Minerals and Waste Local Plan Issues and Options Summary of Responses Report

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

September 2022

This page has intentionally been left blank.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

- Between 15 November 2021 and 7 March 2022 Surrey County Council, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, held the first public consultation relating to the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan - the Issues and Options public consultation.

- The statutory purpose of the Issues and Options consultation was to formally notify stakeholders of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's intention to prepare the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and find out what is important to them about minerals and waste management development in the county.

- The Issues and Options consultation was the first formal opportunity for stakeholders to contribute to the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Specifically, the consultation set out the strategic (spatial and policy) context for minerals provision and waste management in Surrey and explored the overall scale of need for additional minerals and waste management facilities over the anticipated plan-period (2024 – 2039).

- A wide range of media, digital tools, correspondence, meetings, and events were employed by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to notify stakeholders about the Issues and Options consultation and encourage their feedback.

- The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority received a total of 144 written representations (email and letter) in response to the Issues and Options consultation. The associated digital consultation platform attracted over 2,300 visitors and 205 contributions, with 208 stakeholders subscribed to receive news and updates about the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

- The Issues and Options consultation included a 'call for sites' exercise inviting landowners to nominate land in the county that may be suitable for future minerals or waste management development. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority received 14 mineral site nominations and 7 waste site nominations.

- The policy options identified, all material planning matters raised by stakeholders, and all site nominations made pursuant to the 'call for sites' exercise will be considered by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and used to inform the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan including its vision and strategic objectives, spatial strategy, policy framework, and any site allocations/areas of search. A further public consultation will be undertaken in June 2023 relating to the Regulation 18 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Should you have any questions about this report or the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, or you are having difficulty accessing relevant documents and information please contact Surrey County Council:

Phone: 03456 009 009

Email: mineralsandwaste.localplan@surreycc.gov.uk

Letter: Planning Group, Surrey County Council, Quadrant Court, Woking, GU22 7QQ

Introduction

Preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan

1.1 Minerals and waste management plays an important role in supporting a modern economy. It is essential that there are sufficient minerals available to build the housing and other infrastructure the country requires, and that waste is managed sustainably. It is therefore crucial that we plan for minerals and waste management development properly to ensure that there are sufficient sites and facilities to extract, transport and process minerals, and to manage waste produced in the county (and a proportion of waste from elsewhere) in the most sustainable way.

1.2 Minerals and waste local plans set out the planning framework for the development of minerals and waste management facilities and are used in determining planning applications for minerals and waste management development. At present in Surrey this framework comprises the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 – 2033 (adopted in 2020); Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011; Surrey Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 2011; Surrey Minerals Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document 2011; and Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document 2013.

1.3 Planning applications for minerals and waste management development in the county must by law be determined in accordance with these policy documents and any other material planning considerations, for example the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. Surrey's 11 district and borough councils must also have regard to these policy documents in preparing their plans and taking planning decisions.

1.4 In November 2020 Surrey County Council's cabinet resolved to begin the preparation of the county's first joint minerals and waste local plan in recognition that Surrey's minerals development framework covers a period up until 2026; and to address the twin crises of climate change and biodiversity loss, and the growing overlap between minerals and waste management development in particular the positive role recycling can play in conserving and keeping primary materials in use for as long as possible to prevent waste. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan, when adopted, will replace the county's existing minerals and waste planning framework.

1.5 Since the adoption of Surrey County Council's existing minerals planning framework the context for minerals development has changed in several ways, with new challenges facing the county and England including the introduction of new legislation, policy, guidance, and strategies at a National and local level. In this regard, preparing a Minerals and Waste Local Plan will provide opportunities to update and make improvements to local minerals planning policy taking account of, amongst other matters, the National Planning Policy Framework and Practice Guidance, the Environment Act 2021 and associated regulations, Surrey's Climate Change Strategy 2020, and local plans prepared by Surrey's district and borough councils since 2011; place increased emphasis on the importance of mitigating against and adapting to the effects of climate change and halting the decline in biodiversity; take account of the changed minerals landscape, market, and industry within Surrey and the wider Southeast, and consider new potential locations for future mineral working in the county. Although the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 was adopted more recently, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan provides an opportunity to

re-examine the waste planning framework and update, improve, and re-examine local waste policy and allocations where appropriate particularly in respect of climate change mitigation and adaptation, and biodiversity loss.

The Issues and Options Consultation

1.6 The Issues and Options public consultation took place over a 16-week period and the relevant consultation material published by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority included:

- Introductory and contextual information about minerals and waste management development in England and the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority's statutory obligations in this regard particularly in respect of plan-making and the Issues and Options consultation.
- A draft vision and 13-strategic objectives for future minerals and waste management development in the county.
- A draft spatial strategy for future minerals and waste management development in the county.
- Information about the issues and challenges facing future minerals and waste management development in the county and the potential policy options to address the same. These issues/challenges and policy options were presented in three discreet documents: Aggregates, Minerals and Infrastructure; Protecting the Green Belt, Environment and Communities; and Waste Management.
- Position statements relating to climate change, biodiversity net-gain, the circular economy, minerals and waste management safeguarding, and the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's obligations pursuant to the 'Duty to Cooperate'.
- A Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Scoping Report.
- An Equalities Impact Assessment.
- Other material including an interactive story-map and a short video explaining minerals and waste planning in Surrey in the context of the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

1.7 A 'call for sites' was linked to the Issues and Options consultation which gave particular stakeholders, including landowners, the opportunity to propose areas of land which might be suitable for future minerals or waste management development, for allocation in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. It is important to note that neither the public consultation exercise nor the consultation material included or otherwise proposed to identify or allocate any land for minerals and waste management development.

