

**CUMBRIA MINERALS AND
WASTE DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK**

**Sustainability Appraisal
Stage 2.1 Report: Changes to
Preferred Options Core Strategy**

**Prepared for
Cumbria County Council
by
Land Use Consultants**

October 2007

37 Otago Street
Glasgow G12 8JJ
Tel: 0141 334 9595
Fax: 0141 334 7789
glasgow@landuse.co.uk

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background To The Development Framework.....	1
Sustainability Appraisal.....	1
Report Structure.....	2
2. PLAN OBJECTIVES.....	3
Introduction.....	3
3. CHANGES TO THE CORE STRATEGY POLICIES.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Overall Strategy.....	5
Waste Core Strategy	6
Minerals Core Strategy.....	7
4. CONCLUSIONS.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Key Conclusions.....	9

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Plan Objectives

Appendix 2: Core Strategy Policies

Appendix 3: Additional Appraisal Matrices

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

- I.1. Cumbria County Council is currently preparing the Cumbria Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF), which will comprise the Core Strategy, Site Allocations Policies, Generic Development Control Policies and a Proposals Map. This Framework will replace the current Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996-2006) and guide minerals and waste development in Cumbria over the period up to 2020.
- I.2. The main stages in the preparation of the MWDF are as follows:
 - (i) Issues and Options;
 - (ii) Preferred Options;
 - (iii) Submission of Draft Plan;
 - (iv) Examination in Public;
 - (v) Inspectors Report;
 - (vi) Adoption.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- I.3. The MWDF is subject to a full sustainability appraisal (SA) under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and national planning policy (Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks). Preparation of the MWDF must also be in accordance with the requirements of the European Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (Directive 2001/42/EC).
- I.4. Following preliminary work undertaken by Cumbria County Council, including preparation of the SA Scoping Report by the Council's Sustainability Team, Land Use Consultants (LUC) were appointed by the County Council in August 2006 to complete the SA of the Cumbria MWDF. The first phase of the appraisal, in relation to the Issues and Options, was completed in October 2006. The second phase of the appraisal, completed in February 2007, was undertaken in relation to the Preferred Options, namely in relation to the following interrelated policy documents:
 - (i) The Core Strategy;
 - (ii) The Site Allocations;
 - (iii) The Generic Development Control Policies.
- I.5. The Preferred Options were published for consultation by the County Council in March 2007. Changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy are proposed as a consequence of this and are now being reissued for further consultation. This Stage 2.1 Report outlines the key findings of the appraisal of the proposed changes. This draws significantly on the SA of the Issues and Options (Stage One) and on the SA of the Preferred Options (Stage Two), and should be read in conjunction with these reports.

- I.6. This appraisal relates only to the Core Strategy document. As outlined in the Stage Two report, the role of the Core Strategy is, firstly, to set out the long term spatial vision and the strategic direction and objectives of the plan. It then has to set out clear and concise strategic policies and proposals to deliver that vision and provide certainty for the future. The Core Strategy must:
- (i) cover all significant strategic issues facing Cumbria;
 - (ii) demonstrate that it accords with national policies and the Regional Spatial Strategy and relate these to the context of Cumbria;
 - (iii) provide a cohesive and comprehensive framework against which the appropriateness and soundness of the subsequent Development Plan Documents (DPDs) can be assessed, namely the site allocation policies; proposals map and the generic development control policies;
 - (iv) include a monitoring and implementation framework with clear objectives for achieving delivery.
- I.7. The Generic Development Control Policies are being taken forward into the Draft Development Framework. The Site Allocations document is being revised to include additional sites and remove others no longer proposed. Consultation in relation to the revised site allocations is programmed for late 2008/early 2009.

REPORT STRUCTURE

- I.8. Following this introduction, Chapter Two addresses the SA of the revised Plan Objectives. Chapter Three provides an overview of the SA findings for the changes to the Core Strategy Policies. Chapter Four outlines the key conclusions of the appraisal.
- I.9. The Long Term Spatial Vision for the Plan has not been appraised separately as the component parts are picked up in the Plan Objectives and the Preferred Policies. This is however 'brought together' with reference to the Long Term Spatial Vision in the concluding chapter.
- I.10. A number of supporting appendices are also provided. These are identified in the contents page and cross-referred to in the text.

2. PLAN OBJECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. The draft Plan Objectives were tested against the sustainability objectives in the SA Scoping Report prepared by Cumbria County Council (Section 12, Scoping Report, July 2006) and modified prior to inclusion in the Preferred Core Strategy (February 2007).
- 2.2. An appraisal of the sustainability implications of the proposed changes to the Preferred Core Strategy Objectives is included as **Appendix I** and summarised in **Table 2.1** below.

Table 2.1: Summary of Appraisal of Revised Objectives

Revised Objective	Implication for SA
Objective 1. That minerals and waste management developments will take due account of the issues of climate change, in particular through energy use and transport; that any adverse impacts on the environment and the local economy will be minimised and that potential benefits will be maximised.	This objective now addresses a wider range of SA objectives. In delivering the plan, striking a balance between potentially conflicting objectives will be key.
Objective 2. That effective waste minimisation measures will be adopted and, following these, that waste, including radioactive waste, will be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy. In order to secure this, that the right type of waste management facilities that Cumbria needs to increase the amounts of its wastes that are re-used, recycled, or composted will be provided in the right places and at the right time in order to minimise the disposal of waste to landfill.	The plan objective now performs more strongly against the key SA objective of minimising waste, albeit that the contribution of the planning system to waste minimisation needs to be defined clearly. Deliverability of the sustainability benefits of the objective is also enhanced by direct reference to the facilities required.
Objective 3. That waste will be managed as near as possible to where it is produced without endangering people's health and without harming the environment.	No significant modifications to Plan Objective.
Objective 4. That the minerals from Cumbria that are required to meet local, regional and national needs will be supplied from appropriately located and environmentally acceptable sources.	The plan objective now performs more strongly against the key SA objective of managing mineral resources sustainably by making a clear reference to an overall level of extraction which has been agreed following broad consideration of environmental, social and economic considerations. The reference to appropriate locations also acknowledges the role of careful siting in minimising impacts.

Revised Objective	Implication for SA
Objective 5. That the need for new mining and quarrying will be minimised by prudent use of resources and by supplies of alternative re-used and recycled materials.	No significant SA implications.
Objective 6. That mineral resources will be identified and safeguarded.	It could be argued that the Plan Objective now performs less strongly against the key SA objective of managing mineral resources sustainably. However, the role of safeguarding mineral resources is not to prevent their extraction and this objective needs to be considered in combination with other plan objectives designed to promote the efficient use of mineral resources.
Objective 7. That the local economic benefits of minerals and waste management developments will be optimised without harming the environment.	Whilst the revised wording performs more strongly against environmental SA objectives, the site allocation and generic development control policies will be key to actually delivering this.
Objective 8. That the overall quality of Cumbria's environment will be protected and, where practicable, enhanced by high standards of design and operation in new developments and high standards of restoration once developments have been completed.	The revised wording performs more strongly against environmental SA objectives as it now relates more closely to the characteristics of anticipated waste management processes and associated facilities.
Objective 9. That the environmental impacts of minerals and waste management developments, including traffic, will be kept to a minimum by appropriate siting of facilities and sound working practices and that any unavoidable harmful impacts will be mitigated.	The revised wording performs more strongly against environmental SA objectives as a consequence of these changes.
Objective 10. That there will be increased community and stakeholder involvement and ownership of initiatives and planning for sustainable minerals and waste developments.	Subject to successful delivery, this performs well against SA Objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well being of people by increasing community involvement and ownership.

3. CHANGES TO THE CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

- 3.1. The Core Strategy Policies comprise the following:
- the Preferred Overall Strategy and Core Strategy Policies 1 to 7;
 - the Preferred Waste Strategy and Core Strategy Policies 8 to 16;
 - the Preferred Minerals Strategy and Core Strategy Policies 17 to 22.
- 3.2. An appraisal of the sustainability implications of the proposed changes to the Preferred Core Strategy policies is included as **Appendix 2**, with the key findings summarised below. The appraisal has been undertaken by reviewing the Strategies and their related policies against the corresponding Stage Two appraisal of the Preferred Options. Further appraisal work has been undertaken for the new policies which were not appraised at the Preferred Option or Issues and Options stages. These are included as **Appendix 3**.

OVERALL STRATEGY

- 3.3. **Core Strategy Policy 1: Sustainable Location and Design** has been revised to reflect the increasing emphasis on the climate change agenda with this, the first objective of the Core Strategy, referring to the climate change issues which are significant for minerals and waste management developments. The performance of this policy against SA objectives in relation to climate change has therefore been strengthened (the supporting questions for the SA Framework for Cumbria were modified in February 2007 to include greater reference to climate change). However, delivering the sustainability benefits associated with this policy will be challenging as this is very much an emerging area of planning policy and is also heavily reliant on supporting economic and technological initiatives.
- 3.4. **Core Strategy Policy 2: Environmental Assets** and **Core Strategy Policy 4: Local Economic Benefit** now perform very strongly against the environmental and economic SA objectives respectively. However, the need to strike a balance between potentially competing plan (and also SA objectives) has been a continuing 'theme' of the SA work undertaken and arguably this becomes increasingly difficult to achieve when individual policies are strengthened further. For example, the mitigation of all significant environmental impacts may not be possible in practice (Policy 2) if the economic objectives are to be fully realised.
- 3.5. **Core Strategy Policy 5: Planning Obligations** has been introduced 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 the scale and form of contributions. The policy 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.

This policy will have a key role in play in delivering the sustainability intentions of the Preferred Options Core Strategy and in striking a balance between potentially competing plan and SA objectives.

- 3.6. **Core Strategy Policy 6: Community Benefits** has been introduced to offset and compensate for potential impacts on communities derived from hosting national or regional facilities. This policy scores well against the SA objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well being of people, albeit that effective and equitable delivery of such a policy will require skilful implementation which successfully reflects Objective 10 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy, which seeks increased community and stakeholder involvement and ownership of initiatives and planning for sustainable minerals and waste developments.
- 3.7. **Core Strategy Policy 7: Strategic Areas for New Developments** is new and has been put in place 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 sand and gravel and crushed rock, in accordance with the proposed waste policies 12 and 13 and minerals policies 17 and 19. One of the key findings of the Stage Two SA report (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 forward. Plan policy development in relation to site allocations is ongoing and will be addressed in relation to the Preferred Options Site Allocations document (programmed for consultation in autumn 2008).

