



**Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004  
Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012**

**Draft Cumbria Minerals and Waste Local Plan  
2014 to 2029**

**TABLE OF MODIFICATIONS  
SITE ALLOCATIONS POLICIES**

**REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION**

**FEBRUARY 2015**

## Site Allocations Policy evolution

<b>MWLP 2013</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>MWLP 2015</b>	<b>Title</b>
SAP1	Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)	SAP1	Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)
SAP2	Waste treatment facilities, including Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants, Materials Recovery Facilities and transfer and bulking stations	SAP2	Waste treatment and management facilities
SAP3	Energy from Waste plants		
SAP4	Non-inert landfill capacity	-	DELETED
SAP5	Low Level radioactive Wastes	SAP3	Low Level radioactive Wastes (LLW) treatment, management, storage and disposal
SAP6	Preferred Areas, Areas of Search and sites for secondary or recycled aggregates facilities	SAP4	Areas for minerals
SAP7	Mineral Safeguarding Areas	SAP5	Mineral Safeguarding Areas
SAP8	Safeguarding of potential railheads	SAP6	Safeguarding of existing and potential railheads and wharves

## Cumbria Minerals & Waste Local Plan – Site Allocations Policies

### Regulation 19 Consultation Responses – policy/section/paragraph order

MWLP Feb 2013	MWLP Feb 2015	Comments – changes made to SA Policies between versions	MWLP representations	Recommended changes
SAP1	SAP1	Number of sites reduced to only those needed to replace existing HWRCs.	Rep. 27: site SL1 facilities are to be located in existing quarries; it is important to establish the relationship between the site and the water table, particularly where the level of the water table has been modified by the mineral working.	That part of the site on the existing quarry floor is no longer allocated as a site. With respect to SL1B, it is noted but it is considered that these detailed matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, and they would not affect the principle of development on the site for the purposes of the proposed allocation
			Rep. 28: site SL1 Kendal Fell Quarry is stated not to be within this Local Plan area, but is in the Lake District National Park; there is concern as to why this has been included – it is considered that any development here would be inappropriate.	That part of the site on the existing quarry floor, and within the LDNP is no longer allocated as a site. This allocation was made in co-operation with LDNPA and SLDC. The latter state in their Land Allocations document, that there is considerable scope to accommodate additional employment development in this area, which benefits from a private access onto the A591 Kendal Bypass. It is not considered that development here would be inappropriate, as this is an employment area that comprises the closed quarry, landfill

				gas management, a small business park and a waste transfer facility.
			Rep. 37: the inclusion of land adjacent to Kendal Fell Quarry, to replace the HWRC at Canal Head is supported.	Noted – no changes required.
			Rep. 38: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL37, support for this allocation in the preceding rounds of consultation was expressed and sustains no objection now.</li> </ul>	Noted – no changes required.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL35, sustains no objections, on the basis that if this allocation were to be developed in the future, the existing facility at Glasson is closed.</li> </ul>	Noted. This allocation has been removed, as the site was taken by other development
			Rep. 39: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for clarification purposes, it is suggested that the text reads: “<i>SL1A Kendal Fell Quarry, the quarry floor outside the Lake District National Park</i>”</li> </ul>	Allocation SL1A has been removed from the MWLP.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>map SL1 should be amended to reflect the area of land KF01W in the LDNPA submitted Allocations of Land (Local Plan Part Two) document and annotate accordingly.</li> </ul>	Allocation SL1A has been removed from the MWLP.
			Rep. 48: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL35 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area to support this development and there are existing sewerage flooding issues within the local drainage catchment, CCC to ensure the development does exasperate the issues and/or transfer the problem to another location.</li> </ul>	Noted – this allocation has been removed, as the site was taken by other development.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL37 – no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> </ul>	Noted – these detailed matters can be dealt with at the planning application stage

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site SL01B – low water supply pressure issues in the area.</li> </ul>	Noted - these matters can be dealt with at the planning application stage
			Rep. 102: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL37 - this site forms part of a current planning application; the Highways Authority has no negative comments to make, but seeks to impose some conditions, should the application be approved.</li> </ul>	Noted – no changes required.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL35 - this site is close to the strategic road network and occupies a site served by an existing industrial estate; there may be a requirement for highway improvements to the A596 depending on proposed traffic levels.</li> </ul>	Noted – this allocation has been removed, as the site was taken by other development.
SAP2	SAP2	Number of sites reduced, as some are no longer available.  Policies SAP2 and SAP3 have been combined in the Feb 2015 consultation draft	Rep. 27: site SL1 facilities are to be located in existing quarries; it is important to establish the relationship between the site and the water table, particularly where the level of the water table has been modified by the mineral working.	Noted – it is considered that these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, and they would not affect the principle of development on the site for the purposes of the proposed allocation This point will be added to the text in the Site Assessments document, in the Evidence Base
			Rep. 28: site SL1 Kendal Fell Quarry is stated not to be within this Local Plan area, but is in the Lake District National Park; there is concern as to why this has been included – it is considered that any development here would be inappropriate.	That part of the site on the existing quarry floor, and within the LDNP is no longer allocated as a site. This allocation was made in co-operation with LDNPA and SLDC. The latter state in their Land Allocations document, that there is considerable scope to accommodate additional employment development in this area, which benefits from a

				<p>private access onto the A591 Kendal Bypass.</p> <p>It is not considered that development here would be inappropriate, as this is an employment area that comprises the closed quarry, landfill gas management, a small business park and a waste transfer facility.</p>
			Rep. 37: the inclusion of Kendal Fell Quarry floor, for waste treatment facilities, is supported.	Noted. This allocation has been removed from the MWLP.
			<p>Rep. 38:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL18, this is a logical location for such a facility, which is accessible by sea, road and rail and there is no objection to this proposed allocation; however, the representor would not wish the allocation of this site for Waste Treatment Facility purposes to constrain it for alternative uses.</li> </ul>	Noted. This allocation is not intended to constrain any other development proposals for the site and clarification text will be added to the Site Assessments document.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL8, no objection to this proposed allocation for Waste Treatment Facilities – this area of Lillyhall already has a specialism in waste treatment and so this allocation is considered reasonable.</li> </ul>	Noted – no changes required.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL8, no objection to this proposed allocation for Energy from Waste Plant – this kind of facility would be assimilated more easily into the Lillyhall context than many other areas and any blighting effects will be significantly less.</li> </ul>	Noted – no changes required.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL3, no objection to this proposed allocation – this site is considered to be accessible and appropriate for such a use.</li> <li></li> </ul>	Noted – no changes required.

