

**North Yorkshire County Council****Executive****17 October 2017****Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for North Yorkshire,  
York and the North York Moors National Park - Responses received during  
consultation on the Addendum of Proposed Changes to the Publication Draft of the  
Joint Plan and to recommend to Full Council that the Joint Plan be submitted for  
Examination in Public****Report of the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services****1.0 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To inform Executive on the outcomes of the consultation on the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Publication Draft of Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for North Yorkshire, York and the North York Moors National Park. A summary of the main representations received is provided as Appendix A together with a draft of the Authorities replies.
- 1.2 To seek approval to recommend to Full Council that approval be given to submit the Publication Draft (November 2016) of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for Examination in Public, and for it to be accompanied by the Addendum of Proposed Changes (July 2017).

**2.0 Executive Summary**

- 2.1 The Council has a statutory duty to prepare a new Minerals and Waste Plan to replace the 'saved' policies in its current Minerals and Waste Local Plans. The Minerals and Waste Plan is being prepared jointly with City of York Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority and will be known as the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (the Joint Plan).
- 2.2 The Joint Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation. A first consultation stage took place in May and June 2013, followed by a full Issues and Options consultation between February and April 2014. The Issues and Options consultation presented comprehensive information about the range of issues to be addressed in the Joint Plan, together with a range of policy options for dealing with them. A Supplementary Sites consultation occurred in early 2015 and consultation on a Preferred Options version of the Joint Plan took place in late 2015/early 2016. A final draft Joint Plan was published for formal representations on soundness and legal compliance in November/December 2016.
- 2.3 A consultation on an Addendum schedule of proposed changes (the Addendum), which could be included alongside the Plan when it is submitted for formal Examination in Public, took place between 12<sup>th</sup> July and 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017 for a period of 8 weeks. Within that period a total of 143 specific comments were received from 36 respondents (in addition, 19 responses stated 'no comment'). The majority of the responses relate to the proposed changes regarding the policy approach for hydrocarbons (oil and gas development). An overview of the main representations

received, in Plan order, is attached as Appendix A. A full summary is contained in Appendix B.

- 2.4 In accordance with the Regulations, the purpose of publishing the Joint Plan was to provide an opportunity for those interested in the Plan to make representations on matters of soundness (i.e. whether the Joint Plan meets the tests of soundness for local plans as established in national planning policy) and whether it complies with relevant legislation including the statutory Duty to Cooperate on strategic cross-boundary issues. The Addendum of Proposed Changes was also published for consultation, in accordance with the Regulations, to give an opportunity for those interested in the Plan to make representations on matters of soundness and legal compliance.
- 2.5 The representations received on the published Joint Plan need to be provided to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Plan, when it is submitted for independent Examination in Public (EiP). These representations, together with any changes proposed by the Joint Plan authorities (i.e. the Addendum), and any representations thereon, will need to be made available for consideration by the Inspector appointed to conduct the EiP. There is no provision for a response by the three authorities to the representations to the Addendum to be formally submitted when the Joint Plan is submitted. However, a draft response has been prepared which is attached as Appendix B for information.
- 2.6 The next statutory stage in preparation of the Joint Plan is to submit the Plan for Examination in Public by an independent planning inspector.

### **3.0 Background**

- 3.1 A decision to prepare a joint plan for minerals and waste was taken in 2013, recognising the benefits and efficiencies that can arise through joint working, including in terms of helping to satisfy the statutory Duty to Co-operate in plan making. Since then a substantial amount of work has taken place, including development of the evidence base, and the undertaking of consultations at various stages, as set out in 2.2-2.3 above, in the production of the Joint Plan between 2014 and 2017.
- 3.2 The new Joint Plan will replace existing policies in the Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plans. It will provide a basis for the taking of local decisions on planning applications on minerals and waste matters which fall to be determined by the County Council over the period to 31 December 2030.
- 3.3 The main purpose of consulting on proposed changes prior to submission was to help ensure that the Inspector appointed to conduct the EiP can have early regard to stakeholder views on the changes, to assist with the EiP process, and to help avoid delay to the Examination in the event that, once submitted, the Inspector considers that consultation should be carried out prior to proceeding with the remainder of the Examination.
- 3.4 It is a requirement of national policy and guidance that, in order to support preparation of a local plan, a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS; essentially a published summary project plan) is maintained and updated as required. An updated project plan in the current MWDS was approved for publication in July 2017 in terms of the timing of submission of the development plan documents (Regulation 22), the commencement of examination (Regulation 24) and the adoption

of the Local Development Documents (Regulation 26). Publication of the updated MWDS took place on 28 July 2017.

#### **4.0 Issues**

- 4.1 The Addendum of Proposed Changes published for an eight week period between 12<sup>th</sup> July and 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017. The consultation was communicated through a range of means consisting of:
- Press release issued jointly by the three authorities;
  - Public notice in papers which provide geographical coverage over the Plan area including the Northern Echo and Yorkshire Post
  - Article in the NYCC electronic newsletter NY NOW
  - Information on the Joint Plan webpage hosted by NYCC
  - Notification via 'Twitter'
  - Posters in all libraries
  - Direct notification via email of over 12,000 individuals identified in the consultation databases of the three Authorities, as well as approximately 3,000 organisations including statutory and prescribed bodies such as parish councils, statutory and non-statutory consultees.
- 4.2 A total of 143 duly made comments were received from 36 respondents and an additional 19 responses stated 'no comment'. Appendix A provides an overview of the main points raised in representations on the Addendum of Proposed Changes.
- 4.3 The majority of representations relate to the hydrocarbon oil and gas policies M16, M17 and M18 and the associated supporting text with the comments (from 18 organisations/industry and 7 members of the public) being a combination of supports, objections and comments. Several comments relate directly to sites and site boundary changes regarding a reduction in the site area in response to historic environment issues. In general widespread support was received for proposed changes in relation to waste, infrastructure, safeguarding and development management policies.
- 4.4 Key matters regarding the hydrocarbon policies are:
- Generally support from activist/environmental groups was received for proposed changes where it was considered the changes went further to acknowledge the implications of shale gas extraction and placed greater restrictions on the industry.
  - Industry objected to the same changes because it was considered that the changes placed additional restrictions on the industry and did not reflect the different regulatory roles of planning relative to organisations such as the Oil and Gas Authority and the Environment Agency; or contradicted policy in adopted Minerals and Waste Plans elsewhere in the UK, or did not add any further value to the Plan.
  - A number of representations suggested that the policies should go further in restricting oil and gas development in order to strengthen the protection of communities, the environment and the economy of the Plan area.
  - Officers consider that as the Plan stands (Publication draft and Addendum of Proposed Changes) it goes as far as it possibly can in terms of protective policies and restricting oil and gas development in certain areas. It is considered that as it stands the Plan is 'sound' and fits within the national policy framework for oil and gas development. Any attempt to go beyond the restrictions imposed by national policy, could result in the Plan being found

'unsound' in relation to it being 'consistent with national policy' (NPPF paragraph 182).

- 4.5 Some objections consider that a proposed change will have a negative effect on the policy/supporting text and that the wording version in the Publication Draft should be used. In considering the proposed approach to submission of the Joint Plan, it is important to have regard to the following legislation and guidance. Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended requires that the plan must not be submitted unless relevant regulations have been complied with and the authority considers that the document is ready for examination. National Planning Practice Guidance indicates that the authority should submit a plan with 'any proposed changes it considers appropriate', the documents made available at publication stage, details of who was consulted and how the main issues are addressed, details of representations following publication and a summary of the main issues raised. It does not give any further detail on the procedure relating to proposed changes.
- 4.6 Procedural Practice in the Examination of Local Plans, published by the Planning Inspectorate in 2016, emphasises that the publication plan should be the plan it intends to submit for examination. It indicates that if the authority wishes to make changes to the publication plan those changes should be prepared as an addendum to the plan and should be subject to further consultation/sustainability appraisal before submission. It highlights that changes post submission are to cater for the unexpected and it is not to allow the authority to complete or finalise preparation of the plan. Main modifications will only be considered necessary to make the plan sound or compliant with the Regulations.
- 4.7 This guidance also states that where an addendum of focussed changes is submitted with the plan the Inspector will need to assess it – whether there is a change to strategy; whether there has been consultation. If satisfied on these points the addendum can be considered as part of the submitted plan. If this is not the case the Inspector may treat these as other main modifications at post submission/pre hearing stage. Authorities can make minor modifications to a plan on adoption and will be accountable for the scope of these.
- 4.8 It is considered that the Proposed Changes reflects the best position in terms of being in line with national planning policy and guidance through a positive approach to planning for development whilst providing robust protection for the communities, environment and economy for the Plan area. Therefore, the intention is to submit for examination the Publication draft Plan (2016) as the Submission Draft accompanied by the Addendum of Proposed Changes (2017) for an Inspector to consider.
- 4.9 Approval of the Plan for Submission for EiP is a matter for Full Council at North Yorkshire which will also be required for the City of York Council and the equivalent function at the North York Moors National Park Authority. Should approval be secured from all three authorities then it is anticipated that all the relevant documents will be ready to be submitted in mid-late November 2017.

## **5.0 Policy Implications**

- 5.1 Preparation of a local plan for minerals and waste is a statutory requirement and is needed to ensure that the policy framework for these types of development is up to date and reflects current national policy. When adopted, the Plan will be part of the Councils' formal policy framework and will be important in guiding decisions on planning applications which fall to be dealt with by the County Council.

## **6.0 Options**

- 6.1 The process of local plan preparation involves the identification and consideration of options and this was addressed in detail in the Issues and Options consultation undertaken in 2014. The outcome of that consultation and other consultation activity has informed the preparation of the Joint Plan.

## **7.0 Financial Implications**

- 7.1 Budgetary provision is in place through allocation of a reserve to support preparation of the Joint Plan through to adoption. Preparation of the Plan on a joint basis has resulted in opportunities for cost saving through joint commissioning of evidence and sharing of costs relating to consultation and document production.

## **8.0 Legal Implications**

- 8.1 Preparation of a local plan for minerals and waste is a statutory requirement under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As the Joint Plan will form part of the Council's formal policy framework, approval from full County Council will be required prior to submission of the Plan for EiP. Equivalent approval from the two partner Authorities will also be required. Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended requires that the plan must not be submitted unless relevant regulations have been complied with and the authority considers that the document is ready for examination.

## **9.0 Consultation Undertaken and Responses**

- 9.1 As noted in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.4, extensive consultation has taken place during preparation of the Joint Plan. This process is outlined in a Statement of Consultation which will be submitted alongside the Plan. A brief summary of representations received to the published Plan was contained in the appendices to the report to Executive on 7 March 2017 and the summary of representations to the Addendum of Proposed Changes is given in Appendix A.
- 9.2 During preparation of the Joint Plan a number of meetings of the informal NYCC Minerals and Waste Development Framework Member Working Group were held, together with meetings of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Joint Member Working Group. These meetings have helped shape the content of the draft Plan. A joint review of shale gas issues by the NYCC Scrutiny of Health and Environment and Transport Scrutiny Committees has also helped to inform the content of the Plan.

## **10.0 Impact on other Services/Organisations**

- 10.1 When finalised, the Joint Plan should provide greater clarity to developers, the public and other interested parties about what types of development are likely to be acceptable and in what locations. The Plan also provides an opportunity to help support sustainable economic growth in the area by identifying and, where practicable, making provision for future development needs.
- 10.2 It is also important to acknowledge that, as a Joint Plan, it needs to adequately reflect the objectives and aspirations of the partner organisations involved in its preparation, whose approval will also be required before the Plan is submitted for EiP.

## **11.0 Equalities Implications**

- 11.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment (screening stage) has been carried out to support the Plan. This has concluded that a full Assessment is not required, taking into account the role of the Plan, the issues addressed and the mitigation measures to minimise adverse impacts on local communities which are contained in the Policies in the Plan.

## **12.0 Environmental Impacts/Benefits**

- 12.1 A key role of the Joint Plan is to help support sustainable minerals and waste development. A Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, incorporating Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and assessment under the Habitats Regulations has been undertaken to help ensure that the policies and site allocations are sustainable and contain appropriate mitigation of adverse effects where necessary. Inevitably, development of this nature can give rise to adverse impacts in particular localities. The policies are intended to ensure that, where necessary development takes place, it can proceed in a manner which ensures appropriate protection of the environment.

## **13.0 Recommendations**

- 13.1 The Executive note the representations received during the consultation on the Addendum of Proposed Changes to Publication Draft of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for North Yorkshire, York and the North York Moors National Park (Appendix A) and the draft response to those representations.
- 13.2 The Executive endorse the points made in paragraphs 4.5 – 4.8 that no substantial changes are needed to be made to the Draft Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.
- 13.3 The Executive recommend to full County Council that the published Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for North Yorkshire, York and the North York Moors National Park, together with the approved schedule of proposed changes, be approved for submission for Examination in Public.
- 13.4 The Executive delegate authority to the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, in consultation with the Executive Member, to agree any further or revised responses and proposed changes during the Examination period.

DAVID BOWE  
Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services

Report author: Rachel Pillar

Background documents: None

**002: Context**

002: Context

**Tarmac**

**0317/0016/PC043/S**

Paragraph 2.026  
 Proposed Change PC043  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The proposed change to para 2.26 is supported in that the para is now consistent with NPPF paragraph 144 and therefore considered to be sound.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)**

**2173/0044/PC044**

Paragraph 2.026  
 Proposed Change PC044  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The inclusion of the revised text in relation to Green Belt is welcomed and has ensured conformity with National Policy and Guidance on the matter, these changes are considered to be sound.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)**

**2173/0045/PC045/S**

Paragraph 2.054  
 Proposed Change PC045  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The reference to conserving the important setting and coastline of the Flamborough Headland Heritage Coast is welcomed and the specific reference to the North East Marine Plan, the Marine Policy Statement is consistent with national policy and proposed change considered sound.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)**

**2173/0046/PC046/S**

Paragraph 2.054  
 Proposed Change PC046  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The reference to conserving the important setting and coastline of the Flamborough Headland Heritage Coast is welcomed and the specific reference to the North East Marine Plan, the Marine Policy Statement is consistent with national policy and proposed change considered sound.

**005: Minerals**

009: Crushed Rock

Paragraph 5.031p  
Proposed Change PC050  
Policy Number M06  
Site Reference

Comment

Policy M06 is not consistent with national policy and so considered unsound.

The policy is not consistent with the wording in the NPPF Paragraph 145 with regards to the provision of landbanks for crushed rock. The NPPF requires 'the maintenance of at least 10 years' and does not refer to a 'minimum 10 year landbank' as set out in Policy M06.

The policy's requirement to source new reserves from outside the National Park and AONBs is also not consistent with National Policy. NPPF Paragraph 144 states:

'...as far as practical, provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside National Parks, the Boards, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas.'

As currently drafted the policy seems to imply no future development in the National Park regardless of the circumstances.

**Suggested Modification**  
Reword the Policy to make it consistent with the NPPF

A [minimum overall] landbank of AT LEAST 10 years will be maintained for crushed rock throughout the Plan period. A separate [minimum 10 year] landbank OF AT LEAST 10 YEARS will be identified and maintained for Magnesian Limestone crushed rock throughout the Plan period.

Where new reserves of crushed rock are required in order to maintain [the overall] A landbank [above the 10 year minimum] OF AT LEAST 10 YEARS these will be sourced form outside the National Park and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty AS FAR AS PRACTICAL.



**Tarmac**

**0317/0017/PC050/LC.U**

Paragraph 5.031p  
Proposed Change PC050  
Policy Number M06  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Although the wording of the proposed change is supported, Tarmac’s initial representations regarding Policy M06 remain. Policy M06 is not consistent with NPPF on two counts and is therefore considered unsound. The wording of Policy M06 is not consistent with the wording of NPPF para 145 with regards to the provision of landbanks for crushed rock. The NPPF requires “the maintenance of at least 10 years” and does not refer to a “minimum 10 year landbank” as set out in Policy M06. The policy’s requirement to source new reserves from outside the National Park and AONBs is not consistent with NPPF para 144, which states: “... AS FAR AS IS PRACTICABLE [emphasis added], provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and Conservations Areas”. Policy M06 seems to imply no future development in the National Park regardless of circumstances.

**Suggested Modification**

Policy M06 should be reworded as suggested below to make it consistent with the NPPF:  
“A landbank of AT LEAST 10 years will be maintained for crushed rock throughout the Plan period. A separate landbank OF AT LEAST 10 YEARS will be identified and maintained for Magnesian Limestone crushed rock throughout the Plan period.

Where new reserves of crushed rock are required in order to maintain overall A landbank OF AT LEAST 10 YEARS these will be sourced from outside the National Park and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty AS FAR AS IS PRACTICABLE.”

010: Maintenance of Primary Aggregate Supply

**Historic England****0120/0006/PC098//S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
 Proposed Change PC098  
 Policy Number M07  
 Site Reference MJP06

**Comment**

This Proposed Change is sound.

