Annex 2: Duty to Cooperate 2014-15

The 'duty to co-operate' requires local planning authorities to co-operate with other planning authorities and relevant bodies on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries to ensure that strategic priorities are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans.

Details of the activities described in the main report that were undertaken by the Council in line with the Duty to Co-operate on the preparation of the Minerals Local Plan during 2014-2015 are set out in this section.

Responses received to the "Call for Sites" in summer 2014 were given unique reference numbers and a response document is currently under preparation to address the sites submitted and any other points raised. This response document will be published on our website at www.worcestershire.gov.uk/minerals early in 2016.

Consultation activities

A "call for sites" consultation was undertaken from 14th July 2014 to 22nd August 2014.

Targeted consultation (shown in Table 1) on the following draft background documents was undertaken from 30th May 2014 to 24th June 2014:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

Any resulting correspondence from these consultations is reported under the relevant organisation in the sections below.

Table 1. Targetted consultation on draft background documents (May-June 2014)

X = consulted, ✓ = responded

	Crushed Rock	Sand and Gravel	Building Stone	Oil and Gas	Bird Strike	ROMPs	Concrete Batching Plants
Minerals industry organisations:							
Tarmac (Worcs)	X	X					X
Cemex (Worcs)	X	X					X ✓
Cullimore (Worcs)	X	X					X
Veolia (Worcs)	X	X					X
Salop Sand and Gravel (Worcs)	X	X					X
Smiths and Sons	X	X					X

	Crushed Rock	Sand and Gravel	Building Stone	Oil and Gas	Bird Strike	ROMPs	Concrete Batching Plants
(fish hill)							
Cinetic Sands	X	X					X
MV Kelly	X	X					X
DECC				X			
UKOOG				X			
BGS	X	X	X	X		X	
Coal authority				X ✓			
Mineral Products Association	X	X	X		X	X	X
British Aggregates Association	X	X	X		X	X	X
West Midlands AWP (secretary)	X	X				X	X
Conservation and other organisations:							
English Heritage[1]			X				
Malvern Hills AONB Partnership	X	X	X	X			
Cotswold AONB partnership	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓			
Environment Agency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Worcestershire LEP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Greater Bham and Solihull LEP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Natural England	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓
Earth Heritage Trust	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓			
Mineral Planning Authorities adjoining Worcestershire:							
Gloucestershire County Council	X ✓	X ✓	X	X	X	X	X
Warwickshire County Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Herefordshire Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Staffordshire County Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Shropshire Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X	X	X	X
Birmingham City Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Local Planning Authorities in Worcestershire							
Bromsgrove District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Malvern Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

[1] Historic England (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) was known as English Heritage until 1 April 2015.

	Crushed Rock	Sand and Gravel	Building Stone	Oil and Gas	Bird Strike	ROMPs	Concrete Batching Plants
District Council							
Redditch Borough Council	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X ✓	X	X	X
Wychavon District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wyre Forest District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Worcester City Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Local Planning Authorities adjoining Worcestershire:							
Forest of Dean District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Tewkesbury Borough Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cotswold District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stratford-on-Avon District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
South Staffordshire District Council	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other organisations							
Defence Infrastructure Organisation					X		
Navigation Services Section, National Air Traffic Services					X		
Aerodrome Standards Department					X		
Director of airspace policy, CAA					X ✓		
UKGA					X		
British ready mix concrete association							X
Refined bitumen association							X

Engagement with other Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities

West Midlands Resource (formerly Regional) Technical Advisory Body for Waste (RTAB)

One of the main mechanisms through which the Council liaised with other Waste Planning Authorities in the West Midlands was through the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body for Waste (RTAB)[2]. The RTAB is a body

[2] At the meeting of RTAB on 10th May 2012, it was agreed that the group's Terms of Reference should be amended to clarify that the duty to cooperate is a formal part of RTAB's

made up of waste planning authorities and members of the waste industry, voluntary and community sectors. Because of the particularly close economic links between them, the WMRTAB includes a representative from the East Midlands RTAB and vice versa. The Chairmen of the RTABs also meet regularly to share ideas and where possible, co-ordinate their efforts. The WMRTAB led on the preparation of the waste policies in the West Midlands RSS Phase Two Revision. Despite the demise of the regional governance structure, the WMRTAB continues to meet to discuss planning issues.

At the meetings of RTAB on 14th May 2014 and 24th September 2014 each authority gave a brief update on plan and development progress.

At the meeting of RTAB on 24th September 2014, a discussion took place regarding any issues relating to waste in the emerging Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan. This resulted in an action point for a formal response to be given by the RTAB. Unfortunately this action was not completed, but the RTAB will continue to be consulted as the development of the Minerals Local Plan progresses.

Meetings of the RTAB are ongoing and Worcestershire County Council will continue to engage with other Waste Planning Authorities through this mechanism.

<u>West Midlands Aggregate Working Party (AWP)</u>
The National Planning Policy Framework expects Minerals Planning Authorities to:
"plan for a steady supply of aggregates by:

- preparing an annual Local Aggregate Assessment, either individually or jointly by agreement with another or other mineral planning authorities, based on a rolling average of 10 years sales data and other relevant local information, and an assessment of all supply options (including marine dredged, secondary and recycled sources);
- participating in the operation of an Aggregate Working Party (AWP) and taking the advice of that Party into account when preparing their Local Aggregate Assessment…"[3]

It also expects Minerals Planning Authorities to plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by co-operating with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals to ensure adequate provision is made to support their likely use in industrial and manufacturing processes.

Worcestershire County Council has been a member of the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party since it was formed and membership is still recommended by the NPPF.

---

role. A protocol has been agreed to make participants' role clear in this respect (e.g. commitment to actively contribute data on capacity and new permissions, to inform the RTAB AMR, which itself would illuminate regional/cross boundary issues). The Deputy Leader of Worcestershire County Council has signed the protocol on the Council's behalf and it was forwarded to the RTAB secretary on 6th November 2013.

[3] National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 145

Targeted consultation on background documents, May-June 2014:
The West Midlands AWP (via the AWP Secretary) was consulted on the following draft background documents: Crushed Rock in Worcestershire, Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire, Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs), and Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire. No response was received from the AWP, although many members were also consulted individually and responses were received from some members.

24th June 2014:
A meeting was held on 24th June 2014 at which Local Aggregates Assessments and progress on developing Minerals Plans were discussed.

27th March 2015:
A meeting was held on 27th March 2015 at which progress on developing Minerals Plans were discussed.

The technical secretary had previously circulated his comments on individual Local Aggregates Assessments, including Worcestershire's. Members agreed to formally endorse the LAA's which had been submitted, noting the comments made in the summary report as 'lessons to be learnt' and considered during the next round of LAA preparation.

A Memo from Worcestershire County Council's Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economy, Skills and Infrastructure was discussed, regarding Worcestershire's approach to provision of crushed rock in view of a number of constraints on, and lack of commercial interest in the resources in the county. The memo outlined how Worcestershire County Council was considering addressing the issue in the emerging Minerals Local Plan to ensure appropriate provision could be made. It was intended to forward the memo to Gloucestershire County Council following the meeting.

AWP members were asked to consider:

a) If the approach set out in the memo was reasonable;
b) If there were any reasonable alternatives which would enable, as a minimum, the delivery of the provision levels set out.

In addition other Mineral Planning Authorities were asked whether they could agree in principle that:

c) on a cross-authority basis, they could meet the additional demand for crushed rock if supply in Worcestershire remains below the requirement identified through Worcestershire's Local Aggregates Assessment; and
d) they were able to support a draft objective from the working version of the Third consultation on the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan which sought to Maximising supply of crushed rock within the delivery limitations that exist in the county and cooperating with other authorities to contribute to the maintenance of supply of crushed rock across the local region; reviewing the plan if a minimum 10 year landbank is not maintained across this area.

The West Midlands AWP was happy to accept the memo in principle, but noted that the main potential external supply of crushed rock to Worcestershire was likely to be Gloucestershire. It was agreed that the Chair of the AWP, in liaison with Worcestershire County Council, would make a formal approach via the South West AWP. This was pursued during 2015 and will be reported in the 2015-16 Annual Monitoring Report.

