

## Schedule of Additional Changes and Draft Main Modifications to the Publication Draft

It has been accepted by the Inspector that the changes suggested in the “Addendum of Proposed Changes” (July 2017)(CD09) be treated as part of the Plan as submitted for examination, along with the Publication Draft and its Appendices (CD17-21).

The changes identified in this document include those identified in the “Schedule of Further Proposed changes to Publication Draft” (November 2017)(SD01), which were incorporated into “Suggested Main Modifications between Submission and MIQs” (February 2018)(LPA37). LPA37 also included amendments to Tables and other supporting text in the draft plan which arose from the document “Implication of any changes resulting from the North Yorkshire sub region LAA 2017 and Addendum of Proposed Changes to Publication Draft July 2017”(January 2018)(LPA06). Some further changes need to be made to those Tables and supporting text (see the Note LPA/68) and these are incorporated into this Schedule. Also included in this Schedule are modifications identified in the Authorities responses to the MIQs and discussed at the examination hearings.

Two types of change/modification will be listed in this document;

- Additional Changes (AC) – this will include corrections to text, typographical errors and any changes which will not influence the policies in the Plan
- Main Modifications (MM) – this will include any changes to Policy or supporting text which will have an influence on the Policy.

The ‘Stage’ column in the table will indicate where the addition/deletion has originated from, the documents will be identified by their library reference or stage of the process:

**CD09** – Addendum of Proposed Changes to Publication Draft

**LPA37** – Suggested Main Modifications between Submission and MIQs (February 2018)

**MIQ** – Main Modification suggested by LPA in response to Matters Issues and Questions and included as part of hearing statements

**EiP** – Main Modification suggested by Inspector during hearing sessions

### Key

**Example:** New Text

~~Example:~~ Deleted Text

**Example:** Text in bold is Policy wording

**Example:** Suggested during hearing sessions

**Example:** Suggested Main Modification

No. AC or MM	Page No.	Policy Ref/Paragraph Number/Reference point	Change proposed	Reason	Stage	Comment
AC01	6	Policy W10	Revise Policy Title: Policy W10: Overall locational principles for provision of waste <a href="#">management</a> capacity	To correct omission of the word 'management' from the Policy title	LPA37	
AC02	10	Figure 1	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC03	11	Figure 2	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC04	27	Figure 4	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC05	27	Figure 5	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC06	28	Figure 6	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC07	32	Figure 7	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC08	45	Waste Key Diagram	Amend plan to reflect the additional safeguarded waste site detailed at 'Addendum of Proposed Changes to Publication Draft Plan': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Showfield Lane, Malton</a></li> </ul>	Corrects an omission to the Waste Key Diagram as a result	LPA37	

				of the 'Addendum of Proposed Changes'.		
MM01	46	4.11	Add and additional trigger point where a review can be triggered an issues arising from waste water disposal in the context of hydrocarbons	At request of the Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC09	48	Figure 9	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
MM02	50	M02	Change reference of “mid-term review” to “5 yearly review” and insert additional text in second paragraph of M02 as following:  <b>Additional provision shall be made, through a <del>mid-term</del> 5 yearly review of provision in the Plan, if necessary to maintain a landbank of at least 7 years for sand and gravel at 31 December 2030 and/or to meet additional requirements identified through updates to the Local Aggregates Assessment, based on an annual rate of provision to be determined through the review.</b>	To be more consistent with updated National Policy	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM03	51	5.15	Revise 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence:  ...the precise level of further provision that may be needed in order to maintain a <del>minimum</del> <u>landbank of at least 7 years</u> <del>landbank</del> at 31 December 2030.	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM04	51	5.15	Change reference of “mid-term review” to “5 yearly review” as following:  Revise 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence:  This is a matter which can be addressed in monitoring of the Joint Plan and via a <del>mid-term</del> <u>5 yearly</u> review, at ...	To be more consistent with updated National Policy	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM05	51	M03	Add in additional paragraph	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Building sand: 5%</b></li> </ul> <p><u>in accordance with the numerical requirements identified in Tables 1 and 2 and based on the indicative location of the Northwards and Southwards distribution areas as shown in the Minerals Key Diagram on page 44.</u></p> <p>If it is not.....</p> <p>Add additional text into <b>Key links to other relevant policies and objectives</b></p> <p><b>M01, M02, M04, M07, M08, S01, S04, S05, D01, <u>Minerals Key Diagram (page 44)</u></b></p>			text at request of the Inspector
MM06	52	5.18	<p>Revise last sentence</p> <p>The division between the concreting sand and gravel northwards and southwards distribution areas is shown indicatively on the minerals key diagram (see page 44 of the Plan). <u>Specific requirements for sand and gravel in order to maintain an adequate supply throughout the Plan period are set out in Policies M07 and M08 and Tables 1 and 2.</u></p>	Provides links to other policies and tables	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM07	52	M04	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Para of the Policy:</p> <p><b>A <del>minimum</del> <u>landbank of at least 7 years</u> <del>landbank</del> for concreting...</b></p> <p><b>A separate <del>minimum 7-year</del> <u>landbank of at least 7 years</u> will be maintained...</b></p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM08	53	M05	<p>Revise wording of Policy:</p> <p><b>Total provision for crushed rock over the 15 year period 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2030 shall be <del>56.3</del> <u>51.75</u> million tonnes, at an equivalent annual rate of <del>3.7</del> <u>4.5</u> million tonnes, within which specific provision for a total</b></p>	To be more consistent with National Policy and to reflect change in figures	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

			<p>of <del>22.5-18</del> million tonnes at an equivalent annual rate of <del>1.5</del>20 million tonnes per annum shall be for Magnesian Limestone</p> <p>Additional provision shall be made through a <del>mid-term</del> 5 yearly review of provision in the Plan, if necessary, in order to maintain <del>a minimum at least a</del> 10 year landbank of crushed rock, including a separate <del>minimum 10 year</del> landbank <del>of at least 10 years</del> for Magnesium Limestone, at 31 December 2030 <del>and/or to meet additional requirements identified through updates to the Local Aggregates Assessment</del>, based on annual rate of provision to be determined through the review.</p>			
MM09	54 - 55	5.30	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> sentences of Para:</p> <p>To ensure that an adequate supply of crushed rock (i.e. <del>a minimum at least a</del> 10 year landbank) is ...</p> <p>...it is not considered appropriate to specify, at this stage, the level of further provision that may be needed to maintain a <del>minimum 10 year</del> landbank <del>of at least 10 years</del> at 2030.</p> <p>This is a matter which can be addressed in monitoring of the Joint Plan and via a <del>mid-term</del>5 yearly review, at ...</p> <p>A commitment to maintaining <del>a minimum at least a</del> 10 year landbank of crushed rock throughout the Plan period, including a separate <del>minimum</del> landbank <del>of at least 10 years</del> for Magnesium Limestone is set out in the following policy.</p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM10	55	M06	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> Para of the Policy:</p> <p><del>A minimum</del> An overall landbank of <del>at least</del> 10 years will be maintained for crushed rock throughout the Plan period. A separate <del>minimum</del> landbank of <del>at least 10 years</del> landbank will be identified and maintained for Magnesium</p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

			<p><b>Limestone crushed rock.</b></p> <p>Where new reserves of crushed rock are required in order to maintain <del>the an</del> overall landbank <del>above the</del> <u>of at least 10 years</u> <del>minimum period</del> these will, <del>as far as practical</del>, be sourced from outside the National Park and Areas of Outstanding National Beauty.</p>			
MM11	55	5.32	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence:</p> <p>National Planning Policy requires a landbank of crushed rock sufficient for a <del>minimum</del> <u>at least</u> 10 years...</p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM12	55	5.33	<p>Revise text to reflect modification to Policy M06</p> <p><u>National policy supports the maintenance of landbanks of aggregate minerals from locations outside National Parks and AONBs, so far as practical.</u> Crushed rock resources occur within highly protected parts of the plan area, including the National Park and in both the Howardian Hills and Nidderdale AONBs. There are no current crushed rock workings in the National Park and the release of crushed rock in the Park to maintain the landbank would not be supported by national policy, <u>unless it is not practical to make provision outside the designated area.</u> Both AONBs currently contribute to the supply of crushed rock and therefore the overall landbank of reserves. The minerals supply policies in the Joint Plan support the limited working of additional resources at these sites. However, such support is provided in order to maintain the benefits that these established sites bring to the local employment and economy rather than the contribution they may make to the landbank. It therefore follows that the release of additional reserves in the AONBs, specifically in order to maintain the landbank <u>of at least 10 years</u> <del>over the 10-year minimum period</del> will not be supported under this policy, <u>unless it is not practical to make provision outside the designated area.</u></p>	To reflect change in Policy wording	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM13	56	M07	Revise 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence of the Policy:	Provides a cross	MIQ/EIP	Additional

			<p>Requirements for concreting sand and gravel will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites and areas identified in the Joint Plan <del>and shown on the Policies Map</del> for working, <u>as shown on the Policies Map and as indicated in Table 1.</u></p>	reference to the Policies Map		text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM14	56	M07	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) i) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Killerby (MJP21), in Hambleton and Richmondshire Districts</u> <u>Additional Preferred Area on Land South of Catterick, in Hambleton and Richmondshire Districts</u></p> <p>In Part 1) ii) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham (MJP33), in Hambleton District</u> <u>Land South of Catterick (MJP17), in Hambleton and Richmondshire Districts</u></p> <p>In Part 2) i) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Langwith Hall Farm (MJP06), in Hambleton District</u> <u>Land at Pennycroft and Thorneyfields, Ripon (MJP14), in Harrogate Borough</u> <u>A Preferred Area on Land at Oaklands (MJP07), in Hambleton District</u></p>	Provides further locational detail for sites to provide clarity and addition of extra area	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector – preferred area for MJP17 under discussion with Industry.
MM15	57	M07	<p>Revise Part 2) ii) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Proposals for development of these sites will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</u></p> <p><del>ii) Areas of Search for concreting sand and gravel are identified as shown on the key diagram.</del> <u>Areas of Search A and C for concreting sand and</u></p>	Provides further locational detail for sites to provide clarity	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

			<p><u>gravel are identified as shown on the key diagram on page 44 and are set out in Appendix 1 as Area of Search A (in Harrogate Borough with a small part in Hambleton District) and Area of Search C (in Harrogate Borough).</u> Planning permission will be granted for development of sites within an Area of Search where necessary in order to maintain an adequate landbank at 31 December 2030 in the southwards distribution area and the need cannot be met through development of allocated sites or preferred areas. Permission will not be granted for development within these Areas of Search prior to 2025, unless there is a need for the earlier release of further reserves in order to maintain an adequate landbank or there is a shortfall in production capacity in the southwards distribution area requiring the release of additional sites for working.</p> <p><u>Proposals for development of site(s) in the Areas of Search A and C will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</u></p> <p><u>Part 3) Permission will be granted outside allocated sites, Preferred Areas and Areas of Search where the development would contribute to maintenance of an adequate and steady supply of concreting sand and gravel that cannot be met through reserves on sites or areas identified in the Plan, and/or the development would support the maintenance of adequate production capacity or an effective geographical distribution of sources of supply in the Plan area. Proposals will also need to be consistent with the development management policies in the Plan.</u></p> <p><b>Key Links to other relevant policies and objectives</b></p> <p><b>M02, M03, M04, S01, <u>Minerals Key Diagram (page 44)</u></b></p>			
MM16	57	New para after 5.38	<u>Whilst overall provision made through the Plan, in combination with existing</u>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text



			<p>permitted reserves, is expected to be sufficient to maintain a steady and adequate supply of concreting sand and gravel over the Plan period, it is possible that, for a range of reasons, reserves in these sites or areas may not be able to deliver the expected supply, or demand may be higher than expected. It is also recognised that circumstances could arise where the release of further reserves for working could help deliver clear sustainability benefits. This could include benefits arising through proposals which would ensure that adequate overall production capacity within the Plan area can be maintained, or an effective overall geographical distribution of sources of supply of concreting sand and gravel (for example through reducing reliance on imports from outside the Plan area, or the meeting of specific and more localised demands, not foreseen at the time of preparation of the Plan, and where a local supply source would deliver demonstrable sustainability benefits compared with reliance on established supply sources). Any proposals for release of further reserves on land not allocated in the Plan, and not falling within the scope of Policy M10 Unallocated extensions to existing quarries, would need to be supported with evidence of the claimed sustainability benefit and demonstrate compliance with relevant development management policies set out in Chapter 9 of the Plan.</p>			requested by the inspector									
AC10	58	Table 1	<p>Revise figures in Table 1:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Summary of concreting sand and gravel requirements and proposed allocations</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Northwards Distribution</th> <th>Southwards Distribution</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total estimated requirement over the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 (million</td> <td>16.5</td> <td>18.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Summary of concreting sand and gravel requirements and proposed allocations				Northwards Distribution	Southwards Distribution	Total estimated requirement over the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 (million	16.5	18.3	Update to tonnages to reflect changes in site allocation	MIQ/EIP	
Summary of concreting sand and gravel requirements and proposed allocations															
	Northwards Distribution	Southwards Distribution													
Total estimated requirement over the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 (million	16.5	18.3													

			tonnes)					
			Estimated shortfall (balance between permitted reserves at 1 January 2016 and total requirement to 31 December 2030) (million tonnes)	10.3		5.9		
			Additional reserves required to provide a 7 year landbank at 31 December 2030 (million tonnes)	7.7		8.5		
			Total estimated reserves available in sites proposed for allocation in Part 1(i) of Policy M07 (million tonnes)	11.4 Comprising: Killerby site MJP21)		<del>6.6</del> 5.8 Comprising: 2.3mt (Langwith Hall Farm site MJP06) <del>4.3</del> 3.5mt (Land at Pennycroft and Thorneyfields, Ripon site MJP14) Oaklands site Preferred Area MJP07 (tonnage estimate not available)		
			Total estimated reserves available in sites proposed for allocation in Part 1(ii) of Policy M07 in order to contribute to longer term landbank requirements (million tonnes)	<del>6.7</del> 5.67 Comprising: 3.5mt (Home Farm site MJP33) <del>3.2</del> 2.17mt (Land south of Catterick site allocation MJP17)		Estimated requirement to be provided from Areas of Search in the southwards distribution area: 6-8mt depending on		

			<p>and  <u>Land south of Catterick additional Preferred Area (tonnage estimate not available)</u></p>	<p>scale of any reserves delivered via the Oakland Preferred Area (MJP07)</p>				
			<p>Sites with permitted reserves of concreting sand and gravel as at 30 June 2016 (excludes dormant sites)</p>	<p>Scorton Quarry, Bridge Farm (Pallet Hill) Quarry, Manor House Farm Quarry</p>	<p>Marfield Quarry, Ripon Quarry, Ripon City Quarry, Nosterfield Quarry, Wykeham Quarry, Ings Farm</p>			
MM17	58	5.39	<p>Change reference of “mid-term review” to “5 yearly review” as following:</p> <p>Revise sentence:</p> <p>Additional provision, if required ... through a <del>mid-term</del> <u>5 yearly</u> review of the Joint Plan in line with Policy M02.</p>		<p>To be more consistent with National Policy</p>	<p>MIQ</p>	<p>Additional text at request of the Inspector</p>	
AC11	59	M08	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Requirements for building sand will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites allocated in the Joint Plan <u>and shown on the Policies Map</u> for working <u>and as indicated in Table 2.</u></b></p>		<p>Provides a cross reference to the Policies Map</p>	<p>MIQ/EIP</p>	<p>Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector</p>	
AC12	59	M08	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p><b>Land at Hensall Quarry (MJP22), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at West Heslerton Quarry (MJP30), <u>in Ryedale District</u></b>  <b>Land adjacent to Plasmor blockworks, Great Heck (MJP44), <u>in Selby District</u></b>  <b>Land at Mill Balk Quarry, Great Heck (MJP54), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p>		<p>Provides further locational detail for sites to provide clarity</p>	<p>MIQ</p>	<p>Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector</p>	

