

**APPENDIX 7: AUDIT TRAIL OF OPTIONS CONSIDERED FOR THE ADOPTED  
CORE STRATEGY AND GENERIC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DPDs**

## TABLE OF ADOPTED CORE STRATEGY POLICIES AND ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE ADOPTED CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<b>Overall Strategy Policies</b>			
<p><b>CSP 1: Sustainable location and design</b></p> <p>Proposals for minerals and waste management developments should demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>energy management, environmental performance and carbon footprint have been determining design factors.</li> <li>their location will minimise, as far as is practicable, the "minerals or waste road miles" involved in supplying the minerals or managing the wastes unless other environmental /sustainability and, for minerals, geological considerations override this aim.</li> <li>all proposed waste management developments with gross floor space</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes in Sustainability Appraisal Issues and Options Report.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Issue 2: Strategic approach to the location of waste facilities.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Option 2A;</b> Centralised provision of two large scale waste facilities, located adjacent to rail network access points or major roads.</p> <p><b>Waste Option 2B:</b> Decentralised network of waste facilities, provided close to waste sources (e.g.</p>	<p>The alternatives to this policy considered in previous stages of the Sustainability Appraisal relate to the location of the minerals and waste management developments considered in the SA Issues and Options Report (Waste Issue 2: Strategic approach to the location of waste facilities and Minerals Issue 3: Strategic location of minerals sites). Alternatives relating to other provisions within this policy (e.g. sustainable design) have not been appraised previously as they generally reflect national and regional policies.</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>Policy included in accordance with national and regional policy. The selection of a decentralised model for waste management as opposed to a centralised one suits the geographic characteristics of Cumbria and its dispersed pattern of settlements.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The Submission Draft policy is in line with the findings of the Issues and Options SA findings.</p> <p>In relation to waste, although</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>of over 1000 square metres gain at least 10% of energy supply, annually or over the design life of the development, from on-site or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy supplies. Any exceptions to this should demonstrate that this would not be viable for the specific development and that the development would form part of an integrated process for reducing greenhouse gas emissions or for carbon-offsetting measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mineral working proposals should demonstrate a life cycle analysis ("cradle to grave") of product and process emissions.</li> <li>construction of buildings minimises waste production and use of primary aggregates and makes best use of products made from recycled/re-used materials.</li> </ul> <p>Work will be undertaken, in conjunction with stakeholders, to develop life cycle analysis criteria that are relevant for</p>	<p>urban areas, centres of industrial and commercial activity).</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 3: Strategic Location of minerals sites.</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Option 3A:</b> Active redistribution of quarrying away from problem areas with, subject to proper consideration of environmental effects, new sites identified in areas where extraction was previously non-existent or limited.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 3B:</b> No redistribution of sites, allowing for extensions and new sites in areas where there are current concerns about transport and amenity impacts. Exploration of</p>	<p>In relation to minerals, the findings of the assessment of options highlighted that locational choices for minerals extraction are relatively constrained. Both options scored comparably against most of the SA objectives, with the exception of Option 3A (i.e. redistribution) performing less strongly against the landscape quality objective. It however left a question open for consideration in further stages in relation to the appropriateness of a policy emphasis on the concentration of extraction where it is already taking place or, alternatively, on the promotion of a different pattern of extraction.</p> <p>As for waste, the appraisal concluded that a centralised approach to providing waste</p>	<p>the decentralised waste option was appraised to have more potentially negative effects in environmental terms with a greater number of sites required, there were also mixed impacts of the alternative centralised model as this concentrated social and environmental impacts at the local level. The policy has also incorporated the SA recommendation to integrate "waste miles minimisation".</p> <p>With respect to minerals, although it was concluded that locational choices for minerals extraction are relatively constrained, the policy is in line with Option 3B (no redistribution of sites) which scored slightly more positively in relation to landscape objectives.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
minerals developments.	mitigation measures and the use of planning agreements with mineral operators to set in place further compensatory measures for communities.	management facilities could benefit the development of the sector itself, but could also have mixed impacts by concentrating social and environmental impacts at the local level. The alternative of a decentralised approach to provision of waste management facilities was also found to have impacts that could potentially be distributed more widely throughout the area. Common to both options, however, was the need to minimise potential impacts derived from waste transporting and the importance of reducing waste miles. Most of the negative impacts of waste management were associated with the transport of waste. Recommendations from SA	<p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>The policy was revised from the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to reflect the increasing emphasis on the climate change agenda with this, the primary objective of the Core Strategy, referring to the climate change issues which are significant for minerals and waste management developments. It also integrated the “minimising road miles” policy driver which was included as an individual policy at the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007).</p> <p>The Submission Draft policy has also been amended</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 2: Economic Benefit</b></p> <p>Proposals for new minerals and waste developments should demonstrate that they would realise their potential to provide economic benefit. This will include such matters as the number of jobs directly or indirectly created or safeguarded and the support that proposals give to other industries and developments. It will also be important to ensure that minerals and waste developments would not prejudice other regeneration and development initiatives.</p>	<p><b>Yes in Sustainability Appraisal Issues and Options Report.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Issue 1: Overall approach to waste management, energy from waste, number of sites required and recycling/composting targets</b></p> <p><b>Waste Option 1A</b> (Provide for more than Cumbria's wastes)</p> <p><b>Waste Option 1B</b> (Provide only for Cumbria's wastes - net self-sufficiency)</p> <p><b>Waste Option 1C</b> (Provide</p>	<p>Issues and Options report therefore concluded that further modelling would assist in further clarifying the relative potential impacts of both options and including "reducing waste miles" as a policy driver.</p> <p>Although specific policy alternatives to this were not assessed in previous stages of the SA, provisions within this policy relate to the "do maximum" and "do minimum" options both considered in the SA Issues and Options report (Waste Issue I and Minerals Issue 1).</p> <p>In relation to waste, the findings of the Issues and Options SA report highlighted that whilst Option W1A would provide some major benefits, it</p>	<p>since the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to incorporate the life-cycle analysis requirement for mineral working proposals to reflect efficient resource management.</p> <p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>To optimise economic and community benefits from minerals and waste management developments, implying a balancing exercise with other interests.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The policy is in line with the findings of the SA report which highlighted the economic benefits associated with Waste Option 1A and Minerals</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>for less than Cumbria's wastes)</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 1: RAWP apportionment, recycling/ secondary materials targets and sites required</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Option 1A:</b> Exceed RAWP sub apportionment figures,</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 1B:</b> Provide for the RSS's apportionment of 700,000 tonnes of sand and gravel per annum.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 1C:</b> Provide for less than 700,000 tonnes of sand and gravel per annum.</p>		<p>would also have the potential to generate some minor negative effects at the site level. Option W1B also performed well, but it was stressed that some benefits provided by W1A would be significantly lower, and that there would be similar potential issues arising at the site selection and development level. On the grounds of the SA findings, it was concluded that Option W1C could be discounted from further assessment.</p> <p>With regard to minerals, the SA findings concluded that Option M1A would provide some clear economic benefits and would support the further development of the minerals and waste sector in Cumbria. However, these would need</p>	<p>Option 1A. The policy does also highlight the need for minerals and waste developments to take into consideration other regeneration and development initiatives, aiming to balance, therefore, the potential negative effects of these options.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>This policy was introduced at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage to ensure that local advantage is taken of the investment in minerals and waste management development and to ensure the plan's contribution towards the achievement of Objective EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<b>CSP 3: Community Benefits</b>	<b>No</b>	<p>to be balanced with potentially higher environmental effects overall, particularly taking traffic movements into consideration. In relation to Option M1B, the Issues and Options SA highlighted that it would be relatively neutral, but could be considered insufficient if development of this industry sector was considered to be a fundamental political aspiration in Cumbria. In the light of the SA findings, it was recommended to exclude Option M1C from further consideration.</p> <p>It was considered that there would be no reasonable alternative for this. The alternative would be not to have such community benefits in place which would not acknowledge the</p>	<p>economy.</p> <p>The policy has since been modified for the Submission Draft plan and no longer relates to “community benefits from nuclear industry” as a new policy has been provided in the Submission Draft plan to cover this (see below).</p> <p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>With recent planning permission being granted for additional waste storage at the Low Level Radioactive Waste Repository near Drigg</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
help to offset the impacts of hosting such facilities.		impacts of hosting these facilities on Cumbria.	and with the prospect of further nuclear waste streams arising from nuclear decommissioning over the next century, this policy reflects the County Council's positive intention to offset any potential impacts arising from hosting these facilities.
