

Annual Monitoring Report 2018/19



Headline Report



Contents

Introduction	1
Minerals	2
M 1. Does the Plan make sufficient provision for Sand and Gravel?	2
M 2. Does the Plan make sufficient provision for cement minerals?.....	2
M 3. Are there adequate supplies of clay to maintain of existing clay product works in Staffordshire?.....	3
M 4. Are the location policies for sand and gravel sites working?.....	4
M 5. Are we doing all we can to reduce the impacts of mineral developments on the environment?	4
M 6. Are we doing all we can to safeguard minerals sites and infrastructure?...	5
M 7. Are we co-ordinating our work with other minerals planning authorities across the region?.....	6
M 8. Are all aggregate mineral sites subject to a restoration strategy/ plan that has been considered in the last 10 years?.....	6
M 9. Does the Minerals Local Plan need to be revised?.....	7
Waste	9
W 1. Is the rate of growth of waste production within the range that we have planned for?	9
W 2. Is waste treatment capacity keeping pace with production?	9
W 3. Are we maintaining net self-sufficiency for waste management?.....	10
W 4. Are the location policies for waste sites working?	10
W 5. Are we doing all we can to safeguard existing waste treatment sites?	11
W 6. Are we doing all we can to reduce the impacts of waste treatment facilities on the environment?	12
W 7. Are we co-ordinating our work with other waste planning authorities across the region?	12
W 8. Does the Waste Local Plan need to be revised?	13

Introduction

Welcome to our new look Annual Monitoring Report.

[Legislation](#) requires local planning authorities to publish information at least annually that shows progress with local plan preparation; and reports any information collected which relates to monitoring of Local Plans and the effect of their policies and proposals, including any policies which are not being implemented. It also suggests that the report can help inform whether there is a need to undertake a partial or full update of the local plan.

This document has been prepared to meet that obligation. It is designed to provide a quick assessment of how effectively our Minerals and Waste Local Plans, known formally as the [Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Waste Local Plan \(2010-2030\)](#) and the [Minerals Local Plan for Staffordshire \(2015-2030\)](#), are achieving their aims, and how we are doing as we work to implement them. It is structured around a series of headline statements, but if you want to find out more about the evidence we have used, then please consult the accompanying technical report.

Based on the findings of this report, there is no current indication to suggest that we need to update either our Waste Local Plan or the Minerals Local Plan and consequently, there is also no need to confirm a programme (or Minerals and Waste Development Scheme) for further plan preparation.

Minerals

M 1. Does the Plan make sufficient provision for Sand and Gravel?		
YES		
Discussion:		
<p>The 10-year average sales of sand and gravel from Staffordshire sites is 4.836 million tonnes. This is less than the level of provision used as part of Policy 1 of the Minerals Local Plan (MLP) i.e. 5 million tonnes of sand and gravel per annum, to assess the allocation of additional sand and gravel resources to meet needs up to the end of 2030. Using the latest 10 year sales average would also mean the landbank of permitted reserves as of 1 January 2019 would last for 16 years. This comfortably exceeds the target of maintaining a 7-year landbank.</p>		
Trend		
2016	2017	2018
Yes	Yes	Yes
Background		
<p>For data refer to our Local Aggregate Assessment which is based on annual surveys carried out on behalf of the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party.</p>		

M 2. Does the Plan make sufficient provision for cement minerals?		
YES		
Discussion:		
<p>Permitted reserves of limestone at Cauldon, and of gypsum and anhydrite at Fauld exceed 15 years supply as required by Policy 2 of the MLP. Permitted reserves of shale at Cauldon do not, but an extension to the shale quarry at Cauldon has been allocated in the MLP which would support maintaining an adequate level of supply.</p>		
Trend		
2016	2017	2018

Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>Background</p> <p>Results for 2018/19 based on a survey undertaken confidentially by SCC.</p>		

M 3. Are there adequate supplies of clay to maintain of existing clay product works in Staffordshire?		
Mixed response		
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>National planning policy requires that there is a steady and adequate supply of brick clay to support the continued operation of brick and tile works and this means ensuring that the quarries have sufficient permitted reserves for 25 years of supply for each works in Staffordshire. For the purposes of the MLP, data are collected in a periodic, confidential survey, but the data cannot be made public as they are commercially sensitive.</p> <p>A survey carried out this year found that the Lodge Lane Works in Cannock did have at least 25 years' supply of clay. Wilnecote in Tamworth does not have 25 years' supply but a permission granted in April 2019 (ref: T.16/02/905 MW) allowed for the extraction of an additional 10 years supply of clay and the Works also receives clays not locally derived (refer to permission T.18/01/905 MW granted March 2019). Supply of clay the three works in the north of the county i.e. Parkhouse, Chesterton and Keele is based on supply from Knutton Quarry in Newcastle under Lyme. The stock of reserves is less than 25 years to maintain supply to all three works.</p> <p>Note that clay extracted in Staffordshire is also used to support brick and tile manufacturing at works outside the county, some of which do not have associated clay quarries to provide their main supply. Whilst maintaining such supplies to works outside the county is important, it is not a current requirement of the MLP for Staffordshire to monitor the landbanks for clay product works outside the county and is not considered in this assessment.</p>		
Trend		
2016	2017	2018

No data collected	No data collected	Mixed response
Background Results for 2018/19 based on a survey undertaken confidentially by SCC.		