WASTE CORE STRATEGY

- 3.8. The new reference in the preferred waste strategy to the promotion of value recovery from wastes strengthens performance against the key SA objective NR4. As **Core Strategy Policy 8: Provision for Waste** has been modified to include reference to the negative effects from the increased 'waste miles' associated with managing waste from outside the county, the performance of this policy against SA objectives in relation to climate change has been strengthened.
- 3.9. The maximum capacity figures included in **Core Strategy Policy 9: Waste Capacity** for managing municipal and commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period have increased significantly. As the upper end of the range of estimated figures is higher, it stands to reason that both positive and negative SA impacts could be greater than predicted in the Stage Two Report, although this would be influenced by other factors in addition to overall processing capacity. Whilst the logic for not including waste reduction policies in the Core Strategy is understood, the SA has previously identified the need for co-ordinated cross-agency action to encourage waste minimisation and the potential contribution of the planning system should not be ruled out entirely. In addition, Plan Objective 2 now refers to the adoption of effective waste minimisation measures so there is a danger of internal plan inconsistency if this is not clarified.
- 3.10. By making a firm commitment to delivering the sites required for the facilities necessary to meet targets for reducing household and municipal waste to landfill and for increasing recycling, **Core Strategy Policy 11: Reducing Landfill** scores

strongly against Key Objective NR4 to manage resources sustainably and to minimise waste and would also contribute to economic objectives ECI and EC3. However, as first discussed in the Stage One Report, the construction and operation of new waste management facilities can score negatively against social and environmental objectives. Whilst waste management facilities can often be perceived as ‘bad neighbours’ by the general public, in practice many safeguards and working practices are in place to ensure that their impacts are minimised. However, some impacts are relatively difficult to mitigate, and these are largely transport related or linked with perceptions and awareness of the sector.

- 3.11. In relation to **Core Strategy Policy 14: High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes Storage**, 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 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 the results of the national review with respect to the latter were awaited. Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal findings for this policy area, as presented in the Stage Two Report still apply. Following publication of the Government’s consultation paper *Managing Radioactive Waste Safely – A framework for implementing geological disposal* (June 2007), the revised Preferred Options Core Strategy now includes **Core Strategy Policy 15: High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Waste Geological Disposal** which would only come into effect should a deep disposal site within Cumbria be volunteered. Whilst this policy area is highly specialised and does not always fit neatly with the appraisal questions, the policy does score well against the overarching key objective NR4 in that it seeks to define the planning context for responding to the identified need for the long term management of these types of wastes in the light of the current governmental review. The policy also performs well by referring to consideration of environmental impacts and arrangements for community involvement.

MINERALS CORE STRATEGY

- 3.12. The **Preferred Minerals Strategy** now has a more explicit reference to making provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals and to the need for environmental protection. As the previously assessed Preferred Core Strategy Policies sought to support these aims, there are no implications for the SA findings. However, the need to strike a balance between potentially competing plan (and also SA) objectives has been a continuing ‘theme’ of the SA work undertaken and arguably this becomes increasingly difficult to achieve when individual components are strengthened further.
- 3.13. The majority of the preferred minerals policies remain unchanged. However, **Core Strategy Policy 17: Supply of Minerals** has been expanded 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. The assessment of Core Strategy Policy 17 relates back to the assessment presented in the original Stage Two Report, which concluded that the supply of

minerals policy (CSM1) corresponded with Option 1B from the Stage One Report. Although the assessed Policy CSM1 did not refer to secondary or recycled aggregates, Minerals Issue 1B in the Stage One Report included these, and therefore the findings of the assessment presented in the Stage Two Report (February 2007) remain valid (paras 3.21 to 3.29 and Appendix 1 and 2). These, however, also need to be supplemented with the findings of the assessment of Issue/Option 3 (Strategic location of mineral sites) and Issue/Option 2 (Landbanks) presented in the Stage One Report (November 2006). The Stage One Report also appraised the alternative options referred to (Minerals Issues 1, 2 and 3).

- 3.14. **Core Strategy Policy 19: Minerals Safeguarding** is new and seeks to safeguard mineral resources for sand and gravel, roadstone, brickmaking mudstones, gypsum and hard rock, thus helping to achieve the policy intention of Core Strategy Policy 17: *Supply of Minerals*. The policy does, however, effectively combine policies CSM 3 *Sand and Gravel Supply*, CSM 1 *Supply of Minerals*, CSM 7 *Brickmaking Mudstones*, CSM 6 *Gypsum*, and CSM 2: *Crushed Rock Supply* as presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007). Therefore, the corresponding assessments, as presented in the SA Stage Two Report (February 2007) still apply (see paragraph 3.31 and Appendix 1; paragraph 3.24 and Appendix 1; paragraph 3.25 and Appendix 1; paragraphs 3.33 and 3.34 and Appendix 2 (Policy CSM 6 Gypsum); and paragraph 3.29 and Appendix 1 respectively).
- 3.15. **Core Strategy Policy 21: Building Stones** is a new policy, although the need for sourcing specific local stone in defined areas was highlighted at the Issues and Options stage. The policy scores positively in ensuring adequate provision of local building stone and protection of resources from sterilisation. Whilst it potentially scores negatively against minimising primary extraction in favour of the use of secondary/ recycled materials, substitutes are limited, particularly as this policy is seeking to help maintain Cumbria's local built distinctiveness. Given this latter point, the policy would contribute positively to meeting Objective EN3 regarding improving the quality of the built environment and to the economic objectives (EC1 and EC3). The potential negative effects of the policy on other sustainability/Plan Objectives should be avoided, reduced and then mitigated as far as is possible through appropriate application of the Site Allocation and Generic Development Control Policies.
- 3.16. **Core Strategy Policy 22: Coal Bed Methane** is a new policy which has been added to ensure that all minerals which may in future be extracted in Cumbria have adequate policy coverage. The extraction of Coal Bed Methane (CBM) involves drilling directly into unworked coal and coal strata to release the methane adsorbed to the coal without detrimentally affecting the physical properties of the coal. As methane can be fed directly into the gas distribution network, this policy scores positively against resource management SA objectives as it diversifies the use of energy minerals. Whilst the policy potentially scores strongly against environmental and social SA objectives in that it includes a policy presumption in favour of proposals for exploitation in appropriate locations, which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts, the Generic Development Control policies will play a key supporting role in achieving these objectives, particularly as Core Strategy Policy 22 does not provide a firm steer with regard to this.

4. CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

- 4.1. The Preferred Options were published for consultation by the County Council in March 2007. Changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy are proposed as a consequence of this and are now being reissued for further consultation. This Stage 2.1 Report outlines the key findings of the sustainability appraisal of the proposed changes.

KEY CONCLUSIONS

- 4.2. A significant number of the plan objectives/policies remain unchanged and therefore the findings of the previous SA work in relation to these remain valid. The wording of a number of additional policies has been amended slightly to improve their clarity, and again there are no implications for the SA.
- 4.3. However, the appraisal of the proposed changes has highlighted a number of issues for consideration in progressing the MWDF to the next stages and, crucially, for delivering the Long Term Spatial Vision for the plan period. These are outlined below.

Responding To Climate Change

- 4.4. The Preferred Objectives and Policies have been revised to reflect the increasing emphasis on the climate change agenda with specific reference to the climate change issues which are significant for minerals and waste management developments, including their 'carbon footprints'. Performance against SA objectives in relation to climate change has therefore been strengthened (the supporting questions for the SA Framework for Cumbria were modified in February 2007 to include greater reference to climate change). However, delivering this key policy intention and component of the Long Term Spatial Vision will be challenging as this is very much an emerging area of planning policy and is also heavily reliant on supporting economic and technological initiatives.

Strengthening Of Individual Policies

- 4.5. A number of individual policies have been strengthened. For example, Core Strategy Policy 2: Environmental Assets and Core Strategy Policy 4: Local Economic Benefit now perform very strongly against the environmental and economic SA objectives respectively. In addition, the Preferred Minerals Strategy now has a more explicit reference to making provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals and to the need for environmental protection. However, the need to strike a balance between potentially competing plan (and also SA) objectives has been a continuing 'theme' of the SA work undertaken and arguably this becomes increasingly difficult to deliver when individual policies are strengthened further. For example, the mitigation of *all* significant environmental impacts may not be possible in practice (Core Strategy Policy 2) if the economic objectives are to be fully realised. Both the Site Allocation

and the Generic Development Control Policies will have a key role to play in efforts to deliver this balance in line with the Long Term Spatial Vision for the plan period.

Waste Management Capacity

- 4.6. As the upper end of the range of capacity figures for managing municipal and commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period has increased significantly, it stands to reason that both the related positive and negative SA impacts could be greater than predicted in the Stage Two Report. However, there is considerable uncertainty in relation to the capacity required to manage commercial and industrial waste streams and the actual sustainability implications would also be influenced by other factors in addition to overall processing capacity. Again, 'successful' implementation of the Site Allocation and the Generic Development Control policies will be key in delivering both the related Plan Objectives and this important component of the Long Term Spatial Vision.

The Planning Remit

- 4.7. Two policy areas have been highlighted where the role of the planning system in supporting and/or delivering wider sustainable waste management (and energy generation) policies may need to be clarified in response to ongoing debate during consultation:
- Plan Objective 2 now performs more strongly against the key SA objective of minimising waste and supports delivery of the Long Term Spatial Vision as it begins with *effective waste minimisation measures will be adopted*. However, the supporting text in relation to the Waste Core Strategy (How Much Waste? Paras. 6.25 – 6.43 and Box 11) explains the rationale for not including waste reduction policies in the Core Strategy. Whilst this is understood, the SA has previously identified the need for co-ordinated cross-agency action to encourage waste minimisation and the potential contribution of the planning system should not be ruled out entirely. In addition, given the wording of Plan Objective 2, there is a danger of internal plan inconsistency if this is not clarified.
 - Core Strategy Policy 15: High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Waste Geological Disposal scores well against the overarching key SA objective in that it seeks to define the planning context for responding to the identified need for the long term management of these types of wastes in the light of the current governmental review. On this basis, the preferred policy is not linked directly to the ongoing debate with regard to Cumbria's role in accommodating new potential nuclear facilities, and the associated SA implications of this. However, given SA and (strengthened) Plan aspirations in relation to community engagement in decision-making, this is likely to require further explanation as the policy is progressed.