			Rep. 39: for clarification purposes, it is suggested that the text reads: “ <i>SL1A Kendal Fell Quarry, the quarry floor outside the Lake District National Park</i> ”.	Allocation SL1A has been removed from the MWLP.
			Rep. 48: ○ site SL01A – low water supply pressure issues in the area	Noted - these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.
			○ site CO11 – existing sewerage/flooding issues in the area, CCC to ensure the development does not exacerbate the issues and/or transfer the problem to another location.	Noted - these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage. These points will be added to the text in the Site Assessments document.
			○ site CA11 – this develop is adjacent to Carlisle WwTW and could impair the future expansion of the assets in supporting the development aspirations of Carlisle City Council.	This site has an existing waste transfer and recycling facility, as well as a partly completed inert waste landfill. Modernisation of this site may free up land/capacity. It is considered that there is sufficient space within the respective sites, and is not likely to constrain the WwTW, but this would be considered in more detail at planning application stage.
			○ site ED31a – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available; there are existing sewerage flooding issues within the local drainage catchment, CCC to ensure the development does exacerbate the issues and/or transferred the problem to another location.	Site ED31 is an existing complex comprising a quarry, landfill, leachate lagoons, landfill gas powered
			○ site ED31b – limited wastewater infrastructure	

			<p>in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available; there are existing sewerage flooding issues within the local drainage catchment, CCC to ensure the development does exacerbate the issues and/or transferred the problem to another location.</p>	<p>electricity generator and a modern HWRC. Reorganisation and modernisation of this site may free up land/capacity. The points raised here by UU would be considered in more detail at planning application stage. These points will be added to the text in the Site Assessments document, in the Evidence Base.</p>
			<p>○ site ED31c – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available; there are existing sewerage flooding issues within the local drainage catchment, CCC to ensure the development does exacerbate the issues and/or transferred the problem to another location.</p>	
			<p>○ site AL3 - no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</p>	
			<p>○ site AL8 - no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</p>	
			<p>○ site AL18 - no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</p>	<p>Noted - these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage. These points will be added to the text in the Site Assessments document, in the Evidence Base.</p>
			<p>Rep. 55:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site CA30, Kingmoor Road Recycling Centre – was included in the Site Allocations Policies (adopted January 2011), as the existing site plus a proposed north western extension; the previous submissions sought the inclusion of land and buildings around the current operation</li> </ul>	<p>Cumbria Waste Management has confirmed that they wish the site to be included as an allocation. The Site Allocations document will refer to constraints identified by Carlisle City Council.</p>



			<p>to allow further development of the site to cater for the levels of use and to provide for an extension to allow for further increases in recycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL34, Alcan Complex, Lillyhall – the south-eastern part of this site was included within the January 2011 Site Allocations Policies; the current situation is that Cumbria Waste Management would like to include the whole of the Alcan site for a waste management facility. Whilst there have been questions relating to land ownership, it is considered important that this site is included as an allocated site.</li> </ul>	<p>Cumbria Waste Management has confirmed that they do not wish to the site to be included as an allocation.</p>
			<p>Rep. 102:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL3 - this site is considered to be one of the preferable sites. It is on a brownfield site, has a good link to the main road network on the A596 and is away from residential properties. It also has good sea and rail links. However, even though the road network has capacity for increases of heavy vehicles to this area, they will come from one of two directions which both have inappropriate junctions; one is the A596/A66 at Ramsay Brow, Workington and the other is the A596/A594 junction at Netherhall Corner, Maryport. Mitigation measures would be required at both of these points for safety reasons.</li> <li>site AL8 - this site is adjacent to the existing landfill site and has good connection to the main highway network. It could easily be accessed by rail and sea using existing infrastructure. If there is to be a large increase</li> </ul>	<p>Text to this effect is already in the Site Assessments document in the evidence base. No change required. The mitigation measures can be dealt with through the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>Text to this effect is already in the Site Assessments document in the evidence base. No change required. The mitigation measures can be dealt with through the detailed planning</p>

			<p>in numbers of vehicles, there would need to be a need for highway improvements in some areas. As this site is next to the A66, the Highways Agency may have an interest in this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site AL18 - this site is considered to be one of the preferable sites. It is a brownfield site, has a good link to the A596 and is away from residential properties. It also has good sea and rail links. However, even though the road network has capacity for increases of heavy vehicles to this area, they will come from one of two directions which both have inappropriate junctions; one is the A596/A66 at Ramsay Brow, Workington and the other is the A596/A594 junction at Netherhall Corner, Maryport. Mitigation measures would be required at both of these points for safety reasons.</li> <li>• site CO11 - there could be access difficulties onto the highway network; it is unclear if a suitable access could be secured.</li> </ul>	<p>application stage</p> <p>This information is already included within the site assessment for site AL18. The text states that a Transport Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application, which would need to assess, among other things, the impact on the junctions of the A596/A594 and the A596/A66. It is considered that these matters will be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage</p> <p>Additional text will be added to the Site Assessments document in the Evidence Base to reflect this comment. It is anticipated that the end use would be relatively small scale with low traffic volumes, and therefore access issues could be resolved at the more detailed planning application stage.</p>
			<p>Rep. 103: all previous comments apply; additional comments on AL3 and AL18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site AL3 - part of the site is known to be of interest for the Small Blue butterfly and is, <b>therefore, part of a proposed Small Blue</b></li> </ul>	<p>The existing text in the Site Assessments document will be expanded to reflect this information.</p>