MM18	59	M08	<p>Add additional paragraph to end of Policy:</p> <p><b>Proposals for the development of these sites will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p> <p><b><u>2) Permission will be granted outside allocated sites where the development would contribute to maintenance of an adequate and steady supply of building sand that cannot be met through reserves on sites identified in the Plan, and/or the development would support the maintenance of adequate production capacity or an effective geographical distribution of sources of supply in the Plan area. Proposals will also need to be consistent with the development management policies in the Plan.</u></b></p> <p><b>Key links to other relevant policies and objectives</b>  <b>M02, M03, M04, S01</b>  <b>Objectives 5, 6, <u>7</u></b></p>	Provides further flexibility	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM19	59	5.41	<p>Revise text:</p> <p>Evidence suggests that the scale of additional provision for building sand needed to meet requirements over the Plan period is relatively small (amounting to around 0.9 million tonnes (mt) over the period to 31 December 2030). A further 0.8mt would be required in order to provide a <del>minimum 7-year</del> landbank <u>of at least 7 years</u> at 31 December 2030. Although there is only very limited evidence available on the distribution of potentially suitable building sand resources, a range of specific locations have been put forward by industry for consideration during preparation of the Joint Plan and these have been assessed. Requirements for building sand during the Plan period can be met through the release of reserves on specific sites put forward for consideration, which contain an estimated 2.5mt of reserves and therefore would also be sufficient to maintain a <del>7-year</del> landbank <u>of at least 7 years for</u> <del>of</del> building sand</p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			at 31 December 2030. The following table summarises requirements and proposed site allocations for building sand, as well as sites with existing permitted reserves expected to be able to contribute to supply.							
MM20	59	New paragraph after 9.41	<p>Insert new paragraph:</p> <p><u>Whilst overall provision made through the Plan, in combination with existing permitted reserves, is expected to be sufficient to maintain a steady and adequate supply of building sand over the Plan period, it is possible that, for a range of reasons, reserves in these sites or areas may not be able to deliver the expected supply, or demand may be higher than expected. It is also recognised that circumstances could arise where the release of further reserves for working could help deliver clear sustainability benefits. This could include benefits arising through proposals which would ensure that adequate overall production capacity within the Plan area can be maintained, or an effective overall geographical distribution of sources of supply of building sand (for example through reducing reliance on imports from outside the Plan area, or the meeting of specific and more localised demands, not foreseen at the time of preparation of the Plan, and where a local supply source would deliver demonstrable sustainability benefits compared with reliance on established supply sources). Any proposals for release of further reserves on land not allocated in the Plan, and not falling within the scope of Policy M10 Unallocated extensions to existing quarries, would need to be supported with evidence of the claimed sustainability benefit and demonstrate compliance with relevant development management policies set out in Chapter 9 of the Plan.</u></p>	To add flexibility	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector				
AC13	59/60	Table 2	<p>Revise figures in Table 2:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Summary of building sand requirements and proposed allocations</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total estimated requirement over the period 1 January <del>2016-2017</del> to 31 December 2030 (million tonnes)</td> <td><del>1.8</del> 1.68</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Summary of building sand requirements and proposed allocations		Total estimated requirement over the period 1 January <del>2016-2017</del> to 31 December 2030 (million tonnes)	<del>1.8</del> 1.68	To reflect the updated minerals reserves figures provided in the LAA covering the calendar year 2016.	LPA37	
Summary of building sand requirements and proposed allocations										
Total estimated requirement over the period 1 January <del>2016-2017</del> to 31 December 2030 (million tonnes)	<del>1.8</del> 1.68									

			<p>Estimated shortfall (balance between permitted reserves at 1 January <del>2016-2017</del> and total requirement to 31 December 2030) (million tonnes)</p> <p>Additional reserves required to provide a 7 year landbank at 31 December 2030 (million tonnes)</p> <p>Total estimated reserves available in sites proposed for allocation in Policy M08 (million tonnes)</p> <p>Sites with permitted reserves of building sand as at 30 June 2016 (excludes dormant sites)</p>	<p>0.9 <del>0.18</del></p> <p>0.8</p> <p>1.7 Comprising: 1.5mt (Hensall Quarry site MJP22) 0.03-0.05mt (West Heselton Quarry site MJP30) 0.9mt (Land adjacent to Plasmor Blockworks, Great Heck site MJP44) 0.07mt (Mill Balk Quarry site MJP54)</p> <p>Hensall Quarry Mill Balk Quarry West Heselton Quarry</p>			
MM21	60	M09	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Requirements for <del>Magnesian Limestone</del> crushed rock over the Plan period will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites allocated in the Joint Plan for working <u>shown on the Policies Map, and as indicated in Table 3.</u></b></p>		<p>Provides a cross reference to the Policies Map and change for Magnesian Limestone to Crushed Roack</p>	MIQ/EIP	<p>Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector</p>
AC14	60	M09	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Land at Jackdaw Crag South, Stutton (MJP23), <u>in Selby District</u></b> <b>Land at Barnsdale Bar Quarry (MJP28), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p>		<p>Provides further locational detail for sites to provide clarity</p>	MIQ	<p>Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector</p>

			<p><b>Land at Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton (MJP29), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Land at Gebdykes Quarry (MJP11), <u>in Hambleton District and Harrogate Borough</u></b></p> <p><b>Land at Potgate Quarry (MJP10), <u>in Harrogate Borough</u></b></p> <p>In Maintenance of supply ... allocated sites at:</p> <p><b>Land at Settrington Quarry (MJP08) (Jurassic Limestone), <u>in Ryedale District</u></b></p> <p><b>Land at Darrington Quarry (MJP24) (retention of processing plant site and haul road), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p>			
MM22	60	M09	<p>Add in additional paragraph at end of Policy:</p> <p><b>Proposals for the development of sites identified in this Policy will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p> <p><b><u>2) Permission will be granted outside allocated sites where the development would contribute to maintenance of an adequate and steady supply of Carboniferous Limestone, Magnesian Limestone and Jurassic Limestone crushed rock that cannot be met through reserves on sites identified in the Plan, and/or the development would support the maintenance of adequate production capacity or an effective geographical distribution of sources of supply in the Plan area. Proposals will also need to be consistent with the development management policies in the Plan.</u></b></p> <p><b>Key links to other relevant policies and objectives</b>  <b>M05, M06, S01</b>  <b>Objectives 5, 6, 7</b></p>	Provides further flexibility	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

MM23	61	5.43	<p>Revise text in paragraph:</p> <p>Evidence indicates that a further <del>8.166.9</del> million tonnes (mt) of reserves of Magnesian Limestone are needed in order to meet requirements over the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030, based on permitted reserves at the end of 2015. Permission was granted in early 2016 for working of 0.7mt of Magnesian Limestone within an area submitted for allocation at Barnsdale Bar (North area), reducing the remaining requirement to <del>7.46.2</del>mt. Sites expected to be able to contribute to supply of Magnesian Limestone during the Plan period are identified in Table 3 below. A further <del>15.12</del>mt of reserves would be required in order to maintain a <del>minimum 10 year</del> landbank of <u>at least 10 years</u> for Magnesian Limestone at 31 December 2030.</p>	To provide updated figures and be consistent with national policy	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector																		
MM24	61	Table 3	<p>Revised table 3:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="544 826 1494 1342"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Summary of crushed rock requirements and allocations</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Rock Type</th> <th>Million Tonnes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>a) Crushed rock (total)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total estimated requirement over the Plan period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 at 3.45 million tonnes per annum.</td> <td>51.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional requirement to maintain 10 year landbank at 31 December 2030</td> <td>34.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>86.3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016</td> <td>91.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09</td> <td>16.2 (sites MJP08, MJP10, MJP11, MJP23, MJP28 and MJP29).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Summary of crushed rock requirements and allocations		Rock Type	Million Tonnes	<b>a) Crushed rock (total)</b>		Total estimated requirement over the Plan period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 at 3.45 million tonnes per annum.	51.8	Additional requirement to maintain 10 year landbank at 31 December 2030	34.5	<b>Total</b>	<b>86.3</b>	Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016	91.9	Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan	Nil	Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09	16.2 (sites MJP08, MJP10, MJP11, MJP23, MJP28 and MJP29).	To provide figures relating to all three forms of crushed rock	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
Summary of crushed rock requirements and allocations																								
Rock Type	Million Tonnes																							
<b>a) Crushed rock (total)</b>																								
Total estimated requirement over the Plan period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 at 3.45 million tonnes per annum.	51.8																							
Additional requirement to maintain 10 year landbank at 31 December 2030	34.5																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>86.3</b>																							
Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016	91.9																							
Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan	Nil																							
Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09	16.2 (sites MJP08, MJP10, MJP11, MJP23, MJP28 and MJP29).																							



<b>b) Carboniferous Limestone</b>				
Total estimated requirement over the Plan period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 at 1.76 million tonnes per annum.	26.4			
Additional requirement to maintain 10 year landbank at 31 December 2030	17.6			
Total requirement	44.0			
Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016	71.5			
Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan	Nil			
Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09	Nil			
<b>c) Magnesian Limestone</b>				
Total estimated requirement over the Plan period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 at 1.20 million tonnes per annum.	18.0			
Additional requirement to maintain 10 year landbank at 31 December 2030	12.0			
Total requirement	30.0			
Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016	11.1			
Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan	18.9			
Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09	14.5 comprising: 7.0 part 1 (sites MJP23, MJP28 and MJP29) 7.5 part 2 (sites MJP10 and MJP11)			
<b>d) Jurassic Limestone</b>				
Total estimated requirement over the Plan period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030 at 0.45 million tonnes per annum.	6.8			
Additional requirement to maintain 10 year	4.5			

			<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><u>landbank at 31 December 2030</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>Total requirement</u></td> <td><u>11.3</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016</u></td> <td><u>9.5</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan</u></td> <td><u>1.8</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09</u></td> <td><u>1.7 (MJP08)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"><b>Sites with permitted reserves of crushed rock as at 30 June 2016 (excludes dormant sites)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Carboniferous Limestone:</u></td> <td><u>Magnesian Limestone:</u></td> <td><u>Jurassic Limestone:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Skipton Rock Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Gebdykes Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Newbridge Quarry</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Pateley Bridge Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Potgate Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Settrington Quarry</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Barton Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Jackdaw Crag Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Wath Quarry</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Forcett Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Brotherton Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Whitewall Quarry</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Leyburn Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Newthorpe Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Hovingham Quarry</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Wensley Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Went Edge Quarry</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Low Grange Quarry</u></td> <td><u>Barnsdale Bar Quarry</u></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Table 3: Summary of crushed rock requirements and allocations and existing sites with existing permitted reserves</u></p>	<u>landbank at 31 December 2030</u>			<u>Total requirement</u>		<u>11.3</u>	<u>Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016</u>		<u>9.5</u>	<u>Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan</u>		<u>1.8</u>	<u>Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09</u>		<u>1.7 (MJP08)</u>	<b>Sites with permitted reserves of crushed rock as at 30 June 2016 (excludes dormant sites)</b>			<u>Carboniferous Limestone:</u>	<u>Magnesian Limestone:</u>	<u>Jurassic Limestone:</u>	<u>Skipton Rock Quarry</u>	<u>Gebdykes Quarry</u>	<u>Newbridge Quarry</u>	<u>Pateley Bridge Quarry</u>	<u>Potgate Quarry</u>	<u>Settrington Quarry</u>	<u>Barton Quarry</u>	<u>Jackdaw Crag Quarry</u>	<u>Wath Quarry</u>	<u>Forcett Quarry</u>	<u>Brotherton Quarry</u>	<u>Whitewall Quarry</u>	<u>Leyburn Quarry</u>	<u>Newthorpe Quarry</u>	<u>Hovingham Quarry</u>	<u>Wensley Quarry</u>	<u>Went Edge Quarry</u>		<u>Low Grange Quarry</u>	<u>Barnsdale Bar Quarry</u>				
<u>landbank at 31 December 2030</u>																																																
<u>Total requirement</u>		<u>11.3</u>																																														
<u>Permitted reserves at 1 January 2016</u>		<u>9.5</u>																																														
<u>Residual shortfall to be met through the Plan</u>		<u>1.8</u>																																														
<u>Total volume of reserves in allocations via Policy M09</u>		<u>1.7 (MJP08)</u>																																														
<b>Sites with permitted reserves of crushed rock as at 30 June 2016 (excludes dormant sites)</b>																																																
<u>Carboniferous Limestone:</u>	<u>Magnesian Limestone:</u>	<u>Jurassic Limestone:</u>																																														
<u>Skipton Rock Quarry</u>	<u>Gebdykes Quarry</u>	<u>Newbridge Quarry</u>																																														
<u>Pateley Bridge Quarry</u>	<u>Potgate Quarry</u>	<u>Settrington Quarry</u>																																														
<u>Barton Quarry</u>	<u>Jackdaw Crag Quarry</u>	<u>Wath Quarry</u>																																														
<u>Forcett Quarry</u>	<u>Brotherton Quarry</u>	<u>Whitewall Quarry</u>																																														
<u>Leyburn Quarry</u>	<u>Newthorpe Quarry</u>	<u>Hovingham Quarry</u>																																														
<u>Wensley Quarry</u>	<u>Went Edge Quarry</u>																																															
<u>Low Grange Quarry</u>	<u>Barnsdale Bar Quarry</u>																																															
MM25	62	New paragraph after 5.47	<p><b>Insert new paragraph:</b></p> <p><u>Whilst overall provision made through the Plan, in combination with existing permitted reserves, is expected to be sufficient to maintain a steady and adequate supply over the Plan period, it is possible that, for a range of reasons, reserves in these sites or areas may not be able to deliver the expected supply, or demand may be higher than expected. It is also recognised that circumstances could arise where the release of further reserves for working could help deliver clear sustainability benefits. This could include benefits</u></p>	To add in flexibility	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector																																										

			<p>arising through proposals which would ensure that adequate overall production capacity within the Plan area can be maintained, or an effective overall geographical distribution of sources of supply of the three main types of crushed rock worked in the area (for example through reducing reliance on imports from outside the Plan area, or the meeting of specific and more localised demands, not foreseen at the time of preparation of the Plan, and where a local supply source would deliver demonstrable sustainability benefits compared with reliance on established supply sources). Any proposals for release of further reserves on land not allocated in the Plan, and not falling within the scope of Policy M10 Unallocated extensions to existing quarries, would need to be supported with evidence of the claimed sustainability benefit and demonstrate compliance with relevant development management policies set out in Chapter 9 of the Plan.</p>			
AC15	66	Figure 10	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National park	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC16	67	M12	<p>Revise Part 1) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>1) Proposals for the continuing extraction of silica sand at Burythorpe ... a minimum 10 year <del>landbank</del> stock for the site.</b></p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM26	67	M12 and 5.66	<p>Part 2)</p> <p>Change text to allocate Blubberhouses Quarry – reflect in supporting justification</p>	Allocation of discounted site at request of Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM27	68	5.67	Revise Para:	Additional text to	MIQ/EIP	Additional