APPENDIX ONE: PLAN OBJECTIVES

MODIFICATIONS TO PLAN OBJECTIVES

Scoping Report (July 2006)	Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>To seek to minimise the impacts of minerals and waste developments on climate change.</p>	<p>1. To seek to minimise the impacts of minerals and waste developments on climate change and the environment.</p>	<p>Objective 1. That minerals and waste management developments will take due account of the issues of climate change, in particular through energy use and transport; that any adverse impacts on the environment and the local economy will be minimised and that potential benefits will be maximised.</p> <p><i>The alternative to this that was put forward at the Issues and Options stage was to focus on minimising the impacts of climate change on people and on developments.</i></p> <p><i>This would not be in accordance with national and regional policies that seek a combined approach of mitigation and adaptation.</i></p>	<p>This objective was modified in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) to include minimisation of impacts on the wider environment, i.e. to increase environmental protection.</p> <p>The draft changes to the Preferred Options propose further modifications to this objective. These detail ways of incorporating climate change mitigation issues, instead of just seeking to minimise impacts on climate change, and also include protection of the local economy.</p> <p>This objective now addresses a wider range of SA objectives. In delivering the plan, striking a balance between potentially conflicting objectives will be key.</p>
	<p>2. To make provision for the supply of the minerals needed by society from environmentally acceptable sources.</p>	<p>Objective 4. That the minerals from Cumbria that are required to meet local, regional and national needs will be supplied from appropriately located and environmentally acceptable sources.</p>	<p>Former Objective 2, current Objective 4, now makes direct reference to Cumbria's contribution to the regional apportionment and also to appropriate locations for extraction.</p> <p>The plan objective now performs more strongly against the key SA</p>

Scoping Report (July 2006)	Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
			<p>objective of managing mineral resources sustainably by making a clear reference to an overall level of extraction which has been agreed following broad consideration of environmental, social and economic considerations. The reference to appropriate locations also acknowledges the role of careful siting in minimising impacts.</p>
<p>To make provision for the waste management facilities that Cumbria needs to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy in accordance with the targets of the national waste strategy.</p>	<p>3. To make provision for the waste management facilities that Cumbria needs to increase the amount of waste reused, recycled or composted to meet national targets and to minimise the disposal of waste to landfill.</p>	<p>Objective 2. That effective waste minimisation measures will be adopted and, following these, that waste, including radioactive waste, will be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy. In order to secure this, that the right type of waste management facilities that Cumbria needs to increase the amounts of its wastes that are re-used, recycled, or composted will be provided in the right places and at the right time in order to minimise the disposal of waste to landfill.</p>	<p>Objective 3 in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) was modified from the one presented in the Scoping Report to make specific reference to the components of the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>The revised objective - Objective 2 - now refers to waste minimisation and the need to provide facilities to deliver the policy objective of moving waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The plan objective now performs more strongly against the key SA objective of minimising waste albeit that the contribution of the planning system to waste minimisation needs to be defined clearly. Deliverability of the sustainability benefits of the objective is also enhanced by direct reference to the facilities required.</p>

Scoping Report (July 2006)	Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
To seek maximum local economic benefits from minerals and waste developments.	4. To optimise local economic benefits from minerals and waste developments.	<p>Objective 7. That the local economic benefits of minerals and waste management developments will be optimised without harming the environment.</p> <p><i>The alternatives to this that were put forward at the Issues and Options stage were to seek maximum benefits or to make no attempt to gain local benefits other than those directly provided by the developments themselves.</i></p>	<p>Objective 4 in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) was modified from the one presented in the Scoping Report to reflect the need to balance different objectives.</p> <p>The current objective - Objective 7 - seeks to make the balance more explicit by making specific reference to environmental protection.</p> <p>Whilst the revised wording performs more strongly against environmental SA objectives, the site allocation and generic development control policies will be key to actually delivering this.</p>
To promote efficient use of minerals and the reuse / recycling of suitable materials in order to minimise the need for new primary extraction.	5. To promote efficient use of minerals and the reuse / recycling of suitable materials in order to minimise the need for new primary extraction.	<p>Objective 5. That the need for new mining and quarrying will be minimised by prudent use of resources and by supplies of alternative re-used and recycled materials.</p>	<p>More clarity in relation to linkages between role of development plan and efficient use of resources.</p> <p>No significant SA implications.</p>
To help secure the management of waste as near as possible to its place of production without endangering human health and without harming the environment.	6. To help secure the management of waste as near as possible to where it is produced without endangering human health and without harming the environment.	<p>Objective 3. That waste will be managed as near as possible to where it is produced without endangering people's health and without harming the environment.</p>	<p>No significant modifications to Plan Objective.</p>
To secure sound working practices so that the environmental impacts of minerals and waste developments, including traffic, are kept to a minimum.	7. To secure sound working practices so that the environmental impacts of minerals and waste developments, including traffic, are kept to a minimum.	<p>Objective 9. That the environmental impacts of minerals and waste management developments, including traffic, will be kept to a minimum by appropriate</p>	<p>Current Objective 9 has been slightly modified from Objective 7 as presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) to take account of siting as a means</p>

Scoping Report (July 2006)	Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
		siting of facilities and sound working practices and that any unavoidable harmful impacts will be mitigated.	<p>of minimising environmental impacts and also to make clearer reference to the role of mitigation.</p> <p>The revised wording performs more strongly against environmental SA objectives as a consequence of these changes.</p>
To protect and, where possible, to enhance the overall quality of the environment once developments are completed through high standards of restoration.	8. To protect and, where possible, to enhance the overall quality of the environment including high standards of restoration once developments are completed.	Objective 8. That the overall quality of Cumbria's environment will be protected and, where practicable, enhanced by high standards of design and operation in new developments and high standards of restoration once developments have been completed.	<p>Objective 8 has been modified to refer to high standards of design and operation.</p> <p>The revised wording performs more strongly against environmental SA objectives as it now relates more closely to the characteristics of anticipated waste management processes and associated facilities.</p>
To help to conserve and safeguard mineral resources.	9. To help to conserve and safeguard mineral resources.	Objective 6. That mineral resources will be identified and safeguarded.	<p>Current Objective 6 has been slightly modified from Objective 9 as presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007) as it now refers to identifying and not conserving mineral resources.</p> <p>It could be argued that the Plan Objective now performs less strongly against the key SA objective of managing mineral resources sustainably. However, the role of safeguarding mineral resources is not to prevent their extraction and this</p>

Scoping Report (July 2006)	Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
			objective needs to be considered in combination with other plan objectives designed to promote the efficient use of mineral resources.
		<p>Objective 10. That there will be increased community and stakeholder involvement and ownership of initiatives and planning for sustainable minerals and waste developments.</p>	<p>This is a newly created objective.</p> <p>Subject to successful delivery, this performs well against SA Objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well being of people by increasing community involvement and ownership.</p>