The application site lies within the Swale/Ure river catchments. This larger area contains the most significant concentration of Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments and related archaeological deposits in the north of England. Within this area are seven henges, two cursus monuments, several barrows, enclosures, pit alignments and the Devil's Arrows standing stones. Many of the features within this landscape are scheduled as nationally important. The three henges on Thornborough Moor are unparalleled in their size, alignment and form, and the degree of preservation. The northern henge, currently under woodland, is probably the best preserved such monument in the country; only the great bank and ditch at Avebury exceeds it in scale.

Historic England was involved in discussions regarding the application for mineral extraction from this site (Langwith House Farm) which is currently awaiting determination. In our response, we commented that we considered that the supporting information had demonstrated that there will not be a direct physical impact on known archaeological deposits associated with the Thornborough Henges or their key visual relationships.

However, we did consider that further mineral extraction in this area would have a harmful cumulative impact on the setting of the heritage assets (designated and undesignated) associated with the Thornborough Henges, the promontory of Thornborough Moor on which they sit and, specifically, the ability to appreciate and experience them in their landscape. However, we considered that the mitigation measures proposed as part of that application offered a clear opportunity to reverse some of the harmful impacts of past quarrying in the landscape and to reconnect the henges with their landscape setting.

Given the potential for nationally-important archaeological remains on at least part of this site, it is essential that any application is informed by a comprehensive archaeological assessment (including an evaluation against the framework set out in Managing Landscape Change project). This Proposed Change reflects the recommendation of the Sustainability Appraisal Heritage Impact Assessment.

**Tarmac****0317/0020/PC098/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
 Proposed Change PC098  
 Policy Number M07  
 Site Reference MJP06

**Comment**

Support the addition of the proposed change under the development requirements criteria for the site allocation MJP06 at Langwith Hall Farm to include a requirement for any application to be supported by an archaeological assessment.

**Historic England****0120/0007/PC099/S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
 Proposed Change PC099  
 Policy Number M07  
 Site Reference MJP07

**Comment**

This Proposed Change is sound.

The application site lies within the Swale/Ure river catchments. This larger area contains the most significant concentration of Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments and related archaeological deposits in the north of England. Within this area are seven henges, two cursus monuments, several barrows, enclosures, pit alignments and the Devil's Arrows standing stones. Many of the features within this landscape are scheduled as nationally important. The three henges on Thornborough Moor are unparalleled in their size, alignment and form, and the degree of preservation. The northern henge, currently under woodland, is probably the best preserved such monument in the country; only the great bank and ditch at Avebury exceeds it in scale.

Archaeological evaluations within the site area have demonstrated the presence of archaeological features in the southern half of this site (identified in the Environmental Statement which accompanied Application No NY/2011/0242/ENV as Area D). These should be considered as having high archaeological value and are part of, and contribute to, our understanding of the significance of the Thornborough landscape.

Given the potential for nationally-important archaeological remains on at least part of this site, it is essential that any application is informed by a comprehensive archaeological assessment (including an evaluation against the framework set out in Managing Landscape Change project). This Proposed Change reflects the recommendation of the Sustainability Appraisal Heritage Impact Assessment.

The Development Requirements for the site East of Well includes one relating to the restoration scheme using opportunities to reconnect the Henges to their landscape setting. In view of the proximity of these two sites, it is wholly appropriate that a similar requirement should be included within its Development Requirements.

**Tarmac****0317/0021/PC099/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
 Proposed Change PC099  
 Policy Number M07  
 Site Reference MJP07

**Comment**

Support the addition of the proposed change under the development requirements criteria for the preferred area MJP07 at Oaklands to include a requirement for any application to be supported by an archaeological assessment and reconnection of henges to their landscape setting.

**Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council****0713/0001/PC100/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
 Proposed Change PC100  
 Policy Number M07  
 Site Reference MJP33

**Comment**

The Proposed Change is considered Legally Compliant and Sound.

**Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council****0713/0002/PC101/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC101  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

[Comment](#)

The Proposed Change is considered Legally Compliant and Sound.

**Natural England****0119/0117/PC101/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC101  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

[Comment](#)

Welcomes this clarification.

**Tarmac****0317/0022/PC1011/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC101  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

[Comment](#)

Support the additional wording “and connectivity” to be added to the last bullet point under the Development requirements criteria for the Killerby site allocation MJP21 which refers to restoration schemes.

## Tarmac

0317/0023/PC102/U

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC102  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

### Comment

Do not support the proposed revision to the site boundary of the Killerby site allocation MJP21 to exclude land nearest to the Killerby Hall Stable Block listed building. This has been made in response to the representations submitted by Historic England (Ref. 0120/0044/M07/U). This revision is not justified.

Tarmac has previously submitted representations on this subject (Dec 2016 and Jan 2017) and it is considered that these are still valid and should be taken into account. See attached copy of the supporting archaeological assessment submitted on behalf of Tarmac by Wardell Armstrong (Dec 2016).

Disagree that the setting of the listed stable block beside Killerby Hall includes the wider agricultural landscape and consider its setting to be the non registered park and garden. There has been change to the immediate surroundings of the stable block over time, not least a new large building (18x24m and 8.8m tall, granted under PD rights in 2014) and constructed approximately 50m away from it to the north, for the storage of biomass. The area which is to be removed from the allocations under PC102 broadly covers Phases 1A and 2A of the proposed extraction area (see attached figure). Once sand and gravel is extracted, this area would be used as silt lagoons progressively infilled and then restored back to agriculture; thus any change to the character of the land south east and beyond the currently non registered park and garden, from which the stable block could be appreciated, would be temporary and generally reversible.

The revised site boundary for the allocation MJP21 will reduce the reserve by approximately 750,000 tonnes (6.8% of the deposit) and the duration of operations by 2 years. These reserves would thus be sterilised unnecessarily.

The land in question is to be used following extraction of sand for silt disposal in formed lagoons. The position of these lagoons for sustainable operations, including water management reasons, needs to be in close proximity to the processing plant. The position of the processing plant has been sited in the most appropriate location following environmental and operational assessment; thus the location of the lagoons and the plant site are interdependent and the proposed site boundary revision to remove the area should not be considered only in terms of an arithmetical reduction of tonnage as referred to above.

MJP21 is currently subject of a planning application with accompanying EIA (App Ref. NY/2010/0356/ENV) which NYCC have resolved to approve. Both NYCC and Historic England (HE) have been carefully consulted as part of the planning application process. A working scheme of investigation (WSI) has been implemented at Killerby and HE has declined the opportunity to make further comment when re-consulted. The application has clearly demonstrated that there would be no significant adverse effect upon the setting of the Killerby Hall Stable Block.

In conclusion, Tarmac strongly believes there is insufficient justification for the proposed site boundary revision to site allocation MJP21 at Killerby.

### Suggested Modification

The original site boundary for the MJP21 Killerby site allocation should be reinstated.

**Minerals Products Association****0115/0087/PC102/U**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC102  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

**Comment**

Have no comments on the specific merits or otherwise of this site allocation but concerned that the site boundaries have been changed at this late stage in the Plan process as a matter of principle.  
A detailed sustainability appraisal has been undertaken by the mineral planning authority to inform the plan making process and it wrong as a matter of principle to reduce the site extent following the observations from Heritage England without detailed evidence.  
The issues of setting, if relevant, would be a matter to be properly tested at the planning application stage. It is not sustainable to sterilise mineral at this stage of the mineral plan process.

**Suggested Modification**

The original site boundary for the site allocation should be reinstated.

**Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council****0713/0003/PC102/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC102  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

**Comment**

The Proposed Change is considered Legally Compliant and Sound.

**Historic England**

**0120/0008/PC102/S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC102  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP21

**Comment**

This Proposed Change is sound.

Following the last Consultation, we visited this site with the local planning authority and the Consultants acting for the applicants. This visit confirmed our concerns about the impact which mineral development in this location might have upon the Grade II Listed stable block to Killerby Hall. As a result we maintain our view that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has under-scored the degree of harm that the development of this area would be likely to cause to this designated heritage asset. Having said that, however, we now are in a position to confirm that, in our opinion, extraction from this area is unlikely to harm the setting of the other designated heritage assets in the vicinity of this site.

In terms of the Stable Block to Killerby Hall, the HIA which accompanied the Sustainability Appraisal considered that this site “forms an important part of the agricultural landscape context of the overall farm/hall complex, which is the primary setting of the building”. Although this could not be said to be true of the whole of this extensive Allocation, certainly this is the case for the field which lies to the south-east of this Listed Building. From the public footpath which runs along the northern boundary of this field the buildings at Killerby Hall and, especially, the stable block are extremely prominent. As such the view from this part of the site enables the Listed stable block to be appreciated in the context of the other historic buildings at Killerby Hall, the parkland surrounding these buildings, and within its wider rural setting. In the words of the NPPF and its definition of setting, we consider these views make a positive contribution to the significance of the stable block.

That being the case, then the loss of this particular field and mineral extraction from it would, according to the scoring system used in the HIA, be likely to have a “Moderate Negative Effect” upon the stable block. Moreover, it does not appear from the Appraisal that this harm is capable of mitigation in a manner which, itself, would not harm the significance of this Listed Building. For example, screening would itself involve the introduction of a feature which is not typical of this particular landscape character and therefore cause harm to the setting of the Listed Building.

When considering the impact of proposals upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, Para. 132 of the NPPF makes it clear that “great weight” should be given to the conservation of those assets. In addition, there is a requirement under S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Therefore, an allocation which would be likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a Listed Building would be contrary to both the provisions of the NPPF and to the statutory requirements set out in the 1990 Act unless there were clear public benefits which outweighed that harm.

The proposed amendment to the site’s boundary will reduce the harm to the setting of this building.

**Natural England****0119/0118/PC103/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC103  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

[Comment](#)

Welcomes this clarification.

**Tarmac****0317/0024/PC103/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC103  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

[Comment](#)

Support the additional wording “and connectivity” to be added to the last bullet point under the Development requirements criteria for the Land South of Catterick site allocation MJP17 which refers to restoration schemes.

**Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council****0713/0004/PC103/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC103  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

[Comment](#)

The Proposed Change is considered Legally Compliant and Sound.

**Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council****0713/0005/PC104/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC104  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

[Comment](#)

The Proposed Change is considered Legally Compliant and Sound.



**Historic England**

**0120/0009/PC104/S**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC104  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

**Comment**

This Proposed Change is sound.

Following the last Consultation, we visited this site with the local planning authority and the Consultants acting for the applicants. The site visit confirmed our view that mineral development of this site is likely to harm the setting of both the Grade II Listed Rudd Hall and its neighbour the Grade II Listed Gyll Hall.

Rudd Hall occupies a prominent hill-top site and has clearly been designed to command views across the surrounding landscape. The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), which accompanied the Sustainability Appraisal, considered that this site “forms an important part of the agricultural landscape context” of this building. We would concur with this evaluation.

In a similar manner the principal elevation of Gyll Hall commands views in a southerly direction across the land which falls away from the house towards Lords Lane. Once again, the Assessment considered that this area formed part of “the wider agricultural landscape” which is “important to the significance” of Gyll Hall. Again, we would agree with this evaluation.

As a result, the HIA considered that the loss of this site and its subsequent development for minerals extraction would be likely to have a “moderately negative effect” on the significance of the both these Listed Buildings (i.e. the second-highest magnitude of harm). We would endorse this conclusion. Moreover, it does not appear from the Appraisal that this harm is capable of mitigation in a manner which, itself, would not harm the significance of these designated heritage assets.

When considering the impact of proposals upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, Para. 132 of the NPPF makes it clear that “great weight” should be given to the conservation of those assets. In addition, there is a requirement under S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Therefore, an allocation which would be likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of two Listed Buildings in its vicinity would be contrary to both the provisions of the NPPF and to the statutory requirements set out in the 1990 Act unless there were clear public benefits which outweighed that harm.

The proposed amendment to the extent of Site MJP17 will help to reduce the harm to the setting of these Listed Buildings.

**Minerals Products Association**

**0115/0088/PC104/U**

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC104  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

**Comment**

Have no comments on the specific merits or otherwise of this site allocation but concerned that the site boundaries have been changed at this late stage in the Plan process as a matter of principle.  
A detailed sustainability appraisal has been undertaken by the mineral planning authority to inform the plan making process and it wrong as a matter of principle to reduce the site extent following the observations from Heritage England without detailed evidence.  
The issues of setting, if relevant, would be a matter to be properly tested at the planning application stage. It is not sustainable to sterilise mineral at this stage of the mineral plan process.

**Suggested Modification**

The original site boundary for the site allocation should be reinstated.

## Tarmac

0317/0025/PC104/U

Paragraph 5.035s  
Proposed Change PC104  
Policy Number M07  
Site Reference MJP17

### Comment

Do not support the proposed revision to the site boundary of the Catterick site allocation MJP17 to exclude land nearest to the Rudd Hall and Ghyll Hall listed buildings. This has been made in response to the representations submitted by Historic England (Ref. 0120/0044/M07/U). This revision is not justified.

Tarmac have previously submitted representations on this subject (Dec 2016 and Jan 2017) and it is considered that these are still valid and should be taken into account. A summary of these representations is set out below.

Given the orientation of the Rudd Hall front façade westwards towards the road that approaches it, and the fact that Rudd Hall farm is immediately east of the Hall at least partially blocking views eastwards, it is considered not proven that development of the allocation would cause the level of harm anticipated by Historic England (HE). Even if the extent of any potential extraction area were to be curtailed, the extent that this should be extended as proposed under PC104 is questionable.

Ghyll Hall clearly faces south and there are a multitude of farm buildings to the east of it. There may be some justification to partially reduce the westward extent of an extraction area south of this Hall, and any boundary redrawn at this stage would require a more detailed assessment.

The removal of the proposed fields from the allocation will reduce the reserve by approximately 1,030,500 tonnes and the duration of operations by just over 2 years assuming 500,000 tonnes per annum production. As a result of the revised site boundary, the area of reserves proposed to be removed from the allocation are substantial, leaving only approximately 1.1m tonnes in a narrow north west corridor, a tonnage that would not be economically viable for a greenfield site.

It has been proposed that, in general terms, landscape planting and temporary screening bunding would be put in place between the site and the listed buildings. Tarmac does not feel that the potential benefits of these measures to mitigate visual effects has been given due consideration and thus the reserves at the site could potentially be sterilised unnecessarily.

The allocation of a site area does not necessarily mean that the whole of the land within the allocation could, would or should be extracted. Extraction boundaries would have to be justified in EIA studies supporting any planning application.

Tarmac strongly believes there is insufficient justification or particular necessity for the proposed site boundary revision to site allocation MJP17 at Catterick at this stage. Instead the text attached to the allocations should require that visibility to and from the setting of listed buildings should be thoroughly investigated, once potential site design has been development, so as not to cause substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings.

### Suggested Modification

The original site boundary for the MJP17 Catterick site allocation should be reinstated.

**Hanson UK**

**1102/0036/PC053/U**

Paragraph 5.072  
Proposed Change PC053  
Policy Number M12  
Site Reference

**Comment**

A planning application for Blubberhouses Quarry was submitted in December 2011. In July 2016 the application considered that all outstanding matters had been addressed and the application was in a position to be determined, to date it remains undetermined.

The delay appears to be the potential re-alignment of the A59 which may impact the Blubberhouses site, since no proposals have as yet come forward it is not possible for the applicant to undertake an assessment of the design or cumulative impact of the potential re- alignment as part of the existing application. The applicant considers that the Council should determine the existing planning application, and that it should be for any road re-alignment planning application to consider and justify the design and cumulative impacts taking into consideration Blubberhouses Quarry. In light of this the revised wording of paragraph 5.72 is not considered to be justified, positively prepared or effective and suggest amending the text.

**Suggested Modification**

A further relevant consideration in respect of Blubberhouses Quarry is that the County Council (within its Local Transport Plan 4: strategy and strategic transport prospectus) and the York and North Yorkshire & East Riding Local Enterprise Partnerships (within its strategic economic plan) have identified the need to realign the A59 road at Kex Gill, near Blubberhouses quarry, as a key strategic priority. The existing alignment of the A59 in the Kex Gill area is subject to poor land stability issues, resulting in several road closures taking place on this regionally important strategic trans Pennine route over the past 15 years.

A definitive proposed realignment is not yet available and there is no safeguarded route. ONCE A DEFINITIVE ROUTE HAS BEEN SAFEGUARDED, THE DESIGN OF THE A59 MAY NEED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT BLUBBERHOUSES QUARRY AND THE POTENTIAL FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACTS. [Work is currently on going identifying options, however there is potential for this project to overlap with the Blubberhouses quarry site. In this scenario there would be a need to ensure that the potential for conflict between road realignment and the quarry is reflected in design of both schemes and the potential for any cumulative impact taken into account where necessary.]

**013: Clay**

**Natural England**

**0119/0120/PC106/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.074s  
Proposed Change PC106  
Policy Number M13  
Site Reference MJP55

**Comment**

Welcomes the addition of the York-Selby Cycle Track SINC in the Key Sensitivities and Development Requirements for allocation MJP55.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0047/PC106**

Paragraph 5.074s  
 Proposed Change PC106  
 Policy Number M13  
 Site Reference MJP55

**Comment**

Welcome the reference to the York and Selby Cycle Track SINC within the 1st bullet point of key sensitivities within MJP55.  
 A full archaeological assessment should be required prior to development (in line with those related suggested changes in PC98 and PC99 relating to sand and gravel sites) and alternative sites should be considered prior to any permission being granted.

