul movement of minerals by rail and water, in the public interest.</p> <p>8) Protection of Designated Sites</p> <p>To afford protection to designated sites of landscape, wildlife, geodiversity, cultural and heritage importance, commensurate with their importance and in the public interest.</p> <p>9) Protection and</p>	<p>development. Restoration of mineral workings will deliver tangible benefits to affected local communities.</p>			<p>to changes in climatic conditions.</p>	<p>handling of minerals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sustainable patterns of minerals transportation</li> <li>- The integration of features which promote climate change mitigation and adaptation into the design of minerals restoration and after-care proposals.</li> </ul> <p>(environmental)</p>
				<p>3. To promote social inclusion, human health and well-being.</p>	<p>6. To ensure that local communities are consulted and their views considered during the development of minerals proposals and in the determination of planning applications for minerals development.</p>

<p>Enhancement of Local Landscape Character and Biodiversity</p> <p>To protect and enhance local landscape character and biodiversity, seeking opportunities to re-connect and extend fragmented habitats, and create new habitats in order to extend the County's green infrastructure and to mitigate the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>10) Mineral Extraction Site Restoration</p> <p>To secure the high quality restoration of extraction sites at the earliest opportunity, with appropriate aftercare to achieve appropriate and beneficial after-uses.</p> <p>11) Local Communities</p> <p>To secure sustainable enhancements for communities, and satisfactorily mitigate adverse environmental impacts and effects on local residential amenity resulting from minerals related development.</p>					<p>7. To ensure that the impacts on amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are rigorously controlled, minimised and mitigated.</p> <p>(social)</p>
				<p>4. To promote the efficient use of minerals by using them in a sustainable manner and reducing the need for primary mineral extraction.</p>	<p>8. To reduce reliance on primary mineral resources in Essex, firstly through reducing the demand for minerals and minimising waste, and secondly, by the re-use and use of recycled aggregates.</p> <p>(economic, social, and environmental)</p>
				<p>5. To protect and safeguard</p>	<p>9. To identify and safeguard the following</p>

<p>existing mineral reserves, existing permitted mineral sites and Preferred Sites for mineral extraction, as well as existing and proposed sites for associated mineral development.</p>	<p>mineral resources in Essex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sand and gravel, silica sand, brickearth, brick clay, and chalk reserves which have potential future economic and/ or conservation value. Unnecessary sterilisation should be avoided.</li> <li>- Existing and potential secondary processing and aggregate recycling facilities that are of strategic importance for future mineral supply to ensure that these are not compromised by other non-mineral development.</li> </ul> <p>(economic,</p>
---	---



					the Plan; (economic)
				7. To promote and enhance the natural, historic and built environment in relation to mineral extraction and associated development.	<p>11. To provide protection from minerals development to designated areas of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity, cultural and heritage importance, in a manner which is commensurate with their importance.</p> <p>12. To secure high quality restoration of extraction sites with appropriate after-care to achieve new after-uses which are beneficial and enhance the local environment.</p> <p>13. To maintain and/or</p>

					enhance landscape, biodiversity and residential amenity for people living in proximity to minerals development.  (environmental, social)
				8. To reduce the impact of minerals extraction and associated development on the transport system.	14. To achieve more sustainable patterns of minerals transportation by, - Giving preference to identifying local sources of aggregate as close as reasonably possible to urban growth areas and growth centres.  - Optimising how minerals sites obtain access to the strategic highway

				<p>network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigating the adverse traffic impacts of mineral extraction and associated development by appropriate traffic management measures.</li> <li>- Increasing the use and availability of rail and water facilities for the long haul movement of mineral products.</li> </ul> <p>(economic, social, and environmental)</p>
<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be significant positive impacts relating to restoration and aftercare of sites under the core objective - Mineral Extraction Site Restoration. Positive impacts across the sustainability objectives are also expected particularly for those relating to the environment, transport</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The Objectives of the MDD are broadly compatible with the Sustainability Framework when the impacts are viewed collectively. In most cases, each Objective only accords with a small proportion of the overall framework.</p> <p>MDD Objective 3 produces a</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.</p> <p>One point of clarification would be recommended regarding Strategic Objective 7 where 'pollution' is a general term that is open to interpretation in so far as it is</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>There were 11 Objectives covering issues of the minerals supply hierarchy, safeguarding minerals resources, secondary processing and recycling facilities, the efficient use of</p>	

	<p>and health.</p> <p>Much of the uncertainty regarding the impact of the core objectives on the sustainability criteria relates to the location of mineral extraction sites, safeguarded sites and facilities which at present are unknown. The restoration of sites has also created uncertainty as the impact would largely depend on the extent of the restoration and the final use of site.</p> <p>Negative impacts are associated with the safeguarding of facilities from new development, which could have an economic impact, and that worked safeguarded minerals sites may disturb local communities or amenities.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> If primary extraction sites and secondary/recycling sites are placed a sufficient distance away from public or publically used areas, the impact can be reduced. (negligible / no impact)</p>	<p>lot of uncertainty in those Sustainability Objectives concerned with environmental and local amenity protection as this MDD Objective ensures a steady supply of minerals in order to assist economic growth. This commitment is however made in other MDD Objectives such as MDD Objective 4 and MDD Objective 5. As such, this uncertainty as it relates to MDD Objective 3 is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Further uncertainty exists under Sustainability Objective 11 which seeks to promote economic growth. There is an element of uncertainty when appraised against MDD Objective 5 which seeks to protect environmental concerns. This is a common area of tension but one which is negated when the MDD Objectives are viewed holistically.</p> <p>Sustainability Objective 10 is not covered by any specific MDD Objective. This is not considered to be an issue as it is understood that the broad objective of the MDD is to provide for sufficient minerals to support economic growth in a sustainable manner. The need for "Essex residents to</p>	<p>relevant to social needs, inclusion, health and well-being.</p>	<p>minerals, appropriate primary mineral supply, sustainable short haul and long haul transportation, the protection of designated sites and the enhancement of local landscape character and biodiversity, mineral extraction site restoration and local communities.</p> <p>Comments received in response to the Further Issues and Options paper objectives were generally supportive of the objectives but concerns were raised about deliverability, protection of the environment and a biodiversity focus on site selection, consistency with national policy and clarification about wording of some objectives.</p> <p><b>Preferred Options Stage</b></p> <p>A number of consultation responses sought the rationalisation of various objectives. It was considered appropriate therefore to combine several of them, and a move towards 7 instead of 11 objectives at the Preferred Approach MDD stage. This sets out more clearly what the MLP exists to achieve in the first instance.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>The above alternatives and alternative approaches for the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>have certainty of where Preferred Sites are located, how applications for 'windfall' sites will be determined, and how their standard of amenity will be protected" is highlighted in the MDD Vision and this is considered to be sufficient.</p>	<p>objectives of the MLP were rejected in favour of tying specific objectives into wider strategic aims, and how they responded to economic, social and environmental themes. This ensures that previous iterations were given a more local specific context that ties in with deliverability, and the three overarching themes of sustainability in line with the NPPF and a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted uncertain impacts related to the location of mineral extraction sites, safeguarded sites and facilities. The restoration of sites has also created uncertainty as the impact would largely depend on the extent of the restoration and the final use of site. In addition to this, negative impacts were highlighted surrounding the safeguarding of facilities from new development, which could have an economic impact, and that worked safeguarded minerals sites may disturb local communities or amenities.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>uncertain issues surrounding the potential conflicts between economic growth and environmental and amenity criteria, although understanding that this was a common and unavoidable theme to some extent. A lack of adherence to the criterion of public participation in plan preparation was also highlighted, although again it was acknowledged that the Plan's Objectives did incorporate a sufficient degree of consultation over preferred site location and windfall sites.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw the Plan's Objectives evolve to tie specific objectives into strategic aims, and how they responded to economic, social and environmental themes. Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, no negative impacts were highlighted, although some clarification was needed regarding the deliverability and mechanisms of controlling 'pollution' as to have no impacts on social receptors. This was amended for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP to remove this element.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p><b>POLICY S1</b> Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> There were no previous iterations of this policy as it has been incorporated into the Submission Draft as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> There were no previous iterations of this policy as it has been incorporated into the Submission Draft as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> The Minerals Planning Authority will take a positive approach to minerals development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will work proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure minerals development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Planning applications that accord with the site allocations and policies in this Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are demonstrably out-of-date at the time of making the decision, the Minerals Planning Authority will grant permission unless material conditions indicate otherwise – taking into account</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> The Minerals Planning Authority will take a positive approach to minerals development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will work proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure minerals development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Planning applications that accord with the site allocations and policies in this Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are demonstrably out-of-date at the time of making the decision, the Minerals Planning Authority will grant permission unless material conditions indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>whether:</p> <p>Any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>Specific policies in the National Planning Policy Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</p>	<p>assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>- Specific policies in the National Planning Policy Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</p>
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There were no previous iterations of this policy as it has been incorporated into the Submission Draft as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There were no previous iterations of this policy as it has been incorporated into the Submission Draft as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>A general procedural policy such as S2 is unlikely to have any significant impacts; however it does look to mitigate potential negative impacts at the application stage. As a procedural policy, it is unlikely to require any translation to a local context, however it translates the presumption in favour of sustainable development into the context of a Minerals Planning Authority and it is useful to note how the approach of fulfilling this feeds into the more county specific spatial vision and strategic objectives.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage &amp; Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>There were no previous iterations of this policy as it has been incorporated into the Submission Draft as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>Although no alternatives have been formally consulted upon, two options have been considered through the plan's development; that is to include the model wording policy, or to not. It has been agreed that the policy should be included in so far</p>

				<p>as it supports a non-restrictive stance on policy and promotes development in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>There were no previous iterations of this policy as it has been incorporated into the Pre-Submission Draft as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework. The SA/SEA supports its inclusion where it translates the presumption in favour of sustainable development into the context of a Minerals Planning Authority and it is useful to note how the approach of fulfilling this feeds into the more county specific spatial vision and strategic objectives.</p>
<p><b>POLICY S2</b> Strategic Priorities for Minerals Development</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Spatial Strategy</b> <b>Option 1: Predominantly Extensions to Existing Extraction Sites</b></p> <p>The description in Essex County Councils Further Issues and Options paper states: “This Option is based on a preference for extensions to existing sites with primary processing plant (where environmentally acceptable).</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach –</b></p> <p>to provide for the best possible geographic dispersal of sites across the County (to support key areas of growth and development and reduce mineral miles) with a focus on extending existing sites (with primary processing plant)</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach 1 –</b></p> <p>To concentrate supply in the heart of Essex. This is based</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> <b>STRATEGY:</b></p> <p>‘To provide for the best possible geographic dispersal of sand and gravel across the County, accepting that due to geographic factors the majority of sites will be located in the central and north-eastern parts of the County (to support key areas of growth and development and reduce mineral miles) with a focus</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The Strategy of the Plan is: To provide for the best possible geographic dispersal of sand and gravel across the County, accepting that due to geographic factors the majority of sites will be located in the central and the north eastern parts of the County (to support key areas of growth and development and to minimise mineral miles) with a focus on extending existing extraction sites with primary processing plant,</p>

	<p>The current distribution of land won sand and gravel extraction sites would be largely maintained, although there would continue to be a gap in the south west of the County. All extension proposals would be required to meet new highway and environmental standards”.</p> <p><b>Option 2: Dispersed Spread of Sites Across the County</b></p> <p>The description in Essex County Councils Further Issues and Options paper states:</p> <p>“This would be based predominantly on a dispersed spread of sites across the County with some concentration in the centre of the county. It would be based across the extent of the geological resources and could contribute to minimising mineral transport miles to serve the Essex market. This Option could incorporate a mix of site extensions and new sites, as well as small or large sites. There are no suggested sites in the southwest and this option would be dependent upon suitable sites coming forward”.</p>	<p>on the triangular area of Chelmsford, Braintree and Colchester and utilising the main highway network of A12, A120 and A131. This Option could incorporate a mix of extensions and new sites, as well as small or large sites.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach 2 –</b></p> <p>Adopting a policy of either dispersal or extensions as a stand-alone approach.</p>	<p>on extending existing extraction sites with primary processing plant, and reducing reliance on restoration by landfill.’</p> <p>The strategic priorities for minerals development are focused primarily on meeting the mineral supply needs of Essex whilst achieving sustainable development. The strategy will promote this by:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensuring minerals development makes a contribution towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions, is resilient, and can demonstrate adaptation to the impacts of climatic change;</li> <li>2. Ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts arising from proposed minerals development for public health and safety, amenity, quality of life of nearby communities, and the environment;</li> <li>3. Reducing the quantity of minerals used and waste generated, through appropriate design and procurement, practices, and encouraging re-use and recycling of construction</li> </ol>	<p>and reducing reliance on restoration by landfill.</p> <p>Policy S2</p> <p>The strategic priorities for minerals development are focused primarily on meeting the mineral supply needs of Essex whilst achieving sustainable development. The strategy will promote this by:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensuring minerals development makes a contribution towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions, is resilient and can demonstrate adaptation to the impacts of climatic change,</li> <li>2. Ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts arising from proposed minerals development for public health and safety, amenity, quality of life of nearby communities, and the environment,</li> <li>3. Reducing the quantity of minerals used and waste generated, through appropriate design and procurement, good practices, and encouraging re-use and encouraging the re-use and recycling of construction materials containing minerals,</li> <li>4. Improving access to, and the quality and quantity of recycled/ secondary aggregates, by</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Option 3: Concentrated Supply of Sites with Some Dispersed Sites</b></p> <p>The description in Essex County Councils Further Issues and Options paper states:</p> <p>“This Option concentrates supply in the heart of Essex based upon the ‘triangle’ around Chelmsford, Braintree &amp; Colchester and utilising the main highway network of the A12, A120 and A131 to distribute the minerals across the county to serve the Essex market. This Option could incorporate a mix of extensions and new sites, as well as small or large sites”.</p> <p><b>Option 4: A Hybrid of the Above Three Options</b></p>		<p>materials containing minerals</p> <p>4. Improving access to, and the quality and quantity of recycled/ secondary aggregates, by developing and safeguarding a well distributed County-wide network of strategic and non-strategic aggregate recycling sites;</p> <p>5. Safeguarding mineral resources of national and local importance, and minerals transshipment and strategic aggregate recycling facilities and coated road stone plants, so that non-minerals development does not sterilise or compromise mineral resources and mineral supply facilities;</p> <p>6. Making planned provision through Preferred Site allocations for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates and industrial minerals to meet identified national and local mineral needs in Essex during the plan-period and maintaining landbanks at appropriate levels;</p> <p>7. Providing for the best possible geographic market dispersal for sand and gravel across the County. To</p>	<p>developing and safeguarding a well distributed County-wide network of strategic and non-strategic aggregate recycling sites,</p> <p>5. Safeguarding mineral resources of national and local importance, minerals transshipment sites, Strategic Aggregate Recycling Facilities facilities and coated roadstone plants, so that non-minerals development does not sterilise or compromise mineral resources and mineral supply facilities,</p> <p>6. Making planned provision through Preferred Site allocations for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates and industrial minerals to meet identified national and local mineral needs in Essex during the plan-period whilst maintaining landbanks at appropriate levels,</p> <p>7. Providing for the best possible geographic dispersal of sand and gravel across the County to support key areas of growth and development, infrastructure projects and to minimise mineral miles,</p> <p>8. Ensuring progressive phased working and the high quality restoration of mineral extraction developments so as to:</p>
--	---	--	---	--

			<p>support key centres of growth and development and infrastructure projects by minimising mineral miles</p> <p>8. Ensuring progressive phased working and for high quality restoration of mineral extraction developments so as to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- significantly reduce future reliance upon the use of landfill materials and;</li> <li>- provide beneficial after-use(s) that secure long lasting community and environmental benefits, (including biodiversity); and</li> <li>- Protect soils resource from best and most versatile agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>9. Maintaining and safeguarding transshipment sites within the County to provide appropriate facilities for the importation of non-indigenous minerals to Essex, and for the exportation of indigenous minerals.</p>	<p>a) significantly reduce reliance upon the use of landfill materials and,</p> <p>b) provide beneficial after-use(s) that secure long lasting community and environmental benefits, including biodiversity, and,</p> <p>c) protect the soils resource for best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>9. Maintaining and safeguarding transshipment sites within the County to provide appropriate facilities for the importation and exportation of minerals.</p>
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> (Options 1,2,3) Through avoiding minerals development in</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. Whilst a lack of spatial context</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Positive impacts across a range of sustainability</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p>