			<p>The proximity of designated internationally important nature conservation sites also means that Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations will be needed. <u>Where applicable to the location, any planning application for future development will need to consider appropriately the impacts on the integrity of the internationally important nature conservation designations in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. This may include the need to demonstrate potential “Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest” (IROPI) subject to securing compensatory measures that ensure the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network. As a result on this ... forward in a planning application.</u></p>	include consideration of IROPI		text at request of the Inspector
AC17	68	5.68	<p>Revise the Para:</p> <p>There are only three Mineral Planning Authority areas in England that produce silica sand suitable for high quality glass manufacture: Norfolk and Surrey County Councils and Cheshire East Council. Supply also takes place from Fife in Scotland. Supply from Cheshire East is due to cease in 2016 with no new supply sources available. <u>Neither of Sites within</u> the other two MPAs in England <u>with reserves of silica sand</u> currently <u>has do not have</u> a 10 year <u>landbank stock</u> as required by <u>the NPPF national policy</u>, although both are seeking to make future provision through their emerging land use plans which, if achieved, would enable supply to continue over a longer period should the market require. In both areas resources are constrained by a range of important environmental designations.</p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC18	69	Figure 11	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC19	69	M13	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) i) of the Policy:</p>	Provides further locational detail for sites to provide clarity and a cross	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of

			<p>i) Allocation <b>as shown on the Policies Map</b> required in order to meet requirements during the Plan period:</p> <p><b>Land to north of Hemingbrough clay pit (MJP45), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p> <p>In Part 1) ii) of the Policy:</p> <p>ii) Allocation <b>as shown on the Policies Map</b> potentially required to contribute to maintaining longer term supply for Plasmor Blockworks</p> <p><b>A Preferred Area on land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks (MJP55), <u>in Selby District</u></b></p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p>2) Maintaining the supply of clay is also supported through identifying an allocated site <b>as shown on the Policies Map</b> for engineering clay at:</p> <p><b>Land north of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (MJP52), <u>in the City of York</u></b></p>	reference to the Policies Map		the Inspector								
MM28	72	5.83	<p>Add additional sentence and table to end of Para:</p> <p><b>The following table identifies active building stone sites in the Joint Plan area and the details of the stone extracted and uses.</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Site name</u></th> <th><u>Type of stone</u></th> <th><u>Details of stone</u></th> <th><u>Uses</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Gatherley Moor Permitted Until 28<sup>th</sup> February 2020</u></td> <td><u>Sandstone</u></td> <td><u>Alston sandstone – generally fine to medium grained, iron rich which gives an orange colour tinged with grey.</u></td> <td><u>Building stone and used for flags and roofing tiles.</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Site name</u>	<u>Type of stone</u>	<u>Details of stone</u>	<u>Uses</u>	<u>Gatherley Moor Permitted Until 28<sup>th</sup> February 2020</u>	<u>Sandstone</u>	<u>Alston sandstone – generally fine to medium grained, iron rich which gives an orange colour tinged with grey.</u>	<u>Building stone and used for flags and roofing tiles.</u>	Additional information about current sources of building stone and addition of Whitewall Quarry during EIP	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
<u>Site name</u>	<u>Type of stone</u>	<u>Details of stone</u>	<u>Uses</u>											
<u>Gatherley Moor Permitted Until 28<sup>th</sup> February 2020</u>	<u>Sandstone</u>	<u>Alston sandstone – generally fine to medium grained, iron rich which gives an orange colour tinged with grey.</u>	<u>Building stone and used for flags and roofing tiles.</u>											

			<u>Grey Yaud</u> <u>Permitted until</u> <u>20 December</u> <u>2036</u>	<u>Sandstone</u>	<u>Lower follifoot grit –</u> <u>coarse grain buff</u> <u>coloured sandstone</u>	<u>Repair and</u> <u>renovation</u> <u>of local</u> <u>buildings</u>			
			<u>Carlin Moor</u> <u>Permitted until</u> <u>31 July 2036</u>	<u>Sandstone</u>	<u>Alston sandstone –</u> <u>generally fine to</u> <u>medium grained, iron</u> <u>rich which gives an</u> <u>orange colour tinged</u> <u>with grey.</u>	<u>Building</u> <u>stone and</u> <u>used for flags</u> <u>and roofing</u> <u>tiles.</u>			
			<u>Melsonby</u> <u>Permitted until 3</u> <u>December 2017</u> <u>(an additional is</u> <u>awaiting</u> <u>determination)</u>	<u>Limestone</u>	<u>Underset limestone –</u> <u>grey base containing</u> <u>white or crystalline</u> <u>fossils, also known as</u> <u>Swaledale Fossil</u> <u>Limestone</u>	<u>Building</u> <u>stone</u>			
			<u>Highmoor</u> <u>Permitted until</u> <u>28 July 2021</u>	<u>Limestone</u>	<u>Lower magnesian</u> <u>limestone – fine to</u> <u>coarse grained, pale</u> <u>yellow-white</u>	<u>Quality</u> <u>building</u> <u>stone</u>			
			<u>Low Grange</u> <u>Permitted until</u> <u>22 February 2042</u>	<u>Limestone</u>	<u>Underset limestone –</u> <u>grey base containing</u> <u>white or crystalline</u> <u>fossils, also known as</u> <u>Swaledale Fossil</u> <u>Limestone</u>	<u>Building</u> <u>stone</u>			
			<u>Went Edge</u> <u>Permitted until</u> <u>September 2023</u>		<u>Lower magnesian</u> <u>limestone – fine to</u> <u>coarse grained, pale</u> <u>yellow-white</u>	<u>Quality</u> <u>building</u> <u>stone</u>			
			<u>Brotherton</u> <u>Permitted until</u>	<u>Limestone</u>	<u>Upper magnesian</u> <u>limestone – Fine to</u>	<u>Field walls</u> <u>and farm</u>			

			<p><u>31 December 2020</u></p>		<p><u>coarse grained, pale yellow-white</u></p>	<p><u>buildings, also used as a source of lime.</u></p>			
			<p><u>Aislaby (Does not have a time limit as so small, but has a resource limit instead)</u></p>	<p><u>Sandstone</u></p>	<p><u>Aislaby stone – medium to coarse grained, buff, yellow and brown in colour</u></p>	<p><u>Building stone, freestone, ashlar, farm buildings, walls and monumental sculptures</u></p>			
			<p><u>Lowther’s Crag Permitted until 6 December 2022</u></p>	<p><u>Sandstone</u></p>	<p><u>Saltwick sandstone - medium to coarse grained, buff, yellow and brown</u></p>	<p><u>Slabs, freestone, ashlar, quoins, walling stone and rubble fill</u></p>			
			<p><u>Whitewall Quarry</u></p>	<p><u>Limestone</u></p>	<p><u>Coralline Oolite Formation</u></p>	<p><u>Dimension stone</u></p>			
MM29	72	M15	<p>Provide additional text in Policy:</p> <p><b>1) In order to secure an adequate supply of building stone, proposals will, where consistent with other policies in the Joint Plan, be permitted for:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. the extension of time for completion of extraction at permitted building stone extraction sites;</b></li> <li><b>ii. the lateral extension and/or deepening of workings at permitted building stone extraction sites;</b></li> <li><b>iii. the re-opening of former building stone quarries;</b></li> <li><b>iv. the opening of new sites for building stone extraction, including the</b></li> </ul>				<p>To be more comprehensive</p>	<p>EIP</p>	<p>Additional text at request of the Inspector</p>

		<p>small- scale extraction of building stone at new sites adjacent to existing historic buildings or structures where the use is specifically for their repair;</p> <p>v. the incidental production of building stone in association with the working of crushed rock;</p> <p>vi. the grant of permission on sites allocated in the Joint Plan for working of building stone.</p> <p>vii. <u>development for building stone products and processing activities including at appropriate locations functionally but not physically linked to an existing quarry, provided compliance with other relevant policies in the Plan can be achieved</u></p> <p>viii. Where development is proposed in the National Park or an AONB under criteria i) to iv) above, and where the development comprises major development due to its scale and nature, proposals will need to meet the requirements for major development set out in Policy D04.</p> <p>2) Proposals for the supply of building stone should be supported by evidence to demonstrate the contribution that the stone proposed to be worked would make to the quality of the built and/or historic environment in the Plan area and/or to meeting <b>important particular</b> requirements for building stone outside the area, <u>such as geological matching</u>. The scale of the proposal should be consistent with the identified needs for the stone.</p> <p>3) <del>For proposals</del> <u>Proposals</u> for <u>the</u> supply of building stone from locations within the National Park or AONBs, <del>it</del> will need to <del>be</del> demonstrated that the stone is required <b>primarily</b> to meet requirements arising from new build or repair work within the National Park and/or AONBs, or for the repair of <b>important designated or undesignated</b> buildings or structures which rely on the proposed source of stone as the original source of supply, or provide a directly equivalent product which can no longer be provided from the original source supply, <u>or is required to be sold out of the National Park or AONB so as to preserve the overall economic viability of the source .</u></p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--



			<p><b>4) Additional reserves to help to maintain the supply of building stone are also provided through a site allocation <u>as shown on the Policies</u> for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Land at Brows Quarry (MJP63) <u>in Ryedale District.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b>Proposals for development at this site will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p> <p>Add additional text:</p> <p>Revise ‘Key links to other relevant policies and objectives’ table:</p> <p><b><u>M10, I02, S01, D04, D08</u></b></p>			
AC20	73	5.86	<p>Add additional sentences to end of paragraph:</p> <p>Building stone quarries are typically relatively small in scale but, as a result of the need to source stone of particular technical or aesthetic properties, may sometimes be proposed in sensitive locations with the potential for impacts on the environment or local communities. It is therefore important that proposals can demonstrate compliance with other relevant policies in the Joint Plan.</p> <p><u>Building stone quarries are typically relatively small in scale but, as a result of the need to source stone of particular technical or aesthetic properties, may sometimes be proposed in sensitive locations with the potential for impacts on the environment or local communities. It is therefore important that proposals can demonstrate compliance with other relevant policies in the Joint Plan. Proposals for sustainable stone processing of materials from a quarry at a quarry or at an existing stone recycling facility including; sawing, tooling and screening would need to demonstrate compliance with the development management and other infrastructure policies in the Joint Plan.</u></p>	To be more consistent with National Policy	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC21	73	5.88	Add additional text:	To provide flexibility	EIP	Additional

			<p>It is nevertheless recognised that in some instances it may be appropriate for high quality building stone worked in the Plan area to serve wider markets, including in cases where stone from the Plan area has been used in important buildings and structures elsewhere or can provide a similar match to stones which are no longer available elsewhere. It is therefore important that applications for working of high quality stone such as ashlar are accompanied by supporting information on requirements for the stone, including, for example, reference to the Strategic Stone Study (a national study led by Historic England working with the British Geological Survey which identifies the most significant building stone resources as well as, in some cases, the original sources of stone for particular buildings or settlements). <u>Existing quarries in designated areas are important in terms of preserving and enhanced the built character of the protected areas by providing geologically correct stone, Where it can be demonstrated that sale of stone outside the protected area is necessary to preserve the economic viability of an existing quarry which primarily supplies stone to the protected area, such sales to preserve economic viability will be supported.</u></p>			text at request of the Inspector
AC22	74	5.90	<p>Add additional text:</p> <p>There may be occasions where suitable stone resources are available immediately adjacent to the site where they will be utilised and, as this can represent a sustainable option, limited extraction specifically to serve repair needs for adjacent existing historic structures or buildings will be supported in principle. <u>There may be sites dealing with stone products that are not at existing quarries which are nevertheless important for the supply of stone products to the plan area, there is support for their ongoing development where there is compliance with the development management and other infrastructure policies in the Joint Plan.</u></p>	Provide links to other policies in Plan	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC23	75	Figure 12	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP	LPA37	

