

Annual Monitoring Report 2020/21



Headline Report

Contents**Headline Report.....5****Minerals.....6**

M 1. Does the Plan make steady and adequate provision for Sand and Gravel? 6

M 2. Does the Plan make steady and adequate provision for Cement Minerals 6

M 3. Does the Plan make steady and adequate provision for brick clay? 7

M 4. Are the location policies for sand and gravel sites working? 8

M 5. Are we doing all we can to reduce the impacts of mineral developments on the environment? 9

M 6. Are we doing all we can to safeguard minerals sites and infrastructure? 9

M 7. Are we co-ordinating our work with other minerals planning authorities across the region? 10

M 8. Are all aggregate mineral sites subject to a restoration strategy/ plan that has been considered in the last 10 years? 11

M 9. Does the Minerals Local Plan need to be revised? 11

Waste13

W 1. Is the rate of growth of waste production within the range that we have planned for? 13

W 2. Is waste treatment capacity keeping pace with production? 13

W 3. Are we maintaining net self-sufficiency for waste management? 14

W 4. Are the location policies for waste sites working? 15

W 5. Are we doing all we can to safeguard existing waste treatment sites? 15

| | |
|---|----|
| W 6. Are we doing all we can to reduce the impacts of waste treatment facilities on the environment?..... | 16 |
| W 7. Are we co-ordinating our work with other waste planning authorities across the region?..... | 17 |
| W 8. Does the Waste Local Plan need to be revised?..... | 18 |

Headline Report

Welcome to our Annual Monitoring Report for 2020 - 2021.

As we have explained in previous reports, 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 Background Report.

Based on the findings of this report, we can conclude that there is still no immediate 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 steady and adequate provision for Sand and Gravel?

YES

Discussion

The 10-year average sales of sand and gravel from Staffordshire sites is 4.37 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, used to assess the allocation of additional sand and gravel resources to meet needs up to the end of 2030. Using the MLP level of provision of 5 million tonnes per annum would mean the landbank of permitted reserves as of 1 January 2019 would last for 11.8 years. This exceeds the target of maintaining a 7-year landbank.

Trend

| 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------|------|------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

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.

M 2. Does the Plan make steady and adequate provision for Cement Minerals

YES

Discussion

This indicator relies on data collected approximately every 3 years. Last survey dated 2019, so some projection of trends is required.

Permitted reserves of limestone at Cauldon, and of gypsum and anhydrite at Fauld can be reasonably expected to still 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, should the operator seek planning permission.

During the monitoring period, no new planning permissions have been granted for new cement mineral sites, or within the allocated extensions. It is, therefore, not relevant to assess whether they were in line with Policy 2 or conditioned to only be worked once working has ceased within the currently permitted sites.

Note that clay extracted from Keele and Kingsley Quarries in Staffordshire continues to be used to supply Tunstead cement works in Derbyshire.

Trend

| 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------|------|------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

Results for 2019/20 based on a survey undertaken confidentially by SCC. This survey was not repeated since, but we have no reason to anticipate any significant changes.

M 3. Does the Plan make steady and adequate provision for brick clay?

Mixed response

Discussion

This indicator relies on data collected approximately every 3 years. The last survey is dated 2019, so some projection of trends is required.

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 Minerals Local Plan, data are collected in a periodic, confidential survey, but the data cannot be made public as they are commercially sensitive.

The latest survey (2019) found that the Lodge Lane Works in Cannock was the only works in the county to have at least 25 years' supply of clay. Wilnecote in Tamworth does not have 25 years' supply but a permission

granted on 30 April 2019 (ref: [T.16/02/905 MW](#)) allowed for the extraction of an additional 10 years' supply of clay. The Works also receives clays not locally derived (refer to permission T.18/01/905 MW granted March 2019). Supply of clay to 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.

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.

Trend

| 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Mixed response | Mixed response | Mixed response |

Background

Results for 2018/19 based on a Periodic Confidential Survey of Industrial Minerals undertaken confidentially by SCC. The survey was not repeated since, but relevant figures have been updated in the light of planning permissions granted.

M 4. Are the location policies for sand and gravel sites working?

YES

Discussion

The permission at Captains Barn Farm Quarry was considered to be consistent with the criteria set out in Policy 1.6 (b) of the MLP as the proposals would: "secure significant material planning benefits that outweighed any material planning objections".

The location proved satisfactory as an existing site. The revised working scheme at Captains Barn Farm will allow comprehensive recovery of the available resource within the existing working area of the quarry.

Trend

| 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|------|------|------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

Refer to list of mineral planning applications determined 1/4/20 – 31/3/21

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.

Trend

| 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020 |
|---------|---------|------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

Refer to list of mineral planning applications determined 1/4/20 – 31/3/21.

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

YES

Discussion

During 2020/21, we were consulted by District/ Borough Councils on 25 planning applications for non-mineral development which fell within Mineral Safeguarding Areas and were not exempt from consideration or subject to [Standing Advice](#). In all cases, we were able to conclude that the proposals would be unlikely to lead to the sterilisation of significant

mineral resources and therefore did not conflict with the requirements of Policy 3 of the MLP.