	<p>areas of high grade agricultural land or using techniques to store topsoil on-site etc. these impacts would be reduced. (negligible / no impact)</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> (Options 1, 2) A call for sites could increase the yield of primary minerals under these three Options; however, this would be dependant on the suitability of sites which may come forward. (negative impact OR negligible / no impact)</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> (Option 3) Through situating sites far from AQMAs or ensuring that road transportation does not impact on them, or that alternative transport routes are available, this negative impact may be avoided. (negligible / no impact)</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> (Option 3) By ensuring that proposed sites are some distance from any site of importance to Essex's historic environment, any negative impacts can be overcome. (negligible / no impact)</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> (Option 2, 3) The impacts on landscape can be prevented by avoiding</p>	<p>means that it is impossible at this stage to fully quantify impacts across the whole Sustainability Framework, there are certain positives that are likely to arise and considerably less uncertainty than there would be under the Alternative Approach. The Preferred Approach allows for both site extensions and site creation, whilst ensuring that sites are dispersed around the County. Extensions allow the continued operation of existing sites which is considered to have less of an impact across much of the Sustainability Framework relative to developing entirely new sites. In addition, a dispersed spread of sites is intrinsically more sustainable as it will ensure that sites are closer to all the key growth locations within Essex, providing economic benefits and reducing the emission of greenhouse gasses by reducing relative transportation distances. A pattern of dispersal also allows for market competition and reduces any risk arising from a lack of deliverability. A dispersed site location strategy will also provide a larger pool of prospective sites from which to allocate the most</p>	<p>objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations were made surrounding what is meant specifically in terms of 'the environment' in priority 2 as it is a general term open to interpretation.</p> <p>Recommendation made that 'The Strategy' statement is highlighted and signposted better in the text.</p>	<p>At this stage four options were explored surrounding the spatial strategy and the broad direction of minerals development over the plan period. These were Option 1 - Predominantly Extensions to Existing Extraction Sites, Option 2 - Dispersed Spread of Sites Across the County, Option 3 - Concentrated Supply of Sites with Some Dispersed Sites, and Option 4 - A Hybrid of the Above Three Options.</p> <p>Option 3 was not progressed due to it being contrary to the principle of promoting market competition, transport costs and emissions being greater to the M11 and Haven gateway from a central concentration, and the implication of increasing road distances from source to use (i.e., from the central part of County to the periphery) would be to increase aggregate imports through existing transshipment facilities with associated costs of double-handling and carbon use.</p> <p>Option 2 was not progressed due to dispersal (in isolation) being difficult to deliver with numerous new sites needed, it ignores the investment and efficiencies that operations from existing sites have, and was not favoured by respondents as a result of</p>
--	---	---	---	--

	<p>negative impacts under criteria 1 (bio/geo-diversity) and 8 (historic environment). The impacts on the greenbelt, however, are more complex. The negative impacts on greenbelt can be overcome in Option 3 through avoidance of sites in this area; however Option 2 includes a sizeable number of sites within the greenbelt which cannot be avoided and therefore will detrimentally impact on this criteria. It is worth noting that minerals extraction in the greenbelt area may have a positive impact through suitable restoration and so these negative impacts may be reversed into positive ones. (negative impact OR positive impact)</p>	<p>sustainable Preferred Sites. In addition, a pattern of dispersal will mean that minerals aren't exhausted in one particular area at a quicker rate than elsewhere.</p> <p>Significant positive impacts for the Preferred Approach are related to the sustainable use of land (SO4) and sustainable use of minerals SO12.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>Sites should only be extended where it can be shown that the value of minerals to be extracted outweighs any potential negative effects on the natural and built environments, human health and local amenity.</p>	<p>consultation.</p> <p>Option 1 in isolation was not progressed as it would fail to adequately address the sustainability issues around mineral miles. Based on likely future patterns of supply, the miles to transport aggregate to areas of demand in the County would increase over the plan period with resulting increases in transport costs, carbon emissions and congestion of the highway network. There may also be cumulative adverse effects of having so many existing sites operating in close proximity.</p> <p><b>Preferred Options Stage</b></p> <p>A mixture of Options 1 and 2 became the preferred approach for spatial distribution (Option 4). Extending existing sites utilises existing infrastructure and mineral supply patterns across the County. It is also more likely to provide certainty of delivery, minimise environmental disturbance and avoid loss / sterilisation. Provision for a dispersed pattern of sites across the County minimises the demands placed on the transport network, cost of transport, carbon emissions and optimises the functional route hierarchy. It was deemed therefore important to</p>
--	---	---	--

			<p>provide for new sites in the west of the County to re-dress the spatial imbalance and limit the need for HGVs to travel from the centre or east. Additional weighting in the site selection process was also provided for a portion of the tonnage needed in the west to make the 'dispersal' component of the spatial strategy viable.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>The spatial direction of growth at the submission stage looks at providing for the best possible geographic dispersal of sand and gravel across the County, accepting that due to geographic factors the majority of sites will be located in the central and north-eastern parts of the County (to support key areas of growth and development and reduce mineral miles) with a focus on extending existing extraction sites with primary processing plant, and reducing reliance on restoration by landfill. The additional weighting of western sites in the site selection process, to support notions of dispersal, was removed due to consultation responses at the Preferred Approach stage. This predominantly surrounded disagreement that the method used to achieve this had been</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>fair, particularly with regards to the western weighting of sites. The western weighting was intended to address the need for sites in the western side of the County where relatively few sites had come forward. However the way that this was implemented resulted in additional points being added after the other scoring had taken place, where no clear evidence was provided to justify this number. As a result of this, the Pre-Submission Draft MLP has adopted an approach based on the dispersal of mineral sites on the main road network, rather than on the allocation of sites to the west, centre or north east.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted that a call for sites could increase the yield of primary minerals dependant on the suitability of sites which may come forward. Numerous potential negative impacts were highlighted surrounding options for dispersal and concentration; however most were dependant on the specific locations of individual sites.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended the preferred approach, allowing for both site extensions and site</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>creation be adopted. Whilst a lack of spatial context means that it is impossible at this stage to fully quantify impacts across the whole Sustainability Framework, there are numerous positives that are likely to arise and considerably less uncertainty than there would be under the alternatives. It was recommended however that sites should only be extended where it can be shown that the value of minerals to be extracted outweighs any potential negative effects on the natural and built environments, human health and local amenity.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft stage saw the Plan's Strategy evolve to an approach based on the dispersal of mineral sites on the main road network, rather than on the allocation of sites to the west, centre or north east, as a result of consultation responses to previous 'western weighting' site selection criteria that affected the dispersal element of the Preferred Approach Strategy. In addition to this, the Strategy at Pre-Submission Draft stage has a number of supporting Strategic Priorities that are important to deliver at a strategic level. Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and</p>
--	--	--	--

				Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, no negative impacts were highlighted other than a few additional explanations of terminology in this instant. These recommendations have been included in the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.
<b>POLICY S3</b> Climate Change	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Vision</b></p> <p><i>10) Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i></p> <p>Minerals Transportation, sites and facilities for mineral development will be planned, located and operated having regard to the need to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Vision</b></p> <p><i>9. Restoration and After-use</i></p> <p>Restoration and after-use will continue to be integral to site selection and to the consideration of mineral extraction proposals, to ensure proposals have regard to existing landscape character and the need to enhance biodiversity. The focus of after-use will shift from purely agricultural use to enhancement of the local environment by means of increased provision for biodiversity, climate change (including providing storage for surface water) and public rights of way. This change in emphasis will result in improvements to the environment, and re-connection of de-graded or fragmented habitats, with sensitivity to surrounding land</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Applications for minerals development shall demonstrate how they have incorporated effective measures to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and to ensure effective adaptation and resilience to future climatic changes having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Siting, location, design and transport arrangements;</li> <li>2. On-site renewable and low carbon energy generation, where feasible and viable;</li> <li>3. Sustainable drainage systems (including measures to enhance on-site water efficiency and minimise flood impacts both on-site and in relation to adjacent land and 'downstream' land-uses) and meet National and Local principles/standards for SuDS Design</li> </ol>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Applications for minerals development shall demonstrate how they have incorporated effective measures to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and to ensure effective adaptation and resilience to future climatic changes, having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Siting, location, design and transport arrangements,</li> <li>2. On-site renewable and low carbon energy generation, where feasible and viable,</li> <li>3. National and local principles/ design standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, including measures to enhance on-site water efficiency and minimise flood impacts both on-site and in relation to adjacent land and 'downstream' land-uses,</li> <li>4. On-site resilience to unexpected climatic events,</li> <li>5. The implications of coastal</li> </ol>

		<p>uses.</p> <p><i>10. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i></p> <p>Minerals Transportation, sites and facilities for mineral development will be planned, located and operated having regard to the need to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>4. On-site resilience to unexpected climatic events;</p> <p>5. The implications of coastal change, where relevant; and</p> <p>6. The potential benefits from site restoration and after-use schemes for biodiversity and habitat creation, flood alleviation, and provision of living carbon sinks.</p>	<p>change, where relevant, and,</p> <p>6. The potential benefits from site restoration and after-use schemes for biodiversity and habitat creation, flood alleviation, and provision of living carbon sinks.</p>
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>This Option will positively impact on the climate change sustainability criteria. The Option may have positive assessments on the other sustainability objectives if it were rewritten to be more specific about how climate change mitigation or adaption could occur (e.g. reduced transportation by road, creation of reservoirs, protection of habitats).</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Both Vision objectives 9 and 10 have a range of positive impacts on the Sustainability Objectives in regards to climate change and associated transport emission criteria.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>Climate change mitigation and adaptation was included at this stage as a statement in the Vision of the MDD, stating that ‘Minerals Transportation, sites and facilities for mineral development will be planned, located and operated having regard to the need to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.’ Although no alternatives were explored at this stage, the issue of climate change adaptation has evolved throughout the process, with each iteration acting as a less sufficient alternative than its predecessor.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>The wording for the climate change mitigation and adaptation issue in the Vision was reiterated</p>

				<p>at the Preferred Option stage. In addition to this the Vision also included climate change issues in a restoration and after-use statement where a focus of after-use will be to the enhancement of the local environment by means of increased provision for climate change (including providing storage for surface water).</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>At the Pre-Submission Draft stage, the issue of climate change was expanded in to a separate policy, regarding conditions for the applications for minerals development to demonstrate how they will incorporate effective measures to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and to ensure effective adaptation and resilience to future climatic changes. This includes siting, location, design and transport arrangements, on-site renewable and low carbon energy generation, sustainable drainage systems on-site resilience to unexpected climatic events, the implications of coastal change, and the potential benefits from site restoration and after-use schemes.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted that</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the statement would positively impact on the climate change sustainability criteria. It was recommended that it be rewritten to be more specific about how climate change mitigation or adaption could occur (e.g. reduced transportation by road, creation of reservoirs, and protection of habitats).</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted that both the climate change and restoration Vision statements will have a range of positive impacts on the Sustainability Objectives in regards to climate change and associated transport emission criteria.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw numerous positive impacts on a range of sustainability criteria and this was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>POLICY S4</b> Reducing the Use of Minerals Resources</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Issue 1</b></p> <p>How to minimise mineral consumption and avoid mineral waste by the efficient and sustainable use of minerals in construction, whilst maintaining and promoting high standards of development.</p> <p><b>Option 8 - The promotion of efficient mineral use in construction in Essex</b></p> <p>What other approach(es) could the MPA take to promote the efficient use of construction materials on development sites in Essex, and why?</p> <p><b>Issue 2</b></p> <p>What policy criteria should be used to assess non-strategic aggregate recycling sites?</p> <p>How could the MPA promote recycling at redevelopment sites?</p> <p>Should the MPA safeguard aggregate recycling sites?</p> <p><b>Option 10 - Policy criteria for non-strategic aggregate recycling sites</b></p> <p>Do you consider it appropriate to continue to</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Preferred Approach -</b></p> <p>That ECC, in partnership with our Local Strategic Partners and other agencies, promotes sustainable construction practises, the efficient use of materials and incorporation of a proportion of re-used, recycled or secondary aggregate in new projects. While this would be delivered, in part, through the development management process it also deliberately encompasses other non-regulatory initiatives i.e., procurement, education, web based resources to link supply of aggregate materials with demand etc.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach 1 –</b></p> <p>A higher standard of sustainable construction (using one or more of the codes or standards referred to in the main text) to be set out in the MDD in the expectation that it would become mandatory at the national level in due course.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach 2 –</b></p> <p>Do nothing.</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>All development shall ensure that mineral waste is minimised and that minerals on development / redevelopment sites are re-used and recycled, in order to reduce the need for primary minerals and the amount of construction, demolition, and excavation wastes going to landfill. This will be supported by joint working with strategic partners to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The use of best practice in the extraction, processing, and transportation of primary minerals to minimise mineral waste;</li> <li>2. The application of national and local standards for sustainable design and construction in proposed development;</li> <li>3. The application of procurement policies which promote sustainable design and construction in proposed development; and</li> <li>4. The maximum possible recovery of minerals from construction, demolition, and excavation wastes produced</li> </ol>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>All development proposals shall ensure that mineral waste is minimised and that minerals on development/ redevelopment sites are re-used and recycled, in order to reduce the need for primary minerals and the amount of construction, demolition, and excavation wastes going to landfill. This will be supported by joint working with strategic partners to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The use of best practice in the extraction, processing and transportation of primary minerals to minimise mineral waste,</li> <li>2. The application of national and local standards for sustainable design and construction in proposed development,</li> <li>3. The application of procurement policies which promote sustainable design and construction in proposed development, and</li> <li>4. The maximum possible recovery of minerals from construction, demolition and excavation wastes produced at development or redevelopment sites. This will be promoted by on-site re-use/ recycling, or if not environmentally acceptable to do</li> </ol>
--	--	---	--	---


<p>designation? (Please provide reasons for your answer).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Yes</li><li>2. No</li><li>3. If yes, how far beyond the strategic aggregate recycling site boundary should the MCA boundary extend, and why?</li></ol>			
---	--	--	--

	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Any uncertainty at this strategic level caused by a lack of spatial context is considered to be outweighed by the positive intention of the Preferred Approach. It is therefore recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. The encouragement of sustainable building practices which would promote a reduction in primary extraction has a positive effect across many of the Sustainability Framework. Whilst there is an uncertain effect on aspects such as biodiversity, water and soil quality and the historic environment, it is assessed that holistically there would be a positive effect due to the reduction in need to develop additional extraction sites moving forward.</p> <p>It is noted that Alternative Approach 1, of promoting a Code of Sustainable Construction above that required by national policy, displays a greater performance under some aspects of the SA/SEA than the Preferred Approach. However, there is little that the MDD itself can do to increase sustainable</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>construction methods. Enforcing more stringent construction methods may also hinder the delivery of development due to higher grades of sustainable construction being more expensive to deliver. In addition, there is also a lack of an evidence base for this kind of approach, whilst there is also an absence of information relating to which of the many available Codes the MPA would promote.</p> <p>Regarding Alternative Approach 2, all SOs not assessed as uncertain have been assessed as being broadly negative in the long term. This long term negative impact has been assessed as a pro-active localised steer, absent under Alternative Approach 2, would be able to more strongly ensure that sustainable construction practices are realised. This would lead to a more sustainable use of land and minerals, as well as more sustainable construction which has further positive impacts on emissions and consequently human health.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p>		
--	--	--	--

		<p>Sustainable Construction could be more clearly defined to eliminate the uncertainty surrounding the impacts on the environmental based indicators.</p>	<p>to what standards or codes need to be specified in Essex came through consultation and there may be economic costs. A second alternative was a 'do nothing' approach. This was rejected where the MPA would not be taking any initiative to address sustainable construction sought as consistent with national policy at the time. Similarly, a reliance on national initiatives may not provide solutions that are flexible enough to address local characteristics / circumstances.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>Reducing the use of minerals resources, evolved into a strategic policy ensuring that all development shall ensure that mineral waste is minimised and that minerals on development/redevelopment sites are re-used and recycled, in order to reduce the need for primary minerals and the amount of construction, demolition, and excavation wastes going to landfill. This is supplemented by criteria regarding the use of best practice in the extraction, processing, and transportation of primary minerals, the application of national and local standards for sustainable design and</p>
--	--	---	--

--	--	--	--	--

				<p>construction methods may also hinder the delivery of development due to higher grades of sustainable construction being more expensive to deliver. A 'do nothing' alternative had a range of negative impacts associated with the sustainability criteria.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw reducing the use of minerals resources evolve to achieve positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. Previous recommendations about sustainable construction definitions are satisfied with references to a number of national and local standards and policies to inform applicants. This was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
<p><b>POLICY S5</b> Creating and Safeguarding a Network of Aggregate</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> The MDD sets out three methods by which optimising the production and use of recycled aggregates can be</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach -</b> The provision of a network of permanent and long term</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> The increased production and supply of recycled/secondary aggregates in the County is</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> The increased production and supply of recycled/secondary aggregates in the County is supported to reduce reliance on</p>