				boundary.		
AC24	77	5.105	<p>Add in text</p> <p>Whilst permission for hydraulic fracturing of an existing gas well near Kirby Misperton was granted in 2016, there is still a high degree of uncertainty about the commercial viability of any resources in this area or the UK generally, and hence the potential scale or distribution of development activity that may come forward. This uncertainty is likely to prevail until further exploration <u>and appraisal</u> activity has taken place.</p>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC25	78	5.109	<p>Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> last sentence</p> <p>Although typically 98-99% of the liquid is water, small quantities of chemicals are often added. Operators must demonstrate to the Environment Agency that all the chemicals used in the process are non-hazardous <u>to groundwater</u>.</p>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM30	81	5.114	<p>Add additional text:</p> <p>Each proposed development is assessed by the Environment Agency, which regulates discharges to the environment, issues water abstraction licences, and acts as a statutory consultee in the planning process. The Environment Agency has issued guidance which notes that an environmental permit will be required for matters such as the emission of waste gasses, <u>the management of waste above ground</u> and the disposal of waste underground. A permit will also be needed if large quantities of gas are to be flared and for groundwater activities, depending on the local hydrology</p>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM31	81	5.115	<p>Add additional text:</p> <p>All drilling operations are subject to notifying the Health and Safety Executive, which will check operators' plans, assess engineering designs and reports and be responsible for checking sites to ensure they meet the requirements of the relevant legislation. The Health and Safety Executive requires that an independent well examiner reviews the design of the well before drilling begins and subsequently monitors its' construction and operation. <u>The drilling</u></p>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			operations are also regulated by the Oil and Gas Authority who will approve each stage of the progression of the well through their WONS system (Well Operations Notification System).			
MM32	84	5.119	<p>Revise text</p> <p>To ensure that the local policy approach to hydrocarbon development is as clear as it can be, it is helpful to define some key words and concepts that will be used by the Mineral Planning Authorities when implementing the Joint Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 'Hydrocarbon development' includes all development activity associated with exploring, appraising and/or producing hydrocarbons (oil and gas), including both surface and underground development.</li> <li>b) 'Surface hydrocarbon development' and 'surface proposals' includes use and/or development of the land surface for the purposes of the exploring, appraising and/or producing hydrocarbons.</li> <li>c) 'Sub-surface hydrocarbon development' and 'sub-surface proposals' includes development taking place below the ground surface for the purposes of exploring, appraising and/or producing hydrocarbons.</li> <li>d) 'Conventional hydrocarbons' include oil and gas found within geological 'reservoirs' with relatively high porosity/permeability, <del>extracted using conventional drilling and production techniques.</del></li> <li>e) 'Unconventional hydrocarbons' include hydrocarbons such as coal bed and coal mine methane and shale gas, <del>extracted using unconventional techniques, including hydraulic fracturing in the case of shale gas,</del> as well as the exploitation of in situ coal seams through underground coal gasification.</li> <li>f) For the purposes of the Plan 'hydraulic fracturing' includes the fracturing of rock under hydraulic pressure regardless of the volume of fracture fluid used.</li> <li>g) In planning terms it is <u>considered that relevant distinctions can be</u></li> </ul>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<p><u>drawn between the specific nature and/or scale of activities associated with certain stages of development for conventional hydrocarbons and those used for unconventional hydrocarbons. These differences may include the potential requirement for a larger number of well pads and individual wells, the volume and pressures of fluids used for any hydraulic fracturing processes and the specific requirements for any related plant and equipment and the management of related wastes.</u></p> <p><del>important to distinguish between:</del></p> <p><del>i. — the use of unconventional techniques to extract hydrocarbons, such as hydraulic fracturing, underground coal gasification and coal bed methane extraction; and</del></p> <p><del>ii. — the use of more conventional, less complex drilling and production techniques to extract hydrocarbons.</del></p>			
MM33	84	M16 b i)	Provide a definition for 'Historic Character'	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM34	84	M16, d) i)	<p>Revise text of Part d):</p> <p><b>d) All <u>Additional criterion applying to</u> surface hydrocarbon development:</b></p> <p><b>i) Where proposals for surface hydrocarbon development <u>meet other locational criteria set out in this policy but</u> fall within a National Park or an AONB or <u>the associated visual sensitivity zone around these areas, as 3.5km buffer zone</u> identified on the Policies map, or <u>are</u> otherwise considered to have the potential to cause significant harm to a National Park and/or AONB, applications <u>should</u> <del>must</del> be supported by a detailed assessment of the potential impacts on the designated area(s) <del>→</del> <u>unless it</u></b></p>	Clarifies the approach to hydrocarbon development in these areas.	LPA37/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<p>can be demonstrated that such an assessment is not required taking into account the particular locational circumstances of the proposed site relative to the designated area/s. Where detailed assessment is required this should include an assessment of views of and from the designated area/s. <del>This includes views of and from the associated landscapes</del> from significant viewpoints and an assessment of the cumulative impact of development in the area. Permission will not be granted for such proposals where they would result in unacceptable harm to the special qualities of the designated area(s) or are incompatible with their statutory purposes in accordance with Policy D04.</p>			
MM35	84	M16 and 5.124	<p>Provide a note to explain distinction between conventional and unconventional</p> <p>Provide a note to explain why subsurface development triggers the MDT and provide more information on the straddling applications</p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM36	86	5.122	<p>Revise text:</p> <p>While the Infrastructure Act 2015 and secondary legislation address hydraulic fracturing which occurs underground, the Government has also introduced <del>consulted on</del> further restrictions, in the form of a prohibition on high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations from <del>taking place being carried out</del> from new or existing wells that are drilled at the surface in <del>certain</del> specified protected areas, <del>although they are not yet in force. As proposed,</del> The restrictions <del>would apply to</del> will principally affect surface development that is used for the carrying out of “associated hydraulic fracturing” the definition of which is contained in section 4B(1) of the Petroleum Act 1998. The Government has stated that, in addition, these restrictions will apply where an operator is required to get consent from the SoS for hydraulic fracturing that is not “associated hydraulic fracturing”, and that the SoS intends to require that such consent be obtained for operations which use more than 1,000 cubic metres of fluid at any single stage, or</p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<p><del>expected stage, unless an operator can persuasively demonstrate why requiring such consent would not be appropriate in their case. for unconventional hydrocarbons involving high-volume hydraulic fracturing but not to conventional hydrocarbons development, or development for unconventional hydrocarbons which do not require high-volume hydraulic fracturing.</del> The areas <del>proposed for protection</del> protected through this means are National Parks, AONBs, World Heritage Sites, Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, SSSIs, Natura 2000 sites (SPAs and SACs) and Ramsar sites. Although these areas all benefit from strong national planning policy protection in their own right, the <del>proposed</del> restrictions <del>would do</del> not, in themselves, constitute planning policy as <del>they are proposed to will</del> be implemented through the oil and gas licensing regime.</p>			
MM37	86	5.123	<p>Revise text:</p> <p>The net effect of the existing restrictions would be to prevent subsurface development involving high-volume hydraulic fracturing at a depth of less than 1,000m below the surface anywhere in the Plan area, and at a depth of less than 1,200m below the surface in some highly protected areas (as indicated in para. 5.121). However, a range of other important types of designation would not be subject to similar legislative protection. Furthermore, whilst the <del>proposed</del> surface restrictions <del>would will</del> provide protection to a range of important designations, albeit not as a matter of planning policy, there are other types of sensitive areas that would not receive equivalent protection.</p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM38	86	5.124	<p>PC66 form Addendum of Proposed Changes</p> <p>Revise last sentence of para. 5.124 and add new text at end: Similarly, it is considered that where hydraulic fracturing is proposed for the purposes of supporting the production of conventional gas resources, <u>there is potential for this to give rise to a generally similar range of issues and potential impacts, although it is acknowledged that fracturing for stimulation of conventional gas production would be likely to involve generally lower volumes and/or pressures. In these circumstances it is therefore appropriate that such</u></p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised

			<p><u>development is subject to the same policy approach. However, it is not the intention of the Mineral Planning Authorities to unreasonably restrict activity typically associated with production of conventional resources, which is a well-established industry in the Plan area and they will therefore apply the policy accordingly and reasonably based on the specific circumstances of the proposal under consideration</u> <del>this should be subject to the same policy approach that is applied to hydraulic fracturing for unconventional gas, as the range of issues and potential impacts are likely to be similar.</del></p> <p>The above revised text does not adequately address the industry concerns, need to review and look at further changes</p>			
MM39	86	5.125	<p>Add text to 1<sup>st</sup> sentence:</p> <p>In view of the limited protection provided by existing and proposed legislation, as well as current uncertainty about the potential scale and geographical distribution of any commercial gas production that may be sought by industry, it is considered important that a comprehensive range of key environmental and other designations in the Plan area are afforded an appropriate degree of protection as a matter of local planning policy. <u>aligning with expressed government policy of seeking to maintain the highest standards.</u></p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector - wording still to be finalised
MM40	87	5.126	<p>Revise text:</p> <p>5.126 Mining operations and drilling at any depth would constitute “development” as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“development” means the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operations in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any buildings or other land). Where horizontal drilling beneath a National Park is proposed from a location outside the Park, a ‘straddling’ application to both mineral planning authorities will be required <u>in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Schedule 1, paragraph 1(1)(i). Such a development, which is likely to fall under EIA regulations, involves mineral extraction from a protected landscape and may be</u></p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector



			<p>regarded as major development in combination with the wider surface development activity associated with it which could impact on the National Park environment itself. For example, emissions to air and ground and surface water close to the National Park could in turn result in ecological impacts in such a sensitive area, where there are important interactions between ground and surface waters and the heath and moor habitats, which are designated as Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation for both their vegetation and specific bird species they support. <del>As the sub-surface protections in the Infrastructure Act and the Onshore Hydraulic Fracturing (Protected Areas) Regulations only refer to high-volume hydraulic fracturing, it is considered that the starting point in local policy is that all applications for appraisal or production of unconventional hydrocarbons within the National Park and AONBs will be considered as major development and should be steered away from these highly protected areas.</del> Further details on how proposals are assessed in terms of the major development test are set out in Policy D04.</p>			
MM41	87	5.127	<p>Add additional text:</p> <p>A key factor leading to designation of an area as a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the quality of its landscape. These areas benefit from a very high degree of protection in national policy, which states that major development within them should be refused unless there are exceptional circumstances and the development would be in the public interest. National Parks and AONBs are very important in contributing to the overall environmental quality, distinctive character and rural economy of the Plan area, yet substantial areas of PEDLs are located in them. In some cases, development outside a National Park or AONB could have an impact on its setting, and conflict with the statutory purposes of its designation. A particular consideration is whether the scale, nature and location of a proposed development <u>close to the designated area</u> would detract from <del>it's the special qualities of the designated area.</del> Tall elements of surface hydrocarbons</p>	Requested by Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<p>development, such as drill rigs associated with exploration and appraisal, or production wells, may typically be 35-40m in height. Such equipment may only be present on site for relatively short periods, or potentially a number of months, or intermittently <u>over a period of years at established well pads where successive wells are drilled or re-fracturing of existing wells take place.</u> However, where they would be located in close proximity to National Parks or AONBs, they have the potential to cause significant adverse impact on the setting of these important areas. This could include impact on important views to or from the National Park or AONB, or on the dark night skies typically associated with such areas as a result of the need for site lighting during 24-hour operations at some stages of development. Further justification for the protection of the setting of National Parks and AONBs is provided in paras. 9.26 and 9.27.</p>			
MM42	88	5.128	<p>Revise text:</p> <p>In order to ensure that National Parks and AONBs are provided with a degree of protection commensurate with their significance to the landscape and overall quality of the environment within the Plan area, proposals for surface hydrocarbons development within <u>the visual sensitivity zone of the National Park or AONB</u> <del>a 3.5km zone around a National Park or AONB</del> should be supported by detailed information assessing the impact of the proposed development, <u>including view into and out of</u> <del>on</del> the designated area, <u>including views into and out from the protected area.</u> <del>The Authorities consider that, for development outside the boundary of the designated area, such a requirement is most likely to apply within a 3.5km zone around the boundary, as defined on the Policies Map. This 3.5km zone is based on standard planning practice relating to the assessment of landscape and visual impact for EIA purposes, where it may be justified to 'screen out' consideration of a 35m tall and relatively linear structure beyond a distance of 3.5km from the receptor. The is distance is based on typical planning practice relating to assessment of landscape and visual impact for EIA purposes, where it may be justified to 'screen out' consideration of a 35m tall and relatively linear structure beyond a distance of 3.5km from the receptor.</del> Whilst it is considered that a 3.5km <u>zone</u></p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			is likely to be adequate to ensure that, in the large majority of cases, the potential for significant impacts is identified and considered, there may be particular circumstances, for example as a result of the local topography, that mean that similar information will be required in respect of proposals beyond the 3.5km zone. <u>Similarly, the particular topography of the landscape surrounding the designated area in places may, within this 3.5km zone, effectively screen the development in views from or towards the designated area and in such cases, such additional assessment and supporting information may not be required.</u> Prospective applicants should seek advice from the relevant Mineral Planning Authority on this matter at pre-application stage.			
MM43	88	5.130	Revise text:  Areas of Heritage Coast have been defined in the Plan area. In these nationally defined non-statutory areas, local planning authorities are required to 'maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes and improve public access to and enjoyment of the coast'. Such areas are therefore afforded a relatively high level of significance in national policy terms and it is appropriate to reflect this in the spatial approach <u>and regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy.</u>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM44	88	M17	Provide more flexibility, review use of 'exceptional circumstances' Provide a note as to why the 500m needs to be retained with supporting evidence to form a view on soundness	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM45	89	M17	M17 1) iii) revise wording to read  ...via underground pipeline where practicable... and ...of water where practicable and having regard to the nature of proposals and cross reference to	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			other policies			– wording still to be finalised
MM46	90	M17	M17 3)  Revise wording to add flexibility to look at individual circumstances not limited to school holidays, e.g. agreeing to a TMP which takes into account seasonal variation and other considerations.	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM47	95	M18	Provide additional text to M18 1) i) to provide clarity by referring to there being adequate capacity for the waste	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM48	96	M18	Clarify position on decommissioning and sub surface restoration and clarify text in M18 and link with text in para 5.151	Requested by the inspector to provide consistency with explanatory text	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC26	96	M18, Key links to other relevant policies and objectives	Amend Key Links section to include: <a href="#">W08</a>	Reflects the links between Part 1) of Policy M18: Waste Management and reinjection of wells and Policy W08: Managing waste water and sewage sludge.	LPA37	

MM49	98	5.159	Possibly add wording to 5.159 to explain that waste water management is subject to other regulatory controls and that the LPA will work with those other bodies.	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC27	99	Figure 16	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
MM50	100	M20	Add wording about climate change – may be an overarching policy rather than adding text into individual policies.	To make sure climate change is taken into account	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC28	102	5.171	<p>Revise wording of paragraph:</p> <p><del>There are various forms of potassium bearing minerals which can be mined for potash including sylvinitite, polyhalite and carnalite. Potash is mainly used as a fertiliser. Rock salt may occur in association with potash and is commonly used for de-icing roads. Both potash and salt occur at substantial depths below the eastern part of the plan area, where existing extraction takes place. Identified resources lie mainly beneath the North York Moors National Park. Potash is the generic term for potassium bearing minerals and has an important economic value for fertiliser. Within the Plan area it takes the form of sylvinitite, which can be processed to create ‘muriate of potash’, and polyhalite, which although lower in terms of potassium content, also includes other important plant nutrients, particularly sulphur. Rock salt may occur in association with potash and is commonly used for de-icing roads. Both potash and salt occur at substantial depths below the eastern part of the Plan area, where existing extraction takes place. Identified resources lie mainly beneath the North York</del></p>	Text for clarification	EIP	

			<u>Moors National Park.</u>			
MM51	102	M22	Add in text  'no unacceptable impact'	To provide flexibility	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC29	103	5.173	Add text to the end of Para:  ... in 2016 under the NSIP process. <u>The “North Yorkshire Polyhalite Project” was approved by the North York Moors National Park Authority when it concluded that the potential economic benefits from the proposal represented a transformational economic opportunity at a regional and national level. At the same time it was concluded that the innovative nature of the mine design and associated landscaping would result in an acceptable reduction in the long term environmental impacts of the development. It was also recognised that there was no realistic scope for locating the development elsewhere outside the National Park. (It is important to note that the need for the mineral was not considered to represent exceptional circumstances as this form of potash did not have any established market globally, and in any case was available in significant volumes at the nearby Boulby Potash mine). Construction of the mine began formally on the 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017. At the time of the MWJP Hearing, site preparation works at both the mine site and the Lockwood Beck intermediate tunnel site (located just outside the National Park in the Redcar &amp; Cleveland BC area) will have been substantially completed. The route of the Mineral Transport System tunnel seismic survey will have been almost completed and coring along the route underway. Diaphragm walling technique construction to create one of the extensive sub-surface mine-head structures will be ongoing and the project will be broadly on target for first Polyhalite</u>	To provide more information about the ‘North Yorkshire Polyhalite Project’	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<a href="#">production around the end of 2021.</a>																											
AC30	109	Table 4	<p>Addition to the ‘comment’ column within the ‘Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste’ row:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">North Yorkshire Sub-region - Estimated Main Waste Arisings 2014 (tonnes)</th> <th>Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Local Authority Collected Waste</td> <td>425,864</td> <td>Does not include arisings within the Redcar and Cleveland area of the NYMNP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial and Industrial waste</td> <td>322,872</td> <td>Excludes large volumes of power station ash from Drax and Eggborough Power Stations deposited at private disposal facilities at Barlow and Gale Common ash disposal sites.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste</td> <td>820,705</td> <td><a href="#">Excludes waste managed at EA Registered Exemption sites.</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hazardous Waste</td> <td>33,143</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agricultural waste</td> <td>33,786</td> <td>Excludes large volumes of organic farm waste managed directly within the farm holding.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low-Level Radioactive waste</td> <td>Estimated at less than 50m<sup>3</sup></td> <td>EA Estimate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Waste water</td> <td>No data available</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	North Yorkshire Sub-region - Estimated Main Waste Arisings 2014 (tonnes)		Comment	Local Authority Collected Waste	425,864	Does not include arisings within the Redcar and Cleveland area of the NYMNP.	Commercial and Industrial waste	322,872	Excludes large volumes of power station ash from Drax and Eggborough Power Stations deposited at private disposal facilities at Barlow and Gale Common ash disposal sites.	Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste	820,705	<a href="#">Excludes waste managed at EA Registered Exemption sites.</a>	Hazardous Waste	33,143		Agricultural waste	33,786	Excludes large volumes of organic farm waste managed directly within the farm holding.	Low-Level Radioactive waste	Estimated at less than 50m <sup>3</sup>	EA Estimate	Waste water	No data available		To provide clarity	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
North Yorkshire Sub-region - Estimated Main Waste Arisings 2014 (tonnes)		Comment																												
Local Authority Collected Waste	425,864	Does not include arisings within the Redcar and Cleveland area of the NYMNP.																												
Commercial and Industrial waste	322,872	Excludes large volumes of power station ash from Drax and Eggborough Power Stations deposited at private disposal facilities at Barlow and Gale Common ash disposal sites.																												
Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste	820,705	<a href="#">Excludes waste managed at EA Registered Exemption sites.</a>																												
Hazardous Waste	33,143																													
Agricultural waste	33,786	Excludes large volumes of organic farm waste managed directly within the farm holding.																												
Low-Level Radioactive waste	Estimated at less than 50m <sup>3</sup>	EA Estimate																												
Waste water	No data available																													
AC31	114	6.26	<p>Revise Para:</p> <p>Environment Agency data indicates that in 2014 the North Yorkshire sub-region imported a minimum of 212,000 tonnes of waste (<a href="#">251,000 tonnes in 2012 and 193,000 tonnes in 2013</a>). However, the actual figure is likely to be higher due to the lack of detail on the origin of some waste arisings. <del>In the same year</del> <a href="#">In</a></p>	Additional information to provide clarification.	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector																								