Non-Aggregate discussions:

At previous AWP meetings, it had been discussed that gathering information on non-aggregate minerals and greater coordination along the lines of the AWPs was desirable. The AWP's technical secretary had canvassed potential representatives and all those contacted welcomed the opportunity to discuss planning issues with planning officers, but a suitable date was not found for all representatives. In the interim, mineral planning authority officers held an informal discussion on issues relating to clay on 27th March 2015. Matters covered included: the nature, scale and status of clay extraction and associated infrastructure in each mineral planning authority area; emerging policy issues; cross boundary issues; engagement with the industry; link to LAAs; any "other" matters to be considered; and value of a regional non aggregate minerals group. Conclusions of this meeting included that there was no evidence of any region wide issues regarding clay supply, but that it is not clear if there is a need to safeguard clay resources, that the region appears to be able to meet the needs of the clay industry, and that no significant Duty to Cooperate issues over the supply or demand for clay had been identified at a regional scale.

Other Aggregate Working Parties

The following Aggregate Working Parties were contacted by direct mail regarding the Call for Sites consultation in summer 2014:

- East Midlands AWP
- East of England AWP
- Greater London Authority AWP
- London AWP
- North East AWP
- North Wales AWP
- North West AWP
- South East AWP
- South Wales AWP
- South West AWP
- Yorkshire and Humber AWP

No responses were received from the AWPs in response to that consultation.

Minerals and Waste Learning Group

The Planning Officers' Society manages a Minerals and Waste Learning Group which the Council subscribed to and attended all four meetings over the monitoring period (2nd April 2014, 9th July 2014, 5th November 2014 and 14th January 2015). The group exists to discuss matters relating to members' statutory mineral and waste planning duties.

Each meeting includes a discussion of member councils' activities and progress in developing and adopting mineral and waste development plans and in

determining associated applications. Discussions are not currently minuted or recorded as part of the duty to co-operate but the meetings and subsequent email exchanges any issues have arisen which may invoke the duty to co-operate . Membership over the year included Bedfordshire and Central Bedfordshire shared planning service, Bradford, Derbyshire, East Sussex, Brighton and Hove, Essex, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire, Surrey, West Berkshire, West London Waste Authorities, West Sussex/South Downs National Park and Worcestershire.

Shropshire Council

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Shropshire Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 10th February 2015 Staffordshire County Council Offices **Present:** Worcestershire County Council: Nick Dean (also representing Herefordshire) Shropshire County Council: Adrian Cooper Staffordshire County Council: Mat Griffin Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council: Maurice Barlow (also representing Birmingham City) Walsall Borough Council: Dawn Sherwood (also representing the Black Country Partnership) Warwickshire County	Discussion on Local Aggregates Assessments (LAAs) • status of and response to the AWP secretary's comments on the LAAs • broad principles of content of LAAs o NPPF paragraphs 145 and 163 and NPPG paragraphs 62 and 64 are particularly useful o 10 year sales average is the best guide to the quantities needed, but this does not have to be the most recent 10 years if "other relevant information" suggests alternatives (following Northamptonshire's Inspectors Report August 2014, paragraphs 52-55) o "other relevant information" can act as a sensitivity test o housing numbers not an appropriate proxy for demand for minerals – West Midlands housing figures are only broadly reflected in aggregate supply, problems of local disaggregation, different sizes and types of house require different amounts, and different technologies in future mean projections can only be indicative o landbanks for different varieties of aggregate not practical in West Midlands

Council: Tony Lyons	as strata are too varied and data too poor. • assessment of "other" matters to be considered in LAAs • role of AWP and engagement with Minerals Products Association and British Aggregates Association • increasing sales / rapid reductions in landbank, applications to extend working hours, extend plant capacity or lorry movements could all be useful indicators of increasing demand. Agreed that there were no matters of concern on these matters between any of the Mineral Planning Authorities about the content of the LAAs produced in 2014. Other matters of mutual interest: • agreement in principle to Worcestershire County Council's approach to crushed rock provision and that unmet demand for crushed rock can and will be met by other councils, according to market demand. Agreed that WCC will put a paper on this to the next AWP meeting for discussion with minerals industry.

<u>Herefordshire Council</u>
A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Herefordshire Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

An email discussion took place in November 2014: Herefordshire requested comments from Worcestershire on its draft Local Aggregates Assessment and these were provided.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 10th February 2015 Staffordshire County Council Offices	Nick Dean (Worcestershire) represented Herefordshire at the discussion on Local Aggregates Assessments (LAAs) which is reported fully under the "Shropshire" section of this report.
Date: 17.03.2015	Herefordshire's minerals and waste officers joined

County Hall, Worcester
Present:
Worcestershire County Council, Development Control Team: Mark Bishop, Steven Aldridge, Emma Johnston, Mark Lane
 	
Worcestershire County Council, Minerals and Waste Policy Team: Nick Dean, Marianne Joynes, Rebecca Schofield
 	
Worcestershire County Council, Strategic Planning Team: Marta Dziudzi
 	
Herefordshire Council: Debby Klein, Rebecca Jenman
	Worcestershire's regular meeting between its development control and policy officers as a learning exercise in the spirit of the Duty to Co-operate (Debby was due to retire in summer 2015 and Becca was shadowing her to take over the minerals and waste role at Herefordshire, primarily development control).
	
	Standard agenda items were discussed, and the following points are the relevant cross-boundary points:
	
	• Monitoring and enforcement update
	  ○ ML stated that the Environment Agency is starting to recoup costs using the Proceeds of Crime Act. DK asked whether there were any issues with EA waiting to see what planning enforcement would do and vice versa, ML didn't think that was a problem in Worcestershire.
	  ○ ML and RJ agreed to swap case notes to learn from each other's experience.
	• Waste and Minerals planning applications update:
	  ○ General update on caseload was of interest to all, but no cross-boundary issues identified.
	  ○ Herefordshire's mineral sites – There could be sand and gravel supply issues in future as further extensions are very limited on some sites, and one permission has lapsed. Crushed rock site at Leinthall Earles is still going.
	• Planning Policy update:
	  ○ WCC has an adopted Waste Core Strategy and progressing with a new MLP. Likely to consult on "draft plan" in 2016.
	  ○ WCC has been preparing background documents which have informed the vision, objectives and spatial strategy which (in draft) have changed since the Second Stage Consultation in 2013/2014.
	  ○ WCC recognised the need to engage with Herefordshire (and other authorities) on the key issue of mineral supply. WCC is proposing to use baseline data for sand and gravel before it was combined with Herefordshire (2011 baseline) and for crushed rock base on 1/3 of combined figure (as set out in both counties LAAs)
	  ○ WCC will have enabling policies for crushed rock but unlikely to be able to meet "apportionment" as ~98% of resources are either in AONB, under

	control of Malvern Hills Conservators with a mandate to protect from quarrying, or in/adjacent to designated SAC. A proposal is being put to the next meeting of the West Midlands AWP (March 2015) from cabinet member, including whether there are any alternatives we could/should consider. ○ Vicky Eaton has attended AWP for Herefordshire and produced LAA but only works part time and has other responsibilities. Both counties LAAs closely reflect each other, could consider a joint LAA in future? ○ 21 sites submitted for consideration to WCC in response to 2nd stage consultation and subsequent call for sites. Now considering these through "deliverability assessment" and HRA/SA which together will determine which should be Specific Sites in the plan. WCC intends to produce "concept plans" as SPDs to guide developers to the issues/constraints and particularly the Green Infrastructure opportunities for each Specific Site. • Strategic Planning team update: ○ Update given on consultations on CIL/S106 and Renewable Energy Strategy ○ Internal Continuing Professional Development sessions – Herefordshire used to be part of the CPD group. MD to discuss with manager whether invitation to take part could be extended again following changes to Herefordshire's training budget. • Herefordshire's Minerals and Waste Planning Policy ○ Following withdrawal of mineral and waste elements of Core Strategy from examination, the rest of Herefordshire's Core Strategy has progressed and Natural England's concerns appear to have been met. ○ Minerals and Waste DPD is likely to be at the top of the list for a new LDS, but resources/expertise to do it are lacking. • Site visits ○ ML has a programme of monitoring visits, will extent to WCC/Herefordshire officers as appropriate ○ WCC's DC team visit Hartlebury EfW approximately once per month,

	Herefordshire will be offered a place in future. ○ DK intending to arrange a visit to EnviroSort and will extend invitation to WCC. • AOB ○ Ongoing cooperation and discussion between the two counties was acknowledged as being essential. Both counties are happy to discuss cases and share experiences and will discuss whether producing a joint LAA might be useful in future.

