

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

INSPECTOR'S DRAFT MATTERS AND ISSUES

MATTER 1 – Legal requirements and the Duty to Co-operate

Issues

1. The Council must demonstrate: how it has prepared the Plan in accordance with the Minerals and Waste (Local) Development Scheme (MWDS); how the Plan complies with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI); how the consultation that has taken place has been carried out consistent with the SCI; that the Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a final report of the findings of the SA prepared; that any requirements for Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations were met before publication of the Plan; and that the Plan complies with all of the requirements of the 2004 Act and the 2012 Regulations (both as amended). Has the Council suitably demonstrated in the evidence that all of these legal tests have been met? Would it be reasonable for me to conclude that the Council has met the legal tests?
2. Document 617 sets out how the Council considers the Duty to Co-operate had been met at the date of submission of the Plan. Would it be reasonable for me to conclude from the evidence in that document and any further evidence that the Council wishes to provide that the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with those prescribed in statute in maximising the effectiveness with which the preparation of the Plan has been undertaken? If not, in what specific ways has the Council failed to meet the Duty?

Potential participants: the Council and South Northamptonshire District Council.

MATTER 2 – Does the Plan make appropriate provision for the steady and adequate supply of aggregates?

Issues

1. Is Policy 1 positively prepared to secure the Council's commitment to have a suitable landbank for both sand & gravel and crushed rock at the end of the plan period?
2. The LAA (2015) indicates that permitted reserves for sand and gravel stand at 3.57 Mt, but the Plan sets out that there are 3.94 Mts of existing reserves. What is the reason for this difference?

3. Could Site Allocation M6: Passenham Extension East within in Policy 4 be delivered without causing unacceptable adverse harm to the Historic Environment, the Natural Environment or Flood Risk? How would the site's omission affect the overall minerals strategy?
4. Should Site Allocation M8: Wakerley, which benefits from planning permission, be included in Policy 5? If so, should the Policy or its supporting text make clear that its capacity has already been counted in the commitments as set out in Paragraph 4.25, to avoid confusion?
5. Is the Plan effective in terms of being able to control any potential highway safety impacts at Site Allocation M10 Harlestone Quarry Extension?

Potential participants: The Council; Historic England; South Northamptonshire District Council; Northamptonshire Borough Council; Natural England; Mr Adams; and GRS Roadstone Ltd.

MATTER 3 - Does the Plan make proper provision for the waste to be managed?

Issues

1. Does Policy 12 provide an appropriate framework for the distribution of waste sites for non-inert and hazardous waste?
2. Should planning permissions since 2012, particularly those in Appendix 4 of the Plan, be taken into account, in terms of calculating the capacity gap set out within Policy 10, in order for the Plan to be effective?
3. Is the Plan positively prepared to deliver the identified advanced treatment capacity gap?
4. The Plan makes two site allocations for integrated waste management facilities. Should an integrated waste management facility be defined in the Plan, in terms of what facilities they may be able to accommodate and the role they may play as part of the strategy?
5. Is the Plan effective at setting out the role that industrial locations may play as part of the overall strategy and the types of facilities that they could accommodate?

6. Is the Plan effective in delivering the future waste management needs in rural areas, having regard to the omission of site allocations in such areas?
7. Is the Plan consistent with national policy and guidance in terms of radioactive waste?

Potential participants: The Council; Corby Borough Council; R V Mawhood; the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority; and Augean PLC.

MATTER 4 - Policy changes required for soundness?

Issues

1. Is the Plan effective in terms of being able to control any potential impacts from future minerals and waste sites?
2. Should the site allocations include detailed mitigation measures to ensure compliance with national policy?

Potential participants: the Council; Corby Borough Council; and Natural England.

MATTER 5 – Proposed modifications

Issues

1. Any other modifications to the Plan that the Council considers are necessary for soundness.

Potential participants: the Council