			<p><u>each year, from 2012-2014</u>, the sub-region is known to have exported over 300,000 tonnes of waste. The majority of import and export movements were from or to other locations in Yorkshire and Humber or the North East. However, <u>as indicated above</u>, data suggests that there are significant annual variations in the scale of movements between particular areas and this limits the potential to establish a comprehensive understanding of current and likely future waste flows.</p>																																	
MM52	115	W02	<p>Add additional text to W02 3) to add flexibility to wording to make sure hazardous waste covered, such as 'usually to accommodate matters such as hazardous waste'</p>	Requested by the Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised																														
AC32	118	Table 6	<p>Revise figures in Table 6:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Waste Management Method</th> <th>Capacity 2016 (tonnes)</th> <th>Capacity 2020 (tonnes)</th> <th>Capacity 2025 (tonnes)</th> <th>Capacity 2030 (tonnes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Recycling (C&amp;I, LACW, Agricultural)</td> <td><del>644,338</del> <u>734,450</u></td> <td><del>889,639</del> <u>979,751</u></td> <td><del>864,639</del> <u>945,230</u></td> <td><del>814,639</del> <u>895,230</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recycling (CD&amp;E)</td> <td><del>279,160</del> <u>315,920</u></td> <td><del>204,160</del> <u>240,920</u></td> <td><del>151,990</del> <u>177,482</u></td> <td><del>151,990</del> <u>177,482</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recycling (Specialist Material)</td> <td><del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u></td> <td><del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u></td> <td><del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u></td> <td><del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Treatment Plant</td> <td><del>198,226</del> <u>272,935</u></td> <td><del>184,780</del> <u>381,949</u></td> <td><del>177,756</del> <u>374,925</u></td> <td><del>177,756</del> <u>374,925</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Composting</td> <td><del>317,877</del> <u>163,171</u></td> <td><del>357,877</del> <u>163,171</u></td> <td><del>342,877</del> <u>148,171</u></td> <td><del>329,541</del> <u>134,835</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Waste Management Method	Capacity 2016 (tonnes)	Capacity 2020 (tonnes)	Capacity 2025 (tonnes)	Capacity 2030 (tonnes)	Recycling (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	<del>644,338</del> <u>734,450</u>	<del>889,639</del> <u>979,751</u>	<del>864,639</del> <u>945,230</u>	<del>814,639</del> <u>895,230</u>	Recycling (CD&E)	<del>279,160</del> <u>315,920</u>	<del>204,160</del> <u>240,920</u>	<del>151,990</del> <u>177,482</u>	<del>151,990</del> <u>177,482</u>	Recycling (Specialist Material)	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	Treatment Plant	<del>198,226</del> <u>272,935</u>	<del>184,780</del> <u>381,949</u>	<del>177,756</del> <u>374,925</u>	<del>177,756</del> <u>374,925</u>	Composting	<del>317,877</del> <u>163,171</u>	<del>357,877</del> <u>163,171</u>	<del>342,877</del> <u>148,171</u>	<del>329,541</del> <u>134,835</u>	Waste Capacity data updated as a result of released 2015 Waste Data Interrogator, inclusion of new waste facilities and changes to methods and waste streams managed at existing waste facilities.	LPA37	
Waste Management Method	Capacity 2016 (tonnes)	Capacity 2020 (tonnes)	Capacity 2025 (tonnes)	Capacity 2030 (tonnes)																																
Recycling (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	<del>644,338</del> <u>734,450</u>	<del>889,639</del> <u>979,751</u>	<del>864,639</del> <u>945,230</u>	<del>814,639</del> <u>895,230</u>																																
Recycling (CD&E)	<del>279,160</del> <u>315,920</u>	<del>204,160</del> <u>240,920</u>	<del>151,990</del> <u>177,482</u>	<del>151,990</del> <u>177,482</u>																																
Recycling (Specialist Material)	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>	<del>105,049</del> <u>106,200</u>																																
Treatment Plant	<del>198,226</del> <u>272,935</u>	<del>184,780</del> <u>381,949</u>	<del>177,756</del> <u>374,925</u>	<del>177,756</del> <u>374,925</u>																																
Composting	<del>317,877</del> <u>163,171</u>	<del>357,877</del> <u>163,171</u>	<del>342,877</del> <u>148,171</u>	<del>329,541</del> <u>134,835</u>																																



			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Energy from Waste</td> <td>0</td> <td>320,000</td> <td>320,000</td> <td>320,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landfill (C&amp;I, LACW, Agricultural)</td> <td>478,822 525,927</td> <td>103,822 148,563</td> <td>85,075 56,816</td> <td>37,140 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landfill (CD&amp;E)</td> <td>559,961 658,444</td> <td>289,312 300,406</td> <td>53,637 131,340</td> <td>53,637 131,340</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landfill (Haz)</td> <td>610</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL</b></td> <td><b>2,583,433</b> <b>2,777,657</b></td> <td><b>2,454,639</b> <b>2,640,960</b></td> <td><b>2,101,023</b> <b>2,260,164</b></td> <td><b>1,989,752</b> <b>2,140,012</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>Table 6: Total actual (2016) and projected (2020, 2025 and 2030) operating waste management capacity in the North Yorkshire sub-region (tonnes per annum)</p>	Energy from Waste	0	320,000	320,000	320,000	Landfill (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	478,822 525,927	103,822 148,563	85,075 56,816	37,140 0	Landfill (CD&E)	559,961 658,444	289,312 300,406	53,637 131,340	53,637 131,340	Landfill (Haz)	610	0	0	0	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,583,433</b> <b>2,777,657</b>	<b>2,454,639</b> <b>2,640,960</b>	<b>2,101,023</b> <b>2,260,164</b>	<b>1,989,752</b> <b>2,140,012</b>			
Energy from Waste	0	320,000	320,000	320,000																											
Landfill (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	478,822 525,927	103,822 148,563	85,075 56,816	37,140 0																											
Landfill (CD&E)	559,961 658,444	289,312 300,406	53,637 131,340	53,637 131,340																											
Landfill (Haz)	610	0	0	0																											
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,583,433</b> <b>2,777,657</b>	<b>2,454,639</b> <b>2,640,960</b>	<b>2,101,023</b> <b>2,260,164</b>	<b>1,989,752</b> <b>2,140,012</b>																											
AC33	118	Footnote to Table 6	North Yorkshire sub region Waste Arisings and Capacity Requirements Update Report September 2016 (Urban Vision) – <a href="#">Capacity information subsequently updated March 2017 in accordance with 2015 Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator</a>	Footnote amended to reflect the update to capacity information subsequent to the publication of the September 2016 Report	LPA37																										
AC34	120	Table 8	<p>Revise figures in Table 8:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Waste Management Method</th> <th>Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2016 (tonnes)</th> <th>Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2020 (tonnes)</th> <th>Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2025 (tonnes)</th> <th>Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2030 (tonnes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Recycling (C&amp;I, LACW, Agricultural)</td> <td>-228,319 -318,261</td> <td>-442,284 -532,226</td> <td>-405,451 -477,369</td> <td>-342,710 -414,655</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recycling</td> <td>16,672</td> <td>386,458</td> <td>456,283</td> <td>471,418</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Waste Management Method	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2016 (tonnes)	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2020 (tonnes)	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2025 (tonnes)	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2030 (tonnes)	Recycling (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	-228,319 -318,261	-442,284 -532,226	-405,451 -477,369	-342,710 -414,655	Recycling	16,672	386,458	456,283	471,418	Projected Capacity Gaps/Surplus updated as a result of updated waste management capacity.	LPA37											
Waste Management Method	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2016 (tonnes)	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2020 (tonnes)	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2025 (tonnes)	Projected Capacity Gap/Surpluses 2030 (tonnes)																											
Recycling (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	-228,319 -318,261	-442,284 -532,226	-405,451 -477,369	-342,710 -414,655																											
Recycling	16,672	386,458	456,283	471,418																											

			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>(CD&amp;E)</td> <td>-20,088</td> <td>349,698</td> <td>422,315</td> <td>437,450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Treatment Plant</td> <td>52,534 135,378</td> <td>90,615 90,959</td> <td>111,350 111,694</td> <td>124,564 124,908</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Composting</td> <td>-134,199 -136,992</td> <td>-133,483 -136,276</td> <td>-117,558 -120,351</td> <td>-103,265 -106,058</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Energy from Waste</td> <td>46,386</td> <td>-102,961</td> <td>-95,418</td> <td>-89,631</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Incineration (Specialist High Temp)</td> <td>13,632</td> <td>13,632</td> <td>13,632</td> <td>13,632</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landfill (C&amp;I, LACW, Agricultural)</td> <td>-261,451 -308,556</td> <td>-64,585 -109,326</td> <td>-44,356 -16,097</td> <td>4,983 42,123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landfill (Hazardous)</td> <td>7,252 6,642</td> <td>23,464</td> <td>24,379</td> <td>25,266</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landfill (CD&amp;E)</td> <td>-75,841 -159,364</td> <td>-20,927 -32,021</td> <td>179,749 102,046</td> <td>185,642 107,939</td> </tr> </table> <p>Table 8: Main projected capacity Gaps/Surplus in the North Yorkshire sub-region (tonnes per annum). Please note that capacity gaps are positive figures and capacity surplus are negative.</p>	(CD&E)	-20,088	349,698	422,315	437,450	Treatment Plant	52,534 135,378	90,615 90,959	111,350 111,694	124,564 124,908	Composting	-134,199 -136,992	-133,483 -136,276	-117,558 -120,351	-103,265 -106,058	Energy from Waste	46,386	-102,961	-95,418	-89,631	Incineration (Specialist High Temp)	13,632	13,632	13,632	13,632	Landfill (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	-261,451 -308,556	-64,585 -109,326	-44,356 -16,097	4,983 42,123	Landfill (Hazardous)	7,252 6,642	23,464	24,379	25,266	Landfill (CD&E)	-75,841 -159,364	-20,927 -32,021	179,749 102,046	185,642 107,939			
(CD&E)	-20,088	349,698	422,315	437,450																																										
Treatment Plant	52,534 135,378	90,615 90,959	111,350 111,694	124,564 124,908																																										
Composting	-134,199 -136,992	-133,483 -136,276	-117,558 -120,351	-103,265 -106,058																																										
Energy from Waste	46,386	-102,961	-95,418	-89,631																																										
Incineration (Specialist High Temp)	13,632	13,632	13,632	13,632																																										
Landfill (C&I, LACW, Agricultural)	-261,451 -308,556	-64,585 -109,326	-44,356 -16,097	4,983 42,123																																										
Landfill (Hazardous)	7,252 6,642	23,464	24,379	25,266																																										
Landfill (CD&E)	-75,841 -159,364	-20,927 -32,021	179,749 102,046	185,642 107,939																																										
AC35	120	Para. 6.46	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence: Based on this approach, capacity gaps exist throughout the plan period for <del>recycling of CD&amp;E waste</del>, treatment of waste (physical and chemical), incineration of waste (specialist high temperature) and landfill of Hazardous waste.</p> <p>Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence: A capacity gap <u>for recycling of CD&amp;E waste is projected over the majority of the Plan period and for</u> landfill of CD&amp;E waste occurs in the second half of the Plan period.</p> <p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence:</p>	Updated text to reflect the changes to capacity gaps/surplus in table 8.	LPA37																																									

			There is potential for a <del>very</del> small capacity gap for landfill of C&I, LACW and agricultural waste at the end of the plan period.			
AC36	120	Footnote to Table 8	Revise footnote: North Yorkshire sub region Waste Arisings and Capacity Requirements Update Report September 2016 (Urban Vision) – <a href="#">Capacity information subsequently updated March 2017 in accordance with 2015 Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator</a>	Footnote amended to reflect the update to capacity information subsequent to the publication of the September 2016 Report	LPA37	
MM53	121	W03	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site and cross reference to Policies Map:</p> <p>In Part 1) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>1) Identification of the Allerton Park (WJP08), <a href="#">in Harrogate Borough</a>, and Harewood Whin (WJP11), <a href="#">in the City of York</a>, sites as strategic allocations over the Plan period for the management of LACW. Proposals to extend the time period for continued waste management operations at these sites over the Plan period and the development of other appropriate waste management infrastructure will be permitted subject, in the case of the Harewood Whin site, to compliance with relevant national and local Green Belt policy.</b></p> <p>Insert a new Part 4) of the Policy and renumber the existing Part 4) to Part 5) and revise Part 4) of the Policy:</p> <p><b><a href="#">4) Provision of capacity for management of LACW is also supported through site allocations for recycling, recovery of energy, transfer and treatment of LACW, as applicable, at:</a></b></p>	Provides further locational detail for sites, and adds allocations and a cross reference to the Policies map to provide clarity	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

			<p><a href="#">North Selby Mine Anaerobic Digestion (WJP02), in the City of York</a>  <a href="#">Southmoor Energy Centre (WJP03), in Selby District</a>  <a href="#">Land at Halton East, near Skipton (WJP13), in Craven District</a>  <a href="#">Land at Seamer Carr, near Scarborough (WJP15), in Scarborough Borough</a>  <a href="#">Land at Skibeden, near Skipton (WJP17), in Craven District</a>  <a href="#">Land at Tancred, near Scorton (WJP18), in Richmondshire District</a>  <a href="#">Land at Fairfield Road, Whitby (WJP19), in the North York Moors National Park</a>  <a href="#">Former ARBRE Power Station (WJP25), in Selby District</a></p> <p><del>4</del> <b>5) Proposals for development at the allocated sites referred to in 1), <del>and 2)</del> and 4) above, <a href="#">and as shown on the Policies Map</a>, will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p>			
MM54	122/ 123	6.55	<p>Revise the Para:</p> <p>During preparation of the Joint Plan a number of potential allocations were put forward for sites which could manage a combination of LACW and C&amp;I waste, due to the similarity between these streams and the ways in which they need to be managed. A number of these are allocated<sup>37</sup> in the Joint Plan and they have been identified in <a href="#">Policy W03 and</a> Policy W04 dealing with C&amp;I waste. <del>although their potential dual role should be noted in the context of Policy W03<sup>37</sup>.</del></p>	Reflects the addition of site allocations to Policy W03	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC37	123	6.56	<p>Revise final sentence:</p> <p>There is potential for a <del>very</del> small gap in non-hazardous landfill capacity at the end of the Plan period.</p>	Updated text to reflect the changes to capacity gaps/surplus in table 8	LPA37	