**015: Hydrocarbons****Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0051/PC056/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.107  
 Proposed Change PC056  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Supportive of the recognition that exploratory activity is intensive and for unconventional hydrocarbons the activity may take considerably longer than conventional sites. A time period of 12 to 25 weeks is given for conventional hydrocarbons but no estimate is given for unconventional hydrocarbons. This suggests that activity will last for a much longer period and any such period may be acceptable.

Much of the Plan area is rural with low levels of background noise. Prolonged activity in the exploration stage will in many cases be unacceptable to local communities.

Supportive of the proposed amendment to state that the production stage may include refracturing of existing wells.

**Suggested Modification**

Exploratory work should be limited to a defined period otherwise there will be excessive (and open ended) nuisance caused to the local community.

**Zetland Group****2145/0012/PC056/U**

Paragraph 5.107  
 Proposed Change PC056  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The Proposed Change to para 5.107 is not effective. Additional text suggested to para 5.107 first bullet point, to clarify that activity will be subsequent to drilling. Our comment at Publication stage on this paragraph still stands.

**Suggested Modification:**

For unconventional hydrocarbons, exploratory activity, SUBSEQUENT TO DRILLING, may take considerably longer, especially if hydraulic fracturing...

**Frack Free Ryedale**

**3684/0052/PC057/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.107  
Proposed Change PC057  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

Supportive of the recognition that exploratory activity is intensive and for unconventional hydrocarbons the activity may take considerably longer than conventional sites. A time period of 12 to 25 weeks is given for conventional hydrocarbons but no estimate is given for unconventional hydrocarbons. This suggests that activity will last for a much longer period and any such period may be acceptable.

Much of the Plan area is rural with low levels of background noise. Prolonged activity in the exploration stage will in many cases be unacceptable to local communities.

Supportive of the proposed amendment to state that the production stage may include refracturing of existing wells.

Suggested Modification

Exploratory work should be limited to a defined period otherwise there will be excessive (and open ended) nuisance caused to the local community.

**4124/0123/PC057/S**

Paragraph 5.107  
Proposed Change PC057  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

This proposed change is supported and should be included in the final Plan.

**Frack Free Ryedale**

**3684/0061/PC058/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.111  
Proposed Change PC058  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

The proposed change of words is contradictory when compared to the description of the exploration stage (i.e. early stage of development) given in the summary in para. 5.107 first bullet point. Here the plan text talks about 'temporary and intermittent activity'. The words in 5.107 talk of 'intense activity' and goes on to say that this will be (in case of unconventional hydrocarbons) for a considerably longer period.

Suggested Modification

There cannot be two different descriptions.

The Plan here must state the same as 5.107 that 'there will be intense activity in the early stages of development of a well site, which could extend for 12-25 years for conventional hydrocarbons and potentially considerably longer for unconventional hydrocarbons'

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0062/PC059/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.112  
 Proposed Change PC059  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

For the sake of clarity and to be consistent with national policy an addition should be made after the proposed amended wording.

**Suggested Modification**

Suggest the addition of the following in relation to and immediately following the new sentence in para. 5.112 that states ..'ALTHOUGH THE ONSITE STORAGE OF SUCH RETURNED WATER AND THE TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH REMOVING THE WATER IS A MATTER FOR THE MPA, AS DIRECTED BY PARAGRAPH 112 OF THE MINERALS PPG.'

**Zetland Group****2145/0013/PC059/U**

Paragraph 5.112  
 Proposed Change PC059  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The Proposed Change to para 5.112 is not effective. The proposed change does not fully reflect the regulatory role of the Environment Agency which, for clarity, includes the management of extractive waste, groundwater protection, soil contamination, air pollution and NORM.

**Third Energy Limited****2762/0100/PC059/U**

Paragraph 5.112  
 Proposed Change PC059  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Considers the proposed change is not effective as it does not reflect the full established regulatory role of the Environment Agency which includes not just management of returned water and NORM but also air pollution, soil contamination, groundwater protection and the management of extractive waste.

**Third Energy Limited****2762/0101/PC061/U**

Paragraph 5.118  
 Proposed Change PC061  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Considers the proposed change is not effective as it reduces the scope of the statement to just pollution control regimes implying that the Mineral Planning Authority reserves the right to focus on other potential impacts that fall outside pollution control, e.g. induced seismicity that is within the remit of the Oil & Gas Authority. This is in contradiction to the statement made at Paragraph 17 of the Addendum (under the heading Explanation of Proposed Changes).

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0063/PC061/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.118  
 Proposed Change PC061  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Suggest additional text to align the Plan more closely with national policy.

**Suggested Modification**

The following should be added to the final amendment to para. 5.118  
 'HOWEVER, THE MPA MUST SATISFY THEMSELVES THAT ISSUES CAN BE AND WILL BE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED BY THE RELEVANT REGULATORY BODY.'

**United Kingdom Onshore Oil and Gas (UKOOG)****3997/0106/PC062/U**

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Paragraph 5.119(g) should be removed. The nature of activities required to extract conventional or unconventional hydrocarbons will vary on a site by site basis. UKOOG see no justification for this paragraph, which is therefore considered to be unsound.

**Egdon Resources (UK) Limited****0150/0090/PC062/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Disagrees as the text still contradicts Policy M9 of the adopted Lincolnshire M&WLP (2016) that makes clear that there is no difference in planning terms between conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons. Moreover, neither NPPF or Minerals PPG makes any distinction between conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons. The focus should be on exploration, appraisal and production stages. It should be amended to more accurately reflect the great importance the Government attaches to hydrocarbon extraction in national policy and guidance and to enable the delivery of sustainable development. Suggested text change is: IT IS CONSIDERED THAT THERE IS NO JUSTIFIABLE REASON IN PLANNING POLICY TERMS TO SEPARATE SHALE GAS FROM OTHER HYDROCARBON DEVELOPMENT. ALL HYDROCARBON DEVELOPMENT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO DELIVER NATIONAL ENERGY REQUIREMENTS, BUT SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS.

**Cuadrilla Resources Ltd****3704/0112/PC062/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Para 5.119 g) to be removed as it doesn't add any further value. The nature of activities required to extract conventional or unconventional hydrocarbons would vary on a site by site basis. Such activities would not necessarily be consistent between different sites where conventional (or unconventional ) geology was present at both sites.

**Proposed Modification**

Delete Para 5.119 g)



Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

#### Comment

PC62 makes the distinction between conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons based on the porosity or permeability of the rocks they are produced from, without giving a precise definition of what conventional and unconventional mean. While shale gas and coal bed methane are well known as unconventional hydrocarbons, tight gas can also be regarded as unconventional as it requires fracturing.

The proposed change is not justified as when a planning application is submitted there may be a dispute about whether certain hydrocarbons are conventional or unconventional. The definition of unconventional hydrocarbons before the proposed change is more appropriate. The definition made it clear that that shale gas and coal bed methane are always regarded as unconventional hydrocarbons while other hydrocarbons are also regarded as unconventional if hydraulic fracturing is used.

The proposed change is not in compliance with national policy as the effect would be to remove restrictions on unconventional hydrocarbon development from some development which includes hydraulic fracturing. The restrictions which will be removed would include spatial restrictions in part e) of Policy M16, which apply to sites being re-purposed from conventional to unconventional hydrocarbon development.

#### Suggested Modification

This change should not be included in the Plan and the definition of conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons should remain as in the Publication document. This will make the plan better justified as it will make the distinction between conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons clearer and the way the policies will be applied will also be clearer.

The removal of the proposed change will also make the plan more consistent with paragraphs 110 and 123 of the NPPF as it will limit the spread of the unconventional gas industry.

### CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

#### Comment

It would be helpful to provide more definitions within this paragraph to explain what is meant by 'short-term' and 'long-term' activities in relation to that set out in the Minerals PPG for greater clarity.

It would also be useful to use the Minerals PPG definition of conventional hydrocarbons setting out that 'higher geology' reservoirs often mean sandstone and limestone.

Fully support the revision to point g) of this paragraph in relation to the fact it is possible to draw distinctions between conventional and unconventional hydrocarbon activity by the details of the proposals.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0064/PC062/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Suggest an amendment to 5.119 bullet d as below  
 Support 5.119 bullet f - i.e. fracking is fracking. The definition is outwith the Infrastructure Act 2015 definitions, which although is a statutory document is not a planning document therefore the Joint Plan Team are entitled to apply there own definition for the purposes of the Plan with a suitably justified reason.  
 Support the proposed amendments to 5.119 bullet g. Associated hydraulic fracturing is defined in section 50 of the Infrastructure Act 2015. Fracking is fracking and therefore whether the volume of any fracturing operation is over or just under the 'defined amount' it should be treated the same for planning purposes. Otherwise there will be applications for hydraulic fracturing which will have the same level of Environmental Impact but be technically under the threshold, as defined in the Infrastructure Act, and so will not gain the same level of scrutiny by the MPA.  
 5.119 deals with definitions and it would be helpful to define short-term and long-term using the Minerals PPG as a reference. Significant harm would be another term which would benefit from a definition.

**Suggested Modification**

In relation to 5.119 bullet d suggest this is amended to state 'FOR EXAMPLE WHERE THE RESERVOIR IS SANDSTONE OR LIMESTONE' in line with national policy.

**Third Energy Limited****2762/0102/PC062/U**

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Considers the proposed change is not effective as the section is entitled 'Definitions' but the amended text for g) is not a definition but a conjecture about possible future scenarios. Considers the proposed change is not legally compliant as there is not evidence that the conjecture has been validated through co-operation with Oil & Gas Authority (who approve field development plans) nor with representatives of the industry.

**INEOS Upstream Ltd****3703/0137/PC062/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.119  
 Proposed Change PC062  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The change implies greater complexity and impact from unconventional gas and the requirement for a greater number of well pads and individual wells. The issue is not the number but the scale and impact. Unconventional gas sites are smaller and may have less impact. Given the principle that all planning decisions are made on their merits on the basis of what the decision maker finds proposed for a site and how to mitigation is proposed to be addressed this is placing a question in the decision maker's mind rather than allowing for objective assessment. Paragraph 5.119 provides definitions of hydrocarbon development for use when implementing the plan. INEOS objects to the definition contained in 5.119 f) as it is contrary to Section 50 of the Infrastructure Act 2015. It states hydraulic fracturing includes the fracturing of rock under pressure regardless of the volume of fracture fluid used. This definition is incorrect and contrary to current legislation. Other concerns with para 5.119 are the use of incorrect or irrelevant terminology in the definitions e.g. conventional drilling, unconventional techniques, more conventional less complex drilling. These technical and non-technical definitions need to be corrected to avoid misinterpretation and misleading the public on what is hydrocarbon development.

The views of UKOOG on this matter are also supported.

**Suggested Modification**

Amend the text to address the criticisms above.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0065/PC063/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Consider that an additional sentence should be included at the end of the amended paragraph 5.122.

**Suggested Modification**

AS PER PARAGRAPH 5.124 OF THIS PLAN, THE MPA ARE AWARE THAT THE SAME ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS CAN OCCUR WHEN HYDRAULIC FRACTURING OR FRACKING OF CONVENTIONAL AND UNCONVENTIONAL HYDROCARBONS AT A THRESHOLD BELOW THE DEFINITION SET BY THE INFRASTRUCTURE ACT AND PETROLEUM ACT, THEREFORE, ALL APPLICATIONS WHICH INVOLVE FRACTURING IN THESE PROTECTED AREAS WILL BE TREATED THE SAME IN POLICY TERMS, IN LINE WITH THE PLAN'S DEFINITION SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 5.119 F.

**Zetland Group****2145/0014/PC063/U**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The Proposed Change to para 5.122 is not effective. Section 4B(1) of the Petroleum Act 1998 does not contain the definition of associated hydraulic fracturing, as is stated.

**4196/0097/PC063/U**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Does not consider it could be effective as many of the fracked wells in the USA would not be counted as fracking under the definition of using 1,000 cubic litres or more of fluid. Queries what is to stop companies saying they are using a few litres less and thus avoiding regulation. Considers the plan should apply to all hydraulic fracturing as it would be virtually impossible to monitor and regulate the quantity of fluid used.

**4194/0130/PC063/U**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This change refers to section 4B1 of the Petroleum Act 1998. This amendment brought in with the Infrastructure Act 2015 defines hydraulic fracturing as using more than 1,000 cubic metres of fluid in one stage or more 10,000 cubic metres overall. This is a misleading definition. While the change does not adopt this definition for the Plan the point needs to be clarified as PC62 and PC66 open the door to such a definition.

The definition of hydraulic fracturing is an important issue. Government introduced measures to protect National Parks from surface development including hydraulic fracturing, but the protection was undermined by the Infrastructure Act and its definition of hydraulic fracturing. The effect of the Infrastructure Act is to allow hydraulic fracturing with less than 10,000 cubic metres of fluid per well to be used within National Parks and AONBs. If the same definition is used in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan the protections included in the plan will also be undermined. The proposed change is not justified as it would threaten all of the important protections against the harm that would be caused by hydraulic fracturing.

The proposed change loosens controls on hydraulic fracturing and is not compatible with paragraphs 110, 123 or 115 of the NPPF.

**Suggested Modification**

The proposed change should make clear that the definition of hydraulic fracturing, included in paragraph 5.119 of the Plan will be used and the definition included in the Infrastructure Act will not be used. This will make the Plan sound and better justified and consistent with National Policy as would protect the region from environmental harm and noise hydraulic fracturing will cause.

**United Kingdom Onshore Oil and Gas (UKOOG)****3997/0107/PC063/U**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Considers there is no justification as to why the same planning restrictions under the Act for the specific purpose of controlling development of 'associated hydraulic fracturing' apply to other oil and gas activity, our assertion is that this position is therefore unsound. It is also unnecessarily restrictive.

**Howardian Hills AONB****0113/0142/PC063**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The points raised in the response made to the Publication Draft in relation to updating references to the Surface Development Restrictions have been fully incorporated into the proposed change.

**4192/0089/PC063/U**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Does not consider it could be effective as many of the fracked wells in the USA would not be counted as fracking under the definition of using 1,000 cubic litres or more of fluid. Queries what is to stop companies saying they are using a few litres less and thus avoiding regulation. Considers the plan should apply to all hydraulic fracturing as it would be virtually impossible to monitor and regulate the quantity of fluid used.

**4193/0096/PC063/U**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Does not consider it is sound as it is not effective and not deliverable. Considers the plan should apply to all hydraulic fracturing irrespective of the quantity of fluid used as it will be virtually impossible to, measure, monitor and regulate (enforce) the quantity of fluid used. Queries what is to stop companies saying they are using a few litres less and thus avoiding regulation. Queries what criteria might be applied to enable an operator to 'persuasively demonstrate why requiring such consent would not be appropriate in their case'. Suggests that such an important issue should be judged on defined robust objective criteria to ensure consistency and fairness in decision making, which is crucial for the wellbeing of communities and citizens and it should be sufficiently defined and detailed within the Plan.

**Ryedale Liberal Party****3846/0082/PC063/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.122  
 Proposed Change PC063  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The paragraph at Publication was incomprehensible and therefore not effective and the proposed changes has not improved this position.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0066/PC065/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC065  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the addition at the end of paragraph 5.124 and recognise that sites will need to be treated on a site by site basis.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0054/PC066**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC066  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Support the inclusion of the last sentence as set out in the addendum. It makes it clear that proposals for the production of conventional gas resources, can generate a similar range of issues and potential impacts to those associated with unconventional gas therefore the same policy approach will apply.

**Egdon Resources (UK) Limited****0150/0091/PC066/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC066  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Addendum does not provide clarity and does not address the fundamental problem with Policy M16 which seeks to apply restrictions to hydraulic fracturing for conventional gas resources. It is not for the Plan to change the definition of hydraulic fracturing which has been defined in the Infrastructure Act 2015. It should be amended to more accurately reflect the great importance the Government attaches to hydrocarbon extraction in national policy and guidance and to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

**INEOS Upstream Ltd****3703/0138/PC066/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC066  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The revised text states that " However, it is not the intention of the Minerals Planning Authority to unreasonably restrict activity typically associated with production of conventional resources." two issues arise from this. Firstly there is an implication that there will be a restriction on unconventional fracturing operations over and above the Infrastructure Act. Secondly, there is a question about how "unreasonably" is defined. Significant restrictions could be placed on activity before it reaches the point where it is judged unreasonable. This provides the decision maker with the scope to bring into their decision making their own prejudices, real or unintended, and to bow to outside pressure. This would not be objective decision making; it would be outside the scope of what is normally considered 'sound' in plan making; and for these reasons the word unreasonable is not considered acceptable in development plan policy because it replaces objectivity with subjectivity in decision making.

Para 5.124 states that the new regulations and proposed surface protections would only apply to high volume fracturing. However the publication draft states that it is not considered appropriate to distinguish between this and lower levels of activity. This is introducing a control that does not exist in national regulations and guidance. This is contrary to Section 50 of the 2015 Infrastructure Act.

**Suggested Modification**

Amend the text to address all the criticisms above.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0067/PC066/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC066  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Support the addition at the end of paragraph 5.124 and recognise that sites will need to be treated on a site by site basis.