<p>Recycling Facilities</p>	<p>achieved. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increasing on-site recycling on redevelopment sites (by mobile crushers);</li> <li>2. Establishing a network of strategic aggregate recycling facilities, capable of producing high quality recycled products;</li> <li>3. Promoting and maintaining a spread of smaller non-strategic aggregate recycling sites across the County.</li> </ol>	<p>temporary recycling facilities able to make significant and long term contributions to recycled aggregate production. Only (Strategic Aggregate Recycling Sites (SARS) in proximity to key urban areas need safeguarding. An additional SARS is supported in or around Harlow either by naming appropriate industrial or employment land, provision within an existing or future IWMFs or development of a 'resource management park'. Other non-strategic sites and on-site recycling will be encouraged through criteria based policy at appropriate industrial areas and as temporary permissions at mineral workings and waste disposal sites. Increases in environmental impacts, HGV movements or duration of mineral / waste sites must be avoided.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach –</b></p> <p>Rather than seeking to differentiate between strategic and non-strategic aggregate recycling sites a criteria only based approach to aggregate recycling could be adopted to promote these types of sites.</p>	<p>supported to reduce reliance on land-won and marine-won primary aggregates. The County's existing network of aggregate recycling facilities shall be maintained and expanded, wherever appropriate. In addition:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing Strategic Aggregate Recycling Sites (SARS) identified on the Submission Policies Map and defined in the maps in Appendices 9 will be safeguarded from development that might result in their closure earlier than their permission. There is a general presumption that existing SARS should remain in operation for the life of the permission.</li> <li>2. The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Minerals Planning Authority for its views and take them into account before determining development proposals that would compromise the continued operation and potential of an existing or proposed SARS.</li> <li>3. Proposals for new aggregate recycling facilities, whether non-strategic or in the form of SARS, should be</li> </ol>	<p>land-won and marine-won primary aggregates. The County's existing network of aggregate recycling facilities shall be maintained and expanded, wherever appropriate. In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing Strategic Aggregate Recycling Sites (SARS) identified on the Policies Map and defined in the map in Appendix 9 will be safeguarded from development that might result in their closure earlier than their permission. There is a general presumption that existing SARS should remain in operation for the life of the permission.</li> <li>2. The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Minerals Planning Authority for its views and take them into account before determining development proposals that would compromise the continued operation and potential of an existing SARS.</li> <li>3. Proposals for new aggregate recycling facilities, whether non-strategic or in the form of SARS, should be located on the main highway network in proximity to the Key Centres of Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester, and Harlow. Such proposals shall be permitted in the following preferred locations, provided they</li> </ol>
-----------------------------	--	--	---	---

			<p>located on the main highway network in proximity to the Key Centres of Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester, and Harlow. Such proposals shall be permitted in the following preferred locations, provided they do not cause unacceptable highway harm and are environmentally acceptable and in accordance with other policies in the Development Plan for Essex:-</p> <p>a. on major demolition and construction sites (on a temporary basis);</p> <p>b. within permanent waste management sites;</p> <p>c. in commercial areas used for general industrial or storage purposes, subject to compatibility with neighbouring land-uses;</p> <p>d. on appropriate previously developed land;</p> <p>e. on current minerals workings and landfill sites provided the development does not unduly prejudice the agreed restoration timescale for the site and the use ceases prior to the completion of the site; and</p> <p>f. within major allocated or</p>	<p>do not cause unacceptable highway harm, are environmentally acceptable and in accordance with other policies in the Development Plan for Essex :</p> <p>a) on major demolition and construction sites (on a temporary basis),</p> <p>b) within permanent waste management sites,</p> <p>c) in commercial areas used for general industrial or storage purposes, subject to compatibility with neighbouring land-uses,</p> <p>d) on appropriate previously developed land,</p> <p>e) on current mineral workings and landfill sites provided the development does not unduly prejudice the agreed restoration timescale for the site and the use ceases prior to the completion of the site, and,</p> <p>f) within major allocated or permitted development areas (as set out in the Development Plan for Essex).</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			permitted development areas (as set out in the Development Plan for Essex).	
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Only method two (the strategic aggregate recycling facilities) can be appraised in such a way as to confer any benefit. The option is likely to have a positive impact on sustainability by improving the sustainable use of minerals, and on the minerals hierarchy through the safeguarding of strategic recycling sites. Impacts on air quality, nuisance, transport and climate change are uncertain as they depend on the location of aggregate recycling facilities in relation to centres of population and primary extraction which is currently unknown. Potential negative impacts on transport may arise if no further strategic sites are developed as there is at present an uneven distribution of sites across the county.</p> <p>Given the incomplete nature of this option the appraisal shows that overall many of the impacts are generally negligible at this stage. As</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. Although each approach is broadly similar in that they seek to promote the high quality recycling of aggregates in order to minimise the need for primary extraction, and allow for this on site if considered viable, there is one significant difference. The Preferred Approach calls for a strategic positioning of large recycling facilities in order to ensure a strategic geographical distribution. This is of extreme importance in the field of recycled aggregates as such aggregates are not inherently cheaper than primary extraction. A strategic distribution of recycling sites at Key Centres for Development and Change will ensure that overall mineral transportation across the County from start to end use is reduced relative to any other approach as will the cost.</p> <p>It is the absence of this strategic location policy in</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. There will be a amount of uncertainty as to how aggregate recycling facilities are perceived by communities in terms of reducing transportation miles to the key centres of Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester and Harlow (as centres of the greatest population) but the overall approach is acknowledged as a sustainable one.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage the MDD set out 3 methods by which optimising the production and use of recycled aggregates can be achieved. These were by increasing on-site recycling on redevelopment sites, establishing a network of strategic aggregate recycling facilities, and by promoting and maintaining a spread of smaller non-strategic aggregate recycling sites across the County.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage the preferred approach was to provide a network of permanent and long term temporary recycling facilities able to make significant and long term contributions to recycled aggregate production with the only safeguarding being the Strategic Aggregate Recycling Sites (SARS) in proximity to key urban areas, with an additional SARS in or around Harlow. There would also be a criteria based policy at appropriate industrial</p>

	<p>the MDD development process evolves, it is likely that the impacts will become clearer.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Through preventing minerals sites encroaching on wildlife or geological sites, and through site restoration, these negative impacts can be overcome. (negligible / no impact)</p>	<p>preference of the purely criteria led allocation policy advocated by the Alternative Approach which creates the difference in assessment. Should the alternative approach be followed there is inherent ambiguity in the final spatial distribution of aggregate recycling centres and as such transport distances cannot be quantified. This effects both emissions and the economic viability of recycling. The secondary effect of the latter is a likely potential reduction in the use of recycled aggregates which is against the overall policy direction. In addition, a non-strategic criteria led approach as promoted by the Alternative Approach leads to difficulties in quantifying cumulative effects. Many of the Sustainability Objectives would also be positively impacted upon as a result of the cumulative and synergistic impacts of the Plan Policies being implemented together if the Preferred Approach was adopted.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan</p>		<p>areas and as temporary permissions at mineral workings and waste disposal sites. This approach was progressed where the SARS network in proximity to 'Key Centres for Development and Change', was considered the best means for the MPA to promote raising the quality of recycled products and provide for economies of scale.</p> <p>An alternative approach looked at a criteria only based approach to aggregate recycling to promote strategic and non-strategic aggregate recycling sites. The alternative was rejected where it is difficult to find suitable sites for aggregate recycling; particularly in areas without existing mineral sites, by not safeguarding sites there is a risk that existing aggregate recycling sites would be displaced by higher value land uses over the course of the Plan period, many consultation responses noted the lack of geographic coverage of the three sites proposed in the Further Issues and Options paper (2009), and in not delivering a site specific safeguarding approach the alternative is considered less consistent with PPS10.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>The Submission stage policy on</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>2009' states that safeguarded facilities should be located in areas sufficiently distant from public or publically used areas to minimise nuisance or disruption to human health or local amenities. The same is stated with regard to natural and built environment concerns although not attributed to safeguarding policies.</p> <p>SARS are likely to generate a number of additional HGV movements and as such must be located in areas with good access and preferably in close proximity to non-road based modes of transport or the main highway network.</p>	<p>aggregate recycling facilities seeks to maintain and expand the existing network of aggregate recycling facilities in addition to safeguarding SARS, requiring LPAs to consult the MPA in regards to determining applications that could compromise the SARS and detailing a criteria based approach to new strategic or non-strategic aggregate recycling facilities; updated to be complimentary with the content of the emerging Waste Local Plan.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD only appraised the element of the option regarding the network of strategic aggregate recycling facilities highlighting positive impacts on sustainability by improving the sustainable use of minerals, and on the minerals hierarchy through the safeguarding of strategic recycling sites, however potential negative impacts on transport may arise if no further strategic sites are developed as there is at present an uneven distribution of sites across the county.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended that the Preferred Approach be adopted where a strategic</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>distribution of recycling sites at urban areas will ensure that overall mineral transportation across the County from start to end use is reduced relative to any other approach. A purely criteria led allocation policy advocated by the alternative approach was said to have ambiguity in the final spatial distribution of aggregate recycling centres and as such transport distances cannot be quantified, affecting both emissions and the economic viability of recycling.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria with just a small amount of uncertainty as to how aggregate recycling facilities are perceived by communities in terms of reducing transportation miles to the key centres of Basildon, Chelmsford, Colchester and Harlow (as centres of the greatest population). This was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
<p><b>POLICY S6</b> Provision for Sand and Gravel Extraction</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Issue 4</b> Management and maintenance of the landbank. <b>Option 17- Overall Approach to Review of the Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach –</b> To maintain a single County-wide land-bank of at least 7 years for sand and gravel based on the County</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> The Mineral Planning Authority shall endeavour to ensure reserves of land won sand and gravel are available, sufficient for at least 7 years extraction or</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> The Mineral Planning Authority shall endeavour to ensure reserves of land won sand and gravel are available, sufficient for at least 7 years extraction or such other period as set out in national</p>

	<p>Do you agree that a partial review of the Plan should be based upon the land won sand and gravel only?</p> <p>1. Yes, 2. No, if no why?</p> <p><b>Option 18 - Proposed Indicators to trigger a partial or whole Review of the MDD</b></p> <p>Which of the 3 mechanisms below should be used? (please explain your answer):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The landbank falls to 7 years (based on the agreed sub-regional apportionment)</li> <li>- The combined provision of both the landbank and outstanding “planned provision” still to come forward fall to 10 years</li> <li>- The plan reviewed every 5 years from date of adoption.</li> </ul> <p>1. If more than one, please place in priority order and explain your reason 2. If one, please state and explain your answer 3. If none, please explain your answer 4. Or are there any other appropriate triggers? (please provide details and your</p>	<p>apportionment and site specific landbanks of 10 years for Martells silica sand and 25 years for Bulmers and Marks Tey brick clay sites. In addition, the MDD will be reviewed either within 5 years of adoption as part of a ‘plan, monitor, manage” approach to planning or should the sand and gravel land-bank fall below 7 years; whichever comes sooner. It is not intended to identify resources now to provide for a 7 year landbank beyond the plan period.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach –</b></p> <p>To partially review the Plan based on land won sand and gravel only.</p>	<p>such other period agreed as national policy, or local annual supply requirement for Essex.</p> <p>The Plan identifies sufficient provision through Preferred Sites allocations (in Table 7 Preferred Sites for Sand and Gravel Extraction) to enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this scale of provision to be achieved by 2029; and,</li> <li>- the maintenance of at least a 7 year landbank</li> </ul> <p>Proposals for mineral extraction on non-preferred sites will be resisted by the Mineral Planning Authority unless the applicant can demonstrate:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. an overriding justification and/or overriding benefit for the proposed extraction; and,</li> <li>b. the scale of the extraction is no more than the minimum essential for the key purpose of the proposal; and,</li> <li>c. the proposal is environmentally suitable, sustainable, and consistent with the relevant policies set out in the Development Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>policy, taking into account the local annual supply requirement for Essex. This requirement will be periodically assessed.</p> <p>The Plan identifies sufficient provision through Preferred Sites allocations (listed in Table 5) until 2029 and will be subject to periodic review to enable the maintenance of at least a seven year landbank.</p> <p>Proposals for mineral extraction on non-Preferred Sites will be resisted by the Mineral Planning Authority unless the applicant can demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An overriding justification and/ or overriding benefit for the proposed extraction, and,</li> <li>b) The scale of the extraction is no more than the minimum essential for the key purpose of the proposal, and,</li> <li>c) The proposal is environmentally suitable, sustainable, and consistent with the relevant policies set out in the Development Plan.</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--	--

reason)				
<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Option 17 and 18 are not appraisable under the SEA criteria.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. The Alternative Approach seeks to commit all available resources to the monitoring of the sand and gravel landbank only. This would mean that those landbanks held for silica sand and brick clay would not be subjected to monitoring. This does not represent best practice despite the fact that the extraction of sand and gravel is by far the most important within Essex. In addition, the other policies within the plan would also remain unmonitored under this Alternative Approach and as such the direction of travel of many of the Sustainability Objectives would be unknown leading to large amounts of uncertainty. This is in direct contravention to existing guidance from Central Government which stipulates that planning policies should be reviewed and monitored to ensure that the direction facilitated by policy is the one which was intended.</p> <p>The Preferred Approach would have a strong positive effect on</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts on a range of sustainability criteria. The policy promotes a flexible approach, in terms of new site proposals as well as the scale/landbank to respond to future development, particularly in line with the spatial strategy and centres for growth in the plan area.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts on a range of sustainability criteria. The policy promotes a flexible approach, in terms of new site proposals as well as the scale/landbank to respond to future development, particularly in line with the spatial strategy and centres for growth in the plan area.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage options for the management and maintenance of the landbank were looked at. These were, a partial review of the Plan based upon land won sand and gravel only (Option 17), and three options on a whole and partial review of the plan/landbank (Option 18) consisting of a 7 year landbank based on the agreed sub-regional apportionment, a combined provision of both the landbank and outstanding “planned provision” still to come forward up to 10 years, and a landbank based on a 5 year review from the plan’s adoption. Elements of the single 7 year landbank for sand and gravel, and a 5 year review were taken forward to the preferred approach stage of the MDD.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage, the preferred approach was to maintain a single County-wide land-bank of at least 7 years for sand and gravel based on the County apportionment and site specific</p>

		<p>the sustainable use of minerals (SO12) whilst also having a positive impact on the other Sustainability Objectives.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>No mitigation measures are proposed as they are not directly applicable to this policy. Contributions towards the notion of sustainable transport could however be made by ensuring that landbanked material is distributed around the County.</p>	<p>landbanks of 10 years for Martells silica sand and 25 years for Bulmers and Marks Tey brick clay sites. In addition, the MDD will be reviewed either within 5 years of adoption as part of a ‘plan, monitor, manage’ approach to planning or should the sand and gravel land-bank fall below 7 years; whichever comes sooner. This was progressed where a single landbank for the whole sand and gravel resource was viewed as the most practical way forward for the MDD. It would appear unnecessary and impractical to propose separate landbanks for different geographic areas or distinguish building sand and concreting aggregates.</p> <p>An alternative approach was explored to partially review the Plan based on land won sand and gravel only. This was rejected where it would not address any important changes to national or regional policy during the Plan period, and the focus of any review would rest on primary extraction.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>The provision for sand and gravel extraction has continued to follow the 7 year landbank approach as per sub-national targets; with</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>additional criteria for proposals for mineral extraction on non-preferred sites should they be viable in the future. This adheres to national policy regarding landbanks not primarily consisting of a few key large allocations. The review and monitoring element of the policy as it appeared in previous iterations has been moved into a separate policy, IMR1.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD for Options 17 and 18 stated that neither was able to be appraised under the sustainability criteria at that stage.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended that the preferred approach be adopted as it would have a strong positive effect on the sustainable use of minerals whilst also having a positive impact on the other Sustainability Objectives. It was recommended however that contributions towards the notion of sustainable transport could be made by ensuring that landbanked material is distributed around the County. The alternative approach was seen to be a contravention to guidance from Central Government which stipulates that planning policies</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>should be reviewed and monitored to ensure that the direction facilitated by policy is the one which was intended.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team a SA/SEA of a Pre-Submission working draft saw the Plan's approach to the provision for sand and gravel extraction having positive impacts on a range of sustainability criteria. The policy promotes a flexible approach, in terms of new site proposals as well as the scale/landbank to respond to future development, particularly in line with the spatial strategy and centres for growth in the plan area. This approach was therefore progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
<p><b>POLICY S7</b> Provision for Industrial Materials</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Vision</b></p> <p><i>8) Primary Mineral Provision</i></p> <p>Brick clay, brickearth and silica sand sites will continue to be protected and planned for.</p> <p><b>Option 14- Scale of development within an MSA requiring consideration of prior extraction by the applicant</b></p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Vision</b></p> <p>Primary extraction sites will have regard to important sites of cultural, historic or biodiversity value and will have good transport connections. Consideration will be given to the cumulative impacts of extraction on the local communities, landscape and flood risk. Essex residents will</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Any proposals for industrial minerals in the County will be considered as follows:-</p> <p>Silica Sand Extraction:</p> <p>Provision is made for a site extension at Martells Quarry, Ardleigh to maintain an appropriate minerals landbank for silica sand of at least ten years during the plan-period as defined in</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Any proposals for industrial minerals in the County will be considered as follows:-</p> <p>Silica Sand Extraction:</p> <p>Provision is made for a site extension at Martells Quarry, Ardleigh to maintain an appropriate minerals landbank for silica sand of at least ten years during the plan-period as defined</p>

