

# **1 Response Paper – Spatial Portrait and Key Mineral Planning Issues**

## **Purpose of Spatial Portrait and Key Mineral Planning Issues**

- 1.1 The Spatial Portrait and Key Mineral Planning Issues sets out the spatial context for the MLP by providing a summary of the plan area characteristics and facts of Essex which have an influence on future minerals and minerals related development.

## **Summary of Amendments Prior to March 2021 Regulation 18 (Reg 18) Consultation**

- The introductory paragraph updated to explain the purpose of this chapter in greater depth
- Numerous statistical and factual references amended to bring the plan up to date, remove historical references and update planning context
- Several unnecessary contextual references proposed to be removed
- Transport infrastructure and environment sections of the Spatial Portrait updated, include references to transshipment facilities, environmental protection, the Green Belt and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- A new climate issues section added, Maps 2 and 3 replaced
- Figure 1 and supporting text updated with more recent statistics
- References to 'Key Centres' replaced with 'current major growth location'
- Bullet points added to provide up to date information around major infrastructure schemes
- Proposed amendments to remove information that is reported on annually through the Local Aggregate Assessment

## **Impact of Revisions to NPPF 2021**

- 1.2 None of the amendments made to the NPPF in July 2021 had an effect on the Spatial Portrait and Key Mineral Planning Issues section of the MLP.

## **Summary of Issues Raised through March 2021 Reg 18 Consultation**

- The need to revise and update references to planning and land designations
- The definition of sustainable development as it relates to the MLP
- Reference to Joint Strategic Planning
- Making Reference to the Quality of Mineral Deposits
- Making Reference to major freight routes
- Accuracy of data/information presented
- Waste targets

- The sustainable use of materials and harvesting of reused material is not adequately discussed
- Restoration

### **Addressing Issues Arising Out of March 2021 Reg 18 Consultation**

- 1.3 This section acts to address the issues raised through the March 2021 Regulation 18 Consultation in relation to this policy, as set out above, and subsequently details any changes in approach made through their consideration. These changes of approach will be incorporated within The Draft Essex Minerals Local Plan 2025-2040 Regulation 18 document which will again be subjected to a Regulation 18 public consultation.
- 1.4 There now follows a discussion of each of the main issues raised in relation to this Plan section:

#### The need to revise and update references to planning and land designations

The Environment section of the Spatial Portrait is proposed to be updated to include reference to Local Geological Sites (LoGS). Through amendments prior to the March 2021 Reg 18 consultation this section of the Spatial Portrait was updated to include reference to Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS) to provide further environmental context. Therefore, to include reference to LoGS only enhances this context further.

- 1.5 Prior to the March 2021 Reg 18 consultation the Environment section of the Spatial Portrait was updated to reference Priority habitats and Priority Species. Through the consultation it was stated that definitions of these terms should be included in the MLP. It is proposed that these definitions will be added to the Glossary. Through the consultation a question was raised in relation to what constituted the 'coastline'. The Ordnance Survey confirmed the definition and as such the third bullet point under this section of the Spatial Portrait will be updated as follows, "Much of the 480 562-mile-long coastline (excluding shorelines along the various river estuaries) is of international/ national biodiversity importance.
- 1.6 Previously the plan was amended to update references around AONB's, however, through the consultation it has been noted that this information was inaccurate. The MLP refers to the "Heaths and Coast" AONB whereas this should be "Coast and Heaths". This is proposed to be corrected in the Environment section of the Spatial Portrait and paragraph 2.12. It was also noted that Map 2 in the MLP (Spatial Portrait of Greater Essex) does not show the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB boundary which now extends into Tending. This is proposed to be updated.
- 1.7 The Environment section of the Spatial Portrait was updated to provide further environmental context around protected landscapes prior to the March 2021 Reg 18 consultation. Through the consultation it was noted that the term "safeguard landscapes" should be substituted with the term "protected

landscapes” as this term is better understood. The MWPA agree with this and therefore propose to change this reference.

- 1.8 Through the consultation it was suggested that ‘Economic growth’ throughout the MLP refers to the construction industry and does not consider the lasting impacts on the leisure and tourism sectors of the economy. Paragraph 1.9 (1.10) of the MLP states that “The Plan has a central role in supporting economic growth in the County through the delivery of land, buildings and infrastructure to meet our future needs. At the same time, it ensures positive steps are taken to protect and enhance the County’s unique natural, historic and environmental assets and resources. It also has a key role to play in supporting the strong, vibrant and healthy communities in Essex to make them sustainable for the future.”. Therefore, reference to economic growth throughout the plan considers the lasting economic, social, and environmental impacts.
- 1.9 Through the consultation it was stated that reference to Bulmer and Marker Tey Brickworks were not consistent in paragraph 2.26. It is proposed to amend this reference to uphold consistency.