			<p><b>butterfly CWS based on the Port of Workington land</b>; measures required to protect/enhance habitat of small blue butterfly population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site AL18 - all areas should be <b>Phase 1</b> surveyed at the appropriate time of year to determine all features of interest.</li> <li>• sites AL3 and AL18 – the inclusion of the whole of the areas for these sites implies the potential to develop the whole footprint of these areas - no guidance is given as to the proportion of the sites that should be left undeveloped or enhanced, as development of all of the sites could affect the Small Blue Butterfly and the species rich grassland habitat areas.</li> </ul>	<p>The existing text in the Site Assessments document will be expanded to reflect this information.</p> <p>It is not intended that the entire footprint of an allocation would be developed; rather, a larger area is identified in order to provide the scope to incorporate undeveloped or enhanced areas for habitats and species – a note to this effect will be added to the Site Assessments text. A detailed development scheme for each of the site allocations would need to take account of biodiversity interests at the planning application stage.</p>
SAP3	SAP2	Policies SAP2 and SAP3 have been combined in the Feb 2015 consultation draft	Rep. 33: support the proposed allocation for an Energy from Waste plant at land at Kingmoor Park East, Carlisle (allocation CA31) and considers that the site is capable of successfully accommodating such a plant.	Noted – no changes required.
			<p>Rep. 48:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site CA31 – no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> </ul>	Noted – it is considered that these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, and should not affect the principle of development

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site AL3 - no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> <li>○ site AL8 - no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> <li>○ site AL18 - no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted – it is considered that these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, and should not affect the principle of development</p> <p>Noted – it is considered that these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, and should not affect the principle of development</p> <p>Noted – it is considered that these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage, and should not affect the principle of development</p> <p>These points will be added to the text in the Site Assessments document.</p>
			<p>Rep. 102:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● site AL3 - this site is considered to be one of the preferable sites. It is on a brownfield site, has a good link to the main road network on the A596 and is away from residential properties. It also has good sea and rail links. However, even though the road network has capacity for increases of heavy vehicles to this area, they will come from one of two directions which both have inappropriate junctions; one is the A596/A66 at Ramsay Brow, Workington and the other is the A596/A594 junction at Netherhall Corner, Maryport. Mitigation measures would</li> </ul>	<p>Text to this effect is already in the Site Assessments document in the evidence base. These matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.</p>

			<p>be required at both of these points for safety reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site AL8 - this site is adjacent to the existing landfill site and has good connection to the main highway network. It could easily be accessed by rail and sea using existing infrastructure. If there is to be a large increase in numbers of vehicles, there would need to be a need for highway improvements in some areas. As this site is next to the A66, the Highways Agency may have an interest in this site.</li> <li>• site AL18 - this site is considered to be one of the preferable sites. It is a brownfield site, has a good link to the A596 and is away from residential properties. It also has good sea and rail links. However, even though the road network has capacity for increases of heavy vehicles to this area, they will come from one of two directions which both have inappropriate junctions; one is the A596/A66 at Ramsay Brow, Workington and the other is the A596/A594 junction at Netherhall Corner, Maryport. Mitigation measures would be required at both of these points for safety reasons.</li> </ul>	<p>Text to this effect is already in the Site Assessments document in the evidence base These matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>Text to this effect is already in the Site Assessments document in the evidence base. These matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.</p>
SAP4	-	This policy has been deleted in the Feb 2015 consultation draft	Rep. 27: site BA10 limestone quarry needs to be considered as a highly vulnerable location; it is, therefore, more appropriate to consider this site for inert landfill only.	The 2014 Cumbria Waste Needs Assessment indicated no additional need for non-inert landfill capacity within the Plan period. This site allocation policy, and the allocation, have been deleted to conform to revised Strategic Policy SP7. The

				situation for both inert and non-inert landfill will be kept under review.
			<p>Rep. 40:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>object to Goldmire Quarry (BA10) proposed allocation as there is an absence of appropriate technical and feasibility studies; without such studies, the suitability of the site, its capacity and its deliverability cannot be adequately demonstrated – Bennett Bank should be considered instead.</li> <li>paragraph 20.10 indicates that there remains 6.5 million cubic metres of landfill capacity in current planning permissions, including 580,000 cubic metres at Bennett Bank. The Plan indicates that there remains 165,000 cubic metres of capacity at the site (BA23).</li> </ul>	<p>The 2014 Cumbria Waste Needs Assessment indicated no additional need for non-inert landfill capacity within the Plan period. This site allocation policy, and the allocation, have been deleted to conform to revised Strategic Policy SP7. Goldmire currently has consent for inert landfill, due to the EAs groundwater concerns and no allocation is required as this is an extant planning permission. The situation for both inert and non-inert landfill will be kept under review.</p>
			<p>Rep. 48:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site CA24 – no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> <li>site BA10 – limited water or wastewater infrastructure in the area to support this development and there are existing sewerage flooding issues within the local drainage catchment, CCC to ensure the development does exacerbate the issues and/or transferred the problem to another location. The local WwTW [Braystone] is small; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available.</li> <li>site BA23 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area to support this development and the</li> </ul>	<p>The 2014 Cumbria Waste Needs Assessment indicated no additional need for non-inert landfill capacity within the Plan period. This site allocation policy, and the allocation, have been deleted to conform to revised Strategic Policy SP7. The situation for both inert and non-inert landfill will be kept under review.</p> <p>Planning applications for time extensions at these sites may be submitted and would be dealt with under SP7, DC10 and other relevant</p>