APPENDIX TWO: CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

MODIFICATIONS TO CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSO 1 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>The overall quality of life within Cumbria will be enhanced by promoting the sustainable minerals and waste management developments that are needed, protecting and enhancing the environment, ensuring prudent use of resources and maintaining social progress and economic growth.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 1 SUSTAINABLE LOCATION AND DESIGN</p> <p>The Preferred Option policy would expect all proposals for minerals and waste management developments to demonstrate that :- energy management, environmental performance and carbon footprint have been determining design factors; 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 considerations override this aim.; all developments with useful floor space 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. construction of buildings minimises waste production and use of primary aggregates and makes best use of products made from recycled/re used materials.</p> <p>The policy would also state that work will be undertaken in conjunction with stakeholders to identify appropriate energy supply/carbon emissions criteria for minerals developments.</p>	<p>The policy has been revised 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.</p> <p>The performance of this policy against SA objectives in relation to climate change has been strengthened. [The supporting questions for the SA Framework for Cumbria were modified in February 2007 to include greater reference to climate change]. However, delivering the sustainability benefits associated with this policy will be challenging as this is very much an emerging area of planning policy and is also heavily reliant on supporting economic and technological initiatives.</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSO 2</p>		<p>This policy no longer exists per se as "Minimising</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>MINIMISING "ROAD MILES" All proposals for minerals and waste management developments will be required to demonstrate that their location will minimise, as far as is practicable, the "minerals or waste road miles" that would be generated in supplying the minerals or managing the wastes.</p>		<p>Road Miles" but has been merged with Policy 1 Sustainable Location and Design (see above).</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSO 3 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS The Preferred Option policy would aim to protect, and enhance where practicable, Cumbria's environmental assets including priority habitats, key species and areas and features of county importance, the distinctive characteristics of Cumbria's landscape, historic and cultural heritage, its rivers, tarns and estuaries and the best and most versatile agricultural land. It would state that planning permission will not be granted for development that would have a significant adverse effect on Cumbria's environmental assets, on its own or in combination with other developments, unless it is demonstrated that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative site that would result in less or no harm and the effects can be adequately mitigated or compensated for. Planning permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances for a development that is likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI, or features of it, that are not protected by international legislation where it is demonstrated that the benefits of the development clearly</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 2 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS The Preferred Option policy would relate to those assets that are not protected by international or national legislation. It would require all significant environmental impacts to be mitigated and would aim to protect, maintain and enhance the natural, historic and other distinctive features that contribute to the environment of Cumbria and to the character of its landscapes and places. It would seek to improve their settings and, where appropriate, the linkages between them and buffer zones around them and to realise the opportunities for expanding and increasing environmental resources including adapting and mitigating for climate change. It would state that planning permission will not be granted for development that would have a significant adverse effect on Cumbria's environmental assets, on its own or in combination with other developments, unless :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is demonstrated that there is a need for the development, • that it cannot reasonably be located on any alternative site that would result in less or no 	<p>This policy now performs very strongly in relation to the environmental SA objectives. However, the mitigation of <i>all</i> significant environmental impacts may not be possible in practice if the required infrastructure is to be delivered.</p> <p>The findings of the Stage Two report (February 2007) on the Overall Strategy still apply, which reflect the need to strike a balance between competing sustainability objectives.</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>outweigh the impacts it is likely to have on its special features and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs.</p>	<p>harm, and then sequentially,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the effects can be adequately mitigated, or • that the effects can be compensated for through offsetting actions. <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>Core Strategy Policy CSO 4 AFTERUSE AND RESTORATION The Preferred Option Core Strategy policy is to expect that full advantage will be taken of the potential for mineral working and waste management site restoration schemes to help deliver sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 3 AFTERUSE AND RESTORATION The Preferred Option Core Strategy policy is to expect that full advantage will be taken of the potential for mineral working and waste management site restoration and after care schemes to help deliver sustainability objectives relating to the environment and the economy of the county.</p>	<p>This policy has been slightly modified to include after care measures and therefore performs more strongly against relevant SA objectives. However, the findings of the Stage Two report (February 2007) still apply: implementation 'on the ground' would be key to delivering this (see para. 3.7).</p>
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 4 LOCAL ECONOMIC BENEFIT The Core Strategy policy would require proposals for new minerals and waste developments to demonstrate that they would realise their potential for local 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. Nationally or regionally significant facilities, particularly ones for the nuclear industry, would be expected to provide off-set packages of</p>	<p>This policy has been introduced to ensure that local advantage is taken of the investment in minerals and waste management development and performs strongly against the economic objectives, especially Objective EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy.</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	community benefits that are commensurate with their impacts on Cumbria.	
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 5 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy would state that 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet the reasonable costs of new infrastructure made necessary by the proposal including transport, utilities and community facilities; 2. Make a positive contribution to enhancing, maintaining or promoting sustainable communities; 3. Secure long term management of environmental assets; 4. Provide financial guarantees. 	<p>This is a new policy which has been introduced 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 the scale and form of contributions. The policy 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> <p>This policy will have a key role in play in delivering the sustainability intentions of the Preferred Options Core Strategy and in striking a balance between potentially competing plan and SA objectives.</p>
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 6 COMMUNITY BENEFITS</p> <p>The Core Strategy policy would state that where large national or regional facilities are proposed, the County Council will seek to negotiate packages of community benefits to help to offset the impacts of hosting such facilities.</p>	<p>This policy has been introduced to offset and compensate for potential impacts on communities derived from hosting national or regional facilities. This policy scores well against the SA objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well being of people, albeit that effective and equitable delivery of such a policy will require skilful implementation which successfully reflects Objective 10 of the Preferred Options Core Strategy, which seeks increased community and stakeholder involvement and ownership of initiatives and planning for sustainable minerals and waste developments.</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 7 STRATEGIC AREAS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS</p> <p>The Core Strategy policy and the Key Diagram would identify Carlisle and the Workington/Whitehaven area in the north and Barrow in Furness and Kendal in the south 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 solution for managing municipal waste. They would identify the Kirkby Thore/Long Marton area as the only location for supplying gypsum; land next to High Greenscoe Quarry as the only location for supplying the Askam in Furness brickworks with mudstones and the igneous rocks near Ghyll Scaur Quarry as the only location for additional very high specification roadstone resources. The policy would state that supply/production areas, strategic locations and preferred sites for sand and gravel and crushed rock for general aggregate use will be identified as part of the work for the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and Proposals Map.</p>	<p>This policy is new and has been put in place 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 sand and gravel and crushed rock, in accordance with the proposed waste (policy 12 and 13) and mineral policy 17.</p> <p>One of the key findings of the Stage Two SA report (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 forward. Plan policy in relation to site allocations, and the accompanying SA implications is ongoing and will be addressed in relation to the Preferred Options Site Allocations document (programmed for consultation in autumn 2008).</p>
<p>PREFERRED STRATEGY WASTE STRATEGY</p> <p>The Waste Core Strategy of this plan is:- to be a good example of resource efficiency, to manage wastes in environmentally sensitive ways, and to reverse the trend of ever-increasing waste arisings for all waste streams.</p>	<p>PREFERRED STRATEGY WASTE STRATEGY</p> <p>The Waste Core Strategy of this plan is:- Cumbria will be a good example of resource efficiency by providing opportunities to help reverse the trend of increasing waste arisings for all waste streams, by promoting recycling and recovery of value from wastes and by managing its wastes in</p>	<p>The only change proposed to the preferred waste strategy is the reference to the promotion of value recovery from wastes.</p> <p>This strengthens performance against the key SA objective NR4.</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p>environmentally sensitive ways.</p> <p>Box 9 <i>Alternatives which would not do anything to reduce waste and would not regard it as a resource that should be used and not just thrown away are not considered to be feasible or sustainable.</i></p>	
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSW 1 PROVISION FOR WASTE</p> <p>The Preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would set out that the plan will seek to make provision for all of Cumbria's wastes. Proposals to manage wastes from outside the county would have to demonstrate that the local social and economic benefits outweigh the principles of managing waste as close as possible to its source and of each community taking responsibility for its own wastes. Any proposals would have to demonstrate that they have no unacceptable environmental impacts.</p> <p>The alternative policy choices can be described as:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> provide for Cumbria's wastes and others with a focus on creating and safeguarding job opportunities. provide only for Cumbria's wastes (net self-sufficiency). provide for less than Cumbria's wastes, assuming that a significant proportion will be managed outside the county. 	<p>Core Strategy Policy 8 PROVISION FOR WASTE</p> <p>The preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would set out that the plan will seek to make provision for all of Cumbria's wastes (net self-sufficiency). 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 and of each community taking responsibility for its own wastes. Any proposals would have to demonstrate that their environmental impacts are acceptable.</p> <p>Box 10 The alternatives would be to:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> provide for Cumbria's wastes and as much waste as possible from elsewhere with a focus on maximising and safeguarding job opportunities. <i>The County Council considers that such an approach would not be sustainable because of the distance to Cumbria from the major sources of waste arising in the cities and the</i> 	<p>The current version of this policy "Provision for waste", Policy 8, has been modified to include reference to the negative effects derived from the increased "waste miles" when managing waste from outside the county. This reflects concerns about climate change as highlighted in Objective 1.</p> <p>The performance of this policy against SA objectives in relation to climate change has been strengthened. Additional findings from the Stage Two report (February 2007) still remain valid (see Stage Two report para 3.9 and Appendix 1).</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 Stage One SA (November 2006) 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 providing for only Cumbria's wastes were lower, this option appeared to be the most appropriate where there is concern about the capacity of the area to absorb</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>The Preferred Option below reflects the comments that people made about seeking a solution that combines the best of (a) and (b).</p>	<p><i>difficulties that Cumbria is likely to face in providing for its own wastes.</i></p> <p>b. provide only for Cumbria's wastes (net self sufficiency). <i>This is the basis of the Preferred Option with flexibility for importing waste where this can be justified.</i></p> <p>c. provide for less than Cumbria's wastes, assuming that a significant proportion will be managed outside the county. <i>It may be that facilities will be developed elsewhere which would benefit from additional amounts of waste being available from Cumbria. However, it is considered to be unwise to assume that this will happen and that any proposals could be justified as being sustainable.</i></p>	<p>the level of development and the associated transport movements that would flow from such an approach.</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSW 4 WASTE CAPACITY</p> <p>It is proposed that the plan should identify sites for managing and treating between 343,000 and 438,000 tonnes/year of municipal waste and between 400,000 and 575,000 tonnes/year of commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period. It is proposed that the plan should identify sites for an additional 2 million cubic metres of landfill over the plan period.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 9 WASTE CAPACITY</p> <p>The Waste Core Strategy policy would state that capacity will be needed 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. It would propose that the plan should provide for around 7 million cubic metres of landfill capacity including void space remaining in sites that have planning permission. These figures will be kept under review as better and more up to date information becomes available.</p> <p>Box 11</p> <p><i>An alternative would be to include waste reduction policies in this Core Strategy or in another part of the Development Framework. It is considered they would</i></p>	<p>Figures have changed significantly to reflect higher maximum figures for managing municipal and commercial and industrial waste by the end of the plan period. The second draft changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy (September 2007) in paragraph 6.31 state that <i>“This range of figures is considerably larger than that included in the original Preferred Options. Because of the range it is not considered necessary to put forward alternative options to be considered”</i>.</p> <p>The Scoping Report (July 2006) states that <i>“capacity for municipal waste is estimated at 5.5 million cubic metres”</i>. Therefore, the figure for landfill capacity has not changed 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</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p><i>largely repeat or duplicate the initiatives that are being taken by other bodies. Lancashire County Council has, however, taken this different approach and is producing a Supplementary Planning Document on Managing and Minimising Waste in New Development.</i></p>	<p>would provide for around 7 million cubic metres of landfill capacity.</p> <p>The SA implications of the Waste Capacity Policy were discussed in the Stage Two Report (February 2007) and the conclusions remain broadly applicable (see para 3.15 to 3.17 and Appendix 1). As the estimated figures are higher, it stands to reason that both positive and negative SA impacts could be greater, although this would be influenced by other factors in addition to overall processing capacity.</p> <p>Whilst the logic for not including waste reduction policies is understood, the SA has previously identified the need for co-ordinated actions to encourage waste minimisation. In addition, Plan Objective 2 now refers to the adoption of effective waste minimisation measures.</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSW 2 WASTE HIERARCHY</p> <p>The Preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would set out that sufficient sites will be identified to enable the wastes that remain after waste reduction measures to be managed as high as possible up the hierarchy.</p> <p>i. re-use of products or materials for the same or a different purpose; ii. recovery of resources through recycling or composting; iii. recovery of value by generating electricity and</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 10 WASTE HIERARCHY</p> <p>The preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would set out that sufficient sites will be identified to enable the wastes that remain, after waste reduction measures, to be managed as high as possible up the hierarchy:-</p> <p>i. re-use of products or materials for the same or a different purpose;; ii. recovery of resources through recycling or composting; iii. recovery of value by generating electricity and</p>	<p>This policy has not been changed from the previous version presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007). Therefore, the findings presented in the Stage Two report still remain valid (see paras 3.10 to 3.12 and Appendix 1).</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision								
<p>using heat from energy from waste plants, (including incinerators);</p> <p>iv. recovery of value by generating electricity from energy from waste plants, (including incinerators) without using the heat;</p> <p>v. if none of the above are appropriate incineration without energy recovery or disposal of waste by landfill.</p> <p>3.25 With regard to the waste hierarchy it is not considered that there are any practicable policy alternatives other than to manage waste as high as possible up the hierarchy, in accordance with national and regional policies. The hierarchy is proposed to be refined for energy from waste plans as set out below:</p>	<p>using heat from energy from waste plants, (including incinerators);</p> <p>iv. recovery of value by generating electricity from energy from waste plants, (including incinerators) without using the heat;</p> <p>v. if none of the above are appropriate incineration without energy recovery or disposal of waste by landfill.</p> <p>Box 11 Alternatives <i>Apart from not incorporating the refined hierarchy for energy from waste it is not considered that there are any practicable policy alternatives to managing waste as high as possible up the hierarchy in accordance with national and regional policies.</i> <i>The consultation version of the Sellafield Integrated Waste Strategy includes additional "steps" in the hierarchy but these are considered to be relevant to that site's waste streams.</i></p>									
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 11 REDUCING LANDFILL</p> <p>The Waste Core Strategy Policy would state that the plan will identify sufficient sites for the facilities that will be needed to meet the following targets for reducing the amounts of waste that are landfilled.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="792 1177 1301 1334"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2010</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2020</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Household waste - re-use, recycling</td> <td>40%¹</td> <td>45%²</td> <td>55%^{3, 5}</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2010	2015	2020	Household waste - re-use, recycling	40% ¹	45% ²	55% ^{3, 5}	<p>This policy proposes the identification of sites to reflect targets for reducing household and municipal waste to landfill and for increased recycling. Targets used reflect a combination of figures derived from the Waste Strategy 2007 and the Regional Spatial Strategy that require most recycling.</p> <p>As this is a new policy, an SA appraisal has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 3.</p> <p>By making a firm commitment to delivering the sites required for the facilities necessary to move</p>
	2010	2015	2020							
Household waste - re-use, recycling	40% ¹	45% ²	55% ^{3, 5}							