#### The Definition of Sustainable Development as it Relates to the MLP

- 1.10 It was suggested through the consultation that the word sustainable in this section only refers to the extraction industry and not the environment. This is not agreed with. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that ‘Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives)’. These objectives are stated as being economic, social, and environmental in nature. At Paragraph 209, the NPPF states that ‘It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs’. Policies in the MLP therefore act to allocate sufficient mineral to support economic development whilst also seeking to both minimise the social and environmental impact of its working, and ensure that social and environmental benefits are returned through restoration.
- 1.11 The sustainability of the plan was questioned through the consultation due to a proposed flood scheme that would be delivered through further extraction at Bradwell Quarry. Whilst ECC notes the comments received, they are not related to a site being proposed for allocation as part of this review and therefore they fall outside of the scope of the Regulation 18 consultation for the Minerals Local Plan review. Any application submitted to work a site that is not allocated as a Preferred Site in the Minerals Local Plan will be assessed against the relevant policy framework in the adopted Minerals Local Plan, particularly Policy S6, at the point of an application being submitted. A specific public consultation exercise on that application would subsequently form part of the determination process.

### Reference to Joint Strategic Planning

1.12 Through the Regulation 18 Consultation 2021 it was raised that the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) are reviewing their approach on Joint Strategic Plans and may proceed with a non-statutory strategic planning framework rather than a statutory strategic plan. Therefore, it is proposed to amend paragraph 2.18 to reference other statutory/non-statutory planning frameworks to recognise that there are a number of potential delivery vehicles for joint planning. As a result of this amendment, paragraph 2.16, Strategic Objective 1 (1b), criteria C and criteria F of the Spatial Vision will also be updated.

### Making Reference to the Quality of Mineral Deposits

1.13 Paragraph 2.22 of the MLP sets out a list of characteristics of the sand and gravel resources in Essex. It was suggested through the Reg 18 consultation that reference should be made to the high quality of the mineral deposits, such as those found at Colemans Farm Quarry. However, it is not considered to be appropriate for the MLP to make such a locally specific reference to a particular site in the list in paragraph 2.22.

### Making Reference to Major Freight Routes

1.14 Through the consultation it was suggested that paragraph 2.35 could be significantly improved by clear identification of the major freight routes such as A12 and A120. However, it is not considered appropriate for the MLP to refer to specific freight routes. Policy S11 states that "Planning applications for new minerals development proposals or proposals that generate traffic impact and/or an increase in traffic movements, shall be accompanied by a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement. Policy S11 also includes a hierarchy of preference in relation to vehicle movements associated with mineral working. In summary, this sets out that only certain roads are appropriate for HGV traffic and the Highway Authority has defined a main road network where such traffic is acceptable. Therefore, the most appropriate route will be assessed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the route hierarchy (as set out in the Highways Development Management Policies (February 2011) or future replacement.

### Accuracy of Data/Information

1.15 The accuracy around housing numbers shows in Figure 1 (Housing Growth as committed to in adopted and emerging Local Plans at April 2019) in the MLP were questioned through the consultation. It was stated that since April 2019, proposed garden communities in Uttlesford District as well as those for Colchester/Braintree Borders, and West of Braintree, have all subsequently been removed from the spatial strategy. This is noted by the MWPA and Figure 1 and supporting text are proposed to be amended to bring this up to

date. As a result of these changes, it has been questioned whether the annualised plan provision should be lowered. Information around the annualised plan provision and apportionment figure is discussed in detail under XXX.

- 1.16 It has been recognised that the occurrence of chalk has been poorly described in paragraph 2.29. It is proposed that paragraph 2.29 and the bullet points that follow will be updated to correct this. This includes referencing that much of the chalk deposits are overlain by London Clay and younger deposits. Amendments are proposed to this section to capture the information provided to the MWPA with regards to chalk deposits other than where this related to Thurrock, as Thurrock is outside of the MLP Plan area.

### Waste Targets

- 1.17 Comments received through the consultation stated that the plan does not adequately explore or create reuse targets for materials which would otherwise go to landfill or be incinerated. It was suggested that a new term is included, “recovered or reconstituted gravel and bulk construction materials”. The MWPA notes that Policy S4 in the MLP is proposed to be amended such that it requires that ‘all development proposals shall demonstrate that mineral waste is minimised and that minerals on development/ redevelopment sites are re-used and recycled. Policy S4 currently requires the application of sustainable procurement policies which promote sustainable design and construction in proposed development. Policy S5 seeks to establish a network of aggregate recycling sites. Table 6 Monitoring Framework, Indicator 1, in the WLP monitors waste arisings against National Waste targets. National waste targets can be found in the Waste Management Plan for England (January 2021) and these, or any future replacement, will be accommodated as part of a review of the WLP as appropriate.

### The sustainable use of materials and harvesting of reused material is not adequately discussed

- 1.18 Through the consultation it was noted that there is a predetermined position on the continued approval of construction techniques rich in mineral use in preference to sustainable materials. For example, timber is not adequately discussed. With regards to the request for the MWPA to explore alternative building materials or trial new technologies, this is outside of the remit of what the MLP can achieve. The role of the MLP is to make sustainable provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals, as required by the NPPF, and this amount is determined by the market. The MLP has a stated aim of seeking to ‘reduce reliance on primary mineral resources’, which the MWPA is able to do by making alternative materials more readily available and economically attractive by promoting a network of aggregate recycling facilities and subsequently safeguarding them (Policy S5, Policy S8/ emerging Policy S9), such that the ‘demand’ for primary minerals is reduced through the provision of economically viable alternatives. The MLP cannot however artificially suppress

demand by not making sufficient provision for the demand or banning the use of minerals in construction or requiring the use of certain technologies or materials.