	<p>Do you consider the scale of development which would merit consideration of prior extraction by the applicant to be appropriate?</p> <p>Brickearth and Brick clay - all development involving construction, unless within a residential curtilage</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>If no, please provide alternative criteria and provide reasons for your answer.</p> <p>Chalk - all development involving construction covering an area in excess of 3 ha.</p> <p>7. Yes</p> <p>8. No</p> <p>9. If no, please provide alternative criteria and provide reasons for your answer.</p>	<p>have certainty of where Preferred Sites are located, how applications for 'windfall' sites will be determined, and how their standard of amenity will be protected. Brick clay, brickearth and silica sand sites will continue to be protected and planned for.</p> <p><b>Core Objectives</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE 2:</b> To identify and safeguard the following resources in Essex:</p> <p>Sand and gravel, chalk, silica sand, brickearth and brick clay which have potential future economic and/ or conservation value. Unnecessary sterilisation should be avoided;</p>	<p>policy P2</p> <p><b>Brick Clay Extraction:</b></p> <p>A minerals landbank of at least 25 years of brick-making clay will be maintained at the following brickworks:-</p> <p>Marks Tey and Bulmer through the extraction of remaining permitted reserves.</p> <p>The extracted brick-making clay from Bulmer Brickworks and Marks Tey respectively should be used to support the brickworks in that locality only, as defined on the Submission Policies Map.</p> <p><b>Chalk Extraction:</b></p> <p>The small-scale extraction of chalk will only be supported for agricultural and pharmaceutical uses at Newport Quarry as identified on the Submission Policies Map. Extraction of chalk for other uses, such as aggregate, as fill material or for engineering will not be supported.</p> <p>Proposals for the extraction of industrial minerals on non preferred sites' will be permitted where:</p>	<p>in policy P2.</p> <p><b>Brick Clay Extraction:</b></p> <p>A minerals landbank of at least 25 years of brick-making clay will be maintained at the following brickworks:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marks Tey and Bulmer through the extraction of remaining permitted reserves.</li> </ul> <p>The extracted brick-making clay from Bulmer Brickworks and Marks Tey respectively should be used to support the brickworks in that locality only, as defined on the Policies Map.</p> <p><b>Chalk Extraction:</b></p> <p>The small-scale extraction of chalk will only be supported for agricultural and pharmaceutical uses at Newport Quarry as identified within the Policies Map. Extraction of chalk for other uses, such as aggregate, fill material or for engineering will not be supported.</p> <p>Proposals for the extraction of industrial minerals on non-Preferred Sites will be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reserves comprising the landbank are insufficient and/ or there is some other over-riding justification or benefit for the</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--	--

			<p>The reserves comprising the landbank are insufficient and/or there is some other over-riding justification or benefit for the release of the site; and</p> <p>The proposal would be environmentally acceptable.</p>	<p>release of the site, and</p> <p>- The proposal would be environmentally acceptable.</p>
<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The two Alternatives for Brickearth and Brick Clay both result in negatives impacts being identified. Development with a specific scale applied would negatively impact on the 'mineral 'hierarchy' and 'sustainability' due to deposits being small and sparse, and on 'economic development' as it may be a hindrance to development. The other alternative of all development (excluding those within a residential cartilage) requiring consideration of previous extraction of these materials would potentially to impede economic development but it would ensure safeguarding of this material therefore positively impacting on 'minerals hierarchy' and 'sustainability' SEA criteria.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Vision element has a positive impact across a range of sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Objective 2; element has a positive impact for economic development and sustainable mineral use.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts on a range of sustainability criteria. The policy promotes a flexible approach, in terms of new site proposals, which responds well to Policy S2.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage of the Further Issues and Options MDD, it was explored whether brickearth, brickclay and silica sand sites should continue to be protected and planned for, within a Vision statement. No alternatives could be identified beyond whether or not sites for industrial minerals should be planned.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage it was stated in a Vision statement that primary extraction sites will have regard to numerous environmental criteria and that brick clay, brickearth and silica sand sites will continue to be protected and planned for. Under the Core Objectives of the plan, it was also covered that chalk, silica sand, brickearth and brick clay will be identified and safeguarded to avoid</p>	

	<p>The two alternatives for Chalk share similar impacts as the second alternative for brickearth and brick clay discussed above. The smaller scale stipulated for development would emphasise the positive and negative impacts.</p>			<p>unnecessary sterilisation as they have potential future economic and/ or conservation value. There were no other reasonable alternatives at this stage.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>The Submission stage policy on the provision for industrial minerals progresses the preferred approach by identifying provision for silica sand, brick clay and chalk extraction and also in line with paragraph 146 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted negative impacts being identified for planning and protecting brick earth, brick clay and chalk due to deposits being small and sparse and may be a hindrance to development.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted positive impacts across a range of sustainability objectives, in particular for economic development and sustainable mineral use.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the progression to a Pre-Submission working draft lead to an assessment of positive</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				impacts on a range of sustainability criteria. The policy promoted a flexible approach, in terms of new site proposals, which responds well to Policy S2. This approach was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.
<b>POLICY S8</b> Safeguarding Minerals Resources and Reserves	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Issue 3</b></p> <p>How to safeguard our mineral resources for future generations, and avoid unnecessary mineral sterilisation</p> <p>How to protect and safeguard our existing and future mineral extraction sites</p> <p><b>Option 13 - Defining MSA boundaries</b></p> <p>Do you agree with the approaches to defining MSA boundaries, outlined above?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No</li> <li>3. If no, please specify your preferred approach(es) and provide reasons for your answers.</li> </ol> <p><b>Option 14- Scale of development within an MSA requiring consideration of prior extraction by the applicant</b></p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach –</b></p> <p>The 'mineral safeguarding area' would be broadly based on the resources shown in associated maps. The MPA would consider prior extraction as a windfall before alternative development occurs on sites greater than 5ha for sand and gravel, 3ha for chalk and greater than a single residential curtilage for brickearth or brick clay. The applicant would be expected to provide information to determine what quality and quantity of deposit would be capable of being economically worked (as per criteria above). The MPA would also oppose incompatible development within 250m of a permitted and / or preferred mineral allocation site.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach –</b></p> <p>Delineate the economic mineral resource around</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority will seek to safeguard indigenous mineral resources of national and local importance by ensuring development proposals do not sterilise or adversely impact on the effective working of an active, permitted or preferred mineral reserve by applying Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs).</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Areas</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) have been designated for the mineral deposits of sand and gravel, silica sand, chalk, brick earth, and brick clay considered to be of national and local importance. These MSAs are defined on the Submission Policies Map and the maps included in</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>By applying Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and/ or Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs), the Mineral Planning Authority will safeguard mineral resources of national and local importance from surface development that would sterilise a significant economic resource or prejudice the effective working of a permitted mineral reserve or Preferred Site allocation within the Minerals Local Plan. The Minerals Planning Authority shall be consulted, and its views taken into account, on proposed developments within MSAs and MCAs except for the excluded development identified in Appendix 9.</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Areas</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Areas are designated for mineral deposits of sand and gravel, silica sand, chalk, brickearth and brick clay considered to be of national and</p>

	<p>Do you consider the scale of development which would merit consideration of prior extraction by the applicant to be appropriate?</p> <p>Sand and Gravel - all development involving construction covering an area in excess of 10 ha.</p> <p>1. Yes 2. No</p> <p>If no, please provide alternative criteria and provide reasons for your answer.</p> <p>Brickearth and Brick clay - all development involving construction, unless within a residential curtilage</p> <p>4. Yes 5. No</p> <p>If no, please provide alternative criteria and provide reasons for your answer.</p> <p>Chalk - all development involving construction covering an area in excess of 3 ha.</p> <p>7. Yes 8. No 9. If no, please provide</p>	<p>preferred sites only. The MPA would seek consideration of prior extraction before any incompatible development at such sites could occur and would oppose inappropriate development within 250m of a preferred mineral allocation site.</p>	<p>Appendix 6.</p> <p>Except for the excluded development identified in Appendix 5 of the Plan, the Local Planning Authority shall consult the Mineral Planning Authority and take account of its views before planning decisions are made with regard to the need for prior extraction in respect of:</p> <p>a. all planning applications for development on a site located within an MSA that is 5ha or more for sand and gravel, 3ha or more for chalk and greater than 1 dwelling for Brickearth or Brickclay; and</p> <p>b. any land-use policy or proposal relating to land within an MSA that is being considered by the Local Planning Authority for possible development, or development management measures, as part of preparing a Local Plan (with regard to the above thresholds).</p> <p>Proposals that meet these thresholds, shall be supported by a minerals resource assessment to establish the existence or otherwise of a mineral</p>	<p>local importance, as defined on the MSAs Policies Map in Appendix 10.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority shall be consulted on:</p> <p>a) all planning applications for development on a site located within an MSA that is 5ha or more for sand and gravel, 3ha or more for chalk and greater than 1 dwelling for brickearth or brick clay; and</p> <p>b) any land-use policy, proposal or allocation relating to land within an MSA being considered by the Local Planning Authority for possible development as part of preparing a Local Plan (with regard to the above thresholds).</p> <p>Non Mineral proposals that exceed these thresholds shall be supported by a minerals resource assessment to establish the existence or otherwise of a mineral resource of economic importance.</p> <p>If, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, surface development should be permitted, consideration shall be given to the prior extraction of existing minerals.</p> <p>Mineral Consultation Areas MCAs are designated within and</p>
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>alternative criteria and provide reasons for your answer.</p> <p><b>Option 15 Provision of information relating to prior extraction potential to be submitted with an application</b></p> <p>Do you agree that the MPA should have a policy requiring this assessment which could be a determining factor for the approval / refusal of planning permission to avoid the needless sterilisation of an economic mineral resource?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No</li> <li>3. If no, what other policy approach would be applicable to protect the resource?</li> </ol> <p><b>Option 16 - The Protection of Permitted and Identified Mineral Reserves Through MCA Designation</b></p> <p>Do you agree that the MPA should have a policy to establish MCAs around extraction sites?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No</li> <li>3. If yes, how far should the MPA boundary extend</li> </ol>		<p>resource of economic importance.</p> <p>Mineral Consultation Areas</p> <p>The LPA shall consult the MPA on proposed developments within the Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs). In addition, MCAs have been designated for an area extending for 250 metres from each safeguarded permitted mineral working and preferred site in the County as shown on the Submission Policies Map and defined on the maps included in Appendix 6. The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Mineral Planning Authority for its views and take them into account before planning decisions are made to ensure that such mineral sites are protected, for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. any planning application for development on a site located within an MCA; and</li> <li>2. any land-use policy or proposal relating to land within an MCA that is being considered through local plan preparation and,</li> <li>3. Existing permitted sites as</li> </ol>	<p>up to an area of 250 metres from each safeguarded permitted minerals development and Preferred Site allocation as shown on the Policies Map and defined on the maps in Appendix 10. The Mineral Planning Authority shall be consulted on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Any planning application for development on a site located within an MCA except for the excluded development identified in Appendix 9,</li> <li>b) Any land-use policy, proposal or allocation relating to land within an MCA that is being considered as part of preparing a Local Plan.</li> </ol> <p>Proposals which would unnecessarily sterilise mineral resources or conflict with the effective workings of permitted minerals development or Preferred Mineral Site allocation shall be opposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

	<p>beyond the permitted or proposed mineral extraction site boundary to afford sufficient protection?</p>		<p>updated under the Annual Monitoring Report.</p>	
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Options 13, 14 and 15 have been appraised together. Alternatives under each option for sand and gravel and chalk promote positive impacts on the sustainability criteria ‘minerals hierarchy’ due to the fact that their implementation would safeguard minerals resources, and on ‘sustainability’ as they would all ensure protection of the best quality minerals resources for sand and gravel. However, negative impacts on the sustainability objective economic development arise from these alternatives where they may impede development through the requirement of extraction. Positive and negative impacts are amplified for the alternatives with development of smaller sizes in an MSA requiring consideration of previous extraction of these materials.</p> <p>The two alternatives for brickearth and brick clay both</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. Adopting a policy of a non-sterilisation of large mineral sites is the most sustainable use of both land and minerals and there are therefore strong positive connotations with those SEA Objectives. The Preferred Approach also directly accords with the minerals supply hierarchy. These positives would be eliminated by adopting the Alternative Approach.</p> <p>It is assessed that there would be a short and medium term negative impact on economic development caused by the need for developers to scope the potential of their development sites for possible mineralogy and delay development until such material is extracted. However, such geo-technical surveys are required for construction in any event. In the long term, the securement of these minerals would be positive for wider economic development. There</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts against a range of sustainability criteria, where the Mineral Planning Authority’s consultation will be required of potentially conflicting proposals in designated MCAs in regards to all elements of the Minerals Local Plan, including transportation and restoration proposals on a site-by-site basis and cumulatively as part of the strategy.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage, numerous options were looked at to safeguard minerals resources and reserves. These were an option defining MSA boundaries (Option 13), an option stating scales of development within an MSA requiring consideration of prior extraction by the applicant (Option 14, stating in excess of 10ha for sand and gravel, all development unless within a residential curtilage for brickearth and brick clay, and 3ha for chalk), an option on the provision of information relating to prior extraction potential to be submitted with an application (Option 15), and an option on the protection of permitted and identified mineral reserves through MCA designation (Option 16).</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage the preferred approach was that the MPA would consider prior extraction as</p>

	<p>promote negative impacts. Both negatively impact on the sustainability criteria 'economic development'. Applying a specific scale for development that require consideration of previous extraction of these materials would also negatively impact on the sustainability objectives for 'mineral hierarchy' and 'sustainability' as deposits of brickearth and brick clay are so small and sparse that any development may threaten them and lead to sterilisation. The alternative of having all development (excluding those within a residential cartilage) requiring consideration of previous extraction of these materials positively impacts on the 'minerals hierarchy' and 'sustainability'.</p> <p>Option 16 has been divided into two alternatives; to establish a 250m MCA 'buffer' around extraction sites, which will have positive effects on the sustainability objectives for 'mineral hierarchy' and 'sustainability' and negative impacts on economic development, and to have no MCA around</p>	<p>is also a mitigatable negative impact surrounding the public uncertainty inherent in promoting windfall sites for extraction. It will be crucial that sufficient information is released in an inclusive fashion to alert local residents to the possibility of mineral extraction occurring before a site is developed for its end use. Both these negative impacts are assessed as being overridden by the importance of adhering to sustainable land use.</p> <p>There is much uncertainty inherent within this high level strategic policy due to a lack of spatial context. However this is considered to be synonymous with this type of high level policy and is assessed as being outweighed by the positive intention of the Preferred Approach. Such uncertainties are also adequately addressed by other policies within the MDD.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that safeguarded sites should be located in areas sufficiently distant from</p>		<p>a windfall before alternative development occurs on sites greater than 5ha for sand and gravel, 3ha for chalk and greater than a single residential curtilage for brickearth or brick clay. The MPA would also oppose incompatible development within 250m of a permitted and / or preferred mineral allocation site, and the applicant would be expected to provide information to determine what quality and quantity of deposit would be capable of being economically worked. This approach was progressed as it was consistent with government policy, built on lessons learnt from safeguarding brick-earth in the previous MLP, and setting a distance of 250m is a pragmatic means of protecting existing or potential workings from incompatible activities.</p> <p>An alternative approach was to delineate the economic mineral resource around preferred sites only. The MPA would seek consideration of prior extraction before any incompatible development at such sites could occur and would oppose inappropriate development within 250m of a preferred mineral allocation site. This was rejected where at the time, the change in national policy with MPS1 was to</p>
--	---	--	--	---

	<p>extraction sites, which has mainly negative impacts on the sustainability criteria.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> (Options 13, 14) Through closely working with local communities, any detrimental impact on local business can be avoided. Through the establishment of jobs in the minerals industry for local residents there may be positive effects. (negative impact OR positive impact)</p>	<p>public or publicly used areas to minimise nuisance or disruption to human health or local amenities Sites at risk of sterilisation should only be extracted when it can be shown that the value of minerals extracted outweighs any potential negative effects on the natural and built environments, human health and local amenity.</p> <p>There is also a negative impact surrounding the public uncertainty inherent in promoting windfall sites for extraction but this can be mitigated against. It will be crucial that sufficient information is released in an inclusive fashion to alert local residents to the possibility of mineral extraction occurring before a site is developed for its end use.</p>		<p>avoid a narrow definition to just mineral sites needed to make up an apportionment. In addition to this the alternative approach may miss opportunities for prior extraction beyond preferred sites which would otherwise require extensive investigation works, allow mineral resources to be sterilised, and also result in a need for aggregate to be bought in from elsewhere.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>The Submission stage policy includes MSAs for silica sand, to avoid the sterilisation for all indigenous mineral resources. The MSA for brickearth and brickclay is also amended to greater than 1 dwelling, rather than any residential curtilage. The policy also seeks to safeguard resources from sterilisation from other development through MCAs and close working with LPAs in line with paragraph 143 of the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Progress through the SA/SEA</b></p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted negative impacts on economic development through impeding development as a result of defining MSA boundaries. Regarding scales of development within an MSA requiring</p>
--	---	--	--	---