**4194/0131/PC066/U**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC066  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

PC66 retreats from the previous version of the Plan, which in paragraph 5.119 says hydraulic fracturing 'includes fracturing of rock under hydraulic pressure regardless of the volume of fluid used.' While PC66 does not delete the existing definition, it does add a caveat which says 'it is not the intention of the Mineral Planning Authorities to unreasonably restrict activity typically associated with conventional resources.' It is not clear what 'typical' means and due to change PC62 it is not clear the term 'conventional resources' means either.

The change is not justified as when a planning application is submitted it will cause confusion as to what constitutes hydraulic fracturing and what constitutes 'activity typically associated with convention resources.' The proposed change is a backwards step when compared with the existing definition in the Publication.

**Suggested Modifications**

The proposed change should not be included in the Plan and the existing definition of hydraulic fracturing in paragraph 5.119 should be used instead, this would be justified as it would make the plan clearer than it would be with the proposed change and would avoid misinterpretation at planning application stage. The removal of the change would make the Plan more compliant with National Policy as it would offer protection against environmental harm.

**Cuadrilla Resources Ltd****3704/0111/PC066/LC.U**

Paragraph 5.124  
 Proposed Change PC066  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Clarification has been provided (PC63) regarding the thresholds of 1,000 cubic metres of fluid defined as 'associated hydraulic fracturing' for a single stage by The Infrastructure Act 2015; this unnecessarily leads into discussions (PC66) in Para 5.124 on lower volume well treatments of conventional wells resulting in 'similar issues' and those under The Infrastructure Act 2015 definitions. There is no justification as to why the same planning restrictions established under the Infrastructure Act 2015 for the specific purpose of controlling development of 'associated hydraulic fracturing' apply to all other oil and gas activity; therefore our assertion is that this position is unsound and unnecessarily restrictive.

**Suggested Modification**

Para 5.124 should be amended to ensure consistency with Section 50 of the Infrastructure Act 2015.

**4124/0124/PC067/S**

Paragraph 5.127  
Proposed Change PC067  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

This proposed change is supported and should be included in the final Plan.

**Frack Free Ryedale**

**3684/0068/PC067/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.127  
Proposed Change PC067  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the additional sentence in Para 5.127 as recognise that equipment will be on site for the long term which is understood to be the reality.

**INEOS Upstream Ltd**

**3703/0139/PC067/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.127  
Proposed Change PC067  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

This addition is not relevant. If a planning application is made it follows that there will need to be equipment and activity on site for the length of the development. The relevant question is the impact of a proposal. Once that is deemed acceptable it follows that all activity and equipment are acceptable in that location under the description of the development that has been approved. Again, the proposed wording is creating uncertainty for the decision maker rather than allowing for objective assessment.

[Suggested Modification](#)

Amend the text to address the criticisms above.



**Malton Town Council**

**0758/0059/PC068/LC.U**

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Support the proposed change as the Yorkshire Wolds and the Vale of Pickering have both been identified in the Ryedale Plan under Policy SP13 as areas of locally important landscapes.  
The change has been included in the explanatory text but not in Policy M16 itself, and it is not clear what the term 'regard will be had' means.  
Concerned that in the future large scale fracking applications will be determined by a National Infrastructure Planning body in London who have no local accountability. It is therefore important that firm and robust guidance should be provided by the MWJP and the proposed change should be given proper consideration.  
In any other planning context surface development for fracking would be classed as employment or economic development. Therefore to make the proposed change robust applications for surface development for fracking in areas of locally important landscapes identified in District or Borough local plans should be determined in accordance with policies in the local plan which apply to employment or economic development.

**Suggested modification**

- a) The proposed change in PC68 should be repeated in the main policy text of either M16 or M17
- b) and reworded 'In some parts of the affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough Local Plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to the proposal which falls to be determined by THE APPROPRIATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION, THE PROPOSAL SHALL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WHICH RELATE TO EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC OR EQUIVALENT DEVELOPMENT, AND SUCH OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AS MAY BE APPLICABLE [North Yorkshire County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy] '

**4124/0125/PC068/S**

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

**Comment**

This proposed change is supported and should be included in the final Plan.

**South Hambleton Shale Advisory Group****4158/0029/PC068**

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

**Comment**

This Proposed Change should also state that NYCC will have regard to the Landscape Character Assessments (LCA) where produced by these authorities and in particular the statements which relate to landscape sensitivity as identified for each landscape area e.g. Hambleton LCA (2016). Where LCAs exist and as more are produced by LPAs they form supplementary planning documents and are therefore part of the development plan process.

**4152/0098/PC068/U**

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

**Comment**

There is no mention of the adopted Ryedale Plan and it is considered the Plan would be unsound if it failed to take proper account of Policy SP13 of the Ryedale Plan. The Ryedale Plan aims to encourage new development to "reinforce distinctive elements of landscape character' in areas including the Vale of Pickering and the Yorkshire Wolds and it is considered that these areas high in landscape value should be protected by solid wording in the Plan. Considers that the phrase 'regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy' needs clarifying and more robust phrasing and that the proposed text addition to paragraph 5.130 should be included Policy M16.

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

#### Comment

The proposed amendment is welcomed as the Yorkshire Wolds and the Vale of Pickering have both been identified in the Ryedale Plan under SP13 as areas of locally important landscapes. However, there is concern that the amendment has been included in the explanatory text and not in Policy 16 itself. It is considered that it is not clear what 'regard will be had' means. There are concerns that, following on from the 2017 General Elections, 'large scale planning applications' for fracking will be referred for determination by a National Infrastructure Planning body in London and there would be no local accountability and so it is important that robust guidance should be provided in the MWJP. Fracking comes with the construction of complex surface structures, including plant and machinery such as compressors, drilling rigs, offices, etc. that would, in any other planning context, be classed as employment or economic development. Therefore, in order to make the amendment robust when fracking applications are situated in areas of locally important landscapes identified in a District or Borough Plan, they should be determined in accordance with the policies in that plan applying to employment or economic development.

#### Suggested Modification

It is considered that the amendment should be repeated the main policy text of either Policy M16 or M17 and reworded as following:

"In some parts of the Plan area affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough Local Plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to a proposal which falls to be determined by [North Yorkshire County Council as Mineral and Waste Planning Authority regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy] THE APPROPRIATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION, THE PROPOSAL WILL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WHICH RELATE TO EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC OR EQUIVALENT DEVELOPMENT AND SUCH OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AS MAY BE APPLICABLE".

**Habton Parish Council****0589/0027/PC068/LC.U**

Paragraph 5.130  
 Proposed Change PC068  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Support the proposed change as the Yorkshire Wolds and the Vale of Pickering have both been identified in the Ryedale Plan under Policy SP13 as areas of locally important landscapes.  
 The change has been included in the explanatory text but not in Policy M16 itself, and it is not clear what the term 'regard will be had' means.  
 Concerned that in the future large scale fracking applications will be determined by a National Infrastructure Planning body in London who have no local accountability. It is therefore important that firm and robust guidance should be provided by the MWJP and the proposed change should be given proper consideration.  
 In any other planning context surface development for fracking would be classed as employment or economic development. Therefore to make the proposed change robust applications for surface development for fracking in areas of locally important landscapes identified in District or Borough local plans should be determined in accordance with policies in the local plan which apply to employment or economic development.

**Suggested Modification**

- a) The proposed change in PC68 should be repeated in the main policy text of either M16 or M17
- b) and reworded 'In some parts of the affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough Local Plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to the proposal which falls to be determined by THE APPROPRIATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION, THE PROPOSAL SHALL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WHICH RELATE TO EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC OR EQUIVALENT DEVELOPMENT, AND SUCH OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AS MAY BE APPLICABLE [North Yorkshire County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy] '

**Ryedale District Council****0116/0083/PC068/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.130  
 Proposed Change PC068  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Supports the proposed change although it does not alter the representations that were previously made in respect of the draft hydrocarbon policies

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

Comment

Support the proposed change as the Yorkshire Wolds and the Vale of Pickering have both been identified in the Ryedale Plan under Policy SP13 as areas of locally important landscapes. The change has been included in the explanatory text but not in Policy M16 itself, and it is not clear what the term 'regard will be had' means. Concerned that in the future large scale fracking applications will be determined by a National Infrastructure Planning body in London who have no local accountability. It is therefore important that firm and robust guidance should be provided by the MWJP and the proposed change should be given proper consideration. In any other planning context surface development for fracking would be classed as employment or economic development. Therefore to make the proposed change robust applications for surface development for fracking in areas of locally important landscapes identified in District or Borough local plans should be determined in accordance with policies in the local plan which apply to employment or economic development.

Suggested modification

- a) The proposed change in PC68 should be repeated in the main policy text of either M16 or M17
- b) and reworded 'In some parts of the affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough Local Plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to the proposal which falls to be determined by THE APPROPRIATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION, THE PROPOSAL SHALL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WHICH RELATE TO EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC OR EQUIVALENT DEVELOPMENT, AND SUCH OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AS MAY BE APPLICABLE [North Yorkshire County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy] '

**Frack Free Malton & Norton****3869/0122/PC068/U**

Paragraph 5.130  
 Proposed Change PC068  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

It is considered that the Plan would be unsound in not taking full account of Policy SP13 of the Ryedale Plan. The proposed amendment gives some recognition to local plans but lacks strength by only appearing in the explanatory text and not actually forming part of Policy M16. The phrase 'regard will be had' lacks clarity. A National Infrastructure Planning body in London may be determining "large scale planning applications" for fracking in the future so it is of the utmost importance that the MWJP consists of firm guidance. In order to make the amendment robust when fracking applications situated in areas of locally important landscapes identified in a District Plan area made, they should be determined in accordance with the policies in that plan applying to employment or economic development. This is because the expansive concrete fracking pads, workshops, offices, pipes, storage facilities, etc. would, in any other planning context, be classed as employment or economic development.

**Suggested Modification**

It is considered that the amendment should be repeated the main policy text of either Policy M16 or M17 and reworded as following:

In some parts of the Plan area affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough Local Plans. Where these continue to form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to a proposal which falls to be determined by [North Yorkshire County Council as Mineral and Waste Planning Authority regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy] THE APPROPRIATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION, THE PROPOSAL WILL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WHICH REALTE TO EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC OR EQUIVALENT DEVELOPMENT AND SUCH OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AS MAY BE APPLICABLE.

**Natural England****0119/0114/PC068/LC.S**

Paragraph 5.130  
 Proposed Change PC068  
 Policy Number M16  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Welcomes the consideration of locally important landscapes in this context.

**Frack Free Ryedale**

**3684/0069/PC068/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.130  
Proposed Change PC068  
Policy Number M16  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Support the proposed amendments. However there is a judgement to be made on a case by case basis relating to the 'regard will be had' in respect of the policies and strategies in place within adopted local plans. Minerals can only be worked where they are found and are a finite resource the 'need' for the mineral should not necessarily outweigh any detrimental impacts when locating a well pad in such an area. The NPPF, whilst stating that a great weight should be attributed to the benefits of mineral extraction, does not suggest anywhere in the document, that this should therefore be given primacy over any other consideration when determining planning applications.

The Yorkshire Wolds and Vale of Pickering have both been identified in the Ryedale Plan under Policy SP13 as areas of locally important landscapes. However, this amendment has been included in the explanatory text and not in Policy M16 itself, and it is not clear what 'regard will be had' means. It is likely this situation will occur in other districts within the plan area.

It is noted that the conservative manifesto published for the 2017 General Election states that 'large scale planning applications' for fracking will be referred for determination by a National Infrastructure Planning body in London which has no local accountability. It is critical that robust guidance should be provided in the MWJP to ensure that, in order to make the Plan effective, the purpose of the above amendment is given full and proper consideration should this happen.

**Suggested Modification**

Consider that more clarity should be contained in Policy M16 itself to reflect the commentary of this paragraph. It is noted that no amendment is proposed to Policy M16 however if this is to be a robust policy this should be contained within the policy wording itself.

PC68 should be reworded and added into the main text of Policy M16

'In some parts of the plan area affected by PEDLs, areas of locally important landscapes have been identified in District and Borough Local Plans. Where these form part of the statutory development plan, and are relevant to the proposal to be determined THE APPROPRIATE BODY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPLICATION, THE PROPOSAL SHALL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WHICH RELATE TO EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC OR EQUIVALENT DEVELOPMENT, AND SUCH OTHER LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AS MAY BE ACCEPTABLE.'

[North Yorkshire County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, regard will be had to the requirements of any associated local plan policy]

It could be incorporated into Policy M17 as an alternative

4194/0132/PC070/U

Paragraph 5.130p  
Proposed Change PC070  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

Comment

This change removes from Policy M17 the need to consider the proximity of other planned well pads and replaces it with a need to consider only permitted well pads. This undermines the policy's requirement for information on how proposals for unconventional hydrocarbons fit within the overall plan for the area. Information about operators intended sites in the future should be considered and used to determine whether the cumulative effect of all planned developments in the area, not just the ones already permitted, would result in unacceptable impacts. The change is not compliant with national policy as it would make planning consent for unconventional hydrocarbon development easier to win without taking into account the cumulative effect of such development. Widespread an intensive unconventional hydrocarbon development can result in environmental harm and so is not compatible with paragraph 110 and 123 of the NPPF.

Suggested Modification

This change should not be accepted and the previous wording, which includes consideration of planned well pads should be included in the Plan, this will make the plan more justified as will allow for the full consideration of the cumulative impact of unconventional hydrocarbon development during planning decisions. It will also make the plan more compliant with national policy as it will tend to limit the environmental harm caused by unconventional hydrocarbon development.

4152/0099/PC070/U

Paragraph 5.130p  
Proposed Change PC070  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

Comment

Considers the wording of Policy M17 2) ii) is currently very weak and needs to be more robust as it does not seem to have considered the unacceptable impact that the density of fracking industry development (production sites) would have on the character of the rural community of Burythorpe and its economy of tourism, agriculture and the various equestrian businesses, depending as it does on the character and rural landscapes of the Vale of Pickering and the Yorkshire Wolds.

**Egdon Resources (UK) Limited**

0150/0092/PC070/LC.U.DTC

Paragraph 5.130p  
Proposed Change PC070  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

Comment

The addendum to Policy M17 2) ii) a) fails to address the fundamental issue that there is no justification for setting a wellpad density or arbitrary limit to the number of individual wells within a PEDL area. Cumulative impacts are already taken into account when planning applications are determined. It should be amended, to more accurately reflect the great importance the Government attaches to hydrocarbon extraction in national policy and guidance and to enable the delivery of sustainable development, by deletion and replacement with a more sensible and proportionate requirement to locate a proposal where the development would not have a material adverse impact, subject to appropriate mitigation.



**4124/0126/PC071/S**

Paragraph 5.131  
 Proposed Change PC071  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This proposed change is supported and should be included in the final Plan.

**INEOS Upstream Ltd****3703/0141/PC071/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.131  
 Proposed Change PC071  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This simply repeats and restates controls that are already contained in a wide range of planning policies and within the remit of other regulators. If the MPA considers it necessary to explain how these policies will be applied specifically to onshore hydrocarbon development this should be done through Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0071/PC071/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.131  
 Proposed Change PC071  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Generally supportive of the amendment. It is noted that there is an AQMA located in Ryedale in Malton.

**Friends of the Earth - Yorkshire & Humber and the North East/ FOE England, Wales and N.I****2753/0136/PC071**

Paragraph 5.131  
 Proposed Change PC071  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This change includes some amendments/ concessions on issues that were identified in our previous response. However these have only been included in the supporting justification, rather than the policy themselves, which therefore carry less 'weight' than it would if it were included in the policy text.

**Third Energy Limited****2762/0103/PC072/U**

Paragraph 5.137  
 Proposed Change PC072  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Considers the proposed change is not effective as regardless of the size of the licence area, this is an arbitrary limit of 10 well pads per 100km2 that is unnecessarily restrictive and without justification. Future well sites may vary both in their size and number of wells hosted on site so this arbitrary limit could potentially be either too low or too high. The existing controls in the planning regime cover the development of hydrocarbon sites effectively without such limits.

**INEOS Upstream Ltd****3703/0140/PC072/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.137  
 Proposed Change PC072  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Para 5.137 deals with a proposed well pad development density. The geographical spacing, scale, and type of development in addition to the topographical and surface characteristics of an area should be considered in the assessment of a proposal and the density of development in a particular area. It should not be based on a PEDL boundary or arbitrary figure for well density that does not reflect the nature of an applicant's proposals or their ability of the environment to accommodate it appropriately.

**Suggested Modification**

Amend the text to address the comments above.