AC38	123	6.59	<p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence:</p> <p>Permission was also granted in 2014 for a substantial anaerobic digestion facility at the former North Selby Mine site in the City of York, <del>although this too has not yet</del> <u>which has</u> been implemented <u>but is not yet operational</u>.</p>	Updated text to reflect the implementation of the North Selby AD planning permission in November 2016	LPA37	
MM55	124	W04	<p>Revise list id allocated sites in Policy</p> <p>Add WJP01 Harmby in as an allocated site as a transfer station</p>	At request of Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC39	124	W04	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site and a cross reference to the Policies Map:</p> <p>In Part 1) iii) of the Policy:</p> <p>iii) <b>Providing large scale capacity for recovery of energy and anaerobic digestion for C&amp;I waste through a combination of spare capacity within the Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility and the Southmoor Energy Centre (WJP03), <u>in Selby District</u>, former ARBRE Power Station (WJP25), <u>in Selby District</u>, and North Selby Mine anaerobic digestion (WJP02), <u>in the City of York</u>, sites, which are identified in the Plan as allocated sites for these uses. The development of the WJP02 site will only be permitted where it would be consistent with the principles of including land in the York Green Belt;</b></p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p>2) <b>Provision of capacity for management of C&amp;I waste is also supported through site allocations for recycling, transfer and treatment of C&amp;I waste at:</b></p>	Provides further locational detail for sites and a cross reference to the Policies Map to provide clarity	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

			<p>Land at Halton East, near Skipton (WJP13), <a href="#">in Craven District</a></p> <p>Land at Tancred, near Scorton (WJP18), <a href="#">in Richmondshire District</a></p> <p>Land at Skibeden, near Skipton (WJP17), <a href="#">in Craven District</a></p> <p>Land at Allerton Park, near Knaresborough (WJP08), <a href="#">in Harrogate Borough</a></p> <p>Land at Seamer Carr, near Scarborough (WJP15), <a href="#">in Scarborough Borough</a></p> <p>Land at Common Lane, Burn (WJP16), <a href="#">in Selby District</a></p> <p>Land at Pollington (WJP22), <a href="#">in Selby District</a></p> <p>Land at Fairfield Road, Whitby (WJP19), <a href="#">in the North York Moors National Park</a></p> <p>Land at Harewood Whin, Rufforth (WJP11), <a href="#">in the City of York</a></p> <p>In Part 3) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>3) Proposals for development of the allocated sites referred to in 1) and 2) above, <a href="#">and as shown on the Policies Map</a>, will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p>			
MM56	125	Justification text to W04	<p>Add additional text:</p> <p>To make clear how monitoring will be dealt with</p>	Additional text at request of inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC40	125	6.61	<p>Revise 6<sup>th</sup> sentence:</p> <p>Policy W10 addressing Overall locational principles for provision of waste <a href="#">management</a> capacity</p>	To correct omission of the word ‘management’ from the Policy title	LPA37	

AC41	125	6.63	<p>Revise 5<sup>th</sup> sentence:</p> <p>An unimplemented A planning permission also exists for a substantial anaerobic digestion facility at the former North Selby Mine site in York.</p>	Updated text to reflect the implementation of the North Selby AD planning permission in November 2016	LPA37	
AC42	125/ 126	6.64	<p>Revise the Para:</p> <p>In these circumstances where committed capacity at all of the following sites: <u>Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility, Southmoor Energy Centre (WJP03), former ARBRE Power Station (WJP25) and North Selby Mine (WJP02), becomes operational</u> it is not considered appropriate to support the principle of further large-scale recovery capacity in the area where the waste proposed to be managed would arise mainly outside the Plan area, unless it can be demonstrated that the facility would represent the nearest appropriate installation for recovery of the waste, in line with relevant legislation.</p>	Identifies large scale waste facilities for clarity	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC43	127	6.70	<p>Revise 5<sup>th</sup> sentence:</p> <p>However, the Waste Arisings and Capacity Assessment (2016) <u>(updated March 2017)</u> identifies an expected capacity gap for recycling under all scenarios considered, up to a maximum of approximately <del>470,000</del> <u>437,000</u> tonnes per annum in the highest case scenario, based on available capacity for managing CD&amp;E waste only.</p>	Updated text to reflect the changes to capacity gaps/surplus in table 8 and the update to capacity information subsequent to the publication of the September 2016 Report	LPA37	
AC44	127	6.73	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence:</p> <p>There is a forecast shortfall in capacity for landfill of non-hazardous CD&amp;E waste, particularly from around 2022, as a result of the expiry of a number of</p>	Updated text to reflect the changes to capacity gaps/surplus in Table	LPA37	

			<p>time limited permissions, with a maximum annual gap of around <del>186,000</del> <u>108,000</u> tonnes per annum by 2030 in the highest case scenario.</p> <p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence:</p> <p>If rates of recycling nearer to that modelled in the higher recycling scenario included in the waste arisings and capacity assessment are achieved, then the requirement for capacity for landfill of non-hazardous CD&amp;E waste could be significantly less, reaching a maximum of around <del>96,000</del> <u>18,000</u> tonnes per annum by 2030.</p>	8		
MM57	128	W05	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site and a cross reference to the Policies Map and add in WJP01 Hillcrest, Harmby as an Allocated site :</p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>2) Provision of capacity for management of CD&amp;E waste is also supported through site allocations for:</b></p> <p><b>i) Allocations for recycling of CD&amp;E waste:</b></p> <p><u>Land at Potgate Quarry, North Stainley (WJP24), in Harrogate Borough</u>  <u>Land at Allerton Park, near Knaresborough (WJP08), in Harrogate Borough</u>  <u>Land at Darrington Quarry, Darrington (MJP27), in Selby District</u>  <u>Land at Barnsdale Bar, Kirk Smeaton (MJP26), in Selby District</u>  <u>Land at Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton (WJP10), in Selby District</u>  <u>Land at Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (WJP05), in the City of York</u>  <u>Hillcrest, Harmby (WJP01), in Richmondshire District</u></p> <p><b>ii) Allocations for landfill of CD&amp;E waste:</b></p>	Provides further locational detail for sites and a cross reference to the Policies Map to provide clarity, added in site to be allocated at request of the Inspector	MIQ/MM	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector



			<p>Land at Brotherton Quarry, Burton Salmon (WJP21), <u>in Selby District</u>  Land at Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (WJP05), <u>in the City of York</u>  Land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks, Escrick (WJP06), <u>in Selby District</u></p> <p>In Part 3) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>3) Proposals for development of the allocated sites for recycling or landfill referred to in 2) above, <u>and as shown on the Policies Map</u>, will be required to take account of the key sensitivities and incorporate the necessary mitigation measures that are set out in Appendix 1.</b></p>			
AC45	129	6.75	<p>Revise 4<sup>th</sup> sentence:</p> <p>Policy W10 addressing Overall locational principles for provision of waste <u>management</u> capacity</p>	To correct omission of the word 'management' from the Policy title	LPA37	
AC46	131	6.79	<p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence:</p> <p>There is however a range of specialist provision in the area, including specialist storage, processing and incineration plants for animals <del>s</del> by-products.</p>	To correct a typographical error	LPA37	
AC47	131	6.81	<p>Revise 4<sup>th</sup> sentence:</p> <p>National policy indicates that local plans for waste should address the need to <del>for</del> manage this waste stream.</p>	To correct a typographical error	LPA37	
MM58	133	W08	<p>Add text into Policy to make clear that Policy W08 is not applicable to <u>hydrocarbons</u></p>	To provide clarity	EIP	<p>Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be</p>

						finalised
AC48	133	6.90	<p>Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence:</p> <p>In some instances, particularly for larger scale <del>WWTW</del> <u>waste water treatment works</u>, it may be appropriate to co-locate anaerobic digestion capacity at the site as this would reduce the need for transport of waste.</p>	To replace an acronym with the full term, as the term has not previously been used	LPA37	
AC49	136	Figure 17	<p>Amend Plan to reflect site data in the North Yorkshire Sub-region Waste Arisings and Capacity Requirements Update Report (September 2016).</p> <p>Amend Plan to reflect updated site data.</p>	<p>Due to an oversight, the Plan in the Publication Draft Plan does not reflect the North Yorkshire Sub-region Waste Arisings and Capacity Requirements Update Report (September 2016). This change corrects this.</p> <p>Waste Sites updated as a result of released 2015 Waste Data Interrogator, inclusion of new waste facilities and changes to methods and waste streams managed at existing waste facilities.</p>	LPA37	
AC50	136	Figure 17	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	

AC51	137	Policy W10 Title	Revise Policy Title:  <b>Policy W10: Overall locational principles for provision of waste <u>management</u> capacity</b>	To correct omission of the word 'management' from the Policy title	LPA37	
MM59	137	W10	Add additional text to the effect  'Authorities' would be seeking best available technology following discussions with regulatory bodies including green completions'	To provide clarity regarding overlap with other Regulatory Bodies	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM60	138	6.104 (if putting against hydrocarbon )	Add additional text into supporting text to the effect  'Authorities' would be seeking best available technology following discussions with regulatory bodies including green completions'	To provide clarity regarding overlap with other Regulatory Bodies	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM61	140	W11	Add additional text into W11 5) to broaden out to refer to hazardous waste	Requested by the Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC52	143	Figure 18	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
MM62	145	I02	Revise Part 1) i) of Policy:  <b>1) Development of ancillary minerals infrastructure at active minerals extraction sites and sites producing secondary aggregate will be permitted</b>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<p>provided the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>i) The ancillary development produces a 'value added' or complementary product based mainly on the mineral extracted or secondary aggregate produced on the host site; and</del></li> <li><del>ii) i) The development would not have significant additional adverse impact on local communities, businesses or the environment; and</del></li> <li><del>iii) ii) The development would not unacceptably increase the overall amount of road transport to or from the host site; and</del></li> <li><del>iv) iii) Where the host site is located in the Green Belt the ancillary development is acceptable in accordance with national and local Green Belt policy; and</del></li> <li><del>v) iv) The development is linked to the overall life of minerals extraction or supply of secondary aggregate at the host site, unless the location is appropriate to its retention in the longer term.</del></li> </ul>			<p>– Suggested text by Industry, LPAs still to review wording.</p>
MM63	146	I02	<p>Revise Part 3) of Policy:</p> <p><b>3) The siting of ancillary minerals infrastructure within the North York Moors National Park will only be supported where it would be located within the <del>Boulby mine existing operational</del> surface site <del>or Doves Nest Farm mine surface site if developed</del>, <u>on other existing industrial land</u>, <del>or within the Whitby Business Park</del> <u>or is constrained to a particular location for which there is sufficient overriding justification identified on the Policies Map.</u></b></p>	To provide flexibility to the Policy	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM64	149	S01	<p>Revise Part 2)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. INEOS and Sirius to meet ASAP to prepare a Statement of Common Ground and/or Statement of Uncommon Ground to be submitted to Inspector and LPA's; to consider a cautious approach; consider buffer zone and whether right size and shape safeguarded; whole resource not to be safeguarded as not proportionate.</li> <li>2. LPA's then to meet with Industry to discuss wording</li> </ol>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised

			3. LPA's to consider a separate policy for Potash with explanatory text			
MM65	152		<p>Revise Part 1) vi) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>vi) It constitutes 'exempt' development (as defined in the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria list, as set out in paragraph 8.47).</b></p> <p>Add additional bullet point to Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hydraulic fracturing</b></li> </ul>	To provide a cross reference to location of the exemptions list and provide a comprehensive list of development	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM66	153	S02	<p>Revise Part 3) and explanatory text (para 8.22)</p> <p>Add in reference to other regulatory bodies and the need to take their views into account</p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM67	154	S03	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Waste management sites identified on the Policies Map and in Appendix 2, with a 250m buffer zone, will be safeguarded against development which would prevent or frustrate unduly restrict the use of the site ...</b></p> <p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the final paragraph of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Where development, other than exempt development as defined in the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria list, as set out in paragraph 8.47, is proposed....</b></p>	To provide cross reference to Appendix 2 and exemptions list and also clarify wording.	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM68	154	S03	Revise Policy:	Requested by the	EIP	Additional

			Add in additional criterion relating to 'lack of viability'	inspector		text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC53	155	8.29	<p>Revise Para:</p> <p>As some waste uses are relatively low-value developments, they are at risk of being replaced by competing, higher-value land uses. Safeguarding facilities can help to guard against this. The purpose of safeguarding certain waste facilities is not to prevent other development from taking place but to ensure that the need to maintain important waste infrastructure is factored into decision-making for other forms of development. <u>Where a site is not in use, viability issues will be relevant to considering whether there is a reasonable prospect of the site being used for waste management in the foreseeable future.</u> This will be particularly important in the two-tier parts of the Plan area, where many development decisions are not taken by the waste planning authority.</p>	To clarify that Policy S03 does not unreasonably restrict development of a safeguarded waste management site.	LPA37	
MM69	155	Para. 8.30 <i>(Italics: PC85 in the Addendum of Proposed Changes to Publication Draft (July 2017))</i>	<p>Revise Para:</p> <p>In some cases, the introduction of other forms of development in close proximity to established or allocated waste uses, can lead to conflict given the potential for impacts on local amenity due, for example, to noise, dust odour or bioaerosols. Whilst it is not possible to identify all such forms of development exhaustively, they include residential uses and also commercial and industrial uses that depend on a high quality local environment (for example within the food and health care sectors). The identification of a buffer zone around safeguarded waste facilities ensures that the potential for such impacts can be properly taken into account, whilst also recognising the importance of allowing the waste facility to continue to operate. As a range of types and scales of development could be associated with waste management activity, it is not practicable to define individual buffer zones for each facility. A 250m buffer</p>	To clarify that Policy S03 does not unreasonably restrict development of land, including future proposals, within the buffer zone of a safeguarded waste management site.	LPA37/ MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector in response to MIQs

			<p>zone reflects a balance between ensuring that the potential for significant impacts arising from some waste uses is allowed for, whilst limiting the extent to which consultation for safeguarding purposes is required. It is also consistent with the Environment Agency’s restrictions on open composting of waste taking place within 250m of residential property. <u>Where proposals for non-exempt development in these zones would not be compatible with the safeguarded use then permission will be refused unless suitable mitigation can be provided as part of the proposals for the encroaching development or there are other overriding benefits.</u> <del>It is acknowledged that in some cases, including at the former mine sites in the Plan area, there are other extant proposals for redevelopment which are matters for determination by the relevant local planning authority and that such proposals could overlap with land proposed for safeguarding in the Joint Plan.</del> In these circumstances the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority will seek to work constructively with the relevant local planning authority and developers to ensure that a proportionate approach to implementing safeguarding of minerals and waste infrastructure requirements is taken.</p>			
MM70	155	S04	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the first paragraph of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Railheads, rail links and wharves identified on the Policies Map <u>and in Appendix 2</u>, with a 100m buffer zone , will be safeguarded against development which would prevent or frustrate <u>unduly restrict</u> the use of the infrastructure for minerals or waste transport ...</b></p> <p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the final paragraph of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Where development, other than exempt development as defined in the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria list, <u>as set out in paragraph 8.47</u>, is proposed....</b></p>	To provide cross reference to Appendix 2 and exemptions list and also clarify wording.	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