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision												
	<table border="1" data-bbox="792 306 1312 651"> <tr> <td>and composting</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recovery of value from municipal waste 6</td> <td>53%⁴</td> <td>67%²</td> <td>75%⁴</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial and industrial waste landfilled</td> <td>80% of 2004⁴ (i.e. of 291,500 tonnes)</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="766 683 1339 1023"> 1. Waste Strategy 2007 and the stretched Local Area Agreement target. 2. Waste Strategy 2007 and the Regional Spatial Strategy target. 3. Regional Spatial Strategy target. 4. Waste Strategy 2007 target. 5. Waste Strategy 2007 also has a target to reduce the amount of household waste not re-used, recycled or composted to 225kg/person by 2020. 6. This includes recycling, composting and energy recovery. </p>	and composting				Recovery of value from municipal waste 6	53% ⁴	67% ²	75% ⁴	Commercial and industrial waste landfilled	80% of 2004 ⁴ (i.e. of 291,500 tonnes)	n/a	n/a	<p data-bbox="1348 306 1924 1023">waste up the hierarchy, the policy scores strongly against Key Objective NR4 to manage resources sustainably and to minimise waste and would also contribute to economic objectives EC1 and EC3. However, as first discussed in the Stage One Report, the construction and operation of new waste management facilities can score negatively against social and environmental objectives. Whilst waste management facilities can often be perceived as ‘bad neighbours’ by the general public, in practice many safeguards and working practices are in place to ensure that their impacts are minimised. However, some impacts are relatively difficult to mitigate, and these are largely transport related or linked with perceptions and awareness of the sector.</p>
and composting														
Recovery of value from municipal waste 6	53% ⁴	67% ²	75% ⁴											
Commercial and industrial waste landfilled	80% of 2004 ⁴ (i.e. of 291,500 tonnes)	n/a	n/a											
<p data-bbox="176 1029 757 1082">Core Strategy Policy CSW 5 WASTE SITES</p> <p data-bbox="176 1088 757 1145">The Preferred Waste Core Strategy is that the plan should seek to provide:</p> <ul data-bbox="176 1152 757 1339" style="list-style-type: none"> • eleven sites of around 2ha for waste treatment facilities (these could include Materials Recovery Facilities, Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer/bulking stations); • two sites of between 2 and 4.5ha for Energy 	<p data-bbox="766 1029 1339 1082">Core Strategy Policy I2 WASTE SITES</p> <p data-bbox="766 1088 1339 1339">The preferred Waste Core Strategy is that the plan should seek to provide eleven sites of around 2ha for waste treatment facilities, (these could include Materials Recovery Facilities, Mechanical and Biological Treatment plants or Transfer/bulking stations); two sites of between 2 and 4.5ha for Energy from Waste gasification plants or incinerators, and an additional 2 million cubic</p>	<p data-bbox="1348 1029 1924 1214">The policy on Waste Sites has not changed significantly from the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007). The only new addition to the policy is clarification that the 2 million cubic metres of landfill capacity is in addition to the void space remaining in existing permitted sites.</p> <p data-bbox="1348 1241 1924 1339">Therefore, the findings of the Stage Two Report (February 2007) still apply (see paragraph 3.18 and Appendix I of the Core Strategy Preferred</p>												