Warwickshire County Council
A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Warwickshire Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

In March 2015 Warwickshire County Council and Stratford District Council were asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. Responses were received from both authorities and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 10th February 2015 Staffordshire County Council Offices	Discussion on Local Aggregates Assessments (LAAs) is reported fully under the "Shropshire" section of this report.

Gloucestershire County Council
A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Gloucestershire County Council was consulted by direct mail. Gloucestershire submitted comments (reference C002-695) setting out that they were also

conducting a consultation on site options and would welcome Worcestershire's views on site options close to the county boundary, in particular Bow Farm.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

Gloucestershire commented on the Crushed Rock and Sand and Gravel documents and their comments have been taken into account in revised versions of the documents which have been published on our website www.worcestershire.gov.uk/mineralsbackground.

In February 2015 Gloucestershire County Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council were asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. In addition to the meetings below, comments were received from both authorities and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 04.06.2014 Tewkesbury Borough Council Offices **Present:** Worcestershire County Council: Nick Dean, Sarah Button Gloucestershire County Council: Kevin Phillips Tewkesbury Borough Council: Nick Croft	Discussion between Worcestershire County Council, Tewkesbury Borough Council and Gloucestershire County Council. **Time frames for plan preparation** Gloucestershire Minerals Local Plan: • Consultation anticipated end of June for 8 weeks, including a Duty to Cooperate paper • Noted that mismatch between plan preparation timelines makes sub-regional cooperation difficult to match up plan preparation. • Intend to proceed with preferred sites and pre-publication consultation draft in early 2015 with regulation 18 publication later in 2015. • Gloucestershire has also put its evidence base out for consultation, although it was mentioned that the inspector for the Gloucestershire Waste Plan was not in favour of the multiple separate background papers approach to evidence base. Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan • Worcestershire held a 12-week consultation on the second stage plan. Most of the responses were received on the last day of the consultation, and in the following week.

	• Worcestershire is officially still on schedule, but lacking in staff resources at the moment. Aiming for a draft plan consultation in order to flush out tweaks to policy wording, similar to the approach taken with the Waste Plan. Tewkesbury – Joint Core Strategy • Approval from all three authorities (Gloucester City, Tewkesbury Borough and Cheltenham Borough) of the pre-submission version for consultation (Reg 19) is expected by the end of June 2014. This version will be submitted to the Secretary of State later this year, and it will go to Inquiry in 2015. • Significant development is expected in this area, including at Tewkesbury, close to Worcestershire. **Allocating specific minerals sites, preferred areas, or areas of search** • WCC: 6 sites were proposed by industry through the Second Stage Consultation. No established method for assessing them as yet. Their total aggregate volume is less than needed to address landbank shortfall, so likely to still require areas of search. Still working on how to identify preferred areas or specific sites. Aggregates provision • GCC: KP explained some of Gloucestershire's constraints and challenges, relating to a lack of mechanism for changing the pattern of supply (bulk of sand and gravel production in Gloucestershire comes from Cotswold Water Park). Suggested WCC look at site options through landowner/operator buy-in and residual unworked sites filter. WCC noted this but at present have only limited operator buy-in and no significant residual sites. • ND explained that unless interest or demand is expressed by landowner or operator we have no way of knowing if resources in Worcestershire are commercially viable. In general there seems to be little interest in losing agricultural land to minerals production in Worcestershire, may be related to high land values at present, and we do not know enough about underlying geology to decide whether potential sites are viable or commercially attractive. High up-front costs of mineral extraction in a county where geology and sites are not large may also be preventing sites from coming forward. • ND accepted that WCC has always contributed to meeting the demand for sand and gravel in areas far from Gloucestershire's main supply area e.g. for the development of Tewkesbury. Agreed that neither WCC nor GCC seek to avoid meeting the demand for aggregates from within their own boundaries and will plan to do so but that these movements are normal

	workings of the market and that there are no conflicts between the three Councils over this. **Flooding and water management – downstream/cumulative effects** • WCC intends to develop broad policies for assessment and monitoring of downstream risk from minerals development on flooding. NC stressed the importance of and value to, improving flood alleviation or attenuation upstream of Tewkesbury. • Other issues mentioned included river use for mineral transportation, the Worcestershire background paper on water transport highlights constraint of the locks in Tewkesbury, potential to investigate a joint project with Tewkesbury perhaps involving EU funds to improve access. **Restoration** • WCC's 'restoration-led' approach is still being refined. Effectively WCC would like to say "you can only develop here if you can demonstrate that you can meet these restoration priorities", but the policy test still needs to be devised. • Gloucestershire indicated that their approach at the moment is fairly broad, with a framework for restoration proposed in the current consultation as the nature of sites dictates what is possible from a restoration perspective. They have used broad development management and policy restoration aims. However, they do have a specific policy aim for the Cotswold Water Park restoration that is landscape-scale, but habitat creation will likely be the most important priority throughout their plan. • Agreed there are no conflicts between the three parties over these matters. **Landbank** Timing • In the second stage consultation, Worcestershire put forward several suggestions which weren't supported. WCC's revised aim is to meet the national landbank as soon as possible, and if they have not achieved it by halfway through the plan period they will review the plan; this will need to be clear in the wording for the next draft. Noted and agreed by all parties. Crushed rock • Crushed rock provision is a problem for Worcestershire. WCC intend to include enabling policies and will encourage crushed rock development. Areas of search are currently identified but there has been no interest in working crushed rock in the county since 1991 except at Fish Hill (Broadway) which has

	now concluded. Worcestershire's crushed rock apportionment was 0.18mtpa, one site could potentially meet that but at present there are no operational sites within Worcestershire. The assumption is that most resources are not commercially viable, 600,000 tonnes of permitted reserves were abandoned in 1991 because they were deemed by the operator to be of insufficient quality. The Malverns are identified as an Area of Search in the second stage consultation of the Worcs plan, but the landowners, the Malvern Hills Conservators, came into existence to stop quarrying in the Hills. Consumption figures for crushed rock for Worcestershire is also a problem, as we only have figures for Worcestershire for 2003, other data is merged with Herefordshire or Warwickshire. There was cross boundary movement in Oolitic (Cotswold) limestone, (crushed rock and building stone) from Worcestershire into Gloucestershire from Fish Hill Quarry Broadway for many years. Similarly movements of building stone and rock aggregate move from quarries in the Gloucestershire part of the Cotswolds into adjacent counties including Worcestershire. Small volumes of Forest of Dean stone are also imported into Worcs from Glos. • Gloucestershire has figures for their crushed rock production and consumption in their plan – much of which is Cotswold Stone from within the AONB. The Gloucestershire LAA indicates what they will make provision for, but also makes clear that production from within the county serves markets in surrounding areas, including Worcestershire. • Gloucestershire cannot pick up the additional Worcestershire crushed rock apportionment outright (and Worcestershire has not asked them to), but they do admit that the market for Gloucestershire-produced crushed stone extends into Worcestershire in line with industry standards of aggregates being used within a 30 to 35 mile radius of the quarry. Gloucestershire has also indicated that the most significant quarry nearest to the Worcestershire border has permission to continue operating until 2024. • Gloucestershire officers stated that they do not have the productive capacity to meet Worcestershire's crushed rock apportionment outright, but that they do have enough reserves to maintain their landbank to 2030 assuming sites reopen. • Both counties will seek to encourage secondary and recycled aggregates through their plans, but are not aware of any specific additional supply. • Agreed that neither WCC nor Gloucestershire CC seek to avoid meeting the demand for aggregates from within their own boundaries and will plan to do so but