M 4. Are the location policies for sand and gravel sites working?		
YES		
Discussion: All three permissions which added sand and gravel reserves during 2018-19 were considered to be consistent with the locational policies set out in Policy 1 of the MLP, but in different ways: The north-western extension at Hints Quarry had been allocated in the MLP; the eastern extension at Shire Oak Quarry had not been allocated, but could be justified under Policy 1.6 (b); and the deepening of Saredon Quarry was justified as it enabled the comprehensive recovery of a resource that would otherwise be sterilised by the restoration of the quarry.		
Trend		
2016	2017	2018
Yes	Yes	Yes
Background Refer to list of mineral planning applications determined 1/4/18 – 31/3/19		

M 5. Are we doing all we can to reduce the impacts of mineral developments on the environment?		
YES		
Discussion:		

Overall, we are taking available steps to reduce the impact of mineral workings on the environment in accordance with Policies 4 and 6 of the MLP. The new permission granted for sand and gravel extraction at Hints accords with the development considerations (environmental criteria) set out in the Minerals Local Plan.

Trend

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Yes	Yes	Yes

Background

Refer to list of mineral planning applications determined 1/4/18 – 31/3/19. Note there were no ROMP applications determined during 2018/19.

M 6. Are we doing all we can to safeguard minerals sites and infrastructure?

YES

Discussion:

During 2018/19, we were consulted by District/ Borough Councils on 70 planning applications for non-mineral development which fell within Mineral Safeguarding Areas and were not exempt from consideration. In all but 2 cases, we were able to decide that the proposals would be unlikely to lead to the sterilisation of significant mineral resources and did not conflict with the requirements of Policy 3 of the MLP.

In the two remaining cases, we objected. One of the objections (ref: [ES.2018/00443 MSA](#)) was resolved by the submission a planning application for mineral development associated with construction of a pond and the other objection (ref: [ES.2018/01077 MSA](#)) was similarly resolved by the submission of a mineral planning application as the proposed building development would affect an approved quarry restoration plan.

Trend

2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
---------	---------	-----------

Yes	Yes	Yes
Background Refer to objections made in response to consultations received from District Planning Authorities as recorded in SCC records.		

M 7. Are we co-ordinating our work with other minerals planning authorities across the region?		
YES		
Discussion: The West Midlands Aggregates Working Party exists to provide a forum to bring Minerals Planning Authorities together to produce “fit-for-purpose” and comprehensive data on aggregates and to support local planning on the provision of aggregates. We have been represented at all of the meetings. Note also the findings for headline statement 7 under the waste section below regarding attendance of the Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB).		
Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes
Background The West Midlands Aggregate Working Party has been established as a technical advisory group of mineral planning authorities and other relevant organisations covering the West Midlands region.		

M 8. Are all aggregate mineral sites subject to a restoration strategy/ plan that has been considered in the last 10 years?		
Almost		
Discussion:		

Restoration plans are important to ensure that quarries are reinstated at the earliest opportunity and that works are carried out to high environmental standards.

Of the 26 the permitted aggregate sites within the Plan area, 6 have no approved restoration strategy or detailed plan and this mainly because the quarries are non-operational and have not been subject to a recent review. No significant improvement to the coverage of restoration requirements has resulted from the applications determined during 2018/19.

During the reporting period, 3 new mineral permissions were granted allowing the extraction of additional mineral. All related to sand and gravel working, and all have restoration strategies to implement as a requirement of the permissions.

Trend

2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Almost	Almost	Almost

Background

SCC Data obtained from planning permissions relating to 37 quarry sites.

M 9. Does the Minerals Local Plan need to be revised?

NO

Discussion:

An [interim review of the Minerals Local Plan](#) was completed in February 2018 concluding that there was no need for a revision.

Since then, there have been no significant changes to national policy as they might affect the MLP. The Plan policies are working as intended, Plan targets are being met, and there have been no significant changes to strategic priorities, or local circumstances. We are, however, aware that we need to continue to monitor the provision of aggregates as circumstances of supply are likely to be affected by the additional demands of constructing HS2. Based on the findings of the survey of the supply of clay to clay product works in north Staffordshire, we also need to undertake another survey in 3 years

Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
No	No	No

Background

There has been a small change to NPPF policy for hydrocarbon development, in response to a legal challenge, but the MLP remains consistent.

