

Mineral and Waste Joint Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Report (Publication Draft) –
Addendum

April 2017

St John's House
Queen Street
Manchester
M2 5JB
UK
T +44 (0)161 832 4542
F +44 (0)161 835 2038

Document Control Sheet

Project Title Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

Report Title Sustainability Assessment Report – Addendum

Report ref no. 1074351/R/001

Version 1.1

Status Draft

Record of Issue

Version	Status	Author	Date	Checked by	Date	Approved by	Date
0.1	Draft	D.Idebolo	Mar 17	T.Taylor	Mar 17		
1	Draft	D.Idebolo	April 17	T.Taylor	April 17	N.Kretschmer	April 17
1.1	Draft	T.Taylor	June 17				

Distribution

Date	Organisation	Contact	Format	Copies
Mar 17	North Yorkshire County Council	Rob Smith	(e)	1
Mar 17	North Yorkshire County Council	Liz Small	(e)	1

Limitations

This report is presented to North Yorkshire County Council in respect of The Mineral and Waste Joint Plan Sustainability Appraisal and may not be used or relied on by any other person. It may not be used by North Yorkshire County Council in relation to any other matters not covered specifically by the agreed scope of this Report.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the report, Mouchel Limited is obliged to exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence in the performance of the services required by North Yorkshire County Council and Mouchel Limited shall not be liable except to the extent that it has failed to exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence, and this report shall be read and construed accordingly.

This report has been prepared by Mouchel Limited. No individual is personally liable in connection with the preparation of this report. By receiving this report and acting on it, the client or any other person accepts that no individual is personally liable whether in contract, tort, for breach of statutory duty or otherwise.

Contents

Tables	iv
1 Introduction	1
2 Proposed Changes to the Joint Plan – Screening Exercise	2
3 Changes to the Sustainability Appraisal	13
3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Scoring.....	13
3.2 Updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Historic Impact Assessment (HIA).....	14
3.3 Joint Plan Policies Matrices	14
3.4 Allocated Site Matrices	16
3.5 Updated Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2016)	18
4 Cumulative Effects	20
Appendix 1 – Proposed Changes to the Joint Plan - Screened Out	21
Appendix 2 – Updated SFRA	46
Appendix 3 – Updated Historic Impact Assessment	47

Tables

Table 2-1 Screened In Changes	3
Table 3-1 SA Scoring.....	13
Table 3-2 Post Publication change to SA Score – Policy W11: Waste site identification principles	15
Table 3-3 Post Publication change to SA Score – MJP07 Oaklands, near Well	17
Table 3-4 Post Publication change to SA Score – MJP21 Land at Killerby	17
Table 3-5 Update to Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2016) - PPSI's	19

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report forms part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC), the City of York Council (CYC) and the North York Moors National Park Authority (NYMNP) Mineral and Waste Joint Plan (the ‘Joint Plan’). The Publication Stage Joint Plan and SA are available on the NYCC website¹.
- 1.1.2 The three planning authorities have come together to produce the Joint Plan. This plan includes policies about where minerals and waste development should take place and how it should be carried out. The plan also identifies a number of specific locations for future development, called site allocations.
- 1.1.3 Following publication in December 2016 a number of proposed changes to the Joint Plan have been identified through representations. It is intended that the proposed changes will be included alongside the Joint Plan when it is submitted for public examination.
- 1.1.4 This report details proposed changes to the Joint Plan and how they have been considered within the SA. To do this a two-step process has been applied to the proposed changes:
- 1) **Screening of changes** – proposed changes have been assessed to consider if they will result in changes to the SA. If a change will not affect the outcome of the SA they are not considered further and are ‘screened out’. Changes that have the potential to affect the SA have been assessed further at Step 2.
 - 2) **Appraisal of changes** – where proposed changes have the potential to affect the SA they have been considered further, and where necessary, re-appraised against the SA objectives.
- 1.1.5 The report also provides updates to the Sustainability Scoping Report (October 2016) in Chapter 3, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) in Appendix 2 and Historic Impact Assessment (HIA) in Appendix 3.

¹ North Yorkshire County Council, 2017 [Online]. Available at <http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/article/26218/Minerals-and-waste-joint-plan>. Accessed March 2017.

2 Proposed Changes to the Joint Plan – Screening Exercise

- 2.1.1 As stated in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)² a SA environmental report does not necessarily need to be amended following responses to consultation, with changes considered where appropriate and proportionate. In order to make this decision a screening exercise has been undertaken of the changes proposed to the Joint Plan and any updated conclusions drawn.
- 2.1.2 The PPG states that changes that are not significant will not require further SA work. The guidance defines significant changes as those that ‘substantially alters the draft plan and/ or is likely to give rise to significant environmental effects’. However, minor changes have also been screened for significant impacts within this addendum.
- 2.1.3 Proposed changes to the Joint Plan are identified in the following way:
- Deletions: strikethrough
 - Additional text: *italics*
- 2.1.4 The following minor proposed changes have not been subject to the screening process:
- Changes aimed at improving presentation
 - Correction of typographical errors, omissions and duplications
 - Operator name change
 - Correction of a factual error that does not relate to the SA
 - To reflect the closure of the publication phase of the Joint Plan i.e. deleting subheadings, notes.
- 2.1.5 The screening exercise identified a large number of proposed changes which were considered not to affect the SA and were subsequently ‘screened out’. The screened out Joint Plan proposed changes and screening summary are provided in Table A1 and Table A2 in Appendix 1.
- 2.1.6 Proposed changes that have been ‘screened in’ are provided below in Table 2-1 with a summary of implications for the SA. Where this has resulted in a change to the SA score given at the publication stage this is provided in Chapter 3.

² Planning Practice Guidance, 2017 [online]. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal>. Accessed March 2017.