- 1.19 It was recommended that it would optimise recovery and minimise new mineral extraction if the plan included targeting and harvesting of reused minerals from demolition or salvaged and removed from incineration and landfill for new building materials. It is however noted that the MWPA requires a Site Waste Management Plan for all major developments which is required to set out conditions to prepare an appropriately detailed waste management strategy. These are expected to ensure that as much waste is recovered and re-used on-site as possible, and that any residual waste is managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible. Policy S4 sets out this requirement and seeks to ensure the sustainable procurement of minerals to also minimise waste.
- 1.20 However, the determining authority for most building projects is the local district. The MLP is restricted to ensuring that sufficient aggregate recycling capacity is available across the county.

### Restoration

- 1.21 A response received though the consultation stated that a failure of the outgoing plan is the use of ex-quarry workings facilitating incineration and highly damaging environmental activities rather than, for example, farmland. The MWPA notes that numerous mineral sites across Essex have been restored at the earliest opportunity to an acceptable environmental condition to support beneficial after-uses, with positive benefits to the environment, biodiversity and/ or local communities (Policy S12 of the MLP). Amendments are currently proposed to link restoration schemes to local plan objectives to maximise those benefits. The most recent report at the time of writing of the 'Minerals Monitoring Indicator 11: Amount of land newly restored for habitat creation' can be found in the Interim Essex Authority Monitoring Report: Minerals 2021 on ECC's website. This shows that there has been significant progress towards the target of delivering 200ha of priority habitat from mineral site restoration across Essex. The specific site mentioned, Rivenhall, does overlap with past areas of mineral working. The Rivenhall integrated waste management facility (IWWMF) was granted permission following a call in Public Inquiry in 2009 and the site is now allocated for Waste Management in the Waste Local Plan (WLP) adopted in 2017. The WLP was subject to full public consultation and an Examination in Public. All Local Plans, including site allocations, are subject to a public consultation ahead of implementation.

### Conclusion

- 1.22 Respondents were broadly in agreement with the suggested amendments to the Spatial Portrait and Key Mineral Planning Issues with most responses received although this was contingent on the need to additionally clarify elements of the amendments. Most of the accepted amendments related to

revisions and updates in relation to the terminology within the plan. Further amendments were proposed to amend references to joint strategic plans, housing growth figures and the extent of chalk deposits.

- 1.23 Some proposed amendments are not proposed to be incorporated. These include locally specific references to the potential quality of specific mineral deposits, and major freight routes which were not considered to be appropriate to appear to lend additional weight to.
- 1.24 A response was received that considered that the MLP would not result in sustainable development as it was too focussed on the economic delivery of minerals to support the construction industry. This is not agreed with. The MWPA considers that policies in the MLP act to allocate sufficient mineral to promote economic growth whilst also seeking to both minimise the social and environmental impact of the working of minerals and ensure that social and environmental benefits are returned through restoration.
- 1.25 It was further requested that reference was made to waste targets, but it is noted that the MLP takes a policy stance of minerals, including construction and demolition waste, as primarily being a resource. It is the separate Waste Local Plan which contains policies to manage 'waste' and which will adopt relevant targets as part of its review.

**Table 1 - Schedule of Proposed Amendments to the Spatial Portrait following March 2021 Regulation 18 Consultation on MLP Review**

Old Ref	New Ref	Proposed Amendment
2.26	2.26	Brick clay is currently used in the small-scale manufacture of bricks, roof tiles and clay materials, at two sites in Essex, namely Bulmer Brickworks in north Essex and Marks Tey <u>Brickworks</u> , west of Colchester.
2.18	2.18	<u>However, given the relatively recent moves towards joint working and the production of joint strategic plans and/or other statutory/non-statutory planning frameworks, it may no longer be the case that districts seek to provide for the collective need for housing across the County on an individual basis.</u>
Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	<u>These protected areas are supported by a network of sites of county/ district value for nature conservation which are known as Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS) and Local Geological Sites (LoGS).</u>
2.29	2.29	Chalk <u>underlies the whole of Essex although over much of the area it is overlain by London Clay and younger deposits.</u> <del>is one of the mainstays of 'solid geology' under Essex and</del> <u>It is</u> the oldest rock exposed at the surface. The chalk resources in Essex are: - <u>Present</u> under the <u>whole surface of Essex</u> but outcrops only in the north west, particularly in Uttlesford District.
Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	Much of the <del>180</del> <u>375</u> -mile-long coastline <u>(excluding shorelines along the various river estuaries)</u> is of international/-national biodiversity importance.
Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	There are also two AONB's <u>in the plan area; located at the</u> Dedham Vale on the Essex and Suffolk border and Suffolk Heaths and Coast <u>and Heaths which extends from the north bank of the river Stour in Tendring, to Kessingland in East Suffolk.</u> These protected areas are supported by a network of sites of county value for nature conservation which are known as

		Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS).
Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	There <del>is one</del> are two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) at Dedham Vale in the north east <u>and Suffolk Coast and Heaths, which has been extended (2020) along the south side of the Stour estuary.</u>
2.12	2.12	Dedham Vale in north Essex/ south Suffolk <u>and Suffolk Coast and Heaths</u> <del>is</del> are the <del>only</del> <u>two</u> designated AONB's in the County.
Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	Environment Section of Spatial Portrait	<u>Protection of the environment is a key objective with significant areas of land designated as protected landscapes, open spaces, and areas of ecological, historical and geological value.</u>
Figure 1 – Indicative Housing Growth in Essex up to 2031	Figure 1 – Indicative Housing Growth as committed to in adopted and emerging Local Plans at [date]	Figure 1 Housing Growth as committed to in adopted and emerging Local Plans at April 2019 and supporting text will be amended to bring this up to date. This includes any future need projections that these figures were based on.