			<b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b>
			N/A.
			<b>Progression to Submission Version</b>
			This policy was integrated with the Local Economic Benefit policy at the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage and has now been incorporated into the Submission Draft plan as a

<b>Adopted Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Alternative Appraised Yes/No</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
<p data-bbox="147 655 622 687"><b>CSP 4: Environmental Assets</b></p> <p data-bbox="147 703 622 775">Minerals and waste management developments should aim to:</p> <ul data-bbox="197 815 719 1334" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="197 815 719 1066">• protect, maintain and enhance overall quality of life and the natural, historic and other distinctive features that contribute to the environment of Cumbria and to the character of its landscapes and places;</li> <li data-bbox="197 1086 622 1158">• improve the settings of the features; and</li> <li data-bbox="197 1179 719 1286">• the linkages between them and buffer zones around them, where this is appropriate;</li> <li data-bbox="197 1307 629 1334">• realise the opportunities for</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="748 655 1077 759"><b>Yes in Sustainability Appraisal Issues and Options Report.</b></p> <p data-bbox="748 799 1155 1015"><b>Waste Issue 1: Overall approach to waste management, energy from waste, number of sites required and recycling / composting targets</b></p> <p data-bbox="748 1035 1137 1142"><b>Waste Option 1A</b> (Provide for more than Cumbria’s wastes)</p> <p data-bbox="748 1163 1137 1270"><b>Waste Option 1B</b> (Provide only for Cumbria’s wastes - net self-sufficiency)</p> <p data-bbox="748 1291 1137 1342"><b>Waste Option 1C</b> (Provide for less than Cumbria’s</p>	<p data-bbox="1169 655 1576 1134">It is considered that there would be no reasonable alternatives for this policy, as these would not be in accordance with national or regional policies. However, provisions within this policy relate to the “do maximum” and “do minimum” options both considered in the SA Issues and Options report (Waste Issue 1 and Minerals Issue 1).</p> <p data-bbox="1169 1179 1536 1318">In relation to waste, the findings of the Issues and Options SA report highlighted that whilst</p>	<p data-bbox="1590 655 1962 687"><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p data-bbox="1590 708 2011 959">This policy is intended to provide the appropriate level of protection to Cumbria’s environmental assets, in accordance with international, European, national or regional policies.</p> <p data-bbox="1590 1035 1995 1099"><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p data-bbox="1590 1120 1995 1334">The policy is in line with the findings of the Issues and Options SA report which highlighted the need to balancing potential environmental impacts with</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>expanding and increasing environmental resources, including adapting and mitigating for climate change.</p>	<p>wastes)</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 1: RAWP apportionment, recycling / secondary materials targets and sites required</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Option 1A:</b> Exceed RAWP sub apportionment figures,</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 1B:</b> Provide for the RSS's apportionment of 700,000 tonnes of sand and gravel per annum.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 1C:</b> Provide for less than 700,000 tonnes of sand and gravel per annum.</p>	<p>Option W1A would provide some major benefits, it would also have the potential to generate some negative environmental and social effects at the site level. Option W1B also performed well, but it was stressed that some benefits provided by W1A would be significantly lower, and that there would be similar potential issues arising at the site selection and development level. On the grounds of the SA findings, it was concluded that Option W1C could be discounted from further assessment.</p> <p>With respect to minerals, the SA findings concluded that Option M1A would provide some clear economic benefits and would support the further development of the minerals and waste</p>	<p>economic benefits.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>The Environmental Assets policy changed from the Core Strategy Preferred Option (February 2007) to the one presented in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to relate only to those environmental assets that are not protected by international and national legislation. It was also updated at this stage to provide for improvement of the settings of these, and to realise the opportunities for expanding and increasing environmental resources including adapting and mitigating for climate change.</p>
<p><b>Areas and features identified to be of international or national importance.</b></p>			
<p>Planning application proposals within these, or that could affect them, must demonstrate that they comply with the relevant national policies as set out in Planning Policy Statements. Wherever practicable, they should also demonstrate that they would enhance the environmental assets.</p>			
<p><b>Environmental assets not protected by national or European legislation</b></p>			
<p>Planning permission will not be granted for development that would have a significant adverse effect on these environmental assets, on its own or in combination with other developments, unless:</p>			

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the development, and</li> <li>• that it cannot reasonably be located on any alternative site that would result in less or no harm, and then,</li> <li>• that the effects can be adequately mitigated, or if not,</li> <li>• that the effects can be adequately and realistically compensated for through offsetting actions.</li> </ul> <p>All proposals would also be expected to demonstrate that they include reasonable measures to secure the opportunities that they present for enhancing Cumbria's environmental assets.</p> <p>Guidance on implementing this policy will be provided by the Landscape Character and Highway Design Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>		<p>sector in Cumbria. However, these would need to be balanced with potentially higher environmental effects overall, particularly taking traffic movements into consideration. In relation to Option M1B, the Issues and Options SA highlighted that it would be relatively neutral, but could be considered insufficient if development of this industry sector was considered to be a fundamental political aspiration in Cumbria. In the light of the SA findings, it was recommended to exclude Option M1C from further consideration.</p>	<p>The policy has changed from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to the Submission version to include again the protection of the areas and features of international and national importance.</p>

<b>Adopted Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Alternative Appraised Yes/No</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