**Egdon Resources (UK) Limited****0150/0093/PC072/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.137  
 Proposed Change PC072  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The addendum fails to address the fundamental issue that there is no justification for setting a wellpad density or arbitrary limit to the number of individual wells within a PEDL area. Cumulative impacts are already taken into account when planning applications are determined. It should be amended, to more accurately reflect the great importance the Government attaches to hydrocarbon extraction in national policy and guidance and to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

**Cuadrilla Resources Ltd****3704/0113/PC072/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.137  
 Proposed Change PC072  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Applying arbitrary thresholds on pad density is unnecessarily restrictive. The key consideration is to ensure that effects of hydrocarbon development can either be removed or appropriately managed through the variety of existing institutional arrangements already in place through the Environment Agency, Natural England, Health and Safety Executive, Oil and Gas Authority, BEIS, DCLG and other bodies plus the proper implementation of the processes such as EIA and ERA. The process by which the pad density had been calculated is unknown and appears to result in arbitrary thresholds. Limits should not be considered until relevant applications are submitted, assessed and concluded in a transparent manner.

**Suggested Modification**

reference to the application of 10 well pads per 100km<sup>2</sup> PEDL area (and its pro-rata application being applied where the area is less or more than 100km) to be removed from Para 5.137.

**United Kingdom Onshore Oil and Gas (UKOOG)****3997/0108/PC072/U**

Paragraph 5.137  
Proposed Change PC072  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Does not consider it is justified to apply arbitrary thresholds on the density placement of well sites as this is unnecessary restrictive and unsound.

**Zetland Group****2145/0015/PC072/U**

Paragraph 5.137  
Proposed Change PC072  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

**Comment**

The Proposed Change to para 5.137 is not effective.  
It is not appropriate to set pad density limits. The para is over complicated and unnecessary – hydrocarbon developments are often temporary, low impact developments – some areas may well have capacity to accommodate numerically more than others. In the context of unconventional oil and gas, where the geology is not targeting specific geological structures such as structural or stratigraphic traps, consideration may well be given to pad density, however in order to consider pad density, a further understanding of the unconventional resource must be obtained through initial exploratory works. The ‘Plan’ can be revised once the potential resource is better understood.

**4124/0127/PC073/S**

Paragraph 5.137  
Proposed Change PC073  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

**Comment**

This proposed change is supported and should be included in the final Plan.

**Egdon Resources (UK) Limited****0150/0094/PC073/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.137  
Proposed Change PC073  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

**Comment**

The addendum fails to address the fundamental issue that there is no justification for setting a wellpad density or arbitrary limit to the number of individual wells within a PEDL area. Cumulative impacts are already taken into account when planning applications are determined. It should be amended, to more accurately reflect the great importance the Government attaches to hydrocarbon extraction in national policy and guidance and to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0072/PC073/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.137  
 Proposed Change PC073  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Generally support the proposed amendment but consider that it should apply to areas of local landscape importance which are of similar importance to the Green Belt.  
 Consider locally designated landscapes of importance are just as important to both the local community and the wider visitor economy of North Yorkshire. These areas are recognised in the local plans, such as in the Ryedale Plan Policy SP13 Landscapes. This will be reflected in other district local plans.

**Suggested Modification**

Suggest that in addition to the text incorporate the following in the sentence immediately after the amended sentence to read  
 'For PEDLs located WITHin the Green Belt OR AREAS OF LOCAL LANDSCAPE IMPORTANCE[,] or where a relatively high concentration of other land use constraints exist, including significant access constraints, a lower density and/or number may appropriate.'

**4124/0124/PC075/S**

Paragraph 5.147  
 Proposed Change PC075  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This proposed change is supported and should be included in the final Plan.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0056/PC075**

Paragraph 5.147  
 Proposed Change PC075  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This paragraph is not in conformity with the guidance as set out in the NPPF and PPG Minerals therefore cannot be considered sound at present. This needs to be reworded to reflect the fact that developers should aim to reduce noise levels at a site to a minimum level, below the absolute thresholds set out in the Minerals PPG, not meet them as set out in the text. The emphasis is on the developer proving to the MPA that the noise produced as a result of development cannot be reduced any further without causing onerous burden. Any planning condition should then reflect the minimum level - not automatically be set at the threshold which is the incorrect interpretation of policy and in rural parts of North Yorkshire that threshold is well above the normal baseline conditions.  
 This approach was discussed in great detail between the Appellant (Cuadrilla) and Lancashire County Council at the recent enquiries for the fracking appeals in Lancashire, and were agreed with by the Inspector in her report.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0075/PC075/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.147  
 Proposed Change PC075  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Consider that the paragraph requires rewording.  
 Site lighting is mentioned however flaring is generally treated as outside the jurisdiction of planning in most general terms. Consider that once multiple well sites start to appear (particularly during the exploration and appraisal stages) there would be potential for multiple flares at the same well site and/or different well sites undergoing exploration and appraisal at the same time. This has potential to cause negative visual impact across the area particularly when it is dark. There will also be associated air quality impacts from the emissions and noise from the flaring, these are not covered in the proposed plan. Much of the Plan area is sparsely populated and subject to extremely low levels of background noise, the matter could be dealt with by the requirement that all well completions are green completions. There should be a text amendment to paragraph 5.147 to reflect the requirements of national policy which seek to ensure that local amenity is protected by reducing noise levels to a minimum, below the absolute threshold set out in the PPG, at night. The onus is on the developer to prove they cannot reduce the levels below a certain level without onerous burden, which also needs to be proved to the MPA. The MPA should set any noise condition at that minimum level.

**Suggested Modification**

New wording should be added to the paragraph to set out

'In considering appropriate noise limits at sensitive receptors, operators WILL BE EXPECTED TO REDUCE TO MINIMUM, ACTIVITIES WHICH GENERATE NOISE, BELOW ABSOLUTE THRESHOLDS AS SET OUT IN THE MINERALS PPG AND NPPF. WHEN THE APPLICANT CAN NOT REDUCE NOISE LEVELS ANY FURTHER WITHOUT ONEROUS BURDEN, THE APPLICANT WILL BE EXPECTED TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF THIS BURDEN, IN LINE WITH GUIDANCE IN THE MINERALS PPG AT PARAGRAPH 21, WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF ENSURING A HIGH STANDARD OF PROTECTION FOR LOCAL AMENITY. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THIS, THE APPLICANT WILL BE EXPECTED TO UNDERTAKE A SERIES OF ACCURATE NOISE LEVEL MONITORING TO CAPTURE BASE LINE CONDITIONS IN THE VICINITY OF THE SITE LOCATION.'

'ALL WELL COMPLETIONS WILL BE GREEN COMPLETIONS WHICH MEANS NO FLARING WILL BE ALLOWED'

The final sentence could alternatively be incorporated into Policy M18 1)i).

**INEOS Upstream Ltd****3703/0135/PC076/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.148  
 Proposed Change PC076  
 Policy Number M17  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The reference to 'induced seismic activity' should be deleted as it not the responsibility of the MPA but falls under the regulatory remit of the Oil and Gas Authority.

**Egdon Resources (UK) Limited****0150/0095/PC076/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.148  
Proposed Change PC076  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The addendum fails to address the fundamental issue that induced seismicity is primarily a consideration of other regulators and is not within the remit of the MPA. It should be amended, to more accurately reflect the great importance the Government attaches to hydrocarbon extraction in national policy and guidance and to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

**Third Energy Limited****2762/0104/PC076/U**

Paragraph 5.148  
Proposed Change PC076  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Considers the proposed change is not effective as any development will be located in areas where the technical study of the geology demonstrates 'suitability' in that there is an effective hydrocarbon system in existence with the potential for commercial production. The potential for inducing seismicity and any impacts at surface are very clearly the remit of the Oil & Gas Authority.

**United Kingdom Onshore Oil and Gas (UKOOG)****3997/0109/PC076/U**

Paragraph 5.148  
Proposed Change PC076  
Policy Number M17  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Consider that this is not the responsibility of the MPA, but falls under the regulatory remit of the Oil & Gas Authority. The statement should be removed, it is not justified and is considered to be unsound.

**Frack Free Ryedale**

**3684/0070/PC079/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 5.152p  
Proposed Change PC079  
Policy Number M18  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Flaring is used to burn waste gas that cannot be pipelined/stored for commercial use and so must be considered waste and dealt with under part 1)i) of this policy. This is a waste stream which has not been taken into account in the Plan, it could be dealt with by not allowing flaring and having a requirement for 'green completions'.

The plan amendments do not fully deal with the potential issues relating to reinjection. The plan talks of a high standard of protection but does not mention the requirement relating to reinjection having to be currently proven to be BAT. The high standard approach seems at odds with the statement relating to induced seismicity which can be 'mitigated to an acceptable level.' There is no recognition in the supporting text of the chain of responsibility should issues arise using such techniques.

Concerned that the amendment to para 2)i) may lead to a situation that many wells may remain suspended in the hope of becoming commercially viable. This may be used as a reason to extend the term of an existing permission in a speculative way. Suspending wells should not become the norm and the MPA should assess each application on its own merits prior to agreeing to this at the site restoration and aftercare stage only if sufficient evidence is provided to justify any such suspension. This could lead to a large number of suspended wells.

**Suggested Modification**

Flaring must be considered an onsite waste operation and should be dealt with under this policy by not allowing flaring and requiring only 'green completions'

Support the original version of section 2)i) of policy M18 without the amendment.

Paragraph 5.152p  
 Proposed Change PC079  
 Policy Number M18  
 Site Reference

#### Comment

This change removes the need to decommission wells that have reached the end of their operational phase and allows wells to be suspended pending further hydrocarbon development. This allows operators to suspend wells for long periods without permanent decommissioning. This leads to uncertainty amongst the public and lengthens the time during which groundwater is put at risk by the possibility of well casing failure. The wording in the Plan is not clear so a change to the wording is necessary. However the proposed change is not clear enough that lengthy periods of suspension will not be permitted. The change is not compliant with paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

Ground water is at risk of contamination from non decommissioned wells so the proposed change should be altered to make clear that hydrocarbon wells that have completed their initial operational phase should be decommissioned promptly with suspension during periods when the operator considers their options are not being permitted.

#### Suggested Modification

The proposed change should have the following text added to the relevant part of Policy M18

FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF OPERATIONS INCLUDED IN ANY EXISTING PLANNING CONSENT HYDROCARBON WELLS MUST NOT BE SUSPENDED PENDING FURTHER PLANNING APPLICATIONS. HYDROCARBON WELLS MUST ALSO NOT BE LEFT SUSPENDED FOR UNNECESSARILY LONG PERIODS BETWEEN OPERATIONS INCLUDED IN THE PLANNING CONSENT. HYDROCARBON WELLS MUST BE DECOMMISSIONED PROMPTLY FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF THEIR OPERATIONAL PHASE.'

The addition of the text would make the plan better justified as it would avoid the current situation where hydrocarbon wells are left suspended for lengthy periods of time. It would also make it more compliant with national policy as it would reduce the risk of contamination from well casing failures.

### Third Energy Limited

Paragraph 5.152p  
 Proposed Change PC079  
 Policy Number M18  
 Site Reference

#### Comment

Considers the proposed change is not effective as the decommissioning of a well is common oil field operational practice and must be undertaken in line with regulatory requirements from the Health and Safety Executive, Environment Agency and Oil & Gas Authority and this is how the risk of any contamination is managed. The remit of the Mineral Planning Authority is the management of surface effects, i.e. site restoration in line with the planning consent.



Paragraph 5.153  
Proposed Change PC080  
Policy Number M18  
Site Reference

Comment

This change deletes the word waste from the paragraph regarding water returned to the surface from the borehole at hydrocarbon wells. This water is typically contaminated with high levels of salt, hydrocarbons, heavy metals and naturally occurring radioactive materials. Because of this contamination the water must be handled and disposed of responsibly. The deletion of the word waste implies that the water returned via the borehole will not always be regarded as waste and therefore might be reused instead of disposed of. This change is not justified as it is important to be clear that contaminated water from the hydrocarbon industry will be disposed of in the appropriate manner. The change is also not consistent with paragraphs 110 and 143 of the NPPF, as the reuse of contaminated water from hydrocarbon wells presents a danger to the environment.

Suggested Modification

The change should not be accepted in the Plan and the reference to waste water should remain in the Plan. This will make the plan better justified as it will prevent contaminated water from hydrocarbon wells being reused in a irresponsible manner. It will also make the plan more consistent with national policy as it will protect the environment from harm.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0076/PC080/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.153  
 Proposed Change PC080  
 Policy Number M18  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

This propose change has not dealt with the suggestion that all waste water from site operations can be treated. This is not the case as the treatment process for the water containing NORM is essentially dilution, and must be taken to a large treatment works able to carry out the process before releasing it into the river system. The paragraph describes the water as being disposed of, it is actually removed from site for further processing. There are no suitable treatment sites within the plan area.

This paragraph is misleading as far as reinjection of waste water into substrata. It is unlikely waste water will be disposed of by reinjection as it will not meet the requirements of assessment of the best available technique (BAT). There is evidence from other parts of the world that links reinjection with increased seismicity in excess of the trigger point in the 'traffic light' warning system used in respect of actually carrying out the fracturing itself. This potential is recognised by the amendment.

Concerned the Plan does not recognise the additional impacts related to noise which can occur should reinjection of water into wells be permitted, this should be taken account of in the plan.

**Suggested Modification**

Where the word 'waste' is deleted it should say after water 'REQUIRING TREATMENT OR PROCESSING.'

An additional sentence should also be added at the end of this paragraph relating to the potential increase in noise should this practice be permitted on sites.

Some clear definitions around the various water descriptors would assist.

**Frack Free Ryedale****3684/0077/PC081/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 5.156  
 Proposed Change PC081  
 Policy Number M18  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Concerned that the amendment to paragraph 5.156 or 5.153 does not reference in anyway the additional impacts to noise levels which can occur as a result of site operations relating specifically to pumping water (waste water), let alone pressurising it should reinjection be allowed on site.

**017: Potash Polyhalite & Salt****CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0037/PC007**

Paragraph 5.171  
 Proposed Change PC007  
 Policy Number M22  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinitite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0038/PC008**

Paragraph 5.171  
 Proposed Change PC008  
 Policy Number M22  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0039/PC009**

Paragraph 5.171p  
 Proposed Change PC009  
 Policy Number M22  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0040/PC010**

Paragraph 5.171p  
 Proposed Change PC010  
 Policy Number M22  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0057/PC082**

Paragraph 5.171p  
 Proposed Change PC082  
 Policy Number M22  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the new sentence in relation to the Major Development Test in Policy M22.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0041/PC011**

Paragraph 5.172  
 Proposed Change PC011  
 Policy Number M22  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**006: Waste****023: Meeting Future Waste Management Needs**

**Natural England****0119/0119/PC105LC.S**

Paragraph 6.060s  
 Proposed Change PC105  
 Policy Number W04  
 Site Reference WJP15

**Comment**

Welcomes this clarification.

**Natural England****0119/0121/PC107/LC.S**

Paragraph 6.073s  
 Proposed Change PC107  
 Policy Number W05  
 Site Reference WJP06

**Comment**

Welcomes the addition of the York-Selby Cycle Track SINC in the Key Sensitivities and Development Requirements for allocation MJ55.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0048/PC107**

Paragraph 6.073s  
 Proposed Change PC107  
 Policy Number W05  
 Site Reference WJP06

**Comment**

Welcome the reference to the York and Selby Cycle Track SINC within the 1st bullet point of key sensitivities within WJP06.  
 A full archaeological assessment should be required prior to development (in line with those related suggested changes in PC98 and PC99 relating to sand and gravel sites) and alternative sites should be considered prior to any permission being granted.

**025: Site Identification Principles for new Waste Management Capacity****CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0058/PC083**

Paragraph 6.112p  
 Proposed Change PC083  
 Policy Number W11  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The proposed change refers to the addition of text within Policy W11 'or adjacent to' in Part 1), and makes equivalent changes to parts 2), 3), and 5). This improves consistency with Policy W10 and has regard to the fact siting facilities adjacent to existing waste management sites can be beneficial in terms of shared infrastructure networks and landscape screening opportunities amongst others, rather than siting new facilities in an isolated open countryside location.

**Tetragen (UK) Ltd****4103/0080/PC083/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 6.112p  
 Proposed Change PC083  
 Policy Number W11  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Supports inclusion of the text in the Policy as it supports the extension of existing waste management sites as well as appropriate waste proposals within the footprint of an existing site. It aligns with Policy W10 2) and is more consistent. The MWJP is now considered to be sound, and no further modification is proposed.

**FD Todd & Sons Ltd****1133/0083/PC083/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 6.112p  
 Proposed Change PC083  
 Policy Number W11  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Supports inclusion of the text in the Policy as it supports the extension of existing waste management sites as well as appropriate waste proposals within the footprint of an existing site. It aligns with Policy W10 2) and is more consistent. The MWJP is now considered to be sound, and no further modification is proposed.

**008: Minerals and Waste Safeguarding****028: Safeguarding Mineral Resources****CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0042/PC017**

Paragraph 8.007p  
 Proposed Change PC017  
 Policy Number S01  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinitite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0043/PC018**

Paragraph 8.017  
 Proposed Change PC018  
 Policy Number S01  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Support the PCs and additional proposed text in relation to potash mines in the North York Moors. The explanation of the differing types of potash (polyhalite and sylvinitite) and salt that can be extracted from the different mines and what exact permissions are in relation to the separate mines provides clarity and is welcomed.

