

# Worcestershire Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Authority Monitoring Report

January 2018 to December 2020

# Contents

<b>Contents</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Monitoring implementation of the Mineral and Waste Local Development Scheme (LDS)</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Milestones set out in LDS adopted April 2017.....	5
Milestones set out in LDS adopted July 2018 .....	6
Milestones set out in LDS adopted September 2020 .....	8
<b>Monitoring Community Involvement</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Indicator SCI1: Satisfaction levels with the Development Plan process/service.....	9
Indicator SCI2: Response rates to planning policy consultations.....	9
Indicator SCI3: Satisfaction levels with the planning application process/service.....	10
<b>Indicators relating to planning applications for mineral development</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Indicator M1. Permissions for minerals development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding.....	12
Indicator M2. Permissions for minerals development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality.....	12
Indicator M3. Permissions for minerals development that include provision for energy efficiency.....	13
Indicator M4. Permissions having an unacceptable adverse impact on landscape character, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, battlefields or registered historic parks and gardens.....	13
Indicator M5. Permissions granted in the Malvern Hills or Cotswolds AONBs.....	14
Indicator M6. Permissions for minerals development take into account local characteristics.....	14
Indicator M7. Permissions for minerals development that take into account amenity considerations.....	15
Indicator M8. Permissions granted in accordance with highways advice.....	15
Indicator M10. Applications for waste management/minerals development determined within 13 weeks (16 weeks for EIA development), or within an agreed extension of time.....	15
Indicator M11a. Proportion of approved applications discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.....	16
Indicator M11b. Number of proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.....	16
Indicator M19. Permitted applications for minerals development which include a Consultation Statement.....	17
Indicator M20. Decisions where there are no policies in the Development Plan which are relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision.....	17
Indicator M21. New mineral development in 'preferred areas'.....	18
Indicator M27. Increase in GVA in Worcestershire from minerals development.....	18
<b>Indicators relating to the supply of mineral</b> .....	<b>20</b>

Indicator M9. Production of secondary and recycled aggregates.....	20
Indicator M12a. Annual production of primary land won aggregates (Sand and Gravel).....	20
Indicator M12b. Annual production of primary land won aggregates (Crushed Rock).....	21
Indicator M13. Landbank of permitted sand and gravel reserves.....	21
Indicator M14. Landbank of permitted crushed rock reserves. ....	22
Indicator M15. Landbank of permitted clay reserves.....	22
Indicator M16. Sufficient productive capacity for sand and gravel supply. ....	23
Indicator M17. Sufficient productive capacity for crushed rock supply.....	23
Indicator M18. Sufficient productive capacity for clay supply. ....	24
Indicator M23. Annual production of silica sand.....	24
Indicator M24. Landbank of permitted silica sand reserves.....	25
Indicator M25. Annual production of building stone. ....	25
Indicator M26. Landbank of permitted building stone reserves. ....	26
<b>Indicators relating to planning applications for waste management development.....</b>	<b>27</b>
Indicator W1. Permissions granted for waste management development contrary to the EA advice on flooding.....	27
Indicator W2. Permissions granted for waste management development contrary to the EA advice on water quality.....	27
Indicator W3. Permissions for waste management development that include measures for energy efficiency.....	28
Indicator W4: Permissions for waste management development with a gross floor space of over 1000m2 gaining at least 10% of energy supply annually from renewable energy supplies.....	28
Indicator W5: Permissions for waste management development that include measures for water efficiency.....	29
Indicator W6: Permissions for new landfill capacity that include landfill gas management systems.....	29
Indicator W7: Permissions for new built waste management development that include provision for biodiversity enhancement.....	30
Indicator W8: Permissions that have an unacceptable adverse impact on landscape character, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, battlefields or registered historic parks and gardens.....	30
Indicator W9: Permissions for new waste management development granted in the Malvern Hills or Cotswolds AONB.....	30
Indicator W10: Permissions for waste new management development that take into account local characteristics.....	31
Indicator W11: Permissions for new waste management development [that] take into account amenity considerations.....	31
Indicator W12: Permissions for new waste management development on greenfield sites.....	32
Indicator W13: Permissions for new waste management development in the Green Belt.....	32

Indicator W14: Permissions granted in accordance with highways advice.....	32
Indicator W24. Applications for Waste Management development determined within 13 weeks.	33
Indicator W25a. Proportion of waste management applications discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.....	33
Indicator W25b. Number of waste management proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage .....	34
Indicator W26. Permitted applications for waste management which include a consultation statement.....	34
Indicator W27. Decisions where there are no policies in the Development Plan which are relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision.....	35
Indicator W28. Increase in GVA in Worcestershire from Waste Management.....	35
Indicator W29. Permitted 'other recovery' and disposal (excluding landfill) capacity at each level of the geographic hierarchy.....	36
Indicator W30. Permitted re-use, recycling, storage, sorting and transfer capacity at each level of the geographic hierarchy.....	36
<b>Indicators relating to waste management capacity .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Indicator W16a. Local Authority Collected Waste sent to landfill.....	38
Indicator W16b. Commercial and Industrial waste sent to landfill .....	38
Indicator W16c. Construction and Demolition waste sent to landfill .....	39
Indicator W16d. Hazardous waste sent to landfill.....	39
Indicator W17a. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of LACW waste .....	40
Indicator W17b. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of Commercial and Industrial waste .....	41
Indicator W17c. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of Construction and Demolition waste.....	42
Indicator W17d. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of Hazardous waste.....	42
Indicator W18. Adoption of appropriate policies regarding managing waste arisings from all new development in City, Borough and District Council DPDs .....	43
Indicator W19. Development permitted within 250m of waste management facilities against County Council advice.....	44
Indicator W20. Progress towards equivalent self-sufficiency in re-use and recycling capacity based on headline delivery milestones in Table 5 and Policy WCS 2.....	44
Indicator W21. Progress towards equivalent self-sufficiency in 'other recovery' capacity, based on headline delivery milestones in table 5 and Policy WCS 2. ....	45
Indicator W22. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in sorting and transfer capacity.....	46
Indicator W23a. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in disposal and landfill capacity for non-inert waste.....	46
Indicator W23b. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in disposal and landfill capacity for inert waste.....	47
Indicator W23c. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in disposal and landfill capacity for hazardous waste.....	48

<b>Duty to co-operate: summary of activities 2018 – 2020 .....</b>	<b>49</b>
Emerging Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan .....	49
Emerging Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) .....	51
Strategic Duty to Co-operate Issue: Waste .....	52
Minerals and waste duty to co-operate activities relating to other public bodies'activities .....	52
Responses to planning policy and planning application consultations .....	52
Wider engagement with duty to Co-operate partners.....	53

# Monitoring implementation of the Mineral and Waste Local Development Scheme (LDS)

Three iterations of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) were in place during the 2018-2020 monitoring period:

- LDS adopted April 2017
- LDS adopted July 2018
- LDS adopted September 2020

The milestones in each iteration are set out below.

**An asterisk (\*) indicates that the milestone was amended in the subsequent Local Development Scheme, and an explanation is provided below.**

The current Local Development Scheme is available at [www.worcestershire.gov.uk/lds](http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/lds).

## Milestones set out in LDS adopted April 2017

### Minerals Local Plan

Fourth call for sites – ending in Q1 2018: **Achieved** (undertaken September 2017 - January 2018)

Preparation of Fourth Stage Consultation Document – spanning from 2017 to Q3 2018\*

Fourth Stage Consultation (Regulation 18) – Q4 2018\*

Consideration of representations – Q1 2019\*

Pre-submission consultation (Regulation 19) – Q2 2019\*

Submission (Regulation 22) – Q3 2019\*

Independent examination (Reg 24) – Q4 2019\*

Receipt of Inspector's Report (Reg 25) – Q1 2020\*

Adoption (Reg 26) – Q2 2020\*

### Waste Core Strategy

Preparatory work including compiling evidence base – commencing Q1 2020\*

### Explanation of changes leading to July 2018 LDS update:

Issues arose after the adoption of the July 2017 LDS which warranted an update to the LDS in July 2018, including adjustments to the milestones for the development of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents. These included:

- Staffing changes which were not foreseen when the July 2017 LDS was approved, which resulted in additional time being required for Sustainability Appraisal work to be continued by specialist consultants rather than in-house staff.
- A decision to address mineral site allocations in a separate Development Plan Document with its own preparation schedule. This would ensure that the strategic elements of the

Minerals Local Plan could be progressed as quickly as possible to provide certainty over the vision, objectives, spatial strategy and development management policies. Although it would significantly delay the certainty provided by allocating Specific Sites and Preferred Areas, it would build in flexibility for the Site Allocations to be reviewed and revised if necessary without affecting the strategic policies set out in the Minerals Local Plan.

- This led to moving the commencement of preparatory work on the Waste Core Strategy back to Q2 2021.