<p><b>CSP 5: Afteruse and restoration</b></p> <p>Restoration and aftercare schemes for mineral working and waste management sites should demonstrate that full advantage has been taken of their potential to help deliver sustainability objectives relating to the environment and the economy of the county.</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>It was considered that there would be no reasonable alternative for this policy. Whilst an alternative to this policy would be only to consider the environmental acceptability of submitted restoration proposals, this would not help deliver results in accordance with national and regional policy</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>The policy aims to comply with national and regional policy by seeking to ensure that afteruse and restoration proposals fully deliver sustainability objectives.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The Preferred Option is repeated in the Submission Draft (see below), with the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>This policy was slightly modified at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to include aftercare in</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p data-bbox="147 647 584 679"><b>CSP 6: Planning Obligations</b></p> <p data-bbox="147 699 725 914">Where it is not possible to achieve the necessary control through the use of planning conditions, the County Council will seek to negotiate planning obligations that ensure that development proposals:</p> <ul data-bbox="147 938 725 1326" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="147 938 725 1074">• Meet the reasonable costs of new infrastructure made necessary by the proposal including transport, utilities and community facilities;</li> <li data-bbox="147 1098 725 1161">• Secure long term management of environmental assets;</li> <li data-bbox="147 1185 725 1326">• Provide financial guarantees except where an appropriate national industry guarantee fund is already in place;</li> </ul>	<b>No</b>	The plan is required to have policies relating to Planning Obligations. There is no reasonable alternative to this.	<p data-bbox="1599 647 1962 600"><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p data-bbox="1599 699 2004 1246">The policy provides the context for securing detailed mitigation measures for particular aspects of minerals and waste management developments. It seeks to ensure that development proposals internalise any potential costs associated with future infrastructure development requirements, and make a positive contribution to sustainable communities or environmental assets.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make a positive contribution to enhancing, maintaining or promoting sustainable communities.</li> </ul>			<p data-bbox="1599 408 2011 475"><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p data-bbox="1599 496 2011 715">The Preferred Option is included in the Submission Draft with minor modifications to wording (see below), and the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.</p> <p data-bbox="1599 783 2011 850"><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p data-bbox="1599 871 2011 1343">This policy was introduced at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage to reflect Planning Circular 05/2005 which states that Development Frameworks should include high level policies that set out the matters to be covered by planning obligations and factors to be taken into account when considering</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 7: Strategic Areas for New Developments</b></p> <p>Carlisle and the Workington/Whitehaven area in the north, and Barrow in Furness and the Kendal area in the south are identified as the strategic locations for major new Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer Stations, and the Penrith area for a Transfer Station for the Municipal Waste Management Strategy's preferred</p>	<p><b>Yes in Sustainability Appraisal Issues and Options Report.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Issue 2: Strategic approach to the location of waste facilities.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Option 2A;</b> Centralised provision of two large scale waste facilities, located adjacent to rail</p>	<p>There has been consideration of alternative strategic approaches to the location of waste management facilities (Waste Issue 2 Options 2A <i>Centralised</i> and 2B <i>Decentralised</i>) in the Issues and Options SA report; however alternative strategic areas have not been appraised.</p>	<p>the scale and form of contributions.</p> <p>The policy has been modified at the Submission Draft stage to clarify that financial guarantees will be provided where it is not possible to achieve the necessary control through the use of planning conditions, except where an appropriate national industry guarantee fund is already in place.</p> <p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>In relation to the proposed pattern of waste management facilities, these need to accord with broad locations that have been identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy and need also to reflect details of the emerging Municipal Waste Management Strategy and the long term municipal</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
solution for managing municipal waste.	network access points or major roads.	Minerals Issue 3 considered the option of redistribution of quarrying from current extraction sites (3A) against no redistribution of sites (3B). Both options scored comparably against most of the SA objectives, with the exception of Option 3A (i.e. redistribution) performing less strongly against the landscape quality objective. It however left a question open for consideration in further stages in relation to the appropriateness of a policy emphasis on the concentration of extraction where it is already taking place or, alternatively, on the promotion of a different pattern of extraction.	waste contract. Provisions relating to gypsum have been included as the Submission Draft MWDF needs to identify additional resources of gypsum before the underground gypsum mine closes. The County Council's Preferred Sites will be identified in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document which is programmed for consultation in the autumn of 2008. However, as it is likely that planning applications for some of the new municipal waste management facilities would need to be submitted before then; potential sites are identified in the Waste Core Strategy.
The Kirkby Thore/Long Marton area is identified as the only location for further supplies of gypsum.	<b>Waste Option 2B:</b> Decentralised network of waste facilities, provided close to waste sources (e.g. urban areas, centres of industrial and commercial activity).		
Land next to High Greenscoe Quarry is identified as the only location for further supplies of mudstones for the Askam in Furness brickworks.	<b>Minerals Issue 3: Strategic Location of minerals sites.</b>		
The igneous rocks near Ghyll Scaur Quarry are identified as the only location for further supplies of very high specification roadstone.	<b>Minerals Option 3A:</b> Active redistribution of quarrying away from problem areas with, subject to proper consideration of environmental effects, new sites identified in areas where extraction was previously non existent or limited.		