Table 2-1 Screened In Changes

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan				
Paragraph 5.124	86	<p>Revise last sentence of paragraph 5.124 and add new text at end:</p> <p>Similarly, it is considered that where hydraulic fracturing is proposed for the purposes of supporting the production of conventional gas resources, <i><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 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</u></i></p>	To clarify the intended approach and ensure appropriate flexibility in the Plan.	<p>The policy justification revision outlines a proportional approach to the application of the policy to hydraulic fracturing for the purposes of conventional gas production. While this may affect the application of the policy to the industry of conventional gas production, it is not considered to change the SA scoring as proposals are still required to apply the policy 'reasonably based on the specific circumstances of the proposal under consideration'. Therefore it is expected that the policy will be applied appropriately to hydraulic fracturing proposals to support conventional gas resources.</p> <p>No changes to the SA score.</p>

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<i>consideration</i> 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.		
Paragraph 5.131 9th line		Insert new sentence after ‘... movements.’: <u><i>Vehicle movements also have the potential to impact on air quality, particularly in locations where Air Quality Management Areas have been identified and this will also be a relevant consideration in identifying suitable traffic routes, via a Transport Assessment.</i></u> It is therefore ...	To reflect the potential for vehicle movements to impact on air quality.	The requirement within the policy justification section specifically refers to potential air quality impacts from vehicle movements moving to and from hydrocarbon developments. The text strengthens protection to air quality impacts outlining that they will be considered as part of a Transport Assessment. However the revision is not considered to affect the SA scores applied to the policy, which is assessed as having a Moderate positive effect on SA Objective 4 (Air). Although it strengthens the policy there is still the potential for some negative air quality impacts and therefore cannot be considered a Major positive effect. No change to the SA score.
Policy M22	102	Add new sentence at end of 2nd paragraph:	To clarify the	The SA scores have been applied with

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
2nd paragraph		... the development. <u>Proposals for new surface development and infrastructure which are considered to represent major development will be assessed against the criteria for major development set out in Policy D04.</u>	proposed policy approach in relation to proposals which are considered to represent major development.	consideration of Policy D04 major development requirements and therefore no change to the SA scores is recorded. However, it is noted the additional text to clarify how Policy D04 is applied is beneficial for interpreting the policy. No further SA required.
Policy W11 parts 1), 2), 3) and 5)	140	Revise text of part 1) to: 1) Siting facilities for the preparation for the re-use, recycling, transfer and treatment of waste (excluding energy recovery or open composting) on previously developed land, industrial and employment land, or at <u>or adjacent to</u> existing waste management sites ... Make equivalent changes to parts 2), 3) and 5)	To improve consistency of the policy with Policy W10.	The addition of siting facilities on land adjacent to existing waste management facilities is expected to change the scoring of SA Objectives 1 and 5. See Table 3-2 for updated SA scores and justification for the changes.
Policy D10 Part 2) viii)	184	Revise to read: Promoting the delivery of <u>Achieving</u> significant net gains for biodiversity and the establishment of a <u>which help create</u> coherent and resilient ecological networks, based on contributing. <u>Where practicable,</u>	To clarify the proposed approach and reflect the diminishing	The proposed policy revision is beneficial for biodiversity as it requires proposals for site restoration to achieve net gains for biodiversity and identifies specific habitat types for restoration in the Swale and Ure valleys and

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<p>towards established objectives including the creation of Biodiversity Action Plan habitats <u>proposals should contribute significantly to the creation of habitats of particular importance in the local landscape</u> and seeking to delivering benefits at a landscape scale. <u>This includes wet grasslands and fen in the Swale and Ure valleys and species-rich grassland on the Magnesian limestone ridge.</u></p>	<p>significance of biodiversity action plans.</p>	<p>on the Magnesian limestone ridge. Although the policy has been strengthened in relation to biodiversity there is no change to the SA score as it already identifies a Major positive effect in relation to SA Objective 1 (Biodiversity/ Geo-diversity).</p> <p>No change to the SA score.</p>
Policy D12 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence	190	<p>Revise 2nd sentence: Development which would disturb or damage soils of high environmental value, such as <u>intact</u> peat or other soil contributing to ecological connectivity or carbon storage, will not be permitted.</p>	<p>To provide further flexibility in the policy recognising that all soils could make some contribution to ecological connectivity or carbon storage.</p>	<p>The text revision provides more flexibility in the application of development proposals in relation to soil. However, it is not considered to affect the score applied to SA Objective 5 (Soil and Land) – Major positive. The policy is still considered to have a Major positive effect on soil and land by requiring reclamation schemes to protect and enhance soils and agricultural land in areas of best and most versatile agricultural land and to consider the long term potential to create areas of best and most versatile land during reclamation of a site.</p> <p>No change to SA score.</p>

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, Appendix 1				
MJP06 Development requirements criteria	17	Insert new bullet point: <u>Applications should be supported by a comprehensive archaeological assessment</u>	To adequately reflect the significance of heritage assets at this site.	The additional development requirement strengthens protection of buried archaeology by requiring an archaeological assessment prior to submission of a planning application. However, there is still the potential for a minor negative effect on SA Objective 10 (historic environment) through the disturbance of buried archaeology. Therefore there is no change to the SA score. No change to the SA score.
MJP07 Development requirements criteria	21	Insert new bullet point: <u>Applications should be supported by a comprehensive archaeological assessment</u> Revise final bullet point: An appropriate restoration scheme using opportunities for habitat creation <u>and reconnecting the henges to their landscape setting</u> , but which is also appropriate to location within a birdstrike safeguarding zone	To adequately reflect the significance of heritage assets at this site	The addition of the requirement to undertake an archaeological assessment prior to submitting a planning application strengthens the protection of buried archaeology at the site. The recognition of an appropriate restoration scheme to reconnect the henges to their landscape setting will reduce the expected effect in the long term from Moderate to Minor negative. Change to SA objective 10 (historic