**030: Waste Management Facility Safeguarding****Tetragen (UK) Ltd****4103/0081/PC084/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 8.027p  
 Proposed Change PC084  
 Policy Number S03  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Supports inclusion of W10 in key links of Policy S03 as now links to overall locational principles for provision of waste capacity as well as the W11 waste site identification principles and so is now sound. No further modification is proposed.

**FD Todd & Sons Ltd****1133/0078/PC084/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 8.027p  
 Proposed Change PC084  
 Policy Number S03  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Supports inclusion of W10 in key links of Policy S03 as now links to overall locational principles for provision of waste capacity as well as the W11 waste site identification principles and so is now sound. No further modification is proposed.

**Harworth Estates (UK Coal Operations Ltd)****0127/0032/PC084/LC.DTC.U**

Paragraph 8.027p  
 Proposed Change PC084  
 Policy Number S03  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Policy S03 and its supporting text is too restrictive and does not take adequate account of the fact that waste uses may prove unviable. Likewise, a waste proposal use may not fully reflect the aspirations for other uses at a local level where there is a two-tier authority, such as Selby District Council. It is considered that Policy S03, and its supporting text, remains to be fully justified and is not flexible enough to deal with rapidly changing circumstances i.e. changes in the waste market which could affect viability. Policy S03 is therefore unsound. Our Client therefore objects to the current wording contained within the Pre-submission Draft.

**Suggested Modification**

To address these concerns and provide greater clarity, it is suggested that the supporting text at paragraph 8.29 is to be amended to include the following text before the final sentence:

'WHERE A SITE IS NOT IN USE, VIABILITY ISSUES WILL BE RELEVANT TO CONSIDERING WHETHER THERE IS A REASONABLE PROSPECT OF THE SITE STILL BEING USED FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE FORSEEABLE FUTURE.'

This will be particularly important in the two-tier parts of the Plan area, where many development decisions are not taken by the waste planning authority. This will ensure that there is an element of flexibility in the event sites safeguarded under Policy S03 can be brought forward for alternative uses in the event that a waste use would be unviable.

**Tetragen (UK) Ltd****4103/0079/PC027/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 8.027s  
 Proposed Change PC027  
 Policy Number S03  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Supports inclusion of the text within the Knapton Quarry waste facility type description. The amended description support the site's existing and future operations as a transfer, treatment and recycling facility, as well as a composting facility, and assists in securing the waste handling infrastructure of the region. The MWJP is now considered to be sound, and no further modification is proposed.

**FD Todd & Sons Ltd****1133/0073/PC027/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 8.027s  
Proposed Change PC027  
Policy Number S03  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Supports inclusion of the text within the Knapton Quarry waste facility type description. The amended description support the site's existing and future operations as a transfer, treatment and recycling facility, as well as a composting facility, and assists in securing the waste handling infrastructure of the region. The MWJP is now considered to be sound, and no further modification is proposed.

**Ryedale District Council****0116/0084/PC113/LC.S.DTC**

Paragraph 8.027s  
Proposed Change PC113  
Policy Number S03  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The proposed change (additional site) is in response to a previous representation and is welcomed.

**Highways England****0112/0026/PC113/S**

Paragraph 8.027s  
Proposed Change PC113  
Policy Number S03  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Highways England have considered this additional safeguarded waste site and have no concerns at this time as the proposed change only safeguards the existing site and will not generate additional traffic.

We do not feel that the proposed changes materially alter the overall policy approach of the plan and we therefore remain generally supportive of the policies set out. Highways England considers that the Joint Plan is sound when considered against the tests of being positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy.

**Harworth Estates (UK Coal Operations Ltd)****0127/0033PC085/LC.DTC,U**

Paragraph 8.030  
 Proposed Change PC085  
 Policy Number S03  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Policy S03: Waste Management Facility Safeguarding proposes to impose a 250m buffer around all allocated waste management facilities to protect and prevent any conflicting uses. However, Policy S03 and its supporting text do not fully acknowledge that such facilities are often sited on sites where other uses are existing or proposed which would require them to sit within close proximity to each other. In particular, we have previously highlighted the example of the proposals for the employment park at the former Kellingley Colliery Site. As such, our Client welcomes the addition of the suggested additional paragraph proposed via amendment PC85.

We would however highlight that Amendment PC85 will only address situations where proposals for a site are already subject to a planning consent. This still does not adequately address situations where new proposals are either proposed via a planning application, or within an emerging development plan. This proposed amendment fails to be effective and our Client therefore continues to object.

**Suggested Modification**

To ensure policy PC85 and its supporting text is “sound”, the word 'extant' should be deleted from the first sentence, resulting in the following:

“It is acknowledged that in some cases, including at the former mine sites in the Plan area, there are other proposals for redevelopment which are matters for determination by the relevant local planning authority and that such proposals could overlap with land proposed for safeguarding in the Joint Plan...”

**Selby District Council****0074/0010/PC085/S**

Paragraph 8.030  
 Proposed Change PC085  
 Policy Number S03  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

We support proposed amendment PC85. The inclusion of this text at revised paragraphs 8.30 should ensure a pragmatic approach is taken when implementing safeguarding requirements, where an overlap of other types of proposed development occurs. We welcome the fact that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority will seek to work constructively, in these circumstances, with the relevant LPA and developers to ensure that a proportionate approach is taken.

031: Minerals and Waste Transport infrastructure Safeguarding



**Selby District Council****0074/0011/PC086/S**

Paragraph 8.033  
 Proposed Change PC086  
 Policy Number S04  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

We support proposed amendment PC86. The inclusion of this text at revised paragraph 8.33 should ensure a pragmatic approach is taken when implementing safeguarding requirements, where an overlap of other types of proposed development occurs. We welcome the fact that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority will seek to work constructively, in these circumstances, with the relevant LPA and developers to ensure that a proportionate approach is taken.

**Harworth Estates (UK Coal Operations Ltd)****0127/0034/PC087/LC.DTC.U**

Paragraph 8.034  
 Proposed Change PC087  
 Policy Number S04  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

We have also previously raised concerns that Policy S04 fails to take account of situations whereby existing waste management facilities are no longer viable and therefore alternative uses may need to be sought. As such, it is considered that Policy S04 does not currently meet the tests of national policy and is therefore 'unsound'.

**Suggested Modification**

It was agreed that the following text would be added to the end of paragraph 8.34:

'WHERE A SITE IS NOT IN USE, VIABILITY ISSUES WILL BE RELEVANT TO CONSIDERING WHETHER THERE IS A REASONABLE PROSPECT OF THE SITE BEING USED FOR MINERALS OR WASTE TRANSPORT IN THE FORSEEABLE FUTURE.'

**034: Safeguarding Exempt Criteria****CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)****2173/0049/PC088**

Paragraph 8.047  
 Proposed Change PC088  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

With specific regard to transport matters, support the inclusion of this change which references the fact that minerals and waste transport infrastructure is also safeguarded within the plan.

**Harworth Estates (UK Coal Operations Ltd)**

0127/0035PC088//LC.DTC.U

Paragraph 8.047  
 Proposed Change PC088  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Our Client has also previously raised concerns that the Joint Plan fails to fully acknowledge the aspirations, both short and longer term, of district authorities, in particular Selby District Council, which is currently progressing its emerging Local Plan, including site allocations. This omission means that policy S04, is not effective and is therefore in direct conflict with the clear tests outlined in national policy. Our Client therefore continues to object. It was therefore agreed to add the following amendment to the exemption criteria listed at paragraph 8.47 (bullet point 12):

**Suggested Modification**

“Applications for development on land which is already allocated in an adopted local plan where the plan took account of minerals, and waste AND MINERALS AND WASTE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE safeguarding requirements, OR, IN THE CASE OF AN EMERGING LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION, WHERE THE MINERALS AND WASTE PLANNING AUTHORITY HAS RAISED NO SAFEGUARDING CONCERNS DURING CONSULTATION ON THE EMERGING PLAN ALLOCATION”.

**CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)**

2173/0055/PC088

Paragraph 8.047  
 Proposed Change PC088  
 Policy Number  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

Welcome the reference to relevant designation in terms of locally important landscape designations identified in District and Borough Local Plans and that the MPA will need to have regard to them in determining applications within those areas.

**009: Development Management****037: Development Management Criteria****CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)**

2173/0050/PC089

Paragraph 9.016  
 Proposed Change PC089  
 Policy Number D03  
 Site Reference

**Comment**

The reference to Air Quality Management Areas is welcomed in this change. It is important to note that that air quality is linked to and often impacted detrimentally by vehicular emissions. We are aware that the Government is placing great weight on the protection and enhancement of air quality, therefore, opportunities to enhance air quality within North Yorkshire should be encouraged.

**Howardian Hills AONB****0113/0143/PC090/S**

Paragraph 9.021  
 Proposed Change PC090  
 Policy Number D03  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The points raised in the response made to the Publication Draft in relation to inserting the full Purposes of AONB Designation have been fully incorporated into the proposed change.

**South Hambleton Shale Advisory Group****4158/0030/PC090**

Paragraph 9.021  
 Proposed Change PC090  
 Policy Number D04  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The Proposed Change states that within AONBs 'particular regard should be paid to promoting sustainable forms of social and economic development that in themselves conserve and enhance the environment'. We would expect this more rigorous test also to apply within the AONB buffer zone ref. Policy M16 (d) i).

**038: Protection of Important Assets****South Hambleton Shale Advisory Group****4158/0031/PC091**

Paragraph 9.042  
 Proposed Change PC091  
 Policy Number D06  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

We note this Proposed Change but remain concerned that this does not provide consistent or comprehensive scrutiny, particular in relation to cumulative impact.  
 We suggest that for each PEDL area, the Councils, in conjunction with District Councils, undertake or adapt existing Landscape Character Assessments (LCA) to include a 'sensitivity assessment which considers the potential impact of each additional drilling site and advises what number could be accommodated without detriment'.  
 Alternatively, whenever more than two drilling sites are approved in any PEDL area, no further planning application for additional shale gas wells on an existing or new site within the PEDL area should be considered until a LCA and sensitivity study has been undertaken to determine the total capacity (number) of drilling sites in that PEDL area that can be accommodated without detriment. This is necessary to avoid adverse cumulative impact.

**Natural England****0119/0115/PC091/LC.S**

Paragraph 9.042  
 Proposed Change PC091  
 Policy Number D06  
 Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Welcomes the consideration of locally important landscapes in this context.

**040: Reclamation and Afteruse**

**Tarmac**

**0317/0018/PC095/LC.S**

Paragraph 9.084p  
Proposed Change PC095  
Policy Number D10  
Site Reference

**Comment**

The rewording of Policy D10 1) i) is supported in that the proposed change is now consistent with para 189 of the NPPF.

**4191/0060/PC095/LC.U.DTC**

Paragraph 9.084p  
Proposed Change PC095  
Policy Number D10  
Site Reference

**Comment**

This change is not fully justified as it does not go far enough in terms of consultation with communities and proof of reasonable low impacts on those affected communities and the environment. Also believe within this context that proof of viability compared to other energy sourcing processes such as micro-renewables and larger scale renewable energy infrastructure is not being clearly demonstrated and as such is subjecting nearby affected communities to unacceptable risk of pollution(s).

**Suggested modification**

Consider the following addition necessary to PC95

AN APPLICANT FOR PLANNING PERMISSION FOR FRACKING OR SHALE GAS OPERATIONS (INCLUDING TEST DRILLING AND EXTRACTION) MUST DEMONSTRATE BY APPROPRIATE EVIDENCE AND ASSESSMENT THAT REASONABLE SCIENTIFIC DOUBT CAN BE EXCLUDED TO ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ALONE OR IN COMBINATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENTS:

- ON THE QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF WATER RESOURCES
- ON AIR QUALITY (INCLUDING THROUGH EMISSIONS OF METHANE AND SULPHUR)
- ON SEISMIC ACTIVITY
- ON LOCAL COMMUNITIES

**Tarmac**

**0317/0019/PC096/LC.U**

Paragraph 9.084p  
Proposed Change PC096  
Policy Number D10  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Acknowledge the changes made to Part 2 (viii) of Policy D10. Nevertheless, these changes do not address the representations previously made in response to this policy.  
The 'landscape scale benefits' which are sought through Part 2 (viii) of the policy can often only be delivered with large areas of land which may not be under the control of the developer. As such, expectations may be created that cannot be delivered. The policy is therefore considered to be unsound.

**Suggested Modification**

Delete the following words from Part 2(viii) of Policy D10:  
".. Seeking to deliver benefits at a landscape scale."

**Minerals Products Association**

**0115/0086/PC096/LC.U**

Paragraph 9.084p  
Proposed Change PC096  
Policy Number D10  
Site Reference

**Comment**

The 'landscape scale benefits' which are sought through Part 2 (viii) of the policy can often be delivered with large areas of land not under the control of the developer. As such, this policy cannot be effectively achieved and the policy is therefore considered unsound.

**Suggested Modification**

Suggest some words are deleted from Part 2 (viii)

'Achieving significant net gains for biodiversity which help create coherent and resilient ecological networks. Where practicable, proposals should contribute significantly to the creation of habitats of particular importance in the local landscape [seeking to deliver benefits at a landscape scale]. This includes wet grasslands and fen in the Swale and Ure valleys and species-rich grassland on the Magnesian limestone ridge.'

**Natural England**

**0119/0116/PC096/LC.S**

Paragraph 9.084p  
Proposed Change PC096  
Policy Number D10  
Site Reference

**Comment**

Welcomes the clarity provided by this modification.

**011: Any Other Comments**

**050: Any Other Comments**

**East Riding of Yorkshire Council****0118/0149**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)[Proposed Change](#)

No further comments to make in respect of the proposed changes and there are no outstanding issues to be resolved.

[Policy Number](#)[Site Reference](#)**Ministry of Defence / Defence Infrastructure Organisation****0114/0148**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)[Proposed Change](#)

No comments in regards to the proposed changes consultation document.

[Policy Number](#)[Site Reference](#)**Burton Salmon Parish Council****0457/0155**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)[Proposed Change](#)

No comments to make.

[Policy Number](#)[Site Reference](#)**Lancaster City Council****0054/0145**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)[Proposed Change](#)

No comments to make on the proposed changes

[Policy Number](#)[Site Reference](#)**Durham County Council****0092/0146**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)[Proposed Change](#)

Do not have any further comments over and above what was submitted in relation to the Publication Draft in December 2016.

[Policy Number](#)[Site Reference](#)

**Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council****0095/0147**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)

Proposed Change

No comments to make regarding the proposed changes.

Policy Number

Site Reference

**Hambleton District Council****0053/0144**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)

Proposed Change

No comments to make of proposed changes.

Policy Number

Site Reference

**CEG****4198/162**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)

Proposed Change

No comments to make.

Policy Number

Site Reference

**Scarborough Borough Council****0286/0152**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)

Proposed Change

In the addendum of proposed changes there are no alterations that relate specifically to Scarborough Borough and so have no comments to make.

Policy Number

Site Reference

**Canal & River Trust****0294/0153**

Paragraph NC

[Comment](#)

Proposed Change

Do not wish to make comments on the proposed changes.

Policy Number

Site Reference

**North Yorkshire Police****1125/0159**

Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

No comments to make.

**West Tanfield Parish Council****0948/0157**

Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

No comments to make.

**Environment Agency****0121/0150**

Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

The changes have no impact on any previous comments that we have provided and so have no comments to make.

**Hull City Council****3027/0161**

Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

No further comments to make in respect of the proposed changes and there are no outstanding issues to be resolved.

**The Coal Authority****1111/0158**

Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

[Comment](#)

Generally supportive of changes but are disappointed are proposed to Policy M16 as previously requested so consider that our previous comments are still relevant and our objections have not been addressed.



**United Utilities****0327/0154**Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference[Comment](#)

No comments to make at this stage but request to be consulted with future planning documents.

**Leaving Parish Council****0726/0156**Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference[Comment](#)

No further comments to make beyond those previously submitted.

**York Health and Wellbeing Board****2175/160**Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference[Comment](#)

Not submitting a formal response to the consultation.

**Yorkshire Wildlife Trust****0128/0151**Paragraph NC  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference[Comment](#)

Do not have any further comments to make.

