


# West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) March 2022

## West Berkshire Local Plan



## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	2
2	The Appraisal Methodology.....	2
3	Background to the SA Report.....	4
4	Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context.....	7
5	Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects .....	17
5.1	Reasonable Alternatives and Assessment of Options.....	17
5.1.1	Policy Approach and Policy Development.....	18
5.1.2	Site Selection / Site Assessments.....	66
5.1.3	The Sequential Test.....	76
5.2	Overall assessment of the plan.....	77
6	Next Stages .....	78
7	Implementation .....	79
8	Conclusions on the Overall Sustainability of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan .....	80

## Appendices

- Appendix 1 - Summary of Relevant Plans and Policies
- Appendix 2 - Summary of Baseline Information
- Appendix 3 - Scoping Report Responses
- Appendix 4 - Assessment of Policy Options
- Appendix 5 - Assessment of Policies
- Appendix 6 - Site Assessments
- Appendix 7 - Sequential Test Summary Table

## 1 Introduction

West Berkshire Council has prepared a Minerals and Waste Local Plan that ~~it intends to~~ has been submitted for independent examination (~~proposed submission version~~).

This report constitutes the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

The main aim of the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of a new Local Plan. This document incorporates the requirements of a SEA for the Local Plan as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>1</sup> and the European Directive on SEA (2001)<sup>2</sup>.

In light of the Main Modifications proposed as part of the Examination process the SA/SEA has been reviewed and updated where required. Updates to the SA/SEA report and supporting appendices are show as follows:

- Additional text (Underlined text)
- ~~Deleted text~~ (Strikethrough text)

### ***The Development Plan for West Berkshire***

The Minerals and Waste Local Plan, when adopted will replace the existing saved minerals and waste planning policies as set out in the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire (incorporating alterations, 2001) and the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (1998).

The Minerals and Waste Local Plan will cover the period to 2037, setting out new policies to manage mineral and waste development in West Berkshire.

Several stages of consultations have already taken place giving members of the public and stakeholders the opportunity to have a say in the plan making process and guide the direction of the Local Plan to ensure it covers minerals and waste issues specifically relevant in West Berkshire.

- Regulation 18<sup>3</sup> and Issues and Options, including a “Call for Sites” (early 2014)
- Sites consultation on all sites submitted as part of the “call for sites” (Summer 2016)
- Preferred Options consultation (Spring 2017)

## 2 The Appraisal Methodology

### ***What is the SA/SEA? Why does it need to be done?***

The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to ensure that sustainability issues are considered during the preparation of plans. The SA is an iterative process which identifies the likely effects of options and subsequently the effect of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, and the extent to which these options and the Local Plan help to achieve economic, environmental and social objectives.

The SA must also incorporate the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC on the ‘assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.’ This is commonly referred to as the Strategic Environmental Assessment or ‘SEA’ Directive. This was transposed into UK law by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 19 (5)(a) <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/section/19>

<sup>2</sup> European Parliament. (2001) “The Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment”, Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament, Luxembourg, 2001  
[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/environment/general\\_provisions/l28036\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/general_provisions/l28036_en.htm)

<sup>3</sup> DCLG (2012) The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/regulation/18/made>

Regulations)<sup>4</sup>. Under these requirements, plans that set out the framework for future development consent of projects must be subject to an environmental assessment to determine if the plan, in this case the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, will have any significant effects on the environment. This context is reiterated in paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)<sup>5</sup>.

Further to the NPPF, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>6</sup> requires an SA and SEA to be carried out for Local Plans. Both of these requirements can be carried out in one appraisal process. In order to avoid any confusion, the reference to SA throughout this document will refer to both the SA and the SEA.

### **Stages to the SA/SEA**

The SA is made up of a series of stages (A to E) which are detailed in the table below.

Table 1 SA/SEA Stages	
Stage A	Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope
Stage B	Developing and refining the options
Stage C	Appraising the effects of the plan
Stage D	Consultation
Stage E	Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan

This report accompanies the proposed submission version of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and contains the following:

- An outline of the contents, the methodology and description of the SA/SEA process and the specific SA/SEA tasks undertaken
- A review of other plans and programmes and their relationship to West Berkshire (Appendix 1)
- A description of the environmental and sustainability context (known as the baseline information) (Appendix 2)
- A summary of key sustainability issues
- The SA/SEA Framework which sets out the SA/SEA objectives for assessing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan
- A review of the options considered and the preferred options selected

### **Consultation**

Public involvement through consultation is a key element of the SA. During the development of the SA there are several stages of consultation, both formal and informal.

Consultation on the SA Scoping Report took place in September 2013 for five weeks with the Consultation bodies<sup>7</sup>. The Council's response to the comments made on the scoping report are included in appendix 3.

The Issues and Options consultation in January/February 2014 set out the issues the Council believed were the key issues facing minerals and waste development in West Berkshire and invited comments and further issues to be raised. This consultation also formed the Regulation 18 consultation on the scope of the plan, and included an Interim Environmental Report which reviewed the sustainability impact (where possible) on the options being consulted on. A summary

<sup>4</sup> The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2004/1633/contents/made>

<sup>5</sup> National Planning Policy Framework 2019:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/779764/NPPF\\_Feb\\_2019\\_web.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779764/NPPF_Feb_2019_web.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents>

<sup>7</sup> Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency, as set out in Regulation 4 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

report following the consultation takes into account all the comments made and sets out a council response. Comments have formed the basis of the topics and issues considered in the Local Plan.

In July/August 2016 a further period of consultation was carried out on all the sites submitted to the Council as part of the “Call for Sites” in early 2014. This allowed members of the public and stakeholders to comment on the potential sites at a very early stage. Comments made during this consultation have been summarised and a council response written and all comments made will be taken into account through the site selection process. As the main aim of this consultation was to gain views on all the sites promoted to the council for consideration in the plan to aid the decision making process it was not accompanied by a SA/SEA report. The comments made during this consultation have been taking into account as part of the site assessment process.

Consultation on the Preferred Options version on the plan took place in May/June 2017. This allowed members of the public and stakeholders to comment on the Council’s Preferred Options plan, including the policies and sites proposed to be included within the plan. This version of the plan was accompanied by an Environmental Report, which was also available for comment as part of the consultation. All comments have been taken into account in the drafting of the submission version of the plan. All comments made have been summarised and the council response to the comments was published in September 2018.

Consultation on the Proposed Submission MWLP took place in January/February 2021. This allowed members of the public and stakeholders to comment on the Council’s Proposed Submission Plan. The consultation was accompanied by an Environmental Report. The plan was then submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in July 2021. Hearing sessions took place in February 2022, and following the publication of the inspector’s Post Hearings Note and associated Main Modifications the Main Modifications to the plan are now subject to a further period of consultation before the Inspector makes his final recommendations on whether the Minerals and Waste Local Plan can be adopted. The SA/SEA Environmental Report has been reviewed and updated where required to take into account the Main Modifications.

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

The collection of baseline information identified issues relating to accuracy of data, format of data and whether the research was up to date. This can cause limitations with the identification of issues (in the scoping stage) and monitoring of the SA objectives. Where there are gaps in the baseline data this has been identified and therefore, pose a degree of difficulty in forecasting effects.

The appraisal of policies is not always a straightforward process, particularly with it being an iterative process, and therefore there will be some degree of uncertainty in the predicted outcomes. Uncertainties can arise from scientific uncertainties, natural variability and lack of precision. A number of policy options were difficult to assess against the SA objectives and sub-objectives. This is particularly the case with topic specific policy options which may only have a significant impact on a small number of sub-objectives.

Where there is uncertainty this can be reduced through research and professional judgement, although there will still remain an element of uncertainty. Where necessary a precautionary approach has been taken in the SA. This is to make sure that where there are threats to the environment and a lack of scientific knowledge, action is taken.

### **3 Background to the SA Report**

#### ***Requirement for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)***

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be carried out for all strategic planning documents. The SA and the SEA requirements can be carried out in one appraisal process. Throughout this document, reference to the SA refers to both the SA and the SEA process.

### Stages of the SA

The sustainability appraisal is made up of a series of stages (Stages A to E).

Local Plan Stage	SA/SEA Stage	
<b>Pre-Production</b>	<b>A (Scoping)</b>	<b>Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope.</b>
	A1	Identify other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives
	A2	Collect baseline information
	A3	Identify sustainability issues and problems
	A4	Develop the SA framework
	A5	Consult on the scope of the SA
<b>Production and Publication</b>  <b>COMPLETE</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Developing and refining options and assessing effects</b>
	B1	Test the Local Plan objectives against the SA framework
	B2	Develop the Local Plan options
	B3	Predict the effects of the Local Plan
	B4	Evaluate the effects of the Local Plan
	B5	Consider mitigation measures and ways to maximise beneficial effects
	B6	Propose measures to monitor the significant effects or implementing the Local Plan
	<b>C</b>	<b>Preparing the SA Report</b>
	<b>D</b>	<b>Consulting on the draft Local Plan and SA Report</b>
	D1	Public participation on the draft Local Plan and SA Report
<b>Submission and Examination</b>  <b>IN PROGRESS</b>	D2 (i)	Appraise significant changes
	D2 (ii)	Appraise significant changes resulting from representations
<b>Adoption and Monitoring</b>	D3	Make decisions and provide information
	<b>E</b>	<b>Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan</b>
	E1	Finalise aims and methods for monitoring
	E2	Respond to adverse effects

The first stage (**Stage A**) is the production of the Scoping Report This is where the scope and overall level of detail of the SA is set out. The Scoping Report was published in September 2013 and went out to consultation with the statutory environmental bodies for 5 weeks. Consultation responses received as part of the Scoping Report consultation have been taken into account in the production of the Environmental Report.

The Scoping Report sets out the sustainability objectives and the proposed Local Plan objectives and these will then be used to assess the preferred options for the Local plan.

The next stage (**Stage B**) is the stage where the options are developed and refined and the effects of the options are assessed. This stage is an iterative process where the options are tested against the SA objectives to predict and evaluate the effects of options in the Local Plan. Mitigation measures are identified where necessary and recommendations to changes of the options are made and the revised options reassessed where necessary.

The findings of Stage B are pulled together to produce the SA report (**Stage C**).

Following the preferred options consultation changes have been made to the plan. These changes have been reassessed and the SA/SEA updated where appropriate. The Proposed Main Modifications have also been reviewed in light of the SA/SEA and the assessments and Environmental Report updated where required as part of **Stage D**.

### **Compliance with the SEA Directive / Regulations**

The requirement to carry out a SA also incorporates the provision of the European Directive 2001/42/EC to include a SEA. The distinction between the two is that the SEA primarily focuses on environmental effects, whereas the SA expands this remit to incorporate economic and social sustainability. In line with the requirements of the European Directive, the SA report seeks to identify only **likely significant effects** of the Local Plan.

The table below shows the locations in this report which meet the Directive (referred in particular to Annex I which specifies the information required by Article 5(1)).

Directive Requirement	Section of the report
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;	1, 4, Appendix 2
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;	4, Appendix 1, Appendix 6
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;	4, Appendix 1, Appendix 6
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;	4, 5, Appendix 1
e) The environmental protection objectives, established at International, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;	4, 5, Appendix 2, Appendix 6
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationships between the above factors <sup>8</sup> ;	5, Appendix 4, Appendix 5, Appendix 6
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	5, Appendix 4, Appendix 5, Appendix 6
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	5, Appendix 4, Appendix 5, Appendix 6
i) A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10;	7, Appendix 6
j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Non-Technical Summary

<sup>8</sup> These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects.

#### 4 Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context

##### ***Link to other policies, plans and programmes***

The Council must take account of relationships between the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and other relevant policies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives. This is in addition to the need to take into account environmental protection objectives established at international, European and national levels. All of these may influence the options to be considered in the preparation of the Local Plan. By reviewing these, relationship inconsistencies and constraints can be addressed and potential synergies can be exploited.

This list of relevant policy guidance, plans and strategies has been compiled. The key emerging objectives, targets and issues which have been considered for the SA objectives are summarised in appendix 1.

Screening exercise has been undertaken as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Article 6 (3) and (4) of the Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora require an Appropriate Assessment of Development Plans and relates to European sites of nature conservation interest, including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs).

##### ***Key environmental, social and economic issues and opportunities***

The key environmental, social and economic issues for West Berkshire have been identified through a review of the baseline data collected (Appendix 2).

Table 4 Key Sustainability Issues	
Environmental	
Climatic factors	<p>The UK is likely to see more extreme weather events, including hotter and drier summers, flooding and rising sea-levels. One of the main challenges is to mitigate for the impacts of climate change for example through flood water storage or the provision of green infrastructure.</p> <p>Waste management and mineral extraction/processing generate greenhouse gases and other air pollutants contributing to climate change.</p>
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	<p>There is a need to protect and enhance biodiversity, ensuring the connectivity of species populations and habitats across West Berkshire, and maximising opportunities for creating and improving habitats. West Berkshire's geodiversity also should be conserved and enhanced where possible. Minerals development has the opportunity to provide net gains for biodiversity through the restoration of former mineral sites.</p>
Landscape and Townscape	<p>Nearly three quarters of West Berkshire is designated as the North Wessex Downs AONB. High priority needs to be given to conserving and enhancing this area, specific character and setting.</p> <p>There is a need to prevent urban sprawl and settlement coalescence to protect West Berkshire's rural character.</p>
Soils	<p>There is a need to protect West Berkshire's 'Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land'. Many existing and potential mineral sites are located on high quality agricultural land, defined as grade 1, 2 and 3a. There can be issues in identifying areas within grade 3a/b as the data available to the Council only shows grade 3 as a whole.</p> <p>Due to the hydrogeological conditions along the Kennet Valley it may be necessary to import inert material for restoration in order that land can be restored back to agriculture where appropriate, and soils can be conserved.</p>



Cultural Heritage	There is a need to conserve and enhance West Berkshire's rich historic environment and diverse historic landscape character.
Air	<p>There are only two areas acknowledged as having poor air quality (designated as Air Quality Management Areas) in West Berkshire. These are at one section of the A339 in central Newbury and a section of the A4 in Thatcham. Traffic movements and processing associated with minerals and waste facilities can impact air quality in some instances.</p> <p>Being situated in close proximity to a strategic road network is ideal for business and other services to locate, presenting a challenge for locating minerals and waste facilities.</p> <p>Sites that offer sustainable transport opportunities such as rail, river or canal should be preferable to help reduce air quality impacts caused by road congestion.</p>
Water	<p>There is a need to avoid and reduce the impacts of river and groundwater flooding in parts of West Berkshire as well as all sources of flooding. With climate change, the frequency, patterns and severity of flooding are forecast to change and become more damaging.</p> <p>There is also a need to protect and enhance water quality and conserve water supplies, including influencing minimising per capita water consumption in West Berkshire, where possible.</p> <p>There is a need to reduce the amount of major and significant pollution incidents which have affected the quality of West Berkshire's water resources.</p>
Noise, Light Pollution	<p>Noise pollution may be an issue for people who live in close proximity to the M4 or the A34.</p> <p>Light pollution may be an issue for residents living in the more rural parts of West Berkshire (e.g. farms, hamlets and small villages in the AONB).</p>
<b>Social</b>	
Human Health	There are negative perceptions about noise and air pollution and the potential health impacts associated with certain types of minerals and waste development. Negative impacts for minerals and waste development can however be controlled through the planning system and the environmental permitting regime.
General social considerations – Population, Education, Housing, Deprivation, Crime and Safety	<p>The population of West Berkshire is projected to increase to 168,396 by 2036<sup>9</sup>. The West Berkshire Core Strategy plans for an additional 10,500 new homes between 2006 and 2026. The Council's Local Housing Need assessment, calculated using the government's standard methodology, is calculated at 551 dwellings per year. The Local Plan Review to 2036 is reconsidering the level of new housing required within the district. This is likely to result in greater demands on resources and minerals supply, and waste infrastructure.</p> <p>The number of people aged 65+ is expected to rise by 47%, between 2016 and 2036, which will have implications on adult social care provision within the district and on the amount of one-bedroom properties that will be required. This high requirement is for one bedroom accommodation, which reflects the increasing numbers of single person households trying to get on the property ladder, which places a greater demand on the need for minerals for the construction industry.</p>

<sup>9</sup> Population Projections (2016 based)

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/datasets/localauthoritiesinengland>  
z1

	<p>The main deprivation issue facing the area is that of barriers to housing and services. The need for affordable housing is likely to increase over the coming years.</p> <p>Although the level of crime is of importance to the residents of the area, it is antisocial behaviour that is of more concern as this has a direct effect on the quality of life and general appearance of the area.</p>
<b>Economic / Material Assets</b>	
Transport	<p>West Berkshire experiences traffic congestion on the strategic road network (M4 and trunk roads) as well as congestion associated with access to the strategic road network during peak periods.</p> <p>A key challenge is to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes throughout West Berkshire for minerals and waste.</p> <p>The likely route of vehicles accessing sites should be carefully considered to avoid problems of congestion, severance, increased costs of maintaining rural roads and safety issues. Opportunities to utilise West Berkshire's rail depots should also be encouraged, where appropriate and sustainable.</p>
Renewable and Low-carbon Energy	<p>The majority of energy used in West Berkshire is understood to be generated by fossil fuels which emit greenhouse gases, contributing to the greenhouse effect. Renewable and low-carbon energy development will be positive in terms of sustainability.</p>
Minerals	<p>Mineral working has a number of key environmental effects which must be considered by the Plan. These include; noise, dust, air quality, lighting, visual impact, landscape character, archaeology and heritage, traffic, contamination, soil, geology, best and most versatile agricultural land, blast vibration, flood risk, land stability, designated/protected wildlife sites, habitats, landscapes, geological features, restoration and aftercare, groundwater, water abstraction.<sup>10</sup></p> <p>Diminishing land won mineral supplies coupled with the general extent of environmental constraints is likely to cause difficulties in maintaining some mineral reserves in West Berkshire.</p> <p>The reserves of primary aggregates in West Berkshire are declining and it is possible that the MWLP may need to consider a shift in strategy to meet the need for aggregates over the plan period away from the reliance on land won sources.</p> <p>Safeguarding of viable or potentially viable mineral deposits from sterilisation by surface development, which would preclude their possible extraction at some future date, is an important component of sustainable development.</p> <p>The acceptability of mineral extraction in the AONB needs to be given consideration due to the sensitive nature of the designation.</p> <p>The issue of whether West Berkshire should pursue a strategy aiming for the provision of minerals to construction and manufacturing businesses solely within West Berkshire, or whether the wider role that West Berkshire has in supplying minerals to other areas that have fewer resources should be acknowledged and accounted for in the MWLP.</p>
Waste	<p>Waste management and associated activities generate greenhouse gases and other air pollutants. Climate change is a major sustainability consideration. The</p>

<sup>10</sup> Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 013 Reference ID: 27-013-20140306 Revision date 06 03 2014  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/minerals>

	<p>Plan should seek to reduce the impacts on climate change through the promotion of more sustainable methods of waste management.</p> <p>Population growth in West Berkshire will increase pressures on the current waste management facilities and may mean new facilities need to be provided. This will also result in an increase in competition for land for waste management facilities.</p> <p>In the preparation of the MWLP consideration will have to be given to whether existing permitted permanent sites, proposed preferred areas for waste development, and existing industrial areas should be safeguarded from alternative uses.</p> <p>Consideration will need to be given to whether small-scale and strategic waste facilities will be encouraged or discouraged from locating in the AONB in terms of policy in the MWLP.</p>
General economic considerations	<p>There is a need to ensure the infrastructure is in place in West Berkshire to continue to attract and retain investment and business.</p> <p>The MWLP should seek to identify facilities that generate employment in areas of relative high unemployment, however this is a challenge in itself, as areas that are densely populated, may also create the largest opposition to minerals and waste sites being located nearby.</p> <p>Areas of high population density in West Berkshire also create the issue of greater competition for other land uses for suitable sites.</p> <p>Waste facilities should be located to meet the demands of a growing population and these facilities should be located in accessible areas, particularly for those typically less mobile, such as the elderly.</p>

### ***Developing the SA Framework***

Developing a SA framework provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, analysed and compared and forms a central part of the SA process.