Supply and production areas, strategic locations and preferred sites for further supplies of sand and gravel and crushed rock for general aggregate use will be identified in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and Proposals Map	<b>Minerals Option 3B:</b> No redistribution of sites, allowing for extensions and	Alternatives/options in relation to the extraction of	

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
	<p>new sites in areas where there are current concerns about transport and amenity impacts. Exploration of mitigation measures and the use of planning agreements with mineral operators to set in place further compensatory measures for communities.</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue/Option 4: Ghyll Scaur Quarry</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Option 4A:</b> actively acknowledging Ghyll Scaur Quarry as a nationally significant resource, thereby implying a presumption in favour of further extraction at the site, subject to site level assessments.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 4B:</b> no active acknowledgement of Ghyll Scaur Quarry as a nationally significant resource within the plan.</p>	<p>gypsum were not considered at the Issues and Options SA report as the Discussion Paper noted that new no new consents for mining gypsum will be required until towards the end of the plan period. Provisions for anhydrite would only be necessary in terms of protecting entrances and workings from sterilisation by other forms of development.</p> <p>In relation to High Greenscoe Quarry, Mineral Issue 6 from the Issues and Options SA report, considered the extension of the Quarry (Option 6A) against the identification of new sites for the extraction of mudstones (Option 6B). The findings of the SA identified the extension of</p>	<p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>There is limited flexibility in the locations for minerals development as they can only be worked where they occur. Alternatives were considered in the Issues and Options SA; the findings of which accord with provisions included in policy CSP7 which support the extraction of mudstone and very high specification roadstone in their current locations.</p> <p>One of the key findings of the Preferred Options SA (February 2007) was the need to establish a clearer spatial view on whether appropriate sites for both minerals extraction and waste management can be identified in Cumbria (paragraph 6.2). This policy represents an important step</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
	<p>This may lead to future consents being refused in the area.</p> <p>Minerals Issue / Option 6: Brick making mudstone</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 6A:</b> allow extension of High Greenscoe Quarry, subject to appropriate provision of mitigation and compensation/enhancement measures by the minerals operator.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 6B:</b> active encouragement of new sources of brick making mudstone away from High Greenscoe Quarry, in recognition of the specific environmental constraints of the site.</p>	<p>High Greenscoe Quarry (Option M6A) as the Preferred Option overall, provided that adequate mitigation/ compensation was identified for the potential woodland loss.</p> <p>Regarding Ghyll Scaur Quarry, Mineral Issue 4 considered the options of further extraction at the site (Option 4A) against not allowing future extraction consents (Option 4B). The outcome of the assessment highlighted that, if Cumbria is seeking to maximise the contribution of the minerals sector to the economy, and if there are few concerns about the sensitivity of the site itself, Option M4A (further extraction at the site) would be preferable.</p>	<p>forward. As stated above however, Plan provisions in relation to site allocations and the accompanying SA implications will be addressed the Proposed Changes to the Preferred Options Site Allocations document (programmed for consultation in autumn 2008).</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>This policy was put in place at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage for the identification of strategic areas for the development of Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer Stations for waste, the extraction of gypsum, brickmaking mudstones, high specification roadstone and</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<b>Waste Core Strategy Policies</b>			
<p><b>CSP 8: Provision for waste</b></p> <p>Provision will be made for the management of all of Cumbria's wastes (net self-sufficiency) within the county. Any proposals to manage wastes from outside the county would have to demonstrate that the local social and economic benefits outweigh other sustainability criteria. These other criteria include the impacts of the additional "waste miles" and the principles of managing waste as close as possible to its source with each community taking responsibility for its own wastes. Any proposals would have to demonstrate that their environmental impacts are acceptable.</p>	<p><b>Yes, in Issues and Options SA report.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Issue 1:</b> Overall approach to waste management, energy from waste, number of sites required and recycling/composting targets.</p> <p><b>Option 1A:</b> Provide for more than Cumbria's wastes</p> <p><b>Option 1B:</b> Provide only for Cumbria's wastes</p> <p><b>Waste Option 1C:</b> Provide for less than Cumbria's</p>	<p>The different approaches to waste management (to provide for more than Cumbria's waste vs to provide only for Cumbria's wastes vs to provide for less than Cumbria's wastes) were assessed as part of the Issues and Options SA which concluded that the option of providing for more than Cumbria's wastes would potentially appear as the most sustainable option if Cumbria's local economy was the key political driver. However, whilst the predicted benefits of</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>A model of net self sufficiency within the County Council appears to be the most appropriate as there is concern about the capacity of the area to absorb the level of development and the associated transport movements that would flow from an approach which provides for more than Cumbria's waste.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The policy corresponds most</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
This policy does not relate to radioactive wastes which are considered separately	wastes	providing for only Cumbria's wastes turned out to be lower, this option appeared to be the most appropriate where there is concern about the capacity of the area to absorb the level of development and the associated transport movements that would flow from such an approach.	<p>closely with Option 1B and is in line with the findings of the Issues and Options SA report. This option appeared to be the most appropriate where there is concern about the capacity of the area to absorb the level of development and the associated transport movements that would flow from such an approach.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>The policy was modified at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to include reference to the negative effects derived from the increased "waste miles" when managing waste from outside the County and to reflect concerns about climate change (as</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 9: Waste Capacity</b></p> <p>Capacity will be provided for managing and treating between 340,000 and 462,000 tonnes/year of municipal waste and between 659,000 and 750,000 tonnes/year of commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period. Around 7 million cubic metres of landfill capacity will be provided, including the void space remaining in sites that have planning permission.</p> <p><b>An Integrated Network</b></p> <p>Sufficient sites will be identified for an integrated network of a range of appropriate and necessary waste management facilities across the county, and preference will be given to sites that can accommodate more than one type of</p>	<p><b>Yes in Issues and Options SA Report.</b></p> <p><b>Waste Capacity:</b></p> <p><b>Waste Issue 1:</b> Overall approach to waste management, energy from waste, number of sites required and recycling/composting targets.</p> <p><b>Option 1A:</b> Provide for more than Cumbria's wastes</p> <p><b>Option 1B:</b> Provide only for Cumbria's wastes</p> <p><b>Waste Option 1C:</b> Provide for less than Cumbria's</p>	<p>In relation to <b>Waste Issue 1</b>, the findings of the Issues and Options SA report highlighted that whilst Option W1A would provide some major economic benefits, it would also have the potential to generate negative environmental and social effects at the site level. Option W1B also performed well, but it was stressed that some benefits provided by W1A would be significantly lower, and that there would be similar potential issues arising at the site selection and development level. On the grounds of the SA findings,</p>	<p>highlighted in Objective 1).</p> <p>The policy has not been modified further for inclusion at the Submission Draft stage.</p> <p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>The policy includes a range of figures for waste management to reflect the Waste Strategy 2007 and the draft Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>This policy amalgamates different policy provisions considered in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007). Therefore, individual policy components will be treated separately in order to discuss compliance with SA</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>facility. Any proposal for the alternative of a centralised network will be considered in the context of the Generic Development Control policies.