	that these movements are normal workings of the market and that there are no conflicts between the three Councils over this. Gloucestershire County Council stressed that it will be guided by the LLA revision and landbank as how to make provision in the MLP. JCS Housing completions and targets figures • The MPA has indicated that they do not want Minerals Planning Authorities to rely on 10-year sales figures alone to predict demand, and so Worcestershire is looking at other ways of projecting demand. We do not have AWP direction on this as the West Midlands AWP has not met in some time, but our impression is that there may be some correlation between housing completions and demand. At a recent meeting that Nick attended, there was some talk among the West Midlands authorities about doing a housing exercise to help defend the LAAs that are being produced. • The JCS for Tewkesbury, Cheltenham and Gloucester is projecting approximately 1000 new houses per year, but the exact breakdown is vague. The plan calls for 13,000 houses up to 2030 on the main urban extension and strategic allocation sites, and another 3000 homes in rural areas – this excludes houses that are planned for Cheltenham and Gloucester as most of these are on existing permissions or have been let in on appeal. • Gloucestershire CC is broadly taking this in to considerations in their LAA and evidence base. Since the downturn (2007/08) house completions have been around 1600-1900 per annum. However in peak periods this may have been 2000-2200 per annum. The JCS may mean a return to these figures but the 10 year average figures in Gloucestershire takes account of these peaks and troughs. The 10 year average for sand and gravel is fairly consistent although could be moving into a period of slight decline. **Safeguarding** • BGS guidance states that all mineral resources should be safeguarded, and though we proposed several options in the second stage consultation, we believe that we will ultimately have to safeguard all of it. WCC are planning to meet with our districts on this specifically, and we do not know whether we will ever be in such a position of conflict between minerals extraction and other development as we do not have enough detailed information about the geology. This is also an untested concept for housing sites – for motorways and other infrastructure, using in-situ mineral for borrow pits has already been proven. • Gloucestershire officers indicated that the Homelands site (north of Bishop's Cleeve) used in-situ sand

	resources for development. Both WCC and GCC plan to include safeguarding policies in their plans. • Gloucestershire are developing options for a MSAs through the consultation are in negotiations with the districts over a potential policy framework to deal with this. **Outcomes and actions** • ND to send contact names to Tewkesbury about lock improvement. • Worcestershire and Gloucestershire to meet and discuss where resources cross boundaries and how Mineral Safeguarding Areas will be mapped and identified in these areas.
Date: 04.06.2014 Bow Farm, Ripple **Present:** Worcestershire County Council: Nick Dean, Sarah Button Gloucestershire County Council: Kevin Phillips Tewkesbury Borough Council: Nick Croft Moreton C Cullimore Ltd (landowner / minerals operator): Roger Cullimore	Discussion of cross-boundary issues at the sites put forward for consideration in Worcestershire's and Gloucestershire's Minerals Local Plans at Bow Farm, Redpools Farm and Page's Lane. This was a without-prejudice discussion and the need for the various areas to be considered through the plan process was stressed. Mr Cullimore gave general information about the sites, quality/quantity of material, potential methods of access, working phases and restoration options. The need for geological, archaeological and nature conservation evidence was discussed. No commitments were asked for or given. Continued co-operation will be necessary to ensure that the sites are worked and restored in mutually agreeable way.

In February 2015, Worcestershire's consultant Conservation and Landscape Officer submitted comments on Gloucestershire County Council's Minerals Local Plan Site Options and Draft Policy Framework Consultation Document. These comments focused on the landscape and visual impact elements of potential sites near the border with Worcestershire in the vicinity of Twyning (Redpools Farm and Page's Lane).

In August 2014 Worcestershire County Council commented on Gloucestershire's Minerals Local Plan Site Options and Draft Policy Framework. This included officer views from a Lead Local Flood Authority, Minerals Planning Authority and Transport Authority perspective.

<u>Staffordshire County Council</u>

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Staffordshire Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 10th February 2015 Staffordshire County Council Offices	Discussion on Local Aggregates Assessments (LAAs) is reported fully under the "Shropshire" section of this report.

In June 2014 Worcestershire County Council responded to Staffordshire's consultation on the new Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire, confirming that we had no objections to the Plan, did not wish to comment on its contents, and that we considered that Staffordshire County Council had complied with the regulations in relation to cross boundary issues with Worcestershire and that the Duty to Co-operate has been discharged appropriately to date.

In March 2015 Staffordshire County Council and South Staffordshire Council were asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. Responses were received from both authorities and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

<u>West Midlands conurbation "county" as Mineral Planning Authorities</u>

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. The West Midlands authorities consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

The authorities adjoining Worcestershire (Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council, Birmingham City Council) were also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council commented on the Crushed Rock, Sand and Gravel and Building Stone documents and their comments have been taken into account in revised versions of the documents which have been published on our website www.worcestershire.gov.uk/mineralsbackground.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 1st April 2014 Worcestershire County Council **Present:** Worcestershire county Council: including Nick Dean (Minerals and Waste Policy Manager) and Emily Barker (Strategic Planning and Environmental Policy Manager) Birmingham City Council	Amongst other matters discussed at the meeting relating to the Birmingham Development Plan, there was a focus on the links between Birmingham City and Worcestershire in relation to the emerging Minerals Local Plan. a) Overall approach including relationship to Vision and Objectives in the MLP - agreed • General information on the vision, strategic objectives and approach of the MLP, including estimated provision of aggregates. • Following abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy, WCC has worked and continues to work with adjoining authorities in the GBSLEP and West Midlands Metropolitan Area and beyond. No conflicts or outstanding issues in relation to the strategy set out in the MLP between the parties. (A separate agreement covers the relationship between WCC and BCC on the Birmingham Development Plan). b) Appropriate provision made for the supply of aggregates and other minerals – agreed • The aggregates, bricks and building stone needed to enable the level of development set out in the Birmingham Development Plan cannot be supplied from within Birmingham City Council's area. WCC accepts that some of the minerals produced within Worcestershire will supply markets in Birmingham and does not seek to limit or frustrate this. • This approach is accepted by both parties. c) Level and distribution of recycled materials for aggregate use – agreed • Redevelopment activity will generate C&D waste which will contribute to the supply of recycled aggregates for both Birmingham City and Worcestershire. • This is accepted by both parties. It was noted and agreed that facilities for waste management, including C&D waste, would need to be located on employment land in Birmingham and the Environmental District at Tyseley in particular.

	d) Consistency of planning policy and proposals across common boundaries such as transport links and green infrastructure – agreed • To be identified and discussed as appropriate across common boundaries. • It was agreed that there are no potential cross-boundary matters conflicts between the proposals in the emerging MLP and the Birmingham Development Plan on these or other green infrastructure matters. e) Green Belt matters – agreed • Mineral development is considered broadly compatible with Green Belt designation and any such development within Worcestershire Green Belt would not conflict with Birmingham Development Plan. • This approach was accepted by both parties. f) Minerals, waste and water resources including flooding – agreed • As a major city Birmingham is reliant on minerals predominantly produced in adjoining shire areas to help facilitate its growth and development. The City Council recognises that it can reduce the demand for mineral extraction through effective recycling and reuse of building materials and aggregates and that its 'footprint' can be reduced through equivalent self-sufficiency in waste management capacity and vigorous adoption of the waste hierarchy. • There are no conflicts between the policies in the proposed Birmingham Plan and the Waste Core Strategy for Worcestershire, the saved policies in the Hereford and Worcester Minerals Local Plan and the proposals in the emerging Minerals Local Plan for Worcestershire. This approach is accepted by both parties. g) Air quality matters – agreed • The two councils are committed to the improvement of air quality for their residents and those in surrounding areas. Both are and will remain, active participants in initiatives to address these matters jointly with adjoining authorities and other agencies subject to the nature of actions being consistent with the city's aspirations for growth and the need for new mineral workings. Detailed policies on air quality and noise matters will be set out in a separate Development Management DPD for the Birmingham Development Plan and in specific

	policies in the MLP. • This approach is accepted by both parties. h) Any other matters that might reasonably be identified under the Duty to Co-operate – agreed • No other matters identified.
Date: 10th February 2015 Staffordshire County Council Offices	Discussion on Local Aggregates Assessments (LAAs) is reported fully under the "Shropshire" section of this report.

Engagement with other planning authorities in Worcestershire

Relevant issues were discussed with the City, Borough and District Councils in Worcestershire through meetings of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Planning Officers Group (WPOG), and the development management Officers Group (known as DC Forum).

The DC Forum met on 2nd June 2014, 1st September 2014 and 1st December 2014. The meeting of 1st September 2014 included an agenda item to discuss any consultation issues for district councils arising from the Minerals Local Plan and Waste Core Strategy. This included a presentation on the emerging Minerals Local Plan, discussion of safeguarding waste sites, and disposing of ground work soils.

The WPOG meeting of Policy Officers met 10 times between April 2014 and March 2015 (no meetings were held in June or August 2014). The Minerals Local Plan is a standing item on the agenda and is discussed under the duty to co-operate and progress with local plans. Discussion during 2014 focused on the Second Call for Sites, and the potential issues raised by safeguarding mineral resources and housing.

Individual meetings have been held with representatives of each of the planning authorities in Worcestershire.