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
				environment) score from Moderate to Minor Negative in the long term (see Table 3-3).
MJP33 Development requirements criteria	25	Revise 5th bullet point: Appropriate site design to ensure protection of the aquifer <u>and the River Swale which lies immediately adjacent to the site</u>	To reflect the proximity of the site to the River Swale	The addition of appropriate site design to protect the River Swale strengthens mitigation to the water environment if the site were to be developed. However, there is still the potential that pollution could enter the water environment if the site is developed, therefore the score is considered to be Minor negative in the short, medium and long term. No change to the SA score.
MJP21 Development requirements criteria	34	Revise last bullet point: An appropriate restoration scheme using opportunities for habitat creation <u>and connectivity</u> , but which is also appropriate to location within a birdstrike safeguarding zone	To recognise the opportunities arising at this site	The additional development requirement is beneficial for habitat connectivity, however, it is not considered to change the SA scores at the site. No change to the SA score.
MJP21 Site Plan	35	Revise site boundary of allocation MJP21 to exclude land nearest to the Killerby Hall Stable Block listed building. There would be a reduction in the overall area of the site from 213ha to 207ha, with a	To reduce the harm to the setting of the listed building	There would be a proportionate increase of the site area within flood zones 2 and 3 from approximately 35% to 40% of the site, as a result of the loss of land outside of these

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		subsequent sand and gravel reserve reduction of 1 million tonnes.		<p>zones. This would increase in size due to the effects of climate change in the long term.</p> <p>Land removed from the site is ALC Grade 3 and therefore an additional 6ha agricultural land would be preserved from development, benefitting agricultural land lost to climate change in the long term.</p> <p>The above changes are not considered to result in a change to the SA score applied to SA Objective 7 (To respond and adapt to the effects of climate change).</p> <p>There would be a reduction in 1 million tonnes of virgin sand and gravel removed from the site due to the reduction in area of the site. Therefore preserved sand and gravel would be available for future use.</p> <p>This is not considered to result in a change to the SA score applied to SA Objective 8 (To minimise the use of resources and encourage their re-use and safeguarding).</p> <p>The revision of the site boundary to exclude land nearest to Killerby Hall Stable Block listed</p>

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
				<p>building would affect the SA Objective 10 score (historic environment).</p> <p>Change to SA Objective 10 score (historic environment). See Table 3-4 below for updated score and justification.</p> <p>The amount of sand and gravel extracted from the site would be reduced from 11.37 to 10.37 million tonnes. Reducing the sites contribution to the construction sector.</p> <p>Overall the change is considered negligible in relation to achieving SA Objective 12 (Achieve sustainable economic growth and create and support jobs), and therefore no change has been applied.</p> <p>There would be a proportionate increase of the site area within flood zones 2 and 3 from approximately 35% to 40% of the site, as a result of the loss of land outside of these zones. This is not considered to affect the SA score applied to SA objective 16 (flood risk). See updated SFRA in Appendix 2.</p> <p>No change to SA Objective 16 score.</p>

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
MJP17 Development requirements criteria	37	Revise last bullet point: An appropriate restoration scheme using opportunities for habitat creation <u>and connectivity</u> , but which is also appropriate to location within a birdstrike safeguarding zone ...	To recognise the opportunities arising at this site	The additional development requirement is beneficial for habitat connectivity, however, it is not considered to change the SA scores at the site. No change to the SA score.
WJP15 Development requirements criteria	70	Revise last bullet point: An appropriate restoration scheme using opportunities for habitat creation <u>and connectivity</u>	To recognise the opportunities arising at this site	The additional development requirement is beneficial for habitat connectivity, however, it is not considered to change the SA scores at the site. No change to the SA score.
MJP55 Key sensitivities and Development requirements	78	Revise 1st bullet point of Key Sensitivities to include <u>York and Selby Cycle Track SINC</u> Revise 1st bullet point of Development Requirements to include <u>York and Selby Cycle Track SINC</u>	To reflect that the potential significance of this constraint	The additional development requirement is beneficial for the protection of the York and Selby Cycle Track SINC, however, it is not considered to change the SA scores at the site. No change to the SA score.
WJP06 Key sensitivities and Development	120	Revise 1st bullet point of Key Sensitivities to include <u>York and Selby Cycle Track SINC</u> Revise 1st bullet point of Development Requirements to include <u>York and Selby Cycle Track SINC</u>	To reflect that the potential significance of this constraint	The additional development requirement is beneficial for the protection of the York and Selby Cycle Track SINC, however, it is not considered to change the SA scores at the

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
requirements				site. No change to the SA score.

DRAFT

3 Changes to the Sustainability Appraisal

3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Scoring

3.1.1 The scoring used to appraise the Joint Plan policies and sites is shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 SA Scoring

Score	Description
++	The option is predicted to have higher positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a highly significant contribution to issues or receptor of regional or wider significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance.
m+	The option is predicted to have moderate positive effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a positive, but not highly positive contribution to issues or receptor of more than local significance, or to several issues or receptors of local significance.
+	The option is predicted to have minor positive effects on achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant contribution to an issue or receptor of more local significance.
0	The option will have no effect on the achievement of the SA objective ³ .
-	The option is predicted to have minor negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative contribution to an issue or receptor of local significance.
m-	The option is predicted to have moderate negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a negative, but not highly negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance.
--	The option is predicted to have higher negative effects on the achievement of the SA objective. For example, this may include a significant negative contribution to an issue or receptor of more than local significance.
?	The impact of the option on the SA objective is uncertain.