A set of sustainability objectives and their indicators, which may be in the form of targets and are a way in which the achievement of the objectives can be measured, make up the SA framework. These objectives and indicators can also be used to monitor the implementation of the Local Plan.

SA Objective	SA Sub-Objective	Suggested Indicators	SEA Topic
1. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geological diversity throughout West Berkshire	1.1 Is there likely to be an impact on biodiversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % SSSI land in favourable condition;</li> <li>• Loss in ha of SSSIs, LWS and ancient woodland;</li> <li>• Extent of BAP priority habitats;</li> <li>• Loss of Geologically/geomorphologically important sites;</li> <li>• Changes in areas and population of biodiversity importance.</li> </ul>	Biodiversity
	1.2 Is there likely to be an impact on geodiversity?		Flora Fauna Soil
2. To maintain and enhance water	2.1 Is there likely to be an impact on water quality?		Water Biodiversity

quality and resources	2.2 Is there likely to be an impact on water resources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures of chemical and biological water quality of inland watercourses “good” or “fair”; (EA)</li> <li>Incidents of major and significant water pollution; (EA)</li> <li>No. Permissions granted contrary to the advice of EA on water quality grounds;</li> <li>No. permissions granted contrary to the statutory waste/sewerage undertakes advice. (Thames Water)</li> </ul>	
3. To minimise the risk and impact of flooding	3.1 Is there likely to be an impact in terms of flood risk?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. permissions granted contrary to the advice of EA, Lead Local Flood Authority or other relevant bodies on flood risk grounds.</li> </ul>	Water Climate Factors
4. To maximise the sustainable use of land and the protection of soils, safeguarding the best and most versatile agricultural land	4.1 Is there likely to be an impact on the best and most versatile agricultural land?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. permissions granted on best and most versatile agricultural land;</li> <li>No. permissions granted on contaminated land;</li> <li>No. permissions granted on previously developed land.</li> </ul>	Soils Material Assets
	4.2 Is there likely to be an impact on soil quality?		
	4.3 Would previously developed land be utilised?		
5. To conserve and enhance the character of the historical environment, cultural heritage assets, and features of archaeological importance	5.1 Is there likely to be an impact on the historic environment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. and % of all designated heritage assets at risk;</li> <li>Areas of highly sensitive Historic Landscape Characterisation types which have been altered and their character types which have been altered and their character eroded;</li> <li>No. nationally important archaeological sites identified in the planning process and preserved in situ or by record;</li> <li>No. permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Council’s conservation or archaeological officer.</li> </ul>	Cultural heritage
6. To minimise the impact on landscape and townscape character	6.1 Is there likely to be an impact on townscape?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developments permitted contrary to the Council’s landscape advice;</li> <li>No. permissions granted within the AONB;</li> <li>Extent of Landscape Character Areas affected.</li> </ul>	Landscape Material Assets Cultural Heritage
	6.2 Is there likely to be an impact on landscape?		
7. To protect air quality in West Berkshire	7.1 Is there likely to be an impact on air quality?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of air pollutants (NO<sub>x</sub>);</li> <li>Proximity to source of poor air quality;</li> <li>Level of traffic flows.</li> </ul>	Air Human health

8. To maximise energy efficiency, the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and adaptability to climate change	8.1 Is there likely to be an impact on the amount of renewable energy capacity being provided in West Berkshire?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of typical energy production (GwH) from various waste facilities allocated or permitted;</li> <li>• Amount of new renewable energy capacity being provided each year (TV Energy Installations database).</li> </ul>	Air Climatic factors
	8.2 Is there likely to be an impact with regard to adaptability to climate change?		
9. To ensure the sustainable management of waste, minimise the quantity of waste sent to landfill, and to maximise the re-use, recovery and recycling of waste	9.1 Is this likely to have an impact on the amount of waste going to landfill?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tonnage of waste recycled;</li> <li>• Tonnage of waste composted;</li> <li>• Tonnage of waste recovered;</li> <li>• Tonnage of waste to be landfilled;</li> <li>• Allocations or permissions granted for various types of waste development.</li> </ul>	Landscape Climatic factors
	9.2 Is this likely to have an impact in terms of the quantity of waste being reused, recovered and/or recycled?		
10. To promote the sustainable transport of minerals and waste within West Berkshire	10.1 Is it likely that rail or waterborne transportation could be used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of developments where a green travel plan is submitted as a condition of development;</li> <li>• Method of transportation;</li> <li>• Proximity to waste arisings / market for mineral;</li> <li>• Proximity to strategic transport network.</li> </ul>	Human Health Air Climatic factors
	10.2 Is there likely to be an impact on the transport network (including the local road network and the Strategic Road Network)?		
11. To conserve mineral resources in West Berkshire through safeguarding of primary aggregates and encouragement of the use of recycled aggregate where possible and appropriate	11.1 Is there likely to be an impact in terms of safeguarding of primary aggregates?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site waste management plans submitted as part of development proposals;</li> <li>• No. permissions granted within identified safeguarding areas;</li> <li>• No. permissions granted contrary to Mineral Planning Authority advice.</li> </ul>	Climatic Factors Material Assets
	11.2 Is there likely to be an impact in terms of the use of recycled aggregate/construction and demolition wastes?		
12. To protect human health and well-being and maintain the quality and quantity of	12.1 Is there likely to be an impact on the quality and quantity of open space amenity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. permissions granted contrary to Environmental Health advice;</li> <li>• No. permissions granted contrary to Countryside (Rights of Way) advice;</li> </ul>	Population Human Health

public open space amenity across West Berkshire, and protect areas of tranquillity	12.2 Is it likely that there would be an impact with regard to areas of tranquillity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with dust control conditions;</li> <li>• Compliance with noise control conditions;</li> <li>• Enhancement of public access to nature (either as linear routes or open space) as part of minerals/waste site working and restoration schemes.</li> </ul>	Landscape Biodiversity Flora Fauna
13. To minimise public nuisance	13.1 Is it likely that there would be an impact with regard to odour?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. permissions granted contrary to Environmental Health advice;</li> <li>• Monitoring complaints regarding odour, dust, noise, light pollution;</li> <li>• Monitor complaints regarding traffic issues;</li> <li>• Define/monitor location of Strategic Lorry Routes.</li> </ul>	Population Human Health Biodiversity Air Fauna Flora
	13.2 Is it likely that there would be an impact on noise levels?		
	13.3 Is it likely that there would be an impact with regard to light pollution?		
14. To support opportunities for economic development, including jobs.	14.1 Is there likely to be an impact on the local and wider economy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No people of working age in employment;</li> <li>• No. non-residential completions;</li> <li>• Vacancy rates within existing centres and employment areas.</li> </ul>	Population
	14.2 Is there likely to be an impact in terms of employment?		

### ***Changes to the SA Objectives since the Scoping Report***

The SA/SEA Scoping report for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan split the SA Objectives into two, one covering waste development and the other covering minerals development. However, it has been decided that these could be combined into a single objective covering all types of development.

The wording has also been amended since the scoping report as some of the objectives referred to “minerals and waste development” however, given that the whole plan is in relation to minerals and waste development this is not required.

In addition, following the Regulation 18/Issues and Options consultation, sub-objectives have been developed for each of the main objectives to help with the assessment of the potential impacts on the objectives.

Following the preferred options consultation two of the sub-objectives under objective 13 have been deleted, the sub-objectives relating to the impact on air quality and impact on traffic have been deleted as they are direct repeats of objectives 7.1 (air quality) and 10.2 (highway impact).

The suggested indicators have also been updated to ensure that those proposed can be monitored and measured.

The SA Objectives have been tested against each other to ensure compatibility and highlight any areas where potential conflict or tensions may arise.

SA Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
2	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
3	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
4	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
5	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
6	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
7	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
8	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Uncertain	Uncertain
9	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
10	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Uncertain	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
11	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain
12	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible
13	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible
14	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible



In general terms the SA objectives are very compatible with each other with none of them being classed as ‘incompatible’. The majority of interactions between objectives are classed as ‘compatible’ and ‘neutral’. As can be seen from the chart, it is ‘uncertain’ whether objectives 1 – biodiversity / geodiversity, 2 - water quality, 3 – flooding, 4 – protection of land / soils, 5 - cultural heritage, 6 – landscape / townscape, 7 - air quality, 10 – sustainable transport, 13 – to minimise public nuisance are compatible with objective 14 – supporting economic development. The reason for this is that development, which is positive in economic terms, will not always be positive in terms of environmental impacts. This is something which needs to be judged on a case by case basis, balancing economic, environmental and social factors. In many cases, particularly in relation to minerals and waste development, potential harmful impacts can be picked up at the pre-application stage, and during determination. These harmful effects can then be mitigated so that the economic benefits can be taken full advantage of, while protecting the environment.

It is also ‘uncertain’ whether objectives 5 – cultural heritage, and 6 – landscape/townscape are compatible with objective 8 – maximising renewable and low carbon energy sources. The reason for this is that despite these sources of energy being greener and cleaner their fossil fuel counterparts, some types of renewable and low-carbon energy technology can have harmful effects, particularly in terms of landscape and visual impacts. Sites, monuments and buildings (and their settings) which are designated for their cultural heritage value can also be negatively impacted on by renewable energy installations. Examples of such technologies are wind turbines, and large solar farms. Again, where applications are submitted for such development, they need to be judged on a case by case basis balancing economic, environmental and social factors. Potential harmful impacts can be picked up at the pre-application stage, and during determination, and can then be mitigated.

The table below confirms all of the SEA objectives have been considered in the SA/SEA framework.

Table 7 Integrating the SEA objectives	
SEA Directive Issue	SA Objective
Biodiversity	1, 2, 12, 13
Population	12, 13, 14
Human Health	7, 10, 12, 13
Fauna	1, 12, 13
Flora	1, 12, 13
Soil	1, 4
Water	2, 3
Air	7, 8, 10, 13
Climatic Factors	3, 8, 9, 10, 11
Materials Assets	4, 6, 11
Cultural Heritage (inc. architectural and archaeological)	5, 6
Landscape	6, 9, 12

### **Minerals and Waste Local Plan Objectives**

The Minerals and Waste Local Plan objectives were set out in the Issues and Options Consultation. Main Modifications are now proposed to the Vision and to Objectives M2, M4 and W8.

Table 8 Minerals and Waste Local Plan Vision and Objectives	
<u>Vision: To facilitate the planned delivery of mineral resources and waste management capacity which meet the requirements for West Berkshire in accordance with national planning policy. In particular to the plan for delivery of mineral resources and waste management capacity in locations which meet the needs of West Berkshire in the most sustainable way, and taking into account climate change.</u>	
<b>Minerals</b>	
A (M1)	To encourage the most appropriate use of all mineral resources and the re-use of recycled minerals and secondary aggregates, having regard to the need to ensure that there is a sufficient supply, whilst maintaining the long term conservation of primary aggregates.
B (M2)	To attain the principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF by taking into consideration the demand for all mineral resources and the need to protect the quality of life of residents and protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment <u>taking into account climate change.</u>
C (M3)	Where practicable to locate minerals development in appropriate locations in order that the potential negative impact from flooding is minimised.
D (M4)	To maintain a stock of permitted reserves (a landbank) for aggregate minerals, in accordance with current Government advice to ensure an adequate and steady supply of minerals, as far as is practical, from outside the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, scheduled monuments and conservation areas. <u>Whilst also taking into account the potential for future contribution that should be made from mineral working in West Berkshire towards the aggregate supply needs of other areas.</u>
E (M5)	To identify sites for future mineral extraction which will provide for the continued extraction of minerals, having regard to the need to avoid demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance.
F (M6)	To prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of proven mineral resources by other forms of development and to safeguard existing and planned rail head sites together with existing and planned concrete batching facilities, coated road stone manufacturing facilities and sites that handle, process and distribute recycled and secondary aggregates.
G (M7)	To provide for the recovery and reuse of aggregate from construction and demolition waste in order to reduce the requirement for new primary resources to a minimum.
H (M8)	To ensure that mineral sites are progressively restored at the earliest opportunity to a high standard, beneficial and viable after-use that delivers meaningful measurable net gains for biodiversity, including the establishment of coherent ecological networks.
<b>Waste</b>	



I (W1)	To seek to prevent the generation of waste arisings at source, and to support and encourage initiatives designed to achieve this.
J (W2)	To enhance waste management in West Berkshire in line with the Waste Hierarchy through the provision of capacity for the re-use of waste materials, the preparation for the reuse of materials, the recycling of waste and the recovery of materials that cannot be recycled and to minimise the quantities of residual waste needing final disposal while recognising that this will continue to be required.
K (W3)	To provide a flexible approach to the delivery of waste management facilities of appropriate capacity and type to achieve net self-sufficiency within West Berkshire area.
L (W4)	To enable the delivery of the West Berkshire Waste Management strategy and increase the proportion of waste managed further up the waste hierarchy.
M (W5)	To locate waste management facilities so that wherever possible they minimise the distances that waste is transported for management and disposal, and to minimise adverse traffic effects of waste management development.
N (W6)	To safeguard existing waste management facilities, which are appropriately located, from competing forms of development that might otherwise constrain their continued operation or lead to their loss.
O (W7)	To ensure appropriate protection of the quality of life of those who live and work in West Berkshire from the adverse effects of waste management related development.
P (W8)	To ensure appropriate protection and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment in West Berkshire from the adverse effects of waste management related development in accordance with the NPPF <u>and taking into account climate change.</u>
Q (W9)	Where practicable to locate waste development in appropriate locations in order that the potential negative impact from flooding is minimised.

The compatibility between the SA objectives and the proposed Minerals and Waste Local Plan Vision and objectives has been tested to highlight any areas where potential conflict or tension may arise.

Table 9 SA and Local Plan Objective compatibility																			
SA Objective		MWLP objective																	
		V	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
1		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
2		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
3		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
4		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
5		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
6		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
7		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
8		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
9		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
10		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
11		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
12		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
13		Compatible	Neutral	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible
14		Compatible	Neutral	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Compatible	Incompatible	Incompatible	Compatible

Compatible    Incompatible    Neutral    Uncertain

The SA objectives are shown to be generally very compatible with the MWLP objectives (see table 9) with none of them being classed as ‘incompatible’. The majority of interactions between objectives are classed as ‘compatible’ and ‘neutral’.

Objective B relates to the principles of sustainable development set out in the NPPF, and striking a balance between the demand for all mineral resources and the need to protect the quality of life of residents, the quality and diversity of areas of nature conservation interest, historic and heritage assets, water environment and landscape character. Objective M is concerned with minimising adverse traffic effects of waste management development. The crux of Objective O is ensuring appropriate protection of residents' quality of life from the adverse effects of waste management development. Objective P is about ensuring the protection of natural and cultural heritage from the adverse effects of waste related development.

As can be seen from the chart it is 'uncertain' whether Objective B, M, O and P are compatible with SA objective 14 – supporting economic development. The reason for this is that even though minerals and waste development may be positive in terms of the economy there can be resulting harmful environmental effects. Often in individual planning applications these harmful impacts can be addressed and controlled through mitigation. In this way economic benefit can be achieved without compromising environmental or social issues.

Objective F is concerned with preventing the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral by other forms of development and safeguarding rail head sites, concrete batching facilities, coated road stone manufacturing facilities and sites that handle, process and distribute recycled and secondary aggregates.

It is 'uncertain' whether Objective B is compatible with SA objectives 8 - maximising energy efficiency, and 9 – sustainable management of waste. The reason for this is that where proposals for renewable/low carbon energy facilities come forward in certain locations, they could potentially be refused on the grounds of 'unnecessary sterilisation of mineral' or because a rail head or minerals associated facility may cease to exist as a result. It is possible that these locations would, apart from the conflict with Objective B, be suitable locations for renewable/low carbon facilities. This is something that would need to be judged as applications come in.

There are no changes in compatibility of the SA Objectives with the plan objectives as a result of the Proposed Main Modifications.

## **5 Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects**

Stage B of the sustainability Appraisal is the development and refinement of options and policies and an assessment of the effects. This stage incorporates the development of the options and policies, the prediction and evaluation of the effects of the options and subsequent policies that make up the Preferred Options Minerals and Waste Local Plan, along with the consideration of any mitigation measures and ways to maximise beneficial effects along the way.

### ***Developing the Options***

The Minerals and Waste Local Plan will set out the framework for minerals and waste development in West Berkshire. This will set out policies to manage development as well as looking to allocate sites, and safeguard existing sites and mineral deposits.

### ***Method of Approach***

The effects of each option have been tested against the SA objectives that were set out in the Scoping Report. The aim of the appraisal is to identify any significant conflicts or combined effects between the options and the SA objectives.

#### **5.1 Reasonable Alternatives and Assessment of Options**

Reasonable alternatives have been identified for the potential policies to be included within the Local Plan and the possible sites to be allocated. Only those options which are considered to be reasonable have been subject to the SA/SEA process. The assessment of the reasonable

alternatives identifies the likely significant effects of the available options, helping to develop and refine the proposals within the Local Plan.