<u>Bromsgrove District Council</u>

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Bromsgrove District Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

In January 2015 Bromsgrove District Council was asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. A response was received and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 19th June 2014 Bromsgrove District Council Offices **Present:** Representatives of Wildmoor Residents Association, Bournheath Parish Council, Belbroughton Parish Council Bromsgrove District Council: John Ruck, Brian Lewis, David Whittles Worcestershire County Council: Councillor Sheila Blagg, Kirk Denton, Mark Bishop, Nick Dean	Discussion of issues relating to quarries, restoration and related development in the Wildmoor area of Bromsgrove District. • Wildmoor Residents Association (WRA) voiced concerns about uncertainty over site restoration and creeping industrialisation in the green belt, including the need for coordination between County and District responsibilities. • Specific points were discussed regarding Wildmoor Quarry, Veolia Quarry, Pinches Quarry and Chadwich Quarry. • It was recognised that a second meeting should be arranged to follow up on these matters.
Date: 6th March 2015 Bromsgrove District Council Offices **Present:** Representatives of Wildmoor Residents Association, Belbroughton Parish Council, Fairfield Parish Council Bromsgrove District Council: Councillor B Lewis, Mike Dunphy, Bryn Pryce Worcestershire County Council:	Discussion of "Deliverability Assessment" for sites in the Bromsgrove area submitted by agents, operators and landowners for inclusion in the emerging Minerals Local Plan. • ND explained the background to the consultation letter to Bromsgrove DC of 15th January 2015, explaining that the consultation was an officer-level exercise to inform the deliverability assessment of the submitted sites (an iterative process) which aimed to establish whether sites "could" be developed, and that a later stage would be to develop criteria over whether they "should" be developed. • ND also set out the anticipated timetable for the development of the Minerals Local Plan. • MD explained the difference between assessing proposals for inclusion in a Plan and determining actual applications. • In a wide ranging discussion the Parish Councils

Councillor Rachel Jenkins, Nick Dean	and Wildmoor representatives explained their concerns about the nature of the existing sites, particularly the lack of progress in restoring the sites, their concern that the proposals were to create landfill space rather than market driven mineral workings and in particular, their concern at the possible risks of these proposals to the aquifer, which supplies local water supplies. They also expressed concern at their perception of the limited enforcement undertaken at these sites and their frustration at having to lead these matters. • The Planning Officers explained the nature of consultation processes between them at the various stages anticipated. • ND emphasised the Parish Councils' value in drawing Officers' attention to local matters and, with MD, the need to respond to consultations at the right time.

Redditch Borough Council

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Redditch Borough Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

Redditch Borough Council commented on the Crushed Rock, Sand and Gravel, Building Stone and Oil and Gas documents and their comments have been taken into account in revised versions of the documents which have been published on our website www.worcestershire.gov.uk/mineralsbackground.

No meetings were held with Redditch Borough Council in this monitoring period.

In January 2015 Redditch Borough Council was asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. A response was received and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Wyre Forest District Council

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. Wyre Forest District Council was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

No meetings were held with Wyre Forest District Council in this monitoring period.

In January 2015 Wyre Forest District Council was asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. A response was received and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

South Worcestershire Authorities (Worcester City, Wychavon District and Malvern Hills District Councils)

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. The South Worcestershire Authorities were consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

They were also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No responses were received.

In January 2015, all three South Worcestershire authorities were asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. Responses were received and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Meeting details	Key issues and outcomes
Date: 28th May 2014 County Hall **Present:** Worcestershire County Council: Marianne Joynes, Sarah Button South Worcestershire Authorities: Malvern Hills DC – David Clarke Worcester City Council – Ann Cooper Wychavon District Council – Andrew Ford	The agenda for the meeting focused on the points raised in South Worcestershire's response to the Second Stage Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan which required discussion. WCC's initial response to all of SW's comments was circulated in the form of extracts from WCC's draft response document in advance of the meeting. Supply and provision: • Discussion centred around the lack of clear targets which the Minerals Local Plan would need to provide. WCC explained lack of clarity and data, coupled with changing requirements and policy framework at the national level. New locally produced LAA (primarily based on average of past 10 years sales) rather than former "apportionment" means amounts will vary slightly every year. • SW concerned that 10 year average could underprovide due to economic downturn in 2008. WCC suggested that the rolling ten-year average still includes some pre-slump years, and in future will capture any upturn, so hopefully it broadly balances out. It is also not maximum figure, so more can be produced if required. SW suggested that WCC should look at breaking targets down into milestones throughout the plan period. WCC agreed to look at this. • SW asked whether there is any joint work taking place to address data issues (e.g. on sales, imports, demand, need, and landbanks) to provide a sound evidence base. WCC confirmed that there is no joint work taking place at present, and WM AWP has not been fully functional for some time to co-ordinate such work. ND was at a regional meeting of mineral planning authorities, and future WM AWP meetings are being arranged, so this may start to happen. Worcestershire is at the moment a net importer of crushed rock, and a net exporter of sand and gravel.

	Allocating specific sites, preferred areas or areas of search • DC expressed concern that the second stage consultation focused too strongly on restoration opportunities up front rather than determining restoration options after sites have been identified. WCC explained that the second stage consultation was focused on the restoration-led approach as this is new, and most other aspects of the plan (e.g. policies to ensure protection of assets, consideration of impacts etc) are more "standard". • Geological data is reasonable in some places and virtually non-existent in others. WCC produced an analysis of mineral resources in the county using BGS data, but it doesn't give detailed enough information to identify suitable "sites". Industry has proposed some sites through this consultation, and WCC is considering whether these can be taken forward as preferred areas or specific sites. However, these are unlikely to provide enough mineral to meet requirements over the plan period, so likely to still need to designate some areas of search. • AC noted that industry can be cautious about releasing site information, and that this can stymie plan-making. WCC intends to have monitoring criteria in place to ensure that we can act if sites are not coming forward. • DC felt the areas of search are too wide and criteria need to be developed to refine these. The wider the area, the more uncertainty is created for industry and local people. MJ explained that the old "sieve test" approach that was previously employed is no longer appropriate due to changes in best practice and national policy. WCC wants to encourage positive development and restoration. WCC believes the policy framework will be strong enough to ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts from development on SSSIs, AONBs or landscape etc. The 2nd stage consultation contained policy headings, but WCC will be developing detailed policy criteria for the next consultation. SW agreed to help with sense-checking these in draft stage. DC suggested this should be extended to other districts. • Comprehensive working of and extensions to existing sites was discussed, and whether this should be prioritised before identifying new sites. WCC agrees that comprehensive working of

	resources is desirable; however need to ensure smaller companies are not prevented from coming forward. In principle we would like all sites to be worked as fully as possible, notwithstanding the need to allow for a useable final landform. DC stated that this needs to be strengthened as did not come across. • DC suggested that any mining or quarrying would be against the purpose of an AONB or SSSI. However, MJ explained that under current National policy these areas are not specifically excluded. Bredon Hill, because of its SAC, may be slightly different. • SW enquired whether the MLP would cover "fracking", WCC confirmed that there will be a chapter on energy minerals which will cover fracking. SB will ensure the background document on oil, gas and unconventional hydrocarbons is circulated to the local authorities in the county. Restoration • SW's had concerns that restoration profiles had been developed without reference to the SWDP. MJ explained that this was mainly due to timescales and was intended to put our thinking forward for comment (type of information which should influence restoration proposals). Areas of search as they appear in the second stage consultation won't necessarily be taken forward in that form. • AC noted that the restoration of sites depends on the envisaged after use, and that a recreation after use might demand a much higher standard of restoration. • AC expressed concern that industrial uses on working sites (e.g. concrete batching or C&D recycling plant) could establish the principle of industrial development, and the MLP needs to prevent these from becoming an "industrial hangover" in the countryside. MJ indicated that the Waste Core Strategy already has a policy that waste recycling infrastructure be tied to the life of the working, and that we are likely to look at doing something similar for Minerals. The MLP will need to balance safeguarding these assets where they are appropriate whilst ensuring there is no undesirable legacy remaining after the working has concluded. • Re-use of waste and landfill for restoration was discussed. The WCS shows that there is enough landfill space for the life of the strategy. Landfill