³ This includes where there is no clear link between the site SA objective and the site.

3.2 Updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Historic Impact Assessment (HIA)

3.2.1 Following proposed changes to the site boundary at allocated site MJP21 Land at Killerby the SFRA and HIA have been updated for this site. A summary is provided below with the full updated SFRA provided in Appendix 2 and HIA in Appendix 3.

- MJP21 SFRA – a decrease in area of 6ha has not resulted in a change to the sequential test result or ranking of the site.
- MJP21 HIA – the removal of the area of land south of the Killerby is expected to reduce the overall effect from minor negative to negligible following the proposed restoration measures.

3.3 Joint Plan Policies Matrices

3.3.1 The screening exercise detailed in Chapter 2 identified changes to the SA score of Policy W11: Waste site identification principles following the proposed changes to the Joint Plan.

3.3.2 The appraisal matrices in Table 3-2 contain a summary of the changes made to the SA objective scores 1 and 5.

Table 3-2 Post Publication change to SA Score – Policy W11: Waste site identification principles

SA Objectives	SA Score – Sustainability Appraisal (Publication Draft)			Changes to the SA following consultation on the Joint Plan			
	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Justification
SA Objective 1. Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and improve habitat connectivity.	-	-	-	m-	m-	m-	Changes to the policy allow additional siting of waste management facilities at sites adjacent to existing to existing waste management facilities. This may result in waste management facilities being located on undeveloped land potentially affecting habitats and land of biodiversity value. Therefore the SA score for this objective has been changed from a Minor negative to a Moderate negative.
	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	
SA Objective 5. Use soil and land efficiently and safeguard or enhance their quality.	++	++	++	m+	m+	m+	Changes to the policy allow additional siting of waste management facilities at sites adjacent to existing waste management facilities. This increases the overall land available to site facilities and may result in waste management facilities being located on undeveloped land with subsequent loss of soil resources and agricultural land. Whilst it is considered the policy is beneficial for soils and land as it largely directs development towards previously developed land and agricultural land of lower quality, overall the SA score has been reduced from a Major positive to a Moderate positive as a result of the change.

3.4 Allocated Site Matrices

- 3.4.1 The screening exercise detailed in Chapter 2 identified changes to the SA score at allocated sites MJP21 Land at Killerby and MJP07 Oaklands, near Well, following proposed changes to the Joint Plan.
- 3.4.2 The appraisal matrices in Table 3-3 and Table 3-4 contain a summary of the changes made to the SA objective scores at these sites post publication of the Joint Plan.

DRAFT

Table 3-3 Post Publication change to SA Score – MJP07 Oaklands, near Well

SA Objectives	SA Score – Sustainability Appraisal (Publication Draft)			Changes to the SA following consultation on the Joint Plan			
	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Justification
10. To conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character	m-	m-	m-	m-	m-	-	The development requirement to provide a restoration scheme that reconnects the henges to their landscape setting would help to mitigate the impact of the development in the long term. The long term score has therefore been changed from Moderate to Minor negative.

Table 3-4 Post Publication change to SA Score – MJP21 Land at Killerby

SA Objectives	Sustainability Appraisal (Publication Draft)			Changes to the SA following consultation on the Joint Plan			
	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Justification
10. To conserve or enhance the historic environment and its setting, cultural heritage and character	-	-	-	-	-	0	The removal of an area of the MJP21 site south of the Listed Building at Killerby would not affect the SA score in the short, to medium term which remains a Minor negative effect due to removal of agricultural landscape context and increased industrialisation in the general area potentially detracting from the designation. In the long term, the SA score is likely to reduce to negligible following restoration, with an element of uncertainty depending on the final restoration scheme implemented.
			?			?	

3.5 Updated Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2016)

- 3.5.1 Following the publication stage of the Joint Plan, a policy statement and report have been included within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2016), Appendix II: Plans, Policies, Programmes, Strategies and Initiative's (PPPSI).
- 3.5.2 PPPSI's have informed the key sustainability issues of relevance to the Joint Plan. A summary of the additional PPPSI's is provided in Table 3-5.

DRAFT

Table 3-5 Update to Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2016) - PPPSI's

Key Objectives, targets and indicators relevant to the Joint Plan and SA	Implications for the Joint Plan	Implications for SA
National Context		
Shale gas and oil policy statement by Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG 2015)		
Sets out the Government's view that there is a national need to explore and develop our shale gas and oil resources in a safe, sustainable and timely way, and the steps it is taking to support this. The policy statement sets out the safety and environmental protection framework for the shale gas and oil developments in planning decisions and plan-making.	The plan should take into the Government's view that there is a national need to explore and develop shale gas and oil.	The SA will need to recognise the Government's view on shale gas and oil exploration being undertaken in a safe and sustainable way.
Committee on Climate Change (CCC 2016) – Onshore Petroleum, the compatibility of UK onshore petroleum with meeting the UK's carbon budgets.		
The Committee for Climate Changes' report finds that the implications of UK shale gas exploitation for greenhouse gas emissions are subject to considerable uncertainty. It also finds that exploitation of shale gas on a significant scale is not compatible with UK carbon budgets, or the 2050 emissions reduction target under the Climate Change Act (2008).	The joint plan and SA should seek to reduce carbon emissions to ensure that consideration for climate change is factored into the assessment process.	The SA should recognise the uncertainties surrounding greenhouse gas emissions of shale gas exploitation and that the tests outlined in the report would need to be met to achieve carbon budgets.

4 Cumulative Effects

- 4.1.1 Cumulative effects are where effects, that may not in themselves be significant, are, when taken together with other effects, significant.
- 4.1.2 Following the change in SA score to Policy W11 and site allocations MJP07 and MJP21 it is considered that the cumulative assessment undertaken for the Sustainability Appraisal (Publication Draft) has not significantly changed in response to the proposed changes. This is due to the proposed changes themselves not leading to significant changes to the overall results of the SA.