			<p>local WwTW [Roanhead] is small; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available. Major water supply infrastructure in the area [easements in place] that could be affected by traffic to and from the development.</p>	<p>policies. Noted matters to be dealt with at detailed planning application stage.</p>
			<p>Rep. 49:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site BA23 – it will be important to ascertain with greater certainty the owner's intention for a) the level of disposal to take place here in advance of the 2017 time limit on the relevant permission given the reduced requirement for landfill space in recent years; and b) the proposals, including timescales, for restoration, especially if the site is not 'full' when the permission for landfilling activity expires.</li> <li>○ site BA10 – it appears premature to allocate this site whilst uncertainty remains about the need for it and the uncertainty surrounding Bennett Bank. It is suggested that either: a) the site is not included; or b) if it is included, that caveats are included in the Policy relating to the timing of any landfilling activity (i.e. post-2017) and the scale of the landfilling would be appropriate having regard to the reduced requirements in recent years.</li> </ul>	<p>See response to Rep 48 above.</p>
			<p>Rep. 50:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ it is not clear what the justification is for not allocating Lillyhall landfill for the plan period and how it can be sustainable to shut and send waste for disposal to more distant landfill sites.</li> </ul>	<p>See response to Rep 48 above.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the MRF at Lillyhall currently treats commercial and industrial wastes, with recyclates exported and non recyclable wastes being sent to landfill. The landfill should be allocated to meet the non-inert landfill need over the Plan period.</li> <li>○ this site could support the development of the West Coast of Cumbria; without it, residual material will need to be transported significant distances, potentially through a National Park, for disposal.</li> <li>○ it is considered that the policy should be re-worded to reflect that Lillyhall should be allowed to play a strategic role in providing a sustainable disposal resource for residual waste arising from West Cumbria in order to achieve a full and sympathetic restoration of the former mineral workings.</li> </ul>	
			<p>Rep. 103: site BA10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nature conservation matters need to be included in the Site Assessment, particularly under paragraph 4.</li> <li>• the site sits entirely within the Goldmire Valley County Wildlife Site; it is anticipated that compensation will be required for the loss of the wildlife site if the site is to be allocated for non-inert landfill.</li> </ul>	See response to Rep 48 above.
SAP5	SAP3	Rewritten to better reflect current situation regarding LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal in Cumbria	Rep. 2: concerned about this policy regarding the storage of LALLW and the proposal by FCC at Lillyhall landfill to bury Sellafield's LLW there; such waste should be stored on the site of arising (CO32, CO35, CO36).	Planning permission was granted on 26 February 2014 (planning application 2/13/9007) to vary conditions attached to a previous planning permission (2/93/9033) to allow an extended period of tipping until 2029 (i.e. to the end of the Local



				Plan period) with an additional year for restoration of land immediately south east of site allocations AL8 and AL37, on land adjacent to Joseph Noble Road, Lillyhall Industrial Estate. This planning permission was restricted to include a maximum limit of 26,000m <sup>3</sup> of High Volume Very Low Level Waste. The planning condition attached to the permission requires records to be maintained at the site of all wastes that are brought to the site for disposal, including the origin of the wastes and for low level nuclear waste shall include the origin and tonnage of waste imported to the site. The consent is a short term measure intended to meet a specific current need, and longer term policies contained in the Local Plan are intended to provide for this type of waste.
			Rep. 22: site CO36 is located in close proximity to National Grid's high pressure underground gas transmission pipelines. National Grid require that no permanent structures are built over or under pipelines, or within the zone specified in the agreements, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the pipeline route and that unrestricted and safe access to any of National Grid's pipeline(s) must be maintained at all times. CCC is directed to National Grid's guidance on their website.	Text will be inserted (paras 12.6 to 12.7) regarding the standing advice that is provided by statutory organisations, such as National Grid.

			<p>Rep. 27: whilst preference should be given to avoiding disposal within the highly engineered facilities at the LLWR wherever practicable, the policy needs to be reworded to allow wastes to be incorporated into the engineered cap or elsewhere in the facility, where there may be benefit in doing so.</p>	<p>Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue.</p>
			<p>Rep. 41:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• this policy is inconsistent with national LLW policy, having not been positively prepared, and is neither justified nor effective, thereby failing the four soundness tests in the NPPF;</li> <li>• disagree with the approach taken in this policy of allocating only the LLWR, Sellafield and greenfield land adjacent to Sellafield for LALLW management and disposal</li> <li>• the wording relating to HALLW sites should be amended to ensure diversion of lower activity wastes from LLWR is maximised on a risk assessment basis</li> <li>• CCC need to provide further evidence on the deliverability of proposed allocated sites CO36 or CO32, since the Inspector in the Site Allocations Policies examinations required them to be removed; in these examinations, site CO35 was left in only by virtue of its status as an existing LLW management site and not as a result of any evidence to support its allocation</li> <li>• it is considered that CCC still has not shown the consistency required with the national LLW policy; this policy has not evolved from a consideration of all the options available and</li> </ul>	<p>Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue.</p>