</p> <p><b>Waste Facilities</b></p> <p>To enable the waste capacity and integrated network to be provided the plan will seek to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>eleven sites of around 2ha for waste treatment facilities, (these could include Materials Recovery Facilities, Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer/bulking stations), and</li> <li>two sites of between 2 and 4.5ha for Energy from Waste gasification plants or incinerators, and</li> <li>an additional 2 million cubic metres of landfill capacity in addition to the void space remaining in existing permitted sites, and</li> <li>nine new or enlarged Household Waste Recycling Centres, with</li> </ul>	<p>wastes</p> <p><b>Waste Issue 4:</b> Landfill thresholds.</p> <p><b>Option 4A:</b> Retain existing landfill thresholds</p> <p><b>Option 4B:</b> Support reduction of landfill thresholds and movement of waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p><b>Option 4C:</b> Provide for the RSS's 10 year estimate of need which would effectively result in an increase in landfill capacity from the present provision.</p> <p><b>An Integrated Network:</b></p> <p><b>Waste Issue 2:</b> Strategic approach to the location of waste facilities</p> <p><b>Waste Option 2A:</b> Centralised provision of two large scale waste facilities, located adjacent to rail</p>	<p>it was concluded that Option W1C could be discounted from further assessment.</p> <p><b>Option W4B</b> emerged as being the most sustainable option in relation to landfill thresholds, with relative benefits particularly in relation to waste management, economic and social objectives. It was also highlighted, however, that any negative issues of concern in relation to Options W4A and W4C could be addressed at the site level, assisted by effective public communication/ participation and through good working practices. Option 4B performed most strongly because it was assumed that this will lead to less waste being landfilled in Cumbria. However, the key</p>	<p>findings.</p> <p><b>Waste Capacity:</b></p> <p>The policy is in line with the findings of the SA which concluded that whilst providing for more of Cumbria's wastes would score strongly against economic criteria, the option of net self sufficiency would be most appropriate where there is concern about the capacity of the area to absorb the level of development and the associated transport movements that would flow from the providing for a higher level of provision.</p> <p>With specific reference to landfill, the Issues and Options SA report reviewed different thresholds for determining when new landfill consents should be granted (Waste Issue 4)</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>innovative solutions or alternative sites kept under review for smaller communities.</p>	<p>network access points or major roads.</p> <p><b>Waste Option 2B:</b> A decentralised network of waste facilities, provided close to waste sources (e.g. urban areas, centres of industrial and commercial activity).</p> <p><b>Waste Facilities:</b> Related to potential impacts associated with waste management sites at a more strategic level (<b>Waste Issue 4:</b> Landfill Thresholds) discussed above.</p>	<p>question raised in considering the Preferred Option, was whether a reduced threshold would actually lead to a reduction in new/extended landfill sites and / or whether other policy initiatives might be better placed to achieve this, including wider regulatory and fiscal measures.</p> <p>Overall, however, the SA acknowledged that it is likely that the Preferred Option would need to reflect regionally and nationally set targets for landfill in the area, as a legitimate means of waste management, albeit as a 'last resort' (Option W4C). Whilst this could generate more negative impacts in relation to some sustainability objectives, these should be</p>	<p>rather than absolute capacities. Provisions within this policy correspond most closely to Option 4C, which has been included to reflect the landfill capacity requirements presented in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. The SA implications of this will require further review at the Site Allocations stage.</p> <p><b>An Integrated Network:</b></p> <p>On the grounds of viability (and therefore deliverability) Policy CSP9 is based on a decentralised model. The potential effects in environmental terms will need to be considered further at the Site Allocations stage.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>Each of the policy provisions</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
		<p>weighed up against the potentially more severe repercussions for sustainability that falling short of providing sufficient landfill capacity within Cumbria would generate.</p> <p>With respect to the Integrated Network, the SA highlighted that <b>Option W2A</b> would perform well in terms of supporting employment and innovation within the sector, developing opportunities for energy from waste, and also minimising potential overall environmental impacts.</p> <p><b>Option W2B</b> was shown to have more potentially negative effects in environmental terms with a greater number of sites required.</p>	<p>are considered separately in turn below:</p> <p><b>Waste Capacity:</b></p> <p>The figures presented in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to the Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) Waste Capacity changed from those presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) to reflect higher maximum figures for managing municipal and commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period. The figure for landfill capacity did not change significantly from the one proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007), as the addition of the two additional million cubic metres to the estimated capacity presented in the Scoping Report would provide for around 7 million</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
			<p>cubic metres of landfill capacity (figure presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options February 2007). The Scoping Report (July 2006) stated that “<i>capacity for municipal waste is estimated at 5.5 million cubic metres</i>”.</p> <p>Policy provisions have not changed for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy.</p> <p><b><i>An Integrated Network:</i></b></p> <p>Policy changed slightly in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to include the words “appropriate and necessary” before waste management facilities.</p> <p>The policy has not been modified for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
			<p><b><i>Waste Facilities:</i></b></p> <p>The policy on Waste Sites did not change significantly from the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007). The only new addition to the policy was clarification that the 2 million cubic metres of landfill capacity was in addition to the void space remaining in existing permitted sites.</p> <p>The policy has been slightly modified for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy to increase the capacity range of waste treatment facilities.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 10: High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes Storage</b></p> <p>Developments involving the interim storage of these wastes at Sellafield will only be permitted where criteria are satisfied relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>benefit clearly outweighing the detrimental effects,</li> <li>compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security, which, if appropriate, are independently reviewed;</li> <li>reasons are explained for rejecting alternative locations and methods that have been considered and</li> <li>that there are no overall adverse impacts on the local economy.</li> </ul> <p>Permission will be granted only if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all possible measures are taken to minimise the adverse effects of development and associated infrastructure; and,</li> </ul>	<p><b>No.</b></p>	<p>No alternatives were considered at the Issues and Options stage as the topic was subject to a national level review. Exploration of alternatives in the absence of clear overall requirements was considered to be inappropriate.</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>In the light of uncertainties about national policy for managing higher level wastes, the plan includes a policy for such proposals, using Structure Plan Policy ST4 as the basis for the policy as it is likely that further planning applications will be submitted in connection with interim storage of higher level wastes at Sellafield.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The findings of the assessment presented in the Preferred Options (February 2007) SA report highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a better understanding of the 'waste miles' (road</li> </ul>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• where appropriate, provision is made to meet local community needs;</li> <li>• acceptable measures are secured for decommissioning and site restoration, and</li> <li>• arrangements are made for suitable local community involvement during the development, decommissioning and restoration.</li> </ul>			<p>and rail) associated with the transport of high and intermediate level radioactive waste would assist in the assessment of the likely effects of the policy as there were a number of potential 'global' and 'local' environmental and social impacts associated with the transportation of this waste; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the policy may impact on the sense of well being of people living close to the facility, given public concerns about radioactive waste.</li> </ul> <p>When Policy CSW 6 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) was assessed against SA objectives, the likely location of the high and intermediate</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
			<p>level radioactive waste management facility was unknown. However, it was assumed to be Sellafield as, this is the only location within Cumbria with the facilities to storage high and intermediate level radioactive waste. It was also assumed that the policy related to storage rather than disposal as means of the latter are under national review. Therefore the findings of the assessment presented in the Preferred Options SA report remain valid even though the policy changed slightly at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) as explained below.</p> <p>Policies presented in the Submission Draft Core Strategy policies have</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