**Table 2 - April 2021 Regulation 18 Consultation Responses to the Spatial Portrait**

ORGANISATION	ON BEHALF OF	SPATIAL PORTRAIT AND KEY MINERAL PLANNING ISSUES	SPATIAL PORTRAIT AND KEY MINERAL PLANNING ISSUES	ECC RESPONSE
Name of Organisation	Are you responding on behalf of another individual or organisation? - If Yes, Who?	1.Do you agree or disagree with the proposed amendments as set out in this section of the emerging Minerals Local Plan?	Please provide any comments and/or alternative wording for this section of the Plan below:	
Runwell Parish Council (631132323)	Runwell Parish Council	Agree	N/a	N/A
W H Collier Limited (769297167/ 942768790)		Agree (but wish to clarify)	2.26 "namely Bulmer Brickworks in north Essex and Marks Tey, west of Colchester"  - Should read namely Bulmer Brickworks in North Essex and Marks Tey Brickworks , west of Colchester OR namely Bulmer in North Essex and Marks Tey west of Colchester.	Paragraph 2.26 will be amended as follows, "Brick clay is currently used in the small-scale manufacture of bricks, roof tiles and clay materials, at two sites in Essex, namely Bulmer Brickworks in north Essex and Marks Tey <u>Brickworks</u> , west of Colchester."
Thurrock Borough	Thurrock	Agree (but	Amendments to paragraph	Paragraph 2.18 will be

<p>Council (97704900)</p>	<p>borough Council</p>	<p>wish to clarify)</p>	<p>2.18 ( and any similar proposed amendments in the draft Mineral Local Plan as Amended) refers to "...production of Joint Strategic Plans,.." being prepared in areas of Essex.</p> <p>The Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) is reviewing its approach on this matter and may proceed with a non-statutory strategic planning framework rather than a statutory strategic plan. Such an approach will be kept under review and also subject to any future government intentions with regard to the future of joint working and strategic planning.</p> <p>Essex County Council may wish to keep this matter under review in the preparation of this draft plan and reflect any changes to the description of joint working between authorities in later stages of the plan preparation.</p>	<p>amended as follows,  <u>"However, given the relatively recent moves towards joint working and the production of joint strategic plans and/or other statutory/non-statutory planning frameworks, it may no longer be the case that districts seek to provide for the collective need for housing across the County on an individual basis."</u> Paragraph 2.16, Strategic Objective 1 (1b), criteria C and criteria F of the Spatial Vision will also be updated.</p>
<p>GeoEssex (538324742)</p>		<p>Agree (but wish to clarify)</p>	<p>2.1 Environment Add LoGS to last section</p>	<p>The Environment section of the Spatial Portrait will be updated as follows, <u>"These protected</u></p>

				<p><u>areas are supported by a network of sites of county/district value for nature conservation which are known as Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS) and Local Geological Sites (LoGS)."</u></p>
			<p>2,29 The occurrence of Chalk is poorly describe and does not use proper geological terms.</p> <p>suggest amendment as below:</p> <p>2.29 Chalk underlies the whole of Essex. Over much of the area it is overlain by London Clay and younger deposits. It is the oldest rock exposed at the surface. Chalk is everywhere under Essex. It outcrops only in the north west – Uttlesford District. (in the extreme south the outcrop is in Thurrock only.)</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.29 will be amended as follows, "Chalk <u>underlies the whole of Essex although over much of the area it is overlain by London Clay and younger deposits.</u> <del>is one of the mainstays of 'solid geology' under Essex and</del> <u>It</u> is the oldest rock exposed at the surface. The chalk resources in Essex are: - <u>Present</u> under the <u>whole surface of Essex</u> but outcrops only in the north west, particularly in Uttlesford District."</p> <p>Thurrock is not part of the administrative area of Essex and is not covered by the Minerals Local Plan. As such it would not be appropriate to mention Thurrock's geology in the spatial portrait.</p>
Blackwater Aggregates		Agree (but wish to clarify)	The table presented within section 2.0 Spatial Portrait and	The MWPA have been in contact with the Ordnance

(623162177)			<p>Key Minerals Planning Issues, Essex at a Glance, 2.1, Environment, states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the <del>480</del> <u>350</u>-mile-long coastline is of international/national biodiversity importance</li> </ul> <p>It would be advisable to define “coastline”. The amendment suggests that Essex has a 350 mile-long coastline. Does the revised figure also include shorelines along the various river estuaries upstream from the coast?</p> <p>In addition, it is suggested that the “27 Priority habitats (four of which are marine) and over 350 Priority” species are presented within an Appendix, or the terms “Priority habitats and Priority species” are defined within the Glossary.</p>	<p>Survey to confirm what the coastline includes. Therefore, the third bullet point under the ‘Environment’ section of the Spatial Portrait will be updated as follows, “Much of the <del>480</del> <u>375</u>-mile-long coastline <u>(excluding shorelines along the various river estuaries)</u> is of international/-national biodiversity importance.</p> <p>A definition of Priority Habitats and Priority Species will be added to the Glossary.</p>
CEMEX (982058282)		Agree (but wish to clarify)	<p>The table presented within section 2.0 Spatial Portrait and Key Minerals Planning Issues, Essex at a Glance, 2.1, Environment, states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the <del>480</del> <u>350</u>-mile-</li> </ul>	<p>The MWPA have been in contact with the Ordnance Survey to confirm what the coastline includes. Therefore, the third bullet point under the ‘Environment’ section of the Spatial Portrait will be updated</p>