Trend

| 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020 |
|---------|---------|------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

Refer to responses 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, to support local planning on the provision of aggregates, and to ensure compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. We continue to be represented at all the meetings.

Note also the findings for headline statement 7 under the waste section below regarding attendance of the RTAB.

Trend

| 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|---------|---------|---------|
| 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.

The pattern remains unchanged from the last year, with 7 of the 24 permitted aggregate sites within the Plan area having no approved restoration strategy or detailed plan. This is mainly because the quarries are non-operational and have not been subject to a recent review.

Trend

| 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|---------|---------|---------|
| Almost | Almost | Almost |

Background

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

M 9. Does the Minerals Local Plan need to be revised?
NO
Discussion

An [interim review of the Minerals Local Plan](#) was published as an appendix to the Annual Monitoring Report in December 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.

As before, we are aware of the continuing need to monitor the provision of aggregates in the light of anticipated additional demands resulting from the construction of the HS2 railway.

Trend

| 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|---------|---------|---------|
| No | No | No |

Background

There have been no changes to NPPF policy since the last AMR was published, and the MLP remains consistent.

Applications reflect preparation for increased production as the construction of HS2 commences. Demand for sand and gravel still remains in line with projections, though uncertainty is increasing.

Waste

W 1. Is the rate of growth of waste production within the range that we have planned for?

YES

Discussion

Reliable estimates of total waste arisings have been difficult to produce, though the Environment Agency's recently modified Waste Data Interrogator has proved useful, and 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.

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.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

Data collected from: 5-year [Review of the Waste Local Plan](#) (published December 2018); [Environment Agency's 2020 Waste Data Interrogator](#) (Last updated May 2022); Staffordshire County Council and Stoke-on-Trent City Council municipal waste management data; Appendices to the Waste local plan.

W 2. Is waste treatment capacity keeping pace with production?

YES

Discussion

The number of waste related planning applications during the reporting period was small, and not all planning applications relating to waste treatment facilities lead to an increase in treatment capacity, or an increase in the number of operational sites. However, data from planning applications does show that there was an overall increase in treatment capacity.

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 already been met on time or ahead of time, with the exception of the 2020/21, and 2025/26 targets for recycling capacity which are yet to be achieved.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| 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 not all of the waste arising within the Plan area is treated within the Plan area, the amount of waste exported for treatment elsewhere is much smaller than the amount of waste imported for treatment. We are, therefore, treating an amount of waste which is equivalent to 230% of the amount generated in the Plan area.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| Yes | Yes | Yes |

Background

Based on [Environment Agency's 2020 Waste Data Interrogator](#) (Last updated May 2022)

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

YES

Discussion

Two of the five planning permissions which had the potential to add new treatment capacity were on industrial sites, in line with locational policies, and two related to sites with existing waste-related permissions. The remaining site was not in line with the criteria, but its location was justified as it was to be a temporary, development to process illegally deposited waste.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| 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 2 District/ Borough Council applications which might have impacted on waste management facilities. In both cases, it was concluded that there would be no adverse impacts.

We continue to receive many fewer waste consultation area (WCA) consultations than mineral safeguarding area (MSA) consultations. As discussed in previous reports, this may reflect the large geographical extent of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas in comparison to the relatively small areas where waste management facilities might be affected, and

also the relative difficulty for local planning authorities to identify where WCA consultations would be appropriate.

All LPAs have been provided with GIS layers providing the locations of all waste sites that might require safeguarding.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| Yes | 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.

On one occasion, where an application involved extending operational hours at a well-established site, the opportunity has been to review environmental controls with a view to improvements across the whole site.

While two of the five permissions did involve outdoor operations, these were small in scale and enclosure would have been impractical, or simply not applicable. The remaining applications, which are much larger in throughput, all require enclosure.

The one completely new site that was permitted makes provision for all waste processing to take place in an enclosed environment, even though the permission is temporary. Conditions to ensure that operations cannot begin until the chosen building has been brought to a standard where enclosure can be effective. This suggests that the Waste Local Plan policies are supporting a move towards most waste management operations being carried out within buildings.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| 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 ensure compliance with the Duty to Cooperate. Though the frequency of meetings has declined in recent years, and they have moved online in response to Covid, Staffordshire County Council has been represented at all meetings and has been fully involved in discussions.

Trend

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| 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

| 2018 – 19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| No | No | No |

Background

[Review of the Waste Local Plan](#), subsequent AMRs, and reviews of changes to legislation and guidance.

For more information please contact:

Planning, Policy and Development Control
Staffordshire County Council
No.1 Staffordshire Place
Stafford
ST16 2LP
E-mail: planning@staffordshire.gov.uk

Postal Address:

Planning, Policy and Development Control
Staffordshire County Council
2 Staffordshire Place
Tipping Street
Stafford
ST16 2DH