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>from Waste gasification plants or incinerators, and;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an additional 2 million cubic metres of landfill capacity, and • nine new or enlarged Household Waste Recycling Centres, with innovative solutions or alternative sites kept under review for smaller communities. 	<p>metres of landfill capacity in addition to the void space remaining in existing permitted sites, and nine new or enlarged Household Waste Recycling Centres, with innovative solutions or alternative sites kept under review for smaller communities.</p> <p>Box 13 Alternatives</p> <p>The fuller range of options which could be considered is to identify sites :-</p> <p>a. for a decentralised network with a range of waste management facilities in each district council area; <i>it is not considered that the quantities of wastes arising within Cumbria would enable such a network to be efficient and effective. It is considered more appropriate to provide facilities for more than one administrative area.</i></p> <p>b. for a centralised network of two sites serving the north and the south of the county with a full range of waste management facilities; <i>This does not seem realistic unless it is led by the provision of facilities for the municipal waste management contract but is an option that should be left open.</i></p> <p>c. a decentralised network but with sites large enough and suitable for co-locating more than one type of waste management facility. <i>This is the basis of the Preferred Option.</i></p> <p>d. not to identify sites but to rely on criteria based development control policies for any proposals that may be submitted. <i>This would not be in accordance with the requirements and intentions of the new development plan system. Criteria based policies</i></p>	<p>Options).</p> <p>The decentralised vs centralised approaches to waste management were assessed as part of the Stage One SA (November 2006) – Waste Issue 2. paras. 3.18 to 3.24 and Appendix 5.</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<i>will be needed for considering sites that may be proposed that are not identified in this Framework.</i>	
<p data-bbox="185 370 546 427">Core Strategy Policy CSW 3 INTEGRATED NETWORK</p> <p data-bbox="185 464 741 644">The Preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would state that the Framework will identify sufficient sites for an integrated network of a range of waste management facilities across the county and that preference will be given to sites that can accommodate more than one type of facility.</p> <p data-bbox="185 681 719 927">3.28 The preferred option is (c) and is for a decentralised network but with a preference for sites which could accommodate more than one type of facility, for example a Household Waste Recycling Centre and a Transfer/Bulking Station. This is considered to relate best to the Overall Strategy and Core Strategy Policy CSO 2 for minimising “waste miles”.</p>	<p data-bbox="772 370 1115 427">Core Strategy Policy 13 INTEGRATED NETWORK</p> <p data-bbox="772 464 1328 676">The Preferred Waste Core Strategy Policy would state that the Framework will identify sufficient sites for an integrated network of a range of appropriate and necessary waste management facilities across the county and that preference will be given to sites that can accommodate more than one type of facility.</p> <p data-bbox="772 713 1305 959">The preferred option is (c) above and is for the decentralised network but with a preference for sites which could accommodate more than one type of facility, for example a Household Waste Recycling Centre and a Transfer/Bulking Station. This is considered to relate best to the Overall Strategy and Core Strategy Policy for minimising "waste miles".</p>	<p data-bbox="1355 370 1832 459">Policy changed slightly to include the words “appropriate and necessary” before waste management facilities.</p> <p data-bbox="1355 496 1910 644">The SA implications of the Integrated Network Policy were discussed in the Stage Two Report (February 2007) and the conclusions remain applicable to Policy 13 (see para 3.13 and Appendix 1).</p>
<p data-bbox="185 1023 651 1112">Core Strategy Policy CSW 6 HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES</p> <p data-bbox="185 1117 734 1326">The Policy for these would set out that developments involving the management of these wastes will only be permitted where criteria are satisfied relating to benefit clearly outweighing the detrimental effects, compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security, which, if appropriate is</p>	<p data-bbox="772 1023 1238 1112">Core Strategy Policy 14 HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES STORAGE</p> <p data-bbox="772 1117 1328 1326">This Policy would set out that developments involving the interim storage of these wastes at Sellafield will only be permitted where criteria are satisfied relating to benefit clearly outweighing the detrimental effects, compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security, which, if appropriate is independently</p>	<p data-bbox="1355 1023 1895 1171">The policy on High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Waste Storage has been modified to specifically refer to the “interim storage” of high and intermediate level radioactive wastes and not management.</p> <p data-bbox="1355 1208 1910 1326">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 level radioactive waste</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>independently reviewed; reasons are explained for rejecting alternative locations and methods that have been considered and that there are no overall adverse impacts on the local economy. It would also state that permission will be granted only if all possible measures are taken to minimise the adverse effects of development and associated infrastructure; and, where appropriate, provision is made to meet local community needs; acceptable measures are secured for decommissioning and site restoration, and arrangements are made for suitable local community involvement during the development, decommissioning and restoration.</p>	<p>reviewed; reasons are explained for rejecting alternative locations and methods that have been considered and that there are no overall adverse impacts on the local economy. It would also state that permission will be granted only if all possible measures are taken to minimise the adverse effects of development and associated infrastructure; and, where appropriate, provision is made to meet local community needs; acceptable measures are secured for decommissioning and site restoration, and arrangements are made for suitable local community involvement during the development, decommissioning and restoration.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Therefore, the Sustainability Appraisal findings for this policy area, as presented in the Stage Two Report (February 2007) still apply (See paras. 3.19 and Appendix 2).</p>
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 15 HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL</p> <p>This policy would state that, if an area within Cumbria is volunteered as a potential repository site, separate planning applications may be expected to be submitted at three stages of developing a possible geological disposal facility :-</p> <p>1. Proposals for surface based site investigation including boreholes. At this stage the planning criteria would be similar to those for exploratory works for other types of development. These would relate to the usual environmental impact considerations including traffic, working hours, noise, visual impact, period of operations, water resources and wildlife.</p> <p>2. Proposals for underground rock characterisation shafts and tunnels and an underground research laboratory. Planning</p>	<p>The Second Draft Changes to the Preferred Options Cores Strategy state in paragraph 6.75 that this policy would only come into effect should a geological disposal site within Cumbria be volunteered.</p> <p>It is not considered that, as worded, the policy itself would construe policy support for the construction of new nuclear power stations in Cumbria.</p> <p>As this is a new policy, an SA appraisal has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Whilst this policy is highly specialised and does not always fit neatly with the appraisal questions, the policy scores well against the overarching key objective in that it seeks to define the planning context for responding to the identified need for the long term management of these types of</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p>considerations at this stage would 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 would 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 final offsetting benefits package; impacts on the local economy and community needs.</p> <p>3. Proposals for a disposal facility and transport links, monitoring, site closure and restoration. At this stage there could be a reasonable expectation that planning permission would be granted unless new information or material considerations demonstrate otherwise or there are material differences from the scheme that had been developed over a considerable period of time up to this stage. Planning criteria would 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>Box 14 An alternative could be to not have any policies at</p>	<p>wastes in the light of the current governmental review. The policy also performs well by referring to consideration of environmental impacts and arrangements for community involvement.</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p>all for these higher level wastes.</p> <p><i>The County Council's view is that some form of policy is likely to be necessary because proposals are likely to come forward for storing wastes that are already within the Sellafield/Windscale complex.</i></p> <p>An alternative would be to not have a policy relating to disposal. This was the approach that the County Council adopted in the original Preferred Options document. However, since the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely consultation paper was published (June 2007) more details are available about such a disposal facility and the processes that would be undertaken for site selection. The Government's intention is to commence the site finding process in 2008. The County Council considers that consultation and discussion about these first draft ideas for local policies could assist communities decide whether to participate in the process for finding a site. Other stages of the process and other planning criteria could be suggested. These will be considered.</p>	
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSW 7 LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE</p> <p>The policy would state that, if possible, further capacity should be identified for those Low Level Wastes that cannot be managed at Sellafield/Windscale and those from small users such as hospitals and research establishments which have traditionally been stored at the existing Low Level Waste Repository near Drigg.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 16 LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE</p> <p>The policy would state that, if possible, further capacity should be identified for those Low Level Wastes that arise at Sellafield/Windscale and for the estimated 9% of total arisings of Low Level Waste that are generated by small users of the existing Repository, such as hospitals, the healthcare technology industry and research establishments. In the short term capacity may also be provided for Low Level Waste from larger users such as nuclear power stations, Ministry of Defence sites and other British Nuclear group</p>	<p>The wording of the policy has changed slightly. A second paragraph has been 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>As the additional provision only applies short term, it is considered that the Sustainability Appraisal findings for this policy area, as presented in the Stage Two Report (February 2007) still apply (See paras. 3.20 and Appendix 2).</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p>facilities where it is demonstrated that the waste cannot be managed elsewhere.</p> <p>Box 15 The alternatives are to regard the Repository near Drigg as a National facility, beyond the short term, for the storage, or disposal, of all of the country's Low Level Wastes, including those from Ministry of Defence sites and nuclear power stations. This national role could be either :- a. in the medium term say 5 to 10 years, or b. long term, say 30 to 50 years. <i>These alternatives are not considered to represent sustainable development and the County Council's policy is that Cumbria should not be regarded as the disposal route for all of the UK's radioactive wastes.</i></p>	
<p>PREFERRED STRATEGY MINERALS STRATEGY The Minerals Core Strategy of this plan is: to balance the economic potential of its mineral resources with prudent use of them in environmentally sensitive ways, and to enhance the scope for using alternative materials.</p>	<p>PREFERRED STRATEGY MINERALS STRATEGY The Minerals Core Strategy of this plan is:- to make provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals; to balance the economic potential of its mineral resources with the protection of the environment and with prudent use of them in environmentally sensitive ways, and to enhance the scope for using alternative re-used or recycled materials.</p>	<p>The Preferred Strategy now makes more explicit reference to making provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals and to the need for environmental protection. As the previously assessed Preferred Core Strategy Policies sought to support these aims, there are no implications for the SA findings.</p> <p>However, the need to strike a balance between potentially competing plan (and also SA) objectives has been a continuing 'theme' of the SA work undertaken and arguably this becomes increasingly difficult to achieve when individual components are strengthened further.</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 1 SUPPLY OF MINERALS</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 17 SUPPLY OF MINERALS</p>	<p>The Supply of Minerals policy has been expanded to also take into account locational and spatial considerations for quarries and crushed rock and</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy Policy would set out that the plan will seek to meet the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment of crushed rock and sand and gravel production, and recognise that the high skid resistance roadstone quarries, gypsum mine and High Greenscoe brick making mudstone quarry are regional or national resources.</p> <p>The options that can be considered are : -</p> <p>a. Maximise the economic potential of Cumbria's mineral resources.</p> <p>b. Continue basically with the present patterns of mineral supply.</p> <p>c. Minimise mineral production in the interests of maximising environmental protection</p> <p>It is considered that (b) is the one that relates best to the overall strategy and policies.</p>	<p>The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy Policy would set out that the plan will seek to :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meet the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment to Cumbria of crushed rock and sand and gravel production, but; • further apply that apportionment to take account of Cumbria's pattern of quarries and the areas they supply, and its dispersed settlement pattern and transport routes; • 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; • recognise that the high skid resistance roadstone quarries, gypsum mine and remaining gypsum resources and High Greenscoe brick making mudstone quarry are regionally or nationally important; • make provision for one quarter of the aggregates used within Cumbria to be met by secondary or recycled aggregates. <p>Box 19 The two extreme alternatives that could be considered are :-</p> <p>a. Maximise the economic potential of Cumbria's mineral resources, or</p> <p>b. Minimise mineral production in the interests of maximising environmental protection.</p> <p><i>The County Council does not consider that either of these extremes is appropriate.</i></p>	<p>sand and gravel landbanks supply, and to emphasise the role of secondary or recycled aggregates.</p> <p>The assessment of Core Strategy Policy 17 relates back to the assessment presented in the original Stage Two Report, which concluded that the supply of minerals policy (CSM1) corresponded with Option 1B from the Stage One Report. Although the assessed Policy CSM1 did not refer to secondary or recycled aggregates, Minerals Issue 1B in the Stage One Report included these, and therefore the findings of the assessment presented in the Stage Two Report (February 2007) remain valid (paras 3.21 to 3.29 and Appendix 1 and 2).</p> <p>These, however, also need to be supplemented with the findings of the assessment of Issue/Option 3 (Strategic location of mineral sites) and Issue/Option 2 (Landbanks) presented in the Stage One Report (November 2006). The Stage One Report also appraised the alternative options referred to (Minerals Issues 1, 2 and 3).</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
	<p><i>The Preferred Option seeks a balance between these extremes which recognizes that an adequate and secure supply of minerals is essential and that this has to be at acceptable environmental, social and economic cost. The extent and life of existing planning permissions are also factors that reduce the options that are realistically available.</i></p> <p>For aggregates there could also be alternatives to :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue basically with the present dispersed patterns of quarries, or 2. Seek to concentrate production at a smaller number of larger quarries <p><i>The existing pattern of planning permissions for hard rock quarries, and the life of those permissions, give little practicable scope for considering alternatives. Sand and gravel quarries have much smaller reserves and much shorter life planning permissions. Concentrating into a few large production units would not suit the dispersed pattern of demand in Cumbria and parts of the county already have issues relating to the volume of quarry lorry traffic which could be exacerbated. The Sustainability Appraisal favours the dispersed pattern and its consequent reduction in "minerals miles".</i></p> <p>Alternative figures could be suggested for the "landbank" periods of seven and ten years. Those periods accord with Mineral Policy Statement 1. National policy suggests that longer periods may be appropriate for other minerals but does not specify what these should be.</p>	
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 4 MARINE DREDGED AGGREGATES The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy I8 MARINE DREDGED AGGREGATES The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy</p>	<p>The policy has not been modified from the one presented in the previous version, Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007). Therefore, the</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>would set out that planning permission will be granted for developments at appropriate locations, and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts, that would enable the increased use of marine dredged aggregates as substitutes for land won ones.</p>	<p>would set out that planning permission will be granted for developments at appropriate locations, and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts, that would enable the increased use of marine dredged aggregates as substitutes for land won ones.</p>	<p>findings of the assessment presented in the Stage Two report remain valid (see paragraphs 3.32 and 3.34 and Appendix 2).</p>
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 3 SAND AND GRAVEL SUPPLY The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy would set out that the plan will seek to maintain throughout the plan period a landbank of permitted reserves equivalent to seven years production at the Regional Spatial Strategy's Cumbria apportionment of 700,000 tonnes/year. This landbank will be refined to relate to local supply patterns and the need to minimise "minerals miles".</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 1 SUPPLY OF MINERALS</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 7 BRICKMAKING MUDSTONES Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy Policy CSM 7 would state that provision will be made to safeguard potential areas for extending this quarry</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 6 GYPSUM The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy Policy would state that additional areas will be</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 19 MINERALS SAFEGUARDING The Core Strategy policy would state that mineral resources will be safeguarded by Identifying :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred Areas and Mineral Safeguarding Areas to enable a landbank of seven years sales at the Regional Spatial Strategy's apportionment level for sand and gravel to be maintained throughout the plan period; • A Preferred Area or Area of Search for extending the very high specification roadstone Ghyll Scour quarry; • An Area of Search for extending the brickmaking mudstones High Greenscoe quarry; • An Area of Search or Preferred Area for working additional gypsum and a Mineral Safeguarding Area for the remaining gypsum resources; • Mineral Safeguarding Areas for the indicative sand and gravel and hard rock resources identified by the British Geological Survey; • Mineral Consultation Areas which will include buffer zones around the Preferred Areas, Areas of Search and Mineral Safeguarding Areas. 	<p>This policy has been newly introduced and seeks to safeguard mineral resources for sand and gravel, roadstone, brickmaking mudstones, gypsum and hard rock, thus helping to achieve the policy intention of Core Strategy Policy 17: <i>Supply of Minerals</i>.</p> <p>The policy does, however, effectively combine components of policies CSM 3 <i>Sand and Gravel Supply</i>, CSM 1 <i>Supply of Minerals</i>, CSM 7 <i>Brickmaking Mudstones</i>, CSM 6 <i>Gypsum</i>, and CSM 2: <i>Crushed Rock Supply</i> as presented in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007). Therefore, the corresponding assessments, as presented in the SA Stage Two Report (February 2007) still apply (see paragraph 3.31 and Appendix 1; paragraph 3.24 and Appendix 1; paragraph 3.25 and Appendix 1; paragraphs 3.33 and 3.34 and Appendix 2 (Policy CSM 6 Gypsum); and paragraph 3.29 and Appendix 1 respectively).</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
<p>considered and safeguarded for the surface working of gypsum if it can be demonstrated that the supply of desulphogypsum is insufficient.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 2 CRUSHED ROCK SUPPLY</p> <p>The Preferred Option Minerals Core Strategy Policy 2 would set out that the plan will not make additional provision for quarrying crushed rock over the plan period.</p> <p>Opportunities will be pursued where they arise for reducing the size of the crushed rock landbank where this is practicable.</p>		
<p>Core Strategy Policy CSM 5 INDUSTRIAL LIMESTONES</p> <p>The Preferred Option policy would state that proposals for the extraction of high purity limestone will only be permitted if 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>Core Strategy Policy 20 INDUSTRIAL LIMESTONES</p> <p>The Preferred Option policy would state that proposals for the extraction of high purity limestone will only be permitted if 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>The policy has not been modified from the one presented in the previous version, Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007). Therefore, the findings of the assessment presented in the Stage Two report remain valid (see paragraphs 3. 32 and 3.33 and Appendix 2).</p>
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 21 BUILDING STONES</p> <p>The Core Strategy policy would state that the plan will seek to identify and protect sources of the full range of local building stones that help to maintain Cumbria's local distinctiveness.</p>	<p>This is a new policy, although the need for sourcing specific local stone in defined areas did arise at the Issues and Options stage.</p> <p>As this is a new policy, an SA appraisal has been undertaken which can be found in Appendix 3.</p> <p>The policy scores positively in ensuring adequate provision of local building stone and protection of resources from sterilisation. Whilst it potentially scores negatively against minimising primary</p>