	would need to be very strongly justified as the best restoration option, and it would usually need to be inert material. Figures for recycled and secondary aggregates need to be included in the MLP. Difficulty establishing 'targets' for recycled and secondary aggregates due to lack of data. Strengthening the role of recycled and secondary material through policies would assist SW in requiring its use in development. • DC stated that his general point that restoration is important but only after sites have been identified still stands. He believes the second stage consultation had an over-emphasis on areas of search and restoration priorities, and that we should not determine restoration profiles until after specific sites are identified. • AC stated that development management policies on restoration and aftercare conditions are required to ensure that restoration is in the context of broader landscape policies and that these are taken into account. Safeguarding • *SWDP site allocations, overlap with mineral resources* ○ At the first stage consultation there was a discussion with Worcestershire Officers about which sites were being allocated. DC stated that as a matter of principle Worcestershire Officers should have spoken to South Worcestershire Authorities about wider areas of search before the second consultation. ○ The SWDP housing sites mainly adjoin existing settlements. A second call for sites has taken place and currently sieving them. ○ Electronic maps were consulted. There are potentially more pockets of overlap between the mineral resource areas and the housing allocations than South Worcestershire officers may have realised. Some of these overlie potentially good mineral resources. Questions were raised about whether these mineral resources might be "showstoppers" for housing applications, or cause significant delays. As the SWDP is at the examination stage, it is important that Officers are aware of the risks. As the MLP work is in the public domain, and the NPPF requires safeguarding mineral resources, even if

	the policy is not written the evidence base is useable. ○ DC asked whether we would have a policy of requiring assessment if there is any overlap between housing allocations and minerals sites, and taking a decision of whether extraction is economically viable and practicable. AC stated that the problem is that the burden of proof for the application is with the applicant, but for plan-making it lies with us, and that she is concerned about what the inspector might say regarding the impact mineral safeguarding might have on the timing of housing sites coming on-line. ○ SW will send WCC the GIS shape files with housing allocations that were used for the transport modelling on the understanding that specific information is confidential. WCC will compare these sites with minerals data and a follow up meeting can be held if required. This needs to happen swiftly as minerals constraints could have an impact on transport modelling and plan phasing. • *Infrastructure assets* ○ The MLP has to safeguard concrete batching plants, rail heads, wharves etc. and will need a policy to say when safeguarding is necessary and when these assets can be let go. DC requested that further detail be provided, and MJ indicated that we have begun work mapping existing assets, but that we would also need to safeguard any similar sites that come forward during the plan period. The policy may resemble the safeguarding policy for waste facilities in the Waste Core Strategy. • *Opportunities for water or rail transport* ○ WCC is also considering whether we should safeguard potential opportunities for rail or wharves. We have no information about where those might be developed, but if we expect significant crushed rock imports, we will need to import it somehow, and if we want to do it sustainably, we'll need a depot to do that. This is unlikely to come forward for a minerals use alone, and this may need to be worked up further through a joint SPD.

	Abberley Hills – continuing old policy • The 1997 Minerals Plan didn't allow quarrying in the Abberley Hills. However, the Hills do not have AONB status, and under current National policy even AONBs are not discounted completely. However our analysis of mineral resources eliminated the Abberleys from consideration on the size of the deposits. Previous quarrying there was abandoned as the material was of poor quality. Landbank • The draft vision in the second stage consultation aims to achieve the landbank "targets" by halfway through the plan period at the latest. Worcestershire does not currently meet landbank requirements, and this is unlikely to change significantly by the start of the plan period, so we can't say we will maintain it throughout. We have tried to be both optimistic about bringing things forward and realistic about when it might occur. We think that halfway through is realistic, but recognise that wording needs to strengthen the aim to achieve landbank levels as soon as possible. Monitoring indicators will be developed so that further work can be done to bring more sites forward if necessary. • There is a mismatch between the old regional apportionments that say we must produce crushed rock and the fact that we have had no applications for crushed rock for many years. Our last crushed rock quarry has now ceased production. If no other sites come forward, then as we move from the old apportionment to the LAA based on past sales, the landbank requirement will diminish and in 10 years' time we would not have a landbank requirement for crushed rock at all. DC asked whether there are counties that just don't have the resources, and AC asked whether that increases the vulnerability of a plan being found sound. MJ said that all we can do is indicate the level we think we should be producing, but make clear the limitations in the deliverability section, or alternatively say that we have a lower target and unmet need and are therefore relying on imports. There are other plans in a similar situation that are reliant on imports, and is this where Duty to Cooperate memoranda are important. For Worcestershire, crushed rock resources are in highly constrained areas, and may not be of great quality. We can encourage development, but if no one wants to work our resources, then it won't happen. • AC asked about instilling a buffer between housing and workings (thinking about the example of SW site allocations). MJ explained that our previous policy of

	buffering workings from any "group of six houses" hasn't worked very well, and so now we want to make sure that the impacts of noise, dust, or visual impacts can be assessed from any location with no strict buffer. For sand and gravel extraction especially, there may be little difference between ground works for a major housing development and working a site for minerals.
	
	• *Housing completions and targets figures*
	  ○ SW's response to the MLP consultation suggested looking at previous housing completion figures and Local Plan targets to assist with demand forecasting. **SW agreed to provide figures confidentially, probably broken down into 2010-2020 and 2020-2030**. The SWDP inspector wants the shortfall in housing to be addressed at the beginning of the plan in order to boost supply as soon as possible.
	  ○ WCC noted that this might mean that Worcestershire's assumption that we need a steady supply of minerals (based on housebuilding) over the life of the plan may not be accurate, as need will increase rapidly at the start of the plan period and become more unclear as the plan period goes on.
	
	Outcomes and actions
	• *Outcomes:*
	  ○ Clarity provided on most major points of concern.
	  ○ Some remaining concern that restoration should not be put before identifying suitable sites.
	  ○ Agreed that maintaining dialogue on progression of MLP and SWDP is essential and that SW and WCC officers will help with data sharing and sense-checking wherever possible.
	
	• *Consideration of and alignment with SWDP*
	  ○ WCC officers will assist SW authorities with looking at overlap between minerals resources and housing allocations in the SWDP.
	  ▪ SW to send allocation GIS data.
	  ○ SW to send WCC their housing completion future projection figures,
	  ○ WCC to contact SW once draft policies

	available, SW to sense-check draft policies. ○ WCC to give greater consideration to SWDP in writing of the spatial portrait for the draft plan, SW to review this with the draft policies. SW to send details of anything that they consider to be of critical importance for inclusion. (DC mentioned that landscape policies might be useful, both SWDP and MLP based on Landscape Character Assessment). • *How can SW officers help?* ○ SW to sense-check draft MLP policies and contribute information for spatial portrait. ○ The potential for a secondment opportunity with WCC (subject to finance and heads of service agreements) was raised. SW indicated that they are under resource and staffing pressure at the moment as well, but said that they would bring it back to their respective teams. ▪ WCC to provide a brief job description/person specification outlining what the secondment would be for, timescale, and skills needed. ○ SW advised that SFRA for SWDP is available on their website and may be useful for the MLP. • *Other points:* ○ WCC agreed to look at breaking targets down into milestones throughout the plan period. ○ SB to circulate background document on oil, gas and unconventional hydrocarbons to the local authorities in the county. **Future meetings** • To review potential overlaps between housing allocations and mineral resources if desk-based GIS work is not sufficient (ASAP). • Workshop sessions for draft policies.
Date: 4th August 2014 County Hall **Present:** Worcestershire County Council: Emily Barker, Nick Dean, Marianne Joynes	Meeting to discuss minerals safeguarding and overlap with SWDP. Discussion of the need for safeguarding of minerals and an overview of national policy context. Policy SWDP32 (Minerals) in the Draft SWDP seeks to align with the NPPF and the emerging MLP.