			<p>long coastline is of international/national biodiversity importance</p> <p>It would be advisable to define “coastline”. The amendment suggests that Essex has a 350 mile-long coastline. Does the revised figure also include shorelines along the various river estuaries upstream from the coast?</p> <p>In addition, it is suggested that the “27 Priority habitats (four of which are marine) and over 350 Priority” species are presented within an Appendix, or the terms “Priority habitats and Priority species” are defined within the Glossary.</p>	<p>as follows, “Much of the <del>480</del> <u>375</u>-mile-long coastline <u>(excluding shorelines along the various river estuaries)</u> is of international/-national biodiversity importance.</p> <p>A definition of Priority Habitats and Priority Species will be added to the Glossary.</p>
<p>Gent Fairhead Aggregates (871678397)</p>		<p>Agree (but wish to clarify)</p>	<p>The table presented within section 2.0 Spatial Portrait and Key Minerals Planning Issues, Essex at a Glance, 2.1, Environment, states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the <del>480</del> <u>350</u>-mile-long coastline is of international/national biodiversity importance</li> </ul> <p>It would be advisable to define</p>	<p>The MWPA have been in contact with the Ordnance Survey to confirm what the coastline includes. Therefore, the third bullet point under the ‘Environment’ section of the Spatial Portrait will be updated as follows, “Much of the <del>480</del> <u>375</u>-mile-long coastline <u>(excluding shorelines along the various river estuaries)</u> is of international/-national</p>

			<p>“coastline”. The amendment suggests that Essex has a 350 mile-long coastline. Does the revised figure also include shorelines along the various river estuaries upstream from the coast?</p> <p>In addition, it is suggested that the “27 Priority habitats (four of which are marine) and over 350 Priority” species are presented within an Appendix, or the terms “Priority habitats and Priority species” are defined within the Glossary.</p>	<p>biodiversity importance.</p> <p>A definition of Priority Habitats and Priority Species will be added to the Glossary.</p>
David L Walker Ltd (559449615)	Brice Aggregates	Agree (but wish to clarify)	<p>Section 1 of the document confirms that increasing populations are driving growth in housing and infrastructure provision, which will need to be underpinned by the supply of minerals. Section 1 recognises the wealth of mineral resources found within the county, and the importance in particular of sand and gravel supply in meeting construction materials demand.</p>	Noted
			<p>Section 2 of the plan provides a detailed update to the spatial portrait provided as part of the Minerals Local Plan adopted in</p>	Noted

			<p>2014. This section does recognise major infrastructure schemes that will form an important component in driving minerals demand for the remainder of the plan period. The section also recognises the need for flexibility to take account of changes in timing in the delivery of the infrastructure schemes as well changes in the distribution and delivery of housing. This flexibility is wholly supported by BAL.</p>	
			<p>Paragraph 2.22 of the plan seeks to set out the positive aspects of the sand and gravel resources within the county. This does not appear to make reference to the high quality of the mineral deposits. For example, the operations at Colemans Farm Quarry work a deposit that has very low levels of silt; high stone content; and very low levels of overburden resulting in a lower carbon footprint of minerals produced relative to other sites. Day to day this translates to less water use in production cycles and better</p>	<p>It is not considered to be appropriate for the MLP to make such a locally specific reference to a particular site in the list in paragraph 2.22.</p>

			<p>energy efficiency. The quality of the minerals within the county is an important character that should be positively highlighted.</p>	
			<p>This section goes onto address the aggregates transported within the county using heavy goods vehicles. However, it is suggested that this content could be significantly improved by clear identification of the major freight routes such as A12 and A120. These transport assets enable mineral producers to export the sand and gravel products across a wide geographical area on an economically sustainable basis and is a key component in minerals supply in the county.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate for the MLP to refer to specific freight routes. Policy S11 states that “<u>Planning applications for new minerals development proposals or proposals that generate traffic impact and/or an increase in traffic movements, shall be accompanied by a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement</u>”. Policy S11 also includes a hierarchy of preference in relation to vehicle movements associated with mineral working. In summary, this sets out that only certain roads are appropriate for HGV traffic and the Highway Authority has defined a main road network where such traffic is acceptable. Therefore, the most appropriate route will be assessed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the route hierarchy (as set out in the Highways Development</p>