**012: Non-Duly Made Representations Received****3386/0171**Paragraph NDM  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference[Comment](#)

4190/0176

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

4189/0175

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

4195/0177

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

4197/0178

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

**Poppleton Junior Football Club**

3219/0170

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

**Helmsley Town Council**

**0603/0163**

Paragraph NDM  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

**Gladman Developments**

**2367/0168**

Paragraph NDM  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

**Wistow Parish Council**

**0966/0164**

Paragraph NDM  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

**Alkane Energy**

**3705/0172**

Paragraph NDM  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

**Newby Hall Estate**

**1351/0166**

Paragraph NDM  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

Comment

1355/0167

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

4098/0174

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

**Pool-in-Wharfedale Parish Council**

1076/0165

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

3836/0173

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

2808/0169

Paragraph  
Proposed Change  
Policy Number  
Site Reference

NDM

Comment

## MINERALS AND WASTE JOINT PLAN - SUMMARY OF MAIN REPRESENTATION ISSUES AT THE ADDENDUM OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PUBLICATION DRAFT (Regulation 22 (1))

### Introduction

*Following the Publication Draft of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan in November 2016 a number of Proposed Changes were identified to the Plan. As a result, it was considered necessary to present the changes, in accordance with regulation 19: Publication of a Local Plan, for representations on Legal compliance and soundness. The additional period for receiving representation ran from 12<sup>th</sup> July 2017 for eight weeks until 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017. The following table provides a focussed summary of the main issues raised and the response by the Authorities.*

*As a substantial number of representations received relate to the Proposed Changes to the Hydrocarbons (oil and gas) policies in the Joint Plan, the table is divided into four main parts:*

- 1) *Key issues raised by the hydrocarbons industry;*
- 2) *Key issues raised by environment/amenity groups and individuals relating to hydrocarbons*
- 3) *Other key policy issues*
- 4) *Site allocations issues*

### Hydrocarbons key issues - industry

Representation main issues	Main representors	Response by the Authorities
PC56: Amends the 'Summary of the process of hydrocarbons development' section, to clarify the expected nature of development at the exploration stage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional text should be added to clarify that activity will be subsequent to drilling.</li> </ul>	Zetland Group	The proposed change was made in the 1st bullet of para. 5.107 regarding unconventional hydrocarbons from exploratory 'drilling' to exploratory 'activity' to address that whilst drilling activities are similar for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbon sources, which is reflected in the sentence before the proposed change, there may be differences in the timing of exploratory activities associated with unconventional sources. <b>No further change proposed.</b>
PC59: Amends the 'Summary of the process of hydrocarbons development' section to clarify the role of the Environment Agency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change does not fully reflect the role of the Environment Agency and should be expanded.</li> </ul>	Zetland Group, Third Energy Ltd	The additional sentence in the Addendum is not a summary of the whole role of the Environment Agency, but was proposed in response to representations regarding the Agency's role as a regulator regarding the management and disposal of returned water and NORM. <b>No further change proposed.</b>

<p>PC61: Amends the 'Other regulatory regimes' section under 'Hydrocarbons' to more closely align the text with national policy and guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change is not effective as it reduces the scope of other regulatory bodies by only making reference to 'control of processes or emissions' with regard to what MPAs do not have to focus on.</li> </ul>	<p>Third Energy Ltd</p>	<p>National policy is clear that local planning authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively and indicates that they should focus on the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions where these are dealt with under other pollution control regimes. In order to ensure that the impacts of a proposed use can be properly assessed through the planning process, it is necessary to ensure that the development plan, as the starting point for the determination of applications, contains relevant policies. This is particularly the case where the regulatory position is relatively complex and where important issues arise which may be relevant to both assessing the land use impacts of a proposed use and the detailed control of processes or emissions. It is therefore inevitable, and appropriate, that there will be a degree of overlap between the Plan and matters subject of specific control through other regimes. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC62: Amends the 'Definitions' section under 'Hydrocarbons', to clarify distinctions between development activity associated with conventional and unconventional resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 5.119 (g) should be removed as it is unjustified. The nature of activities required to extract conventional or unconventional hydrocarbons will vary and there is no difference in policy terms between extracting conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons. This change is conjecture, as opposed to a definition, which has not been validated by the Oil &amp; Gas Authority nor industry.</li> <li>Amend the change to remove the implication that unconventional hydrocarbon extraction is more complex and requires a greater number of well pads/individual wells than conventional hydrocarbons, Focus on the potential scale and impact of development.</li> <li>Object to the definition of 'hydraulic fracturing' in para 5.119 (f) as it is contrary to Section 50 of the Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>UKOOG, Egdon Resources (UK) Ltd, Cuadrilla Resources Ltd, Third Energy Ltd, INEOS Upstream Ltd</p>	<p>Development of unconventional hydrocarbons may require use of a range of techniques and the specific techniques used will depend on a range of factors. These could include; the type of unconventional resource being developed (e.g. some activities associated with underground coal gasification will require different processes to those associated with development of shale gas); the specific geology and technical considerations and; commercial factors. In terms of land use planning issues, it is considered that relevant distinctions can be drawn between the specific nature and/or scale of activities associated with certain stages of development for conventional hydrocarbons and those used for unconventional hydrocarbons. These differences may include the potential requirement for a larger number of well pads and individual wells, the volume and pressure of fluids used for any hydraulic fracturing processes and the specific requirements for any related plant and equipment and for the management of any related wastes. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>

<p>Act 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorrect and irrelevant terminology needs to be corrected (e.g. conventional drilling, unconventional techniques).</li> </ul>		
<p>PC63: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M16: Key spatial principles for hydrocarbon development, to more accurately reflect the regulatory position of the Government's Surface Protections for hydraulic fracturing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4B(1) of the Petroleum Act 1998 does not contain the definition of associated hydraulic fracturing.</li> <li>• It is unnecessarily restrictive that the planning restrictions under the Infrastructure Act 2015 for the purpose of 'associated hydraulic fracturing' should also apply to other oil and gas activity.</li> </ul>	<p>Zetland Group, UKOOG</p>	<p>The definition of "associated hydraulic fracturing" was inserted into the Petroleum Act 1998 Section 4, as Section 4B (1), by the Infrastructure Act 2015.</p> <p>The changes proposed in the Addendum reflect the current regulatory position relating to the Government's current position with regard surface protections for hydraulic fracturing, but the changes also recognise there are some distinctions between development activity associated with conventional and unconventional resources. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC66: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M16: Key spatial principles for hydrocarbon development, to clarify the approach and ensure appropriate flexibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This change does not address the fundamental problem with Policy M16 which seeks to apply restrictions to hydraulic fracturing for conventional gas resources.</li> <li>• The change implies that there may be restrictions on unconventional fracturing operations over and above the Infrastructure Act 2015.</li> <li>• The term 'unreasonably' in the change is not considered acceptable because it replaces objectivity with subjectivity in decision making.</li> <li>• The application of new regulations and proposed surface protections to only high volume fracturing is contrary to the earlier statement that it is not considered appropriate to distinguish between this and lower levels of activity. This is contrary to Section 50 of the Infrastructure Act 2015.</li> </ul>	<p>Egdon Resources (UK) Ltd, INEOS Upstream Ltd, Cuadrilla Resources Ltd,</p>	<p>It is not the intention of the Plan to unreasonably restrict activity typically associated with production of conventional resources, such as well stimulation techniques where any fracturing activity would involve substantially lower volumes and pressures and the clarification in para 5.124 aims to ensure appropriate flexibility in the Plan. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC67: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M16: Key spatial principles for hydrocarbon development, to</p>	<p>INEOS Upstream Ltd</p>	<p>It is considered that the text illustrates and reflects the potential position where circumstances may arise such that the presence of</p>

<p>reflect the potential position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change creates uncertainty for the decision maker rather than allowing for objective assessment.</li> </ul>		<p>equipment and activity on site may vary over time and which is therefore relevant to the consideration of, for example, impact on amenity. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC70: Clarifies the proposed approach in Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change fails to address the fundamental issue that there is no justification for setting a well pad density limit within a PEDL area. Cumulative impacts would be taken into account when planning applications are determined.</li> </ul>	<p>Egdon Resources (UK) Ltd</p>	<p>An objective within Policy M17 is ensuring that unacceptable cumulative effect does not arise. However, it is recognised that bearing in mind the very early stage of development of the industry in this area there is a need for a degree of appropriate flexibility. The text in 5.137, including the Addendum, regarding well pad density provides an indication of the approach that could be taken to preventing unacceptable cumulative impact, but, as acknowledged in the last sentence of the paragraph PEDL boundaries are based on an OS grid and do not reflect other considerations and constraints. Therefore, the location of existing or planned developments in the vicinity of a proposal will also be considered in assessing cumulative impact under this Policy. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC71: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change restates controls that are within the remit of other regulators. If the MPA wishes to explain how these are applied to hydrocarbon development this should be done through a Supplementary Planning Document.</li> </ul>	<p>INEOS Upstream Ltd</p>	<p>National policy is clear that local planning authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively and indicates that they should focus on the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions where these are dealt with under other pollution control regimes. In order to ensure that the impacts of a proposed use can be properly assessed through the planning process, it is necessary to ensure that the development plan, as the starting point for the determination of applications, contains relevant policies. This is particularly the case where there the regulatory position is relatively complex and where important issues may arise which may be relevant to both assessing the land use impacts of a proposed use and to the detailed control of processes or emissions. It is therefore inevitable, and appropriate, that there will be a degree of overlap between the Plan and matters subject of specific control through other regimes. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>



<p>PC72 &amp; PC73: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to clarify the approach to preventing unacceptable cumulative impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change is not effective as this arbitrary limit on well pad density is unnecessarily restrictive and without justification. The geographical spacing, scale, type of development and topographical and surface characteristics should be considered in the assessment of a proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>Third Energy Ltd, INEOS Upstream Ltd, Egdon Resources (UK) Ltd, Cuadrilla Resources Ltd, UKOOG, Zetland Group</p>	<p>Policy M17 of the Plan seeks to address the potential for cumulative impact but doesn't set out any absolute limit on well pad or well numbers, recognising current uncertainty about the precise development model which industry may seek to follow and that a range of local circumstances are likely to arise and that bearing in mind the very early stage of development of the industry in this area there is a need for a degree of appropriate flexibility. The overarching objective of the policy is to prevent unacceptable cumulative impact. It is acknowledged that planning applications will need to be determined on a case by case basis and that cumulative impact, including the location of existing or planned developments in the vicinity of a proposal, may also be addressed via Environmental Impact Assessment, where this is required. However, it is considered important that the Plan sets out policy to provide a framework for addressing this potentially important issue. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC76: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to more accurately reflect the available evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reference to 'induced seismic activity' should be deleted as this is the responsibility of the OGA.</li> <li>The change is not effective as any development will be required to demonstrate that the geology is suitable via a technical study.</li> </ul>	<p>INEOS Upstream Ltd, Egdon Resources (UK) Ltd, Third Energy Ltd, UKOOG,</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Oil and Gas Authority has in place specific measures relating to the control of seismic risk, there is potential for this issue to give rise to wider considerations of local amenity, which is a matter relevant to planning and is therefore appropriately referenced in the Plan. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC79: Amends Policy M18: Other specific criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to more accurately reflect the relevant regulatory requirements relating to decommissioning of wells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change is not effective as the decommissioning of wells is undertaken in line with regulatory requirements of the HSE, EA and OGA.</li> </ul>	<p>Third Energy Ltd,</p>	<p>The wording of the Policy was revised to delete the reference to the need for decommissioning where wells are suspended pending further hydrocarbon development, to more accurately reflect the regulatory position and help ensure consistency with other legislative processes. National policy is clear that local planning authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively and that they should focus on the impact of the use. In order to ensure that the impacts of a proposed use can be</p>

properly assessed through the planning process, it is necessary to ensure that the development plan, as a starting point for the determination of applications, contains relevant policies. This is particularly the case where the regulatory position is relatively complex and where important issues may arise which may be relevant to both assessing the land use impacts of a proposed use and to the detailed control of processes or emissions. It is therefore inevitable, and appropriate that there will be a degree of overlap between the Plan and matters subject of specific control through other regimes. **No further change proposed.**

**Hydrocarbons key issues - environment/amenity groups and individuals**

Representation main issues	Main representors	Response by the Authorities
<p>PC56 &amp; PC57: Amends the 'Summary of the process of hydrocarbons development' section to clarify the expected nature of development at exploration and production stages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exploratory work should be limited to a defined period otherwise excessive nuisance could be caused.</li> </ul>	<p>Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>Whilst this concern is noted it is considered that the suggested approach would lack flexibility to reflect a wide range of potential circumstances that apply to a specific proposal in the Plan area and it is considered that, in combination, the policies provide for a high degree of protection of local communities, taking into account also the role of other relevant regulators. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC58: Amends the 'Summary of the process of hydrocarbons development' section to clarify the expected nature of development that could come forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change appears to contradict the description of the exploration stage in para 5.107, which states that this is an 'intense activity' which for unconventional hydrocarbons may take 'considerably longer' than '12 to 25 weeks'. Therefore, the proposed change should be amended to reflect this.</li> </ul>	<p>Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>This is not agreed. It is considered that the text, together with other relevant paragraphs, including 5.107 make it clear that some activities can be short-term, some intensive, some temporary, some intermittent and some may last for longer periods. The activities will vary with the nature of the development and the circumstances of the individual site. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC59: Amends the 'Summary of the process of hydrocarbons development' section to clarify the role of the Environment Agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change should be expanded to include reference to</li> </ul>	<p>Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>The suggested addition is not necessary as paragraph 5.112 already refers, in the last sentence of the paragraph, to 'where matters subject to regulation through other regimes also give rise to land use implications, the Authorities will seek to address them through the planning process'. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>

<p>para 112 of the Minerals PPG, stating that onsite storage of returned water and associated traffic movements is a matter for the MPA.</p>		
<p>PC61: Amends the 'Other regulatory regimes' section under 'Hydrocarbons' to more closely align the text with national policy and guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand the change to state that 'the MPA must be satisfied that issues will be adequately addressed by the relevant regulatory body'.</li> </ul>	<p>Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>National policy is clear that local planning authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively and indicates that they should focus on the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions where these are dealt with under other pollution control regimes. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC62: Amends the 'Definitions' section under 'Hydrocarbons' to clarify distinctions between development activity associated with conventional and unconventional resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change should be removed and the previous text which defines conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons, as provided in the Publication Draft, should remain as this provided greater clarity to the decision maker.</li> <li>Utilise the Minerals PPG definition of conventional hydrocarbons setting out that higher geology reservoirs often mean sandstone and limestone.</li> <li>Define the terms 'long term' and 'short term' as set out in the Minerals PPG, in addition to 'significant harm'.</li> <li>Expand the change to para 5.119 (d) to include 'for example where the reservoir is sandstone or limestone' to be in accordance with national policy.</li> </ul>	<p>Individual, CPRE (North Yorkshire Region), Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>Development of unconventional hydrocarbons may require use of a range of techniques and the specific techniques used will depend on a range of factors. These could include; the type of unconventional resource being developed (for example some activities associated with underground coal gasification will require different processes to those associated with development of shale gas); the specific geology and technical considerations and; commercial factors. In terms of land use planning issues, it is considered that relevant distinctions can be drawn between the specific nature and/or scale of activities associated with certain stages of development for conventional hydrocarbons and those used for unconventional hydrocarbons. These differences may include the potential requirement for a larger number of well pads and individual wells, the volume and pressures of fluids used for any hydraulic fracturing processes and the specific requirements for any related plant and equipment and for the management of any related wastes. Given the nature of hydrocarbons and that development can vary on a site by site basis, it is not considered appropriate to provide separate definitions for short-term or long-term to those used in the Minerals PPG and it is not necessary to further expand 5.119 d) regarding the nature of the geological reservoirs. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC63: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M16: Key spatial principles for hydrocarbon development, to</p>	<p>Frack Free Ryedale,</p>	<p>The changes proposed in the Addendum reflect the current regulatory position relating to the Government's current position</p>

<p>more accurately reflect the regulatory position of the Governments Surface Protections for hydraulic fracturing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand change to include text stating that as similar environmental impacts occur when hydraulic fracturing occurs below the defined threshold all proposals in protected areas will be treated the same in policy terms.</li> <li>The use of a '1,000 cubic metres of fluid' threshold is not effective and the Plan's policies should apply to all hydraulic fracturing proposals</li> <li>Query what criteria will be used to judge how an operator may 'persuasively demonstrate why requiring such a consent would not be appropriate'. Defined, robust and objective criteria should be used to ensure consistency.</li> <li>This change should be clear that the Plan will utilise the definition of hydraulic fracturing in para 5.119 (f) which is consistent with National Policy and not that provided in the Infrastructure Act 2015.</li> </ul>	<p>Individuals</p>	<p>with regard surface protections for hydraulic fracturing, but the changes also recognise there are some distinctions between development activity associated with conventional and unconventional resources. It is not necessary to replicate in paragraph 5.122, matters addressed in other paragraphs, such as 5.124. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC66: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M16: Key spatial principles for hydrocarbon development, to clarify the approach and ensure appropriate flexibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change should not be included, and the Plan should utilise the definition of hydraulic fracturing in para 5.119 (f) which is consistent with National Policy.</li> </ul>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>It is not the intention of the Plan to unreasonably restrict activity typically associated with production of conventional resources, such as well stimulation techniques where any fracturing activity would involve substantially lower volumes and pressures and the clarification in paragraph 5.124 aims to ensure appropriate flexibility in the Plan. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC68: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M16: Key spatial principles for hydrocarbon development, to reflect the presence of other potentially relevant designations in district local plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The text of this change should be included in the wording of Policy M16 or M17.</li> <li>The change should be amended to refer to the 'appropriate body responsible' rather than NYCC to</li> </ul>	<p>Malton Town Council, South Hambleton Shale Advisory Group, Individuals, Barugh (Great &amp; Little) Parish Council, Habton Parish Council, Frack</p>	<p>It is not considered that specific reference is required within Policy M16 as Policy D06 of the Plan states that all landscapes will be protected from the harmful effects of development, and that they will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable impact on the quality and/or character of the landscape, having taken into account any proposed mitigation measures. This would ensure that appropriate consideration is given to impacts on landscapes within Ryedale (or elsewhere within the Plan area) which are not nationally designated for protection.</p>

