

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>General</b>	Support – strong linkages between climate change, flood management, green infrastructure and minerals planning agenda.	11/11686	North Yorkshire County Council
	Comment – it is important that the waste recycling centre at Towthorpe is safeguarded for the foreseeable future to cope with planned additional demands. With the recent announcement the whole of the North of England may have shale gas deposits. This element should also be included in the local plan.	77/12776	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – key evidence base for waste – this is out of date (most recent document is dated 2008).	1665/12984	York Environment Forum
	Support – agree with preferred approach.	6508/17687	City Of York Council Conservative Group

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy WM1 Sustainable Waste Management</b>	Comment – it would be helpful if greater clarity could be provided on the approach of facilities for municipal waste. Alternatively, reference could be made to a need to identify capacity for the management of all waste streams, as this may provide more flexibility including circumstances where a proportion of waste is managed outside the area. It would be helpful of clarity could be provided that the bullet point priority list is intended to apply specifically to the delivery of facilities on the CYC area, as different priorities may be appropriate in other parts of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan area. It may be preferable to apply this requirement to significant new development only, as provision for waste management may not be appropriate or viable in some very small schemes. Through reference to provision for waste management and onsite management of waste retail and commercial development.	11/11687	North Yorkshire County Council
	Comments – acknowledge and support the policies with particular reference to WM1 vi and WM2 iv points 1,2,3,4 and 5.	190/13981	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Objection – strongly object to the proposed waste treatment facility at Allerton. It is unsustainable and will require waste to be brought from other areas to make it viable, thus creating additional congestion and pollution. Defra has rejected the facility as being unnecessary now that landfill requirements are reducing nationally. No further resources should be spent on this scheme.	433/16566	
	Objection – challenge the Waste Management Policy which needs re-thinking in view of the withdrawal of finance for Allerton Quarry facilities. Any further developments will put a greater strain on waste treatment, there being a limit of how much is biodegradable.	1589/17557	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – should re-open West York household waste recycling facility.	1596/9925	
	Support – allocation of energy generation plant in proximity to a major landfill of Harewood Whin provides an opportunity to develop energy from waste proposals that would be a major benefit to the local economy, could improve environmental conditions and designation of this as an area of generation.	1599/9937	
	Comment – York needs to have city scale solutions for residual municipal waste, as well as county scale. This reduces distance of transport of arisings and permits local benefit e.g. From anaerobic digestion. Integration of waste facilities in association with new development important. Support – this approach and particularly the emphasis on waste as a valuable resource.	1665/12985	York Environment Forum
	Comment – there is a great deal of evidence which strongly condemns incineration as a method of waste disposal. Incineration is outdated and in itself does extreme	3243/8315	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	damage to the environment. Waste incineration is a continuous process requiring continued supplies of waste which would be counter-productive to the idea of reducing waste in the first place, this project should not proceed.		
<b>Policy WM1 Sustainable Waste Management Continued</b>	Comment – uncertainty surrounding future of Allerton Park, given level of uncertainty, and in order to ensure the Local Plan is flexible enough to deal with change, effective and robust (as required by the framework), consider that alternative sites should also be identified to deal with waste arisings, including not only municipal, but also commercial and industrial and agricultural waste arisings, suggested such sites be included.	4382/11348	Peel Environmental & North Selby Mine Waste Ltd
	Objection – highlight the cost of waste, should be turning waste into a resource.	4819/14307	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Comment – the Towthorpe waste recycling centre is an important asset for the village and it should continue to provide the existing level of service.	5189/12406	
	Comment – should close down the Harewood Whin site or, at least, enforce the S106 agreement to cut down the number of waste HGV`s driving through Rufforth. In addition, the stench emitting from the site is a blight on local residents.	5228/12540	
	Comment – why retain a waste recycling centre near the city centre ? When that land could be used for other purposes and services transferred outside to save cost and make travelling to the site easier.	5313/14478	
	Comment – on the A64 there is no waste or recycling area. Is the plan to put all the South side of the city`s waste to the anaerobic digester?	5885/15183	
	Comment – Reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill sites is an achievement which needs to be sustained and improved.	6042/15468	
	Comment – the feasibility of mixed plastics recycling and means of facilitating markets for recycled plastics should be looked at again in the light of refusal for Allerton Park. Commercial/community developments should separate waste at source for recycling – at least recyclable from non-recyclable and also to ensure that recyclables are sent for recycling. The legal possibility of enshrining this in planning conditions could perhaps be looked at. Consideration should also be given to the first 2 tiers of the waste hierarchy – prevention and re-use and further to this consideration of: Sites for encouraging re-use including swap markets and commercial/industrial materials exchanges should be considered. Re-processing of old goods – as means of training/apprenticeship.	6132/15568	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy WM1 Sustainable Waste Management Continued</b>	Comment – the plan needs to site the waste plant in York and ensure that the tightest emissions regulations are adhered to. Given the city`s laudable determination to end poverty it must engage with the key part that district heating can play in reducing fuel poverty as well as reducing carbon emissions.	6137/15590	
	Comment – paragraph 2.70 is out of date as the planning application has been approved.	6516/16319	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – preferred approach is wrong in terms of the major solution being one of incineration. This is outrageously expensive, unsustainable financially, unsustainable environmentally, potentially injurious to health and ludicrously over sized for the amount of municipal waste produced in the two council`s areas, will be unnecessary as waste volumes continue to fall. May also fall foul of EU law. An alternative method of waste management must be found, one which truly adheres to the `waste hierarchy` ; encouraging waste prevention, re-use, recycling, composting and mechanical and biological treatments. Propose a system working towards `zero waste` which has been employed elsewhere. Given the uncertainty about funding Allerton Park the strategy should consider alternative models and sites required. Driving volumes of waste from one part of the county to another cannot be seen to be sustainable, especially as fuel costs may rise. Localised management of recycling and disposal is likely to create more jobs and still be cheaper than Allerton Park.	6518/16438	York Green Party
<b>Para 22.05</b>	Comment – planning permission has been granted for the Allerton Waste Recovery Park facility, but is subject to a legal challenge. In the last line of paragraph 22.5 it may be preferable to refer to “ residual municipal waste”	11/11688	North Yorkshire County Council
	Comment – unwilling to finance a development which will become obsolete in the foreseeable future.	529/16686	
	Comment –should not be financing Allerton Waste Recovery Park which will become obsolete in the foreseeable future.	835/16910	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy WM2 Safeguarding Mineral Resources and Local Amenity</b>	Comment – it would be helpful if it could be clarified that the criteria for site allocation are only intended to apply in the Council area rather than across the whole of the joint area plan. It may not be realistic or necessary to meet these criteria for minerals development, where geological factors may be a fundamental constraint on location.	11/11689	North Yorkshire County Council
	Objection – Policy WM2 should include policies to deal with the expected development of shale gas in the area.	42/11723	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – should adopt policies which state a presumption against fracking bearing in mind that the exploitation of a further type of fossil fuel is likely to make reducing greenhouse gas emissions much more difficult.	90/12795	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Comment – acknowledge and support the policies with particular reference to WM1 vi and WM2 iv points 1,2,3,4 and 5.	190/13982	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Comment – the criteria for allocating new minerals should include the following: There is no detrimental impact on existing utilities within the site.	295/14166	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Support – apart from minor wording changes the first and third criteria are acceptable. Objection – severe reservations about the wording of criteria ii and iv. Starting point in a strategic policy should be a commitment to making a contribution to a wider demand. Ensure that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. There also needs to be a commitment to maintaining a land bank of material once this is expressed in a working site or sites. Guidance within the plan to where any prospective mineral operations should be directed. In the absence of detailed knowledge of the quality or quantity of mineral resources, or any currently expressed demand by mineral operators, the best plan needs to keep open the possibility for sites to be established. The best way of achieving this is to mention Areas of Search for aggregates rather than the reference to sites in the policy, since it is not known whether the identification of sites will be forthcoming. Not best policy to merely refer to the intention to safeguard minerals in the policy. The policy needs to be developed in line with the latest available best practice advice from BGS, which constitutes national guidance for this purpose. Suggested Policy changes: Policy WM2: Title should read Sustainable Minerals Management. Part ii should read: defining, through the Joint City of York Council, North Yorkshire and North York Moors Waste and Minerals Plan, Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs)(shown on the Key Diagram) around all sand and gravel resources of economic importance and policies to avoid sterilisation of resource either directly, or proximately by non-mineral development. Such MSAs will include urban areas and environmental designations. Part iii- after safeguarding, delete, 'if	531/16694	Mineral Products Association