				Management Policies (February 2011) or future replacement.
Resident (850344129)		Agree (but wish to clarify)	<p>The table presented within section 2.0 Spatial Portrait and Key Minerals Planning Issues, Essex at a Glance, 2.1, Environment, states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the <del>480</del> <u>350</u>-mile-long coastline is of international/national biodiversity importance</li> </ul> <p>It would be advisable to define “coastline”. The amendment suggests that Essex has a 350 mile-long coastline. Does the revised figure also include shorelines along the various river estuaries upstream from the coast?</p> <p>In addition, it is suggested that the “27 Priority habitats (four of which are marine) and over 350 Priority” species are presented within an Appendix, or the terms “Priority habitats and Priority species” are</p>	<p>The MWPA have been in contact with the Ordnance Survey to confirm what the coastline includes. Therefore, the third bullet point under the ‘Environment’ section of the Spatial Portrait will be updated as follows, “Much of the <del>480</del> <u>375</u>-mile-long coastline <u>(excluding shorelines along the various river estuaries)</u> is of international/-national biodiversity importance.</p> <p>A definition of Priority Habitats and Priority Species will be added to the Glossary.</p>

			defined within the Glossary.	
Coggeshall Parish Council (598729813)	Coggeshall parish council	Disagree (please clarify)	The area under question is within the Coggeshall boundary. At this moment Coggeshall has suffered the impact of quarries up to the South East flank of Coggeshall. The plan is to expand on the quarry already in use. The desire is to excavate the land to the south of the River Blackwater. This is also in conjunction with a proposed flood dam. This is not wanted The word sustainable in this section means the extraction industry and not the environment.	Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that 'Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives)'. These objectives are stated as being economic, social and environmental in nature. At Paragraph 209, the NPPF states that 'It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs'. Policies in the MLP therefore act to allocate sufficient mineral whilst also seeking to both minimise the social and environmental impact of its working and ensure that social and environmental benefits are returned through restoration.  Whilst ECC notes the

				<p>comments received, they are not related to a site being proposed for allocation as part of this review and therefore they fall outside of the scope of the Regulation 18 consultation for the Minerals Local Plan review. Any application submitted to work a site that is not allocated as a Preferred Site in the Minerals Local Plan will be assessed against the relevant policy framework in the adopted Minerals Local Plan, particularly Policy S6, at the point of an application being submitted. A specific public consultation exercise on that application would subsequently form part of the determination process.</p>
			<p>Economic growth throughout this document refers to the construction industry (roads, houses etc) and does not consider the lasting impact on the leisure and tourism sectors of the economy which are significantly more sustainable.</p>	<p>The Plan Introduction, paragraph 1.9 (1.10), states that “The Plan has a central role in supporting economic growth in the County through aiding the delivery of land, buildings and infrastructure to meet our future needs across all sectors. At the same time, it ensures positive steps are taken to protect and enhance the County’s unique natural,</p>

				<p>historic and environmental assets and resources. It also has a key role to play in supporting the strong, vibrant and healthy communities in Essex to make them sustainable for the future, in particular through its restoration policies.”. Therefore, economic growth is balanced against social, and environmental impacts. It is also noted that this is a Minerals Local Plan. District and Borough Local Plans take a more holistic approach to supporting leisure and tourism.</p>
			<p>The plan touches on but does not adequately explore or create reuse targets for materials which would otherwise go to landfill or be incinerated e.g. <a href="http://www.macrebur.com">www.macrebur.com</a> (plastic roads) – suggest a new term is included “recovered or reconstituted gravel and bulk construction materials”</p>	<p>Policy S4 in the MLP is proposed to be amended such that it requires that ‘all development proposals shall demonstrate that mineral waste is minimised and that minerals on development/ redevelopment sites are re-used and recycled. Policy S4 currently requires the application of sustainable procurement policies which promote sustainable design and construction in proposed development. Policy S5 seeks to establish a network of</p>

				<p>aggregate recycling sites.</p> <p>The MLP takes a policy stance of minerals, including construction and demolition waste, as primarily being a resource. Such waste is converted into recycled aggregate, which becomes a resource, at aggregate recycling facilities as supported through the aforementioned Policy S5. It is the separate Waste Local Plan which contains policies to manage 'waste'. Table 6 Monitoring Framework, Indicator 1, in the WLP monitors waste arisings against National Waste targets. National waste targets can be found in the Waste Management Plan for England (January 2021) and these, or any future replacement, will be accommodated as part of a review of the WLP as appropriate.</p>
			<p>There is a predetermined position on the continued approval of construction techniques rich in mineral use in preference to sustainable materials e.g. timber is not</p>	<p>With regards to the request for the MWPA to explore alternative building materials or trial new technologies, this is outside of the remit of what the MLP can achieve. The role of</p>

			adequately discussed.	the MLP is to make sustainable provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals, as required by the NPPF, and this amount is determined by the market. The MLP has a stated aim of seeking to 'reduce reliance on primary mineral resources', which the MWPA is able to do by making alternative materials more readily available and economically attractive by promoting a network of aggregate recycling facilities and subsequently safeguarding them (Policy S5, Policy S8/ emerging Policy S9), such that the 'demand' for primary minerals is reduced through the provision of economically viable alternatives. The MLP cannot however artificially suppress demand by not making sufficient provision for the demand or banning the use of minerals in construction or requiring the use of certain technologies or materials.
			The targeting and harvesting of reused minerals from demolition OR salvaged and	The MWPA requires a Site Waste Management Plan for all major developments which