<p>ensure the National Infrastructure Planning body takes account of these policies if responsible for determining the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change should be amended to refer specifically to employment and economic policies in a local plan because under any other planning context surface development for hydraulic fracturing would be classed as employment or economic development.</li> <li>• The change should be expanded to include having regard to Landscape Character Assessments.</li> <li>• Clarify what is intended by the term 'regard will be had to the requirements of associated local plan policy'.</li> <li>• Ensure areas high in landscape value (i.e. Vale of Pickering and Yorkshire Wolds) are protected.</li> </ul>	<p>Free Malton &amp; Norton, Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>Furthermore, Policy D08 specifically recognises the significance of the archaeological resource of the Vale of Pickering, the Yorkshire Wolds and the North York Moors and Tabular Hills and indicates that particular regard will be had to conserving the distinctive character and sense of place in these areas. In combination these policies will help ensure that distinctive landscape character, including historic landscape character, in Ryedale is protected where minerals or waste development is proposed. Furthermore, the Ryedale Plan itself forms a part of the statutory development plan and existing Policy SP13 of that Plan may be relevant to proposals for minerals and waste development, depending on the circumstances. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC70: Clarifies the proposed approach in Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change should not be accepted as it removes the need to consider planned well pads, which is important when considering the overall plan for the area and cumulative impacts of both planned and permitted sites.</li> <li>• The wording of the Policy should be more robust to consider the density of hydraulic fracturing sites.</li> </ul>	<p>Individuals</p>	<p>An objective within Policy M17 is ensuring that unacceptable cumulative effect does not arise. However, it is recognised that bearing in mind the very early stage of development of the industry in this area there is a need for a degree of appropriate flexibility. The text in 5.137, including the Addendum, regarding well pad density provides an indication of the approach that could be taken to preventing unacceptable cumulative impact, but, as acknowledged in the last sentence of the paragraph PEDL boundaries are based on an OS grid and do not reflect other considerations and constraints. Therefore, the location of existing or planned developments in the vicinity of a proposal will also be considered in assessing cumulative impact under this Policy. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC71: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to reflect the potential for vehicle movements to impact on air quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The text of this change should be included in the wording of Policy M17.</li> </ul>	<p>Friends of the Earth (Y&amp;H and the NE)</p>	<p>It is not considered that specific references to matters such as transport and air quality are required within the individual mineral policies, including those relating to hydrocarbons, as the policies of the Plan should be considered as a whole, including Policy D02 (local amenity and cumulative effects) and Policy D03 (transport of minerals and waste and associated traffic impacts). This will enable the consideration of the circumstances of developments</p>

		such that there will be no unacceptable impact having taken into account any proposed mitigation measures. <b>No further change proposed.</b>
<p>PC73: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to clarify the approach to preventing unacceptable cumulative impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand the change to include, in addition to green belt, areas of local landscape importance designated in District/Borough Local Plans.</li> </ul>	Frack Free Ryedale	<p>This matter is already addressed in Policy D06 of the Plan, which states that all landscapes will be protected from the harmful effects of development, and that they will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable impact on the quality and/or character of the landscape, having taken into account any proposed mitigation measures. In the two-tier part of the Plan area the District and Borough Local Plans form part of the statutory development plan and therefore where areas of local landscape importance are identified in local plans and are relevant to a proposal under consideration these will need to be taken into account in determining the acceptability of the proposals. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC75: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M17: Other spatial and locational criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to improve consistency with national policy and guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change is not in conformity with national guidance as developers should aim to reduce noise levels to a minimum level, below the thresholds set out in guidance, not meet them as the change suggests.</li> <li>In accordance with para 21 of the Minerals PPG, the change should be expanded to require applicants to provide evidence if noise levels cannot be reduced without onerous burden (i.e. noise level monitoring).</li> <li>Expand the change to require all well completions to be 'green' completions (i.e. no flaring allowed)</li> </ul>	CPRE (North Yorkshire Region), Frack Free Ryedale	<p>National policy requires that the issue of noise be addressed in the Plan. The Plan sets out a comprehensive range of criteria, including regarding noise and giving consideration to the nature of the proposed development (which could include whether or not flaring is involved), to ensure a robust approach to protection of the amenity whilst providing appropriate flexibility for development in line with national policy. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC79: Amends Policy M18: Other specific criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to more accurately reflect the relevant regulatory requirements relating to decommissioning of wells.</p>	Frack Free Ryedale, Individual	<p>The wording of the Policy was revised to delete the reference to the need for decommissioning where wells are suspended pending further hydrocarbon development, to more accurately reflect the regulatory position and help ensure consistency with other</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support this change as this will lead to wells remaining suspended in the hope of becoming commercially viable, and used as a reason to extend permissions in a speculative way.</li> <li>Wells should be decommissioned promptly following completion of the operational phase and should not be suspended pending further planning applications.</li> <li>Flaring at sites, should be considered an onsite waste operation, and not be permitted.</li> </ul>		<p>legislative processes. National policy is clear that local planning authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively and that they should focus on the impact of the use. In order to ensure that the impacts of a proposed use can be properly assessed through the planning process, it is necessary to ensure that the development plan, as a starting point for the determination of applications, contains relevant policies. This is particularly the case where the regulatory position is relatively complex and where important issues may arise which may be relevant to both assessing the land use impacts of a proposed use and to the detailed control of processes or emissions. It is therefore inevitable, and appropriate that there will be a degree of overlap between the Plan and matters subject of specific control through other regimes. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC80: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M18: Other specific criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to clarify that water arising on site may not always constitute waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support this change as removal of the term ‘waste’ implies that water returned via a borehole may be reused instead of disposed of which is contrary to para 110 &amp; 143 of the NPPF (i.e. presents dangers to the environment).</li> <li>The change should be amended to clarify that returned water would require treatment or processing.</li> <li>The change should refer to the potential increase in noise should onsite treatment of waste be permitted.</li> </ul>	<p>Individual, Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>In view of the uncertainty which exists in relation to future management of waste from any shale gas industry it is considered important to ensure that implications of on-site water management as well as off-site management requirements are properly addressed. The submission of a water management plan provides a mechanism for this. It is recognised that applications may also need to be accompanied by a transport assessment and that there could be some degree of overlap but this is considered reasonable bearing in mind the potential for large volumes of waste water requiring transport off site. Paragraph 5.154 of the supporting text to Policy M18 already indicates that a waste water management plan will need to address arrangements for the safe and sustainable management and transport of waste. Issues such as noise are dealt with by Policy D02. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC81: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy M18: Other specific criteria applying to hydrocarbon development, to clarify the position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change should reference the additional impacts to noise levels as a result of site operations (i.e. pumping</li> </ul>	<p>Frack Free Ryedale</p>	<p>Whilst this concern about noise is noted it is considered that, in combination, the policies provide for a high degree of protection of local communities and the environment, taking into account also the role of other relevant regulators. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>

wastewater).		
Other key policy issues		
Representation main issues	Main representors	Response by the Authorities
<p>PC50: Clarifies the proposed approach in Policy M06: Landbanks for Crushed Rock:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representations have suggested that the Policy is not in accordance with Para 145 of the NPPF, insofar as the Policy uses the wording 'a minimum overall landbank of 10 years' whereas national policy states 'the maintenance of at least 10 years'.</li> <li>Representations have suggested that the Policy is not in accordance with Para 144 of the NPPF, insofar as the Policy does not include the term 'as far as practical' when referring to sourcing new crushed rock reserves from outside of the National Park and AONBs.</li> </ul>	<p>Minerals Products Association, Tarmac</p>	<p>It is considered that there is no material difference between maintenance of a minimum landbank of 10 years as stated in the policy, and the maintenance of a landbank of 'at least 10 years'. It is not considered necessary to refer, in the second paragraph of the Policy, to sourcing crushed rock from outside the National Parks and AONBs as far as practicable as it is not expected that there will be a need to seek to develop resources in these protected areas during the plan period in order to maintain the landbank and the policy as currently worded provides greater clarity on the approach the relevant Mineral Planning Authorities intend to take. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC53: Amendments to the Justification Text supporting Policy M12: Continuity of supply of silica sand, to reflect proposals for the realignment of the A59:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording is not justified, positively prepared or effective and should be revised to clarify that the design of the A59 realignment should take into account Blubberhouses Quarry.</li> </ul>	<p>Hanson UK</p>	<p>Progress with determination of the planning application at Blubberhouses Moor is a separate, although relevant, matter to progress with the development of the policies in the Joint Plan. Progress with the Joint Plan has not been an influence on the determination period for the application.</p> <p>The Addendum reflects that realigning the A59 at Kex Gill to the other side of the valley is part of North Yorkshire County Council's strategic transport plan to improve east to west connections between the east coast and Humber ports and Lancashire, and that investigations were occurring towards finding a solution to the existing problems with the stability of the road in the vicinity of Blubberhouses. Subsequent to the closure of the Addendum consultation, in September 2017 the County Council as Highway Authority has launched a public consultation based on four route corridors for the realigned road.</p> <p>Whilst the suggested amendment is noted, it is considered that the</p>



		Addendum wording provides greater flexibility to deal with the progression of the quarry in the context of both the existing A59 and the, as yet, draft proposals for a realignment of the road. <b>No further change proposed.</b>
<p>PC84: Addition of link to Policy W10 in the key links to other policies section of Policy S03: Waste management facility safeguarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy S03 is too restrictive and does not take account of the fact that waste uses on safeguarded sites may prove unviable.</li> </ul>	Harworth Estates	The Policy's purpose is not to prevent to other development on a safeguarded waste site, but to ensure that the presence of the safeguarded site is taken into account in decision making on other forms of development. The Policy states that the need for alternative development may outweigh the need to safeguard the site and the supporting text, at para. 8.29 already clarifies that the purpose of safeguarding sites in the MWJP is not to prevent other forms of development from taking place but to ensure that the need to maintain important infrastructure is factored into decision-making for other forms of development. This represents an appropriate and proportionate approach reflecting the requirements of national policy. <b>No further change proposed.</b>
<p>PC85: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy S03: Waste management facility safeguarding, to emphasise the need for a pragmatic approach to implementing safeguarding requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed change is not effective as it does not adequately address situations where new proposals are proposed or within an emerging development plan, therefore the word 'extant' should be removed.</li> </ul>	Harworth Estates	The Addendum change to para 8.30. was proposed to emphasise the need for a pragmatic approach to implementing safeguarding requirements. <b>No further change proposed.</b>
<p>PC87: Amendment to the Justification Text supporting Policy S04: Transport infrastructure safeguarding, to emphasise the linkage between marine and terrestrial planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy S04 is not sound as it does not take account of the fact that waste uses on safeguarded sites may prove unviable.</li> </ul>	Harworth Estates	It is agreed that where a site is not in use, viability issues will be relevant to considering whether there is a reasonable prospect of the site being used for minerals or waste transport in the foreseeable future. <b>No further change proposed.</b>
PC88: Amendment to the Safeguarding Exemption Criteria to reflect the safeguarding of minerals and waste transport	Harworth Estates	The Addendum change to the 12th bullet point was proposed to reflect that minerals and waste transport infrastructure is also

<p>infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revised bullet point should include reference to 'emerging plan allocations where the minerals and waste planning authority has raised no safeguarding concerns during consultation'</li> </ul>		<p>safeguarded in the plan and is considered to still be appropriate. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC90: Amendment to introductory text for Policy D04: Development affecting the North York Moors National Park and the AONBs, to clarify the purposes of the AONB designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term 'particular regard should be paid to promoting sustainable forms of social and economic development that in themselves conserve and enhance the environment' should also apply within the AONB buffer zone in Policy M16 (d) (i).</li> </ul>	<p>South Hambleton Shale Advisory Group</p>	<p>Whilst this concern is noted, Policy M16 d) i) provides policy to protect against impacts outside but near to AONBs and would operate in association with Policy D04 Part 3) to further protect the setting of such areas. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC91: Amendment to Justification Text supporting Policy D06: Landscape, to reflect the presence of other potentially relevant designations in District local plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change does not provide consistent scrutiny. Landscape Character Assessments should be undertaken which include sensitivity assessments considering potential impacts of additional drilling sites and what number could be accommodated without detriment to avoid adverse cumulative impact.</li> </ul>	<p>South Hambleton Shale Advisory Group</p>	<p>Policy D06 of the Plan states that all landscapes will be protected from the harmful effects of development, and that they will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable impact on the quality and/or character of the landscape, having taken into account any proposed mitigation measures. In the two-tier part of the Plan area the District and Borough Local Plans form part of the statutory development plan and therefore where areas of local landscape importance are identified in local plans and are relevant to a proposal under consideration these will need to be taken into account in determining the acceptability of the proposals. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC95: Amends Policy D10: Reclamation and Afteruse, to more closely reflect the requirements of national policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change does not go far enough in terms of consultation with communities and proof of reasonable low impacts on the community and environment.</li> </ul>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>Whilst the concerns are noted it is considered that, in combination, the policies set out a robust approach to consultation, information requirements and the protection provided for the environment (including water resources and air quality) and for local communities, taking into account as well the role of other relevant regulators, such as the Environment Agency and the Oil and Gas Authority. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>

<p>PC96: Amends Policy D10: Reclamation and Afteruse, to clarify the proposed approach and reflect the diminishing significance of biodiversity action plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'benefits at a landscape scale' can often only be delivered with large areas of land which may not be under the control of a developer and as such this policy cannot be effectively achieved. Therefore, reference to this should be removed.</li> </ul>	<p>Minerals Products Association, Tarmac</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that delivery of landscape scale benefits may not often be practicable in the Plan area, it is considered that the potential benefits of such an approach, where it can be delivered, justify the inclusion of this element of the Policy. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Site allocation issues</b></p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Representation main issues</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Main representors</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Response by the Authorities</p>
<p>PC102: Revision of site boundary - MJP21: Land at Killerby</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision of the site boundary, to exclude land nearest the Killerby Hall Stable Block Listed Building, is opposed. Historic England's assertion, that the previous site boundary would 'be likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a Listed Building' (i.e. Stable Block) is not justified.</li> </ul>	<p>Tarmac, Minerals Products Association</p>	<p>The Proposed Change of reducing the site area has been proposed to address a specific concern raised by Historic England, as statutory consultee regarding historic issues, concerning the potential harm to the setting on the listed building that could arise from the proposed development of the field closest to the listed building. However, it is acknowledged that, as pointed out by the objector, no objections have been raised by Historic England to the site design proposed in the planning application (ref. NY/2010/0356/ENV) for which in April 2017 the Planning &amp; Regulatory Functions Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement (which is currently being prepared). <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC104: Revision of site boundary - MJP17: Land to South of Catterick</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision of the site boundary, to exclude land nearest to Rudd Hall and Ghyll Hall Listed Buildings, is opposed. Historic England's assertion, that the previous site boundary would 'be likely to result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of two Listed Buildings' (i.e. Rudd Hall and Ghyll Hall) is not justified.</li> </ul>	<p>Tarmac, Minerals Products Association</p>	<p>The Proposed Change of reducing the site area has been proposed to address a specific concern raised by Historic England, as statutory consultee regarding historic issues, concerning the potential harm to the setting on the two listed buildings that could arise from the proposed development. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>

<p>PC106: Amendment to Key Sensitivities and Development Requirements - MJP55: Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full archaeological assessment should be required prior to development</li> </ul>	<p>CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)</p>	<p>The support for the proposed addition, in the Addendum, of the reference to the SINC is noted. With regard to an archaeological assessment, the development requirements listed in Appendix 1 to the Publication Draft is not, as is explained at paragraph 1.9 in the introduction text to that appendix, an exhaustive list. PC98 and PC99 were proposed in relation to known significant heritage assets at those sites. The position at the Escrick MJP55 and WJP06 site is not the same and it is considered that the existing bullet point regarding 'appropriate site design and landscaping to mitigate impact on: heritage assets (archaeological remains, Escrick Conservation Area, Listed Buildings ... Escrick Park) is sufficient, as, at the point of an application any applicant should be following the guidance regarding archaeology as provided in the National Planning Practice Guidance. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>
<p>PC107: Amendment to Key Sensitivities and Development Requirements - WJP06: Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks, Escrick</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full archaeological assessment should be required prior to development</li> </ul>	<p>CPRE (North Yorkshire Region)</p>	<p>The support for the proposed addition, in the Addendum, of the reference to the SINC is noted. With regard to an archaeological assessment, the development requirements listed in Appendix 1 to the Publication Draft is not, as is explained at paragraph 1.9 in the introduction text to that appendix, an exhaustive list. PC98 and PC99 were proposed in relation to known significant heritage assets at those sites. The position at the Escrick MJP55 and WJP06 site is not the same and it is considered that the existing bullet point regarding 'appropriate site design and landscaping to mitigate impact on: heritage assets (archaeological remains, Escrick Conservation Area, Listed Buildings ... Escrick Park) is sufficient, as, at the point of an application any applicant should be following the guidance regarding archaeology as provided in the National Planning Practice Guidance. <b>No further change proposed.</b></p>