Core Strategy Preferred Options (February 2007)	2 nd Draft Changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options (August 2007)	SA Implications of the Revision
		<p>extraction in favour of the use of secondary/ recycled materials, substitutes are limited, particularly as this policy is seeking to help maintain Cumbria's local built distinctiveness. The policy would also positively contribute to meeting Objective EN3 regarding improving the quality of the built environment and to the economic objectives (EC1 and EC3). Potential negative effects of policy on other Priority Objectives should be mitigated through careful consideration of the Development Control Policies.</p>
	<p>Core Strategy Policy 22 COAL BED METHANE The Core Strategy Policy would state that planning permission will be granted for proposals to exploit and use coal bed methane in appropriate locations and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts.</p>	<p>This is a newly introduced policy which has been appraised in Appendix 3.</p>

APPENDIX THREE: ADDITIONAL APPRAISAL MATRICES

**CORE STRATEGY POLICY II
REDUCING LANDFIL**

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria	Preferred Policy Option	Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
NR4 To manage mineral resources sustainably and to minimise waste	Does the option reflect the waste management hierarchy, with the recycling and re-use of waste as a priority?	++	Policy scores positively in relation to objective NR4 to minimise waste as it supports the identification of enough sites to meet the targets for reducing landfilled waste. Although the policy implies the identification of facilities for the recycling and composting of waste, it doesn't specifically refer to renewable forms of energy (the Council is still considering the option of Energy from Waste incineration).
	Does the option make adequate provision for facilities to produce secondary and recycled aggregates?	+	
	Will it promote the use of renewable forms of energy?	?	
Primary Objective			
SP2 To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	Will the option improve access to recycling and composting services, where possible within local communities using sustainable transport choices?	0	No relationship between the policy and objective SP2 as although the policy promotes recycling and composting it does not refer to the accessing of these by local communities or the means of transport.
SP5 To improve the health and sense of well being of people	Does the option reflect fully the role of the planning system in minimising potential health impacts associated with waste management facilities?	0	Although it is assumed that compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security will be in place, the policy scores slightly negatively given that there will always be some impacts associated with the transportation of wastes to the relevant facilities. Policy would also have a potential negative effect on the sense of wellbeing of people from communities living near the new proposed facilities. Public concerns could however be reduced through effective community consultation and communication.
	Does the option reflect fully the role of the planning system in ensuring a healthy and safe working and living environment?	0	
	Will the option impact on the sense of well being of people?	-/0	
EN1 To promote and enhance biodiversity	Does the option seek to minimise the impact of waste management facilities on designated and priority habitats?	-/0	Although it is assumed that the development of any facilities would not take place on a site designated for its habitats or species and that best practice for environmental protection would be in place, there is a potential negative effect on designated and priority habitats and species due to the creation of new facilities and the transportation and management of wastes and minerals.
	Does the option seek to minimise the impact of waste management facilities on protected and key species?	-/0	
EN2 To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and	Does the option protect areas of designated landscape and cultural	-/0	Although it is assumed that other plan protection policies will be in place, there is still a potential negative effect on the landscape character, countryside remoteness and tranquillity

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria	Preferred Policy Option	Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
character for future generations	heritage value and acknowledge wider landscape sensitivity to development?		due to the construction of new waste facilities and the transport of the waste to the treatment facilities.
	Does the option recognise the importance of countryside remoteness and tranquillity and seek to protect this?	-/0	
NR1 To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Does the option seek to control adequately dust emissions associated with the management of waste?	0	The policy won't significantly change the overall baseline situation with regards to local air quality as instead of being transported to a landfill, waste will be transported to different waste facilities. It is unknown, at the moment, whether the facilities proposed will involve the application of clean/carbon efficient technologies or energy from waste recovery. The Council, however, is still considering Energy from Waste incineration.
	Does the option promote the movement of waste by rail where feasible including the safeguarding of railway sidings?	0	
	Will the option stimulate the development and application of clean / carbon efficient technologies?	?	
	Does the option support energy from waste facilities?	?	
NR2 To improve water quality and resources	Does the option provide adequate protection for waterbodies and the marine environment and promote the efficient use of water?	-/0	Although it is assumed that compliance with national standards and best environmental practice will be in place, there will always be some risk of water pollution, however low. Effective application of the generic development control policies will be important.
NR3 To restore and protect land and soil	Does the option encourage the siting of waste management facilities on brownfield land?	?	The location of the new proposed facilities is unknown, therefore it is unclear whether they would be located on brownfield/previously developed land or whether a greenfield site or good quality agricultural land would be needed. The worst case scenario is applied here and it is assumed that there is a risk to agricultural land/Greenfield sites. Although it is assumed that compliance with national standards and best environmental practices will be in place, there will always be some risk of soil pollution, however low. As a consequence, effective application of the generic development control policies will be important.
	Does the option seek to protect good quality agricultural land and Greenfield sites as far as possible?	-/0	
	Does the option include measures to avoid soil degradation and pollution?	-/0	
EC1 To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	Will the option encourage the retention of existing jobs in the waste management sector and stimulate further employment creation?	0/+	The creation of new facilities should stimulate further employment creation. The transferability of existing landfill related employment is unknown, although some jobs will be retained.

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria	Preferred Policy Option	Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
EC3 To diversify and strengthen the local economy	Will the option stimulate private sector investment – generally and within the waste management sector?	0/+	This policy option would stimulate the diversification within the waste management sector and could stimulate private sector investment.
	Will the option stimulate diversification within the waste management sector?	+	
	Will the option stimulate innovation and research relating to emerging waste management technologies?	0	

**CORE STRATEGY POLICY 15
HIGH AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL**

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria	Preferred Policy Option	Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
NR4 To manage mineral resources sustainably and to minimise waste	Does the option reflect the waste management hierarchy, with the recycling and re-use of waste as a priority?	- (see comments)	High and intermediate level radioactive wastes are a special type of waste which cannot be re-used or recycled. Whilst this policy is highly specialised and does not fit neatly with the appraisal questions, the policy scores well against the overarching key objective in that it seeks to define the planning context for responding to the identified need for the long term management of these types of wastes in the light of the government's review.
	Does the option make adequate provision for facilities to produce secondary and recycled aggregates?	0	
	Will it promote the use of renewable forms of energy?	0	
Primary Objective			
SP2 To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	Will the option improve access to recycling and composting services, where possible within local communities using sustainable transport choices?	0	No relationship between the preferred policy option and primary objective 2 to improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces as high and intermediate level radioactive wastes are special wastes, with no opportunity for community involvement in their management.
SP5 To improve the health and sense of well being of people	Does the option reflect fully the role of the planning system in minimising potential health impacts associated with waste management facilities?	-/0	Although it is assumed that compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security will be in place, the policy scores slightly negatively given that there will always be some risk of impacts, however low, associated with the transportation and storage of these wastes. Whilst compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security is assumed, the policy would impact on the sense of well being of people living close to the facility, given public concerns about radioactive waste. This could be reduced to a minimum through the community involvement already included in the policy as part of the planning criteria for deciding on planning applications for high and intermediate level radioactive waste geological disposal.
	Does the option reflect fully the role of the planning system in ensuring a healthy and safe working and living environment?	-/0	
	Will the option impact on the sense of well being of people?	-/0	
EN1 To promote and enhance biodiversity	Does the option seek to minimise the impact of waste management facilities on designated and priority habitats?	-/0	Although it is assumed that the development of this kind of facility would not take place on a site designated for its habitats or species and that best practice for environmental protection would be in place, there is a potential negative effect on designated and priority habitats and species due to the transportation of waste. The policy, however, includes environmental impact considerations as part of the three stage planning process and criteria for deciding on planning applications for high and intermediate level radioactive waste geological disposal.
	Does the option seek to minimise the impact of waste management facilities on protected and key species?	-/0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria	Preferred Policy Option	Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
EN2 To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	Does the option protect areas of designated landscape and cultural heritage value and acknowledge wider landscape sensitivity to development?	-/0	There is a potential negative effect on landscape character, countryside remoteness and tranquillity due to the construction of this facility and the transport of waste. The policy, however, includes environmental impact considerations as part of the three stage planning process and criteria for deciding on planning applications for high and intermediate level radioactive waste geological disposal.
	Does the option recognise the importance of countryside remoteness and tranquillity and seek to protect this?	-/0	
NR1 To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Does the option seek to control adequately dust emissions associated with the management of waste?	-/0	Whilst it is assumed that the handling of the waste itself would not give rise to dust emissions, both dust and carbon emissions would be associated with the road transportation of these wastes. These potential effects could be minimised through promotion of the movement of waste by rail where possible. Nuclear technology is considered to be a carbon efficient technology with no associated carbon emissions.
	Does the option promote the movement of waste by rail where feasible including the safeguarding of railway sidings?	0	
	Will the option stimulate the development and application of clean / carbon efficient technologies?	0/+	
	Does the option support energy from waste facilities?	0	
NR2 To improve water quality and resources	Does the option provide adequate protection for waterbodies and the marine environment and promote the efficient use of water?	-/0	Although it is assumed that compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security will be in place, there will always be some risk of water pollution, however low. There are also potential impacts associated with transportation of the waste (road, rail, and, importantly, sea).
NR3 To restore and protect land and soil	Does the option encourage the siting of waste management facilities on brownfield land?	?	It is not clear whether these facilities could be located on brownfield/previously developed land or whether a greenfield site or good quality agricultural land would be needed, given overriding geological requirements. Although it is assumed that compliance with national standards and best practice for environment, safety and security will be in place, there will always be some risk of soil pollution, however low. There are also potential impacts associated with transportation of the waste by road.
	Does the option seek to protect good quality agricultural land and Greenfield sites as far as possible?	?	
	Does the option include measures to avoid soil degradation and pollution?	-/0	
ECl To retain existing jobs and create new employment	Will the option encourage the retention of existing jobs in the waste	0/+	The creation of disposal facilities is likely to retain existing jobs and possibly stimulate further employment creation.