The options, preferred policy approaches and policies have been assessed in terms of probability, duration, frequency and reversibility. The following issues have been considered:

- Effect – What is the overall sustainability impact on the SA objectives?
- Likelihood – How likely is it that the effect will actually occur?
- Scale – what is the potential scale of the effect, considering the geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected?
- Duration – Are the potential effects likely to be permanent or temporary?
- Timing – Are the potential effects short, medium or long term?

### 5.1.1 Policy Approach and Policy Development

The Council have an existing plan, which is now considered to be dated and out of date, therefore, continued reliance on the policies of this plan is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. In addition, reliance on the NPPF (in effect having no plan), is also not considered to be a reasonable alternative, as the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to have up to date plans. Therefore, a new plan with new policies is considered to be the only reasonable alternative.

For the topics the plan needs to cover there are a number of potential strategies or approaches to deliver the topic, these are discussed below and the reasonable alternatives for delivering each section of the plan set out. The Issues and Options/Reg 18 consultation set out the topics the plan should cover. The detailed assessments for each option considered are set out in appendix 4. The detailed assessments for each of the policy option taken forward are set out in appendix 5.

The SA/SEA has been reviewed in light of the Proposed Main Modifications to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Appendix 8 sets out a summary of all the Main Modifications and how the SA/SEA has been reviewed in the light of these. Where an update to the SA/SEA has been made because of a Proposed Main Modification, this is noted. Where necessary, the text in the following sections has been updated as have the relevant appendices.

#### Issue 1 – Timing of the plan

The Issues and Options consultation considered a number of options relating to the end date for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which are no longer considered to be reasonable alternatives:

- End date of 2031 (NPPF 2012 guidance)
- End date of 2026 (PPS10 guidance)
- End date 2026 (in line with West Berkshire Core Strategy)
- Other time period

However, since the Issues and Options consultation, the revised NPPF (2019) states that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption (para 22), therefore, the end date for the plan has been chosen to be 2037 as the only reasonable alternative. The plan will be reviewed every five years to ensure that the policies included within it are up to date in line with the NPG<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> National Planning guidance Paragraph 042 Reference ID:61-042-20180913 (revision date 13 09 2018)  
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/plan-making>

**Issue 2 – Future-mix of supply of aggregates in West Berkshire**

Options Considered		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
2.1	Reliance on extraction of primary minerals, recognising the wider role West Berkshire has in supplying minerals to other areas with fewer resources.	Overall there is a high degree of uncertainty as to the sustainability impact on this option. While this option would likely bring economic benefits this option is considered to be the least sustainable of the options considered, primarily due to the resultant nuisance and carbon emissions from the extraction and transportation of primary material.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option would not readily align with the NPPF as consideration needs to be given to other sources of construction aggregates in the development of the plan.</p> <p>A recognition of the district's role in supporting the wider regional need for minerals is in line with the NPPF. While sharp sand and gravel is widely available in the south east, soft sand reserves are more limited and therefore, there are some benefits to considering the role that West Berkshire could play in meeting the regional need.</p>
2.2	Reliance on extraction of primary mineral, seeking to maintain the remaining reserves for construction and manufacturing within West Berkshire.	Option 2.2 focuses on the provision of aggregate primarily for use within West Berkshire and was considered likely to impact positively on 9 sustainability objectives, including in regards to biodiversity and geodiversity, water quality and resources, protection of quality agricultural land, amenity impacts and sustainable transport issues. In relation to economic development, this option is likely to have negative impact.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option was generally seen as an unrealistic and inappropriate option which may not comply with the NPPF or be supported through the DtC.</p>
2.3	Maximising recycled aggregates to reduce reliance on land won sources.	Option 2.3 relies on encouraging the production of recycled aggregate, thereby reducing the reliance on land-won sources and was considered likely to impact very positively on 2 sustainability objectives regarding 'sustainable waste management', and the 'conservation of mineral resources'. Under this option, less extraction would be taking place so less land would be disturbed, therefore, impacting positively on 4 objectives including those related to biodiversity and geodiversity, water quality	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>It is recognised that recycled aggregates do play an important part in meeting overall demand for construction aggregates</p>

		and resources, the protection of quality agricultural land, and public open space amenity. Although, this would reduce the impact of quarry traffic, there may be increased negative impact from transportation of processed and unprocessed construction, demolition and excavation waste. It was unclear what impacts this option would have in economic terms, as jobs may be lost in the primary extraction industry but may be created in the recycled aggregate industry.	
2.4	Mix of primary land-won aggregates, imported aggregates and recycled aggregates.	Option 2.4 is a combination of different types of aggregate provision and was considered likely to impact positively on 7 sustainability objectives and negatively on none of the objectives. It appears that in sustainability terms this option may be less beneficial than options 2.2 or 2.3. However, for practical reasons including suitability of recycled aggregate for certain purposes, and market demands, it may be that option 2.4 is preferable.	<b>This option is to be taken forward</b>  This option was seen as the most appropriate option when considering the requirements of the NPPF. While this option is not necessarily the most sustainable option, it is considered to be the most appropriate overall strategy for the plan, with a reliance on a range of mineral sources.

An additional ‘catch all’ option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own and so no sustainability assessment has been made.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Landbank / Need Policy has been developed (policy 2). This sets out the Council’s landbank and need requirements (taken from the LAA) for mineral extraction, promotes the use of recycled and secondary aggregates, as well as allocating sites to meet this need. Since the preferred options the policy has been updated and as a result the SA/SEA for the policy has been reviewed and updated. The table below sets out the summary of the SA/SEA:

<b>Policy 2: Landbank/Need SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall the inclusion of this policy in the local plan is likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. There are a number of potential positive impacts on economic sustainability as the policy will support the delivery of sites to meet the district’s need for construction materials and provide employment as well as encouraging the use of recycled and secondary aggregates before virgin material.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> short/medium term

The safeguarding policy proposed for inclusion within the plan (Policy 9), also helps to deliver the chosen alternative by safeguarding rail capacity for imported aggregates and existing or permitted mineral infrastructure facilities. The safeguarding policy has been subject to SA/SEA, and the summary is set out under Issue 5.

### Issue 3 – Extraction of sharp sand and gravel from within the AONB

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
3.1	Meet needs from outside the AONB, which could limit the level of aggregates that could be produced.	Option 3.1 would discourage extraction of sharp sand and gravel in the AONB and it was considered likely that it could impact positively on 3 sustainability objectives concerned with protecting the historic environment, the landscape, and open amenity space. It may however, limit employment opportunities as there is, potentially, a limited amount of reserves outside the AONB, and it would limit employment potential in the AONB, so it may therefore be negative in economic terms.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option gained support through the consultation recognising that sites should be located outside the AONB, but that in some cases, where ‘exceptional circumstances’ can be demonstrated sensitive sites may need to be considered. The SA/SEA shows that options that seek to avoid extraction in the AONB would have a positive impact on environmental sustainability.</p> <p>Adequate suitable sites for sharp sand and gravel have been submitted outside the AONB, therefore, it is not considered appropriate to consider allocating sites for sharp sand and gravel within the AONB.</p>
3.2	Meet needs from outside and inside the AONB. Inc. identification of strategic area/areas or sites within the AONB.	Option 3.2 would allow the extraction of sharp sand and gravel in the AONB and was considered likely to impact positively in economic terms, as it could potentially maximise employment as there are understood to be reserves in the AONB. It would likely be negative for protecting the historic environment, the landscape, and open amenity space.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option would result in a negative impact on environmental sustainability and as the BGS data shows that there are large sharp sand and gravel deposits outside of the AONB, it would not be appropriate to consider the allocation of sites within the AONB if suitable sites are available outside the protected area.</p>

An additional ‘catch all’ option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Location of Development – Construction Aggregates policy (Policy 4) has been developed. This sets out the locations where there will be a presumption in favour of mineral extraction. The policy has been subject to SA/SEA, which has been updated since the Preferred Options to take into account the change in approach to soft sand and including the allocation of specific sites. The reassessment of the policy has not resulted in any changes to the overall outcome of the SA/SEA assessment. A summary of the SA/SEA outcome is set out below:

Policy 4: Location of Development – Construction Aggregates policy SA/SEA Summary	Summary of effects
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. While there are some potential negative environmental and social impacts as a result of this policy, especially in relation to the potential for soft Sand sites in the AONB to come forward where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. However, these are only likely to be short/medium term as mineral extraction is only temporary in nature and appropriate mitigation measures would be required. Following restoration of any site considered under the policy the overall impact should be neutral. There is a potential positive impact on economic sustainability as the policy sets out where there would be a presumption in favour of development for mineral extraction.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium term

The sites prosed for allocation have been subject to SA/SEA as part of the site selection process, and the details can be found in section 5.1.2 of this report.

The Main Modifications (MM12) proposed for this policy have not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

#### Issue 4 – Soft Sand

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
4.1	Meet needs from outside the AONB, which could limit the level of aggregates that could be produced.	<p>Option 4.1 would not allow extraction of soft sand from within the AONB, and was therefore considered likely to be very positive for protecting the historic environment, the landscape, and open space amenity. However, it may limit job creation potential so it is likely to be very negative in economic terms.</p> <p><b>This is the option that was taken forward in the Preferred Options, however it is no longer the option being taken forward.</b></p> <p>Given the protected nature of the AONB and the lack of a separate land bank figure for soft sand in the previous LAAs the Preferred Options did not propose the allocation of any soft sand sites. Following the publication of separate landbank figures in the 2017 and 2018 LAAs this approach is no longer considered appropriate. It is noted that this option, along with option 4.3 would be the most beneficial in sustainability terms.</p>

4.2	Meet need from within the AONB. Inc. identification of strategic area/areas or sites within the AONB.	Option 4.2 on the other hand would allow extraction of soft sand from within the AONB, and it was therefore considered likely to be very negative for protecting the historic environment, the landscape, and open space amenity. It was considered likely to create jobs so it could be very positive in economic terms.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option does not give the required weight of the NPPF to the protected landscape of the AONB and therefore, as a blanket policy approach it is not considered appropriate.</p>
4.3	Meet need from outside the AONB, recognising exceptional circumstances where extraction may be acceptable from within the AONB.	Option 4.3 would seek to have the extraction of soft sand from outside the AONB, however, if there were exceptional local circumstances, the soft sand could be extracted on a small scale. This was considered likely to be positive for the historic environment, the landscape, open space amenity, and in economic terms.	<p><b>This option has been taken forward following the preferred options and the publication of separate landbank figures for soft sand.</b></p> <p>This approach is considered to be the most in line with the requirements of the NPPF, and is considered to have a positive sustainability impact.</p> <p>Following the publication of the 2017/18 LAAs, which included separate landbank figures for soft sand, there is a need for soft sand within West Berkshire.</p> <p>No suitable sites were submitted outside the AONB, therefore, it is considered that there may be exceptional circumstances which allow for allocations in the AONB to be considered.</p>

**Discussion of options and change of approach:** Option 4.1 was initially taken forward into the Preferred Options version of the plan, and no soft sand sites were considered for allocation. However, since the publication of the Preferred Options additional information has come to light which suggests that this is no longer a reasonable option to take forward and further consideration of the approach to soft sand is required. As a result option 4.3 has been taken forward into the MWLP. As part of the further work into how best to deal with the issue of soft sand, option 4.3 was further refined, and split into five alternatives for consideration in the Soft Sand Study<sup>12</sup> commissioned by the Council.

These new options are outlined below.

<sup>12</sup> West Berkshire Soft Sand Study [www.westberks.gov.uk/mwevidencebase](http://www.westberks.gov.uk/mwevidencebase)



Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
4.3.1 Allocate specific sites for soft sand, including from within the AONB. Future planning applications would have to pass the exceptional circumstances test in para 116 of the NPPF.	This policy option is likely to have an overall neutral impact on sustainability, but it would be likely to have a negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of development in the AONB. There would be a positive impact in relation to economic sustainability as development of sites for soft sand would supply material to local and regional markets.	<b>This option has been taken forward in part</b>  See comments in table below relating to option Db.
4.3.2 Do not allocate specific sites within the AONB – work with surrounding authorities and/or rely on alternative sources (eg. marine sand) to secure supply.	This option is likely to have a significantly positive impact on environmental sustainability due to the protection of the landscape of the AONB, but also a potentially significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability due to the need for material to be imported into the district. The importation of material could also have a negative impact on air quality and climate change through greater transport emissions as a result of bringing the material into the district.	<b>This option has been taken forward in part</b>  See comments in table below.
4.3.3 Do not allocate specific sites within the AONB – identify preferred areas, or areas of search outside of the AONB.	This option would be likely to have a significantly positive impact on environmental sustainability due to the protection of the landscape of the AONB. There would be a number of unknown impacts, in particular air quality and transport impacts, as it is unknown where the alternative sources of soft sand would be found.	<b>This option has not been taken forward.</b>  The NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances consideration of mineral extraction in the AONB can be considered. Exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated and therefore, it is appropriate to consider allocations in the AONB.  Areas of search outside the AONB will be considered.
4.3.4 Combination of options 1 and 3. Seek to allocate the most appropriate sites (whether in AONB or not) and where this is not sufficient to deliver the requirement	This option would be likely to have an overall neutral impact on sustainability, but would be likely to have a negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the potential for development in the AONB. There would be a	<b>This option has been taken forward in part</b>  See comments in table below relating to option Db.

	over the plan period, identify preferred areas or areas of search outside of the AONB.	positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of the policy providing soft sand to local markets and resulting in job creation within the district.	
4.3.5	Do not allocate specific sites in the AONB – identify preferred areas, or areas of search both within and outside of the AONB.	This option would be likely to have an overall neutral impact on sustainability, but there are a number of unknown impacts, as the areas of search mean the location of the sites is unknown	<p><b>This option has not been taken forward.</b></p> <p>The NPPF states that in exceptional circumstances consideration of mineral extraction in the AONB can be considered. Exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated and therefore, it is appropriate to consider allocations in the AONB.</p>

The Soft Sand Study concludes that the only realistic alternative to providing for extraction within the AONB in West Berkshire would be to supply soft sand from elsewhere, specifically from quarries in the south of Oxfordshire. On the basis of the conclusions and recommendations of the study therefore, a new set of options have been considered, including the allocation of sites within the AONB. The study takes into account the potential soft sand sites within West Berkshire. Three soft sand sites were proposed through the Call for Sites for consideration for allocation. One site, while located outside of the AONB, has significant access and road safety constraints leaving the other two sites (within the AONB) to be considered further for allocation. Specific details of the site assessments can be found in section 5.1.2 and appendix 6 of this report.

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
A	Do not allocate sites within the AONB – work with Oxfordshire to enable supply to West Berkshire.	Overall this option would be likely to have an overall neutral impact on sustainability, however as it would rely on the importation of material from elsewhere there would be likely to be negative impacts on environmental sustainability, largely as a result of the additional transportation requirements which would have a knock-on effect on air quality and climate change adaptability. There would be positive impacts in relation to safeguarding of West Berkshire's resources and maintaining soft sand supply for West Berkshire. While the impacts on neighbouring authorities have not specifically been taken into account in the assessment above, reliance on importation of	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward.</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire is unlikely to be able to supply West Berkshire's full need and therefore, this option is not realistic to take forward.</p> <p>There may be scope for some material to be provided to West Berkshire from Oxfordshire, Further work on the likelihood of this is being a realistic option is being undertaken through the Duty to Cooperate. Option D below considers this further.</p>

		material from neighbouring authorities would be likely to require additional sites to be allocated and greater transportation of material through neighbouring authorities, and therefore, it is likely that this option would also have a negative sustainability impact on the neighbouring authorities.	
B	Allocate both sites for soft sand within the AONB (Chieveley Services and 60 Acre Field).	There would be a potentially significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of development of sites in the AONB, as development of one of the two sites under consideration is considered to result in significant harm to the AONB. There would be a positive impact in relation to economic sustainability as soft sand resources for the local market would be provided from within the district, and development would result in job creation in the local area.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward.</b>  The allocation of both sites would provide over and above the amount of soft sand required in West Berkshire, which is not considered appropriate within the AONB, especially as there is scope for some of West Berkshire soft sand need to come from Oxfordshire (see option D below).
C	Include areas of search and a criteria based policy to enable future applications to be considered.	While overall this option would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability, there are a number of uncertain impacts as the impacts on sustainability would depend on the location of the sites coming forward for consideration under this policy. The policy could require consideration of a number of factors that would then result in a longer term positive impact through the restoration of the site.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward.</b>  On their own, criteria based policies will not provide certainty regarding supply of soft sand within West Berkshire and therefore, it is not considered reasonable to rely on this option.
D	Allocate one site in the AONB, include a criteria based policy and areas of search outside the AONB to enable future applications to be considered and work to secure some supply from Oxfordshire.	Da) 60 Acre Field  This option would result in a negative impact on environmental sustainability related to the allocation of a site which would result in harm to the AONB. The use of a criteria based policy would result in a number of unknown impacts as the impact would depend on the sites coming forward. However, it could require mitigation	<b>This option is not to be taken forward.</b>  Exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated and therefore, the allocation of a site in the AONB is considered to be reasonable, however, this site is considered to have a significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the landscape impact and as a result when considering this site against the

	(Combination and variation of Options A, B and C) Option Da) Allocation 60 Acre Field	measures/design practices that would in the longer term result in a positive impact. The importation of material from Oxfordshire would reduce the number of sites required to be considered by the criteria based policy, but would also result in additional transport related impacts, therefore, the positive / negative impacts of each of these would be likely to balance each other out.	Chieveley Services site (option Db below), the site at Chieveley Services is considered to be more appropriate.
	Option Db) Allocation Chieveley Services	Db) Chieveley Services  This option would result in an overall neutral impact on sustainability. The site to be allocated is considered acceptable in landscape terms, and the use of a criteria based policy would result in a number of unknown impacts as the impact would depend on the sites coming forward. However, it could require mitigation measures/design practices that would in the longer term result in a positive impact. The importation of material from Oxfordshire would reduce the number of sites required to be considered by the criteria based policy, but would also result in additional transport related impacts, therefore, the positive / negative impacts of each of these would be likely to balance each other out.	<b>This option is to be taken forward.</b>  Exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated and therefore, the allocation of a site in the AONB is considered to be reasonable. The site is considered acceptable in landscape terms and therefore, it is considered more appropriate to allocate the site at Chieveley Services than the site at 60 Acre field (option Da), which is not considered acceptable in landscape terms. There is potentially some scope for material to be supplied to West Berkshire from Oxfordshire and this is being pursued through the Duty to Cooperate.  As a result this option is considered to be the most appropriate option to take forward.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** Option Db is to be taken forward and the details are set out in the Location of Development – Construction Aggregates Policy (Policy 4). Exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated and therefore, is it considered appropriate to allocate a site in the AONB to help to meet the Council’s soft sand need. It is recognised that the allocation of a single site will not fully meet the Council’s need, however, there is potentially scope for some soft sand to come from Oxfordshire and further work is taking place through the Duty to Cooperate to identify whether this is an option (as set out in the Statement of Common Ground<sup>13</sup>) to help to meet the remaining requirement. Areas of search will be set out and a criteria based policy (included in policy 4) has been developed, should any other sites come forward for consideration over the plan period. Policy 4 has been subject to SA/SEA and a summary can be found under Issue 3 above.