			<p>addressed the issues raised at the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) through CSP 1: Sustainable location and design and CSP 3: Community Benefits respectively.</p>
			<p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>The policy on High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Waste Storage was modified at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to specifically refer to the “interim storage” of high and intermediate level radioactive wastes at Sellafield and not management.</p> <p>The policy has not been modified for inclusion at the</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 11: High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Waste Geological Disposal</b></p> <p>If an area of suitable geology within Cumbria is volunteered for consideration as a possible geological disposal facility, separate planning applications will be expected to be submitted at three stages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proposals for surface based site investigation including boreholes.</b> At this stage, the planning criteria will be similar to those for exploratory works for other types of development. These relate to the usual environmental impact considerations including traffic, working hours, noise, visual impact, period of operations, water resources and wildlife.</li> <li>• <b>Proposals for underground rock characterisation shafts and tunnels and an underground</b></li> </ul>	<b>No.</b>	<p>No alternatives were considered at the Issues and Options stage as the topic was subject to a national level review. Exploration of alternatives in the absence of clear overall requirements was considered to be inappropriate.</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>The development of a geological disposal facility within Cumbria for higher level wastes is not proposed. It is not considered that, as worded, the policy itself would construe policy support for the construction of new nuclear related facilities in Cumbria.</p> <p>In addition, it is not known if there are areas of the county where the geology is suitable for such a facility and further research is needed on this critical aspect. However, as the Government intends to commence the siting programme in 2008, it is therefore considered to be necessary to include a policy that relates to that</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>research laboratory.</b> Planning considerations at this stage will need to include not just the environmental impacts of the proposed operations themselves, but also the details of a generic design for a disposal facility and of its likely impacts. The planning criteria will relate to the inventory of wastes; environmental impacts; benefits clearly outweighing detrimental impacts; compliance with best international standards and best practice for the environment, safety and security; the offsetting benefits package; impacts on the local economy; and community needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proposals for a disposal facility and transport links, monitoring, site closure and restoration.</b> At this stage, there will be a reasonable expectation that planning permission will be granted. That is unless new information or material considerations demonstrate otherwise, or there are material differences from the scheme</li> </ul>			<p>programme and to the procedures that it will involve.</p> <p>The policy would only come into play if a community in Cumbria volunteered to participate in the process of finding a site and if any possible sites passed the initial screening out of areas of unsuitable geology.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The Preferred Option is repeated in the Submission Draft (see below), with the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>This policy was introduced at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>that has been developed over a considerable period of time up to this stage. Planning criteria will relate to the environmental impacts of the proposed construction and operation of the facility; the inventory of wastes to be brought to the facility; to transport matters; arrangements for local community involvement; monitoring and reporting; contingency and emergency planning issues; the offset benefits package; site decommissioning, clean-up and closure proposals; and restoration/afteruse of the site.</p>			<p>Core Strategy Preferred Options stage (August 2007) to provide procedures should radioactive waste geological disposal be proposed in Cumbria.</p> <p>The policy has not been modified for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy.</p>
<p><b>CSP 12: Low Level Radioactive Waste</b> Provision will be made for the Low Level Repository near Drigg to continue to fulfil a role as a component of the UK's radioactive waste management capability. Proposals for very long term storage or disposal of waste will have to demonstrate that they are feasible in relation to the long term integrity of the site with regard to sea level rise and</p>	<b>N</b>	<p>No alternatives were considered at the Issues and Options stage as the topic was subject to a national level review. Exploration of alternatives in the absence of clear overall requirements was considered to be inappropriate.</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b> Policy included to acknowledge that, with its reduced role in terms of the types of waste, the Repository will continue to be an integral component of the UK's waste management capability, in accordance with Government policy.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>coastal erosion. Proposals for additional storage or disposal facilities will have to demonstrate that they are within the site's radiological capacity.</p> <p><b><i>[Proposals to expand LLWR storage facility have been approved recently]</i></b></p>			<p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The SA of the Preferred Options concluded that the policy performed positively against economic criteria and highlighted that nuclear technology is considered to be a carbon efficient technology with no associated carbon emissions. However, whilst compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security is assumed, a number of potential 'global' and 'local' environmental and social impacts associated with the transportation of this waste were highlighted. As the Repository will now continue to play a limited national role (see below), a better understanding of the</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
			<p>'waste miles' (road and rail) associated with the transport of low level radioactive waste to the LLWR would assist in assessing this further.</p>
			<p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p>
			<p>The wording of the policy changed slightly at the 2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007). A second paragraph was added to the policy to include the short term provision of capacity for the storage of Low Level Radioactive waste arising from larger users such as nuclear power stations and MoD.</p>
			<p>The wording of the policy has changed since the 2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
			<p>2007) for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy to refer to the long term storage and disposal of low level waste. This change was introduced to reflect the nuclear industry's representations relating to the role of the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) near Drigg as a national repository for the short term only, five years, as proposed in the Preferred Options, or for the longer term. The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA), and others, also considered the policy to be out of line with Government policy for the management of Low Level Waste. Government policy requires the NDA to make optimal use of the LLWR as part of the national radioactive waste</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	<b>Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft</b>
			<p>management capability.</p> <p>More information is now available about the NDA's strategy and plans for making optimal use of facilities at the LLWR. Details are also emerging of the proposals for making more effective use of the facilities that have been put forward by the new company that will soon be taking over the management of the Repository. The NDA has given assurances that any further capacity would be used only for those wastes that need such an engineered facility and details provided of the measures that are being taken in connection with the waste hierarchy to minimise wastes. A new national LLW Strategy Group is being set up, of which the County</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<b>Minerals Core Strategy Policies</b>			