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	appropriate'. Part iv should read: making an appropriate contribution to the regional supply of aggregates by identifying Areas of Search for mineral extraction, through the Joint City of York, North Yorkshire and North Moors Waste and Minerals Plan, and granting planning permissions for mineral operation in appropriate sustainable locations only where they would not give rise to significant adverse impacts on the amenity of local communities and the historic and natural environment, in accordance with other relevant policies in the plan.		
<b>Policy WM2 Safeguarding Mineral Resources and Local Amenity Continued</b>	Objection – the plan would benefit from the deletion of these unnecessary policies, such as WM2	544/16760	
	Objection – 'climate change impacts are acceptable' should read 'there are no significant climate change impacts'.	1665/12986	York Environment Forum
	Support – agree with options 3 or 4, providing high level local criteria/detailed local criteria/identify sites to guide waste and minerals development. Agree with the preferred approach of including strategic policies in the plan and more detailed policies in the York and North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan. Agree that the waste management and mineral policies provide the appropriate strategic direction for the more detailed policies which will be in the Minerals Local Plan.	2846/7574	
	Objection – suggest additional bullet point to the effect: 'Proposals do not constitute a risk of earth movements likely to damage buildings'.	3077/7952	
	Comment – one key statement that is missing, but believe that nearly all York residents support, is an absolute ban on fracking.	5476/14830	
	Objection – potential for shale gas extraction in the upper Bowland in the City of York and surrounding areas South of the city. Is there any consensus within councillors if extraction by hydraulic fracturing within the city of York`s boundary will offer any environmental or economic benefits to the city? Contaminating groundwater, disturbance of the geological strata thus causing tremors, has this been discussed with either Dart Energy or CBRE? Opposed to shale gas extraction by hydraulic fracturing.	6324/15985	
	Comment – no problem with the approach.	6516/16343	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Comment – the approach needs to be greatly strengthened in opposing the potential of exploitation by `fracking`. Plan needs to carefully consider economic, environmental and climate change impacts of `fracking` as a means of extracting oil and gas from shales within the area.	6518/16439	York Green Party