Demand for sand and gravel remains in line with projections, however, changes are anticipated as the HS2 construction is takes place.

Waste

W 1. Is the rate of growth of waste production within the range that we have planned for?		
YES		
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Reliable estimates of total waste arisings are difficult to find at present, though a new methodology is being prepared by the Regional Technical Advisory Body on Waste (RTAB). A 5-year review of the Waste Local Plan (published in December 2018) relied on population as a proxy. This suggested that arisings were unlikely to exceed forecasts within the plan period. This appears to be consistent with Environment Agency data for the total amount of waste treated in the Plan area, though the origin of this waste is not recorded.</p> <p>More reliable figures are available for Municipal Solid Waste, which makes up less than 10% of total arisings. The total figure is well below the original Regional Waste Forecast for both 2015/16 and 2020/21, while the landfill diversion percentages are significantly higher than forecast.</p>		
Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>Background</p> <p>Data collected from: 5-year review of the Waste Local Plan (published December 2018); Environment Agency's 2017 Waste Data Interrogator (published 10 Sept 2018); Staffordshire County Council municipal waste management data; Appendices to the Waste local plan.</p>		

W 2. Is waste treatment capacity keeping pace with production?
YES
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Not all planning applications relating to waste treatment facilities lead to an increase in treatment capacity, but data from planning applications does show that capacity is being added within the plan area at a steady rate.</p>

The Waste Local Plan set a series of targets for additional capacity for Recycling, Organic Treatment, and Residual Treatment to support a movement of waste up the treatment hierarchy. All of these have been met on time or ahead of time, with only the 2020/21, and 2025/26 targets for recycling capacity yet to be achieved.

Trend

2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes

Background

Data collected from: 5-year [review of the Waste Local Plan](#) (published December 2018); and from planning applications.

W 3. Are we maintaining net self-sufficiency for waste management?

YES

Discussion:

While we do not have reliable data for total waste arisings within the Plan area, the data that we do have clearly show that the amount of waste treated within the Plan area is significantly greater than the amount of waste exported for treatment elsewhere.

Trend

2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes

Background:

Based on Environment Agency 2018 Waste Data Interrogator.

W 4. Are the location policies for waste sites working?

YES

Discussion:		
Of the 7 new planning permissions, 6 were on or adjacent to existing waste management sites or industrial sites, in line with locational criteria (Policy 3.1 of the Waste Local Plan).		
The remaining new permission related to small-scale, farm-based activities which were in line with the exceptions criteria (Policy 3.3 of the Waste Local Plan)		
Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes
Background		
Data from County Council's applications register.		

W 5. Are we doing all we can to safeguard existing waste treatment sites?		
YES		
Discussion:		
The County Council was consulted on 3 District / Borough Council applications which might have impacted on waste management facilities. In all cases, it was concluded that there would be no adverse impacts.		
It should be noted, however, that the number of waste consultation area (WCA) consultations is much smaller than the number of mineral safeguarding area (MSA) consultations. This may, at least in part, be due to the large geographical extent of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas, but steps may be necessary to confirm that WCA consultations are being carried out in all cases where they are appropriate.		
Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes / No	Yes	Yes
Background:		
Data from County Council's applications register.		

W 6. Are we doing all we can to reduce the impacts of waste treatment facilities on the environment?

YES

Discussion:

The impacts of waste treatment facilities on the environment are being well managed. Potential impacts are being controlled through conditions.

There have not been any applications where an existing facility was being extended or enhanced, and a programme of phased improvements was required to bring the whole site up to modern standards.

It has been harder to achieve the level of enclosure of waste management facilities that was hoped for in the plan, but the open-air sites that have been approved have been more difficult to enclose acceptably, and their impacts are being controlled in other ways. The one exemption and one temporary approval can be justified by their specific circumstances and only appear significant in the context of a very small total number of applications.

Trend

2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes

Background

Data from County Council's applications register.

W 7. Are we co-ordinating our work with other waste planning authorities across the region?

Yes

Discussion:		
Meetings of the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body provide a forum to discuss regional issues relating to waste management provision, and to promote co-operation. Though the frequency of meetings has declined in recent years, Staffordshire County Council has been represented at all meetings and has been fully involved in discussions.		
Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
Yes	Yes	Yes
Background		
Data from minutes of RTAB meetings.		

W 8. Does the Waste Local Plan need to be revised?		
No		
Discussion:		
A 5-year review of the Waste Local Plan was completed in December 2018 concluding that there was no need for a revision.		
Since then, there have been no significant changes. The Plan policies are working as intended, Plan targets are being met on time or ahead of schedule, and there have been no significant changes to National Planning Policy, strategic priorities, or local circumstances.		
Trend		
2016-17	2017-18	2018 – 19
No	No	No
Background		
See review of the Waste Local Plan for details		