<sup>13</sup> Duty to Cooperate Statement Appendix 3 available at: [www.westberks.gov.uk/mwlpps](http://www.westberks.gov.uk/mwlpps)

**Issue 5 – Safeguarding of minerals**

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
5.1	Safeguarding areas around potentially viable deposits, including a buffer	This option is considered to have a positive impact on conserving mineral resources, biodiversity and geodiversity, water quality and resources, soils, the historic environment and landscape due to less land being disturbed by other forms of development as a result of the safeguarding.	<b>This option is to be taken forward alongside option 5.5</b>  This option was considered to be the most appropriate option, taking into account all potential resources in the district not just sharp sand and gravel. The safeguarding of mineral resources is considered to be likely to have a positive sustainability impact.
5.2	Safeguard active mineral workings and sites identified for allocation	This option is considered to have a positive impact on conserving mineral resources, biodiversity and geodiversity, water quality and resources, soils, the historic environment and landscape due to less land being disturbed by other forms of development as a result of the safeguarding.	<b>This option is to be taken forward</b>  As well as safeguarding mineral resources, it is considered important that mineral related infrastructure is safeguarded for the duration of its permission.

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional options, which are not considered to be reasonable alternatives as they asked consultees for their opinions on specific areas, rather than asking about a policy approach. Therefore, they have not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 5.3 – asking whether consultees agree that there are circumstances when surface development might be allowed over in-situ mineral deposits
- Option 5.4 – Asking whether any other considerations that should be taken into account
- Option 5.5 – Asking whether any other mineral deposits to be safeguarded (Soft Sand, Chalk, Coal, shale gas). It is considered that option 5.1 would cover all potentially viable deposits, which would include soft sand. There is no identified need (and no history of extraction) for Chalk, Coal or shale gas, and therefore, these resources do not need to be safeguarded.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** Safeguarding policies have been developed. The Minerals safeguarding policy (Policy 9) sets out the Mineral Safeguarding Area which will safeguard mineral resources and infrastructure from non-mineral development. Since the preferred options slight changes have been made to the policy, however, this has not changed the outcome of the SA/SEA. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out in the table below:

Policy 9: Mineral Safeguarding policy SA/SEA Summary	Summary of effects
<p>There is likely to be a significantly positive environmental and economic impact as a result of safeguarding primary aggregates. There is also a potential positive impact on environmental sustainability as the policy seeks to safeguard rail head sites, which will allow for material to be transported by rail, reducing reliance on road transport. There is a potential negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of extraction on the local geology of an area. There is a possible positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of the policy as should sites within safeguarded areas come forward for mineral extraction this would provide primary aggregates for the construction industry.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral  <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium  <b>Scale:</b> District Wide  <b>Duration:</b> Permanent  <b>Timing:</b> long term</p>

The Main Modifications (MM26) proposed for this policy have not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

#### Issue 6 – Existing industrial users of minerals

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
6.1	<p>Identification of a personal landbank for the Beenham Tile Factory.</p> <p>Option 6.1, which relates to identifying a landbank for the Beenham tile factory, was considered to positively impact on economic development, as it would provide certainty and potential employment, and have a negative impact on maintaining the quality and quantity of open space, as it would potentially encourage extraction.</p>	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>It is unlikely that national policy would support the allocation of a bespoke landbank for the tile factory. The Tile Factory has very specific quality requirements for the material used on the site, and it is not guaranteed that the mineral resources within West Berkshire could meet the required specification. Therefore, any resources identified specifically for the Beenham Tile Factory could end up in the general market.</p>
6.2	<p>Acknowledge existing industrial users (tile factory, asphalt plant, concrete batching) in the overall demand for aggregate.</p> <p>Option 6.2 would acknowledge the existence of the Beenham Tile Factory in the consideration of the demand for aggregates in West Berkshire. It was also considered likely that it would positively impact on economic development, as it would provide certainty and potential employment, and have a negative impact on maintaining the quality and quantity of open space as it would potentially encourage extraction.</p>	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The approach used to calculate aggregate need using historic sales data as an indicator for future demand is considered to adequately capture the existing demand for aggregates for existing users of construction aggregates.</p>

6.3	Acknowledge existing industrial users through policy approach that supports use of indigenous primary aggregates within West Berkshire.	Option 6.3 would recognise the existence of the Beenham Tile Factory through a policy approach supporting indigenous primary aggregate use within West Berkshire. It was also considered likely that it would positively impact on economic development as it would provide certainty and potential employment, and have a negative impact on maintaining the quality and quantity of open space as it would potentially encourage extraction.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The plan should acknowledge the presence of existing manufacturing facilities within the district however, it is considered that a policy approach that seeks to husband the authority's mineral resources solely for use by users within the authority could be both impractical and restrict competition, which would not be an appropriate approach for the plan.</p>
6.4	Treat tile factory as any other end user of aggregates.	Option 6.4 would mean that the tile factory would be treated the same as any other end user of aggregates in West Berkshire. This is likely to impact positively on maintaining the quality and quantity of public open space amenity, but negatively on economic development, as it would not involve the provision of a landbank for such potential primary mineral need so this could discourage extraction within West Berkshire, potentially minimising employment potential.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This tile factory is just one of many local end users for products, therefore, its need it taken into account through the general landbank figures calculated in the LAA, meaning that it does not need a specific landbank and can be considered as one of many other end users.</p>
6.5	safeguarding of existing industrial users.	Option 6.5 would see the safeguarding of existing and any subsequently approved concrete batching facilities. Safeguarding of sites could restrict the harmful impacts to the surrounding areas, meaning that other areas of the authority are protected. It is considered likely that this option could impact positively on 8 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option is supported by national policy and the plan will seek to safeguard existing and new facilities.</p>

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** The landbank and need policy has been developed and considers the overall need for minerals in the district. In addition the safeguarding policy seeks to safeguard minerals infrastructure. These policies have been subject to separate SA/SEA, see issue 2 above for landbank and need and issue 5 for safeguarding policies.

**Issue 7 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates**

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
7.2	Maximise production of recycled aggregates.	Option 7.2 would seek to maximise the production of recycled aggregates production. This was considered likely to impact positively on 4 objectives and very positively on 2 objectives, these being the 'sustainable management of waste', and 'conserving mineral resources / encouraging use of recycled aggregate'.	<b>This option is to be taken forward</b>  It is acknowledged that there will always be a demand for primary aggregates and the availability of recycled aggregates are finite (as are primary aggregates), but it is considered that the plan should seek to maximise the production of recycled aggregates where appropriate.
7.3	Suitability of AONB for recycled aggregate plant.	Option 7.3 poses the question of whether the AONB is a suitable place for sites for processing recycled and secondary aggregates. This was considered likely to impact very positively on 1 objective (the sustainable management of waste), positively on 1 objective (conserving mineral resources) and negatively on 3 objectives (historical environment, landscape, open space amenity).  This option appears to make the least positive contribution to the sustainability objectives.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  A policy approach that seeks to prevent recycled aggregate production in the AONB would be contrary to the NPPF, therefore, the use of criteria based policies for any development in the AONB would be more appropriate.
7.4	Identification of preferred areas for processing capacity.	Option 7.4 proposes identifying preferred areas for recycled and secondary aggregates sites to provide any additional processing capacity. As development would be largely confined to these preferred areas. It is likely that this would isolate and mitigate harmful impacts across a wider area, and therefore protect other areas. It was considered likely that this would impact positively on 9 objectives and very positively on 2 objectives, these being the 'sustainable management of waste' and 'conserving mineral resources / encouraging use of recycled aggregate'.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  Processing usually takes place within a mineral site, and there is no identified need for additional processing capacity to be provided through the plan. Therefore, it is considered more appropriate to consider applications for processing on a case by case basis.



		Along with option 7.5 this option appears to make the most positive contribution to the sustainability objectives.	
7.5	Safeguarding of existing/planned facilities.	<p>Option 7.5 proposes to safeguard existing and planned facilities that handle, process and distribute secondary and recycled aggregates. It was considered likely that this would impact positively on 9 objectives and very positively on 2 objectives, These are the 'sustainable management of waste' and 'conserving mineral resources / encouraging use of recycled aggregate'.</p> <p>Along with option 7.4 this option appears to make the most positive contribution to the sustainability objectives.</p>	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward.</b></p> <p>This option is supported by national policy and the plan will seek to safeguard existing and new facilities.</p>

The Issues and Options Consultation also included the following additional option, which is not considered to be reasonable alternatives as it asked consultees to agree to a specific statement. Therefore, it has not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 7.1 – Asking for agreement that recycled aggregates can replace primary aggregates, but only for crushed hard rock.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** The Landbank / Need Policy (Policy 2) has been developed, this states that where possible aggregate needs should be met in preference from recycled and secondary aggregates and specifies a minimum requirement for recycled and secondary aggregate processing capacity. As set out above (Issue 2) this policy has been subject to SA/SEA. A safeguarding policy (Policy 9) has also been developed to safeguard mineral resources and infrastructure, including those for recycled and secondary aggregates. As set out above (Issue 5) this policy has been subject to SA/SEA.

#### Issue 8 – Movement of aggregates within West Berkshire

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
8.1	Reliance on rail based transport for movement of aggregates.	<p>Option 8.1 seeks to rely primarily upon rail based transport for the importation, exportation and within District movement of aggregates. It was considered likely that this option would impact positively on 8 of the sustainability objectives and</p> <p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option is not considered to be a realistic alternative due to the location of the sites promoted</p>

		would likely be more sustainable than road, but not as sustainable as by waterway.	for aggregate extraction in the district and the capacity of the railway.
8.2	Reliance on road based transport for movement of aggregates.	Option 8.2 seeks to rely primarily upon road based transport for the importation, exportation and within District movement of aggregates. It was considered that this option could impact very positively on economic opportunities/job creation, and negatively on 7 of the other sustainability objectives. Generally speaking, it was considered to be the least sustainable option.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  This option does not fully consider more sustainable transport methods, and therefore, is not considered an approached strategy to take forward.
8.3	Reliance on water based transport for movement of aggregates.	Option 8.3 seeks to rely primarily upon water based transport for the importation, exportation and within District movement of aggregates. Water based transport appears to be the most sustainable option making very positive contributions to 5 objectives, positive contributions to 2 objectives, and a negative contribution to 1 objective. The negative contribution was to economic opportunities/job creation, as it is considered that transport by waterway is likely to provide the least jobs.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  This option is not considered to be a realistic alternative due to the location of the sites promoted for aggregate extraction in the district many of which are away from waterways and therefore, material would require transportation by another method to reach the waterways.
8.4	Reliance on mix of road, rail and water based transport for movement of aggregates.	Option 8.4 seeks to rely on a mixture of the rail, road and water based transport methods and it was likely to make a positive contribution to 8 objectives. It may be that, practically speaking, this is the option that will be implemented because of site locations, relevant transport links, the size of site necessary, and the expense/resources required to make options such as rail and waterway more viable.	<b>This option is to be taken forward</b>  This option is the most practical option due to the locations of the promoted sites and the available transport links. This option would allow for the most sustainable transport options to be considered for each site.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A transport policy (Policy 22) has been developed for the plan, which sets out that sustainable transport will be encouraged where this is practicable. The policy has been updated since the preferred options and the SA/SEA reviewed, the updated wording has not resulted in any changes to the SA/SEA outcome. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

Policy 22: Transport policy SA/SEA Summary	Summary of effects
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There is a potential positive environmental sustainability impact as a result of the policy's promotion of sustainable modes of transport. Sites considered under the policy could impact on traffic levels unless mitigation measures are implemented as required by the policy. There are no potentially negative impacts identified as a result of this policy.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

### Issue 9 – Importation of Primary aggregates and other materials by Rail

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
9.1	Provision of more capacity for importing material.  Option 9.1 would see the present policies for rail depots being reviewed, in order to provide for more capacity for importing minerals from elsewhere. It was considered that this option would be likely to make positive contributions to 7 sustainability objectives and very positive contributions to 2 sustainability objectives (safeguarding of primary mineral resources in West Berkshire and the sustainable transport of minerals). It is recognised by the Council that, whilst this is a critical matter that is of key importance to the construction industry, it is possible that the role of the emerging WBMWDPD could involve seeking to maintain existing site provisions.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>It is understood that the capacity at the rail depots is limited by the capacity on the rail lines themselves and therefore, the plan cannot considered adding more capacity to the rail depots.</p>
9.2	Presumption in favour of planning permission at safeguarding of rail depot sites.  Option 9.2, relates to a presumption in favour of safeguarded rail depot sites being granted planning permission, subject to meeting defined planning and environmental criteria. Safeguarding of sites restricts the potential harmful impacts to the surrounding areas, meaning the other areas in the authority could be protected. It was considered that this option would likely make positive contributions to 9 sustainability objectives, and impact very positively on 1 sustainability objective (sustainable transport of minerals).	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>By definition sites that are safeguarded for a specific purpose would result in a presumption in favour of that type of development at those sites.</p>

9.3	Safeguarding of rail depot sites.	Option 9.3 is concerned with safeguarding the existing rail depots. Safeguarding of sites restricts the harmful impacts to areas located around new mineral sites, meaning the other areas are protected. It was considered that this option could make positive contributions to 8 sustainability objectives and a very positive contribution to 1 sustainability objective (sustainable transport of minerals).	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The rail depot sites will be safeguarded and therefore, there would be a presumption in favour of development for mineral uses, subject to the other policies in the plan.</p> <p><i>Safeguarding Policy</i></p>
-----	-----------------------------------	---	--

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A mineral safeguarding policy (Policy 9) has been developed, which includes the safeguarding of railhead sites. This policy has been subject to SA/SEA as set out above (Issue 5).

#### Issue 10 – Windfall Sites

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
10.3	Inclusion of a windfall allowance within need for the supply of aggregates.	Option 10.3 would mean that the WBM/DPD would make an allowance for windfall sites when calculating the need and resulting supply of aggregates within West Berkshire. Where sites are going to be excavated for development proposals (other than for mineral extraction) and mineral can be extracted as part of this, this will potentially supply demand meaning that other areas may not need to be disturbed by mineral extraction and the associated impacts. It was considered likely that this option would contribute positively to 10 objectives.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option could be difficult to implement in practical terms as it is difficult to estimate that amount of aggregate that would be generated. In reality, the need figure for the district is calculated based on the last 10 years sales figures, which would include any sales from windfall sites coming forward and therefore, windfall sites are already taken into account.</p>
10.4	Include a policy approach that allows for windfall sites to be considered where necessary to maintain the landbank.	Option 2 would allow for sites to come forward outside of allocations where a need for that mineral was demonstrated. The option would allow for criteria to be set for when these sites would be considered acceptable. The policy has a number of unknown sustainability impacts as the impact would depend on the location of the sites coming forward.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>Windfall sites are by definition sites coming forward that are not allocated in a plan or known about in advance. Where there is an identified need for a mineral, which is not being met, this approach would allow sites to come forward</p>

			outside of the plan making process to meet this need.
10.5	Borrow Pits.	Option 3 would allow for sites to come forward outside of allocations, where they were linked to and geographically close to a, specific infrastructure project. This option would have a positive sustainability impact in terms of reducing the need material required for infrastructure projects needs to travel. Many of the other impacts are unknown as it would depend on the location of the sites coming forward for consideration.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>Borrow pits can help to deliver large scale infrastructure projects where otherwise mineral would have to be imported over much larger distances. It is therefore, preferable to include a policy in the plan setting out when such proposals would be considered acceptable.</p>

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional options, which are not considered to be reasonable alternatives as they. Therefore, they have not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 10.1 – review of existing policies to allow more scope for windfalls. It has already been decided that reliance on the existing policies is not a reasonable alternative.
- Option 10.2 – Asking whether further safeguards in place to minimise the impacts of large construction projects.