			<p>removed from incineration and landfill for new building materials is not developed in this paper or targeted and would optimise recovery and minimise new mineral extraction.</p>	<p>is required to set out conditions to prepare an appropriately detailed waste management strategy. These are expected to ensure that as much waste is recovered and re-used on-site as possible, and that any residual waste is managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible. Policy S4 sets out this requirement and seeks to ensure the sustainable procurement of minerals to also minimise waste.</p> <p>However, the determining authority for most building projects is the local district. The MLP is restricted to ensuring that sufficient aggregate recycling capacity is available across the county.</p>
			<p>“recovered or reconstituted gravel and bulk construction materials” is not adequately defined. This is essential in order for recovery sites to be identified / supported and measures and reuse targets to be applied meaningfully vrs new raw minerals extraction.</p>	<p>The MLP has a stated aim of seeking to ‘reduce reliance on primary mineral resources’, which the MWPA is able to do by making alternative materials more readily available and economically attractive by promoting a network of aggregate recycling facilities and subsequently safeguarding them (Policy S5,</p>

				<p>Policy S8/ emerging Policy S9), such that the 'demand' for primary minerals is reduced through the provision of economically viable alternatives.</p> <p>It is the separate Waste Local Plan which contains policies to manage 'waste'. Table 6 Monitoring Framework, Indicator 1, in the WLP monitors waste arisings against National Waste targets. National waste targets can be found in the Waste Management Plan for England (January 2021) and these, or any future replacement, will be accommodated as part of a review of the WLP as appropriate.</p> <p>There is no need for the MWPA to set waste targets as there is already a need to meet these National waste Targets. These, or any future replacement, will be accommodated as part of a review of the WLP as appropriate.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>A failure of the outgoing plan is the use of ex quarry workings to facilitate incineration and highly damaging environmental activities “re-use” – through allowing progressive changes ECC has given in to sustained land owner pressure e.g Rivenhall not restored to farmland or even a small local Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) it is now likely to be the 3rd largest incinerator in the UK at 600,000 tonnes a year with no anaerobic digestion or recycling. It is a strategic Waste management site in this paper but now just a HUGE incinerator.</p>	<p>Numerous mineral sites across Essex have been restored at the earliest opportunity to an acceptable environmental condition to beneficial after-uses, with positive benefits to the environment, biodiversity and/ or local communities (Policy S12 of the MLP). Amendments are currently proposed to link restoration schemes to local plan objectives to maximise those benefits. The most recent report at the time of writing of the ‘Minerals Monitoring Indicator 11: Amount of land newly restored for habitat creation’ can be found in the Interim Essex Authority Monitoring Report: Minerals 2021 on ECC’s <a href="#">website</a>. This shows that there has been significant progress towards the target of delivering 200ha of priority habitat from mineral site restoration across Essex. The specific site mentioned, Rivenhall, does overlap with past areas of mineral working. The Rivenhall IWMF was granted permission following a call in Public Inquiry in 2009</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				and the site is now allocated for Waste Management in the Waste Local Plan (WLP) adopted in 2017. The WLP was subject to full public consultation and an Examination in Public.
			All the sites are road dependent creating mineral miles.	Minerals development differs from other forms of development because minerals can only be worked where they occur. However, it is proposed that Policy S11 of the MLP is amended to state that “where the movement of minerals are by road, HGV movements shall not generate unacceptable impacts on highways safety, highways capacity and air quality (particularly in relation to any potential breaches of National Air Quality Objectives and impacts on any Air Quality Management Areas).”.
CPRE Essex (665562826)		Disagree (please clarify)	Accurate housing numbers are central to the role of the MLP in providing for sufficient supply. However, the future	Figure 1 Housing Growth as committed to in adopted and emerging Local Plans at April 2019 and supporting text will

			<p>housing requirement baseline date of April 2019 means that the figures are out of date and misleading. Proposed garden communities in Uttlesford District as well as those for Colchester/Braintree Borders and West of Braintree have all subsequently been thrown out by Planning Inspectors and removed from the spatial strategy.</p> <p>In addition, the more recent ONS housing projections are suggesting considerably lower levels of requirement than reflected in the Government's housing targets.</p> <p>As a result, it seems totally unnecessary to insist on continuing with such an unrealistically high target for sand and gravel extraction. The annualised plan provision - which stands at 22.3% above the 3 year sales average - therefore needs to be revised downwards.</p>	<p>be amended to bring this up to date. This includes any future need projections that these figures were based on.</p> <p>The removal of Garden Communities themselves had no impact on the need for additional housing, the Inspector thought that those particular mechanisms for the delivery of those houses was not appropriate for the reasons they set out in the Inspectors Report into the Examination in Public on those Plans.</p> <p>The Regulation 18 Consultation on the MLP Review was supported by a document entitled 'Other Relevant Local Information to Justify Aggregate Provision in Essex 2012-2029, 2021' (Aggregate Provision Paper) which was published as part of the evidence base supporting the consultation. The assessment carried out by this paper in relation to future housing need was based on the Standard Method.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>The NPPF expects strategic policy-making authorities to follow the standard method as outlined in Planning Practice Guidance for assessing local housing need.</p> <p>From Paragraph 3.14 onwards, the Aggregate Provision Paper compares current rates of housing delivery with future delivery rates which would be required under the Standard Method for forecasting future housing need.</p> <p>It found that for Greater Essex, the standard method indicates an annual provision of 10,683 dwellings between 2020 and 2029, compared with recorded dwelling completions of 5,605 between 2010 and 2019. This represents an expected increased rate of dwelling provision of 90%.</p> <p>Since 2014 when the MLP was adopted through the 2019 (latest data at the time of the report), completions have increased by 42%, but current rates of delivery can be seen to be below the rate required to satisfy demand derived from</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>the Standard Methodology. Planning applications continue to be lodged and approved by LPAs despite the current COVID-19 pandemic which suggest housing completions will continue to increase for the remainder of the MLP plan period.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is now proposed to adopt a new plan apportionment based on an average of the last ten years of sales plus 20%. This would currently equate to 3.74mtpa. The current apportionment of 4.31mtpa was derived from the 'National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005 to 2020' (the Guidelines) which have since expired. As of July 2021, no new Guidelines have been put in place and there has been no indication that the figures in the expired Guidelines are to be 'rolled forward'. As such, a revised apportionment is proposed which considers the methodology set out in NPPF paragraph 213 (2021).</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Strutt & Parker (891506607)	G&B Finch	No comment		N/A
Kelvedon & Feering Heritage Society (677892382)		No comment		N/A
Suffolk County Council (549043477)		No comment	No comment.	Noted
Suffolk County Council - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty team (480752632)		Not Answered	Thank you for consulting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty team on the above consultation.	Noted.
			None of the Mineral Sites being proposed for allocation in The Minerals Local Plan 2014 (Draft Proposed Amendments) document, are located within or within the setting to the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB. The AONB team will therefore not be submitting any detailed comments on the allocated sites or policies.	
			Minor changes are needed to the text in Section 2.0 Spatial Portrait and Key Minerals Planning Issues Essex at a Glance under the Environment	The Environment section in the Spatial Portrait will be amended as follows, "There are also two AONB's <u>in the plan area</u> ; located at <u>the</u>