				<p>consideration of prior extraction by the applicant in terms of brickearth and brickclay would both promote negative impacts where any development may threaten them and lead to sterilisation. A 250m MCA 'buffer' around extraction sites, would have positive impacts on minerals and sustainability, however negative impacts on economic development.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended the Preferred Approach to be adopted; according with the sustainable use of land and with the minerals supply hierarchy. These positives would be eliminated by adopting the alternative approach of delineating around preferred sites only. It was recommended that sufficient information is released in an inclusive fashion to alert local residents to the possibility of mineral extraction occurring before a site is developed for its end use.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw the safeguarding of mineral resources and reserves to evolve to be more descriptive. There will be positive impacts against a range of sustainability criteria through the MSAs, and where the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				Mineral Planning Authority's consultation will be required of potentially conflicting proposals in designated MCAs in regards to all elements of the Minerals Local Plan. This was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP, with added emphasis on sterilisation in regards to MCAs, and under clearer circumstances what stance the MPA will take during consultation with LPAs.
<b>POLICY S9</b> Safeguarding Mineral Transshipment Sites and Coated Stone Plant	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Issue 5</b></p> <p>How to ensure Essex maintains access to alternative sources of minerals, through the safeguarding of transshipment sites.</p> <p><b>Option 19 - Safeguarding of Mineral Transshipment Facilities</b></p> <p>1. In addition to Harlow Mill Station, Chelmsford Railway sidings, Marks Tey rail depot, and the port of Harwich, are there any other rail head or wharf facilities in Essex that should be safeguarded? Please give reasons for your answer.</p> <p><b>Option 20 - Designation of Mineral Consultation Areas around mineral transshipment facilities</b></p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach -</b></p> <p>The MPA is looking to safeguard the rail heads and wharfage facilities of Chelmsford, Marks Tey, Harlow Mill, Port of Harwich and, while extraction continues, Fingringhoe. When proposals for other development would result in the above facilities being lost the applicants will be required to demonstrate that these sites no longer meet the needs of the aggregates industry or there are appropriate alternative facilities available / or ones that can be made available. Fingringhoe is to be safeguarded for the life of the permitted reserve. Once permitted reserves are exhausted the site is no longer to be safeguarded for this use</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The following mineral facilities identified on the Submission Policies Map are of strategic importance and shall be safeguarded from development which would compromise their continued operation or potential</p> <p>Safeguarded Transshipment Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chelmsford Rail Depot</li> <li>b. Harlow Mill Rail Station</li> <li>c. Marks Tey Rail depot</li> <li>d. Ballast Quay, Fingringhoe (safeguarding to apply only up to the end of mineral extraction at the nearby Fingringhoe Quarry)</li> <li>e. Parkeston Quay East, Harwich</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The following mineral facilities identified on the Policies Map are of strategic importance and shall be safeguarded from development which would compromise their continued operation.</p> <p>Safeguarded Transshipment Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chelmsford Rail Depot</li> <li>b. Harlow Mill Rail Station</li> <li>c. Marks Tey Rail depot</li> <li>d. Ballast Quay, Fingringhoe (safeguarding to apply only up to the end of mineral extraction at the nearby Fingringhoe Quarry)</li> <li>e. Parkeston Quay East, Harwich (potential operation)</li> </ul> <p>Safeguarded Coated Stone Plant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. Suttons Wharf, Rochford</li> </ul>

	<p>1. Do you consider it appropriate to designate Mineral Consultation Areas around safeguarded mineral transshipment facilities, extending 250 metres from the transshipment site boundary, to ensure the MPA is made aware of any development proposal which might compromise the effective operation of these sites?</p>	<p>because of poor road servicing. It is also proposed that proposals for other development within 250m of these rail heads and wharfage facilities should demonstrate that they would not prejudice or be prejudiced by those facilities.</p> <p><b>Alternative –</b> No alternative offered</p>	<p>Safeguarded Coated Stone Plant (Asphalt):</p> <p>f. Suttons Wharf, Rochford g. Stanway, Colchester h. Wivenhoe Quarry i. Bulls Lodge, Chelmsford j. Essex Regiment Way, Chelmsford k. Harlow Mill Rail Station</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Mineral Planning Authority and take account of its views before making planning decisions on all developments within 250 metres of the above facilities as defined in the maps in Appendices 8 and 10. Where planning permission is granted for new rail or marine transshipment sites and coated stone plant (asphalt) of strategic importance, those sites will also be safeguarded so that their operation is not compromised. The safeguarding of a strategic plant is for the life of the planning permission or where located in a mineral working, until completion of the site.</p>	<p>g. Stanway, Colchester h. Wivenhoe Quarry i. Bulls Lodge, Chelmsford j. Essex Regiment Way, Chelmsford k. Harlow Mill Rail Station</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Mineral Planning Authority and take account of its views before making planning decisions on all developments within 250 metres of the above facilities as defined in the maps in Appendices 8 and 10. Where planning permission is granted for new rail or marine transshipment sites and coated stone plant of strategic importance, those sites will also be safeguarded so that their operation is not compromised. The safeguarding of a strategic plant is for the life of the planning permission or where located in a mineral working, until completion of extraction.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Mineral Planning Authority for its views and take them into account on proposals for development within the Mineral Consultation Area surrounding each of these safeguarded sites, as identified on the Policies Map, before making planning decisions on</p>
--	---	---	---	---

			<p>The Local Planning Authority shall consult the Mineral Planning Authority for its views and take them into account on proposals for development within the Mineral Consultation Area surrounding each of these safeguarded sites, as identified on the Submission Policies Map, before making planning decisions on such proposals.</p>	<p>such proposals.</p>
--	--	--	--	------------------------

	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p><b>Option 19: Safeguarding of Mineral Transshipment Facilities</b></p> <p>This Option is not appraisable under the SEA criteria.</p> <p><b>Option 20: Designation of Mineral Consultation Areas around Mineral Transshipment Facilities</b></p> <p>The appraisal for this Option is similar to that in Option 16 (a) in 6.4.3.4 and the alternatives have again been assessed separately below.</p> <p><i>a) 250m MCA around transshipment facilities</i></p> <p>This Option has also been covered in the Core Objectives, Statement 7, in 4.2.2, which promotes the safeguarding of facilities for long haul minerals transportation. The SEA appraisal is, therefore, similar. The positive impacts are associated with the safeguarding of transshipment facilities, thus reducing road related emissions.</p> <p>A negative impact is associated with SEA criteria 11 (economic development) due to the fact that the MCA may impede development in</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>This is a very specific policy and as such has no impact on the majority of Sustainability Objectives. The impacts that it does have however are strongly positive. The protection of transshipment sites would allow for the continued transport of minerals by rail and sea. Such forms of transport produce relatively smaller amounts of fine particulates and emissions harmful to health than road transport for an equivalent weight carried. In addition, a single freight train can carry the same amount of material as 50 HGVs, resulting in more sustainable methods of transportation. There is also a positive economic effect to safeguarding transshipment sites as they are imperative for facilitating wider economic goals.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that safeguarded facilities should be located in areas sufficiently distant from public or publically used areas</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. The policy benefits from a flexible approach in regards to individual sites and is not overly dependant on policy conditions or restrictions. The policy works well alongside Policy S2.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At the further Issues and Options stage, two isolated options were considered regarding the safeguarding of transshipment sites; the safeguarding of mineral transshipment facilities, and the designation of 250m Mineral Consultation Areas around mineral transshipment facilities. Elements of both these options were progressed to the preferred approach stage.</p> <p>Preferred Approach Stage</p> <p>At this stage the MPA looked to safeguard the rail heads and wharfage facilities of Chelmsford, Marks Tey, Harlow Mill, Port of Harwich and, while extraction continues, Fingringhoe. Once permitted reserves are exhausted the site is no longer to be safeguarded for this use. It is also proposed that proposals for other development within 250m of these rail heads and wharfage facilities should demonstrate that they would not prejudice or be prejudiced by those facilities. This was progressed as retaining existing rail heads, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities and making</p>
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>the area.</p> <p><i>b) No MCA around transhipment facilities</i></p> <p>The positive impacts of the above Option have been classed as uncertain without the MCA area. Although an MCA buffer area around the transhipment facilities would safeguard these areas, it is not certain that the lack of an MCA would lead to an increased reliance on road transportation.</p> <p>The negative impact under SEA criteria 11 (economic development) as seen above is negligible in this Option as there would not be any obstruction to development near the transhipment facilities.</p>	<p>to minimise nuisance or disruption to human health or local amenities. This statement, whilst sound in essence, cannot be applied uniformly as it may make strategic sense to locate transhipment sites within urban industrial estates. In such cases, sufficient mitigation measures will need to be employed which recognise that these sites are operating in publicly used areas.</p> <p>Safeguarded transhipment sites are likely to generate a number of additional vehicle movements and as such must be located in areas with good access and in close proximity to the main highway network.</p>		<p>provision for new facilities, where necessary, is considered vital to secure the long distance movement of minerals. Also, given the proximity of London, it is inevitable that aggregates produced in Essex will also serve this market and beyond. Indeed this aspect forms part of the future demand modelling that feeds into the apportionment.</p> <p>An alternative explored was the permanent safeguarding of existing rail heads and wharfage considered to be of strategic importance for the maintenance of existing mineral infrastructure for the supply of aggregates needed in Essex. Their safeguarding needs to be continued to prevent their conversion to other uses, in the possibility of such proposals for other development being made; however it is not considered a reasonable alternative to permanently safeguard existing mineral transhipment infrastructure as the consequences could be significant and irreversible.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>For the Pre-Submission Draft stage, the policy has evolved into safeguarding mineral transhipment sites for the life of</p>
--	--	---	--	--

				<p>the planning permission or where located in a mineral working, until the completion of the site, through a flexible non-restrictive approach of MCAs. The policy also includes the safeguarding of coated stone plants in the same way to reflect their strategic importance. In Essex a 'strategic' plant for coated stone is considered to be a facility essential to the delivery of a critically important service and/ or one which enables delivery of an essential infrastructure project over the longer term. This approach has been progressed to safeguard sites/uses of strategic importance to sustainable and economic development, in line with paragraph 143 in the NPPF.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted that the safeguarding of mineral transshipment facilities was not appraisable under the SEA criteria. In appraising the designation of Mineral Consultation Areas around mineral transshipment facilities highlighted positive impacts are associated with the safeguarding of transshipment facilities, thus reducing road related emissions, although a negative impact associated with economic</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>development due to the fact that the MCA may impede development in the area. An option of no MCA around transshipment facilities had uncertain impacts; although an MCA buffer area around the transshipment facilities would safeguard these areas, it is not certain that the lack of an MCA would lead to an increased reliance on road transportation. There would be no negative impact on economic development however as there would not be any obstruction to development near the transshipment facilities.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted that there would be no impact on the majority of sustainability objectives under the preferred approach, although the impacts that it does have are strongly positive where the protection of transshipment sites would allow for the continued transport of minerals by rail and sea. There would also be a positive economic effect to safeguarding transshipment sites as they are imperative for facilitating wider economic goals.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw the Plan's Objectives evolve to include coated stone plants as</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				strategically important under paragraph 143 of the NPPF. As such there will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria; the policy benefiting from a flexible approach in regards to individual sites under the MCA approach and not being overly dependant on policy conditions or restrictions. The policy works well alongside Policy S2 and the NPPF. This was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.
<b>POLICY S10</b> Protecting	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Issue 6</b>	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> PREVIOUSLY A DM POLICY	<b>Policy:</b> Applications for minerals	<b>Policy:</b> Applications for minerals

<p>and Enhancing the Environment and Local Amenity</p>	<p>How to protect the Essex environment and communities from the adverse impacts of minerals development, including minerals transportation.</p> <p>How to achieve environmental enhancements through minerals planning.</p> <p><b>Option 21 - The promotion of more sustainable transportation of mineral by road</b></p> <p>Other than described earlier to apply the existing route hierarchy and criteria, are there other means of improving the transportation of mineral by road that the MPA should consider? (Please provide details).</p> <p><b>Option 22 - The nature of mineral extraction proposals requiring Cumulative Impact Assessment</b></p> <p>1. Do you consider it appropriate to require Cumulative Impact Assessment:</p> <p>a) For all mineral extraction proposals;</p> <p>b) Only on mineral extraction proposals above a certain size;</p> <p>c) Only on mineral extraction proposals within certain</p>	<p><b>OPTION</b></p> <p><b>Preferred Approach –</b></p> <p>Set out those environmental and health criteria that should be assessed as part of any application without specifying any weighting between different aspects of the environment. As such, specific mention would be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effects of noise, lighting and emissions to air (eg - dust);</li> <li>- Landscape and countryside;</li> <li>- Highway Network (including PROWs);</li> <li>- Historic and archaeological resources;</li> <li>- Water environment including flooding;</li> <li>- Agricultural grades 1, 2 or 3a</li> <li>- Nature conservation particularly ecological or wildlife designations;</li> <li>- Safeguarding around airports and aerodromes;</li> <li>- Cumulative Impacts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Approach –</b></p> <p>PPS12 does not set out how development management matters are to be addressed while MPS2 addressed many of the issues discussed above.</p>	<p>development shall demonstrate that:</p> <p>a. Appropriate consideration has been given to public health and safety, amenity, quality of life of nearby communities, and the natural, built, and historic environment; and appropriate mitigation measures shall be included in the proposed scheme of development, and</p> <p>b. No unacceptable adverse impacts would arise and;</p> <p>c. Opportunities have been taken to improve/enhance the environment and amenity.</p>	<p>development shall demonstrate that:</p> <p>a) Appropriate consideration has been given to public health and safety, amenity, quality of life of nearby communities, and the natural, built, and historic environment,</p> <p>b) Appropriate mitigation measures shall be included in the proposed scheme of development, and</p> <p>c) No unacceptable adverse impacts would arise, and,</p> <p>d) Opportunities have been taken to improve/ enhance the environment and amenity.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>areas of the County.</p> <p>Please provide reasons for your answer, including any areas where c) might be applicable.</p> <p><b>Option 23 - Protection of Ground Water Resources</b></p> <p>1. Do you agree there should be a presumption against the location of mineral extraction, processing or recycling sites within Source Protection Zone 1, to afford protection to groundwater resources? (Please give reasons for your answer).</p> <p>a) Yes</p> <p>b) No</p>	<p>A reasonable alternative would be to not set out any relevant policy. Rather development management and the consideration of applications would be informed by relevant national policy and guidance.</p>		
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Options 21 and 22 have not been appraised under the SEA criteria.</p> <p>The Alternative for Option 23 which has a presumption against sites in SPZ 1 will have positive impacts across a range of SEA criteria. However, an uncertain impact was assessed for the SEA criteria 3 (flooding). The other Alternative, no presumption against sites in SPZ 1, will have negative impacts on a range of SEA</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The Preferred Approach will have strong positive effects on minimising greenhouse gas emissions and increasing adaptability to climate change. There will be positive impacts across much of the Sustainability Framework as it specifically details a number of environmental considerations expected at the application stage. However there are uncertainties over the need to ensure a sustainable use of minerals (SO12) and</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. A point of clarification was required as to the scope of the policy in regards to working and post-working after use and restoration proposals. The policy requires applications to demonstrate the information stated in the policy for both the working and post-working proposals of the site, in line with Policy S12 and the stated</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage, numerous issues were looked at regarding the protection of the Essex environment and communities from the adverse impacts of minerals development, including minerals transportation, and ways in which to achieve environmental enhancements through minerals planning. Option 22 looked at the nature of mineral extraction proposals requiring Cumulative</p>