MM71	155	S04	<p>Revise Policy:</p> <p>Add in additional criterion relating to 'lack of viability'</p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC54	156	8.34	<p>Revise Para:</p> <p>Transport of coal by barge has previously occurred in the Selby area, and some infrastructure remains but needs repair if it is to be used again. Growing interest in the potential for increased supply of marine aggregate into the Yorkshire and Humber area may increase the significance of both water and rail transport of minerals in future, adding to the justification for safeguarding wharfs and railheads<sup>42</sup>. <u>Where a site is not in use, viability issues will be relevant to considering whether there is a reasonable prospect of the site being used for minerals or waste transport in the foreseeable future.</u></p>	To clarify that Policy S04 does not unreasonably restrict development of a safeguarded minerals or waste transport infrastructure site.	LPA37	
MM72	157	S05	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the first paragraph of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Minerals ancillary infrastructure sites identified on the Policies Map and in Appendix 2, with a 100m buffer zone, will be safeguarded against development which would prevent or frustrate unduly restrict the use of the site for minerals ancillary ...</b></p> <p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the final paragraph of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Where development, other than exempt development as defined in the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria list, as set out in paragraph 8.47, is proposed....</b></p>	To provide cross reference to Appendix 2 and exemptions list and also clarify wording.	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector



MM73	157	S05	<p>Revise Policy:</p> <p>Add in additional criterion relating to 'lack of viability'</p>	Requested by the inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC55	158	S06	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Where development, other than exempt development as defined in the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria list, <u>as set out in paragraph 8.47, is proposed....</u></b></p>	To provide a cross reference to location of exemptions list	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
AC56	159	8.47, Safeguarding exemption criteria list ( <i>Italics: PC88 in the Addendum of Proposed Changes to Publication Draft (July 2017)</i> )	<p>Revise 12<sup>th</sup> bullet point:</p> <p>Applications for development on land which is already allocated in an adopted local plan where the plan took account of minerals, waste <i>and minerals and waste transport infrastructure</i> safeguarding requirements, <u>or, in the case of an emerging local plan allocations, where the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has raised no safeguarding concerns during consultation on the emerging plan allocation</u></p>	To clarify that the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria list includes reference to allocations in emerging local plans, in addition to those that are adopted.	LPA37	
MM74	160	D01	Policy not required, but leaving it in does not make the Plan unsound. LPAs to take a view whether to leave in or take out	Only MM if removed	EIP	Inspector raised as a consideration – still to be decided
MM75	161	D02	<p>Revise Part 1) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>1) Proposals for minerals and waste development, including ancillary</b></p>	Change of text to include local communities and	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at

			development and minerals and waste transport infrastructure, will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable impacts on <del>local amenity</del> <u>the amenity of local communities and residents</u> , local businesses and users ...	residents		request of the Inspector
MM76	161	D02	<p>Revise wording in Policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add ' local and communities and residents' after local amenity (<i>done above as part of response to MIQ</i>)</li> <li>2. Add explanatory sentence to link in monitoring under the EI regulations</li> <li>3. Add wording to clarify that there will be interaction with other agencies regarding monitoring</li> <li>4. Add explanation on HIA Regulations 2012 and explain interaction</li> </ol>	Additional text to provide flexibility and clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised
MM77	166	D04	<p>Revise Policy wording:</p> <p><b>Part 1) – Major minerals and waste development</b>  Proposals for major development in the National Park, Howardian Hills, Nidderdale, North Pennines and Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty <del>will</del> <u>should</u> be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated it is in the public interest. The demonstration of exceptional circumstances and public interest will require justification based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The need for the development, which <u>can will usually</u> include a national need for the mineral or the waste facility and the contribution of the development to the national economy; and</li> <li>b) The impact of permitting it, or refusing, it upon the local economy <u>which includes that</u> of the National Park or AONB; and</li> <li>c) Whether <u>in terms of cost and scope</u>, the development can <u>viably technically</u> and <u>technically viably</u> be located elsewhere outside the</li> </ol>	Additional text at request of Inspector	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

			<p>designated area, or the need for it can be met in some other way; and</p> <p>d) <b>Whether <u>The extent to which</u> any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, can be moderated. <del>to a level which does not significantly compromise the reason for the designation.</del></b></p> <p>Where there are exceptional circumstances and the proposal is considered to be in the public interest, every effort to avoid adverse effects will be required. <u>Particular consideration will be given as to whether the proposal is likely to significantly compromise the reason for the landscape designation.</u> Where adverse effects cannot be avoided, harm should be minimised through appropriate mitigation measures. Appropriate and practicable compensation will be required for any <u>unavoidable</u> effects which cannot be mitigated.</p> <p><b>Part 2) – All other developments</b>          Planning permission will be supported where proposals contribute to the achievement of, or are consistent with, the aims, policies and aspirations of the relevant Management Plan and are consistent with other relevant development management policies in the Joint Plan.</p> <p><b>Part 3) – Proposals which impact the setting of Designated Areas</b>          Proposals for development outside of the National Parks and AONBs will not <u>usually</u> be permitted where it would have an <u>unacceptable</u> harmful effect on the setting of the designated area.</p>			
AC57	167	9.24	<p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence:</p> <p>It should be noted that major development in terms of paragraph 116 of the NPPF is not the same as that defined under the Town and Country Planning Act (Development Management Procedure <del>Order</del>) (England) Order <del>2010</del><u>2015</u>.</p>	To update to reflect the current regulations	LPA37	
MM78	167	9.25	<p>Add additional text to paragraph 9.25 and add an additional paragraph after 9.25:</p>	Additional text to at request of Inspector	EIP	Additional text into Policy at

		<p>9.25 For major development in the National Park and AONBs, the four strands of the major development test need to be addressed in order to determine whether the proposal represents an exceptional circumstance and is in the 'public interest'. One of the main considerations in this assessment, where relating to proposals for minerals extraction, should be the need for the resource itself, including at a national level, and whether there are alternative sources available to meet any national need. <u>The need for the development can also include the need for wider national economic benefits that would flow from the development but in the context of the National Park Authority's statutory conservation purposes greater weight is more likely to be given to a national need for the specific mineral that can only be extracted within the National Park.</u> The outcome of these considerations will then, where relevant, need to be assessed in accordance with the Habitats Regulations and other relevant policies contained in this Joint Plan and the NPPF. Applicants will be expected to supply sufficient information to demonstrate robustly that proposals fulfil the requirements of the major development test.</p> <p><u>9.26 Proposals should be designed to avoid adverse impacts (including cumulative impacts) on the special qualities of the National Park, though because of the inherent nature and scale of major development it is unlikely that impacts can be moderated to a level where significant adverse effects are completely avoided. A proposal that is likely to harm a National Park or AONB to the extent that it compromises the reason for its designation (i.e. wide scale impact on scenic beauty, tranquillity) is unlikely to be regarded as being in the public interest. The North York Moors has an existing potash mine and a second mine is under construction which in terms of volume of production is stated to become the largest potash mine in the world. Other significant major developments have also been located in the National Park such as RAF Fylingdales and there is growing pressure on the southern part of the Park from the hydrocarbons industry. Cumulatively it is considered that the impact of these large scale developments of an industrial nature are starting to impact on the special qualities of the National Park, particularly in terms of far reaching open moorland views, remoteness and a sense of wildness and tranquillity</u></p>			<p>request of the Inspector</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------

			<u>which were important reasons for its designation.</u>			
MM79	168	D05	<p>Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> Para of Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Substantial weight will be given to any harm to the Green Belt and <del>inappropriate waste development in the Green Belt will only be permitted in</del> very special circumstances, <del>which must</del> <u>will need to</u> be demonstrated by the applicant, in <del>which the harm by reason of inappropriateness, or any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</del> <u>order to outweigh harm caused by inappropriateness or and any other harm.</u></b></p>	To provide consistency with National policy	MIQ/EIP	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM80	169	D05	<p>Revise Part 2) of the Policy</p> <p><b>Part 2) - Waste</b></p> <p><del>Proposals for waste development in the Green Belt, including new buildings or other forms of development which would result in an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt or on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, including those elements which contribute to the historic character and setting of York, that include the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt will be considered inappropriate.</del></p> <p><b>Substantial weight will be given to any harm to the Green Belt and <del>inappropriate waste development in the Green Belt will only be permitted in</del> very special circumstances, <del>which must</del> <u>will need to</u> be demonstrated by the applicant, in <del>which the harm by reason of inappropriateness, or any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations</del> <u>order to outweigh harm caused by inappropriateness, or any other harm.</u></b></p> <p><u>Proposals for other forms of waste development which would result in an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt or on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, including those elements which contribute to the historic charater and setting of York, will only be permitted</u></p>	To provide consistency with National policy	MIQEIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			<p><u>in very special circumstances, which must be demonstrated by the applicant, in which the harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</u></p> <p>The following forms of waste development <del>will be appropriate</del> <u>may be permitted</u> in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, including those elements which contribute to the historic character and setting of York:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) open windrow composting;</li> <li>ii) individual farm-scale on-farm composting and anaerobic digestion;</li> <li>iii) recycling of construction and demolition waste in order to produce recycled aggregate where it would take place in an active quarry or minerals transport site and is linked to the life of the quarry or site;</li> <li>iv) short term waste sorting and recycling activity in association with, and on the same site as, other permitted demolition and construction activity;</li> <li>v) recycling, transfer and treatment activities at established industrial and employment sites in the Green Belt where the waste development would be consistent with the scale and nature of other activities already taking place at the site;</li> <li>vi) landfill of quarry voids including for the purposes of quarry reclamation and where the site would be restored to an after use compatible with the purposes of Green Belt designation;</li> <li>vii) small scale deposit of inert waste for agricultural improvement purposes or the improvement of derelict or degraded land; and</li> <li>viii) continued activities within the footprint of established waste sites in the Green Belt.</li> </ul>			
MM81	170	9.35	<p>Revise text</p> <p>In order to provide local guidance on this matter, the policy identifies a number of types of waste management activities and types of locations where waste development may be <del>appropriate</del> <u>permitted</u>, provided that openness is</p>	To be consistent with change in policy D05	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector

			maintained and the development would be consistent with the purposes for which the land is included in the Green Belt.			
MM82	173	D07	<p>Revise Policy</p> <p>1) Proposals will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that, <b>having taken into account any proposed mitigation measures</b>, there will be no unacceptable impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity. <del>including on statutory and non-statutory designated or protected sites and features, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, Sites of Local Interest and Local Nature Reserves, local priority habitats, habitat networks and species, having taken into account any proposed mitigation measures.</del> <b>The level of protection provided to international, national and locally designated sites are outlined in parts 2) to 8) below.</b></p> <p>2) A very high level of protection will be afforded to sites designated at an international level, including SPAs, SACs and RAMSAR sites. Development which would have an unacceptable impact on these sites will not be permitted.</p> <p>3) Development which would have an unacceptable impact on the notified special interest features of a SSSI or a broader impact on the national network of SSSIs <b>will only be permitted where the benefits of the development would clearly outweigh the impact.</b> <del>or the</del> <b>The</b> loss or deterioration of ancient woodland or aged or veteran trees, will only be permitted where <b>both</b> the <b>need for, and the</b> benefits of the development would clearly outweigh the impact or loss.</p> <p>4) Where development would be located within an Impact Risk Zone defined by Natural England for a SPA, SAC, RAMSAR site or SSSI, and the development is of a type identified by Natural England as one which could potentially have an adverse impact on the designated site, proposals should be accompanied by a detailed assessment of the potential impacts</p>	Policy redrafted to provide more clarity	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector

		<p>and include proposals for mitigation <u>and enhancement</u> where relevant.</p> <p><b>5) <u>Locally important sites and assets include:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (including candidate sites);</u></li> <li>ii. <u>Local Nature Reserves;</u></li> <li>iii. <u>Local Geological Sites; and</u></li> <li>iv. <u>Habitats and species of principal importance or other sites of geological or geomorphological importance.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Development will not be permitted that will result in an unacceptable impact to locally important sites and assets unless it can be demonstrated that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the benefits of development clearly outweigh the nature conservation value or scientific interest of the site and its contribution to wider biodiversity objectives and connectivity; and</u></li> <li>• <u>the proposed mitigation or compensatory measures are equivalent to the value of the site/asset.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>6) <del>5)</del> Through the design of schemes, including any proposed mitigation <u>and or compensation</u> measures, proposals should seek to contribute positively towards the delivery of agreed biodiversity and/or geodiversity objectives, including those set out in agreed local Biodiversity or Geodiversity Action Plans, or in line with agreed priorities of any relevant Local Nature Partnership, with the aim of achieving net gains for biodiversity or geodiversity and supporting the development of resilient ecological networks.</b></p> <p><b>7) <del>6)</del> In exceptional circumstances, and where the development site giving rise to the requirement for offsetting is not located within a SPA, SAC, RAMSAR or SSSI, the principle of biodiversity offsetting to fully compensate for any losses will be supported. These circumstances include</b></p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--



			<p>where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) It has been demonstrated that it is not possible to <u>fully</u> avoid or mitigate against adverse impacts; and</li> <li>ii) The provision of compensatory habitat within the site would not be feasible; and</li> <li>iii) The need for and/or benefits of the development override the need to protect the site; and</li> <li>iv) Any compensatory gains would be delivered within the minerals or waste planning authority area in which the loss occurred <del>-, unless otherwise agreed by the planning authority. Compensatory gains outside of the planning authority area will only be deemed as acceptable where it is clearly demonstrable that the approach will lead to greater biodiversity and/or geodiversity benefits than alternative options within the planning authority area.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>8) Proposals must consider the cumulative impacts as a result of a combination of individual impacts from the same development and/or through combinations of impacts in conjunction with other development. Proposals will only be permitted where it would not give rise to unacceptable cumulative impacts.</u></p>			
MM83	173	D07	<p>Revise text in Policy D07:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add wording along lines of ‘whether within or outside the nature conservation area’ and to redraft the end of (3) in liaison with Kit Bennett</li> <li>2. Redraft wording of (6) to push offsetting into the background and look at other methods Kit Bennet to submit suggested wording to LPA by Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> March</li> <li>3. Redraft wording of (6) (iv) to incorporate flexibility to go cross border if necessary</li> </ul>	At request of Inspector	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be finalised in liaison with KB