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria	Preferred Policy Option	Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
opportunities	management sector and stimulate further employment creation?		
EC3 To diversify and strengthen the local economy	Will the option stimulate private sector investment – generally and within the waste management sector?	0/+	It is anticipated that this policy would stimulate further research into the development and management of this type of facility.
	Will the option stimulate diversification within the waste management sector?	0/+	
	Will the option stimulate innovation and research relating to emerging waste management technologies?	+	

**CORE STRATEGY POLICY 2I
BUILDING STONES**

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
NR4 To manage mineral resources sustainably and to minimise waste	Does the option seek to provide a steady flow of minerals to meet demand within the area?	+	Policy scores positively in ensuring adequate provision of local building stone and protection of resources from sterilisation. Policy potentially scores negatively against minimising primary extraction in favour of the use of secondary/recycled materials although substitutes are limited, particularly as this policy is seeking to help maintain Cumbria's local built distinctiveness.
	Does the option protect mineral resources from sterilisation by development?	+	
	Does the option seek to minimise primary extraction in favour of use of secondary / recycled materials?	-/0	
	Does the option support the use of co-products from minerals working?	-/0	
	Does the option seek to conserve minerals as far as possible?	-	
Primary Objective			
SP5 To improve the health and sense of well being of people	Does the option seek to reduce the potential health impacts of minerals extraction and associated activities – e.g. noise and dust emissions?	-/0	Although it is assumed that all sites will comply with environmental/health and safety regulations, the extraction of local building stone will have a potential negative impact on health and wellbeing particularly given the transport implications. As a consequence, effective application of the generic development control policies will be important.
	Does the option seek to secure safety both on and off site, relating to extraction methods and other issues (e.g. transportation)?	-/0	
	Does the option seek to mitigate impacts on quality of life of the sector?	0	
EN1 To promote and enhance biodiversity	Does the option seek to avoid adverse impacts on protected environmental sites and species?	-/0	Again, effective application of the generic development control policies will be important in avoiding or minimising impacts of this preferred option on protected habitats/species and wider diversity, particularly as Cumbria has more nationally and internationally important wildlife sites than any other county. Preferred Core Strategy Policy 3 will also be important as this addresses aftercare and restoration.
	Does the option avoid adverse impacts on environmental frameworks and	-/0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
	networks?		
	Does the option actively seek enhancement of natural / ecological resources?	0	
	Does the option actively promote restoration of current and past mineral working sites for biodiversity benefits?	0	
EN2 To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	Does the option aim to protect landscape features from inappropriate development – designated and non designated areas?	-/+	Mineral working will inevitably have an impact on landscape quality, whilst its transportation will impact upon countryside remoteness and tranquillity. However, the use of local building stone to restore and maintain historic buildings will contribute to the protection of landscape features. The policy has a mixed effect on landscape objective EN2. It will be therefore important for the plan to incorporate a policy to minimise such impacts as far as is possible.
	Does the option recognise the importance of countryside remoteness and tranquillity?	-/0	
EN3 To improve the quality of the built environment	Does the option seek to support conservation of the built environment (e.g. locally sourced stone for construction), and to avoid adverse impacts on the built heritage from mineral working?	-/++	The preferred policy would have a strong positive effect on the quality of the built environment as it supports the conservation of the built environment by means of providing locally sourced stone for construction. However, it would also score negatively under the second part of the same objective, to avoid adverse impacts on the built heritage from mineral working. Whilst compliance with environmental regulations is assumed, there will be impacts associated with the transport of local building stones. The effect of this on the built environment will depend largely on the routing of vehicles which would be considered at the site-specific stage.
	Does the option seek to avoid inappropriate development in flood risk areas?	0	
	Does the option seek to reduce noise, light pollution, dust emissions, etc arising from minerals developments and associated land use?	-/0	
	Does the option aim to enhance the degraded urban and rural environment within the area?	0	
NRI To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Does the option seek to reduce dust emissions from mineral working?	-/0	Whilst it is assumed that all relevant environmental safeguards and regulations will be adhered to, there will still be some emissions derived from transport.
	Does the option promote sustainable	0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
	transport of extracted materials as a means of helping to reduce emissions?		No reference is made to the sustainable transport of local building stone.
	Does the option promote the development and application of clean / carbon efficient technologies?	0	
	Does the option seek to contribute to the use of renewable energy sources?	0	
	Does the option take into account predicted climate change and proactively promote adaptation within the minerals sector?	0	
NR2 To improve water quality and resources	Does the option seek to reduce risk to waterbodies arising from discharges and sedimentation as a result of minerals extraction?	-/0	It is assumed that all relevant environmental safeguards and regulations will be adhered to and that the generic development control policies will be in place for the protection of the water bodies and high water quality environment present in Cumbria. However, the risk to the water environment can not be eliminated entirely, particularly given the potential need for transportation of building stone.
	Does the option seek to prevent stress on the water environment?	-/0	
NR3 To restore and protect land and soil	Does the option recognise geological quality and fragility?	-/0	It is assumed that all relevant environmental/ planning protection policies will be taken into account in considering areas for the extraction of local building stone. However, because of potential extraction in areas where this activity did not previously take place, there is a risk to geological fragility.
	Does the option aim to assist with reducing the amount of contaminated land within the area?	0	
	Does the option seek to protect good quality agricultural land and Greenfield sites as far as possible?	0	
	Does the option include measures to avoid soil degradation, pollution and the use of peat?	0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
EC1 To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	Does the option aim to create more jobs in the minerals sector, to diversify employment or to improve quality of job opportunities?	0/+	The preferred policy option is likely to slightly increase employment opportunities in this sector.
	Does the option aim to create more or better rural employment opportunities?	0	
	Does the option aim to support local business development or investment?	0/+	
	Does the option provide support for retaining better educated people?	0	
EC3 To diversify and strengthen the local economy	Does the option encourage minerals related business growth?	0/+	The preferred policy option may encourage further related business growth.
	Does the option support improvements to the environmental performance of minerals companies?	0	
	Does the option aim to stimulate innovation, entrepreneurship and diversification within the minerals sector?	0	
	Does the option stimulate innovation and research relating to the recycling of minerals products and sustainable use of co-products?	0	

**CORE STRATEGY POLICY 22
COAL BED METHANE**

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
NR4 To manage mineral resources sustainably and to minimise waste	Does the option seek to provide a steady flow of minerals to meet demand within the area?	+	The policy scores positively in making provision for the exploitation of coal bed methane. Whilst it potentially scores negatively against minimising the extraction of primary minerals in favour of the use of secondary/recycled materials, the extraction of coal bed methane for power generation could, to a limited extent, offset the use of other more traditional energy minerals. The methane quality is such that it has the potential to be fed directly into the gas distribution network.
	Does the option protect mineral resources from sterilisation by development?	0	
	Does the option seek to minimise primary extraction in favour of use of secondary / recycled materials?	-/0	
	Does the option support the use of co-products from minerals working?	-/0	
	Does the option seek to conserve minerals as far as possible?	-/0/+	
Primary Objective			
SP5 To improve the health and sense of well being of people	Does the option seek to reduce the potential health impacts of minerals extraction and associated activities – e.g. noise and dust emissions?	0	It is assumed that all sites will comply with environmental/health and safety regulations.
	Does the option seek to secure safety both on and off site, relating to extraction methods and other issues (e.g. transportation)?	0	
	Does the option seek to mitigate impacts on quality of life of the sector?	0	
EN1 To promote and enhance biodiversity	Does the option seek to avoid adverse impacts on protected environmental sites and species?	-/0	Although the policy states that only proposals in appropriate locations and which do not have unacceptable environmental impacts would be granted planning permission, there is still the potential for adverse effects. Effective application of the generic development control policies will be important in avoiding
	Does the option avoid adverse impacts on environmental frameworks and	-/0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
	networks?		or minimising impacts of this preferred option on biodiversity, particularly as Cumbria has more nationally and internationally important wildlife sites than any other county. .
	Does the option actively seek enhancement of natural / ecological resources?	0	
	Does the option actively promote restoration of current and past mineral working sites for biodiversity benefits?	0	
EN2 To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	Does the option aim to protect landscape features from inappropriate development – designated and non designated areas?	-/0	Although the policy states that planning permission will not be granted for proposals which will have unacceptable impacts on the environment, there is potential for the policy to negatively affect landscape features and countryside remoteness and tranquillity. The implementation of Preferred Core Strategy Policy 2 will be important in avoiding/minimising potential negative effects on the landscape, in addition to effective application of the generic development control policies.
	Does the option recognise the importance of countryside remoteness and tranquillity?	-/0	
EN3 To improve the quality of the built environment	Does the option seek to support conservation of the built environment (e.g. locally sourced stone for construction), and to avoid adverse impacts on the built heritage from mineral working?	0	Potential negative effect on objective EN3 through potential noise, and pollution arising from the drilling of coal seams. However, compliance with environmental regulations is assumed.
	Does the option seek to avoid inappropriate development in flood risk areas?	0	
	Does the option seek to reduce noise, light pollution, dust emissions, etc arising from minerals developments and associated land use?	-/0	
	Does the option aim to enhance the degraded urban and rural environment within the area?	0	
NR1 To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Does the option seek to reduce dust emissions from mineral working?	-/0	Although compliance with environmental regulations is assumed, there is potential for the policy to score negatively against objective NR1. Whilst this policy would support the diversification of energy generating sources, there is still potential for the policy to contribute
	Does the option promote sustainable	0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
	transport of extracted materials as a means of helping to reduce emissions?		to greenhouse gas emissions/deterioration of local air quality through the combustion of the methane for power generation.
	Does the option promote the development and application of clean / carbon efficient technologies?	-/0	Nature/extent of post-extraction transportation and associated impacts is unclear.
	Does the option seek to contribute to the use of renewable energy sources?	-/0	
	Does the option take into account predicted climate change and proactively promote adaptation within the minerals sector?	-/0	
NR2 To improve water quality and resources	Does the option seek to reduce risk to waterbodies arising from discharges and sedimentation as a result of minerals extraction?	-/0	It is assumed that all relevant environmental safeguards and regulations will be adhered to and that the generic development control policies will be in place for the protection of the water bodies and high water quality environment present in Cumbria. Adherence to these will be particularly important given the potential for drilling to impact upon groundwater resources.
	Does the option seek to prevent stress on the water environment?	-/0	
NR3 To restore and protect land and soil	Does the option recognise geological quality and fragility?	-/0	It is assumed that all relevant environmental/ planning protection policies will be taken into account in considering appropriate locations for the extraction of methane. However, given the nature of drilling activities, there is a particular risk to geological quality and fragility. As the coal remains in the ground there is no surface subsidence.
	Does the option aim to assist with reducing the amount of contaminated land within the area?	0	
	Does the option seek to protect good quality agricultural land and Greenfield sites as far as possible?	0	
	Does the option include measures to avoid soil degradation, pollution and the use of peat?	0	

Sustainability Objective	SA Criteria		Key Comments/Explanation
Key Objective			
EC1 To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	Does the option aim to create more jobs in the minerals sector, to diversify employment or to improve quality of job opportunities?	0/+	The preferred policy option is likely to slightly increase employment opportunities in this sector.
	Does the option aim to create more or better rural employment opportunities?	0	
	Does the option aim to support local business development or investment?	0/+	
	Does the option provide support for retaining better educated people?	0	
EC3 To diversify and strengthen the local economy	Does the option encourage minerals related business growth?	0/+	The preferred policy option may encourage further related business growth.
	Does the option support improvements to the environmental performance of minerals companies?	0	
	Does the option aim to stimulate innovation, entrepreneurship and diversification within the minerals sector?	0	
	Does the option stimulate innovation and research relating to the recycling of minerals products and sustainable use of co-products?	0	