	<p>criteria and the assessment under SEA criterion 3 (flooding) is again uncertain.</p>	<p>transportation (SO14). Applying the Sustainability Framework to both the preferred and alternative approaches produces an identical effect in pure sustainability terms. There would however be an important benefit to applying the Preferred Approach which would not be picked up by this Framework as it is not a direct issue of sustainability. A re-iteration of national policy would not only give clarity and consolidate all these issues into a single locally derived policy; it would also provide a more local context to the Minerals Development Document itself whilst ensuring that these aspects remain at the forefront of policy formation. Such a reiteration would also show that the Mineral Planning Authority recognises the importance of local concerns and will base decisions on local level measurements, strategies and documents pertaining to the highlighted criteria rather than relying on overarching national policy which would lack this localised spatial context. This will give greater certainty to local communities and as such</p>	<p>contributions to a 200ha minimum priority habitat creation to 2029 within that policy.</p>	<p>Impact Assessment, and options including whether they should be needed for all mineral extraction proposals, only on mineral extraction proposals above a certain size, or only on mineral extraction proposals within certain areas of the County. In addition to this, Option 23 looked at the protection of ground water resources and whether there should be a presumption against the location of mineral extraction, processing or recycling sites within Source Protection Zone 1, to afford protection to groundwater resources.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage the preferred approach was to set out those environmental and health criteria that should be assessed as part of any application without specifying any weighting between different aspects of the environment, including noise, lighting and emissions to air, landscape and countryside, the Highway Network (including PROWs), historic and archaeological resources, the water environment including flooding, agricultural land grades 1, 2 or 3a, nature conservation particularly ecological or wildlife designations, safeguarding around airports and aerodromes,</p>
--	---	--	---	---

		<p>it is recommended that this Preferred Approach is adopted.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that promoted mineral sites should be located away from designated natural and built amenity, public areas and publically used areas. In addition, it states that mineral development should be avoided in areas of high grade agricultural land whilst storing top-soil on site will also aid mitigation. Dust and further impacts on air quality can be reduced using suitable measures. This report also states that mineral extraction can be seen as having a long-term positive effect on the environment when suitable restoration schemes are implemented.</p>	<p>and the cumulative impacts of any of the above. This was progressed where the approach provided a basis for encouraging the best mineral schemes to developers and rejecting unacceptable planning applications; identifying the issues that are most likely to be of concern over and above any relevant national or regional policies and guidance.</p> <p>An alternative approach was to not set out any relevant policy; where development management and the consideration of applications would be informed by relevant national policy and guidance. This was rejected as it would not give decision makers any guidance on issues of general relevance to Essex, may weaken the ability of Officers to undertake successful negotiations and decision makers to ensure appropriate levels of on-site mitigation, and it provides little reassurance to a potentially affected community that their concerns would be addressed.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>At the Pre-Submission Draft stage the policy progressed to specifically set out the criteria to which applications for minerals development should abide,</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>involving health and safety, amenity, quality of life of nearby communities and the natural built and historic environment. The policy is also implicit that applications demonstrate protection, mitigation and enhancement.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD did not appraise Options 21 and 22 under the SEA criteria. The alternative for Option 23 was stated as having positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria; however an uncertain impact was assessed for flooding. The alternative to have no presumption against sites in SPZ 1, was highlighted as having a negative impact on a range of SEA criteria and uncertain impacts surrounding flooding.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted strong positive effects on minimising greenhouse gas emissions and increasing adaptability to climate change through the preferred approach, along with numerous other environmental impacts where a number of environmental considerations will be expected at the application stage. However there are uncertainties over the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>need to ensure a sustainable use of minerals and transportation. The preferred approach was recommended where it gave clarity and provided a local context.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the policy progressed to a Pre-Submission working draft stage which was assessed as having positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. The policy requires applications to demonstrate the information stated in the policy for both the working and post-working proposals of the site, in line with Policy S12 and the stated contributions to a 200ha minimum priority habitat creation to 2029 within that policy. This was progressed for the Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>POLICY S11</b> Access and Transport</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Core Objectives</b></p> <p><i>6) Sustainable Short Haul Transportation</i></p> <p>To achieve the most sustainable transportation of minerals by road over short distances.</p> <p><i>7) Sustainable Long Haul Transportation</i></p> <p>To identify and safeguard rail head and wharf facilities which enable the long haul movement of minerals by rail and water, in the public interest.</p> <p><b>Issue 6</b></p> <p>How to protect the Essex environment and communities from the adverse impacts of minerals development, including minerals transportation.</p> <p>How to achieve environmental enhancements through minerals planning.</p> <p><i>Option 21 - The promotion of more sustainable transportation of mineral by road</i></p> <p>Other than described earlier to apply the existing route hierarchy and criteria, are there other means of</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> PREVIOUSLY A DM POLICY OPTION</p> <p><b>Preferred Approach –</b></p> <p>The order of preference for aggregate transportation from a mineral site would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transport, where in the public interest, via rail or boat.</li> <li>- Road access via a short length of existing road to the main highway network.</li> <li>- Road access direct to the main highway network.</li> <li>- Road access onto a secondary road before gaining access to the main highway network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives Considered –</b></p> <p>No alternatives considered.</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Proposals for minerals development shall be permitted where it is demonstrated that the development would not have unacceptable impacts on the efficiency and effective operation of the highway network, including safety and capacity; local amenity or the environment.</p> <p>Proposals for the transportation of minerals by rail and/or water will be encouraged subject to other policies of this Plan.</p> <p>Where transportation by road is proposed this will be permitted where the highway network is suitable for use by Heavy Goods Vehicles, or can be improved to accommodate such vehicles for transportation by road and the following hierarchy of preference for transportation by road shall be applied:</p> <p>(i) Access to a suitable existing junction with the Main Road Network (motorway, trunk road, strategic route or main distributor) as defined in the</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Proposals for minerals development shall be permitted where it is demonstrated that the development would not have unacceptable impacts on the efficiency and effective operation of the highway network, including safety and capacity, local amenity and the environment.</p> <p>Proposals for the transportation of minerals by rail and/ or water will be encouraged subject to other policies in this Plan.</p> <p>Where transportation by road is proposed, this will be permitted where the highway network is suitable for use by Heavy Goods Vehicles or can be improved to accommodate such vehicles. The following hierarchy of preference for transportation by road shall be applied:</p> <p>(i) Access to a suitable existing junction with the main road network, as defined in Section 7, via a suitable section of an existing road, as short as possible, without causing a detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the network.</p> <p>(ii) Where (i) above is not feasible, direct access to the main road network involving the</p>
---	---	--	--	--

	<p>improving the transportation of mineral by road that the MPA should consider? (Please provide details).</p>		<p>Essex County Council Development Management Policies via a suitable section of an existing road, as short as possible, without causing a detrimental impact upon the safety and efficiency of the network .</p> <p>(ii) Where (i) above is not feasible, direct access to the Main Road Network involving the construction of a new access/junction where there is no suitable existing access point or junction,</p> <p>(iii). Where access to the Main Road Network in accordance with (i) and (ii) above is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing road before gaining access onto the Main Road Network will exceptionally be permitted having regard to the scale of development, the capacity of the road and that there would be no undue impact on road safety’.</p>	<p>construction of a new access/ junction when there is no suitable existing access point or junction,</p> <p>(iii) Where access to the main road network in accordance with (i) and (ii) above is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing road prior to gaining access onto the main road network will exceptionally be permitted, having regard to the scale of the development, the capacity of the road and an assessment of the impact on road safety.</p>
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The policy relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation will promote positive effects on the SEA criteria 7 (climate change). The other policy linked to the</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. The promoted transport hierarchy and the preference for mineral sites to be located in areas close to the main</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts on transport and well-being related sustainability objectives. It was recommended that the potential post-working</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage issues surrounding the transportation of minerals were explored under the</p>

	<p>Vision, primary mineral provision, results in a large amount of uncertainty and may have a negative impact on air quality. Positive impacts are attributed to it's protection of the landscape and biodiversity.</p> <p>The policies relating to the Core Objectives will both have a positive impact on SEA criteria 14 (transport) and secondary positive effects relating to reduced transport related emissions.</p> <p>Option 21 could not be fully appraised due to the fact that it is an open question but is covered in the Core Objectives, Statement 6, in 4.2.2.</p>	<p>highway network results in this approach having a strong positive impact on the use of sustainable transport. It also positively accords with the notions of protecting air quality and mitigating against the potential effects of climate change. The policy is further strengthened by the recognition that access should not be directly on to the main highway network in order to improve through flows of traffic. It is the opinion of this assessment that this Preferred Approach would have no negative impact on the Sustainability Objectives that make up this Sustainability Framework.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that, with regard to air quality, a mitigatable measure would be to ensure that there are alternative routes available to transport minerals.</p>	<p>restoration details of sites, in line with the 200ha increase in habitat creation and any general restoration to amenity, be included within the policy. It is possible that the transport implications of post-restoration proposals may be more disruptive and have greater impacts on the efficiency and effective operation of the highway network than movements to and from the site whilst working, in relation to potential visitor numbers. It has been acknowledged however, that this issue may be more relevant to individual proposals rather than strategic policy, and as such is included within Policy DM1 point 8.</p>	<p>headings, Sustainable Short Haul Transportation (to achieve the most sustainable transportation of minerals by road over short distances) and Sustainable Long Haul Transportation (to identify and safeguard rail head and wharf facilities which enable the long haul movement of minerals by rail and water) within the plan's core objectives. In addition to this, an option was looked at regarding the promotion of more sustainable transportation of mineral by road (Option 21); specifically the existing route hierarchy and criteria. Elements of these issues were progressed to the preferred approach stage.</p> <p><b>Preferred Options Stage</b></p> <p>At the preferred approach stage, transport was deemed a development management issue, and a hierarchy of preference for aggregate transportation from a mineral site was listed as rail or boat in the foist instance, followed by road access via a short length of existing road to the main highway network, road access direct to the main highway network and finally road access onto a secondary road before gaining access to the main highway network. This was progressed as although the MPA would have liked to maximise the</p>
--	---	---	---	---

				<p>modal share for water borne and rail freight, realistically aggregates will continue to need to be carried by road to serve the County markets. Having a clear policy direction on how this will occur was seen as important to mitigate the adverse impacts by getting lorry traffic onto appropriate routes as quickly as possible. No alternatives were considered reasonable or deliverable by a MPA.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>The policy progressed to elaborate on what will be expected of successful applications, in light of a presumption in favour of sustainable development as specified in the NPPF. The policy also aids applicants by defining terminology in the hierarchy of transportation by road.</p> <p><b>Progress through the SA/SEA</b></p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted a positive impact on transport and secondary positive effects relating to reduced transport related emissions. It was stated that Option 21 in regards the promotion of more sustainable transportation of mineral by road to could not be fully appraised.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. The promoted transport hierarchy and the preference for mineral sites to be located in areas close to the main highway network had a strong positive impact on the use of sustainable transport, on air quality and also mitigating against the potential effects of climate change. The policy was further strengthened by the recognition that access should not be directly on to the main highway network in order to improve through flows of traffic.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw the issue of access and transport become a strategic policy, rather than a development management one. Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, it was assessed that there would be positive impacts on transport and well-being related sustainability objectives. It was recommended that the access implications of potential post-working restoration details of proposals be included within the policy; the transport implications of post-restoration proposals may be more disruptive and have greater impacts on the</p>
--	--	--	---

				highway network than movements to and from the site whilst working. It was acknowledged however, that this issue was more relevant to individual proposals rather than strategic policy, is included within Policy DM1 point 8, and as such this was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.
POLICY S12 Mineral Site Restoration and After Use	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Option 26 - Achieving wider sustainability objectives through site restoration and after-use</b></p> <p>1. Which of the following approaches should the MPA employ, through minerals policy and the consideration of planning applications, to bring improvements to local biodiversity, extend the green infrastructure and improve public access (Multiple choice):</p> <p>a) Apply the Living Landscape approach to identify opportunities, and use this as the basis from which to determine appropriate restoration and after-use proposals;</p> <p>b) Require clear evidence that restoration and after-use proposals have drawn from landscape and biodiversity</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Preferred Approach -</b></p> <p>To provide for multi-functionality in after-use schemes while achieving a minimum 200ha of BAP priority habitat creation comprising:</p> <p>New large, terrestrial habitats in Essex;</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement at a site specific level for other / smaller sites and/or</p> <p>Contributions to support the restoration / management of remote sites in proximity to a proposal e.g., LoWS etc.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach 1 -</b></p> <p>An alternative explored in the Further Issues and Options paper was implementing a Living Landscape approach. Living Landscapes is an initiative by the Wildlife Trusts. In Essex it involves mapping</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Proposals for minerals extraction development will be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that the land is capable of being restored at the earliest opportunity to an acceptable environmental condition and beneficial after-use, with positive benefits to the environment, biodiversity and/or local communities.</p> <p>Minerals extraction development shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be restored using phased, progressive working and restoration techniques</li> <li>2. provide biodiversity gain following restoration;</li> <li>3. be restored in the following order of preference; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) at low level with no landfill (including restoration to</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>Proposals for minerals development will be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that the land is capable of being restored at the earliest opportunity to an acceptable environmental condition and beneficial after-uses, with positive benefits to the environment, biodiversity and/or local communities.</p> <p>Mineral extraction sites shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be restored using phased, progressive working and restoration techniques,</li> <li>2. Provide biodiversity gain following restoration, demonstrating their contribution to priority habitat creation and integration with local ecological networks,</li> <li>3. Be restored in the following order of preference,</li> </ol>

	<p>survey information, and incorporate positive measures to protect and enhance these areas;</p> <p>c) Require mineral extraction applications include a survey of PROW in the vicinity of the site, and on the basis of local consultation, demonstrate what improvements to this network might be achieved through site restoration and after-use, including the provision of permissive rights of way;</p> <p>d) Employ additional or other measures (Please provide details)</p>	<p>80 Living Landscape areas across Essex with the aim of bringing these fragmented landscapes back to life.</p> <p><b>Alternative Approach 2 -</b></p> <p>Generally prioritise habitat restoration and enhancement on a case by case basis. No specific target or direct link with other national or local initiatives is made.</p>	<p>water bodies) ,</p> <p>(ii) if (i) above is not feasible then at low level but with no more landfill than is essential and necessary, to achieve satisfactory restoration.</p> <p>(iii) if neither of these are feasible and the site is a preferred site as may be determined by the Waste Local Plan, then by means of landfill.</p> <p>4. provide a scheme of aftercare and maintenance of the restored land for a period of not less than 5 years to ensure the land is capable of sustaining an appropriate after.</p> <p>Where appropriate, proposals shall demonstrate the best available techniques to ensure that:</p> <p>1. Soils resources are retained, conserved and handled appropriately from site preparation, during operations and restoration;</p> <p>2. In the case of minerals development affecting the best and most versatile agricultural land, the land is capable of being restored at least to its former quality if proposed for an agricultural</p>	<p>(i) At low level with no landfill (including restoration to water bodies),</p> <p>(ii) If (i) above is not feasible then at low level but with no more landfill than is essential and necessary, to achieve satisfactory restoration,</p> <p>(iii) If neither of these are feasible and the site is a Preferred Site as may be determined by the Waste Local Plan, then by means of landfill.</p> <p>4. Provide a scheme of aftercare and maintenance of the restored land for a period of not less than five years to ensure the land is capable of sustaining an appropriate after-use,</p> <p>5. Where appropriate, proposals shall demonstrate the best available techniques to ensure that:</p> <p>a) Soil resources are retained, conserved and handled appropriately during operations and restoration,</p> <p>b) In the case of minerals development affecting the best and most versatile agricultural land, the land is capable of being restored back to best and most versatile land,</p> <p>c) Hydrological and hydro-</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>afteruse;</p> <p>3. Hydrological and hydro-geological conditions are preserved and maintained and where appropriate managed to prevent adverse impacts on the adjacent land's groundwater conditions and elsewhere, and;</p> <p>4. Flood risk is not increased;</p> <p>5. Important geological features are maintained and preserved.</p> <p>Proposals shall demonstrate that there will not be an unacceptable adverse impact on groundwater conditions, surface water drainage and the capacity of soils for future use and will have regard to any relevant Surface Water or Shoreline Management Plans. Proposals shall also demonstrate that the working and restoration scheme is appropriate and the implementation and completion of restoration is feasible.</p> <p>Proposals shall demonstrate positive benefits to the environment and to local</p>	<p>geological conditions are preserved, maintained, and where appropriate, managed to prevent adverse impacts on the adjacent land's groundwater conditions and elsewhere,</p> <p>d) Flood risk is not increased,</p> <p>e) Important geological features are maintained and preserved,</p> <p>f) Adverse effects on the integrity of internationally or nationally important wildlife sites are avoided.</p> <p>Proposals shall demonstrate that there will not be an unacceptable adverse impact on groundwater conditions, surface water drainage and the capacity of soils for future use. Proposals shall also have regard to any relevant Surface Water or Shoreline Management Plans. Proposals will also demonstrate that the working and restoration scheme is appropriate and the implementation and completion of restoration is feasible.</p>
--	--	---	---

			communities, having regard to biodiversity enhancement and habitat creation. This will include contributions towards the target to create a minimum of 200 hectares priority habitat creation in Essex by 2029	
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The Living Landscapes approach for Option 26 scores well under the majority of the SEA criteria. Only the impacts on criteria 3 (flooding) and 4 (land and soil) are uncertain. The landscape and biodiversity survey information approach has the same focus on wildlife as the first approach, therefore scoring well under many of the same criteria. However, with less focus on climate change it has an uncertain impact on the respective SEA criteria and only marginal positive impacts on SEA criteria 10 (public engagement) and 11 (economic development). The final approach for Option 26, PROW survey and local consultation approach, has uncertainties associated with SEA criteria 1 (bio/geodiversity), 6 (air quality), 7</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. This approach would have positive benefits in the medium and long term when restoration schemes are implemented. The Preferred Approach states that site after-use will display multi-functionality albeit with the onus on biodiversity and a habitat creation target imposed. This will positively impact on a number of Sustainability Objectives and have strong positive impacts on biodiversity (SO1), restoration and aftercare (SO13) and nuisance and amenity (SO16).</p> <p>The Preferred Approach is assessed as being more positive than Alternative Approach 1 as this Alternative Approach is less strongly aligned to established national practice and, in addition, not all sites will be suited to forming</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria, where the policy seeks to improve conditions pre-working through restoration, particularly regarding biodiversity and habitat creation. There are also a number of indirect positive impacts associated with this approach.</p> <p>It is recommended that point 3.(iii) is reworded as presumably the conditions of this are not viable in a hierarchy below 3.(ii).</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage restoration and after-care/use was explored under Option 26 - Achieving wider sustainability objectives through site restoration and after-use, through minerals policy and the consideration of planning applications and to bring improvements to local biodiversity, extend the green infrastructure and improve public access. Alternative approaches were listed as applying the Living Landscape approach to identify opportunities, and use this as the basis from which to determine appropriate restoration and after-use proposals; require clear evidence that restoration and after-use proposals have drawn from landscape and biodiversity survey information, and incorporate positive measures to protect and enhance these areas;</p>