DRAFT

Appendix 1 – Proposed Changes to the Joint Plan - Screened Out

Table A1 – Local Planning Authority Representations Screened Out

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan				
Potash, Polyhalite and Salt Section	102	Replace section heading: Potash, Polyhalite and Salt with <u>Potash and Salt</u>	For consistency with proposed changes to paragraphs 5.171 and 5.172.	There is no change to the SA appraisal. Potash is a generic term for potassium bearing minerals that includes polyhalite (see clarification in paragraphs 5.171 and 5.172). SA score for Policy M22: Potash, polyhalite and salt supply, remains the same. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.171	102	Replace current paragraph 5.171 with: <u>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</u>	To clarify terminology relevant to potash and salt mineral resources.	This is a change to clarify terminology relating to potash and does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<u>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 Moors National Park.</u>		
Policy M22 1st paragraph, 1st line.	102	Revise first line: <u>Proposals for the extraction of potash, and salt from new sites...</u>	To clarify terminology relevant to potash and salt mineral resources.	This is a change to clarify terminology relating to potash and does not have implications for the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy M22 2nd paragraph, 2nd line.	102	Revise second line: <u>Proposals for new surface development and infrastructure associated with the existing permitted potash and salt mine sites in the National Park, ...</u>	To clarify terminology relevant to potash and salt mineral resources.	This is a change to clarify terminology relating to potash and does not have implications for the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.172	103	Replace current paragraph 5.172 with: <u>In planning terms, the differentiation between the two forms of potash is important, in relation to the policy requirements of the</u>	To clarify terminology relevant to potash	This is a change to clarify terminology relating to potash and does not have implications

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<i><u>major development test relating to need assessment. There is an existing national requirement for the sylvinite form of potash, whereas polyhalite is new to the global fertiliser market and is not yet an established product. Planning permission for Boulby Mine allows for the extraction of ‘potash’, covering both sylvinite and polyhalite (and also rock salt), whereas the 2015 permission for Sirius Minerals at Doves Nest is restricted to polyhalite only. Another important distinction is the fact that sylvinite requires processing and therefore has significant additional infrastructure requirements, whereas when polyhalite is mined the entire ore is used with only the need for granulation. In Policy M22, the term ‘potash’ means all forms of the mineral unless where otherwise explicitly stated.</u></i>	and salt mineral resources.	for the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 7.12 3rd Sentence	145	... constitute permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) <u>(England) 2015 Order 1995 (as amended)</u> .	To update sentence to refer to the current legislation.	An update to refer to the latest legislation does not have any implications for the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy S01 1st paragraph of Part 2)	149	Potash and <i>(including polyhalite)</i> resources within the Boulby Mine licensed <u>permitted</u> area ...	To clarify the status of the relevant area.	Clarification of the relevant area, no changes to the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
				required.
Paragraph 8.17 6th line	151	However, it would be appropriate to safeguard reserves and resources within the area licensed for extraction from <i>that part of the Boulby Mine permission area indicated on the Policies Map</i> (the only active potash mine in the Plan area), along with those resources forming part of the York Potash project that have been identified with a higher degree of confidence (i.e. the indicated and inferred resources). This will ...	To clarify the status of the relevant area.	Clarification of the relevant area, no changes to the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Text following Paragraph 10.1	194	Note: when providing a response relating to a specific site please ensure the site reference number is included with the relevant comments.	To reflect the closure of the publication phase of the Plan.	Closure of the publication phase of the Plan, no changes to the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, Appendix 2				
Appendix 2	159	Insert new safeguarded waste transfer (non-hazardous) site into table: <u>Showfield Lane, Malton</u>	Consequential change arising from response to consultation.	Policy S03 seeks to safeguard waste management facilities on the Policies Map, under certain conditions. The addition of the Showfield Lane site, Malton does not affect the SA scores applied to Policy S03.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		Revise waste facility type description for Knapton Quarry to : Composting, <u>transfer, treatment and recycling</u>		<p>Screened out – no further SA required.</p> <p>Policy S03 seeks to safeguard waste management facilities on the Policies Map, under certain conditions. The revision of the Knapton Quarry site does not affect the SA scores applied to Policy S03.</p> <p>Screened out – no further SA required.</p>
Appendix 2	201	Revise boundary to reflect allocated area WJP17	For consistency.	<p>Amendment of safeguarded waste management facility site – Skipton Home Waste Recycling Centre site map, to show the correct location of the HWRC.</p> <p>The amendment to the site map has no implications to the SA of Policy S03 or allocated Site WJP17, which has</p>

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
				appraised the correct location of the HWRC. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policies Map				
Policies Map Map Key		Revise references in Key to potash or polyhalite in the supporting justification to potash and salt	For consistency with the text of the Plan.	This is a change to clarify terminology relating to potash and does not have implications for the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Table A2 – Other Representations Screened Out