<p><b>CSP 13: Supply of Minerals</b></p> <p>Provision will be made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>meet the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment to Cumbria of crushed rock and sand and gravel production, but</li> <li>further apply that apportionment to take account of Cumbria's pattern of quarries and the areas they supply, and its dispersed settlement pattern</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes- In Issues and Options SA Report.</b></p> <p><b>Minerals 1issue 1:</b> RAWP apportionment, recycling/ secondary materials targets and sites required.</p> <p><b>Option 1A:</b> Exceed RAWP sub apportionment figures, also exceed target for aggregates from recycled/</p>	<p>The Issues and Options SA findings concluded that <b>Option M1A</b> would provide some clear economic benefits and would support the further development of the minerals and waste sector in Cumbria. However these would need to be balanced with potentially higher environmental effects</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>This policy has been included to ensure that the plan makes provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals in accordance with national (Minerals Planning Statement 1) and regional policy.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>and transport routes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identify areas sufficient to maintain landbanks of permitted reserves for supply/production areas equivalent to seven years annual average sales for sand and gravel and ten years for crushed rock for general aggregate use, throughout the plan period, and</li> <li>recognise that the high and very high skid resistance roadstone quarries, gypsum resources and High Greenscoe brick making mudstone quarry are regionally or nationally important,</li> <li>enable at least one quarter of the aggregates used within Cumbria to be met by secondary or recycled aggregates.</li> </ul>	<p>secondary sources recycling facilities.</p> <p><b>Option 1B:</b> Provide for the RSS's apportionment of 700,000 tonnes of sand and gravel per annum. Increase production levels for recycled / secondary aggregates to meet national target and RAWP targets.</p> <p><b>Option 1C:</b> Provide for less than regional apportionment on the grounds of practicality and environmental acceptability.</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 3: Strategic Location of minerals sites.</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Option 3A:</b> Active redistribution of quarrying away from problem areas with, subject to proper consideration of environmental effects, new sites identified in areas where extraction was</p>	<p>overall, particularly taking traffic movements into consideration. In relation to Option M1B, the Issues and Options SA highlighted that it would be relatively neutral, but could be considered insufficient if development of this industry sector was considered to be a fundamental political aspiration in Cumbria. In the light of the SA findings, it was recommended to exclude Option M1C from further consideration.</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 3</b> considered the option of redistribution of quarrying from current extraction sites (3A) against no redistribution of sites (3B). Both options scored comparably against most of the SA objectives, with the exception of Option 3A (i.e.</p>	<p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>Policy CSP 13 amalgamates Minerals Issues 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 as considered in the Issues and Options SA Report.</p> <p>It corresponds with Option 1B from the Issues and Options SA report and is in line with the SA findings which highlighted that although this level of production could be insufficient if economic development of Cumbria's minerals resource was considered to be a fundamental imperative, Option B provided a greater balance of economic, social and environmental considerations.</p> <p>The policy also provides for the consideration of the dispersed pattern of quarries</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
	<p>previously non existent or limited.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 3B:</b> No redistribution of sites, allowing for extensions and new sites in areas where there are current concerns about transport and amenity impacts. Exploration of mitigation measures and the use of planning agreements with mineral operators to set in place further compensatory measures for communities.</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue/Option 2: Landbanks</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Option 2A:</b> maintain current landbank policies for crushed rock and sand and gravel in Cumbria - at least 15 and 7 years respectively. Do not seek to reduce over time.</p>	<p>redistribution) performing less strongly against the landscape quality objective. It however left a question open for consideration in further stages in relation to the appropriateness of a policy emphasis on the concentration of extraction where it is already taking place or, alternatively, on the promotion of a different pattern of extraction.</p> <p>Assuming a corresponding fall in extraction, <b>Option M2B</b> would perform relatively positively in terms of the key objective for sustainable mineral extraction, and, if it further encouraged aggregate recycling as a consequence, against the sustainable waste management objective. It would also have potentially positive</p>	<p>and settlements. This links with Mineral Issue 3 which discussed the redistribution of quarrying from current extraction sites against no redistribution of sites. The outcome of this discussion was that locational choices for mineral extraction are relatively constrained and, given that both options scored comparably, left a question open in relation to the appropriateness of a policy emphasis on the concentration of extraction where it is already taking place or, alternatively, on the promotion of a different pattern of extraction. The policy approach appears to support extraction where it is already taking place, although aspects of this, particularly in relation to sand and gravel extraction, will require confirmation through</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
	<p><b>Minerals Option 2B:</b> actively seek to reduce current landbanks for crushed rock to 10 years, by exploring scope to revoke consents which could collectively have greatest environmental impacts.</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 4:</b> Ghyll Scaur Quarry.</p> <p><b>Option 4A:</b> Actively acknowledging Ghyll Scaur Quarry as a nationally significant resource, thereby implying a presumption in favour of further extraction.</p> <p><b>Option 4B:</b> No active acknowledgement of Ghyll Scaur Quarry as a nationally significant resource within the plan. This may lead to future consents being refused in the area.</p>	<p>effects on amenity and wellbeing, and would contribute positively to most environmental objectives, as it would reduce the risk of future environmental effects. However, Option M2B would not perform as well against economic objectives, including employment retention and generation.</p> <p>Assuming a fall in extraction levels, Option M2B performed generally better in relation to sustainability objectives with the exception of economic considerations. However, in the absence of a site-specific review of consented landbank reserves, it was suggested that no significant adverse impacts were flagged up with Option M2A that would justify Option M2B, given the difficulties</p>	<p>the Site Allocations.</p> <p>In relation to landbanks, policy provisions correspond to those considered in Minerals Issue Option 2B to reduce current landbanks for crushed rock to 10 years. This option scored better against sustainability objectives although the findings of the Issues and Options Stage SA report suggested that no significant adverse impacts were flagged up with Option M2A that would necessitate Option M2B. The reduction to 10 years for the crushed rock landbank however has been introduced to comply with Minerals Policy Statement 1 (Annex 1).</p> <p>Policy provisions in relation</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
	<p><b>Alternatives/options in relation to the extraction of gypsum were not considered at the Issues and Options SA report</b> as the Discussion Paper noted that new no new consents for mining gypsum will be required until towards the end of the plan period. Provisions for anhydrite would only be necessary in terms of protecting entrances and workings from sterilisation by other forms of development.</p> <p><b>Minerals Issue 6:</b> Brick making mudstone.</p> <p><b>Option 6A:</b> Allow extension of High Greenscoe Quarry, subject to appropriate provision of mitigation and compensation/enhancement measures by the minerals</p>	<p>and potential financial costs that could arise in its implementation. Although there may be individual sites within the current landbank that could not be exploited without significant environmental impacts, it was suggested that these are dealt with on a site-by-site basis.</p> <p>Regarding Ghyll Scaur Quarry, <b>Mineral Issue 4</b> considered the options of further extraction at the site (Option 4A) against not allowing future extraction consents (Option 4B). The outcome of the assessment highlighted that, if Cumbria is seeking to maximise the contribution of the minerals sector to the economy, and if there are few concerns about the sensitivity of the</p>	<p>to Ghyll Scaur Quarry correspond to Minerals Option 4A which is in line with the SA findings. These highlighted that this would be the preferred option if Cumbria is seeking to maximise the contribution of the minerals sector to the economy, and if there are few concerns about the sensitivity of the site itself.</p> <p>In relation to the High Greenscoe brickmaking mudstones, the policy also recognises these as national or regional resources. Findings of the Issues and Options SA report highlighted this as the preferred option overall, provided that adequate mitigation/ compensation was identified for the potential woodland loss on</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