## **Milestones set out in LDS adopted July 2018**

### **Minerals Local Plan**

Fourth call for sites – ending in Q1 2018: **Achieved** (undertaken September 2017 to January 2018)

Preparation of Fourth Stage Consultation Document – spanning from 2017 to Q4 2018: **Achieved**

Fourth Stage Consultation (Regulation 18) – Q4 2018 to Q1 2019: **Achieved** (undertaken December 2018 to February 2019)

Consideration of representations – Q1-Q2 2019: **Achieved** (response document published May 2019)

Pre-submission consultation (Regulation 19) – Q3 2019: **Achieved** (undertaken August-September 2019)

Submission (Regulation 22) – Q4 2019: **Achieved** (submitted December 2019)

Independent examination (Reg 24) – Q4 2019 to Q3 2020: **Partially achieved, ongoing** (examination commenced December 2019)\*

Receipt of Inspector's Report (Reg 25) – Q3-Q4 2020\*

Adoption (Reg 26) – Q4 2020 to Q1 2021\*

### **Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document**

Consultation on site selection methodology (under Reg 18) – Q4 2018 to Q1 2019: **Achieved** (undertaken December 2018 to February 2019)

Consideration of representations – Q2 - Q3 2019: **Achieved** (response document published May 2019)

Preparation of draft document – Q4 2019 to Q2 2020\*

Consultation on draft document (Reg 18) – Q3-Q4 2020\*

Consideration of representations – Q1-Q2 2021\*

### **Waste Core Strategy**

5 year review through Authority Monitoring Report – Q4 2018 to Q1 2019: **Achieved in Q4 2020** (review incorporated in AMR of the period 2016-2017, published December 2020)

Preparatory work for review and revision of Waste Core Strategy – commencing Q2 2021\*

### **Explanation of changes leading to September 2020 LDS update:**

A revision to the Local Development Scheme was adopted in September 2020 which extended the timetable for the examination and adoption of the Minerals Local Plan and the timetable for the production of the Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document due to delays caused by the Covid-19 pandemic:

- The Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination in Public in December 2019, and public hearing sessions were scheduled to take place in May and June 2020, in line with the 2018 LDS. The Covid-19 pandemic and resulting restrictions meant that the hearing sessions had to be postponed by the Planning Inspectorate. The September 2020 LDS anticipated that the hearings would take place either by virtual technology or in a blended “physical and virtual” format in November 2020.
- The delays to the examination of the Minerals Local Plan were beyond the Council’s control but meant that the Inspector’s Report would not be received in Q3 or Q4 of 2020 and therefore that the Plan would not be returned to full Council for adoption in Q4 2020 or Q1 2021, as anticipated in the 2018 LDS.
- New anticipated milestones for the remaining stages of the examination and adoption of the Minerals Local Plan were proposed, with some flexibility incorporated to reflect uncertainty around ongoing and potential future Covid-19 restrictions and to avoid potential conflict with the County Council election period in 2021.
- The Covid-19 pandemic had also resulted in some delays to the programme for the Mineral Site Allocations DPD because of restrictions on officers’ ability to visit sites, and furloughed staff at consultancies and mineral companies. In addition, the majority of officers’ time in the Mineral and Waste Planning Policy team would still be engaged in the examination of the Minerals Local Plan over the coming months.
- As the Mineral Site Allocations DPD is intended to provide local policies which will be read alongside the strategic policies set by the Minerals Local Plan, and to minimise the potential for any confusion between the process for the two documents, consultation on the “preferred options” version of the Mineral Site Allocations DPD was scheduled to take place after the Inspectors’ Report on the Minerals Local Plan was received.
- The September 2020 LDS noted that there were significant uncertainties inherent in the timetable for the Mineral Site Allocations DPD, and that it was therefore very likely that the LDS would need to be revised during the course of the development of the Mineral Site Allocations DPD.

The September 2020 revision of the LDS also outlined the consequent changes to the timetable for commencing the review and revision of the adopted Waste Core Strategy for Worcestershire.

- The Authority Monitoring Report published in July 2020 included a statement on the review of the Waste Core Strategy, and this informed the September 2020 LDS. The review concluded that although the majority of the objectives of the Waste Core Strategy were being delivered, there were some areas which need to be addressed through policy revisions. More detailed review of the evidence would guide whether only parts of the Waste Core Strategy would need to be revised, or whether full revision would be required.
- The submission and examination of the Minerals Local Plan and the preparation of the Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document were given priority in the July 2018 LDS, and this prioritisation was maintained in the September 2020 LDS, with changes to the timetable for commencing this work reflecting the delays caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. The proposed timetable for commencing the review and revision of the Waste Core



Strategy from Q3 2021 was considered to be as soon as practicable given the need to progress the Minerals Development Plan Documents within existing staffing resources, and was considered to be an appropriate means of securing compliance with statutory requirements for reviewing plans.

## **Milestones set out in LDS adopted September 2020**

### **Minerals Local Plan**

Independent examination (Reg 24) – continuing up to Q4 2021: **Hearing sessions held November-December 2020 and examination ongoing\***

Remaining milestones (Receipt of Inspector’s Report and adoption of the plan) were scheduled for beyond this AMR monitoring period

### **Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document**

Fifth call for sites – Q1 2020: **Achieved** (undertaken January-March 2020)

Preparation of Preferred Options consultation documents – Q4 2019 to Q4 2021: **Partially achieved** (ongoing beyond monitoring period)\*

Remaining milestones were scheduled for beyond this AMR monitoring period

### **Waste Core Strategy**

5 year review through Authority Monitoring Report – Q3 2020: **Achieved in Q4 2020** (review incorporated in AMR of the period 2016-2017, published December 2020)

Detailed review establishing scope and purpose of revision of Waste Core Strategy, and subsequent milestones, were scheduled for beyond this AMR monitoring period.

# Monitoring Community Involvement

## **Indicator SCI1: Satisfaction levels with the Development Plan process/service.**

### **Target:**

Satisfaction with consultation methods employed.

### **2020 Performance:**

No data available.

### **Trend:**

2019: 71% of respondents were satisfied with the consultation process.

2018: No data available.

### **Explanation:**

As part of the December 2018 to February 2019 consultation on the Fourth Stage Consultation on the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan and the proposed methodology for the Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document, consultees were asked how satisfied they were with the consultation process. Based on a small number of responses, five consultees were satisfied (71%) and two were not satisfied (29%). This is a slight decrease compared to the previous AMR monitoring period, when 86% of respondents were satisfied with the Third Stage Minerals Local Plan consultation process. The limited sample size in both cases means that meaningful comparisons cannot be made. Although consultation on the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan took place in 2019, this did not include the question on satisfaction, as this was a focussed consultation concerned only with legal and procedural compliance, the soundness of the Minerals Local Plan, and the duty to co-operate.

### **Further information:**

More detail on the data behind this indicator is available in the Fourth Stage Consultation on the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan and Consultation on proposed methodology for Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document Response Document (2019)

## **Indicator SCI2: Response rates to planning policy consultations.**

### **Target:**

The SCI does not set specific targets.

### **2020 Performance:**

0.9%

### **Trend:**

2019: 4.3% and 11.5% response rates

2018: 2.5% response rate

### **Explanation:**

One consultation closed in 2018. This was the 4th Call for Sites consultation for the Mineral Site Allocations DPD, which ran from September 2017 to January 2018. The consultation was sent to 752 consultees. There were 19 responses, giving an overall response rate of 2.5%

Two consultations closed in 2019. One was a joint consultation on the fourth stage of the Minerals Local Plan and on the proposed methodology for Mineral Site Allocations DPD. The consultation ran from December 2018 to February 2019. The consultation was sent to 762 consultees. There were 33 responses, giving an overall response rate of 4.3%. The other consultation was on the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and ran from August 2019 to September 2019. This consultation was sent to 757 consultees. There were 87 responses, giving an overall response rate of 11.5%.

One consultation took place in 2020. A Call for Sites for the Mineral Site Allocations DPD ran from January 2020 until March 2020. This consultation was sent to 742 consultees. Responses were received from 7 consultees, giving an overall response rate of 0.9%.

### **Further information:**

More details on the responses received can be found in the response documents prepared following each consultation.

*Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan 4th Call for Sites Response Document (July 2018)*

*Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan Response Document: Fourth Stage Consultation on the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan and Consultation on proposed methodology for Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2019)*

*Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan Schedule of representations made on the Publication Version of the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan in accordance with Regulation 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Representations in plan order) (December 2019)*

## **Indicator SCI3: Satisfaction levels with the planning application process/service.**

### **Target:**

Zero complaints upheld by the Local Government Ombudsman, court decisions against the council, or appeals upheld.

### **2020 Performance:**

Zero complaints or appeals upheld.

### **Trend:**

2019: Zero complaints or appeals upheld.

2018: Zero complaints or appeals upheld.

**Explanation:**

Within the monitoring period, no complaints were upheld by the Local Government Ombudsman, no court decisions were made against the council, and no appeals were upheld. One enforcement notice appeal was submitted in 2018, but was subsequently withdrawn.

**Further information:**

N/A.

# Indicators relating to planning applications for mineral development

## **Indicator M1. Permissions for minerals development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding.**

### **Target:**

None

### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

### **Trend:**

2019: No permissions for minerals development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding (0 of 2).

2018: No applications determined.

### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither being granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding.

## **Indicator M2. Permissions for minerals development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality.**

### **Target:**

None

### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

### **Trend:**

2019: No permissions for minerals development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality (0 of 2).

2018: No applications determined.

### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither being granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality.

### **Indicator M3. Permissions for minerals development that include provision for energy efficiency.**

#### **Target:**

100%

#### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

#### **Trend:**

2019: No permissions for minerals development granted which do not include provision for energy efficiency (0 of 2).

2018: No applications determined.

#### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither including measures for energy efficiency. In both these cases, this was believed to be acceptable due to the retrospective nature of the applications and limited scope to apply energy efficiency measures.

### **Indicator M4. Permissions having an unacceptable adverse impact on landscape character, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, battlefields or registered historic parks and gardens.**

#### **Target:**

None

#### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

#### **Trend:**

2019: No permissions for minerals development granted which have an unacceptable adverse impact on landscape character, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, battlefields, or registered historic parks and gardens (0 of 2).

2018: No applications determined.

#### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither having an unacceptable adverse impact on

landscape character, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, battlefields or registered historic parks and gardens.

## **Indicator M5. Permissions granted in the Malvern Hills or Cotswolds AONBs.**

### **Target:**

No unacceptable adverse change in the quality or character of the landscape.

### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

### **Trend:**

2019: No relevant applications determined in the AONBs

2018: No relevant applications determined in the AONBs.

### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither located in the Malvern Hills or Cotswolds AONB.