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan				
Paragraph 2.26 2nd line	18	The NPPF also places emphasis upon conserving important landscape and heritage assets by requiring that landbanks of non-energy minerals are, <i>as far as is practical</i> , provided outside National Parks, AONBs ...	To be consistent with national policy.	Clarifies national policy within the Plan. The requirements of the NPPF are recognised within the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 2.26 4th sentence	18	The NPPF advises that in considering planning applications substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt but <i>inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances</i> . It also advises that minerals extraction is not considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, provided the development <i>it preserves openness and</i> would not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. <i>Harm to assets, including landscape and heritage assets, relevant to the purpose of Green Belt designation equate to harm to the purposes of Green Belt designation. Green Belt policy</i> This is addressed further ...	To clarify the national policy context relating to Green Belt.	SA Objective 11 – Protect and enhance the quality and character, seeks to, ‘Protect the purposes and ‘positive use’ of the Green Belt’. This is in line with national policy and therefore no changes to the SA are required. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Paragraph 2.54	25	Add new sentence at end of Paragraph 2.54: <i><u>For the area north of Flamborough Head, and pending finalisation of a North East Marine Plan, reference should be made to the national Marine Policy Statement, which also highlights the importance of marine aggregates in supplying the construction industry.</u></i>	To clarify the status of marine planning in the area.	This is a clarification of marine planning in the Joint Plan area and does not affect the SA. The Marine Policy Statement has been considered during the development of objectives at the SA scoping stage. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 2.68 Final sentence	29	Revise last sentence of paragraph 2.68: These imports, other <i><u>than clear glass grade silica sand</u></i> , are thought to relate ...	To clarify the specific position relating to silica sand.	Clarification within the Joint Plan that does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 2.88 2nd bullet point	33	Revise 2nd bullet point: Cross boundary supply issues relating to silica sand, which is a mineral of national significance <i><u>importance</u></i> .	To more closely align the text with national policy.	Amendment does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 4.11	46	Add additional text to end of 3rd bullet point, part c): ... in the Plan area <i><u>or other significant regulatory changes relevant to the</u></i>	To further clarify where review may	Additional text does not affect the SA.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
3rd bullet point, part c)		<u>development of local planning policy</u>	be required.	Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy M06 1st paragraph	55	A minimum overall landbank of 10 years will be maintained for crushed rock throughout the plan period. A separate minimum 10 year landbank will be identified and maintained for Magnesian Limestone crushed rock <u>throughout the plan period.</u>	To clarify the proposed approach.	Additional text does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.68 4th sentence	68	Revise 4th sentence: Neither of Sites within the other two MPAs in England <u>with reserves of silica sand</u> currently has <u>do not have</u> a 10 year landbank as required by the NPPF <u>national policy</u> , although both are ...	To more closely align the text with national policy.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.72	68	Replace existing paragraph 5.72 with: <u>A further relevant consideration in respect of Blubberhouses Quarry is that the County Council (within its Local Transport Plan 4: strategy and strategic transport prospectus) and the York and North Yorkshire & East Riding Local Enterprise Partnerships (within its strategic economic plan) have identified the need to realign the A59 road at Kex Gill, near Blubberhouses quarry, as a key strategic priority. The existing alignment of the A59 in the Kex Gill area is subject to poor land stability issues, resulting in several road closures taking place on this regionally important strategic trans Pennine route over the past 15 years.</u>	To reflect the evolving situation in relation to proposals for realignment of the A59 near Blubberhouses.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<i><u>A definitive proposed realignment is not yet available and there is no safeguarded route. Work is currently on going identifying options, however there is potential for this project to overlap with the Blubberhouses quarry site. In this scenario there would be a need to ensure that the potential for conflict between road realignment and the quarry is reflected in design of both schemes and the potential for any cumulative impact taken into account where necessary.</u></i>		
Paragraph 5.93 2nd sentence	75	Revise 2nd sentence: This is a highly relevant issue for the Plan area following the announcement by Government in late 2015 of new oil and gas exploration and development licences ...	To reflect the fact that a Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence (PEDL) is now awarded by the Oil and Gas Authority.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.94 1st sentence	75	Revise 1st sentence: The Government <u>Oil and Gas Authority</u> awards PEDLs ...	To reflect the fact that PEDL licenses are now awarded by the Oil and Gas Authority.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Paragraph 5.107 1st bullet		Revise last sentence of 1st bullet point: For unconventional hydrocarbons, exploratory drilling <u>activity</u> make take considerably longer, especially ...	To clarify that it is aspects of unconventional gas development other than drilling which may mean that development activity takes place over longer periods.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.107 3rd bullet	78	Revise last sentence of 3rd bullet point: The production stage <u>may involve re-fracturing of existing wells and</u> is likely to require the periodic maintenance of wells, which may require use of drilling equipment.	To clarify the expected nature of development at production stage.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.111	80	Add new text at end of paragraph 5.111: ...appropriately located. <u>Hydrocarbon development typically involves temporary and intermittent activity particularly during the early stages of development. Depending on the nature of the development, it is likely that there will generally be a lesser degree of activity during any production phase.</u>	To provide further clarification of the expected nature of development that could come forward. To clarify the important	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
			regulatory role of the Environment Agency in this matter.	
Paragraph 5.112	81	Add new text after end of 5th sentence: ... health and safety. <i>The Environment Agency has an important regulatory role in relation to the management of returned water and Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM).</i> In accordance with ...	To clarify the important regulatory role of the Environment Agency in this matter.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.118	83	Revise paragraph 5.118: Planning guidance and case law makes clear that Minerals Planning Authorities do not need to carry out their own assessments of potential impacts which are controlled by other regulatory bodies. <i>focus on the control of processes or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes.</i> It states that they can determine planning applications having considered the advice of these <i>the relevant regulatory</i> bodies without having to wait for other approval processes to be concluded.	To more closely align the text with national policy and guidance.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph	83	Revise paragraph 5.119 d):	To clarify the	Text revision does not affect