	<p>(climate change) and 9 (landscape and greenbelt). However, it scores positively on the same number of SEA criteria</p>	<p>Living Landscapes. This final point is considered Such an emphasis on biodiversity would also produce less of a holistic sense of sustainability. An emphasis on a purely biodiversity focussed restoration would reduce, if not eliminate entirely, any positive economic or local amenity benefit, and as such the positive effect on SO13 would also be reduced.</p> <p>With respect to Alternative Approach 2, it is assessed that by not stipulating a target, progress towards a desirable end goal would be either more problematic or unachieved despite the flexibility inherent in this option. In addition, a lack of strategic planning could lead to an imbalance in the type of after-use created, with cumulative effects far more problematic to assess without a clear strategic vision.</p> <p>Regarding, the level of public engagement, SO10, it is assessed as being uncertain as it is not known what level of public engagement, if any, would be sought when devising potential restoration schemes.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals</p>		<p>require mineral extraction applications include a survey of PROW in the vicinity of the site, and on the basis of local consultation, demonstrate what improvements to this network might be achieved through site restoration and after-use, including the provision of permissive rights of way; and finally, employ additional or other measures.</p> <p><b>Preferred Options Stage</b></p> <p>At this stage the preferred approach was to provide for multi-functionality in after-use schemes while achieving a minimum 200ha of BAP priority habitat creation comprising new large, terrestrial habitats in Essex, biodiversity enhancement at a site specific level for other / smaller sites, and/or contributions to support the restoration / management of remote sites in proximity to a proposal e.g., LoWS etc. This approach was progressed due to many preferred sites being located on versatile soils and this has to be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations. However, the after-care arrangements for all new sites provide some opportunities for habitat creation and some sites could provide larger inland areas of priority</p>
--	---	--	--	---

		<p>Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that impacts on the environment could be mitigated against in the first instance by locating mineral sites away from wildlife sites, and by prohibiting mineral site encroachment onto these areas.</p> <p>Progressive restoration schemes, where possible, will allow for a more rapid realisation of those benefits accrued through restoration. Linking restoration schemes to the wider environment will act to broaden the spatial extent of these new habitats, with larger sites shown to have a greater capacity to sustain biodiversity as well as being less susceptible to damage from external influences.</p>		<p>habitats.</p> <p>Two alternatives were explored. Alternative Approach 1 looked further at a Living Landscape approach with the aim of bringing fragmented landscapes back to life. This approach was rejected where it was not specifically supported by national planning policy; links between Living Landscape and the LAA process are likely to change during the course of the MDD, and the correlation between suggested mineral sites and Living Landscape areas being mixed.</p> <p>Alternative Approach 2 looked at prioritising habitat restoration and enhancement on a case by case basis, with no specific target or direct link with other national or local initiatives. This was rejected where it was deemed as missing an opportunity for more strategic 'spatial planning' and integration with biodiversity targets, it does not prioritise or distinguish between different habitats and therefore underrepresented habitats may be ignored, and also it would be difficult to monitor the success of the approach and its wider contribution to goals for improving biodiversity.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage The Pre-Submission Draft policy</p>
--	--	---	--	--

				<p>on restoration and after-use progresses the preferred approach offers guidance to applicants in terms of the restoration of proposals for minerals extraction, offering a hierarchical approach to restoration in terms of the suitability of different levels of inert landfill. The policy is more descriptive in regards to environmental considerations, and flexible in after-use on a case by case basis, with a strategic aspiration for positive biodiversity and other environmental benefits, and with no specific biodiversity restoration targets that could be seen as restrictive to proposals coming forward and potentially contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted that the Living Landscapes approach for Option 26 would have predominantly positive impacts; however uncertainty surrounds those on flooding and soil. The landscape and biodiversity survey information approach would have similar impacts on wildlife; however, with less focus on climate change it has an uncertain impact. Marginal positive impacts would be realised in terms of public</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>engagement and economic development. The final approach for Option 26, PROW survey and local consultation approach would have uncertainties associated with biodiversity, air quality, climate change and landscapes.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended that the Preferred Approach be adopted through positive benefits on biodiversity, restoration and aftercare and minimising public nuisance and amenity.</p> <p>Alternative Approach 1 was assessed as less strongly aligned to established national practice and, in addition, not all sites will be suited to forming Living Landscapes and an emphasis on a purely biodiversity focussed restoration would reduce, if not eliminate entirely, any positive economic or local amenity benefit, and as such the positive effect on restoration would be reduced.</p> <p>Alternative Approach 2 assesses that by not stipulating a target, progress towards a desirable end goal would be either more problematic or unachieved despite the flexibility inherent in the option. In addition, a lack of strategic planning could lead to an imbalance in the type of after-</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>use created, with cumulative effects far more problematic to assess without a clear strategic vision.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the progression to a Pre-Submission working draft resulted in an assessment of positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria, where the policy seeks to improve conditions pre-working through restoration, particularly regarding biodiversity and habitat creation. There are also a number of indirect positive impacts associated with this approach. Despite this, it was recommended that point 3.(iii) is reworded as presumably the conditions of this are not viable in a hierarchy below 3.(ii) in terms of what is 'essential' and 'necessary'. It was acknowledged however that a hierarchy of restoration with inert landfill as the least desirable was important to specify in the policy, and the approach provided important links to the inert landfill element of the emerging Waste Local Plan. As such, this policy was progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
POLICY DM1	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b>	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b>	<b>Policy:</b>	<b>Policy:</b>

<p>Development Management Criteria</p>	<p><b>Issue 8</b>                  Effective methods to protect public health from mineral extraction and processing  <b>Option 27 - Requirement of an HIA</b>                  How and when should an HIA be requested by the MPA?                  1. Where mineral extraction or processing over a specific tonnage is proposed.                  If so, what tonnage would you suggest?                  1. Any proposal                  2. Any proposal over 5,000 tonnes per annum                  3. Any Proposal over 10,000 tonnes per annum                  4. Any Proposal over 15,000 tonnes per annum                  2. Where mineral extraction or processing over a specific area is proposed.                  If so, what area would you suggest?                  1. Any proposal                  2. Any proposal over 5ha                  3. Any proposal over 10ha                  4. Any proposal over 15ha</p>	<p><b>Preferred Approach –</b>                  Set out those environmental and health criteria that should be assessed as part of any application without specifying any weighting between different aspects of the environment. As such, specific mention would be given to:                  - Effects of noise, lighting and emissions to air (eg - dust);                  - Landscape and countryside;                  - Highway Network (including PROWs);                  - Historic and archaeological resources;                  - Water environment including flooding;                  - Agricultural grades 1, 2 or 3a                  - Nature conservation particularly ecological or wildlife designations;                  - Safeguarding around airports and aerodromes;                  - Cumulative Impacts.  <b>Alternative Approach –</b>                  PPS12 does not set out how development management matters are to be addressed while MPS2 addressed many of the issues discussed above. A reasonable alternative would</p>	<p>Proposals for minerals development will be permitted subject to it being demonstrated that the development would not have an unacceptable impact upon:                  1. Local amenity (including demonstrating that the impacts of noise levels, air quality and dust emissions, light pollution and vibration are acceptable);                  2. The health of local residents adjoining the site;                  3. The quality and quantity of water within water courses, groundwater and surface water;                  4. Drainage systems;                  5. The soil resource from the best and most versatile agricultural land;                  6. Farming, horticulture and forestry                  7. Aircraft safety due to risk of bird strike;                  8. The safety and capacity of the highway network;                  9. Public Open Space, the definitive public rights of way network and outdoor recreation facilities;</p>	<p>Proposals for minerals development will be permitted subject to it being demonstrated that the development would not have an unacceptable impact, including cumulative impact with other developments, upon:                  1. Local amenity (including demonstrating that the impacts of noise levels, air quality and dust emissions, light pollution and vibration are acceptable);                  2. The health of local residents adjoining the site;                  3. The quality and quantity of water within water courses, groundwater and surface water;                  4. Drainage systems;                  5. The soil resource from the best and most versatile agricultural land;                  6. Farming, horticulture and forestry                  7. Aircraft safety due to the risk of bird strike;                  8. The safety and capacity of the highway network;                  9. Public Open Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities;                  10. The appearance, quality and character of the landscape,</p>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>3. On a case by case basis, where there are possible significant effects?</p> <p>4. Other criteria (please specify)</p> <p><b>Issue 9</b></p> <p>Establishment of criteria to prevent and mitigate effects of noise from minerals developments, and which can be effectively monitored and enforced.</p> <p><b>Issue 10</b></p> <p>Protecting residential amenity and environment from dust impacts.</p> <p><b>Issue 11</b></p> <p>The protection of soils, especially those considered the ‘best and most versatile’, during minerals development.</p> <p><b>Issue 12</b></p> <p>Design requirements for Agricultural Reservoirs, to ensure effective water storage.</p>	<p>be to not set out any relevant policy. Rather development management and the consideration of applications would be informed by relevant national policy and guidance.</p>	<p>10. The appearance, quality and character of the landscape, countryside and visual environment and any local features that contribute to its local distinctiveness;</p> <p>11. Land stability;</p> <p>12. The natural and geological environment (including biodiversity and ecological conditions for habitats and species);</p> <p>13. The historic environment including heritage and archaeological assets; and</p> <p>14. The cumulative impacts of the proposed development, including the cumulative impact with other mineral and non-mineral development within the vicinity of the proposed development and over time.</p>	<p>countryside and visual environment and any local features that contribute to its local distinctiveness;</p> <p>11. Land stability;</p> <p>12. The natural and geological environment (including biodiversity and ecological conditions for habitats and species);</p> <p>13. The historic environment including heritage and archaeological assets.</p>
<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>Option 27 is not appraisable.</p> <p>There are no appraisable Options relating to noise under Issue 9.</p> <p>There are no appraisable</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>The Preferred Approach will have strong positive effects on minimising greenhouse gas emissions and increasing adaptability to climate change.</p> <p>There will be positive impacts</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria. These will also be strengthened with point 14. regarding</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At this stage the Further issues and Options MDD looked at</p>

	<p>Options relating to dust under Issue 10.</p> <p>There are no appraisable Options relating to soil under Issue 11.</p> <p>There are no appraisable Options relating to water storage under Issue 12.</p>	<p>across much of the Sustainability Framework as it specifically details a number of environmental considerations expected at the application stage. However there are uncertainties over the need to ensure a sustainable use of minerals (SO12) and transportation (SO14). These uncertainties are however outweighed by the larger positive impacts whilst uncertainty is further reduced by other policies in the MDD</p> <p>Applying the Sustainability Framework to both the preferred and alternative approaches produces an identical effect in pure sustainability terms. There would however be an important benefit to applying the Preferred Approach which would not be picked up by this Framework as it is not a direct issue of sustainability. A re-iteration of national policy would not only give clarity and consolidate all these issues into a single locally derived policy; it would also provide a more local context to the Minerals Development Document itself whilst ensuring that these aspects remain at the forefront of policy</p>	<p>cumulative impacts.</p>	<p>effective methods to protect public health from mineral extraction and processing. This was through Option 27 - Requirement of an HIA and whether this should be requested over specific tonnages of 5,000tpa, 10,000tpa, or 15,000tpa, over specific areas of any proposal, any proposal over 5ha, any proposal over 10ha, any proposal over 15ha, or on a case by case basis, where there are possible significant effects. Further 'Issues' looked at the establishment of criteria to prevent and mitigate effects of noise from minerals developments, and which can be effectively monitored and enforced, protecting residential amenity and environment from dust impacts, the protection of soils, especially those considered the 'best and most versatile', during minerals development, and design requirements for Agricultural Reservoirs, to ensure effective water storage.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>The preferred approach looked at setting out those environmental and health criteria that should be assessed as part of any application without specifying any weighting between different aspects of the environment. As</p>
--	--	---	----------------------------	--

		<p>formation. Such a reiteration would also show that the Mineral Planning Authority recognises the importance of local concerns and will base decisions on local level measurements, strategies and documents pertaining to the highlighted criteria rather than relying on overarching national policy which would lack this localised spatial context. This will give greater certainty to local communities and as such it is recommended that this Preferred Approach is adopted.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that promoted mineral sites should be located away from designated natural and built amenity, public areas and publically used areas. In addition, it states that mineral development should be avoided in areas of high grade agricultural land whilst storing top-soil on site will also aid mitigation. Dust and further impacts on air quality can be reduced using suitable measures. This report also states that mineral extraction can be seen as having a long-</p>		<p>such, specific mention would be given to the effects of noise, lighting and emissions to air (eg - dust), landscape and countryside, the highway Network (including PROWs), historic and archaeological resources, the water environment including flooding, agricultural grades 1, 2 or 3a, nature conservation particularly ecological or wildlife designations, safeguarding around airports and aerodromes, and the cumulative impacts of the above.</p> <p>An additional preferred development management criterion looked at non-preferred sites / windfalls and a general presumption against non-preferred sites unless there are either insufficient reserves in the land-bank or some other overriding justification (although this is not intended to apply to windfalls associated with prior extraction of non-mineral development). This was selected due to a need to maintain a plan-led approach and provide certainty for local communities in respect of mineral development remains paramount, and windfalls for prior extraction associated with alternative development will be assessed on their merits as its the intent of the preferred approach to</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>term positive effect on the environment when suitable restoration schemes are implemented.</p>	<p>safeguarding to avoid mineral sterilisation.</p> <p>An alternative approach to this was to adopt appropriate criteria for borrow pits, agricultural reservoirs and prior extraction to allow assessment of future sites for minerals extraction and processing etc. This approach was rejected due to the criteria based approach weakening the general presumption against non-preferred sites and certainty for plan users, and a difficulty to plan for and rely upon (in terms of contributions to) the apportionment of sand and gravel.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>The development management policy for the submission stage looked at grouping numerous preferred approaches to cover a range environmental and social criterion in a non-restrictive manner. Other development management issues were separated for clarity.</p> <p><b>Progress through the SA/SEA</b></p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted that there were no appraisable options at that stage, as issues were addressed as questions to be answered through the</p>
--	--	---	--

				<p>consultation process.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD highlighted strong positive effects on minimising greenhouse gas emissions and increasing adaptability to climate change through the preferred approach, along with numerous other environmental impacts where a number of environmental considerations will be expected at the application stage. However there are uncertainties over the need to ensure a sustainable use of minerals and transportation.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the policy's progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria; strengthened with an important recognition of cumulative impacts. This was then progressed for the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.</p>
<p>POLICY DM2 Planning Conditions and Legal Agreements</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> When granting planning permission for minerals developments the Minerals Planning Authority will impose conditions and or require legal agreements to mitigate and control the</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> When granting planning permission for minerals developments the Minerals Planning Authority will impose conditions and/ or require legal agreements to mitigate and control the effects of the</p>

			effects of the development and to enhance the environment.	development and to enhance the environment.
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> There will be no direct positive impacts as a result of this policy however there will be numerous positive impacts cumulatively across all elements of the Minerals Local Plan.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage: A policy regarding planning conditions and legal conditions was not explored at this stage of the MDD.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage A policy regarding planning conditions and legal conditions was not explored at this stage of the MDD.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage The inclusion of a policy regarding planning conditions and legal conditions at Submission stage offers clarity on the mechanisms to deliver mitigation and environmental enhancement required by developers. The policy specifies these requirements at this stage in line with speeding up the application process in a non-restrictive manner.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA A policy regarding planning conditions and legal conditions was not explored at the Further</p>