## **Indicator M6. Permissions for minerals development take into account local characteristics.**

### **Target:**

No unacceptable adverse impact on local characteristics.

### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

### **Trend:**

2019: No permissions for minerals development granted which had an unacceptable adverse impact on local characteristics (0 of 2).

2018: No applications determined.

### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither having an unacceptable adverse impact on local characteristics.

## **Indicator M7. Permissions for minerals development that take into account amenity considerations.**

### **Target:**

No unacceptable adverse impact on amenity.

### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

### **Trend:**

2019: No permissions for minerals development granted which had an unacceptable adverse impact on amenity (0 of 2).

2018: No applications determined.

### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither having an unacceptable adverse impact on amenity.

## **Indicator M8. Permissions granted in accordance with highways advice.**

### **Target:**

100%

### **2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

### **Trend:**

2019: 100%

2018: No applications determined.

### **Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither being granted contrary to highways advice.

## **Indicator M10. Applications for waste management/minerals development determined within 13 weeks (16 weeks for EIA development), or within an agreed extension of time.**



**Target:**

100%

**2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

**Trend:**

2019: 100%

2018: No applications determined.

**Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with both being determined within an agreed extension of time.

**Indicator M11a. Proportion of approved applications discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.****Target:**

Increase

**2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

**Trend:**

2019: 100%

2018: No applications determined.

**Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with both having been previously discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.

**Indicator M11b. Number of proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.****Target:**

Increase

**2020 Performance:**

9 proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council.

**Trend:**

2019: 7 proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council.

2018: 9 proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council.

**Explanation:**

During 2020 9 proposals for minerals development were discussed with WCC at pre-application stage, an increase from 7 proposals discussed in the 2019 monitoring period.

**Indicator M19. Permitted applications for minerals development which include a Consultation Statement.**

**Target:**

100%

**2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

**Trend:**

2019: No applications permitted for minerals development which included a Consultation Statement (0 of 2)

2018: No applications determined.

**Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. In 2019, two applications were determined for minerals development, with neither submitting a consultation statement. This issue has been highlighted in previous AMRs, with action taken in the form of the adoption of the Validation Document.

**Indicator M20. Decisions where there are no policies in the Development Plan which are relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision.**

**Target:**

None

**2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

**Trend:**

2019: Two applications determined.

2018: No applications determined.

**Explanation:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020. However, there were two applications for minerals development determined in 2019. However, much of the adopted 1997 Minerals Local Plan is out of date, with a small number of policies still in place. Therefore, indicator M20 failed to meet its target in 2019. This is being rectified through the development of the emerging Minerals Local Plan, which was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in December 2019.

**Indicator M21. New mineral development in 'preferred areas'.**

**Target:**

100%

**2020 Performance:**

There were no applications relevant to this indicator determined in 2020.

**Trend:**

2019: No applications granted for new mineral development in 'perferred areas' (0 of 2)

2018: No applications determined.

**Explanation:**

Due to the limited extent of remaining Preferred Areas in the adopted Minerals Local Plan, this failure has been determined to be appropriate in order to ensure a steady and adequate supply of mineral resources. The emerging Minerals Local Plan will set out new locational policies relating to mineral working.

**Indicator M27. Increase in GVA in Worcestershire from minerals development.**

**Target:**

Increase

**2020 Performance:**

Not yet available

**Trend:**

2019: 0.06% of Worcestershire GVA.

2018: 0.06% of Worcestershire GVA.

**Explanation:**

Estimated Gross Value Added (GVA) from minerals in Worcestershire was £8m in 2019, representing 0.06% of total GVA. This is the same proportion as in 2018. There has been a steady increase since 2015, when the proportion was 0.03%. Due to a revised ONS methodology, the GVA figures are not directly comparable with any figures in previous AMRs.

# Indicators relating to the supply of mineral

## Indicator M9. Production of secondary and recycled aggregates.

### Target:

Monitor baseline

### 2020 Performance:

No data

### Trend:

2019: No data

2018: No data

### Explanation:

National policy states that, so far as practicable, planning authorities should "take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials, before considering extraction of primary materials". Secondary aggregates is a term often used to describe mineral that is produced as a by-product of other mining or quarrying activities or as a by-product of an industrial process. There are currently no industrial processes in Worcestershire which are known to produce secondary aggregates. However, there is potential for some provision of secondary aggregates in the future. An Energy from Waste Plant at Hartlebury, near Kidderminster, commenced operation in 2017. This plant is predicted to produce 40,000 tonnes per annum of incinerator bottom ash which may be capable of being used as secondary aggregate, although further processing would be required to enable this.

An application for an Incinerator Bottom Ash Processing and Recovery Facility at Hill and Moor Landfill Site was granted in January 2017. This facility is tied to the life of the Hill and Moor Landfill Site and is limited to processing 50,000 tonnes per annum of incinerator bottom ash.

Recycled aggregates arise from several sources, notably construction and demolition waste (C&D waste) such as from the demolition of buildings, asphalt planings from road resurfacing, and railway track ballast. "Recycling" aggregates involves the processing of waste materials to remove unwanted or inappropriate material such as fines, wood, plastic and metal. It will usually include crushing and screening. The recycled aggregate is then re-used, usually for a less demanding application.

### Further information:

Further information about the development of the Energy from Waste Plant can be viewed at <http://www.severnwaste.com/recovery/envirecover-project/>

## Indicator M12a. Annual production of primary land won aggregates (Sand and Gravel).

**Target:**

Monitor baseline

**2020 Performance:**

0.377 million tonnes

**Trend:**

2019: 0.648 million tonnes

2018: 0.596 million tonnes

**Explanation:**

The 2020 result is believed to be anomalous due to the severe temporary impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on minerals operators and the wider economy. For this reason, the latest LAA (covering data up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020) discounts 2020 sales figures as erroneous in its analysis of likely future demand in setting a production guideline.

**Indicator M12b. Annual production of primary land won aggregates (Crushed Rock).****Target:**

Monitor baseline

**2020 Performance:**

0 tonnes.

**Trend:**

2019: 0 tonnes.

2018: 0 tonnes.

**Explanation:**

No crushed rock working has taken place in Worcestershire since 2009. This issue will be addressed in the emerging Minerals Local Plan, including through the duty to cooperate discussion with the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party (AWP), other neighbouring AWP's and relevant Minerals Planning Authorities.

**Indicator M13. Landbank of permitted sand and gravel reserves****Target:**

Minimum 7 years

**2020 Performance:**

2.94 years

**Trend:**

2019: 4.60 years (estimated)

2018: 5.29 years (estimated)

**Explanation:**

The latest Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) for Worcestershire is the 2020 LAA covering data up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020. This LAA covered the period between 1<sup>st</sup> Jan 2018 – 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020. The landbank for 2018 and 2019 was not individually calculated, therefore the figures based in this report for these years are based on the 10-year average sales and remaining permitted reserves. They do not therefore take into account the uplift to the 10-year average which was applied to 2020.

**Further information:**

Neither application determined for minerals development in 2019 was for additional extraction, therefore the assumed landbank did not increase in 2019 despite these permissions.

**Indicator M14. Landbank of permitted crushed rock reserves.**

**Target:**

Minimum 10 years.

**2020 Performance:**

0 years.

**Trend:**

2019: 0 years.

2018: 0 years.

**Explanation:**

The latest Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) for Worcestershire is the 2020 LAA covering data up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020. As no crushed rock has been worked in Worcestershire since 2009, and no new permissions have been granted, the landbank is unable to be anything other than 0 years.

**Indicator M15. Landbank of permitted clay reserves.**

**Target:**

Minimum 25 years

**2020 Performance:**

65 to 72 years (estimated)

**Trend:**

2019: 66 to 73 years (estimated)

2018: 67 to 74 years (estimated)

**Explanation:**

For all years displayed, estimates are based on correspondence with Weinerberger (02.12.2014) which stated 71 years at that point in time, and 76 years estimate based on sales average (Mineral Extract: Great Britain Reports 2002 – 2011) and Weinerberger estimate of permitted resource (02.12.2014), adjusted to reflect two years of working conducted since that dataset.

**Indicator M16. Sufficient productive capacity for sand and gravel supply.****Target:**

Monitor baseline (number of sites)

**2020 Performance:**

3 sites.

**Trend:**

2019: 4 sites (3 active).

2018: 4 sites (3 active).

**Explanation:**

In 2020, there were 3 sand and gravel sites in the County, of which all were "active" (in production for some time during the year) and operated by separate companies. In both 2018 and 2019 there was an additional "inactive" (worked in the past and contains permitted reserves) site, which was undergoing restoration in line with its permission which ended on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

**Further information:**

Worcestershire's sand and gravel sites as of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020 were:

- Clifton Quarry, Clifton Arles Wood, Severn Stoke
- Wildmoor quarry, Sandy Lane, Wildmoor, Bromsgrove
- Ryall's Court Quarry (extraction), Ryall Court Lane, Ryall, Upton-upon-Severn & Ryall House Farm (Processing), Tewkesbury Road, Ryall, Upton-upon-Severn

**Indicator M17. Sufficient productive capacity for crushed rock supply.****Target:**



Monitor baseline

**2020 Performance:**

0 sites.

**Trend:**

2019: 0 sites.

2018: 0 sites.

**Explanation:**

There were no sites with permitted reserves of crushed rock at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020, and no planning applications for working crushed rock are pending decision. This means that Worcestershire has no productive capacity for crushed rock.

This issue is considered in the emerging Minerals Local Plan, and through ongoing duty to cooperate discussions with the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party (AWP), other neighbouring AWP's and relevant Minerals Planning Authorities.

**Indicator M18. Sufficient productive capacity for clay supply.**

**Target:**

Monitor baseline

**2020 Performance:**

2 sites.

**Trend:**

2019: 2 sites.

2018: 2 sites.