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
5.119		<p>'Conventional hydrocarbons' include oil and gas found within geological 'reservoirs' with relatively high porosity/permeability, extracted using conventional drilling and production techniques.</p> <p>Revise paragraph 5.119 e):</p> <p>'Unconventional hydrocarbons' include hydrocarbons such as coal bed and coal mine methane and shale gas, extracted using unconventional techniques, including hydraulic fracturing in the case of shale gas, as well as the exploitation of in-situ coal seams through underground coal gasification.</p> <p>Revise para. 5.119 g):</p> <p>In planning terms it is <u>considered that relevant distinctions can be 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> important to distinguish between:</p> <p>i) The use of unconventional techniques to extract hydrocarbons such as hydraulic fracturing, underground</p>	<p>distinctions between development activity associated with conventional and unconventional resources.</p>	<p>the SA.</p> <p>Screened out – no further SA required.</p>

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<p>gasification and coal bed methane extraction; and The use of more conventional, less complex drilling and production techniques to extract hydrocarbons.</p>		
Paragraph 5.122	86	<p>Revise paragraph 5.122: While the Infrastructure Act 2015 and secondary legislation address hydraulic fracturing which occurs underground, the Government has also consulted on <u>introduced</u> further restrictions, in the form of a prohibition on high-volume hydraulic fracturing operations from <u>taking place</u> being carried out from new or existing wells that are drilled at the surface in specified protected areas, although they are not yet in force. As proposed The restrictions would <u>will principally affect</u> apply to surface development for unconventional hydrocarbons involving high volume hydraulic fracturing <u>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 Secretary of State for hydraulic fracturing that is not “associated hydraulic fracturing”, and that the Secretary of State 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 expected stage, unless an operator can</u></p>	To more accurately reflect the current regulatory position relating to the Government’s Surface Protections for hydraulic fracturing.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<u>persuasively demonstrate why requiring such consent would not be appropriate in their case. The areas proposed for protection 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 policy protection in their own right, the proposed restrictions would <u>do</u> not, in themselves, constitute planning policy as they would will be implemented though</u>		
Paragraph 5.123 3rd sentence	86	Furthermore, whilst the proposed surface restrictions would <u>will</u> provide ...	To more accurately reflect the current regulatory position relating to the Government's Surface Protections for hydraulic fracturing.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.124 1st sentence	86	An additional consideration is that the new Regulations and proposed surface protections <u>restrictions</u> would <u>will</u> only apply to ...		Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Paragraph 5.127 15th line	87	Revise 7th sentence: 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 refracturing of existing wells takes place.</u>	To reflect the potential position.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.130	88	Add new text at end of paragraph 5.130: <u>In some parts of the Plan area affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough local plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to a proposal which falls to be determined by North Yorkshire County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy.</u>	To reflect the presence of other potentially relevant designations in district local plans and to ensure that appropriate links are made.	Local level landscape plans have been considered within the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy M17 2) ii) a)	89	Revise text: The proximity of a proposed new well pad site to other existing, planned <u>permitted</u> or unrestored well pads, ...	To clarify the proposed approach.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.137	92	Revise 1st sentence and add new sentence between 1st and 2nd sentences: To give an indication at this stage, however, it is considered	To clarify the approach to preventing unacceptable	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		unlikely that proposals which would lead to a total development density, including operational and restored sites, of more than 10 well pads per 100km ² PEDL area (pro-rata for PEDLs of less than 100km²) would be compatible with the purpose of this element of the policy. <i>Where an area being developed by an operator comprises a PEDL or licence block area of less, or more, than 100km² the density guideline will be applied pro-rata.</i>	cumulative impact.	required.
Paragraph 5.137 7th line	92	Revise 2nd sentence: For PEDLs located in the Green Belt or where a relatively high concentration of other land use constraints exist, including significant access constraints, a lower density <u>and/or number</u> may be appropriate.	To clarify the approach to preventing unacceptable cumulative impact.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.143	93	Revise 1st sentence: Whilst oil and gas <u>hydrocarbon</u> development has the potential ...	For consistency.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.147	94	Revise text to state: In considering appropriate noise limits at sensitive receptors, operators will as a minimum be expected to meet the suggested <u>required</u> limits set out in the <u>NPPF and</u> national Planning Practice Guidance, with the objective of ensuring a high standard of	To improve consistency with national policy and guidance.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		protection for local amenity. Site lighting ...		
Paragraph 5.148 3rd sentence	94	Although evidence suggests that any earth tremors that could be induced are likely to be of very low magnitude, it <i>It</i> will be important to ensure that development which could give rise to induced seismicity is located in areas of suitable geology.	To more accurately reflect the available evidence.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.149	94	Revise 1st sentence: The potential for emissions to water or air is also a key issue, particularly for proposals involving hydraulic fracturing <u>hydrocarbon development</u> .	To clarify that these issues may also be relevant to other forms of hydrocarbon development.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.151	95	Replace reference in 2nd sentence to DBEIS with <u>Oil and Gas Authority</u>	To correct a factual inaccuracy.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy M18 2) i)	96	Revise text of 2) part i): Following completion of the operational phase of development, or where wells are to be suspended pending further hydrocarbon development, any wells will be decommissioned so as to prevent the risk of any contamination of ground and surface waters and	To more accurately reflect the relevant regulatory requirements relating to decommissioning of	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		emissions to air; and ...	wells.	
Paragraph 5.153	96	Revise 1st sentence: A significant issue with hydrocarbon development, particularly development involving hydraulic fracturing, is the need to manage the various forms of waste water that may be returned to the surface via a borehole. Revise 4th sentence: <u>Water constituting waste and requiring management as waste</u> Such waste can arise in substantial volumes and may contain Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (NORM) and other contaminants.	To clarify that water arising on site may not always constitute waste.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 5.156 16th line	97	Revise text: ... potentially leading to very small scale induced seismic activity (<u>earth tremors</u>). Proposals for this ...	To clarify the position.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy I02 Part 2)	146	<u>In addition</u> , within the City of York area, development of ancillary minerals infrastructure will also <u>only</u> be permitted provided the following criteria are met:	To clarify the position.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy S03 key links to	154	Add reference in key links: <u>W10</u>	To clarify this important link.	Text revision does not affect the SA.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
other policies and objectives				Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 8.30	155	Revise Paragraph 8.30 by inserting new text at end of paragraph: <u><i>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. 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.</i></u>	To emphasise the need for a pragmatic approach to implementing safeguarding requirements.	Text addition does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 8.33	156	Add new text at end of Paragraph 8.33: <u><i>It is recognised that rail transport infrastructure at former mine sites in the Plan area are important for their potential to serve other existing or proposed rail-linked uses. It is not the intention in safeguarding them for minerals and waste transport to prevent other such beneficial uses from taking place but to ensure that their potential significance in providing opportunities for modal shift in</i></u>	To emphasise the need for a pragmatic approach to implementing safeguarding requirements.	Text addition does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<i>transport of minerals and waste is taken into account in other development decisions. 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.</i>		
Paragraph 8.34	156	Add new sentence at end of Paragraph 8.34: <i>The East Coast marine Plan (Policy PS3) supports the protection and expansion of port and harbour capacity.</i>	To emphasise the linkage between marine and terrestrial planning.	Text addition does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 8.47 Safeguarding exemption criteria list	159	Revise 11th bullet point: Applications for development on land which is already allocated in an adopted local plan where the plan took account of minerals, and waste <i>and minerals and waste transport infrastructure</i> safeguarding requirements	To reflect the fact that minerals and waste transport infrastructure is also safeguarded in the plan.	Text addition does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 9.16	164	Revise final sentence: Vehicle movements can have a range of impacts, including cumulative impacts, such as on local amenity and in some cases on the landscape and tranquillity. <i>Air quality can also be adversely affected, particularly in locations where Air Quality Management</i>	To reflect the potential for vehicle movements to impact on air quality.	Identification of Air Quality Management Areas has been undertaken within the SA. Vehicle movements have been considered in relation to air