**Policy Approach taken forward:** A location of development – construction aggregates policy (Policy 4) has been developed setting out where across the district. This policy has been subject to SA/SEA (see issue 3). In addition a borrow pits policy (Policy 8) has also been developed setting out the criteria which would need to be met for a borrow pit to be permitted. While the policy has been tweaked since the preferred options the outcome of the SA/SEA has not changed. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 8: Borrow Pits policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. While there are a number of potential negative environmental and social sustainability impacts associated with this policy, they are likely to be short/medium term impacts associated with the working of the site itself, following restoration of the site the overall impact should be neutral. There are potential positive impacts on economic sustainability through the supply of raw materials for construction projects.	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral</p> <p><b>Likelihood:</b> Medium</p> <p><b>Scale:</b> District Wide</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> Temporary</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Short / medium term</p>

**Issue 11 – Restoration Strategy**

None of the options included in the Issues and Options consultation are now considered to be reasonable alternatives for this issue. They asked more general questions regarding what consultees would like to see in terms of restoration. The following questions were asked:

- Option 11.1 – Scope for more lake following mineral extraction, or are there already enough lakes as a result of mineral extraction?
- Option 11.2 – What other forms of restoration would you like to see?
- Option 11.3 – Sufficient infill for new sites to be restored to existing levels?
- Option 11.4 – Scope to infill some existing lakes

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** National Policy requires consideration of restoration and therefore the only reasonable alternative is to include a restoration policy. The restoration policy (Policy 17) has been developed that seeks to promote the prompt restoration of mineral sites following extraction using progressive restoration, to ensure that the restored landscape is compatible with its context and intended after-use and delivers net gains for biodiversity. The wording of the policy has been updated since the preferred options to take into account the comments made as part of the consultation. The SA/SEA has been updated to take into account this new wording. The Restoration policy has been subject to SA/SEA and a summary is set out below:

Policy 17: Restoration and After-Use policy SA/SEA Summary	Summary of effects
Overall there is likely to be a significantly positive impact on sustainability as a result of this policy as the policy seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity. There are likely to be a number of positive impacts on environmental and social sustainability as a result of this policy, as the policy seeks a number of environmental or social benefits to be provided as part of site restoration.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

## Issue 12 – Chalk and Clay

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
12.1 Provision of adequate safeguards to minimise effects of chalk and clay extraction.	Option 12.1 would put forward a policy approach to ensure that there are adequate safeguards to minimise the possible effects of potential future extraction of chalk and clay. The potential effects of the extraction would directly relate too many of the issues raised by the sustainability objectives. It was therefore considered that this option could have a positive impact on 9 of the sustainability objectives.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  There have been no active sites in West Berkshire since 1995 and no planning applications have been received.  Therefore, there is not considered to be a need for chalk and clay to be safeguarded.
12.2 Need for certainty regarding location of future chalk and clay (Allocation of sites).	Option 12.2 questions whether there is a need for more certainty about where chalk and clay might be worked in the future. It was considered likely to have a positive impact on	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  There have been no active sites in West Berkshire since 1995 and no planning applications have been received.

		the sustainability objective relating to 'economic considerations', while for the rest of the sustainability objectives there was considered to be 'no clear link' to the option.	No sites for chalk or clay were submitted as part of the call for sites, therefore, no sites could be considered for allocation.
12.3	Identification of strategic areas for chalk and clay extraction.	Option 12.3 questions whether the WBMWDPD should identify strategic areas for the working of chalk and clay. Identifying strategic areas for the working of chalk and clay could limit the detrimental effects of mineral working to any allocated sites, and limited surrounding areas. It was considered likely that it would impact positively on 12 sustainability objectives.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  There have been no active sites in West Berkshire since 1995 and no planning applications have been received. It is considered that criteria based polices should be included in the plan rather than identifying preferred areas.
12.4	Inclusion of DM policies to consider chalk and clay.	Option 12.4 questions whether the WBMWDPD should include development management policies that could be used when considering proposals for the working of chalk and clay. Development management policies relating to the working of chalk and clay deposits are likely to consider many of the issues addressed by the sustainability objectives and it was therefore considered that this option would have a positive impact on 13 of the sustainability objectives.	<b>This option is to be taken forward</b>  There have been no active sites in West Berkshire since 1995 and no planning applications have been received. It is considered that criteria based polices would be the most appropriate approach.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Chalk and Clay policy (Policy 11) has been developed that seeks to set out the criteria by which any proposals coming forward for chalk or clay extraction would be judged. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 11: Chalk and Clay policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are a number of potential negative impacts on environmental and social sustainability in the short/medium term. However, in the long term, due to the temporary nature of mineral extraction there should be an overall neutral impact on sustainability once the sites considered under this policy have been restored. There are potential positive impacts on	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium term

environmental sustainability in terms of improved flood mitigation possibilities and economic sustainability through the creation of jobs and meeting local needs to material.

### Issue 13 – Energy Minerals – Coal, Gas and Shale Gas

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
13.1	Policy to ensure adequate safeguards to minimise the effects of possible extraction.	Option 13.1 would put forward a policy approach to ensure that adequate safeguards are in place to minimise the effects of future extraction of energy minerals. It is anticipated that the effects of the extraction would relate too many of the issues raised by the objectives. This option is likely to have a positive impact on 9 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>Given the lack of clarity around the location of unconventional hydrocarbon deposits it is considered inappropriate for the MWLP to include a safeguarding policy for energy minerals.</p>
13.2	Greater certainty regarding where energy minerals may be worked (allocation of sites).	Option 13.2 questions whether there is a need for more certainty about where energy minerals might be worked in the future, and it was considered likely to have a positive impact on the sustainability objective relating to economic considerations. Unfortunately due to the extent of the assumptions and 'unknowns' there was considered to be 'no clear link' with the option and the rest of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>There has not been any applications for exploration of energy minerals received for the district.</p> <p>There is a lot uncertainty regarding the location of energy minerals and therefore, the council would not be able to provide any certainty regarding where these minerals could be worked in the future.</p>
13.3	Identification of strategic areas for working of energy minerals.	Option 13.3 questions whether the WBMWDPD should identify strategic areas for the working of energy minerals. Identifying strategic areas for the working of energy minerals could limit the potential detrimental effects to the allocated areas / sites and surrounding areas. It was considered likely that it would impact positively on 12 sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>There has not been any applications for exploration of energy minerals received for the district.</p> <p>There is a lot uncertainty regarding the location of energy minerals and therefore, the council would not be able to provide any certainty regarding where these minerals could be worked in the future.</p>
13.4	Inclusion of DM policies to consider energy minerals.	Option 13.4 questions whether the WBMWDPD should include development	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p>



		<p>management policies that could be used to consider any potential proposals for the working of energy minerals. Development management policies relating to the working of energy minerals are likely to relate to many of the issues addressed by the sustainability objectives and it was therefore considered that this option would have a positive impact on 13 of the sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>Given the lack of clarity around the location of unconventional hydrocarbon deposits it is considered appropriate for the MWLP to include a policy to enable both conventional and unconventional hydrocarbon extraction to ensure planning considerations are fully considered. In addition the NPPF requires that Minerals Planning authorities consider energy minerals within their plans and put in place policies to facilitate their exploration and extraction (para 209).</p>
--	--	--	---

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Energy Minerals policy (Policy 12) has been developed that seeks to set out the criteria by which any proposals coming forward for energy mineral extraction would be judged. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 12: Energy Minerals policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
<p>Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are a number of potential negative impacts on environmental and social sustainability in the short/medium term. However, in the long term, due to the temporary nature of mineral extraction there should be an overall neutral impact on sustainability once the sites considered under this policy have been restored. There are potential positive impacts on economic sustainability through the creation of jobs and meeting the need for energy minerals.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral  <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium  <b>Scale:</b> District Wide  <b>Duration:</b> Temporary  <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium term</p>

The Main Modification (MM28) to this policy has slightly changed the SA/SEA assessment in terms of the impact on water quality, as protection of water quality is now specifically referred to in the policy. However, this has not changed the overall SA/SEA assessment for the policy.

**Issue 14 – Pattern of waste management**

<b>Option</b>	<b>Summary of SA/SEA</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>14.1</p>	<p>Concentrate waste management in the upper parts of the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>Option 14.1 would concentrate on the upper parts of the waste hierarchy such as recycling facilities. It was considered that this is likely to have a very positive impact on the sustainability objectives relating to 'sustainable waste management' and 'encouraging the use of recycled aggregate' (through encouraging construction demolition and excavation waste reprocessing facilities). It was also considered</p>
		<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This approach is considered to be the most appropriate strategy and is considered to be the most positive in terms of the SA/SEA. However, it is acknowledged that there will always be some waste that cannot be managed in the upper part pf the waste hierarchy.</p>

		likely that this option would have a positive impact in terms of 'economic development', as waste facilities could provide employment.	
14.2	Covering all aspects of the waste hierarchy (excluding landfill).	Option 14.2 would see the implementation of a pattern of waste management facility types to cover all aspects of the waste hierarchy, excluding landfill. It was considered that this could be likely to have a very positive impact on the sustainability objectives relating to 'sustainable waste management' and 'encouraging the use of recycled aggregate' (through encouraging additional construction demolition and excavation waste processing facilities). It was also considered likely that this option would have a positive impact in terms of economic development, as waste facilities could provide employment.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  National policy requires that waste is dealt with at the highest possible point of the waste hierarchy, although there is an acknowledgement that will always be some residual waste that needs to be dealt with through landfilling.
14.3	Cover all aspects of waste hierarchy (inc. landfill).	Option 14.3 would see the implementation of a pattern of waste management facilities to cover all aspects of the waste hierarchy, including landfill. This option was considered likely to have a positive impact on the 3 sustainability objectives relating to 'sustainable waste management', 'conserving mineral resources / encouragement of use of recycled aggregate', and 'economic development' as waste facilities would provide employment.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  National policy requires that waste is dealt with at the highest possible point of the waste hierarchy, with an acknowledgement that will always be some residual waste that needs to be dealt with through landfilling.

An additional 'catch all' option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A net self-sufficiently in waste management policy (Policy 3) has been developed which seeks to drive waste up the waste hierarchy. The policy has been subject to a separate SA/SEA and a summary of the outcome is shown under issue 15.

**Issue 15 – Self-sufficiency in waste management**

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
15.1	Net-self-sufficiency.	Option 15.1 proposes to plan for net self-sufficiency, providing sufficient waste management capacity (recycling, treatment and recovery facilities) equal to the volume of waste arising in West Berkshire. This option was considered likely to impact positively on sustainability objectives related to 'air quality', and 'maximising energy efficiency' due to waste being transported shorter, localised distances, potentially leading to reduced carbon emissions. It was also considered likely that there would be a positive impact on the 'sustainable waste management' sustainability objective, due to the potential for moving waste up the waste hierarchy, increasing the opportunities for waste to be recycled, treated and recovered.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option is well aligned to national policy and is considered the most appropriate option for the plan.</p>
15.2	Over capacity.	Option 15.2 proposes to plan for a level of waste management capacity (recycling, treatment and recovery facilities) greater than the volume of waste arising in West Berkshire. This option was considered likely to have a positive impact on the 'sustainable waste management' sustainability objective, due to the potential to move even more waste up the waste hierarchy. It is considered likely to impact negatively on sustainability objectives related to 'air quality' and 'maximising energy efficiency', due to the potential for such an approach to result in waste being transported longer distances, from outside the authority area, potentially leading to increased carbon emissions.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>While this option is aligned to national policy, and there is a recognition that the district does over-provide waste capacity for some waste streams, this cannot be provided for all waste streams and so this option may not be deliverable.</p>

An additional 'catch all' option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made.

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional option, which is not considered to be a reasonable alternatives as is does not comply with the requirement of the NPPW. Therefore, they have not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 15.3 – Under capacity

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Net Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management policy (Policy 3) has been developed that sets out the Council's aim to deliver net self-sufficiency in waste management. No changes have been made to the policy since the preferred options. The policy has been subject to SA/SEA and a summary is set out below:

<b>Policy 3: Net Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall the inclusion of this policy in the local plan is likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. There are a limited number of potential positive impacts resulting from the policy in relation to environmental and economic sustainability. In terms of environmental sustainability the policy seeks to move waste up the waste hierarchy, which promotes the reuse, recovery and recycling of waste over disposal. In terms of economic sustainability the policy will have a positive impact through the creation of jobs and the benefits to the economy that the waste industry can have, especially in relation to the provision of reuse, recovery and recycling of materials which have an economic value. No potentially negative sustainability impacts have been identified.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

The Main Modifications (MM17) proposed for this policy have not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

#### Issue 16 – Landfill / Land raising of non-inert wastes

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
16.1	Meet demand for waste disposal to land where generated locally.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>There are no active non-inert landfill sites in West Berkshire and no sites have been promoted through the call for sites, therefore, no need has been identified. However, it is recognised that there may be proposals for landfilling in the future which would need to be considered.</p>

		be used in the landfilling or land raising operations rather than recycled. In addition until a landfill site is fully restored, the disposal of waste to land may have a negative impact on quantity/quality of open space.	
16.2	Provision of greater recycling capacity (if not planning for disposal of waste to land).	Option 16.2 relates to whether greater provision should be made for the recycling of waste if the disposal of waste to land is not being planned for, and to progress with a strategy that aims to maximise recycling rates and maximise the value that can be derived from waste materials. It is considered likely that this option would impact very positively on the sustainability objectives related to 'energy efficiency' and 'sustainable waste management', as recycling is 'higher up' the waste hierarchy than 'disposal' and 'recovery'. It was also considered likely to impact on the sustainability objectives related to 'safeguarding of primary aggregates/recycled aggregate'. This is because construction demolition and excavation waste may be landfilled/raised rather than recycled.	<b>This option will be taken forward</b>  It is recognised that policies should seek to drive waste up the waste hierarchy, and therefore policies will be developed in to plan to do this.
16.3	Provision of greater recovery and /or treatment capacity (if not planning for disposal of waste to land).	Option 16.3 relates to whether greater provision should be made for the treatment and recovery of waste if the disposal of waste to land is not being planned for, and to progress with a strategy that aims to maximise the value that can be derived from waste materials and minimise the volumes of waste originating in West Berkshire that is disposed of to land. Due to 'recovery' being 'higher up' the waste hierarchy than 'disposal', this was considered likely to impact positively on the two sustainability objectives related to 'maximising energy efficiency' and 'sustainable waste management'.	<b>This option will be taken forward</b>  It is recognised that policies should seek to drive waste up the waste hierarchy, and therefore policies will be developed in to plan to do this.

An additional 'catch all' option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A landfilling of waste policy (Policy 7) has been developed that sets out when landfilling may be considered acceptable. The policy has been subject to SA/SEA, which has been updated to take into account changes to the policy wording since the preferred options, however, the changes have not changed the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below.

Policy 7: Location of Development – Permanent Deposit of Waste to Land policy SA/SEA Summary	Summary of effects
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. While there are a number of potential negative environmental and social sustainability impacts associated with this policy, they are likely to be short/medium term impacts associated with the infilling process itself, but following completion of the works, there could be a potential positive impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the restoration of the site.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Temporary / Permanent <b>Timing:</b> Short / medium / Long term

The Main Modifications (MM25) proposed for this policy have not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

The net-self-sufficiency in waste management policy (Policy 3) encouraging the recycling of waste this policy has been subject to SA/SEA above (Issue 15).

**Issue 17 – Location and distribution of waste sites**

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
17.1 Expand existing permanent facilities/co-location of facilities with exiting permanent facilities.	This option relates to the expansion of existing waste facilities and co-location of facilities. It was considered likely to impact positively on the sustainability objective relating to the 'encouragement of the use of recycled aggregate'. It was unclear what impact this option would have on the rest of the sustainability objectives due to the existing facilities not being identified at this stage. The impacts would therefore be dependent on site specifics in terms of the surrounding landscape characteristics, method of operation, transport links and conditional requirements. With regard to the impact on sustainability objectives related to 'energy efficiency', 'minimising public nuisance' and 'air	<p><b>A Hybrid option covering all of the assessed options is to be taken forward.</b></p> <p>Overall it is considered that there is no one strategy that the MWLP should develop in respect of the location and distribution of waste sites, but that a criteria based policy setting out a range of factors would be most appropriate.</p>

		quality', this would be partly dependant on whether or not transport movements could be shared between facilities/operators which would depend on facility/waste type, location and the operators involved.	
17.2	Concentration of new facilities in key urban areas and population centres/growth areas.	This option would concentrate new facilities in key urban areas and centres of population and growth, and was considered likely to impact positively on the objectives related to 'air quality', 'maximising energy efficiency', 'sustainable transport of waste', and 'encouraging the use of recycled aggregate'. This is due to the likelihood that sites in key urban areas and centres of population and growth are likely to be more efficient in terms of transport movements which may reduce carbon emissions.	<p><b>A Hybrid option covering all of the assessed options is to be taken forward.</b></p> <p>Overall it is considered that there is no one strategy that the MWLP should develop in respect of the location and distribution of waste sites, but that a criteria based policy setting out a range of factors would be most appropriate.</p>
17.3	Decentralisation with facilities distributed across the urban and rural centres.	This option would adopt a decentralised approach with facilities distributed across all the urban areas and rural centres. A decentralised approach is likely to result in waste development that would generate a lot of transport movements which may not be energy efficient and may generate more carbon emissions. This was therefore considered likely to impact negatively on the sustainability objectives related to 'air quality', 'maximising energy efficiency', and the 'sustainable transport of waste'. It would however, potentially positively impact on the sustainability objective related to the 'encouragement of the use of recycled aggregate'.	<p><b>A Hybrid option covering all of the assessed options is to be taken forward.</b></p> <p>Overall it is considered that there is no one strategy that the MWLP should develop in respect of the location and distribution of waste sites, but that a criteria based policy setting out a range of factors would be most appropriate.</p>
17.4	Concentration of new facilities in areas of waste arisings with limited existing capacity.	This option questioned of whether an approach that combines options 1, 2 and 3 would be suitable. As the approach is unknown it is 'unclear' what the impacts on the objectives would be.	<p><b>A Hybrid option covering all of the assessed options is to be taken forward.</b></p> <p>Overall it is considered that there is no one strategy that the MWLP should develop in respect of the location and distribution of waste</p>

			sites, but that a criteria based policy setting out a range of factors would be most appropriate.
--	--	--	---

An additional 'catch all' option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Location of Development policy has been developed for General Waste Management Facilities (Policy 5), setting out locations where there will be a presumption in favour of waste management facilities. The policy has been subject to SA/SEA which has been updated since the preferred options to take into account changes in the policy wording, however, this has not changed the overall SA/SEA assessment. A summary of the SA/SEA assessment is set out below:

<b>Policy 5: Location of Development – General Waste Management Facilities policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are a number of potential negative sustainability impacts identified, especially in relation to environmental sustainability. However, mitigation measures would be required and should reduce the impact, in many cases resulting in a neutral impact. There are also a number of potential positive impacts as a result of the policy on environmental and economic sustainability, through the use of previously developed land, and the impact on the economy of waste management facilities, especially those processing waste material for recycled/secondary materials.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> Long term

The Main Modifications (MM21) proposed for this policy have not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

### Issue 18 – Safeguarding of existing waste sites

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
18.1 Safeguarding of existing permitted permanent waste sites.	Option 18.1 seeks to safeguard existing permitted permanent waste sites from alternative uses. Safeguarding of sites could restrict the resulting harmful impacts to these specific areas, meaning that other areas are protected, and therefore in the wider context this was considered likely to impact positively on 8 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward</b></p> <p>This option is seen to be the most appropriate option as it seeks to ensure existing waste management provision is protected and retained. It is also important that temporary sites granted permission are safeguarded for the duration of their permission.</p> <p>The safeguarding of existing sites reduces the need for new facilities to be provided.</p>



18.2	Safeguard proposed preferred areas identified in the plan.	Option 18.2 seeks to safeguard any proposed preferred areas for waste identified in the plan from alternative uses. Safeguarding of sites could restrict the resulting harmful impacts to these specific areas, meaning that other areas are protected. Therefore in the wider context, this was considered likely to impact positively on 8 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The LWA has not identified a need for additional areas to be identified in the plan and therefore, preferred areas are not going to be provided.</p>
18.3	Identify and safeguarding existing industrial areas that could provide additional capacity.	Option 18.3 seeks to identify and safeguard existing industrial areas that could provide additional waste management capacity within the existing permitted industrial areas. Safeguarding of sites could restrict the resulting harmful impacts to these specific areas, meaning that other areas are protected. Therefore in the wider context this was considered likely to impact positively on 8 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>Industrial areas are already safeguarded through policies in the Core Strategy and the West Berkshire Local Plan saved polices, such policies do not need to be repeated.</p>

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional option, which is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as it asked consultees for their opinion on a specific area, rather than a policy approach. Therefore, it has not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 18.4 – Any particular types of waste facility that should have greater protection than others?