	<p>operator.</p> <p><b>Option 6B:</b> Active encouragement of new sources of brick making mudstone away from High Greenscoe Quarry, in recognition of the specific environmental constraints of the site.</p>	<p>site itself, Option M4A (further extraction at the site) would be preferable.</p> <p>In relation to High Greenscoe Quarry, <b>Mineral Issue 6</b> from the Issues and Options SA report, considered the extension of the quarry (Option 6A) against the identification of new sites for the extraction of mudstones (Option 6B). The findings of the SA identified the extension of High Greenscoe Quarry (Option M6A) as the Preferred Option overall, provided that adequate mitigation/ compensation was identified for the potential woodland loss.</p>	<p>the site.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>The Supply of Minerals policy was expanded at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage to also take into account locational and spatial considerations for quarries and crushed rock and sand and gravel landbanks supply, and to emphasise the role of secondary or recycled aggregates.</p> <p>The policy has not changed in content for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy, however the wording has changed slightly to refer specifically to “primary land won” crushed rock and sand and gravel.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 14: Minerals Safeguarding</b></p> <p>Mineral resources will be safeguarded by identifying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Areas and/or Areas of Search to enable a landbank of at least seven years sales at the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment level for sand and gravel to be maintained throughout the plan period;</li> <li>A Preferred Area or Area of Search for extending Ghyll Scaur quarry for very high specification roadstone;</li> <li>An Area of Search for extending High Greenscoe quarry for brickmaking mudstones;</li> <li>A Preferred Area and/or Area of Search for working additional gypsum and a Mineral Safeguarding Area for the remaining gypsum resources;</li> <li>Mineral Safeguarding Areas for the indicative sand and gravel and hard rock resources identified by the</li> </ul>	<p><b>No.</b></p>	<p>There were not considered to be any reasonable alternatives to minerals safeguarding.</p> <p>In relation to Mineral Consultation areas, paragraph 6.10 of the Issues and Options Discussion Paper stated that “these areas (designated following the Local Government and Planning Act 1980) require review. This is an important issue, but would not generate appropriate options for testing through the SA process. The issue should be considered further by CCC in the process of formulating the plan”.</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>This policy has been introduced to reflect national planning requirements to ensure that adequate supplies of minerals can continue to be provided for future generations, by preventing minerals resources being sterilised by other forms of development. Policy provisions will help achieve provisions of policy CSP 13 <i>Supply of Minerals</i>.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The Preferred Option is repeated in the Submission Draft with only minor wording alterations (see below), with the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft  Progression to Submission Version
<p>British Geological Survey;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mineral Safeguarding Areas for resources of local building stones;</li> <li>Mineral Consultation Areas, which will include buffer zones around the Preferred Areas, Areas of Search and Mineral Safeguarding Areas.</li> </ul> <p>The need to safeguard other mineral resources, secondary aggregate resources and potential railheads and wharves, will be considered in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.</p>			<p>This policy was newly introduced at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to the Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) to safeguard mineral resources for sand and gravel, roadstone, brickmaking mudstones, gypsum and hard rock, thus helping to achieve <i>Supply of Minerals</i> policy intentions.</p> <p>The policy has been expanded for inclusion in the Submission Draft Core Strategy to also include provision for the inclusion of “Mineral Safeguarding Areas for resources of local building stones”.</p>
<p><b>CSP 15: Marine Dredged Aggregates</b></p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for developments at appropriate locations,</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	<p>In the Issues and Options SA, it was decided that although this issue could</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>To make planning provision for marine dredged</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts, that would enable the increased use of marine dredged aggregates as substitutes for land won ones.		influence conclusions drawn on levels and sources of sand from primary / recycled / secondary aggregates, no alternative options focusing on this issue alone would be explored.	aggregates, as allowed for by the Regional Aggregates Working Party before assessing the need for primary land won aggregates.  <b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b>  The Preferred Option is repeated in the Submission Draft (see below), with the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.  <b>Progression to Submission Version</b>  The policy has remained unchanged since the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007).
<b>CSP 16: Industrial Limestones</b> Planning permission for the extraction of	<b>No</b>	No reasonable alternatives were considered to the	<b>Justification/Reasoning</b> To make planning provision

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>high purity limestone will not be granted unless it is primarily for non-aggregate uses, and national or regional need has been demonstrated, or where significant benefits would accrue to local communities and/or the environment.</p>		<p>requirement to demonstrate national and regional need for the extraction of high purity limestone within Cumbria.</p>	<p>for the extraction of high purity limestone where national or regional need has been demonstrated.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>The Preferred Option is repeated in the Submission Draft (see below), with the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>The policy has remained unchanged since the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007).</p>
<p><b>CSP 17: Building Stones</b></p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for proposals that would help to provide the full range of local building stones that are</p>	<p><b>Yes in Issues and Options SA Report.</b></p> <p><b>Minerals Issue/Option 5: Local building stone</b></p>	<p>The findings of the Issues and Options SA revealed that should the selection of the option be</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>Policy complies with draft RSS policy which states that plans should identify and</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p>needed to maintain Cumbria's local distinctiveness, and that have acceptable environmental impacts.</p>	<p><b>Minerals Option 5A:</b> Maintaining the status quo with respect to supplying local building stone and slate. Focus on small-scale operations and extensions where there are no other reasonable alternatives. This option implies that a degree of importation may be required to meet needs arising within Cumbria.</p> <p><b>Minerals Option 5B:</b> Positive promotion of extraction of a greater range of local building stones to secure supplies, as far as possible, to meet Cumbrian needs. This could result in the opening of new quarries and / or significant extensions to existing operations.</p>	<p>environmentally led, it should be borne in mind that whilst Option M5B involves higher levels of extraction, it could provide potential significant benefits for the built environment within Cumbria, and reduce transport impacts associated with importation. Should Option M5B be progressed, it was suggested that it would be useful to explore whether this particular type of mineral resource coincides with areas with particular environmental sensitivities, thereby further increasing the potential environmental impacts associated with this policy.</p>	<p>protect sources of building stone for use in repairing and maintaining historic buildings and public realm improvements.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p> <p>Policy CSP I7 is in line with the findings of the SA Issues and Options Report and corresponds with Option 5A, although it is not certain whether importation may be required.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>This policy was newly introduced at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage, although the need for sourcing specific</p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
<p><b>CSP 18: Oil and Gas and Coal Bed Methane</b></p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for proposals associated with the exploration and development of onshore and offshore oil and gas and coal bed methane in appropriate locations, and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts.</p>	No	<p>Oil and gas were not considered in the Issues and Options SA as these were not considered to be a key issue as existing policies relating to these sectors were defined in the Discussion Paper. These generally noted that permission could be granted where applications are in line with wider schemes for the appraisal and development of these resources. It was reported, however, that consideration to these would be given at subsequent stages of the</p>	<p><b>Justification/Reasoning</b></p> <p>To reflect national policy. The Energy White Paper proposes that UK Continental Shelf and onshore oil and gas reserves should be sustained and exploited in the interest of maintaining security of supplies. Also to clarify the planning policy position should applications for the extraction of coal bed methane be submitted.</p> <p><b>Compliance with previous SA findings</b></p>

Adopted Core Strategy Policy	Alternative Appraised Yes/No	Discussion	Justification for selecting the related Preferred Option/s and progression to Submission Draft
		<p>MWDF preparation.</p> <p>The extraction of coal bed methane was not highlighted as an issue at this stage.</p>	<p>The Preferred Option for Coal Bed Methane is repeated in the Submission Draft (see below), with the SA findings provided in Appendix 6.</p> <p><b>Progression to Submission Version</b></p> <p>This was a newly introduced policy at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007) stage. However, it only referred to Coal Bed Methane at that stage.</p>
			<p>The policy has been expanded since to also include provisions for oil and gas exploitation.</p>