			referred to in national LLW strategy.	
			<p>Rep. 42:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ as the policy refers to management and disposal, the Lillyhall Metal Recycling Facility and the Lillyhall landfill should be added to the list</li> <li>○ the Plan should acknowledge the LLWR Site as the national facility for the management (including disposal) of Low Level Radioactive Waste</li> <li>○ the Plan should provide for facilities to take other types of radioactive waste such as lower activity low level waste and very low level waste within Cumbria</li> <li>○ the Plan should be sufficiently flexible not to preclude the development of new waste management facilities within Cumbria and the use of facilities out with Cumbria</li> <li>○ the scope of the Plan should include waste treatment facilities as well as disposal facilities</li> </ul>	<p>Policy SAP3 now includes these two sites to safeguard their functions over the Plan period.</p> <p>Not agreed - the LLWR is currently 'a' national facility and not 'the' national facility.</p> <p>Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue.</p> <p>Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue.</p> <p>Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the Plan should not rule out the disposal of suitable radioactive waste to appropriately permitted and licensed landfill facilities where it is demonstrated to be the Best Available Technique (BAT)</li> <li>○ the Plan should recognise that regions are not necessarily self sufficient in the management of radioactive waste and transfer between regions will be required. This applies to waste generated within Cumbria and waste generated elsewhere</li> <li>○ the Plan should acknowledge that there will be a requirement to export waste to other countries for treatment prior to disposal.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue. New Strategic Policy SP4 has been added to the MWLP, regarding the use of BAT.</p> <p>Agree – appropriate text inserted to reflect that point.</p> <p>Agree – appropriate text inserted to reflect that point.</p>
			Rep 47 this policy does not include Lillyhall as an identified disposal facility for VLLW, which will be operating during the Local Plan period	Policy SAP3 now includes this site to safeguard its functions over the Plan period.
			<p>Rep. 48:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site CO35 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available. Access to Drigg Tanks WwTW must be maintained at all times.</li> <li>○ site CO36 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available.</li> </ul>	<p>The points raised here by UU would be considered in more detail at planning application stage.</p> <p>The points raised here by UU would be considered in more detail at planning application stage.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site CO32 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available.</li> </ul>	The points raised here by UU would be considered in more detail at planning application stage.
			<p>Rep. 58: site CO35 – there are other potential impacts that need mitigating, in addition to the ones already identified, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ potential impacts from deep cut off wall on the ground and surface water levels on the heath and slack features on the SAC, near the boundary fenceline.</li> <li>○ possible impacts on flocculants on the estuary/marine environment.</li> <li>○ coastal erosion and loss of SAC habitats/species.</li> </ul>	It is considered that all these matters can be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage. Include reference in Site Assessment Report and Habitats Regulations Assessment.
			<p>Rep. 61: the non-inclusion of the permitted Lilyhall facility is questioned and the following points should be more openly and transparently recognised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the Plan should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy on the long term management of LLW and consistent with and support the timely implementation of NDA Strategy and Plans which play a major role in the management of LLW in the UK, taking into account the strategic need now and in the future for viable landfill disposal capacity for VLLW and lower activity LLW in West Cumbria;</li> <li>○ recognise the status of the Lillyhall Landfill Site as a permitted disposal facility in West Cumbria for VLLW from Sellafield and other nuclear sites;</li> </ul>	Policy SAP3 has been rewritten to be more flexible with regard to LLW treatment, management, storage and/or disposal. The preceding text (paras 18.7 to 18.23) also discusses this issue.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in accordance with the principle of sustainable development, set out in the NPPF, acknowledge the potential future long term role of the Lillyhall Site as a commercial disposal facility in West Cumbria for the disposal of lower activity radioactive wastes from Sellafield and other nuclear sites.</li> </ul>	
			<p>Rep. 102:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site CO35 - current planning application (at appeal); comments made during that process still apply.</li> <li>sites CO32 and CO36 - both the sites to be assessed against the proposed policies.</li> </ul>	Noted
SAP6	SAP4	Updated – some sites added, some removed, to reflect granting of planning permissions or nearing of mineral permission end dates	<p>Rep.17: with regard to site M30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a large area of land is taken up by spoil heaps – any further expansion could exacerbate the problem;</li> <li>the height of the spoils is also a concern;</li> <li>quarrying can lower and affect the skyline;</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concerned about the possible afteruse of the quarry when it becomes redundant;</li> </ul>	<p>No significant landscape and visual issues were identified in the Site Assessment for this site. The height of the spoil heaps are regulated by the conditions attached to the existing planning permission. If the quarry expands, there will be a restoration scheme, which will enable backfilling to mitigate the effects on the landscape.</p> <p>This is a detailed matter for consideration at the planning application stage, and appropriate conditions can be applied at that stage. Any proposals for afteruse will be subject to further consultation and, therefore, the views of consultees will be sought and taken into consideration at that time.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the possible harmful impact on the footpath along the crest of the ridge;</li> <li>○ light pollution is not covered by any of the draft policies within the Plan;</li> <li>○ the draft policies for areas surrounding development should be strengthened, especially in the case of water pollution.</li> </ul>	<p>At the planning application stage, the re-routing of the public right of way, that follows the existing quarry boundary, would be a material consideration.</p> <p>Policy SP14 requires assessment of broad environmental impacts, which would include the effects of light pollution. Add reference to light in the text and preceding Policy DC2.</p> <p>This matter would be considered under Development Control policy DC2</p>
		Rep. 22: site M12 is located in close proximity to National Grid's high pressure underground gas transmission pipelines. National Grid require that no permanent structures are built over or under pipelines, or within the zone specified in the agreements, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the pipeline route and that unrestricted and safe access to any of National Grid's pipeline(s) must be maintained at all times. CCC is directed to National Grid's guidance on their website.	Text will be inserted (paras 12.6 to 12.7) regarding the standing advice that is provided by statutory organisations, such as National Grid.
		Rep.23: the omission of Holmescales Quarry from policy SAP6 makes it unsound.	Agree. It is proposed that this site be included as an Area of Search.
		Rep. 26: Solway Moss should be identified in the list of Preferred Areas. Boundaries of the existing extraction site (planning permission 1/99/9020) should be shown on a corresponding Site Allocation map. "P1 Solway Moss for continued extraction of peat"	Disagreed – this policy identifies physical extensions or new sites for mineral extraction. Solway Moss is not identified for a physical extension.

		Rep. 29: site M33 – the area that the representor is currently appraising for extraction, and likely to be included in a planning application in the near future, has been refined following further geological assessment; a map of the new area is attached.	This site is removed from policy SAP4 as it has now received planning permission.
		Rep. 30: in line with responses made to previous consultations on the Minerals and Waste Plan, the representor feels that a future extension of Holmescales Quarry should be reconsidered as an Area of Search – the extension should be considered as, the reserves of stone are there, it is an existing quarry with planning permission to 2042 and it is one of two remaining high psv quarries in North West England.	Agree. It is proposed that this site be included as an Area of Search.
		Rep. 34: to ensure consistency with the NPPF, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should identify Kirkby Quarry as a Preferred Area, or at least an Area of Search, for an extension to the quarry.	Agree. Site to be added as an Area of Search
		Rep. 37: the inclusion of land adjacent Roan Edge Quarry as an area of search for high specification roadstone is supported.	Noted – no change required
		Rep. 38: site M6, the local highway system in the area is inadequate to accommodate significant numbers/frequencies of quarry-related traffic; would expect proposals to extend quarrying activities in the locality to be subject to conditions to restrict traffic levels and traffic movements.	It is considered that these are detailed matters that can be dealt with through the planning application process.
		Rep. 40: as the Preferred Area does not form part of the existing Roosecote Sand and Gravel Quarry, it is suggested that the site name is amended to avoid confusion. Object to this being included as a Preferred Area on the basis of unacceptable visual impact upon the area. The area is currently a	The owner of the land and the minerals rights of the existing quarry, on the other side of Rampside Road, will only allow mineral extraction by licence on a year at a time basis. Barrow Borough Council has