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Safeguarding waste facilities policy (Policy 10) has been development, setting the sites/facilities that will be safeguarded for waste uses. The policy also safeguards temporary sites for the duration of their planning permission. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 10: Waste Safeguarding policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. The policy seeks to safeguard existing waste sites, and therefore, there are likely to be positive environmental sustainability impacts in relation to waste management and reuse and recycling of waste materials and on the use of previously developed land. The policy is not predicted to have any negative impacts on sustainability.	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral</p> <p><b>Likelihood:</b> Medium</p> <p><b>Scale:</b> District Wide</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> Permanent</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> long term</p>

**Issue 19 – New Technologies**

Option	Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
19.1	<p>Inclusion of policies that allow a range of technologies to come forward in a given location.</p>	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The LWA indicates that there is adequate waste facilities within the district and therefore, the plan does not propose to allocate additional waste sites. However, it is considered appropriate to include criteria based policies for waste sites, should any applications be received, which would be considered against the criteria, and would take into account any new technologies being proposed.</p>
19.2	<p>Inclusion of policies that specify where particular technologies/facilities would be acceptable.</p>	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The LWA indicates that there is adequate waste facilities within the district and therefore, the plan does not propose to allocate additional waste sites. However, it is considered appropriate to include criteria based policies for waste sites, should any applications be received, which would be considered against the criteria, and would take into account any new technologies being proposed.</p>

19.3	Inclusion of policies to support waste re/processing or recycle industry.	Option 19.3 would involve adopting policies to support the development of the waste re / processing or recycle industries (i.e. industries that use processed waste materials for specific manufacturing / industrial purposes). This was considered likely to be very positive for the 'sustainable waste management' objective as it encourages re/processing and recycle facilities which are 'higher up' the waste hierarchy than disposal. Supporting these types of waste industry should provide jobs in that industry so this would potentially benefit the 'economic development' sustainability objective.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The LWA indicates that there is adequate waste facilities within the district and therefore, the plan does not propose to allocate additional waste sites. However, it is considered appropriate to include criteria based policies for waste sites, should any applications be received, which would be considered against the criteria, and would take into account any new technologies, including development of re-processing/recycle facilities being proposed.</p>
------	---	--	---

An additional 'catch all' option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own so no sustainability assessment has been made

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** It is not considered that a separate new technology policy would be required, applications for new technologies could be considered using the policies of the plan as a whole and the plan does not restrict the use of new technologies.

#### Issue 20 – Facilities in the AONB

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
20.1	Small scale facilities to meet local identified need in AONB.	Option 20.1 proposes small scale waste management facilities that meet an identified local need being allowed in the AONB. This was considered likely to be positive in terms of creating employment potential while how the rest of the sustainability objectives would be affected would be dependent on implementation.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward in part</b></p> <p>It is recognised that some waste generating activities, such as equine and green waste, are best dealt with within the rural areas, which would include the AONB. In addition the management of waste close to its origin is likely to be more sustainable than transporting waste material large distances for management. Development within the AONB would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances as set out by the NPPF.</p>

20.2	Large scale facilities in AONB.	Option 20.2 proposes large scale strategic waste management facilities being allowed in the AONB. This was considered likely to be very positive in terms of job creation, and very negative for the sustainability objectives relating to the 'historic environment' and 'the landscape' due to large scale waste facilities being potentially intrusive in the AONB, in terms of landscape and landscape character impact.	<p><b>This option is to be taken forward in part</b></p> <p>While no large scale waste facilities are proposed within the AONB, it is recognised that some waste generating activities, such as equine and green waste are best dealt with in rural areas, which could include the AONB. In addition, the management of waste close to its origin is likely to be more sustainable than transporting waste large distances for management. Any large scale waste proposals put forward within the AONB would need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances as set out by the NPPF.</p>
------	---------------------------------	--	--

An additional ‘catch all’ option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made.

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional option, which is not considered to be a reasonable alternatives as is does not comply with the requirement of the NPPF which recognises that some development may be necessary in the AONB. Therefore, they have not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 19.3 – Exclude all waste management operations from AONB

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Protected Landscapes policy (Policy 19) has been developed setting out when, in exceptional circumstances, major minerals and waste proposals within the AONB (or in its setting) would be considered acceptable. It was considered appropriate to include mineral proposals within this policy as they also have the potential to cause harm to the AONB. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 19: Protected Landscape policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There is likely to be a significantly positive impact on environmental sustainability due to the focus of the policy on the protection of landscape character of the AONB. There is potential for a positive impact on economic sustainability should a site be permitted in the exceptional circumstances set out in the policy.	<p><b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive</p> <p><b>Likelihood:</b> Medium</p> <p><b>Scale:</b> AONB</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> Permanent</p>

<b>Timing:</b> long term
--------------------------

The Main Modifications to this policy (MM31 & MM32) have not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA, as the policy still seeks to protect the AONB.

### Issue 21 – Equine Waste

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
21.1	Additional capacity.	Option 21.1 proposes to provide more waste management capacity to deal with equine waste. It is likely that equine waste management facilities would generate a small number of jobs, so this was considered likely to be positive for the 'economic development' sustainability objective. It was considered 'uncertain' how the rest of the sustainability objectives would be impacted upon, as it would come down to site-specifics, or there was 'no clear link'.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>No sites have been put forward for equine waste management facilities and the LWA has not identified a need for such facilities.</p>
21.2	Provision of facilities within the AONB.	Option 21.2 proposes to provide equine waste facilities near to the waste arisings, accepting that this may mean in the AONB. Equine waste is likely to be either applied directly to the land for agricultural purposes, or managed through a recovery process and locating facilities close to the arisings would be positive in terms of energy efficiency. The facilities would also generate some employment. Therefore, it was considered likely to have a positive impact on the 3 sustainability objectives relating to 'energy efficiency', 'sustainable waste management' and 'economic development'. It was considered that there would likely be a negative impact on the sustainability objectives relating to the 'historic environment', 'the landscape', and 'maintaining open space amenity'. This is due to potential negative impacts of facilities in the AONB.	<p><b>This option is not to be taken forward</b></p> <p>The majority of equine waste in the district is produced from within the AONB. However, it is not usually considered to be a 'waste' activity as it is reused for a useful purpose before it reaches the waste stream. No sites have been put forward and there is no identified need for such facilities in the LWA. If there was a specific policy for the AONB, there would also be a need for a policy for facilities outside the AONB. As a result it is not considered necessary to have a specific AONB policy, a criteria based policy is considered to be more appropriate.</p>

21.3	Criteria based policies.	Option 21.3(ii) proposes that criteria based policies be used to consider any forthcoming applications that are submitted for equine waste management facilities. As the majority of the issues covered by the sustainability objectives would be considered through a criteria based policy approach to equine waste management, it was considered likely that this option could also impact positively on 11 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option will be taken forward</b></p> <p>Given the existing uses of equine waste, which are not considered to be ‘waste’ activities, and therefore, this is not considered to be a strategic issue. However, as equine waste is generated in West Berkshire and therefore could be applications for management facilities it is considered appropriate to include criteria based policies against which applications could be considered.</p>
------	--------------------------	--	---

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional option, which is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as the quantity of equine waste produced in the district is not considered to be of a strategy nature. Therefore, it has not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 21.3a – equine waste is a strategic matter

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Specialist Waste Management Facilities policy (Policy 6) has been developed which considers the criteria by which all specialist waste (including equine waste) would be judged. It was considered that there are a number of specialist waste streams (eg. equine and sewage sludge) which would be subject to the same sort of policy requirements and therefore, separate policies for each one would not be necessary to avoid repetition of policy wording within the plan. The policy has been subject to SA/SEA, which has been reviewed following changes to the policy wording, however no changes are considered necessary to the SA/SEA as a result of the updated policy. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 6: Specialist Waste Management policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are some potential negative environmental and social sustainability impacts as a result of this policy; however, mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce this impact. There are potential positive economic and environmental sustainability impacts, economically in terms of employment and supporting the local economy.	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral</p> <p><b>Likelihood:</b> Medium</p> <p><b>Scale:</b> District Wide</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> Permanent</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Long term</p>

The Main Modification (MM24) proposed for this policy has not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

**Issue 22 – Sewage Waste**

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
22.1	Additional capacity.	Option 22.1 questions whether West Berkshire needs more waste management capacity to deal with sewage. It was considered likely that this would impact positively on economic development as more sewage waste management capacity could potentially generate more employment. However it was considered likely to impact negatively on the objective relating to 'open space and amenity' as this development could potentially take place on land which is currently open space.	<b>This option will not be taken forward</b>  Thames Water, the statutory sewerage undertaker for West Berkshire have confirmed that they do not require additional sewage facilities over the life of the plan.
22.2	Provision of facilities within the AONB.	Option 22.2 proposes locating sewage facilities near to the waste arisings, accepting that this may mean developing new waste facilities, expanding existing facilities, or locating facilities in sensitive areas, such as the AONB. It was considered likely that this option would impact positively on the sustainability objective related to 'energy efficiency', as the distance that the waste could be travelling would be minimised. It was also considered likely that the facilities would generate a small amount of employment so this could potentially be positive in economic terms. Due to the likelihood that development would be required to take place in the AONB, it was considered that there would potentially be a negative impact in regard to the 'historical environment', 'landscape' and 'open space amenity' sustainability objectives.	<b>This option will not be taken forward</b>  If there was a specific policy for the AONB, there would also be a need for a policy for facilities outside the AONB. As a result it is not considered necessary to have a specific AONB policy, a criteria based policy is considered to be more appropriate.

22.3b	Criteria based policies.	Option 22.3(ii) proposes that criteria based policies be used to consider any forthcoming applications that are submitted for sewage waste management facilities. As the majority of the issues identified through the sustainability objectives would be considered through a criteria based policy approach to sewage waste management, it was considered likely that this option would impact positively on 11 sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option will be taken forward</b></p> <p>While there is unlikely to be a need for additional sewage treatment facilities over the life of the plan the inclusion of a criteria based policy would allow any applications to be considered against the relevant criteria</p>
-------	--------------------------	--	---

The Issues and Options Consultation included the following additional option, which is not considered to be a reasonable alternative as dealing with sewage sludge is a requirement of the Waste Water board, in this case Thames Water, not an issue for the Council to deal with at a strategic level. Therefore, it has not been assessed through the SA/SEA process.

- Option 22.3a – Sewage Sludge is a strategic matter

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Specialist Waste Management Facilities policy (Policy 6) has been developed which considers the criteria by which all specialist waste (including Sewage Sludge) would be judged. It was considered that there are a number of specialist waste streams (eg. equine and sewage sludge) which would be subject to the same sort of policy requirements and therefore, separate policies for each one would not be necessary to avoid repetition of policy wording within the plan. The policy has been subject to SA/SEA and a summary is given under issue 21 above.

### Issue 23 – Radioactive Waste arisings

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
23.1	VLLW arisings to be managed within the district.	Option 23.1 proposes for the WBMWDPD to plan for the management / storage / packaging of VLLW arising within West Berkshire to be managed in West Berkshire.	<p><b>This option will be taken forward in part</b></p> <p>It is clear that radioactive waste is and will continue to be produced by facilities in West Berkshire, predominantly at the AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield Nuclear Licensed Area. A specific policy has been developed for Nuclear Waste to be managed at AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield, and a criteria based</p>



			'specialist waste' policy will cover proposals for radioactive waste from other sources.
23.2	LLW arisings to be managed within the district.	Option 23.2 proposes for the WBMWDPD to plan for the management / storage / packaging of LLW arising within West Berkshire to be managed in West Berkshire.	<p><b>This option will be taken forward in part</b></p> <p>It is clear that radioactive waste is and will continue to be produced by facilities in West Berkshire, predominantly at the AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield Nuclear Licensed Area. A specific policy has been developed for Nuclear Waste to be managed at AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield, and a criteria based 'specialist waste' policy will cover proposals for radioactive waste from other sources.</p>
23.3	ILW arisings to be managed within the district.	Option 23.3 proposes for the WBMWDPD to plan for the management / storage / packaging of ILW arising within West Berkshire to be managed in West Berkshire. In respect of all of these options it was considered likely that the options could impact positively on the sustainability objective related to 'economic development', as these options could potentially provide some employment. It was considered 'uncertain' as to how this option would impact on 12 of the sustainability objectives, as this would be dependent on implementation in terms of site specifics, transport links, and planning conditions.	<p><b>This option will be taken forward in part</b></p> <p>It is clear that radioactive waste is and will continue to be produced by facilities in West Berkshire, predominantly at the AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield Nuclear Licensed Area. A specific policy has been developed for Nuclear Waste to be managed at AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield, and a criteria based 'specialist waste' policy will cover proposals for radioactive waste from other sources</p>
23.4	Plan for strategic facility to accept VLLW (allowing importation).	Option 23.4 proposes for the WBMWDPD to plan for a strategic management / storage / packaging facility for VLLW accepting that this would mean that VLLW could be imported into West Berkshire for management.	<p><b>This option will not be taken forward</b></p> <p>The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority report published in 2010 concluded that there was sufficient capability in the nuclear estate for the provision of waste management, treatment and disposal services. Therefore, there would not be the necessary demand to make the development of new facilities feasible at this time.</p>

23.5	Plan for strategic facility to accept LLW (allowing importation).	Option 23.5 proposes for the WBMWDPD to plan for a strategic management / storage / packaging facility for LLW accepting that this would mean that LLW could be imported into West Berkshire for management.	<p><b>This option will not be taken forward</b></p> <p>The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority report published in 2010 concluded that there was sufficient capability in the nuclear estate for the provision of waste management, treatment and disposal services. Therefore, there would not be the necessary demand to make the development of new facilities feasible at this time.</p>
23.6	Plan for strategic facility to accept ILW (allowing importation).	Option 23.6 proposes for the WBMWDPD to plan for a strategic management / storage / packaging facility for ILW accepting that this would mean that ILW could be imported into West Berkshire for management. In respect of all of these options it was considered likely that they could impact positively on the sustainability objective related to 'economic development' as these options could potentially provide some employment. Importing waste to the unitary area may not be seen as 'energy efficient' so this was considered likely to have a negative impact on this sustainability objective. It is uncertain how this option would impact on 11 of the sustainability objectives, as this would be dependent on implementation in terms of site specifics, transport links, and planning conditions.	<p><b>This option will not be taken forward</b></p> <p>While it is recognised that there are not currently any disposal methods for intermediate and high level radioactive wastes within the UK, only small amounts of this higher level radioactive waste is produce, meaning that such waste facilities need to be considered on a wider than local level. The Government are looking for a location for a national Geological Disposal Facility. Such facilities are likely to have very specific geological and environmental requirements, which West Berkshire does not have.</p>
23.7	Inclusion of criteria based policies.	Option 23.7 proposes an approach whereby criteria based policies be included to allow the consideration of any future applications to manage radioactive waste. The majority of the issues covered by the objectives would be considerations in the development management process, therefore criteria based policies were considered likely to impact positively on 11 of the sustainability objectives.	<p><b>This option will be taken forward</b></p> <p>Radioactive waste is and will continue to be produced by facilities in West Berkshire, the waste is managed through existing contracts and at present there appears to be adequate management capacity at a national level to manage this waste stream, however, it is considered appropriate to have a criteria based policy in case any applications for waste</p>

			management do come forward during the lifetime of the plan.
--	--	--	---

An additional 'catch all' option was presented in the Issues and Options consultation asking whether there are any other strategies that could be considered. However, this is not a reasonable alternative on its own, so no sustainability assessment has been made.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Waste Treatment and Storage at AWE policy (Policy 13) has been developed, setting out how proposals for waste treatment and storage at AWE (the district's main generator of radioactive waste) would be judged. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 13: Radioactive Waste Treatment and Storage at AWE policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. The location of the site does not lend itself to use of rail or water transportation, which results in a potential negative impact on environmental sustainability, however, material considered under this policy is likely to have been generated on the site and therefore, would not need to be transported, resulting in an overall neutral impact. There is a possible positive impact on environmental sustainability as the policy refers to development on an existing brownfield site.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> Long term

A specialist waste management policy (policy 6) has also been developed, which would be used to determine applications for radioactive waste management facilities outside of AWE. This has been subject to SA/SEA, see Issue 21 above.

#### **Issue 24 – Management of London's Waste**

This issue is no longer considered to be necessary as the new London Plan seeks to deliver net self-sufficiency in waste management, meaning that specific consideration of the management of London's waste is not required.

Waste is already imported to West Berkshire from London in small quantities, and there is no indication that the quantity of waste imported from London will increase and therefore, this waste is already taken into account when considering the amount of waste capacity within West Berkshire.

As a result this options considered in the Issues and Options consultation are no longer considered to be reasonable alternatives.

- Option 24.1 – plan for London waste to be managed in district
- Option 24.2 – plan for London waste to be disposed of to land in district

**Issue 25 – Re-working old landfill sites**

Option		Summary of SA/SEA	Recommendation
25.1	Strategic policy on reworking former landfill sites.	Option 25.1 questions whether the WBMWDPD should provide a strategic policy position on the re-working of former landfill sites. Many of the issues addressed by the sustainability objectives would be considered in allocating strategic sites for the re-working of former landfill sites, and therefore it was considered likely to have a very positive impact on the 'sustainable waste management sustainability objective', with a positive impact on 12 of the other sustainability objectives.	<b>This option is not to be taken forward</b>  There has been no interest in the re-working of former landfill sites to date, and therefore, it is not considered to be a strategic issue.
25.2	DM policies relating to reworking former landfill sites.	Option 25.2 questions whether the WBMWDPD should provide development management policies that relate to the potential for applications to come forward for the re-working of former landfill sites. Many of the issues addressed by the sustainability objectives would be considered in the development management process for the re-working of former landfill sites, and therefore it was considered likely to have a very positive impact on the 'sustainable waste management' sustainability objective, with a positive impact on 12 of the other sustainability objectives.	<b>This option is to be taken forward</b>  While there has been no interest in the re-working of former landfill sites to date, there could be a greater interest over the course of the plan and so the inclusion of a policy within the plan is considered to be appropriate.

**Policy Approach to be taken forward:** A Reworking old landfill sites policy (Policy 14) has been developed, setting out how proposals for the reworking of landfill sites would be judged. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 14: Reworking old landfill sites policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are a number of potential negative impacts on environmental and social sustainability in the short/medium term as a result of the policy, however following the reworking and restoration of the site there should be no long term negative impacts. There are also a number of potential positive environmental impacts as reworking would only be considered where there would be net gains in landscape, biodiversity or amenity. These positive environmental impacts would be long term and permanent.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Temporary / Permanent

	<b>Timing:</b> Short / Medium / Long term
--	---

The Main Modification (MM29) proposed for this policy has not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

**Other policies to be included within the Local Plan not included above:**

**Policy 1: Sustainable Development**

Achieving sustainable development is the main aim of the NPPF (section 2), however, it is considered to be worthwhile to include a local sustainable development policy within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. No changes have been made to the policy since the preferred options.