**Explanation:**

Clay is worked in Worcestershire at two sites in Hartlebury, at New House Farm and Waresley quarries, with associated brickworks. Both these sites are operated by the same company.

**Indicator M23. Annual production of silica sand.**

**Target:**

Monitor baseline

**2020 Performance:**

Unknown.

**Trend:**

2019: Unknown.

2018: Unknown.

**Explanation:**

One site currently produces a very small volume of silica sand as an ancillary activity to the working of aggregate sands. The 2014 Annual Minerals Raised Inquiry (AMRI) survey is the most recent dataset available which reports on silica sand production. In 2014 the production figure was withheld for confidentiality reasons and therefore this indicator cannot be monitored.

**Indicator M24. Landbank of permitted silica sand reserves.****Target:**

Monitor baseline.

**2020 Performance:**

Unknown.

**Trend:**

2019: Unknown.

2018: Unknown.

**Explanation:**

One site currently produces a very small volume of silica sand as an ancillary activity to the working of aggregate sands. No data is available relating to the proportion of silica sand within the permitted reserves at this site, therefore the landbank of permitted silica sand reserves cannot be calculated.

**Indicator M25. Annual production of building stone.****Target:**

Monitor baseline.

**2020 Performance:**

0 tonnes.

**Trend:**

2019: 0 tonnes.

2018: 0 tonnes.

**Explanation:**

Building stone has not been produced since the closure of Fish Hill Quarry near Broadway (2010) when it was worked as ancillary to crushed rock. Due to this the annual production of building stone is 0 tonnes in this monitoring period.

## **Indicator M26. Landbank of permitted building stone reserves.**

### **Target:**

Monitor baseline.

### **2020 Performance:**

0 years.

### **Trend:**

2019: 0 years.

2018: 0 years.

### **Explanation:**

Building stone has not been produced since the closure of Fish Hill Quarry near Broadway (2010) when it was worked as ancillary to crushed rock. As there are no permitted reserves in the county, the landbank of permitted building stone reserves is 0 years.

# Indicators relating to planning applications for waste management development

## **Indicator W1. Permissions granted for waste management development contrary to the EA advice on flooding**

### **Target:**

0% of permissions granted for waste management development contrary to the EA advice on flooding

### **2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none were contrary to EA advice on flooding)

### **Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none were contrary to EA advice on flooding)

2018: 0% (The single permission granted was not contrary to EA advice on flooding)

### **Explanation:**

No applications were permitted in 2018, 2019 or 2020 for waste management development contrary to EA advice on flooding.

## **Indicator W2. Permissions granted for waste management development contrary to the EA advice on water quality**

### **Target:**

0% of permissions granted for waste management development contrary to the EA advice on water quality

### **2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none were contrary to EA advice on water quality)

### **Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none were contrary to EA advice on water quality)

2018: 0% (The single permission granted was not contrary to EA advice on water quality)

### **Explanation:**

No applications were permitted in 2018, 2019 or 2020 for waste management development contrary to EA advice on water quality.

### **Indicator W3. Permissions for waste management development that include measures for energy efficiency**

#### **Target:**

100% of permissions for waste management development to include measures for energy efficiency

#### **2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the six permissions granted, none included measures for energy efficiency)

#### **Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none included measures for energy efficiency)

2018: 0% (The single permissions granted did not include measures for energy efficiency)

#### **Explanation:**

Although this target has technically been missed, the waste management applications that were permitted in 2018, 2019 or 2020 were not for the types of development that would typically allow for energy efficiency measures. As such, no action is considered necessary.

### **Indicator W4: Permissions for waste management development with a gross floor space of over 1000m<sup>2</sup> gaining at least 10% of energy supply annually from renewable energy supplies**

#### **Target:**

100% of relevant permissions for waste management development to include 10% renewable energy

#### **2020 Performance:**

100% (1 relevant permission, with 10% renewable energy required by condition)

#### **Trend:**

2019: 100% (1 relevant permission, with 10% renewable energy required by condition)

2018: No relevant permissions granted within the 2018 monitoring year

#### **Explanation:**

Indicator W4 looks at waste permissions with a gross floorspace of >1000m<sup>2</sup> and whether they gain at least 10% of their energy supply annually from renewable energy sources (policy WCS11 (d)). The requirement for renewable energy will often be secured through one or more conditions attached to the grant of planning permission. As such, relevant permissions that include such condition(s) are deemed to satisfy indicator W4, even where the planning application itself does not include such provision.

## **Indicator W5: Permissions for waste management development that include measures for water efficiency**

### **Target:**

100% of permissions for waste management development to include measures for water efficiency

### **2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none included measures for water efficiency)

### **Trend:**

2019: 11% (Of the nine permissions granted, one included measures for water efficiency)

2018: 17% (Of the six permissions granted, one included measures for water efficiency)

### **Explanation:**

This indicator looks at how water demand has been reduced where possible and how water efficiency has been considered in the design and operation of all new built development (policy WCS11 (b)). Although the headline percentage figures suggest that performance against this target is very poor, this is largely due to the nature of the applications for which permission has been granted. In most cases the type of application does not offer scope for water efficiency measures (for example, the development may include no buildings and may not use water within its operations) or, where there are water efficiency measures, they may be controlled through different regulatory frameworks (such as environmental permitting).

## **Indicator W6: Permissions for new landfill capacity that include landfill gas management systems**

### **Target:**

100% of permissions for new landfill capacity to include landfill gas recovery systems

### **2020 Performance:**

N/A. No permissions were granted for new landfill capacity

### **Trend:**

2019: N/A. No permissions were granted for new landfill capacity

2018: N/A. No permissions were granted for new landfill capacity

### **Explanation:**

Applications for new landfill capacity are rare, and none were permitted within the period of this AMR.

## **Indicator W7: Permissions for new built waste management development that include provision for biodiversity enhancement**

### **Target:**

100% of relevant permissions for new built waste management development to include provision for biodiversity enhancement

### **2020 Performance:**

75% (Out of four applications, three included biodiversity enhancement)

### **Trend:**

2019: 100% (Out of two applications, both included biodiversity enhancement)

2018: 100% (Out of three applications, all three included biodiversity enhancement)

### **Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 9(c).

## **Indicator W8: Permissions that have an unacceptable adverse impact on landscape character, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, battlefields or registered historic parks and gardens**

### **Target:**

No permissions to have an unacceptable adverse impact

### **2020 Performance:**

0% (0 of 5)

### **Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none had unacceptable adverse impacts)

2018: 0% (Of the six permissions granted, none had unacceptable adverse impacts)

### **Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 9(b).

## **Indicator W9: Permissions for new waste management development granted in the Malvern Hills or Cotswolds AONB**

### **Target:**

No relevant permissions to have an unacceptable adverse change on either AONB

**2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none had unacceptable adverse impacts)

**Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none had unacceptable adverse impacts)

2018: 0% (Of the six permissions granted, none had unacceptable adverse impacts)

**Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 12(b).

**Indicator W10: Permissions for waste new management development that take into account local characteristics**

**Target:**

No relevant permissions to have an unacceptable adverse impact

**2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none had an unacceptable adverse impact)

**Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none had an unacceptable adverse impact)

2018: 0% (Of the six permissions granted, none had an unacceptable adverse impact)

**Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 12(a).

**Indicator W11: Permissions for new waste management development [that] take into account amenity considerations**

**Target:**

No relevant permissions to have an unacceptable adverse impact

**2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none had an unacceptable adverse impact)

**Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none had an unacceptable adverse impact)

2018: 0% (Of the six permissions granted, none had an unacceptable adverse impact)



**Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 14.

**Indicator W12: Permissions for new waste management development on greenfield sites****Target:**

No relevant permissions granted on greenfield sites

**2020 Performance:**

0% (Of the five permissions granted, none were on greenfield sites)

**Trend:**

2019: 0% (Of the nine permissions granted, none were on greenfield sites)

2018: 0% (Of the six permissions granted, none were on greenfield sites)

**Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 6.

**Indicator W13: Permissions for new waste management development in the Green Belt****Target:**

No unacceptable cumulative impact on the purposes of Green Belt designation

**2020 Performance:**

0 (1 of 6 applications were in the Green Belt, but no unacceptable cumulative impact)

**Trend:**

2019: 0 (5 of 9 applications were in the Green Belt, but no unacceptable cumulative impact)

2018: 0 (1 of 6 applications were in the Green Belt, but no unacceptable cumulative impact)

**Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 13.

**Indicator W14: Permissions granted in accordance with highways advice.****Target:**

100% of relevant permissions granted in accordance with Highways advice

**2020 Performance:**

100% (All of the six permissions granted were in accordance with Highways advice)

**Trend:**

2019: 100% (All of the nine permissions granted were in accordance with Highways advice)

2018: 100% (All of the six permissions granted were in accordance with Highways advice)

**Explanation:**

This indicator helps to measure performance against policy WCS 8(c).

**Indicator W24. Applications for Waste Management development determined within 13 weeks.**

**Target:**

100%

**2020 Performance:**

100% (6 of 6)

**Trend:**

2019: 100% (9 of 9)

2018: 100% (6 of 6)

**Explanation:**

100% of applications for waste management development determined were within 13 weeks (16 weeks for EIA development), or within an agreed extension of time in 2020.

**Indicator W25a. Proportion of waste management applications discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage.**

**Target:**

Increase

**2020 Performance:**

Increase to 83% (5 of 6)

**Trend:**

2019: Increase to 78% (7 of 9)

2018: Decrease to 71% (5 of 7)

**Explanation:**

83% of waste management applications determined in 2020 had been discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage. This was an increase on the 2019 result when 78% had been discussed at pre-application stage.

**Indicator W25b. Number of waste management proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage**

**Target:**

Increase

**2020 Performance:**

39 proposals discussed.