			<b>4. Redraft Policy to give more emphasis to consider cumulative impacts.</b>			
MM84	175	9.56	<p>Insert new text after 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of paragraph 9.56:</p> <p>Where development requiring offsetting is proposed, the arrangements for provision of the offsetting biodiversity gain should be set out as part of the proposals, and the location where the offsetting provision is to be made should be within the same minerals or waste planning authority area as the development giving rise to the need for offsetting. This is to ensure that biodiversity assets are not displaced out of the local area. <u>Offsetting proposals may only be permitted outside of the plan area with agreement with the planning authority, and only where sufficient evidence could be provided to demonstrate the biodiversity/geodiversity benefits of undertaking offsetting outside of the Plan area. For example, if a site was on the plan area boundary and sufficient evidence could be provided to demonstrate the biodiversity benefits of undertaking an offset outside of the Plan area.</u> A further consideration is...</p>	To take account of cross boundary issues	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
AC58	179-180	Water Environment Heading	Ensure the 'Water Environment' and 'Policy Justification' headings are at the head of the page.	To improve presentation of the document	LPA37	
MM85	179	D09	<p>Revise Part 4) of the Policy:</p> <p><b>....climate mitigation and adaption measures including use of sustainable urban drainage systems.</b></p>	Corrected for accuracy	MIQ/EIP	Text removed from Policy at request of the Inspector
AC59	183	Figure 19	Amend Plan to reflect the extended boundary of Yorkshire Dales National Park.	Reflects the change in the YDNP boundary.	LPA37	
AC60	187	9.97	<p>Revise last sentence of Para:</p> <p>The emerging City of York Local Plan is proposing to require that new</p>	To be consistent with national policy	MIQ	Additional text at request of

			developments <del>are meet the relevant BREEAM or Code for Sustainable Homes standards</del> in line with the 2013 Building Regulations by having a 19% reduction in Dwelling Emission Rate and a reduced water consumption rate.			the Inspector
MM86	188	D11	<p>Add additional text</p> <p><b>Proposals for substantial new minerals extraction and for the large-scale treatment as well as for hydrocarbon proposals, recovery or disposal of waste should be accompanied by a climate change assessment showing how the proposals have taken into account impacts from climate change and include appropriate mitigation measures where necessary.</b></p>	To provide link between climate change and hydrocarbons	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – to be finalised as discussion needs to be had with FoE
AC61	188	9.98	<p>Revise 4<sup>th</sup> sentence of the Para:</p> <p>The incorporation of sustainable design measures such as sustainable <del>urban</del> drainage systems (SuDs),</p>	Corrected for accuracy	MIQ	Text removed from Policy at request of the Inspector
MM87	190	D12	<p>Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> Para, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sentence of the Policy:</p> <p><b>Development proposals will be required to demonstrate that all practicable steps will be taken to conserve and manage on-site soil resources, including soils with environmental value, in a sustainable way. Development which would disturb or damage <del>soils of high environmental value such as intact peat or other soil contributing to ecological connectivity or carbon storage</del> will not be permitted unless there would be overriding benefits in doing so.</b></p>	To provide clarity	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM88	190	D12	<p>Revise Policy text</p> <p>Sufficiently define ‘high environmental value’ or remove the term from the policy</p>	At request of Inspector, to provide clarity.	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector – wording still to be

						finalised
AC62	192	D13	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the Policy:</p> <p>... identified by the Coal Authority <a href="#">as shown on the Interactive Policies Map and on page 4 of the paper version of the Policies Map</a>, proposals should be accompanied by ...</p>	Provides a cross reference to the Policies Map	MIQ	Additional text into Policy at request of the Inspector
MM89	192	D13	<p>Revise text in Policy</p> <p>Amend text of Policy D13 as following:            ‘... exempt development as defined in the Development High Risk Exemptions list, <a href="#">as set out in paragraphs 9.116 and 9.117</a>, is proposed within Development High Risk Areas ...’</p>	To provide clarity	EIP	Additional text at request of the Inspector
AC63	192	9.113	<p>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence:</p> <p>They occur mainly within Selby District and more limited locations in the <a href="#">North York Moors National Park and in the</a> western part of the Plan area.</p>	To provide clarity	MIQ	Additional text at request of the Inspector
MM90	193	New Policy D14 Introductory text and Policy wording	<p>Add new Policy and Introductory text under the ‘Section 106, Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Performance Agreements’ heading:</p> <p><a href="#">9.118 Development of land will, to varying degrees depending on its nature and location, impact on the environment, communities, amenities and physical infrastructure of the Plan area. As such the authorities will, where there is appropriate justification, expect development to mitigate the extent of this impact through the use of planning obligations on the granting of planning permissions. Planning obligations also known as Section 106 agreements under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), are benefits that may be in kind or take the form of financial contributions. Section 106 agreements are legally binding undertakings which seek to secure that development is acceptable, by securing contributions to offset negative consequences of development.</a></p>	To deal with Section 106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Performance Agreements	MIQ	Additional Policy at request of Inspector

		<p><u>9.119 Prior to the submission of relevant applications within the Plan area, developers/applicants are encouraged to engage in the pre-application process to determine whether there is likely to be a requirement for a Section 106 agreement in respect of a particular proposal.</u></p> <p><b><u>Policy D14 – Planning Obligations</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Developer contributions will be sought to eliminate or mitigate the potential adverse effects of new development on site or on the surrounding area, and to ensure the provision of any necessary and adequate improvements to infrastructure to support the functioning of the development.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The level of contributions required will be negotiated as part of a Section 106 agreement, or set out in any adopted Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule or successor framework.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Contributions will only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and where they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Main responsibility for implementation of policy: NYCC, NYMNPA, CYC, Minerals and Waste industry</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Key links to other relevant policies and objectives: D01, D02, D03, D04, D05, D06, D07, D08, D09, D10, D11, D12</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Objectives: 9, 10, 12</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Monitoring: Monitoring indicator 57 (see Appendix 3)</u></b></p> <p><u>Policy Justification</u></p> <p><b><u>9.120 9-118</u></b> Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides a</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>mechanism for planning obligations, in order to make development acceptable in planning terms which would otherwise not be acceptable. This can include the making of a financial contribution towards measures (which may be off-site in some circumstances) where needed to mitigate against or compensate for the impacts of the development. Such contributions should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development and the matters which need to be dealt with. The minerals and waste planning authorities will seek such agreements where justified and where they would be in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p><u>Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Performance Agreements</u></p> <p><u>9.121 9-119</u> The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a planning charge, introduced by the Planning Act 2008 as a tool for local authorities in England and Wales to deliver infrastructure to support the development of their area. It came into force on 6 April 2010 through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. NYCC is not a CIL-charging authority. City of York Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority have not yet adopted any CIL policy. However, should CIL be introduced in either of these areas any relevant obligations relating to minerals and waste development would need to be met.</p> <p><u>9.122 9-120</u> A Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) is defined as an agreement between the local planning authority (or minerals and waste planning authority in the context of this Joint Plan) and an applicant to provide a project management framework for handling a planning application. A PPA enables the planning authority and the applicant to agree timescales, actions and resources for handling a particular application. It should cover the pre-application stages but may also extend through to the post-application stage. PPAs can be particularly useful in setting out an efficient and transparent process for determining large and/or complex planning applications. They encourage joint working between the applicant and the planning authority and can also help to bring together other parties such as statutory consultees. Their form can vary in type from a detailed legal document through to much simpler</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

			memoranda of understanding. Due to the scale and complexity of some minerals and waste developments, it may be appropriate for a planning application to be dealt with through a PPA.			
MM91	tbc	New Policy D15 – Air Quality Policy	Consider inclusion of an overarching air quality Policy	At request of Inspector	EIP	Additional Policy at request of Inspector – wording still to be finalised
AC64	Appendix 1 Title Page		Revise Appendix 1 Title: Allocated Sites <u>and</u> Areas of Search	To correct a typographical error.	LPA37	
MM92	Appendix 1 p32	MJP21	<p>Additional text to be added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain boundary as shown on plan on page 35 of Appendix 1 (CD18) and do not make revision to boundary that was proposed in PC102 (CD09).</li> <li>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Key sensitivities on page 33 of Appendix 1 (CD18) as following: ‘Heritage asset issues <u>as identified by Historic England</u>, including proximity to ...’</li> <li>Revise 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Development requirements on page 33 of Appendix 1 (CD18) as following: ‘Appropriate site design and landscaping of site to mitigate impact on: heritage assets <u>as identified by Historic England</u>, (Scheduled Monuments including: ... local landscape features and their respective settings.’</li> </ul>	To reflect decision of Inspector in EIP	EIP	Additional text at request of inspector
MM93	Appendix 1	MJP17	Revise site boundary to show additional preferred area in consultation with Industry and Historic England.	To provide accurate site boundary for site	EIP	Change to site boundary at

	p39					request of inspector-still to be finalised in conjunction with Industry
AC65	Appendix 1 p41	MJP14 Key sensitivities	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point: Ecological issues, including impacts on: Ripon Parks and River Ure Bank Ripon Parks SSSIs, SINCS, High Batts <del>SSSI and</del> Nature Reserve and river Ure Corridor, woodland, protected species, <u>lamprey as an Annex ii species of the Humber Estuary SAC and the presence of invasive species including himalayan balsam.</u></p> <p>Revise 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point: Water issues, including: hydrology, dewatering, flood risk (zones 2 and 3), surface water drainage, <del>and</del> potential for flood storage <u>and water quality &amp; geomorphology issues important to the features of the SSSI.</u></p>	To correct a factual error and clarify the key sensitivities of the Site	LPA37	
AC66	Appendix 1 p41	MJP14 Development requirements criteria	<p>Revise 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point: Mitigation of ecological issues, in particular with regard to avoiding impacts on the Ripon Parks and River Ure Bank Ripon Parks SSSIs and the River Ure to demonstrate that minerals extraction at this site will not destroy or damage the interest features for which the High Batts <u>Nature Reserve</u>, Ripon Parks and River Ure Bank Ripon Parks SSSIs are designated. <u>This includes designing the development (including any bunds and discharge outfalls) to protect the SSSI ecological features from the impact of haul roads and the impacts of flood events and potential erosion by the river that might lead to river encroachment into the quarry and SSSI (to include a buffer zone between the north western part of the development and the River Ure), or alterations to the stability of the hydrology associated with the SSSI and to protect lamprey as an Annex ii species of the Humber Estuary SAC;</u> and, in respect of protected species, including measures to address and control invasive species</p> <p>Revise last bullet point: An appropriate restoration using opportunities for habitat creation, but which</p>	To clarify the Development requirements of the Site	LPA37	



			is also appropriate to location within a birdstrike safeguarding zone <u>and which includes long term management arrangements to ensure the protection and enhancement of the SSSI.</u>			
MM94	Appendix 1 after page 47	MJP15	<p>Insert MJP15 into Harrogate Borough section of Allocated sites in Appendix 1 (CD18) between end of MJP10 text on page 47 and beginning of WJP08 text on page 48.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use plan as used on page 42 of SD18.</li> </ul> <p>Text to comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>details from pages 40-41 of SD18 up to and including Key Sensitivities with the addition of text to the following bullet points:                      1<sup>st</sup> bullet point: 'Ecological issues <u>including as identified by the RSPB and the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</u>, including impacts on: North Pennine Moors SPA ...'                      3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point: 'Heritage asset issues <u>as identified by Historic England</u>, including proximity to ...'.                      • The development requirements listed on page 107 of SD18 with the addition of text to the following bullet points:                      1<sup>st</sup> bullet point: 'An Appropriate Assessment ... mitigation of ecological issues <u>including as identified by the RSPB and the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</u>, in particular with regard to avoiding ... protected species'                      4<sup>th</sup> bullet point: 'A suitable landscape assessment and appropriate site design and landscaping of site to mitigate potential impacts on heritage assets <u>as identified by Historic England</u>, (Redshaw Hall ...rights of way in the area.</li> </ul>	Inclusion of allocated site at request of Inspector	EIP	Allocation of site at request of Inspector
MM95	Appendix 1 after p55	WJP01	Add WJP01 in as an allocated site as a waste transfer station	At request of the Inspector	EIP	Allocation of site at request of Inspector- Text still to be finalised
MM96	Appendix 1	WJP22 – Reasons for	Revise the Para:	To clarify the Development requirements of the	MIQ/EIP	Additional text at request of

	p126	allocating site, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Para	The allocation of this site could contribute to the further provision of a range of infrastructure which could help move waste up the waste hierarchy (Policy W01) and provide flexibility in capacity for management of C&I waste in line with Policy W04. and it The allocation would not conflict with other strategic policies in the Plan, including Policy W02 facilitating net self-sufficiency in the management of waste and would be consistent with the overall locational principles for waste capacity (Policy W10) and Policy W11 waste site identification principles.	Site		the Inspector														
AC67	Appendix 2 p186	Knapton Quarry safeguarding plan	Revise plan area to reflect the inclusion of the existing additional facility types (transfer, treatment and recycling).	To more accurately reflect the current size of the site	LPA37															
MM97	Appendix 3 – Monitoring p279		<p>Insert new monitoring mechanism into Table titled ‘Monitoring of implementation of policies in Minerals and Waste Joint Plan’: for Policy D14 – Planning Obligations</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Policy (inc. link to objectives)</u></th> <th><u>Indicator Number</u></th> <th><u>Indicator</u></th> <th><u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Method</u></th> <th><u>Trigger Point</u></th> <th><u>Action Required if Trigger Point hit</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>D14: Planning Obligations</u> <u>. Linked to Objectives 9, 10, 12</u></td> <td><u>57</u></td> <td><u>Approved applications are consistent with this policy (where appropriate)</u></td> <td><u>NA</u></td> <td><u>Monitoring of planning application decisions, annual monitoring</u></td> <td><u>NA</u></td> <td><u>NA</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Policy (inc. link to objectives)</u>	<u>Indicator Number</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Trigger Point</u>	<u>Action Required if Trigger Point hit</u>	<u>D14: Planning Obligations</u> <u>. Linked to Objectives 9, 10, 12</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>Approved applications are consistent with this policy (where appropriate)</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>Monitoring of planning application decisions, annual monitoring</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	To reflect addition of new policy	MIQ	Addition of reference to new policy at request of the Inspector
<u>Policy (inc. link to objectives)</u>	<u>Indicator Number</u>	<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Trigger Point</u>	<u>Action Required if Trigger Point hit</u>														
<u>D14: Planning Obligations</u> <u>. Linked to Objectives 9, 10, 12</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>Approved applications are consistent with this policy (where appropriate)</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>Monitoring of planning application decisions, annual monitoring</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>														

AC68		Policies Map	Revise MJP11, MJP17 and WJP22 site allocation boundaries, and safeguarded Showfield Lane waste facility on the interactive map	To reflect change in boundaries for these sites	MIQ/EIP	To provide accurate site boundaries at request of the Inspector
AC69		Policies Map	<p>Revise MJP11, MJP17 and WJP22 site allocation boundaries and add in Allocations for WJP01 and MJP15 as well as safeguarded Showfield Lane waste facility on paper version of the following maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aerodrome Safeguarding - Policy No. = D10</li> <li>• Agricultural Land Classification - Policy No. = D12</li> <li>• Coal Mining Development Referral Area - Policy No. = D13</li> <li>• Water Environment including Flood Risk - Policy No. = D09</li> <li>• PEDL licences - Policy No.s M16, M17 &amp; M18</li> <li>• Environmental and Historic Designations - MAP FIVE</li> <li>• Environmental and Historic Designations - MAP SIX</li> <li>• Environmental and Historic Designations - MAP EIGHT</li> <li>• Minerals Resource Safeguarding Maps - MAP 5</li> <li>• Minerals Resource Safeguarding Maps - MAP 6</li> <li>• Minerals Resource Safeguarding Maps - MAP 8</li> </ul>	To reflect change in boundaries for these sites	MIQ/EIP	To provide accurate site boundaries at request of the Inspector
AC70		Policies Map	<p>Revise title on 4<sup>th</sup> page of the paper version (CD23):</p> <p><del>Coal Mining Development Referral Area</del> <u>Development High Risk Area</u> == Policy Ref No. D13</p>	Corrected for accuracy	MIQ	Revised text at request of the Inspector
AC71		Policies Map	Add in PEDL 258 onto hydrocarbon layer	Corrected for accuracy	EIP	