			<p>heading about the Essex AONBs for accuracy.</p> <p>The text currently reads - In total there are 81 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) covering 31,056 hectares of the Plan area, ten Special Protection Areas and three Special Areas for Conservation designated for wildlife covering 59,109 hectares and ten other international sites (Ramsar sites) covering 26,662 hectares. There are also two AONB located at Dedham Vale on the Essex and Suffolk border and Suffolk Heaths and Coast. These protected areas are supported by a network of sites of county value for nature conservation which are known as Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS).</p> <p>The text should be changed as follows as shown in CAPITALS AND QUOTE MARKS: - In total there are 81 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) covering 31,056 hectares of the Plan area, ten Special Protection Areas and</p>	<p>Dedham Vale on the Essex and Suffolk border and Suffolk Heaths and Coast <u>and Heaths which extends from the north bank of the river Stour in Tendring, to Kessingland in East Suffolk</u>. These protected areas are supported by a network of sites of county value for nature conservation which are known as Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS).”. The Environment section in the Spatial Portrait will also be updated as follows, “There <del>is</del> <del>one</del> are two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) at Dedham Vale in the north east <u>and Suffolk Coast and Heaths...</u>”.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>three Special Areas for Conservation designated for wildlife covering 59,109 hectares and ten other international sites (Ramsar sites) covering 26,662 hectares. There are also two <b>AONB'S 'IN THE PLAN AREA;</b> the Dedham Vale on the Essex and Suffolk border and the Suffolk <b>'COAST &amp; HEATHS WHICH EXTENDS FROM THE NORTH BANK OF THE RIVER STOUR IN TENDRING TO KESSINGLAND IN EAST SUFFOLK.'</b> These protected areas are supported by a network of sites of county value for nature conservation which are known as Local Wildlife Sites (LoWS).</p>	
			<p>A Further minor text change is needed to section 2.12 in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The text currently reads - Dedham Vale in north Essex/south Suffolk and Suffolk Heaths and Coast are the two designated AONB in the County</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.12 will be amended as follows, "Dedham Vale in north Essex/ south Suffolk <u>and Suffolk Coast and Heaths</u> is are the <u>only two</u> designated AONB's in the County."</p> <p>Map 2 Spatial Portrait of Greater Essex will be updated will be updated to show both</p>

			<p>The text should be changed as follows (shown in CAPITALS AND QUOTE MARKS) - Dedham Vale in north Essex/south Suffolk and Suffolk '<b>COAST AND HEATHS</b>' are the two designated AONB'S' in the County.</p> <p><b>The Spatial Portrait Map (Map 2) only shows the Dedham Vale AONB and does not show the Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths AONB boundary which now extends into Tending.</b> Please see the link below to the Variation boundary information from GOV.UK which shows the extension area for the Suffolk CAAOST &amp; Heaths in Essex. Please note that it the Stour Estuary is now included in the Suffolk Coast &amp; Heaths AONB.</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/areas-of-outstanding-national-beauty-aonb-extensions-to-the-suffolk-coast-and-heaths-aonb">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/areas-of-outstanding-national-beauty-aonb-extensions-to-the-suffolk-coast-and-heaths-aonb</a></p>	AONB's.
Natural England		Not Answered	Lastly, it is noted that in the	The Environment section in the

<p>(792269846)</p>			<p>second bullet point on page 21 (of the version of the Review Plan with shows amendments as tracked changes) there is reference to “safeguard landscapes”. The meaning of the reference may be to “protected landscapes” and this term could be substituted as it is better understood.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	<p>Spatial Portrait will be amended as follows, “<u>Protection of the environment is a key objective with significant areas of land designated as protected landscapes...</u>”.</p>
--------------------	--	--	---	---