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Para 22.12</b>	Comment – identification of a Minerals Safeguarding Area for coal bed methane is unlikely to be feasible and probably unnecessary as it is unlikely to be sterilised by surface development.	11/11690	North Yorkshire County Council
<b>Para 22.13</b>	Comment – as it is not the specific role of the Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) to apportion mineral requirements it may be preferable to state that the LAA has not presented specific evidence on aggregate mineral requirements for the York area. It may be helpful to clarify whether the reference to fracking is intended specifically in the context of exploitation of shale gas (for which there is no apparent evidence of commercial interest in this area), or is intended to be read in association with the immediately following reference to coal bed methane, in which case it is suggested that the reference to fracking (which is a term not usually used in association with coal bed methane) be deleted.	11/11691	North Yorkshire County Council
	Comment – assurances needed that fracking will not take place in the Vale of York.	529/16685	
	Comment – assurances needed that fracking will not take place in the Vale of York.	835/16909	
	Comment – ‘There has been no interest expressed in fracking or exploring for coal-bed methane’ – Is this true? York`s response to these serious and damaging forms of mineral extraction must be resolved rather than avoided.	1665/12987	York Environment Forum

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Question 22.01</b>	Support – for the preferred approach and are satisfied that policy WM1.	3/11634	Environment Agency
	Comments – the issue of minerals and waste management has the potential to impact on a broad range of issues including the impediment of strategic open watercourses. Where such conflict arises with either watercourses or other environmental assets planning applications should incorporate a site management plan demonstrating how such assets will be protected and sustained.	190/13983	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Support – broadly endorse the approach to waste and minerals that is set out in this section.	238/14118	English Heritage
	Comment – the preferred approach in regard to waste and minerals is appropriate.	943/16970	
	Support – agree with preferred approach.	1109/17216	
	Comment – support most elements of the preferred approach.	1665/12988	York Environment Forum
	Comment – support for Option 4, providing detailed local criteria/identify sites to guide waste and minerals development.	5228/12539	
<b>Question 22.02</b>	Support – confident that detailed policies in the joint plan will address issues within the Environment Agency’s remit. Supportive of the strategic direction.	3/11635	Environment Agency
	Comment – support the approach. The issue of minerals and waste management has the potential to impact on a broad range of issues including the impediment of strategic open watercourses. Where such conflict arises with either watercourses or other environmental assets planning applications should incorporate a site management plan demonstrating how such assets will be protected and sustained.	190/13984	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Comment – it would make things far easier (and ensure consistency in the strategic framework) if the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan set out a single Strategic Policy which could be used in the local plans covered by the Joint MWLP.	238/14119	English Heritage
	Comment – the preferred approach of including strategic policies in York’s Local Plan and more detailed policies in joint North Yorkshire and North York Moors Waste and Minerals Local Plan is appropriate.	943/16971	
	Support – more strategic policies with neighbouring authorities required together with housing and transport.	1109/17217	
	Comment – City of York should have a local level strategy too.	1665/12989	York Environment Forum
	<b>Question 22.03</b>	Comment – support the approach. The issue of minerals and waste management has the potential to impact on a broad range of issues including the impediment of strategic open watercourses. Where such conflict arises with either watercourses or other environmental assets planning applications should incorporate a site management plan demonstrating how such assets will be protected and sustained.	190/13985
Comment – waste and mineral policies provide the appropriate strategic direction for		943/16972	



**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 22: Waste & Minerals Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	the more detailed policies which will be included in the York, North Yorkshire and North York Moors Waste and Minerals Local Plan.		
<b>Question 22.03 Continued</b>	Comment – agrees that the waste and mineral policies provide the appropriate strategic direction for the more detailed policies which will be included in the York, North Yorkshire and North York Moors Waste and Minerals Local Plan.	1109/17218	
	Objection – there may be a conflict of interests/circumstances between City of York Council and North Yorkshire County/North York Moors Councils. The current strategic direction, centring on one major centre (Allerton Quarry) is the best as some of the technology and approach has been shown to be outdated and rejected at government level.	1665/12990	York Environment Forum