		<p>prominent area of greenfield land and located in an area of locally valuable open countryside. The Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (page 91) shows that the site forms part of a “well composed landscape which will be conserved and enhanced”.</p>	<p>ambitions for regeneration and development at the Port and other areas of the Borough. To achieve this, aggregates will be necessary for building roads, houses, etc.; the next nearest sand and gravel quarry to this one is 65km away by road.</p> <p>Every part of Cumbria has been assessed and recorded in the Landscape Character Guidance Toolkit. Paragraph 8.19 explains how the Guidance will be used, but it is not intended to preserve all landscapes in their current form. Policies SP14 and DC18, in particular, will be used to assess any planning application that may come forward for site M12.</p>
		<p>Rep. 44: CCC should include consideration of an Area of Search or Preferred Areas for industrial minerals.</p>	<p>This option was considered, but rejected (see Options Report document, issue MIN2H). Policy SP10 on industrial limestones has been amended to reflect the current situation.</p>
		<p>Rep. 48:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site M05 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available; and there are major water supply trunk mains in the area [easements in place] that could be affected by traffic to and from the development.</li> <li>○ site M06 – limited wastewater infrastructure in</li> </ul>	<p>The points raised here by UU would be considered in more detail at planning application stage.</p>

			<p>the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site M08 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area.</li> <li>○ site M15 – United Utilities has no wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore foul flows cannot be of service.</li> <li>○ site M17 – United Utilities has no water or wastewater infrastructure in the area to support this development.</li> <li>○ site M18 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available.</li> <li>○ site M10 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm if capacity is available.</li> <li>○ site M30 – United Utilities has no water or wastewater infrastructure in the area to support this development.</li> <li>○ site M12 – no known issues; but transferred private sewers may be affected by development.</li> <li>○ site M33 – United Utilities has no water or wastewater infrastructure in the area to support this development.</li> </ul>	
			<p>Rep. 52:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Area of Search M15 should be re-categorised as a Preferred Area - due to the location of the site, the local market and significance in supply to Seascale extensions, the loss of this site</li> </ul>	<p>Not agreed. For Sites M8 and M15, the designation as a Preferred Area does not give any greater weight to the decision making process. At this</p>

			<p>would be significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site M8 should be classed as a Preferred Area, as supplying from further afield would have a significant detrimental effect on the environment and locality and would inevitably increase the carbon footprint.</li> <li>○ the site and potential extensions at Low Plains should be included as an Area of Search.</li> </ul>	<p>stage there is insufficient evidence to support the classification of this site as a Preferred Area. The definition of these areas is set out in paragraph 5.78.</p> <p>Not agreed. The operator submitted an application for an extension of time for Low Plains when its permission ran out; they consider that they still have over 20 years of reserves left in the site, so no physical extension is required.</p>
			<p>Rep. 103: all previous comments apply, most notably with regards to M12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site M5 - the woodland proposed to be lost is Ancient Semi-natural Woodland, County Wildlife Site and listed as Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland UK Priority Habitat.</li> <li>• site M6 - the four surrounding County Wildlife Sites rely on water table/water supply being maintained.</li> <li>• site M6 - Tarn Dubbs CWS is also a Site of Invertebrate Significance</li> <li>• site M6 - the main interest is the relationship between the hydrology and the surrounding high value wildlife sites; an assessment of this</li> </ul>	<p>The boundary of the proposed Area of Search has been revised to exclude the designated areas. A future planning application could be submitted that includes land within the designated areas, but would be considered on its merits without the benefit of a prior site allocation.</p> <p>Text to reflect these comments will be added to the Site Assessments document.</p>

			<p>is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site M6 - this land should be restored with significant biodiversity gains incorporated – woodland, scrub woodland, grassland and hedgerow.</li> </ul>	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site M10 - enhancement of the whole site to nature conservation/biodiversity after use is desirable – heathland/acid grassland/woodland and possibly some limestone grassland.</li> <li>site M12 - although nearby to SAC/SSSI/SPA and Ramsar, this development unlikely to have significant effects.</li> <li>site M12 - very close to Stank and Roosecote Moss County Wildlife Site, could be problems of water management.</li> <li>site M12 - UK Priority Habitat of flood plain grazing marsh to the east.</li> <li>site M12 - serious likelihood of finding badger setts.</li> <li>site M12 - if this site is developed, there is significant potential for habitat enhancement, especially wetland/pond areas, scrub and woodland.</li> </ul>	<p>Text will be added to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Noted – no changes required.</p> <p>Text is included to state that “Hydrological connectivity between the site and the Moss CWS would need to be investigated”.</p> <p>This information will be added to the list of the ‘Environmental assets’.</p> <p>Text will be added to state that any planning application will need to be accompanied by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site M12 - subject to there being no damage to the County Wildlife Site, I can see considerable potential for the creation of a site of public and wildlife interest, that could be developed into a Local Nature Reserve within walking distance of this side of town; it needs really good design.</li> </ul>	<p>Additional text under ‘Enhancement potential’ will read: <i>“There is significant potential for habitat enhancement, especially wetland/pond areas, scrub and woodland. There is also potential for the creation of a well designed site of public and wildlife interest that could</i></p>