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<i>Areas have been identified</i> and other development management policies in the Joint Plan will therefore be relevant in some circumstances.		quality impacts. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 9.21	165	Add new text after the end of paragraph 9.21: <i><u>The primary purpose of AONB designation is to conserve and enhance natural beauty. In pursuing the primary purpose of designation, account should be taken of the needs of agriculture, forestry and other rural industries and of the economic and social needs of communities. Particular regard should be paid to promoting sustainable forms of social and economic development that in themselves conserve and enhance the environment. Recreation is not an objective of designation, but the demand for recreation should be met so far as this is consistent with the conservation of natural beauty and the needs of agriculture, forestry and other uses.</u></i>	To further clarify the purposes of AONB designation.	Text addition does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Paragraph 9.42	171	Add new sentence at end of paragraph 9.42: <i><u>In some parts of the Plan area, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in other local plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to a proposal which falls to be determined by the relevant minerals and waste planning authority, regard will be had to the</u></i>	To reflect the presence of other potentially relevant designations in district local plans and to ensure that	Local landscape designations have been considered within the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
		<u>requirements of any associated local plan policy.</u>	appropriate links are made.	
Policy D05 part 1)	167	Proposals for minerals and waste development within the York and West Yorkshire Green Belts will be supported where it would <u>be consistent with the purposes of Green Belt identified in national policy including</u> preserve the openness of the Green Belt and, where the development would be located within the York Green Belt, would preserve the historic character and setting of York.	To more closely reflect the requirements of national policy.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy D05 part 2) 2nd paragraph	168	Substantial weight will be given to any harm to the Green Belt and inappropriate waste development in the Green Belt will only be permitted in very special circumstances, which must <u>will need to be demonstrated by the applicant in which the harm by reason of inappropriateness, or any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. order to outweigh harm caused by inappropriateness, or any other harm.</u>	To more closely reflect the requirements of national policy.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Policy D10 1) i)	183	Replace existing text of D10 1) i) with: <u>Applicants are encouraged to discuss proposals at an early stage with local communities and other relevant stakeholders and where practicable reflect the outcome of those discussions in submitted schemes.</u>	To more closely reflect the requirements of national policy.	Text revision does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, Appendix 1				
1st Column text: Estimated date of commencem ent	140	Revise this text to read: Estimated d <u>Date</u> of commencement	To reflect that the planning permission for this development has been implemented.	Clarification does not affect the SA score. Screened out – no further SA required.
2nd Column text relating to date of commencem ent	140	Revise this text to read: By April 2017 (base on requirement for implementation specified in decision notice for planning application 12/03385/FULM) <u>November 2016</u>	To reflect that the planning permission for this development has been implemented.	Clarification does not affect the SA score. Screened out – no further SA required.
Minerals and Waste Joint Plan, Appendix 2				
Southmoor Energy Centre safeguarded site	179	Revise plan to only show core site and principal access to the highway	To reflect the fact that there are proposals for other development on the former Kellingley Colliery site.	Clarification does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Knapton	186	Revise reference to facility type to: Composting, <i>transfer, treatment</i>	To more accurately	Clarification does not affect the

Policy Ref/ Paragraph Number/ Reference point	Page Number	Change Proposed	Reason	Sustainability Appraisal Screening
Quarry safeguarded site Facility Type		<u>and recycling</u>	reflect the current role of the site.	SA. Screened out – no further SA required.
Safeguarded waste sites		Insert new safeguarded waste transfer (non-hazardous) site: <u>Showfield Lane, Malton.</u>	To reflect the significant role currently played by this site in the Ryedale area.	Clarification does not affect the SA. Screened out – no further SA required.

Appendix 2 – Updated SFRA

MJP21 Land at Killerby

DRAFT

Appendix 3 – Updated Historic Impact Assessment

MJP21 Land at Killerby

DRAFT