**Trend:**

2019: 28 proposals discussed

2018: 25 proposals discussed

**Explanation:**

39 waste management proposals discussed with Worcestershire County Council at pre-application stage in 2020. This was an increase on the 2019 result when 28 waste management proposals were discussed at pre-application stage.

**Indicator W26. Permitted applications for waste management which include a consultation statement.**

**Target:**

100%

**2020 Performance:**

0% (0 of 6)

**Trend:**

2019: 22% (2 of 9)

2018: 17% (1 of 6)

**Explanation:**

No applications approved in 2020 included a consultation statement, therefore this indicator has failed to meet its target. This has been highlighted in previous AMRs, with action taken in the form of the adoption of the Validation Document alongside the Waste Core Strategy as a mechanism intended to support the delivery of this objective. Therefore, it is not considered this is a failure of the Waste Core Strategy which requires modifications to policies to rectify. Therefore, it has been determined that although there is a failure to deliver this objective, no actions are required at this time.

### **Indicator W27. Decisions where there are no policies in the Development Plan which are relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision.**

**Target:**

None

**2020 Performance:**

None.

**Trend:**

2019: None.

2018: None.

**Explanation:**

There were no decisions where there were no relevant policies in the development plan, or where policies were absent or out of date, in 2020.

### **Indicator W28. Increase in GVA in Worcestershire from Waste Management.**

**Target:**

Increase

**2020 Performance:**

Not yet available

**Trend:**

2019: 1.1% of Worcestershire GVA.

2018: 1.1% of Worcestershire GVA.

**Explanation:**

Estimated Gross Value Added (GVA) from waste management in Worcestershire was £152m in 2019, representing 1.1% of total GVA. This is the same proportion as in 2018, but there has been a steady fall since 2015, when the proportion was 3.6%. Due to a revised ONS methodology, the GVA figures are not directly comparable with any figures in previous AMRs.

## **Indicator W29. Permitted 'other recovery' and disposal (excluding landfill) capacity at each level of the geographic hierarchy.**

### **Target:**

100% of new 'other recovery' and disposal (excluding landfill) capacity at level 1 and 2 of the geographic hierarchy.

### **2020 Performance:**

0 of 1 relevant application permitted in level 1 or 2 of the geographic hierarchy.

### **Trend:**

2019: No relevant applications.

2018: 0 of 1 relevant application permitted in level 1 or 2 of the geographic hierarchy.

### **Explanation:**

In both 2018 and 2020, only one application was permitted for new 'other recovery' or disposal (excluding landfill) facilities in the county. In both these cases, the applications were permitted despite being in level 5 of the geographic hierarchy. For the application in 2018, this was deemed to be acceptable as the application was located on a current waste management site, while in 2020 the application demonstrated a local need for the facility.

## **Indicator W30. Permitted re-use, recycling, storage, sorting and transfer capacity at each level of the geographic hierarchy.**

### **Target:**

100% of new re-use, recycling, storage, sorting and transfer capacity at level 1 and 2 of the geographic hierarchy.

### **2020 Performance:**

1 of 2 relevant application permitted in level 1 or 2 of the geographic hierarchy (50%).

### **Trend:**

2019: No relevant applications.

2018: 0 of 1 relevant application permitted in level 1 or 2 of the geographic hierarchy.

### **Explanation:**

In both 2018, only one application was permitted for new re-use, recycling, storage, sorting and transfer capacity. In this case, the application was permitted despite being in level 5 of the geographic hierarchy due to a demonstrated need for the facility in the application process. In 2020, two applications were permitted for new re-use, recycling, storage, sorting and transfer capacity. One of these was located in level 2 of the hierarchy, however the other was permitted in level 5, this was deemed to be acceptable as the application was temporary.

# Indicators relating to waste management capacity

## **Indicator W16a. Local Authority Collected Waste sent to landfill**

### **Target:**

Decrease in percentage of local authority collected waste sent to landfill

### **2020 Performance:**

Decrease on 2019 and 2018. A total of 9% of local authority waste was sent to landfill.

### **Trend:**

2019: 11%

2018: 12%

### **Explanation:**

Landfill rates for Local Authority Collected Waste decreased in 2020 to 9%. This is a slight reduction compared to previous years, but does not indicate a dramatic change.

### **Further information:**

Data sourced from WasteDataFlow, the web-based system for municipal waste data reporting by UK local authorities to government.

## **Indicator W16b. Commercial and Industrial waste sent to landfill**

### **Target:**

Decrease in percentage of commercial and industrial waste managed sent to landfill

### **2020 Performance:**

Increased to 20%

### **Trend:**

2019: 18%

2018: 24%

### **Explanation:**

In 2020, the percentage of Commercial and Industrial waste sent to landfill increased to 20% compared to 18% in 2019. Although this means the target has failed to be met in 2020, the percentage of C&I waste landfilled in 2019 was the lowest recorded over the preceding ten years,

and as the percentage drops each year, some fluctuations are to be expected due to reduced ability to constantly record decreases.

### **Further information:**

The Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) gives combined data for Household, Commercial and Industrial waste (HCI) managed in Worcestershire. Please note, LACW and Household waste streams are not interchangeable, therefore LACW cannot be deducted from HCI figures to derive C&I data. HCI is therefore the best available data to indicate C&I and will be used unless better data becomes available in the future. However, there are several limitations with this data:

- It does not record the geographical origin of the waste managed.
- It does not record waste managed under an Environment Agency exemption (A waste exemption is a waste operation that is exempt from needing an environmental permit from the Environment Agency. Each exemption has specific limits and conditions that the holder must operate within).

## **Indicator W16c. Construction and Demolition waste sent to landfill**

### **Target:**

Decrease in percentage of construction and demolition waste managed sent to landfill

### **2020 Performance:**

Unable to monitor

### **Trend:**

Unable to monitor

### **Explanation:**

There is no reliable data on how C&D waste arisings in Worcestershire are managed.

### **Further information:**

The lack of reliable data is a concern nationally and was acknowledged in 2013 by the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (CIWM) in their report "Commercial and Industrial Waste in the UK and Republic of Ireland". As of publication of this AMR this concern was ongoing and not resolved. 75% recycling and recovery will be retained as a target for C&D waste and this will be monitored if better data becomes available in the future, but at present it is not possible to monitor this effectively.

## **Indicator W16d. Hazardous waste sent to landfill**

### **Target:**

Decrease in percentage of hazardous waste sent to landfill

### **2020 Performance:**



8%

**Trend:**

2019: 62%

2018: 46%

**Explanation:**

The proportion of hazardous waste sent to landfill decreased between 2019 and 2020 to 8%, the lowest proportion on record, in line with the Waste Core Strategy target. This follows an increase between 2018 and 2019, which was contrary to the Waste Core Strategy target. Although there was an increase in hazardous waste landfilled, there was also been an increase in the overall volumes of hazardous waste being managed, with an increase also occurring in the volumes of hazardous waste within the "Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery'" category (although the rate of this increase is lower than that for landfill and disposal).

The increase in hazardous landfill in 2019 is attributed to the opening of a permitted hazardous waste cell within an existing permitted landfill site. The opening of the cell is a decision for the waste site operator and is a normal part of the functioning of the waste market.

By far the greatest regional source of the hazardous waste sent to landfill in Worcestershire was West Yorkshire, which sent 9,501 tonnes of hazardous waste for landfill in the county (compared to Worcestershire's own 319 tonnes of hazardous waste landfilled within the county).

**Further information:**

Data sourced from the Environment Agency's Hazardous Waste Interrogator

**Indicator W17a. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of LACW waste**

**Target:**

By 2020: 78% with minimum of 50% re-use and recycling

**2020 Performance:**

91% (43% re-use and recycling)

**Trend:**

2019: 89% (44% re-use and recycling)

2018: 88% (42% re-use and recycling)

**Explanation:**

The 2020 target for at least 78% of LACW waste undergoing re-use, recycling or 'other recovery' was comfortably met in 2020 and was exceeded in 2019 and 2018. The 50% target for LACW waste to be re-used or recycled, however, has not been met. In 2020, the

proportion re-used or recycled was 43%, which is broadly consistent with recent years (44% in 2019 and 42% in 2018) in being consistently below the 2020 target.

LACW waste in Worcestershire is managed through the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) (2004). As no planning applications for facilities which manage LACW have been refused in 2018-2020, it has been judged that the Waste Core Strategy is not responsible for preventing the delivery of additional re-use and recycling capacity. Proposals for additional capacity or facilities are likely to be required in order to address this capacity gap, and the Waste Core Strategy continues to provide an enabling framework for such proposals. It is therefore considered that no action is required.

**Further information:**

Data sourced from WasteDataFlow, the web-based system for municipal waste data reporting by UK local authorities to government.

## **Indicator W17b. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of Commercial and Industrial waste**

**Target:**

By 2020: 75% with minimum of 55% re-use and recycling.

**2020 Performance:**

Decreased to 80% (percentage re-used and recycled cannot be monitored)

**Trend:**

2019: 82% (percentage re-used and recycled cannot be monitored)

2018: 76% (percentage re-used and recycled cannot be monitored)

**Explanation:**

Due to data limitations, the proportion of C&I waste sent for re-use and recycling cannot be accurately monitored. As noted below, data for Household, Commercial and Industrial waste is used as a proxy measure for C&I waste. However, looking at the proportion sent for re-use, recycling or 'other recovery', performance is good, with 80% of waste managed this way, compared to the 2020 target of 75%. This is despite a small decrease between 2019 and 2020, however this is likely to be due to natural market fluctuations.

**Further information:**

The Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) gives combined data for Household, Commercial and Industrial waste (HCI) managed in Worcestershire. Please note, LACW and Household waste streams are not interchangeable, therefore LACW cannot be deducted from HCI figures to derive C&I data. HCI is therefore the best available data to indicate C&I and will be used unless better data becomes available in the future. However, there are several limitations with this data:

- It does not record the geographical origin of the waste managed.
- It does not record waste managed under an Environment Agency exemption (A waste exemption is a waste operation that is exempt from needing an environmental permit from the Environment Agency. Each exemption has specific limits and conditions that the holder must operate within).