				<i>be developed into a Local Nature Reserve</i> ".
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site M15 – the original Phase 1 habitat survey shows primarily improved grassland with small areas of marshy grassland in the southern corner to the west of High House Farm, and just outside the marked boundary at Crossleys.</li> <li>• site M15 - all impacts on wetland features should be avoided.</li> <li>• site M15 - several ponds dotted around, though probably not within the site, could be important for great crested newts and the nearest newt record is 2.2 km away, so would need to be considered.</li> <li>• site M15 – Squeeze Guts Lane is notable for its double line of hedges and this may be an important wildlife link.</li> <li>• site M15 – another restoration benefit could be public access/enjoyment of a developing woodland area/nature reserve.</li> <li>• site M17 - Duddon Marsh County Wildlife Site and Natterjack Toad Site nearby.</li> </ul>	<p>Additional text will be placed in the Site Assessments (under 'Environmental assets' section of the evidence base to reflect this information.</p> <p>A sentence to this effect will be added under the 'Environmental assets' section.</p> <p>Text will be amended to read: "There are records in the vicinity for brown hare, common pipistrelle, otter, common toad, red squirrel, barn owl, badger <i>and great crested newts</i>".</p> <p>Text is included which reads: "The other prime feature on the site is the doubled hedged lane, known as Squeeze Guts Lane".</p> <p>The following text will be added under 'Environmental potential':  <i>"Restoration of the site could include the development of a woodland area/nature reserve for public access/enjoyment"</i>.</p> <p>Reference is made to the natterjack sites potential zone lying 720m from the site. The representation is incorrect as to the name and designation, Millom Marsh County</p>

				Wildlife Site is already listed, and Duddon Mosses SAC is consulted on under the SSSI designation.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site M17 - Phase 1 survey shows some mires of interest to the west of the site, but these will hopefully not be affected because they are on the other side of the hill – should be confirmed, as Lowscales Bank CWS includes some of this land.</li> <li>• site M17 - possible red squirrel issues in this extensive conifer woodland; a full assessment required.</li> <li>• site M17 - there are likely to be bat issues, especially if mature trees are present; a full assessment of the bat situation is required.</li> <li>• site M18 – original Phase 1 survey shows improved/improved reseeded and arable land; however, the aerial photo does show areas within the site that could be notable.</li> <li>• site M18 – small streams that run through the site enter Trout Beck, a designated tributary of the River Eden SSSI/SAC; likely significant effect would have to be determined.</li> <li>• site M18 – the great crested newt records, circa 2km to the north, plus several features on the site and nearby, would suggest that this could be great crested newt country; a full assessment would be required.</li> </ul>	<p>Text will be added to state that any planning application will need to include a Phase 1 Habitat Survey.</p> <p>Noted –as above</p> <p>Noted – as above</p> <p>The ‘Enhancement potential’ section refers to the need to consider habitat creation/enhancement. Text will be added to this section to list potential conservation afteruses.</p> <p>The Site Assessment recognises that, without mitigation measures for other habitat and drainage, this site could have impacts on the River Eden SAC.</p> <p>The Site Assessment recognises the great crested newt records nearby. However, text will be added to state that a full assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application.</p>



			within the North West and Cheshire Shoreline Management Plan as a 'no active intervention' zone, therefore, natural erosion of this section of coastline will occur, which may impact on the viability of this allocation.	M24 is owned by the County Council, and it will have some control over the extent of development on the slag heap. The County Council is discussing with the EA about the impact of natural erosion, and any update will be inserted into the Site Assessments document.
			Rep. 48: site M24 – existing sewerage flooding issue in the area, CCC needs to ensure the development does not exacerbate the issues and/or transferred the problem to another location. Major sewer running through the development site.	Noted. Additional comment will be made to the Site Assessments document. It is considered unlikely that sewerage would compromise the development of this site, and a suitable engineering solution could be found as part of a detailed planning application.
			Rep 62: the southern extent of the gypsum Mineral Safeguarding Area should be extended to include all of the Eden Shales outcrop near Appleby – these host the gypsum/anhydrite beds where economically viable deposits have been proven in the past	The MSA of Gypsum has been extended (on the Policies Map) to include the areas agreed with the operator.
SAP8	SAP6	This policy has been expanded to include existing railheads and wharves	Rep. 23: the safeguarding of potential railheads is supported, but the Salthouse siding is operationally constrained by Network Rail, who will limit live line loading to Energy Coast contracts only.	Noted. The site is considered suitable for future use as part of any Energy Coast developments.
			Rep. 38: site AL32, no objection is raised to this railhead safeguarding proposal.	Noted – no changes required.
			Rep. 48: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site AL32 – development is adjacent to Workington WwTW and could impair the future expansion of the assets in supporting the development aspirations of Allerdale Council.</li> </ul>	Noted. Any constraints identified will be added to the Site Assessments documents. However, this allocation is a safeguarding allocation only and



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ site M31 – limited wastewater infrastructure in the area; therefore, CCC will need to provide foul discharge flow data before United Utilities PLC can confirm when capacity is available; and major water supply infrastructure in the area to and from to Low House service reservoir [easements in place] that could be affected by traffic to and from the development.</li> </ul>	<p>does not of itself support any future development of minerals or waste proposals on the site.</p> <p>Noted. The additional information will be inserted into the Site Assessments document.</p>
			<p>Rep. 103: all previous comments apply; no additional comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● site AL32 – in addition to the Small Blue butterfly, it is likely that Dingy Skipper, Grayling and Small Heath, other UK Priority Species, are also present.</li> <li>● site AL32 - this site may support reptiles.</li> </ul>	<p>Text will be added to the Site Assessments document to reflect these comments.</p>
<b>General comments</b>				
Appendices			<p>Rep. 26: The DLP tabulates existing minerals sites, except for Solway Moss, the only remaining peat site. Recognition should be given to the existence of Solway Moss in a separate table: "Table 5.7. Peat Extraction Sites".</p>	<p>Agreed and it is an oversight that this has not been added to the Tables in Appendix 2. This will be rectified in the next draft of the MWLP.</p>
Site allocations			<p>Rep. 27:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ all sites allocated for development will need to be subject to site specific hydro geological assessments;</li> <li>○ for mineral applications, there is a requirement to establish the relationship that the development has with the water table; if the base of the excavation is near or below the</li> </ul>	<p>Where applicable, additional text will be placed in the Site Assessments to reflect these three comments.</p>