The proposed policy has been subject to SA/SEA and a summary is set out below:

<b>Policy 1: Sustainable Development policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There will be an overall positive impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. The policy’s aim is to ensure sustainable development is achieved in line with the direction of the NPPF. There is some potential for short/medium term impacts on any element of sustainability as a result of temporary development, such as mineral workings, but in the long term mitigation measures and restoration will result in natural or positive impacts on all elements of sustainability	<b>Effect:</b> Positive <b>Likelihood:</b> High <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> Long Term

**Policy 15: Location of Permanent Construction Aggregate Infrastructure**

There are a number of permanent infrastructure facilities in the district, many which are strategic in nature serving both local and wider markets. The policy sets out the criteria under which new facilities would be considered to continue to serve the local and wider aggregate industry. No changes have been made to the policy since the preferred options.

The proposed policy has been subject to SA/SEA and a summary is set out below:

<b>Policy 15: Location of Permanent Construction Aggregate Infrastructure SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are potential negative impacts on environmental and social sustainability without the implementation of adequate mitigation measures. There are potential positive impacts on economic sustainability through the production of material for the construction industry and environmental sustainability as the policy seeks for sites to be located on previously developed land, protecting agricultural land and soils.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> Long term

The Main Modification (MM30) proposed for this policy has not resulted in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.

**Policy 16: Temporary Minerals and Waste Infrastructure**

Temporary mineral and waste processing infrastructure is often required at sites to enable minerals to be processed in order to be sold and to facilitate the recycling of waste with residues to be used in the restoration of a site. The policy sets out the criteria against which proposals for temporary infrastructure will be assessed. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 16: Temporary Infrastructure policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There are potential negative impacts on environmental and social sustainability in the short/medium term as a result of the policy, however following the completion of works and restoration of the site there should be no long term negative impacts. There are a number of potential positive environmental and economic impacts as the infrastructure considered under the policy would not result in additional traffic movements, and will result in material for the construction industry, diverting waste away from landfill for recycling or reuse therefore, providing benefits for the local and wider economy.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short / Medium term

**Policy 18: Landscape**

The NPPF requires that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, including the recognition of intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (para 170), therefore, it is considered appropriate that the new Local Plan includes a policy setting out the landscape considerations required for any minerals or waste proposals coming forward. The plan proposes to include a specific policy relating to the protected landscape of the AONB (see Issue 20 above). Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 18: Landscape policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There is likely to be a significantly positive impact on environmental sustainability due to the focus of the policy on the protection of landscape character and townscape. There is also likely to be a positive impact on environmental sustainability in terms of biodiversity and heritage assets as a result of the wording of the policy.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Policy 20: Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

The NPPF requires that impacts on biodiversity are minimised and sets out requirements for planning policies (para 174 - 177). While the West Berkshire Core Strategy includes a biodiversity policy (CS17), the Core Strategy is current under review, and therefore, it is not considered appropriate to rely on this policy and so a new policy within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan is proposed. Following the Preferred Options consultation the wording of the policy has been reviewed and changes made to make the policy stronger and to include provision for net gains for biodiversity through the restoration of sites. The SA/SEA has been updated to reflect the new policy wording. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 20: Biodiversity and Geodiversity policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There is likely to a significantly positive impact on environmental sustainability as a result of this policy, with potential positive impacts on social sustainability due to the focus of the policy being on protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

### **Policy 21: Agricultural Land and Soils**

The NPPF states that development should, where possible safeguard best and most versatile agricultural land (Para 170). As this is a specific issue relating to minerals development there are no alternative policies available, and solely relying on the NPPF is not considered appropriate, therefore, a new policy is proposed for inclusions within the Minerals and Waste Local plan. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 21: Agricultural Land policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There will be a significant positive impact on environmental sustainability as the policy seeks to preserve the best and most versatile agricultural land and soils.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

### **Policy 23: Public Rights of Way**

Minerals and Waste Development can have specific impacts on the rights of way network resulting in the need for rights of way to be diverted or replaced. As a result it is considered necessary that a specific policy approach is included within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to set out the considerations regarding the rights of way network when considering applications. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 23: Public Rights of Way policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There will be a significant positive impact on environmental sustainability as the policy seeks to preserve the best and most versatile agricultural land and soils.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Policy 24: Flooding**

The NPPF requires Local planning authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations (para 149). Coastal change is not relevant in West Berkshire and water supply and demand are not specific issues for minerals and waste planning. Flood risk is a particular issue in parts of West Berkshire, as demonstrated by the SFRA and therefore, it is considered important to include a policy in relation to flooding and water management within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

The West Berkshire Core Strategy includes a policy on flooding (CS16), however, as the Core Strategy is currently under review, and therefore, it is not considered appropriate to rely on this policy and therefore, a new policy within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan is proposed. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 24: Flooding policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There is likely to be a significantly positive impact on all elements of sustainability as a result of this policy as it specifically looks to reduce flood risk and take into account the impacts of climate change on flood risk.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Policy 25: Climate Change**

Climate Change is a global issue, and in a small way the Minerals and waste Local Plan has the opportunity to require consideration of the impacts such development would have on greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. As a result it is considered appropriate to include a climate change policy within the Local Plan. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 25: Climate Change policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
There is likely to be a significantly positive impact on all elements of sustainability as a result of the policy's requirement to consider climate change and the risks associated with it. There are a number of other potential positive environmental impacts as a result of the policy specifically in relation to flood risk and sustainable transport.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

The Main Modification (MM42) proposed for this policy have not result in any changes to the outcome of the SA/SEA assessment.



**Policy 26: Public Health, Environment and Amenity**

Minerals and waste development have the potential to negatively impact on public health amenity, therefore, these are specific areas that it is considered should be included within the Local Plan. There are no other local policies related to these topic areas, and solely relying on the NPPF is not considered appropriate. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to include a policy within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 26: Public Health, Environment and Amenity policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. There is a potential positive environmental and social sustainability impact as a result of the policy's requirement to consider the impacts on the impacts on the local community and the natural, built and historic environment. Many of the predicted impacts on the policy are neutral, as the policy requires consideration of public health and safety, amenity and quality of life are not detrimentally impacted. This does not necessarily mean that there would be a positive impact on sustainability, although mitigation measures could result in a positive impact.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Policy 27: Historic Environment**

The NPPF requires Local Plans to have a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment (para 186). While the West Berkshire Core Strategy includes a policy on the Historic Environment and Landscape Character (CS19), the Core Strategy is currently under review, and therefore, it is not considered appropriate to rely on this policy. As a result a new policy is proposed to be included within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 27: Historic Environment policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a potentially significant positive environmental effect as a result of the policy's focus on preserving and enhancing the historic environment.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly positive <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Policy 28: Design**

The NPPF requires good design as a key aspect of sustainable development (para 124). While the core Strategy includes a policy on Design Principles (CS14), the Core Strategy is currently under review, and therefore, it is not considered appropriate to rely on this policy. As a result a new policy is proposed to be included within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed but there is no change to the overall outcome. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 28: Design policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. The policy requires consideration of a site's setting, which means that could be a positive impact on environmental and social sustainability in relation to the historic environment, townscape and landscape all of which can contribute to the setting of a site. There are no likely negative impacts as a result of this policy.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Policy 29: Cumulative Impact**

There are specific issues, such as transport and impact on amenity that can result from minerals and waste development occurring in close proximity to each other or over the same timescale. As a result it is considered that the Local Plan should include a specific policy requiring consideration of cumulative impacts. Minor changes have been made to the policy following the preferred options, the SA/SEA has been reviewed as a result but no changes are considered necessary. A summary of the SA/SEA is set out below:

<b>Policy 29: Cumulative Impact policy SA/SEA Summary</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability as a result of this policy. As the policy seeks to ensure no cumulative impacts, the policy itself will not have any impact on sustainability, however, it will prevent potential negative impacts occurring if several sites were to come forward within close proximity to each other.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> District Wide <b>Duration:</b> Permanent <b>Timing:</b> long term

**Site Policies**

The plan seeks to allocate sites for mineral extraction. The site allocations are accompanied by site policies setting out what would be required on the site and for consideration at the planning application stage. The site policies have been subject to SA/SEA and a summary of the outcome of the assessment is set out below. No site policies were provided at preferred options, so these assessments have been done to support the proposed submission version of the plan. Details of the site assessments resulting in the allocation of these sites is set out in section 5.1.2 below.

<b>Policy 30: Tidney Bed</b>	<b>Summary of effects</b>
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability. The policy will have a positive impact on economic and social sustainability by allowing for the extraction of mineral resources to support the local economy, including the local building trade. The impact on environmental sustainability is likely to be natural due to mitigation measures during the extraction phase, and good restoration of the site should return the site to the same, or better quality.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> High <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term

Policy 31: Chieveley Services	Summary of effects
Overall there is likely to be a neutral impact on sustainability. The policy will have a positive impact on economic and social sustainability by allowing for the extraction of mineral resources to support the local economy, including the local building trade. The impact on environmental sustainability is likely to be natural due to mitigation measures during the extraction phase, and good restoration of the site should return the site to the same, or better quality.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> High <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term

## 5.1.2 Site Selection / Site Assessments

### 5.1.2.1 Mineral Sites

Minerals can only be worked where they lie, which means that there are a limited number of sites suitable for mineral extraction. Sharp Sand and Gravel deposits are largely focused along the Kennet Valley in the south west of West Berkshire, while Soft Sand deposits are located to the north of the district within the North Wessex Downs AONB. Minerals working is a temporary land use, and following completion of the extraction phase restoration should return the site to its original land use, or an alternative land use with additional benefits, such as biodiversity enhancements, flood mitigation measures or amenity benefits. Therefore, many of the impacts highlighted in the SA/SEA process are only temporary for the lifetime of the works, with a longer term neutral impact following completion of the works on site.

A total of 16 possible minerals sites were submitted to the Council for consideration for allocation in the Local Plan, 12 for sharp sand and gravel, three for soft sand and one as a processing plant (MW006 - Colthrop Processing Plant). MW006 was not considered to be a realistic alternative for allocation as it already benefits from permanent planning permission and therefore, does not need to be allocated.

The remaining 15 sites are considered to be realistic alternatives for development for their respective mineral resource and therefore, have been subject to site assessment and SA/SEA. The comments made during the 'Sites Consultation' in summer 2016 have also been taken into account as part of the site assessment process. The detailed Site Assessments and SA/SEA are included in appendix 6.

It should be noted that two sites were withdrawn by the landowner in December 2019. Despite being included in the Proposed Submission and Submission versions of the SA/SEA these sites have subsequently been deleted as they are no longer reasonable alternatives for allocation.

### Sharp Sand and Gravel Sites

Sharp Sand and Gravel Site Assessments			
Site Details	Summary of SA/SEA of Site	Summary of Effects	Recommendation and Justification
Frounds Lane, Aldermaston (MW001)	Overall development of this site would be likely to have a neutral impact on environmental sustainability, with a potential significantly negative impact as a result of the landscape	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral impact, with a possible significant negative impact on	<b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b>  The site is not considered suitable for development in landscape terms, which results

	<p>impact. Despite the temporary nature of this development, it is considered that the landscape impact could not be mitigated to prevent harm to the landscape. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy.</p>	<p>environmental sustainability in terms of landscape.  <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium  <b>Scale:</b> local  <b>Duration:</b> Temporary  <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p>in a potential significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability.</p> <p>No additional evidence received following the preferred options to change the recommendation.</p>
<p>Aldermaston Bridge,  Aldermaston  (MW003)</p>	<p>Overall development of this site would be likely to have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. However, development of this nature is temporary and good restoration would return the site to a similar, or better, state than its current state. Mitigation measures would be required for the duration of the development to ensure no long term negative impacts result from the development. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly negative  <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium  <b>Scale:</b> Local  <b>Duration:</b> Temporary  <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p><b>This site is not recommended for allocation.</b></p> <p>Only a small portion of the site is considered suitable for development, which makes the site unviable and therefore undeliverable and it will not be taken forward into the plan.</p> <p>No additional evidence received following the preferred options to change the recommendation.</p>
<p>Boot Farm,  Brimpton  Common  (MW004)</p>	<p>Overall development of this site would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. A number of negative impacts have been identified, mainly in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term impacts as a result of the development itself but there should be no long term negative impacts as mineral development is temporary in nature. Good restoration should mean that there is no long term negative impact, and could result in improvements, especially in relation to environmental sustainability. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy. Potential impacts on social sustainability are</p>	<p><del><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral  <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium  <b>Scale:</b> Local  <b>Duration:</b> Temporary  <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</del></p>	<p><del><b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b></del></p> <p>The site is considered suitable for development in landscape terms, with limited long term impacts on sustainability that can be mitigated. In the long term restoration of the site will result in net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>However, the site has been withdrawn from consideration for allocation and so is no longer available.</p>

	<del>likely to be neutral in the long term, but there could be some short/medium term negative impacts unless adequate mitigation measures are introduced.</del>		
Cowpond Piece, Ufton Nervet (MW007)	Overall development of this site would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. A number of negative impacts have been identified, mainly in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term impacts as a result of the development itself but there should be no long term negative impacts as mineral development is temporary in nature. Good restoration should mean that there is no long term negative impact, and could result in improvements, especially in relation to environmental sustainability. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy. Potential social sustainability is likely to be neutral in the longer term, but in the short term, without adequate mitigation measures there could be a negative impact on amenity.	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term	<b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b>  The site is located within a local wildlife site, and it is considered that there would be a likely significant negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the ecological impact of development on the site. There may also be a negative impact on the landscape as a result of the development of the whole site.  The site was included as a preferred option, however, more sites were included as preferred options than are needed for allocation and therefore, choices had to be made. As a result of the additional information gathered since the preferred options, other sites are considered more suitable for allocation to meet the Council's identified need.
Firlands, Burghfield Common (MW008)	Overall development of this site would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. There are some potential negative impacts in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term impacts as the result of the development itself but there should be no long term negative impacts as mineral development is temporary in nature. Good restoration should mean that there is no long term negative impact, and could result in improvements, especially in relation to environmental sustainability. It is predicted that	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term	<b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b>  While the site is considered suitable for development, there are significant concerns over the provision of adequate access to the site, which at the current time means that there site may not be deliverable within the plan period.  The site was included as a preferred option. However, more sites were included as preferred options than are needed for allocation

	there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy. Potential social sustainability is likely to be neutral in the longer term, but in the short term, without adequate mitigation measures there could be a negative impact on amenity.		and therefore, choices had to be made. As a result of the additional information gathered since the preferred options, other sites are considered more suitable for allocation to meet the Council's identified need.
Gravel Pit Farm, Beenham (MW009)	Development of the site would be likely to have a significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the landscape impact. A number of other negative impacts are also identified in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term as good restoration of the site would restore the site to a similar, or better state. Mitigation measures could be introduced to ensure there are no longer term impacts. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation/retention and support of the local economy. There are also potential positive impacts as a result of processing the infill material for any recyclable/reusable material prior to infilling of the site.	<b>Effect:</b> Potentially significant negative impact on environmental sustainability in relation to landscape <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/medium Term	<b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b>  The Site is located within the AONB. No exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated as there are other suitable sites available for sand and gravel. There are significant highway concerns regarding safe and adequate access to the site.
Land off Spring Lane, Aldermaston (MW010)	Overall the site is likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. A number of negative impacts have been identified, mainly in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term impacts as a result of the development itself but there should be no long term, negative impacts as mineral development is temporary in nature. Good restoration should mean that there is no long term negative impact, and could result in improvements, especially in relation to	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term	<b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b>  Only a small part of the site is considered suitable for development in landscape terms, which could impact on viability and delivery of the site.  In addition there is significant concern regarding access and the suitability of the local highway network for HGV traffic.

	<p>environmental sustainability. There are concerns regarding landscape, although a reduced site area would help to mitigate this impact. There are also concerns regarding the impact of HGVs on the local highway network. It is considered that this could have longer term negative sustainability impacts without mitigation measures, both during and after works on the site. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy. Potential social sustainability is likely to be neutral in the longer term, but in the short term, without adequate mitigation measures there could be a negative impact on amenity.</p>		<p>No additional evidence received following the preferred options to change the recommendation.</p>
<p>Wasing Lower Farm, Aldermaston (MW012)</p>	<p>Overall development of this site would be likely to have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. Development of this nature is temporary and good restoration would return the site to a similar or better state than its current state. Mitigation measures would be required for the duration of the development to ensure no long term negative impacts result from the development. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of supporting the local economy. It is also predicted that there would be a positive impact in relation to flooding as extraction of the site could result in improved flood water storage.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly negative <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p><b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b></p> <p>While the site is considered suitable for development, there is concern regarding deliverability of the site within the plan period as it is proposed as an extension to an existing quarry which has permission (granted in 2013) but has not started working.</p> <p>The site was included as a preferred option, however, more sites were included as preferred options there are needed for allocation and therefore, choices had to be made. As a result of the uncertainty regarding deliverability of the site, other sites are considered more suitable for allocation to meet the Council's identified need.</p>
<p>Manor Farm, Brimpton (MW013)</p>	<p>Overall the site would be likely to have a negative impact on environmental sustainability, with the exception of the environmental benefits</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly negative <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium</p>	<p><b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b></p>

	<p>of the production of recycled aggregate and the associated recycling rates. However, development of this nature is temporary and good restoration would return the site to a similar, or better, state than its current state. Mitigation measures would be required for the duration of the development to ensure no long term negative impacts result from the development. It is predicted that there would be an unknown impact on economic sustainability, as while mineral extraction creates jobs, there could be a loss of farming related employment as a result of the loss of agricultural land. There is also a potentially positive impact in relation to managing and reducing flood risk.</p>	<p><b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p>While the site is considered suitable for development in principle there are third party shooting rights on the land which means that the site is not currently deliverable.</p> <p>The site was included as a preferred option, however, more sites were included as preferred options there are needed for allocation and therefore, choices had to be made. As a result of the uncertainty regarding deliverability of the site, other sites are considered more suitable for allocation to meet the Council's identified need.</p>
Padworth Park Farm, Lower Padworth (MW014)	<p>Overall development of the site would be likely to have a negative impact on sustainability, with a significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the landscape impact from developing the site. It is not considered that this negative impact could be mitigated, where as many of the other negative sustainability impacts could be mitigated reducing the impact of the development in the short/medium term. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy and also in terms of flood risk as restoration of the site could provide improved flood risk management.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly Negative, with a significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the landscape impact. <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p><b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b></p> <p>The site is not considered suitable for development in landscape terms, which results in a potential significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability.</p> <p>No additional evidence received following the preferred options to change the recommendation.</p>
Tidney Bed, Ufton Nervet (MW015)	<p>Overall development of this site would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. However, development of this nature is temporary and good restoration would return the site to a similar or better state than its current</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p><b>The site is recommended for allocation.</b></p> <p>The site is considered suitable for development in landscape terms, with limited long term impacts on sustainability that can be mitigated.</p>



	<p>state, resulting in a neutral impact. Mitigation measures would be required for the duration of the development to ensure no long term impacts result from the development. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy. It is also predicted that there would be a positive impact in relation to flooding as extraction of the site could result in improved flood water storage.</p>		<p>In the long term restoration of the site will result in net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>The site was included as a preferred option and is still considered suitable for allocation to meet the Council's identified need.</p> <p><i>The southern part of the site was withdrawn following the preferred options consultation and as a result the SA/SEA has been updated to reflect this change in site area.</i></p>
<p>Waterside Farm, Thatcham (MW016)</p>	<p>Overall development of this site would be likely to have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. However, development of this nature is temporary and good restoration would return the site to a similar, or better, state than its current state. Mitigation measures and monitoring of effects would be required for the duration of the development to ensure no long term negative impacts result from the development. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Predominantly negative <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> Local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p><b>The site is not recommended for allocation</b></p> <p>While part of the site is considered acceptable for development in landscape terms, this reduced site area is not considered viable for mineral extraction and would result in a negative impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The site was included as a preferred option, however, more sites were included as preferred options there are needed for allocation and therefore, choices had to be made. As a result of the question over the viability and therefore, deliverability of the site, and the additional highway impact of the smaller site, other sites are considered more suitable for allocation to meet the Council's identified need.</p>

### **Site selection summary**

The SA/SEA of the specific sites shows that for all potential minerals sites the impacts are largely neutral or negative, but that due to the nature of mineral workings the impacts are only likely to be temporary for the short/medium term throughout the duration of the works on site. Following completion of the works and restoration of the sites, the impacts are likely to be neutral, or with some environmental or social benefits in the long term.