				<p>Issues and Options stage of the MDD, or the Preferred Approach stage</p> <p>The inclusion of a Pre-Submission Draft policy was deemed to have a number of cumulative positive impacts with the delivery of more specific policies in the MLP; however there will be no direct impacts as a result of it.</p>
<p>POLICY DM3 Primary Processing Plant</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach -</b> To stipulate a presumption in the MDD at all mineral sites:  - for primary processing and against non-indigenous aggregate importation (except where it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or sustainability benefits) .  - Although the MPA would encourage any water efficiency measures at individual mineral sites it will not make specific provision for this issue.  <b>Alternative Approach –</b> Allowing for the importation of a small proportion of Non-Indigenous Materials is considered a reasonable alternative.</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> Proposals for minerals extraction will be permitted where the primary processing plant and equipment is located within the limits of the mineral site's boundary and the plant would not have any unacceptable impact on local amenity and/or the surrounding environment.  Proposals for extension sites shall be expected to include the location of the existing processing plant and access arrangements within the planning application.  Where it is demonstrated that the positioning of the primary processing plant within the boundary of the mineral site is not feasible, the exportation of mineral</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b> Proposals for minerals extraction will be permitted where the primary processing plant and equipment is located within the limits of the mineral site's boundary and the plant would not have any unacceptable impact on local amenity and/ or the surrounding environment.  Proposals for extension sites shall be expected to include the location of the existing processing plant and access arrangements within the planning application.  Where it is demonstrated that the positioning of the primary processing plant within the boundary of the mineral site is not feasible, the exportation of mineral from the site shall not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity and/ or the safety, efficiency and capacity of the</p>

			<p>from the site shall not have an unacceptable impact upon amenity and/or the safety, efficiency and capacity of the highway network.</p> <p>Minerals shall only be imported to a minerals site, from non-indigenous sources, when it is demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or overriding benefits from doing so.</p> <p>In all cases permission will only be granted for a temporary duration so as not to delay restoration of the site.</p>	<p>highway network.</p> <p>Minerals shall only be imported to a minerals site, from non-indigenous sources, when it is demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or overriding benefits from doing so.</p> <p>In all cases permission will only be granted for a temporary duration so as not to delay restoration of the site.</p>
<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. Although there are strong positive associations with the Alternative Approach, particularly relating to economic gains and the sustainable use of minerals, these are outweighed by the negative effects on transportation, landscape and societal issues. Allowing for the importation of non-indigenous material from sites which, for whatever given reason, are</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage: The issue of primary processing plants and the criteria required for applications was not looked at at this stage.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage At this stage the preferred approach was to stipulate a presumption in the MDD at all mineral sites for primary processing and against non-indigenous aggregate importation</p>	

	<p>unable to house a primary processing plant would ensure that all extracted material could be processed to the highest possible grade. Such processing increases the range of uses for which the mineral could be used for as well as increasing its value. However, the transportation of minerals is inherently unsustainable due to the volume and weight of material that would have to be transported. Importation would create a number of additional transport movements, creating potential congestion issues as well as increasing emissions. In addition, the importation of non-indigenous material will likely increase the lifetime of the plant. This could affect local amenity, restoration schemes and the ability to remediate any landscape impacts. There is also the risk that should a site accept non-indigenous material for a period of time, the site may become a de facto mineral processing site, thereby introducing an industrial land use into what would likely be primarily a rural locality.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>It is assessed that the inclusion of the statement 'except where</p>		<p>(except where it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or sustainability benefits), and that although the MPA would encourage any water efficiency measures at individual mineral sites it will not make specific provision for this issue. This approach was progressed as primary processing of aggregates allows use on higher value applications, technological improvements in recent years allow smaller and more mobile kit to be brought even onto relatively small mineral sites, and encouraging such on site processing reduces the number of lorry movements on the highway network.</p> <p>An alternative approach was looked at to allow for the importation of a small proportion of Non-Indigenous Materials. This was not progressed as despite there being certain circumstances where importation has been allowed, the general presumption should be against importation as restricting importation gives clarity to the working programme, life of quarry, and vehicle movements, it ensures that sites do not become de facto industrial operations which would have an incongruous impact upon the countryside, and</p>
--	---	--	--

		<p>it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or sustainability benefits' within the policy wording preclude the need for further mitigation measures.</p>	<p>while there may be sustainability benefits importation should never be allowed to increase vehicle movements beyond what is acceptable or extend the overall life of a quarry.</p> <p><b>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</b></p> <p>At the Pre-Submission Draft stage the development management policy regarding primary processing plants evolved into a non-restrictive policy to aid applicants, in regards to environmental considerations, extensions, positioning within site boundaries, the conditions regarding the importation of minerals from non-indigenous sources, and the duration of proposals.</p> <p><b>Progress through the SA/SEA</b></p> <p>The issue of primary processing plants was not looked at at the stage Further Issues and Options stage.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. Although there are strong positive associations with the Alternative Approach, particularly relating to economic gains and the sustainable use of minerals, these are outweighed by the negative effects on</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>transportation, landscape and societal issues. Allowing for the importation of non-indigenous material from sites which, for whatever given reason, are unable to house a primary processing plant would ensure that all extracted material could be processed to the highest possible grade. Such processing increases the range of uses for which the mineral could be used for as well as increasing its value. However, the transportation of minerals is inherently unsustainable due to the volume and weight of material that would have to be transported. Importation would create a number of additional transport movements, creating potential congestion issues as well as increasing emissions. In addition, the importation of non-indigenous material will likely increase the lifetime of the plant. This could affect local amenity, restoration schemes and the ability to remediate any landscape impacts. There is also the risk that should a site accept non-indigenous material for a period of time, the site may become a de facto mineral processing site, thereby introducing an industrial land use into what would likely be primarily a rural locality.</p>
--	--	--	---

				The policy's progression to the Pre-Submission Draft MLP was assessed as having positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.
POLICY DM4 Secondary Processing Plant	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> N/A	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> <b>Preferred Approach -</b> While the MPA supports an approach of safeguarding any future secondary processing facilities considered to be of strategic importance and not otherwise safeguarded at a mineral or transshipment site, it is considered that there are no additional sites which warrant site specific provision. Non-strategic sites would be addressed through criteria based policies and not specifically safeguarded. <b>Alternative Approach –</b> Rather than differentiating between what secondary processing facilities are strategic - safeguard all known secondary processing facilities on a site by site basis.	<b>Policy:</b> Proposals for the secondary processing and/or treatment of minerals will only be permitted at mineral sites where it can be demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable impact upon amenity and/or the local environment and/or the safety, efficiency and capacity of the highway network.  The minerals for secondary processing and/or treatment shall be sourced from within the boundary of the mineral working within which the plant is located unless it is demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or overriding benefits from sourcing materials from elsewhere to supplement indigenous supply, subject to no unacceptable adverse amenity and/or the local environment.  In all cases permission will only be granted for a	<b>Policy:</b> Proposals for the secondary processing and/ or treatment of minerals will only be permitted at mineral sites where it can be demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable impact upon amenity and/ or the local environment and/ or the safety, efficiency and capacity of the highway network.  The minerals for secondary processing and/or treatment shall be sourced from within the boundary of the mineral working within which the plant is located unless it is demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances or overriding benefits from sourcing materials from elsewhere to supplement indigenous supply, subject to no unacceptable adverse impacts.  In all cases permission will only be granted for a temporary duration so as not to delay restoration of the site.

			temporary duration so as not to delay restoration of the site.	
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> N/A</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted. It could however be strengthened with further insight into what would constitute a strategic site in order to provide a measure of clarity. The Preferred Approach gives preference to locating secondary processing facilities on-site but recognises the potential for a strategic site which is positive in terms of the wider notion of sustainability. As a result there will be positive impacts on many of the Sustainability Objectives.</p> <p>The Alternative Approach would have a broadly positive impact on making a sustainable use of land. Due to future development patterns it may occur that secondary processing plants could be sited in locations that remain strategic despite a cessation of mineral working. As such it would be prudent to safeguard processing plants in such locations. A retained secondary processing plant could however conflict with any</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>The issue of secondary processing plants and the criteria required for applications was not looked at at this stage.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>At this stage the preferred approach was to support an approach of safeguarding any future secondary processing facilities considered to be of strategic importance and not otherwise safeguarded at a mineral or transshipment site, but considered that there are no additional sites which warrant site specific provision. Non-strategic sites would be addressed through criteria based policies and not specifically safeguarded. This approach was progressed where there are at least six asphalt plants widely located in Essex, and only two are located outside existing mineral or transshipment sites and have permanent planning permission. Although undoubtedly important they are small scale 'collection based</p>

		<p>potential restoration scheme and facilitate a de facto industrial use in a primarily rural area. The Alternative Approach avoids determining what would constitute a strategic site, with a site-by-site approach being put forward instead. This leads to difficulties in quantifying cumulative effects and could also lead to a clustering of facilities. Such clustering in any one part of the County will increase transportation distances to other parts of the County, and negatively impact on a number of the Sustainability Objectives.</p> <p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>The Eunomia report 'Minerals Development Document: Issues and Options. First Stage Environmental Report Jan 2009' states that safeguarded facilities should be located in areas sufficiently distant from public or publically used areas to minimise nuisance or disruption to human health or local amenities. The same is stated with regard to natural and built environment concerns although not attributed to safeguarding policies.</p> <p>Whilst not strictly a mitigation</p>		<p>systems' which are unlikely to serve or meet the long term strategic needs of critical service delivery or infrastructural projects. In addition, the identification of non strategic sites are to be left to the market. In regards to concrete batching or mortar plants, many are located beyond mineral sites and most have permanent planning permission and are physically re-locatable.</p> <p>An alternative approach explored was that rather than differentiating between what secondary processing facilities are strategic - safeguard all known secondary processing facilities on a site by site basis. This approach was rejected where sites at quarries exist by virtue of the temporary mineral permission utilising the mineral at the site. For facilities associated with secondary processing to extend after the expiry of the time mineral planning permission would effectively retain incongruous industrial developments in the countryside, and extend the length of impacts on local communities and potentially conflict with a site's restoration scheme.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage At the Pre-Submission Draft</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>measure, it is recommended that further insight into what would constitute a strategic site is provided in order to provide a measure of clarity.</p>	<p>stage the development management policy regarding secondary processing plants evolved into a non-restrictive policy to aid applicants, in regards to environmental and traffic considerations, positioning within site boundaries, the conditions regarding the importation of minerals and the duration of proposals.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The issue of secondary processing plants was not looked at at the stage Further Issues and Options stage.</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Preferred Approach MDD recommended that the Preferred Approach is adopted, giving preference to locating secondary processing facilities on-site but recognising the potential for a strategic site. It could however be strengthened with further insight into what would constitute a strategic site in order to provide a measure of clarity.</p> <p>The Alternative Approach would have broadly positive impacts; however it may occur that secondary processing plants could be sited in locations that remain strategic post mineral working; a retained secondary processing plant could conflict</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>with any potential restoration scheme and facilitate an industrial use in a rural area. It also avoids determining strategic sites, with a site-by-site approach being put forward instead. This leads to difficulties in determining cumulative effects and could also lead to a clustering of facilities.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission Draft policy will see positive impacts across a range of sustainability criteria.</p>
POLICY DM Information in Support of Planning Applications	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> N/A	<b>Policy/Alternatives:</b> N/A	<b>Policy:</b> Proposals for minerals development will only be permitted provided the planning application is supported by sufficient information, including relevant supporting drawings, plans and information as may be required by the Council's National and Local Validation list.	<b>Policy:</b> N/A
	<b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> N/A	<b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> N/A	<b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b> There will be no direct positive impacts resulting from this policy, however the policy supports other policies cumulatively; particularly Policy S2, and can be seen to support the speed in	<b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b> Further Issues and Options Stage: Information in support of planning applications as a separate policy in the MDD was not looked at at this stage.

			<p>which planning applications are processed.</p>	<p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>Information in support of planning applications as a separate policy in the MDD was not looked at at this stage.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>Information in support of planning applications as a separate policy in the MLP was incorporated into Policy DM1 at this stage.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>Information in support of planning applications as a separate policy in the MDD was not looked at at the Further Issues and Options stage.</p> <p>Information in support of planning applications as a separate policy in the MDD was not looked at the Preferred Approach stage.</p> <p>Through iterative working between the ECC Minerals and Waste Planning Team and the SA/SEA Team, the progression to a Pre-Submission working draft saw a separate policy on information in support of planning applications, which was assessed as having no direct positive impact; however would support other policies cumulatively; particularly Policy S2, and can be seen to support the speed in which planning applications are</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				processed. This policy was integrated into Policy DM1 in the final Pre-Submission Draft MLP.
POLICY IMR1 Monitoring and Review	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p><b>Issue 13</b></p> <p>Efficient policy monitoring and review of the development document is crucial to a successful core strategy document, as stated by PPS 1 and PPS 12.</p>	<p><b>Policy/Alternatives:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The Plan will be monitored and reviewed to ensure that the County's sand and gravel landbank is maintained to at least 7 years during the plan period to 2029 in accordance with national policy. This will be undertaken either by a plan review within five years of adoption as part of a "plan, monitor, and manage" approach to forward planning, or should the landbank fall below this minimum requirement, whichever comes sooner.</p>	<p><b>Policy:</b></p> <p>The Plan will be monitored and reviewed within five years of adoption as part of a "plan, monitor, and manage" approach to forward planning, or should the landbank fall below the minimum requirement, whichever comes sooner.</p>
	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>This issue is crucial to a successful core strategy document, as stated by PPS 1 and PPS 12.</p> <p>There are no appraisable Options relating to policy monitoring and review.</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>	<p><b>SA/SEA Appraisal:</b></p> <p>There will be uncertain impacts on sustainability criteria as future conditions are unknown. However there will be secondary positive impacts related to other wider objectives through a flexible approach and continual monitoring regarding landbanks.</p>	<p><b>Summary of the reasons, and their validity, for rejecting the alternatives:</b></p> <p>Further Issues and Options Stage:</p> <p>At the Further Issues and Options stage of the MDD, this policy was explored with the view that efficient policy monitoring and review of the development document would be crucial to a successful core strategy document, as stated by PPS 1 and PPS 12. This was progressed in the lack of any</p>

			<p>reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Preferred Options Stage</p> <p>There was no specific policy regarding monitoring at this stage of the MDD, however it is acknowledged that there will be a need to monitor data and to respond in the most appropriate way, through an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to review the progress of Local Development Documents against the milestones set out in the Local Development Scheme and assess the extent to which the policies in the documents are being achieved. This was to be achieved through a comprehensive suite of performance indicators and targets. Similarly, the AMRs of the district councils will be examined each year to assess whether the supply of aggregates might be restricting housing and/or commercial developments; if it is, the MPA's own AMR will consider how the problem could be rectified. This approach and text was progressed.</p> <p>Pre-Submission Draft Stage</p> <p>At the Pre-Submission Draft stage, the monitoring approach of the preferred approach was reiterated. In addition to this, it was felt necessary that the</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>alternative of identifying a specific policy was required to address the issue of the sand and gravel landbank; separating this element from the previously identified 'Landbank' policy in the Preferred Approach stage MDD (Preferred Approach 8). The landbank element of this preferred approach has been incorporated into Policy S8 in the Submission MLP, and the monitoring / review element given its own policy under Policy IMR1.</p> <p>Progress through the SA/SEA</p> <p>The SA/SEA of the Further Issues and Options MDD highlighted the issue was crucial to a successful core strategy document, as stated by PPS 1 and PPS 12, and that there are no appraisable Options relating to policy monitoring and review.</p> <p>There was no specific policy regarding monitoring at the Preferred Approach MDD and us such no appraisal was undertaken of the text.</p> <p>The progression to a Pre-Submission Draft MLP policy saw monitoring information divided between general monitoring of the plan in text, and the specific monitoring of landbanks in policy. Although all impacts from this policy will be uncertain at this</p>
--	--	--	--

				stage there will be secondary positive impacts related to other wider objectives through a flexible approach and continual monitoring regarding landbanks.
--	--	--	--	--



The logo for 'place services' is located in the top left corner. It consists of a dark blue square with the words 'place' and 'services' stacked vertically in a white, lowercase, sans-serif font.

This information is issued by  
**Place Services Team at Essex County Council**  
You can contact us in the following ways:

Visit our website:  
**[essex.gov.uk](http://essex.gov.uk)**

By telephone:  
**08456 430 430**

By post:  
**Place Services, Essex County Council**  
**PO Box 11, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH**

Read our online magazine at **[essex.gov.uk/ew](http://essex.gov.uk/ew)**

Follow us on  **Essex\_CC**

Find us on  **[facebook.com/essexcountycouncil](https://facebook.com/essexcountycouncil)**

The information in this document can be translated, and/  
or made available in alternative formats, on request.

Published November 2012