	<p>anticipated water table, then there will be a requirement to establish an appropriate monitoring scheme;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in some circumstances, the development may be considered unacceptable if it is carried out below the level of the water table.</li> </ul>	
Number of sites	Rep. 40: paragraph 19.3 should be removed as it conflicts with strategic approach outlined within the proposed Local Plan.	The approach to allocation of waste management sites is explained in chapter 3 Waste Management.
Roan Edge Quarry	Rep. 17: there are no references in the Plan about Wilson's site at Roan Edge for the recycling of inert demolition material.	This site is referenced in the Annual Monitoring Report and was taken into consideration in the Waste Needs Assessment
Local Aggregates Assessment	<p>Rep. 44:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in paragraphs 20.23 to 20.27, an LAA needs to be completed before the next publication of the Plan; this would need to look at past trends and assess if it is wise to plan for the future on these past trends, given that this period will include the recession.</li> <li>• in paragraphs 20.23 to 20.27, we expect to see a site by site analysis of the sand and gravel units, the distribution of reserves through the landbank and capacity analysis - the LAA should look at if the remaining units can carry the shortfall of those sites which are close to exhaustion.</li> <li>• in paragraphs 20.28 and 20.29, CCC should produce an LAA in respect of crushed rock with an analysis of the distribution of material through the landbank; the flexible approach proposed is supported.</li> </ul>	A joint LAA, with the Lake District National park Authority, has been carried out for calendar years 2011/2012 and 2013, and any relevant findings from those assessments will be used to update the Local Plan.

Landbanks	<p>Rep. 52:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in paragraph 20.24, refer to previous comments about the minimum landbank, which should have regard to the advice of the AWP.</li> <li>• in paragraph 20.25, in the absence of anything specific, the best evidence of future demand must be taken as the current position, combined with the advice of the AWP and Government projections for growth.</li> <li>• in paragraph 20.25, in addition to the reference to the recession, there should be reference made to the fact that if there is a local building boom or large scale infrastructure project come on stream, the landbank will be shortened.</li> <li>• in paragraph 20.27, this would appear to imply that even when there is a deficit in the landbank there would be no applications that would be approved for at least 10 years – this is contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</li> <li>• in paragraph 20.27, merely highlighting Areas of Search in itself does not provide certainty that the Plan can deliver the necessary resources throughout the plan period.</li> <li>• in paragraph 20.27, whilst it may not be necessary to identify 100% of the landbank required, it is considered that identifying less than 50% of the requirement to 2035 is adequate (<i>sic</i>) and represents a major concern as to whether or not the Plan is fit for purpose.</li> </ul>	A joint LAA, with the Lake District National park Authority, has been carried out for calendar years 2011/2012 and 2013, and any relevant findings from those assessments will be used to update the Local Plan.
High Specification Aggregates	Rep. 44: in paragraph 20.30, the HSA merits more of an analysis than one short paragraph and CCC should take note of comments made about the	Paragraph 5.49 discusses the shortfall of resources in the Yorkshire Dales NP, and an Area of Search will

	need to consider the Yorkshire Dales sites; the issue deserves consideration of the designation of an Area of Search.	be added to policy SAP4 for Holmescales Quarry. Any relevant findings from the LAA will be added to the text of the Local Plan
Building stones	<p>Rep. 44:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>paragraphs 20.31 and 20.32 should be reconsidered in light of previous comments about treating building stone as an industrial mineral - the production should not just be for local uses.</li> <li>it is requested that references to 'more sustainable' are removed, as the representor does not agree with the approach taken.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Added explanation will be provided in the Local Plan to indicate that local building stone will not be purely for local use. Building stone is not viewed as industrial or commercial in NPPF paragraph 146.</p> <p>Noted. Additional text will be provided to explain the meaning of 'more sustainable' and the use of local building stone.</p>
Radioactive waste	<p>Rep. 41:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in paragraph 20.13, it should make clear the limited type and radioactivity levels of waste CLESA can accept and that it is solely for the Sellafield site's wastes, rather than being 'open gate'.</li> <li>paragraph 20.17 states that CCC and Copeland Borough Council have a policy that decommissioning wastes should be managed on or adjacent to the site where they arise - the representor believes that, for CCC, this draft plan is seeking to introduce such a policy and there is no such existing policy currently in place.</li> <li>in paragraph 20.20, no evidence is provided on the timescales for, or the deliverability of, the potential for use of soil and rubble-type LALLW</li> </ul>	Chapter 4 on radioactive waste has been completely rewritten.

	<p>in the profiling of the LLWR capping and restoration, as well as potential provision of other new LALLW facilities on the 100ha LLWR site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in paragraph 20.21, the assessment currently being carried out is welcomed, but until the study is in the public domain, the allocation of these very large sites is largely aspirational and under the proposed policies, no new LLW management routes could progress.</li> <li>• in paragraph 20.22, there is no evidence provided by CCC that there is adequate capacity for LLW disposal at the LLWR, the Sellafield complex and land adjacent to it; there is also no evidence that this constitutes the most sustainable solution or the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree - Further work on deliverability will be carried out and amplifying text will be provided. The feasibility study into LLW has now been completed and is in the public domain.</p> <p>As above. It is considered that the Study provides confidence, but further work on deliverability will be carried out. Detailed options and alternatives will be looked at the detailed planning applications stage.</p>
	<p>Rep. 45:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the representor strongly supports the proposals within the draft Local Plan regarding the management, storage and disposal of the range of radioactive wastes.</li> <li>• the representor supports the Government's existing position on the arrangements for funding and development of a deep waste facility, under the arrangements set out in the Funded Decommissioning Programme.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted – no changes required.</p> <p>Noted – no changes required</p>