South Worcestershire Authorities: SWDP Project Manager – Paul Bayliss Malvern Hills DC – David Clarke Worcester City Council – Ann Cooper Wychavon District Council – Fred Davies	Following the meeting of 28th May, SW provided WCC with GIS polygons of 188 proposed site allocations in the SWDP, together with other sites being assessed to meet the required uplift in housing numbers. WCC assessed those against the best information available on the location of potentially economic mineral resources. This assessment concluded that there were 23 sites where there may be minerals worthy of safeguarding and where further information may be required relating to whether the mineral is of economic potential and worth safeguarding. Discussion and matters arising: • Planning permission had already been granted on a number of sites. • A saved policy from the current MLP includes criteria which make a buffer strip of 200m from the boundary of a potential working area to the nearest main walls of the nearest property in a settlement group of 6 or more dwellings a Primary Constraint to mineral working. Whilst this criterion may be revised in the emerging MLP, it was agreed that the current policy is nonetheless part of the Development Plan and should be applied to the current assessment of sites. • Some of the sites may be too small to be viable for minerals extraction or are constrained by surrounding development. In light of the above factors, the list of 23 sites was re-considered and it was concluded that the only site where a minerals resource assessment is likely to be required is on the north of the Worcester West site at Temple Laugherne. It was also agreed that, subject to consultation, the emerging MLP could include an exemption relating to sites allocated in adopted Local Plans being exempt from the minerals safeguarding policy. (Following this meeting, the need for a Minerals Resource Assessment at Temple Laugherne was raised by Malvern Hills District Council at a meeting with the developers in November 2014)

From March 2015, following Inspector's questions, officers from Worcestershire County Council assisted in refining the text of policies in the South Worcestershire Development Plan relating to Minerals and Waste.

<u>"SPAIG" consultations</u>

Through the Worcestershire "Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Group" (SPAIG) the council comments on applications made to the City, Borough and District councils for planning permission for strategically significant development in and adjoining the county and on emerging Plans. Alongside other matters including flooding, green infrastructure and highways, comments were made on the mineral and waste implications of the following planning applications, neighbourhood and local plans, and pre-application queries during the monitoring year:

Planning applications:

- 4.85MW solar farm at Morton Wood Farm, Abbots Morton (Wychavon, 14/01549)
- Solar farm at Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane (Malvern Hills, 15/00386/FUL)
- 299 dwellings, etc. at land east of Brockhill Lane, Redditch (Redditch, 2014/256/OUT)
- Reconfiguration of Cathedral Plaza (Worcester, P14D0253)
- 49.86MW solar Farm at Defford Aerodrome (Wychavon, 14/01244)
- 190 dwellings at land to the East off Evesham Road, Harvington (Wychavon, 14/02434)
- Reserved matters for 100 dwellings off Stonepit Lane, Inkberrow (Wychavon, 15/00282)
- 260 dwellings at land at Oldbury Road, Worcester (Malvern Hills, 14/00025/OUT)
- 2250sq.m of class A1, etc. at Land North of the Orchard (Wychavon, 14/01817)
- Retail development at Longbridge Town Centre (Birmingham, 2013/09229/PA)
- 110 dwellings at land at Lower Howsell Road (Malvern, 14/01231/OUT)
- Erection of Laboratory U1 at Malvern Hills Science Park (Malvern, 14/00380/REM)
- 550 dwellings, etc. at Campden Road, Long Marston (Stratford, 14/01186/OUT)
- Mixed use development at land east of Nunnery Way (Worcester, P14Q0023)
- 250 bed hotel, etc. and water park at land to the East of Bunkers Hill (Wyre Forest, 14/0591/FULL/OUT)
- 8.94MW solar park at Rectory Farm, Upton Warren (Wychavon, 14/02267)
- Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a 4856sqm Class A1 (Worcester, P14G0153)
- Erection of a building comprising of Class 110 C2 care apartments and 29 C3 apartments at Wood Norton, Evesham (Wychavon, 14/00547)
- 103 dwellings at Broomhall Way, Worcester (Worcester, P14L0266)
- 200 dwellings, etc. at Middle Battenhall Farm, Worcester (Worcester, P13B0632)
- Reserved matters for a 3-storey office (B1a) building at Worcester Technology Park (Wychavon, 14/02522)
- Development comprising of B1, B2 and B3 uses at Worcester Technology Park (Wychavon, 14/02524)
- Reserved matters for structural landscaping, etc. at Worcester Technology Park (Wychavon, 14/02523)

- Creation of new class A1, A3 and A5 units, etc. at Worcester Woods Retail Park (Worcester, P14Q0562)
- Siting of 540 solar panels at The Groaten, Ashton under Hill (Wychavon)
- 1 turbine at Norton Fields Farm (Wychavon, 14/01569/PN)
- Solar farm at land at Woodhall Farm, Wichenford (Malvern Hills)
- Reserved matters for siting, design, etc. at Perdiswell Leisure Centre (Worcester, P15M0061)
- 120 dwellings at Worcester Road, Drakes Broughton (Wychavon)
- Perdiswell Leisure Centre (Worcester, P15M0061)

Planning Appeal

- 98 houses at Tewkesbury road, Bredon (Wychavon, 13/02148)

SPDs

- Wyre Forest Affordable Housing SPD

Neighbourhood Plans

- Bredon Neighbourhood Plan
- Cleve Prior Neighbourhood Plan
- Application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area from Drakes Broughton, Wadborough and Pirton
- Eckington Neighbourhood Plan
- Feckenham Neighbourhood Plan
- Application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area from Great Witley and Hillhampton
- Application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area from Hanbury
- Application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area from Hanley Castle
- Harvington Neighbourhood Plan
- Application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area from Malvern Town
- Upton Neighbourhood Plan

Local Plans

- Gloucestershire Minerals Local Plan
- Dudley Town Centre Area Action Plan
- Staffordshire Minerals Local Plan
- Tewkesbury Borough Plan (Site Options and Policies)

Pre application discussion on minerals safeguarding

- Proposed development in Hallow
- Proposed development in Rushwick

Engagement with other bodies

Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (WLEP)

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. WLEP was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire

- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

No meetings were held with WLEP in this monitoring period, although its representatives were updated on progress on the Minerals Local Plan through their attendance at meetings of the Worcestershire Local Nature Partnership.

Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP)
A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. GBSLEP was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

No meetings were held with GBSLEP in this monitoring period

Worcestershire Local Nature Partnership (LNP)
The Worcestershire Partnership has been remodelled into a wider range of groups. One of the most relevant to the Minerals Local Plan is the newly formed Local Nature Partnership.

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. GBSLEP was consulted by direct mail via the LNP secretary but did not submit comments.

Date: 4th June 2014 The Hive, Worcester **Present:** Worcestershire Minerals and Waste Team: Nick Dean, Sarah Button LNP members: Adrian Darby, Kemerton Conservation Trust; Cllr Anthony Blagg, Worcs. CC; Ben Horovitz, Worcs. CC; Chris Dobbs,	Worcestershire's Minerals and Waste team gave an introduction to the Minerals Local Plan at this meeting, outlining that: • The Minerals Local Plan (MLP) will set the context for how and where minerals are extracted in Worcestershire, and how minerals sites are restored, over the next 15 years and beyond. The plan seeks to challenge the conventional way of doing things by being 'restoration-led'. Worcestershire is leading nationally in this approach and as such it is 'uncharted territory'. • Ongoing demand and expected growth in construction means there will be continuing pressure to provide mineral resources. • Recent changes in national policy mean the MLP

Worcester City Council; Claire Bridges, Worcestershire LEP; Colin Raven, Worcestershire Wildlife Trust; Dave Throup, Environment Agency (Chair); David Jullien, Act on Energy; Elaine Halford-Bishop, Wyre Forest DC; Emily Barker, Worcs. CC; Ewan Calcott, Forestry Commission; Glenys Tucker, Natural England; Jack Hanson, Worcs. Archive & Archaeology; Justin Milward, Woodland Trust; Katy Boom, University of Worcester; Moira Jenkins, Earth Heritage Trust; Peter Boland, English Heritage; Rachel Datlen, Worcs. CC; Rebecca Lashley, Worcs. CC.	will need to identify sites. Threshold for potential areas of search in Second Consultation was 200Ha to enable landscape-scale restoration. However, this threshold is being reviewed. • Key challenges that have emerged from the second stage consultation include refining the areas of search, assessing the sites that have been submitted by industry, and moving forward with drafting policies. Conclusions The group voiced strong support for the restoration-led approach, but stressed the importance of working with industry and gaining their support in making the plan a reality. LNP members were requested to get in touch with the Worcestershire planners if they feel they have GI evidence that could be used to support development of the MLP. Other agenda items at this meeting included Historic Environment Floods Project, Worcestershire LEP Update, Commissioning at Worcestershire County Council, The New Environmental Land Management Scheme, and Renewable Energy Update.

Other LNP meetings took place during the monitoring year but minerals and waste matters were not on their agendas.