## **Indicator W17c. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of Construction and Demolition waste**

### **Target:**

By 2020: 75% with minimum of 55% re-use and recycling

### **2020 Performance:**

Unable to monitor

### **Trend:**

Unable to monitor

### **Explanation:**

There is no reliable data on how C&D waste arisings in Worcestershire are managed.

### **Further information:**

The lack of reliable data is a concern nationally and was acknowledged in 2013 by the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (CIWM) in their report "Commercial and Industrial Waste in the UK and Republic of Ireland". As of publication of this AMR this concern was ongoing and not resolved. 75% recycling and recovery will be retained as a target for C&D waste and this will be monitored if better data becomes available in the future, but at present it is not possible to monitor this effectively.

## **Indicator W17d. Re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of Hazardous waste**

### **Target:**

By 2020, re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' of 75% of hazardous waste (with a minimum of 55% re-use & recycling)

### **2020 Performance:**

92% (15% re-use & recycling)

### **Trend:**

2019: 38% (0.08% re-use & recycling)

2018: 54% (0% re-use & recycling)

### **Explanation:**

The proportion of hazardous waste being managed through re-use, recycling and 'other recovery' rose between 2019 and 2020 to 92% due to an increase in waste treatment from 26.6 tonnes to 5391 tonnes. This follows a fall between 2018 and 2019 to 38%. The 2020 performance is comparable to performance between 2012 and 2014, and it is believed operational decisions at waste management sites led to the reduction in hazardous waste treatment between 2015 and 2019. There has been a negligible increase in the proportion of hazardous waste that is re-used and recycled, although this proportion remains almost zero. Data over the last ten years suggests that the proportion of hazardous waste that is re-used and recycled has never exceeded 15% and the WCS re-use and recycling target is therefore unlikely to be achievable.

No planning applications for additional re-use or recycling capacity for hazardous waste were refused by the County Council in the monitoring period. It has therefore been judged that the Waste Core Strategy is not responsible for this failure. However, it may be unrealistic for a significant proportion of hazardous waste to be re-used or recycled and it may be appropriate for this issue to be reconsidered when the Waste Core Strategy is reviewed.

### **Further information:**

Data sourced from the Environment Agency's Hazardous Waste Interrogator, freely available to download.

## **Indicator W18. Adoption of appropriate policies regarding managing waste arisings from all new development in City, Borough and District Council DPDs**

### **Target:**

Policies adopted by all City, Borough and District Councils

### **2020 Performance:**

All City, Borough and District Councils had relevant adopted policies in place

### **Trend:**

2019: All City, Borough and District Councils had relevant adopted policies in place

2018: All City, Borough and District Councils had relevant adopted policies in place

### **Explanation:**

No relevant DPDs were adopted within the monitoring period. Appropriate policies are contained within the extant Wyre Forest Core Strategy (adopted 2010), South Worcestershire Development Plan (adopted 2016), Bromsgrove District Plan (adopted 2017), and Borough of Redditch Local Plan (adopted 2017). Within the monitoring period, WCC has provided waste comments in consultation responses to the Bromsgrove District Plan Review Issues and Options (November 2018); South Worcestershire Development Plan Review Issues and Options (December 2018); South Worcestershire Development Plan Review Preferred Options (December 2019); Wyre Forest Local

Plan Review pre-submission draft (December 2018); and the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review Examination: Statement of Common Ground between Wyre Forest District Council and Worcestershire County Council (August 2020). In addition to these formal consultation responses, WCC continues to engage with the city, borough and district councils on an ongoing basis under the duty to cooperate, to ensure that waste matters are reflected as necessary in emerging Local Plan reviews.

**Further information:**

The Local Plans adopted by the City, Borough and District Councils are available on their respective websites. Note that the three South Worcestershire authorities (Malvern Hills District Council, Wychavon District Council and Worcester City Council) are all covered by the single South Worcestershire Development Plan.

**Indicator W19. Development permitted within 250m of waste management facilities against County Council advice**

**Target:**

None

**2020 Performance:**

None (0 relevant responses)

**Trend:**

2019: None (1 relevant response; application was refused)

2018: None (0 relevant responses)

**Explanation:**

WCC did not object to any planning applications in 2020 on the grounds of their impact on waste management facilities.

**Indicator W20. Progress towards equivalent self-sufficiency in re-use and recycling capacity based on headline delivery milestones in Table 5 and Policy WCS 2.**

**Target:**

100% of the phased minimum milestones for re-use and recycling capacity set out in the Waste Core Strategy being met by actual re-use and recycling capacity

**2020 Performance:**

93% (719,539 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 770,000 tonnes)

**Trend:**

2019: 102% (745,341 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 727,850 tonnes)

2018: 105% (718,352 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 685,700 tonnes)

### **Explanation:**

In 2020 re-use and recycling capacity fell below the phased target capacity in the Waste Core Strategy for the first time since adoption of the Strategy in 2012. It should be noted that the tonnages are based on published data on the throughput of all relevant sites for any given year. Where sites showed a certain capacity one year but showed zero capacity the next, this may be a result of the capacity being lost (for example through sites temporarily or permanently closing down) or may simply be down to the data not being provided in time to be shown. The reduction in capacity from 2019 to 2020 is largely due to negligible reductions in recorded capacity at a range of sites, with the biggest single reductions resulting from a lack of data returns from a biological treatment facility and a material recycling facility, which together had previously accounted for over 23,000 tonnes of capacity. If future monitoring continues to show zero capacity at those sites, it is likely that the capacity will have been permanently lost. A degree of fluctuation in capacity from year to year is not in itself a cause for concern and reflects the normal operation of the market and the difficulties of data collection and monitoring. In the context of capacity having been at or above the target in previous years, capacity in 2020 being at 93% of the phased target in 2020 is not considered to be of significant concern, but if a continued trend becomes evident in future AMRs, further evidence may be required. No planning applications for additional re-use or recycling capacity were refused by the County Council in the monitoring period.

### **Further information:**

The Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) provides annual throughput figures for all relevant sites within Worcestershire. The WDI is freely available online.

## **Indicator W21. Progress towards equivalent self-sufficiency in 'other recovery' capacity, based on headline delivery milestones in table 5 and Policy WCS 2.**

### **Target:**

100% of the phased minimum milestones for 'other recovery' capacity set out in the Waste Core Strategy being met by actual 'other recovery' capacity

### **2020 Performance:**

108% (298,209 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 276,000 tonnes)

### **Trend:**

2019: 118% (295,949 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 250,750 tonnes)

2018: 93% (210,560 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 225,500 tonnes)

### **Explanation:**

In 2020 'other recovery' capacity was above the phased target capacity in the Waste Core Strategy. Although the proportions against the WCS targets decreased from 2019, which in turn were an increase on 2018, the actual tonnages have continued to increase year-on-year within the monitoring period. A degree of fluctuation in capacity from year to year is to be expected and reflects the normal operation of the market and the difficulties of data collection and monitoring.

**Further information:**

The Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) provides annual throughput figure for all relevant sites within Worcestershire. The WDI is freely available online.

**Indicator W22. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in sorting and transfer capacity**

**Target:**

100% of the phased minimum milestones for sorting and transfer capacity set out in the Waste Core Strategy being met by actual sorting and transfer capacity

**2020 Performance:**

208% (866,850 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 416,153 tonnes)

**Trend:**

2019: 204% (788,740 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 387,549 tonnes)

2018: 216% (772,352 tonnes of capacity against a phased target of 358,945 tonnes)

**Explanation:**

In 2020 sorting and transfer capacity was comfortably above the phased target capacity in the Waste Core Strategy. This continues the trend from 2018 and 2019, when capacity was also comfortably above requirements. A degree of fluctuation in capacity from year to year is to be expected and reflects the normal operation of the market and the difficulties of data collection and monitoring.

**Further information:**

The Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator (WDI) provides annual throughput figure for all relevant sites within Worcestershire. The WDI is freely available online.

**Indicator W23a. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in disposal and landfill capacity for non-inert waste**

**Target:**

No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

**2020 Performance:**

No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

**Trend:**

2019: No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

2018: No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

**Explanation:**

As of 2020, a cumulative 2,494,996 tonnes of non-inert waste has been landfilled in the county since 2009. This is 20% below the projection of 3,130,215 made in the Waste Core Strategy. As of 2020, there was 3,762,543m<sup>3</sup> of available void space. This means that there is more non-inert landfill capacity remaining at this stage in the Waste Core Strategy's plan period than was projected. Therefore, there is no capacity gap for disposal and landfill for non-inert waste.

**Further information:**

Landfill capacity is set out in the Environment Agency's 'waste management for England' data tables, which provide information on landfill void space annually. In some cases, void space increases or decreases at a different rate than the amount of waste deposited. This is not uncommon and results from re-assessments of void space by the Environment Agency, the creation of new cells at existing sites, or by a void increasing as mineral workings which have planning permission to be restored by landfilling are excavated.

**Indicator W23b. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in disposal and landfill capacity for inert waste****Target:**

No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

**2020 Performance:**

No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

**Trend:**

2019: No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

2018: No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

**Explanation:**

The amount of inert waste landfilled in Worcestershire was 197,256 tonnes in 2018, 236,308 tonnes in 2019, and 180,951 tonnes in 2020, leading to a cumulative 1,660,191 tonnes of non-inert waste landfilled in the county since 2009. This is 38% above the projections made in the Waste Core Strategy. However, with a current void space of 1,966,292 tonnes across the county, this is believed to be sufficient to meet this extra demand over the lifetime of the Waste Core Strategy. This means that there is sufficient inert landfill capacity remaining at this stage in the Waste Core Strategy. Therefore, there is no capacity gap for disposal and landfill for inert waste.