Sites where there is likely to be a significant impact on sustainability, in most cases environmental sustainability as a result of the potential impact on the landscape, have been excluded and are not proposed to be taken forward as preferred options (**MW001 Frouds Lane, MW009 Gravel Pit Farm, MW014 Padworth Park Farm**).

Only a small part of **MW003** (Aldermaston Bridge) was considered suitable for development in landscape terms, and therefore, the SA/SEA assessment is overall neutral with no significant impacts predicted. However given the reduced developable area of the site to ensure there is no significant negative impact on environmental sustainability the site is not considered viable and therefore would not be deliverable. As a result the site is not proposed for allocation.

Only a small part **MW010** (Spring Lane) was considered suitable for development in landscape terms and while no significant impacts are predicted there are also concerns regarding highways access to the site and the potential impact this could have on local amenity. This, in addition to the small area of the site suitable for development could impact on viability and delivery of the site, and therefore the site is not proposed for allocation.

Seven sites were proposed as preferred options for allocation (**MW004 Boot Farm, MW007 Cowpond Piece, MW008 Firlands, MW012 Wasing Lower Farm, MW013 Manor Farm, MW015 Tidney Bed, and MW016 Waterside Farm**). Development of these sites is considered acceptable in landscape terms, with appropriate mitigation measures, which in some cases include a reduced site area. The other potential negative impacts can be mitigated in the short/medium term, and in the longer term, following restoration will be neutral.

Following the preferred options further technical work and additional information provided through the consultation have been taken into account. More sites were included in the preferred options than are required to meet the Council's need (as set out in the LAA 2018) and as a result choices need to be made as to which sites to take forward into the proposed submission plan.

The site area at **Waterside Farm (MW016)** has been significantly reduced to ensure no significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of impact on the landscape that the site is not considered viable and therefore, is no longer proposed for allocation. Further ecological work carried out has indicated that development of **Cowpond Piece (MW007)** would result in a significant negative impact on environmental sustainability in terms of ecological impact and therefore, the site is no longer proposed for allocation.

**Boot Farm and Manor Farm** were withdrawn from consideration for allocation by the landowner in December 2019, and so are no longer available.

Concerns have been raised regarding the deliverability of ~~**Boot Farm (MW004), Manor Farm (MW013), Wasing Lower Farm (MW012) and Firlands (MW008)**~~. ~~**Boot Farm** has been withdrawn from consideration for allocation by the landowner, and so is no longer available. There are shooting rights on the **Manor Farm** site, which mean that at the current time the site is not considered deliverable.~~ The site at **Wasing Lower Farm** was proposed to be an extension to an existing quarry granted permission in 2013. No work has started on the site, and therefore, there is uncertainty over the deliverability of the site within the plan period. As a result neither of these sites are now proposed for allocation. There are concerns over the access arrangements regarding the site at **Firlands** which mean that the site is not currently considered to be deliverable.

The remaining site, **Tidney Bed (MW015)** is proposed for allocation. There are no significant constraints to the development of these sites that cannot be mitigated, and in the longer term there should be net gains following the restoration of the sites.

**Soft Sand Sites**

<b>Soft Sand Site Assessments</b>			
<b>Site Details</b>	<b>Summary of SA/SEA of Site</b>	<b>Summary of Effects</b>	<b>Recommendation and Justification</b>
60 Acre Field, Hermitage (MW002)	It is predicted that there would be a potentially significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the landscape impact from developing the site. A number of other negative impacts are predicted in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term as good restoration of the site would restore the site to a similar, or better state. Mitigation measures would be required to ensure no long term negative impacts on these elements. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy.	<b>Effect:</b> Significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability in relation to landscape. <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term	<b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b>  The site is not considered acceptable for development in landscape terms and while there is a need for soft sand within the district there is another soft sand site which is considered suitable for development in landscape terms.  No soft sand sites were included in the preferred options
Chieveley Services, Cheiveley (MW005)	Overall development of this site would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability. A number of negative impacts have been identified, mainly in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term impacts as a result of the development itself but, there should be no long term negative impacts as mineral development is temporary in nature. Good restoration should mean that there is no long term negative impact, and could result in improvements, especially in relation to environmental sustainability. The site is located within the AONB, however the site is not considered to be of high landscape	<b>Effect:</b> Predominantly neutral <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium <b>Scale:</b> local <b>Duration:</b> Temporary <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term	<b>The site is recommended for allocation.</b>  While the site is located in the AONB the site is considered acceptable for development in landscape terms with mitigation measures.  There is an overriding need for soft sand within the district, and therefore, exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated regarding the allocation of the site within the AONB.  No soft sand sites were included in the preferred options

	<p>sensitivity and mitigation measures, including a reduced site area, would mitigate this impact. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy. While the site could result in additional traffic movements, it is adjacent to the strategic road network and therefore, it is unlikely that there would be a significant impact on environmental sustainability. Potential social sustainability is likely to be neutral in the long term, but in the short term, without adequate mitigation measures there could be a negative impact on amenity.</p>		
<p>Long Lane, Cold Ash (MW011)</p>	<p>Overall development of the site would be likely to have a neutral impact on sustainability, however it is predicted that there would be a significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability as a result of the landscape impact from developing this site. A number of other negative impacts are predicted in relation to environmental sustainability, however, these are likely to be short/medium term as good restoration of the site should restore the site to a similar state to its current state. Mitigation measures would be required to ensure no long term negative impacts on these elements. It is predicted that there would be a positive impact on economic sustainability as a result of job creation and supporting the local economy.</p>	<p><b>Effect:</b> Potentially significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability in relation to landscape and highway impact  <b>Likelihood:</b> Medium  <b>Scale:</b> local  <b>Duration:</b> Temporary  <b>Timing:</b> Short/Medium Term</p>	<p><b>The site is not recommended for allocation.</b></p> <p>There is significant concern regarding the deliverability of safe and adequate access to the site.</p> <p>In addition the site is not considered suitable for development in landscape terms, which results in a potential significantly negative impact on environmental sustainability</p> <p>No additional evidence received following the preferred options to change the recommendation.</p>

### **Site selection summary**

No soft sand sites were proposed for allocation in the Preferred Options as the Council was unable to calculate a soft sand landbank figure. However, following the operators forgoing confidentiality the 2017 and 2018 LAAs have been able to publish separate landbank figures for sharp sand and gravel

and soft sand. As a result the 2018 LAA shows that there is a need for soft sand within the district which has resulted in the change of approach and the consideration of allocating site/s for soft sand in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Three soft sand sites were promoted for allocation **60 Acre Field (MW002)**, **Chieveley Services (MW005)** and **Long Lane (MW011)**. **MW011 Long Lane** is not considered suitable for development in relation to highways as a safe and adequate access to the site cannot be achieved, as well as not being considered suitable for development in landscape terms. Both **60 Acre Field** and **Chieveley Services** are located within the AONB. Given the need for soft sand in the district as set out in the LAA there is a need to allocate a site (or sites) for soft sand, the need figure providing evidence of exceptional circumstance. Given the location in the AONB, landscape is a critical consideration. The Council's landscape assessment indicates that subject to mitigation measures the site at **Chieveley Services** would be suitable for development, while **60 Acre Field** is not considered acceptable in landscape terms.

While on its own the site at **Chieveley Services** does not quite meet the annual requirement for soft sand, it is not considered appropriate to allocate another site which would result in significant harm to environmental sustainability in terms of the landscape impact. Therefore, the Council will continue to rely on imported material to meet its overall need as set out under Issue 4 above.

#### 5.1.2.2 Waste Sites

Five possible waste sites were submitted to the Council for consideration for allocation in the MWLP, of these sites four already benefit from planning permission and therefore, do not need to be allocated and are therefore, not considered to be reasonable alternatives for allocation. The remaining site was promoted for inert infill of a former mineral site, now a lake which is of ecological and recreational value. It is considered that inert waste from which no further value can be obtained should be used primarily in the restoration of permitted minerals sites to ensure that such sites can be restored to an acceptable landuse in a timely manner. In addition, the Local Waste Assessment (LWA) 2019 shows that there is no need for additional waste management capacity within the district, and the allocation of mineral sites would create void space for inert landfill material, therefore it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative to consider this site further for allocation. As a result no waste sites are proposed for allocation and so no site assessment has taken place.

#### 5.1.3 The Sequential Test

The sequential test has been carried out for the sites recommended for allocation.

##### ***Sharp Sand and Gravel***

**Tidney Bed (MW015)** is located partly within flood zone 3 (44%), with the majority of the site at risk from groundwater flooding. However, the only other sites considered as a preferred option with a lower flood risk than **Tidney Bed (MW015)** are **Boot Farm (MW004)**, **Cowpond Piece (MW007)** and **Firlands (MW008)**. ~~**Boot Farm (MW004)** has been withdrawn from consideration for allocation by the landowner and so is no longer available.~~ **Cowpond Piece (MW007)** is not considered acceptable for development in ecological terms, and there are questions over the deliverability of the site at **Firlands (MW008)** due to access constraints. The layout and design of the site will need to take into account the flood risk, directing buildings and plant equipment (if required) to the areas of the site at least risk of flooding.

**Soft Sand**

**Chieveley Services (MW005)** is within flood zone 1, but is shown to have approximately a quarter of the site at risk from surface water or groundwater flooding. These areas at risk from flooding are largely located to the south of the site, within the area proposed as part of the landscape buffer, therefore, the risk of flooding on the active part of the site is reduced.

While the other soft sand site considered **60 Acre Field (MW002)** is identified in the SFRA as bring at lowest risk from flooding, the site is not considered suitable for development in landscape terms, and therefore, as the extraction of sand and gravel is considered to be a water-compatible activity it is considered appropriate to allocate **Chieveley Services (MW005)** despite the flood risk on the site. The layout and design of the site will need to take into account the flood risk, directing buildings and plant equipment (if required) to the areas of the site at least risk of flooding.

A table summarising the flood risk on each of the sites considered to be reasonable alternatives at preferred options is included in appendix 7.

**5.2 Overall assessment of the plan**

The overall assessment of the plan takes into account all the changes made to the plan since the preferred options.

Summary	Overall	Minerals	Waste
<b>Effect</b> <i>What is the overall sustainability impact on the SA Objectives?</i>	Overall the Minerals and Waste Plan should have a <b>positive impact</b> on all strands of sustainability, economic, environmental and social.	The development of mineral sites should have an overall <b>positive impact</b> in the short/medium/long term. Extraction of the mineral has a positive impact on economic sustainability, helping to meet local and regional needs. The restoration of the site should deliver net gains environmentally and socially.	The development of waste sites should have an overall <b>positive impact</b> in the short, medium and long term. Waste generated needs to be dealt with and the plan seeks to ensure adequate suitable provision for waste, pushing it up the waste hierarchy.
<b>Likelihood</b> <i>How likely is it that the effect will actually occur?</i>	There is a <b>high</b> likelihood that there will be a positive impact on sustainability as a result of the plan if the policies of the plan are adhered to as expected.	As sites are required to be restored and this should be to the same or better quality, it is <b>highly likely</b> that there will be a positive impact in the medium/long term as a result of the extraction of mineral from the site.	It is <b>highly likely</b> that the development of waste sites will have an overall positive impact.
<b>Scale</b> <i>What is the potential scale of the effect, considering the geographical area</i>	Overall the plan should have a positive impact on sustainability at the <b>local</b> level in terms of the overall policy, but will also support the wider <b>regional</b> need for minerals.	Overall the development of mineral sites will be likely to have an impact at both the <b>local scale</b> and the <b>regional scale</b> . The provision or mineral into the local and regional markets ensures a positive sustainability impact. It is recognised	Waste sites meet a <b>local</b> need for waste management facility, but also support wider waste management needs at the <b>regional</b> scale. It is recognised that without adequate mitigation measures

<i>and size of the population likely to be affected?</i>		that without adequate mitigation measures there could be a negative impact at the very local level surrounding a site.	there could be a negative impact at the very local level surrounding a site.
<b>Duration</b> <i>Are the potential effects likely to be permanent or temporary?</i>	The impact the plan has will depend on the nature of the development being considered.	Overall the development of mineral sites is <b>temporary</b> in nature. In the long term the benefits provided following the extraction of the mineral should provide a permanent benefit.	The majority of waste development will be <b>permanent</b> in nature and therefore, any impacts would be permanent.
<b>Timing</b> <i>Are the potential effects short, medium or long term?</i>	The plan will have an impact over the <b>long term</b> as it is due to be in place until 2037.	It is recognised that in the <b>short</b> term, without mitigation measures, there could be a negative impact. However, in the <b>medium/long</b> term when mitigation measures are in place and the site has been restored there should be an overall positive impact on sustainability.	It is recognised that in the short term, during the construction phase of development there could be some negative impacts if adequate mitigation is not provided, however, in the medium/long term, there should be neutral, or potentially positive impacts on sustainability as a result of the development.

The Proposed Main Modifications to the plan have not resulted in any changes to the outcomes of the SA/SEA. Each modification has been reviewed in terms of the SA/SEA objectives and a summary can be found in Appendix 8.

## 6 Next Stages

~~The SA/SEA Report is being published alongside the Proposed Submission Minerals and Waste Local Plan as part of the Regulation 19<sup>14</sup> consultation. Comments on the SA/SEA are invited at this stage. The consultation will last 6 weeks from 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021 until 15<sup>th</sup> February 2021.~~

~~Following the consultation the proposed plan and all supporting documents, including the SA/SEA Environmental Report will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination<sup>15</sup>.~~

The Minerals and Waste Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in July 2021. The hearing sessions took place in February 2022, and the Inspector's Post Hearings Note recommends a number of modifications to the plan ("Main Modifications") suggested by the Council

<sup>14</sup>The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Regulation 19 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/regulation/19/made>

<sup>15</sup>The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Regulation 22 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/regulation/22/made>

which the Inspector believes are necessary for the plan to be found sound. These modifications are now subject to consultation. The consultation will last just over 6 weeks from Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022 until Monday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2022.

Following the consultation all representations made will be submitted to the Inspector who will make his final decision on whether to recommend adoption of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

## 7 Implementation

The SEA Directive (European Directive 2001/42/EC “The assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the Environment”) requires that the significant environmental effects of implementing a plan of programme should be monitored in order to identify at an early stage any unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action. SA monitoring will cover significant sustainability effects as well as the environmental effects.

The suggested monitoring regime includes (sourced from the European Commission, 2003):

- Determination of the scope of monitoring
- Identification of the necessary information
- Identification of existing sources of information
  - Data at project level
  - General environmental monitoring and
  - Other data
- Filling the gaps
- Procedural integration of monitoring into the planning system
- Taking remedial action

In particular and in line with the guidance, monitoring will be focused on significant environmental effects, such as those;

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

The monitoring framework has been set out, and the key indicators to be monitored and relevant conclusions will be included in the Annual Monitoring Reports. The monitoring framework is set out in section 5 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, and contains more detail on the monitoring indicators and how they will be measured.

Potential indicators have been proposed in the Scoping Report context and baseline (see table 5) for each of the SA sub-objectives, drawing from existing sources to ensure the recording of data for the indicator is already established. The effectiveness of policies should be assessed against



measurable targets. Some policies aim to deliver a qualitative rather than quantitative outcome and in such instances it is appropriate to monitor whether the policy is delivering the intended trend or direction of travel.

In some cases information used in monitoring will be provided by outside bodies.

## **8 Conclusions on the Overall Sustainability of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan**

The SA/SEA shows that the impact of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan on sustainability has been taken into account, and the most appropriate options for the plan have been taken forward. The plan seeks to direct development to the most appropriate locations for that type of development, setting out policies and allocating sites, to deliver sustainable development for minerals and waste in West Berkshire. The Proposed Main Modifications to the MWLP have been reviewed in light of the SA/SEA and they do not impact on the SA/SEA objectives, or result in a change in the outcome of the SA/SEA.

If you require this information in an alternative format or translation, please call 01635 519111 and ask for the Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team.

**West Berkshire Council  
Development and Regulation**

Council Offices  
Market Street  
Newbury  
RG14 5LD  
T: 01635 519111  
F: 01635 519408  
E: [mwdpd@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:mwdpd@westberks.gov.uk)  
[www.westberks.gov.uk/mwlpmm](http://www.westberks.gov.uk/mwlpmm)