Joint activities and approaches

The county and district planning officers in Worcestershire work closely together, through the Worcestershire Planning Officers Group, to address issues which are of importance to both county and districts, are better considered collaboratively, or impact on more than one district. This has included Continuing Professional Development training events, and work on evidence based research papers which have informed district and county planning policy. The County Council's Planning Team has also developed shared evidence based documents for use by the Districts and the County Council which have informed the development of the Waste Core Strategy and will inform the development of the Minerals Local Plan.

Green Infrastructure Partnership

The Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership includes statutory agencies such as the Environment Agency, Natural England, Forestry Commission and

English Heritage[4], local authorities, and voluntary sector organisations such as Worcestershire Wildlife Trust. Worcestershire County Council is a lead member of the Partnership and provides its secretariat. The GI Partnership has developed the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy and supporting evidence to guide the delivery of green infrastructure in the county through development, regeneration and environmental projects. The GI Partnership also works at the site level to influence development and ensure the successful delivery of ecosystem services.

The Minerals Local Plan was an agenda item at the meeting of 8th July 2014. A note was circulated to Partnership members in advance outlining how the council was considering changing its approach to areas of search and site concept plans following responses to the Second Stage Consultation. The Green Infrastructure Partnership members were thanked for their contribution so far and were asked to contribute to the preparation of Green Infrastructure Concept Plans for specific sites through providing representatives on the Minerals / GI steering group and supplying datasets and comments as necessary.

The Minerals Local Plan was also an agenda item at the meeting of 14th January 2015. Officers explained how areas of search have evolved since the Second Stage Consultation into Strategic Corridors, how profiles are being developed for these to achieve coordinated benefits across the landscape, and how individual site proposals are being assessed.

Minerals Green Infrastructure Steering Group

A steering group was established to assist with embedding the Green Infrastructure approach in the Minerals Local Plan. The group consists of:

- English Heritage[5]
- Environment Agency
- Forestry Commission
- Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Group
- Natural England
- Nature After Minerals/RSPB
- Worcestershire Wildlife Trust
- Worcestershire County Council:
    - Strategic Planning & Environmental Policy
    - Ecology
    - Landscape
    - Development Management
    - Water/flooding
    - Countryside Access & Recreation
    - Historic Environment

Not all participants have attended all meetings, but all have been included on email circulations with agendas, minutes and draft documents for comment.

21st August 2014:

[4] Historic England (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) was known as English Heritage until 1 April 2015.

[5] Historic England (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) was known as English Heritage until 1 April 2015.

Workshop looking at how to take forward the Green Infrastructure approach to areas of search "corridors" and "concept statements" for individual sites. Members assisted in developing the strategic approach as well as potential policy wording and identifying priorities within concept plans.

The Environment Agency

In addition to being a member of the Green Infrastructure Steering Group, the Environment Agency was consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation which was held during July and August 2014. The Environment Agency did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

No response was received.

In January 2015, the Environment Agency was asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. A response was received and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Date: 14th August 2014 County Hall **Present:** Worcestershire Minerals and Waste Team: Nick Dean, Marianne Joynes, Martyn Wilson Environment Agency: Carl Cording	Meeting to discuss draft Minerals Local Plan background document "flood risk and water management issues" and the Environment Agency's comments on the Second Stage Consultation. The document had been shared and commented on in advance, discussion focused on those comments. The Environment Agency is producing Water Improvement Plans and Water Action Plans. They are not currently in public domain but will share with WCC as soon as possible as they may be useful in identifying opportunities the MLP could help to deliver. River Basin Management Plans will be consulted on in September 2014. Ground water and ground water flooding: not much information for Worcestershire at plan-level, but Flood Risk Assessments should pick up on it at site-level. MLP policy will need to consider water compatible

	development and the sequential test but not be so rigid that opportunities for betterment are lost. SFRA level 2 could draw on districts' SFRAs.

The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage[6])

In addition to being a member of the Green Infrastructure Steering Group, English Heritage was consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation which was held during July and August 2014. English Heritage submitted comments (reference C016-716). These were general comments relating to; traditional building stone and roofing materials, considering impacts to the historic environment and opportunities for conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, links to English Heritage's guidance documents, and heritage impact assessments.

English Heritage was also consulted on the draft background evidence documents Building Stone in Worcestershire. No response was received.

In January 2015 English Heritage was asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. A response was received and these comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

Date: 12th February 2015 County Hall **Present:** Worcestershire County Council: Nick Dean, Rebecca Schofield (Minerals and Waste Planning Policy), Adam Mindykowski (Historic Environment and Countryside Advisor) English Heritage: Kezia Taylerson, Katriona Byrne	Explanation and discussion of the background to and nature and content of the emerging Minerals Local Plan for Worcestershire. Matters included an explanation of the nature and distribution of mineral resources in Worcestershire and the stages undertaken so far, broadening into general discussion about spatial strategy, development management policies, building stone and local clay, specific sites, concept plans. Agreed that there were no outstanding objections in principle between English Heritage and Worcestershire County Council on the Minerals Local Plan to date and both parties will continue to work together to develop it.

[6] Historic England (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) was known as English Heritage until 1 April 2015.

Natural England

In addition to being a member of the Green Infrastructure Steering Group, Natural England was consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation which was held during July and August 2014. Natural England submitted comments (reference C017-717). These comments were generic advice on key natural environment considerations, including: avoiding harm to the international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; avoiding harm to nationally and locally designated sites of importance for geological conservation; soil, agricultural land quality and reclamation; avoiding harm to the character of nationally protected landscapes, national parks and locally valued landscapes; avoiding harm to priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations; seeking opportunities to contribute to landscape restoration and enhancement; seeking opportunities to contribute to the restoration and re-creation of habitats, the recovery of priority species populations and biodiversity enhancement; and seeking opportunities to enhance public rights of way and accessible natural green space.

Natural England was also consulted on the following draft background evidence documents:

- Crushed Rock in Worcestershire
- Sand and Gravel in Worcestershire
- Building Stone in Worcestershire
- Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Oil and Gas; excluding Coal)
- Bird Strike
- Review of mineral planning permissions in Worcestershire (ROMPs)
- Concrete Batching and Asphalting Plants in Worcestershire

A response was received to each of these and the comments have been taken into account in revised versions of the documents which have been published on our website www.worcestershire.gov.uk/mineralsbackground.

In January 2015 Natural England was asked to comment on whether, considering the issues within their remit, they considered that minerals development on each of the sites which had been submitted by landowners, operators and agents for consideration as specific sites in the Minerals Local Plan in response to the Second Stage Consultation and the Call for Sites is likely or unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms. A response was received and Natural England's comments will inform a "Deliverability Assessment" of the sites.

The Mayor of London

The Mayor did not respond to the "Get involved in Planning" leaflet. No issues have been identified which require co-operation with the Mayor of London; therefore the Mayor was not consulted on any activities during this monitoring year.

The Civil Aviation Authority

A "call for sites" consultation was held during July and August 2014. The Civil Aviation Authority was consulted by direct mail but did not submit comments.

It was also consulted on the Bird Strike draft background evidence documents. A response was received from the Civil Aviation Authority's Directorate of Airspace

Policy, referring to chapter 5 of CAP 168 and CAP 172 Aerodrome Wildlife Strike Hazard Management and Reduction. These comments have been taken into account in revised versions of the documents which have been published on our website www.worcestershire.gov.uk/mineralsbackground.

The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)

No issues have been identified which require co-operation with the Homes and Communities Agency. However, they were consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation held during July and August 2014. A response was received (reference C012-2192) stating that the HCA had no comments to make.

Clinical Commissioning Groups

The Primary Care Trusts and Acute Hospitals Trusts were sent the "Get Involved with Planning" survey and did not respond. The Primary Care Trusts have been disbanded and new Clinical Commissioning Groups set up. These are:

- South Worcestershire CCG
- Redditch and Bromsgrove CCG
- Wyre Forest CCG

A single point of contact was established to act as conduit for all liaison over health matters.

The Office of Rail Regulation

The Office of Rail Regulation was consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation during July and August 2014. No response was received.

Transport for London

No issues have been identified which require co-operation with Transport for London; therefore Transport for London was not consulted on any activities during this monitoring year.

Integrated Transport Authorities

Centro were consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation held during July and August 2014. No response was received.

Highways Authorities

The Highways Agency was consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation which was held during July and August 2014.No response was received.

WCC Highways team were consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation which was held during July and August 2014.No response was received.

Marine Management Organisations

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) was consulted by direct mail on the "call for sites" consultation which was held during July and August 2014. No response was received.