**Further information:**



Landfill capacity is set out in the Environment Agency's waste management for England data tables, which provide information on landfill void space annually. In some cases, void space increases or decreases at a different rate than the amount of waste deposited. This is not uncommon and results from re-assessments of void space by the Environment Agency, the creation of new cells at existing sites, or by a void increasing as mineral workings which have planning permission to be restored by landfilling are excavated.

## **Indicator W23c. Maintain equivalent self-sufficiency in disposal and landfill capacity for hazardous waste**

### **Target:**

No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

### **2020 Performance:**

No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

### **Trend:**

2019: No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

2018: No capacity gap for disposal and landfill

### **Explanation:**

The amount of inert waste landfilled in Worcestershire was 0 tonnes in 2018, 14,700 tonnes in 2019, and 12,804 tonnes in 2020, leading to a cumulative 27,608 tonnes of non-inert waste landfilled in the county since 2009. This is 85% below the projections made in the Waste Core Strategy. Based on current levels of hazardous waste landfill and disposal, the current landfill void space in Worcestershire of 202,962 tonnes is believed to be sufficient over the life of the Waste Core Strategy. This means that there is sufficient hazardous landfill capacity remaining at this stage in the Waste Core Strategy. Therefore, there is no capacity gap for disposal and landfill for hazardous waste.

### **Further information:**

Landfill capacity is set out in the Environment Agency's waste management for England data tables, which provide information on landfill void space annually. In some cases, void space increases or decreases at a different rate than the amount of waste deposited. This is not uncommon and results from re-assessments of void space by the Environment Agency, the creation of new cells at existing sites, or by a void increasing as mineral workings which have planning permission to be restored by landfilling are excavated.

# Duty to co-operate: summary of activities 2018 – 2020

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires Worcestershire County Council (WCC) to comply with the 'duty to co-operate'. The duty requires local planning authorities to co-operate with other planning authorities and prescribed 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 activities WCC has undertaken under the duty are set out below.

## Emerging Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan

Development of the Minerals Local Plan (MLP) has involved extensive and ongoing consultation. At each consultation stage, information on the consultation was sent to all contacts registered on the Council's planning consultation database for minerals planning policy updates, as well as being advertised by Public Notice. The Council also provided press releases to all newspapers covering the county. Consultation on the Emerging Minerals Local Plan within the 2018-2020 period took place as below:

### 4th Call for Sites 2017-2018

A 4th call for mineral sites ran from September 2017 until January 2018. A response document published in July 2018 records the comments received and WCC's response:

[https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11792/cd85\\_4th\\_call\\_for\\_sites\\_response\\_document.pdf](https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11792/cd85_4th_call_for_sites_response_document.pdf)

### Fourth Stage Consultation 2018-2019

The fourth stage consultation on the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan ran from December 2018 until February 2019. Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment reports were consulted on alongside the main document. An Addendum to the Fourth Stage Consultation contained information about a technical error and was sent to all those who were consulted on the main document. A 'Fourth Stage Consultation on the Worcestershire MLP and Consultation on proposed methodology for Mineral Site Allocations DPD response document' provides more detail on the comments received and WCC's response.

[https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/12130/cd88\\_fourth\\_stage\\_consultation\\_on\\_the\\_worcestershire\\_mlp\\_and\\_consultation\\_on\\_proposed\\_methodology\\_for\\_mineral\\_site\\_allocations\\_dpd\\_response\\_document.pdf](https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/12130/cd88_fourth_stage_consultation_on_the_worcestershire_mlp_and_consultation_on_proposed_methodology_for_mineral_site_allocations_dpd_response_document.pdf)

### Publication Version (Regulation 19) Consultation 2019

The Regulation 19 consultation on the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan ran from August 2019 until September 2019. All comments received, together with WCC's responses, can be seen in the 'Minerals Local Plan Publication Version Schedule of representations (in plan order) December 2019' document available at:

[https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/12077/cd4\\_minerals\\_local\\_plan\\_publication\\_version\\_schedule\\_of\\_representations\\_in\\_plan\\_order\\_december\\_2019.pdf](https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/12077/cd4_minerals_local_plan_publication_version_schedule_of_representations_in_plan_order_december_2019.pdf)

The potential for land and/or watercourses in Worcestershire to be functionally linked to the

international habitat designations in the Severn Estuary was identified at a meeting between WCC and Natural England in August 2019, during the consultation on the Publication MLP. Further meetings and exchanges on this DtC issue have continued to take place.

## **Submission 2019**

To support the submission of the Minerals Local Plan for examination in December 2019, formal Duty to Co-operate agreements were reached with relevant DtC bodies between October and November 2019. These agreements can be viewed on the documents list on the examination website under references CD7a-CD7zz: <http://www.hwa.uk.com/site/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/WCC-Examination-documents-list-15-12-2020.pdf>

A summary of activities undertaken under the DtC up to submission of the Minerals Local Plan can be found in the “Duty to Cooperate Statement, incorporating the Statement of Common Ground October 2019”, which was also prepared to support the submission of the MLP, and which is available here:

[https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11784/cd7\\_duty\\_to\\_cooperate\\_statement\\_incorporating\\_the\\_statement\\_of\\_common\\_ground\\_october\\_2019.pdf](https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/11784/cd7_duty_to_cooperate_statement_incorporating_the_statement_of_common_ground_october_2019.pdf)

The issue of ‘functionally linked land’ first recognised in the Publication Version consultation continued to be the subject of DtC discussions between WCC, Natural England, and the Environment Agency. A Memorandum of Understanding between all three organisations, in relation to land and watercourses which may be functionally linked to the Severn Estuary SPA and SAC, was published in February 2020 to support the examination of the MLP. This can be viewed on the documents list on the examination website under reference CD7zo: <http://www.hwa.uk.com/site/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/WCC-Examination-documents-list-15-12-2020.pdf>

## **Examination 2020**

Hearing sessions were held on the MLP in November and December 2020. The Planning Inspectors’ “Matters, Issues and Questions” considered whether the Duty to Cooperate had been met. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, the hearing sessions were held remotely. The sessions were live-streamed and recordings of all sessions were made available to watch online on demand. All DtC bodies were notified of the hearings and were able to request to attend sessions. One DtC body, Natural England, was involved in the hearing sessions.

## **Matters of strategic importance for the Minerals Local Plan**

During the monitoring period covered by this AMR, WCC determined that the matters of strategic importance, and which were the focus of significant DtC discussions, were minerals provision, green infrastructure, and safeguarding of mineral resources, sites and supporting infrastructure.

### *Strategic Duty to Co-operate Issue: Provision of minerals*

Ongoing consideration was given to the provision of minerals, particularly the proposed approach to crushed rock and the likely reliance on the Managed Aggregate Supply System to meet Worcestershire’s demand for crushed rock. WCC participates in the West Midlands Aggregates Working Party (WM AWP) which is supported by government and includes industry representatives alongside the Mineral Planning Authorities in the West Midlands region. The group provides expert technical advice, provides scrutiny of and advice on the preparation of local aggregate assessments (LAA), and assesses the overall demand and supply of aggregates in the West Midlands. Following consultation with the West Midlands, South West, East Midlands and South Wales Aggregate Working Parties, the WM AWP endorsed Worcestershire’s LAA (using data to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2016) on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2018. This formed the baseline for the Fourth Stage Consultation and Publication Versions of the Minerals Local Plan.

### *Strategic Duty to Co-operate Issue: Green Infrastructure*

Flood risk and water quality issues were explored with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that these issues could be fully embedded into the green infrastructure approach of the emerging Minerals Local Plan.

Natural England raised new evidence in relation to opportunities for the Minerals Local Plan to contribute functionally linked habitats for the Severn Estuary SPA in times of flood. The priorities for the Lower Severn and Avon & Carrant Brook Strategic Corridors, which refer to wetland habitats, are likely to be flexible enough to accommodate this, but references to functional links with the SPA have been incorporated in the Reasoned Justification.

### *Strategic Duty to Co-operate Issue: Safeguarding minerals and supporting infrastructure*

Safeguarding of mineral resources and supporting infrastructure remained an issue of strategic importance over this monitoring period. WCC worked closely with Worcestershire's city, borough, and district councils to ensure the importance of safeguarding was understood. WCC took into account the councils' comments on safeguarding made in response to the Fourth Stage consultation on the MLP. This close working involved refining the minerals policies in the MLP, and also providing GIS shapefiles of minerals sites and infrastructure to ensure that the district Local Plans were able to avoid these areas when making site allocations.

WCC continued to promote early engagement whenever minerals safeguarding queries arose, and attended beneficial meetings with district planning officers to discuss minerals safeguarding in detail. Key issues explored included the purpose of safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure, how to best reflect the requirements of the MLP in district plans without leading to duplication or unintended ambiguity, the need for clarity around exemptions and when safeguarding would be required, and how requirements would be applied proportionately.

## **Emerging Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)**

At each DPD consultation stage, information on the consultation was sent to all contacts registered on the Council's planning consultation database for minerals planning policy updates, as well as being advertised by Public Notice. The Council also provided press releases to all newspapers covering the county. Consultation relating to the Emerging Mineral Site Allocations DPD within the 2018-2020 period took place as below:

### **Proposed methodology for Mineral Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2018-2019**

A proposed methodology for the Mineral Site Allocations DPD was consulted on alongside the Fourth stage consultation on the MLP, from December 2018 until February 2019.

A 'Fourth Stage Consultation on the Worcestershire MLP and Consultation on proposed methodology for Mineral Site Allocations DPD response document' provides more detail on the comments received and WCC's responses.

[https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/12130/cd88\\_fourth\\_stage\\_consultation\\_on\\_the\\_worcestershire\\_mlp\\_and\\_consultation\\_on\\_proposed\\_methodology\\_for\\_mineral\\_site\\_all](https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/12130/cd88_fourth_stage_consultation_on_the_worcestershire_mlp_and_consultation_on_proposed_methodology_for_mineral_site_all)

[ocations\\_dpd\\_response\\_document.pdf](#)

## 5th call for sites

A 'Call for Sites' ran from January 2020 until March 2020. This call for sites was an opportunity to promote potential sites for mineral extraction, processing or supporting infrastructure for consideration in the preparation of the Minerals Site Allocations DPD. A 'Consultation update document' provides details of the sites promoted through this call for sites and other responses received.

[https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/12560/worcestershire\\_mineral\\_site\\_allocations\\_development\\_plan\\_document\\_-\\_consultation\\_update\\_document\\_june\\_2020](https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/12560/worcestershire_mineral_site_allocations_development_plan_document_-_consultation_update_document_june_2020)

## Strategic Duty to Co-operate Issue: Waste

WCC participates in the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (WM RTAB) which includes waste planning authorities, waste industry and voluntary and community sector representatives, providing a forum to help waste planning authorities take an overview of strategic waste issues. RTAB chairs had discussed the need for structured agreements on cross-boundary waste issues in Statements of Common Ground. WM RTAB discussed refreshing its DtC Protocol in this context and agreed that thresholds for consultations between authorities should be strategic, and could be reviewed and incorporated into the Protocol. There remained an ongoing need to identify criteria for determining strategic sites, and then to identify strategic facilities in each waste planning authority area.

During the period covered by this AMR, WM RTAB explored producing guidance on assessing existing waste capacity and future needs, to secure a consistent approach and avoid unnecessary detail/expense.

## Minerals and waste duty to co-operate activities relating to other public bodies' activities

Worcestershire County Council engages with other public bodies under the duty to co-operate to ensure strategic issues are fully considered. Most engagement involves issues that can be resolved through the sharing of information and constructive dialogue by letter/email, but some, depending on the issues involved, require ongoing dialogue and meetings.

## Responses to planning policy and planning application consultations

Worcestershire County Council comments on the minerals and waste implications<sup>7</sup> of applications made to the city, borough and district councils. Comments are also made in response to strategically significant development in and adjoining the county and on emerging Development Plan Documents. During the monitoring period, Worcestershire County Council made responses as follows:

January to December 2018:

- 13 Planning application responses
- 5 Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses (Bewdley, Broadwas and Cotheridge, Harvington, Lickey & Blackwell and Cofton Hackett, and Pebworth)

- 4 Local Plan consultation responses (Bromsgrove District Council Plan Review - Issues and Options Consultation, Gloucestershire Minerals Local Plan Publication Plan, South Worcestershire Development Plan review, and Wyre Forest Local Plan Review Pre-submission publication)

January to December 2019:

- 11 Planning application responses
- 3 Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses (Eckington, Honeybourne, and Pebworth)
- 4 Local Plan consultation responses (South Worcestershire Development Plan Review – Preferred Options; Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Review Issues and Options; Herefordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan draft plan; Gloucestershire Minerals Local Plan - Main Modifications)

January to December 2020:

- 3 Planning application responses
- 2 Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses (Honeybourne and Ombersley & Doverdale)
- 1 Local Plan consultation response (Solihull Local Plan Review: Regulation 19)

## **Wider engagement with duty to Co-operate partners**

In addition to the formal engagement on the Minerals Local Plan and Mineral Site Allocations DPD, and the responses to planning policy and application consultations, WCC engages with a wide range of DTC partners on an ongoing basis. WCC engages in one-to-one discussions and engages as members of relevant groups, both formally and informally. The section below lists the other bodies WCC has engaged with and the key points arising from discussions with them during the AMR period:

### **Tri-county Minerals and Waste planning policy officer meetings between Gloucestershire County Council, Herefordshire Council and Worcestershire County Council**

These duty to co-operate meetings provide an opportunity for each authority to update the other authorities on the preparation of their minerals and waste planning documents and to share information on current and forthcoming planning applications (especially those with cross-boundary implications). Meetings were held on:

- 15th February 2018
- 8th August 2018
- 30th November 2018
- 10th May 2019
- 21st June 2019
- 5th November 2019

The key actions from this monitoring period were the development and signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the three authorities and the co-operation on respective Statements of Common Ground (SoCG). The Memorandum of Understanding related to facilitating the steady and adequate supply of aggregates and industrial minerals; meeting demand for other non-energy minerals; and delivering sustainable waste management across the three counties. It was agreed by all three authorities as of June 2019. Gloucestershire and Herefordshire officers also confirmed at the June 2019 meeting that they were comfortable with WCC's intention for its SoCG to address

mineral supply, including the supply of crushed rock and reliance on imports, setting out that other authorities are already making provision through the Managed Aggregates Supply System. The SoCG would also address mineral safeguarding and green infrastructure.

No meetings were held in 2020 due to the impact of Covid-19 and WCC's commitments regarding the examination in public of the Minerals Local Plan, but all three authorities remain committed to ongoing engagement. It is anticipated that the meetings will resume, either physically and/or virtually, within the next AMR monitoring period.

### **Development Management Managers' Forum (covering Worcestershire's County, City, Borough and District councils and Herefordshire Council)**

The Development Management Managers' Forum brings together senior development management officers from Worcestershire's County, City, Borough and District Councils, and Herefordshire Council, to focus on development management practice and the interpretation of policy. Meetings were held on:

- 4th June 2018
- 10th September 2018
- 3rd December 2018
- 8th March 2019

Within the monitoring period of the AMR, WCC used the meetings to advise of the need for district councils to be aware of minerals safeguarding and to engage with the County Development Management team/Policy officers when handling applications in minerals safeguarding areas. The group discussed how best to handle safeguarding, and early involvement at the pre-application stage was seen as important.

### **Meetings and exchanges between WCC and Worcestershire's city, borough and district councils to ensure minerals and waste safeguarding is reflected in Local Plan policies and allocations.**

- 1st April 2020 (meeting between WCC and South Worcestershire Councils)
- 1st June 2020 (meeting between WCC and Bromsgrove District Council)

To inform these discussions, GIS data was exchanged between WCC and SWCs and between WCC and BDC. WCC also provided maps of emerging Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas to district councils where requested, to enable the identification of any potential conflicts at the earliest stage.

### **Meeting and email exchanges between WCC and the Environment Agency (Flood and Coastal Risk Management)**

Emails were exchanged between the Environment Agency (EA), WCC's planning officers, and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) from November 2017 – June 2018, and a meeting was held on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2018. The meeting and emails allowed for data to be shared and for a draft 'Catchment Based Management in Worcestershire' document to be produced in partnership. This technical background document (published June 2018) strengthened the strategic corridor information and

policies in the Fourth Stage Consultation MLP in relation to flood risk and water quality. The exchanges also allowed the EA to comment on proposed MLP Strategic Corridor priorities.

WCC met the EA on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2019. The EA updated on their ways of working including reduced EA engagement at early stages of plan preparation due to capacity limitations. The timescales for the MLP and DPD were outlined. Functionally linked land was discussed. It was agreed that links would be explored between EA fisheries colleagues and WCC to consider how to use available data. Also agreed that the EA would sign WCC's Statement of Common Ground.

Emails between WCC, the LLFA and the EA were exchanged between November 2019 and December 2019 to allow WCC to discuss the scope of the SFRA for the Minerals Site Allocations DPD. The EA had limited capacity to input but provided guidance on climate change allowances in SFRA.

Further emails were exchanged in August 2020. WCC requested clarification about the climate change allowances to be used in the SFRA. The EA tentatively supported WCC's proposal to use lower climate change allowances and offered to review the final draft SFRA through the cost recovery programme if there is capacity. Agreed that the draft SFRA would be updated by the consultant to reflect this correspondence.

### **Emails between WCC and Historic England and Planning and Archaeology Advisor for Malvern Hills and Wychavon District Councils**

Emails were exchanged between July and August 2018 between WCC, Historic England (HE), and the Planning and Archaeology Advisor for Malvern Hills and Wychavon District Councils, to gain feedback on WCC's proposed approach to the MLP's historic environment policy and wider heritage issues. HE provided a series of specific recommendations for improving the MLP and ensuring the historic environment aspects accorded with the NPPF and best practice. WCC amended the plan as necessary prior to the formal Fourth Stage consultation.

### **Meeting with Integrated Transport Authority (WCC Highways)**

A meeting was held on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2018 to discuss the production of mineral transport assessments for potential mineral site allocations. Agreed to share shapefiles of potential minerals sites with WCC Highways and agreed a pro-forma for WCC Highways to carry out transport assessments that will inform the development of the Mineral Site Allocations DPD.

### **Meeting with Natural England**

Meeting between WCC Minerals & Waste and Ecology officers and a Natural England officer on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2019 to discuss Habitats Regulations Assessment, and the implications of a high-profile legal judgement regarding Habitat Regulations Assessment. The meeting informed Natural England's response to the Fourth Stage consultation on the MLP and WCC's subsequent development of the Publication Version of the MLP.

Emails were exchanged between 12<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> December 2019 regarding the detail of researching functionally linked land to inform the MLP.

### **Email and telephone exchange with Severn Trent Water**

In June 2019 emails were exchanged and a telephone conversation held between WCC and Severn Trent Water (STW) in response to the publication of the Fourth Stage consultation response document. STW requested GIS files of promoted minerals site allocations, to understand any



potential risks to water resources and water quality. WCC clarified that it would not be the right time to share any

shapefiles, as WCC would be verifying sites with proposers over the next few months. WCC confirmed that the SPZ shapefiles from data.gov would be used as part of site screening in developing the Mineral Site Allocations DPD.