1.8 Given the subject matter, the material published as part of the public consultation was in some parts necessarily technical, lengthy, and strategic in nature. However, a concerted effort was made to make the material:

- Accessible to all stakeholders irrespective of their technical knowledge or abilities or means and resources available to them. It was drafted in plain English and did

not include unnecessary jargon and technical detail; and organised to easily allow stakeholder navigation based on their particular interest.

- Informative and stimulating with clear links to topical issues that are relevant to and have a direct impact on all stakeholders such as climate change and the decline in biodiversity.

- Meaningful with clearly presented policy options and discussion points to stimulate stakeholder engagement with the consultation and provision of constructive feedback and input to the plan-preparation process.

1.9 This report provides a summary of the responses received to the Issues and Options public consultation, in accordance with Surrey County Council's Statement of Community Involvement. It also sets out the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's initial responses to the issues raised and feedback provided by stakeholders (these are provided within Annex A to K attached to this report). Any feedback material to the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be considered by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and used to inform the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The Regulation 18 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be published as part of a further public consultation in June 2023.

Who We Consulted

Statement of Community Engagement

1.10 Surrey County Council's Statement of Community Involvement (October 2019) sets out when, and who the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority should consult about the preparation of, or updates to, planning policy documents. It also sets out a requirement for the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to involve a wide range of groups, organisations and people who may be directly or indirectly affected by planning decisions in Surrey including statutory organisations, and other stakeholders including stakeholders and hard-to-reach groups who may find it challenging to get involved in the planning process.

1.11 The Statement of Community Involvement requires that formal consultations are publicised by sending an email or letter to all statutory organisations and other organisations or groups, and by updating Surrey County Council's website with details of current and upcoming consultations.

1.12 The Statement of Community Involvement also requires that the gathering of evidence and public consultation about what a Local Plan ought to contain should last for 12-weeks. However, due to the disruption of the Covid-19 pandemic and associated public health measures and the 2021 festive period, the Issues and Options consultation was held for an extended period to ensure that stakeholders would have sufficient time to consider and respond to the relevant consultation material.

1.13 In preparing and carrying out the Issues and Options consultation, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority have complied with their obligations pursuant to Surrey County Council's Statement of Community Involvement and have endeavoured to go beyond the engagement measures it requires to secure meaningful feedback from as wide and diverse a group of stakeholders as possible in the circumstances.

Duty to Cooperate

1.14 Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) places a duty on the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, in preparing local plans, to "engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis" with other relevant organisations to maximise the effectiveness with which plan preparation is undertaken.

1.15 Methods of implementing the Duty to Cooperate are set out in both the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and National Planning Practice Guidance. Pursuant to the Duty to Cooperate, Local Planning Authorities are expected to cooperate with each other, and to collaborate to identify the relevant strategic matters which need to be addressed in their plans (paragraphs 24 to 26 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021).

1.16 The Duty to Cooperate applies to specific bodies as set out in the relevant legislation and guidance. Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 places a legal duty on Local Planning Authorities to cooperate with one another; county councils and other prescribed bodies. Those prescribed bodies are identified in identified in Regulation 4

of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

1.17 In preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority will need to take account of, and where relevant and appropriate ensure that the new minerals and waste planning framework aligns with, other planning policy (including emerging and updated policy). This will include minerals and waste plans prepared by adjoining authorities, National planning policy, Local plans prepared by Surrey's 11 Local Planning Authorities and any neighbourhood plans.

Identifying Consultees

1.18 Considering the duties set out above, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority identified a broad and extensive range of statutory and non-statutory stakeholders to consult about the Issues and Options consultation including:

- The Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.
- Surrey's district and borough councils.
- Surrey's parish councils.
- Neighbouring county councils and district and borough councils.
- Other minerals and waste planning authorities in England.
- Government bodies such as Historic England, Natural England, and the Environment Agency.
- Non-governmental bodies such as the Lead Local Flood Authority, the County Highway Authority, Surrey Wildlife Trust, and the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty board.
- Surrey's residents.
- Surrey's elected members.
- Surrey neighbourhood planning groups, resident associations, amenity societies and special interest groups.
- The minerals and waste management industry including representative bodies such as the Minerals Products Association and Environmental Services Association.
- Regional technical forums such as the South East England Aggregate Working Party and the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group.
- Local technical and strategic forums such as Surrey's Planning Working Group, Surrey Planning Officer Association, and the Surrey Future Steering Board.
- Other services within Surrey County Council such as the Greener Futures Group and the Waste Disposal Authority.

Summary of Consultation and Engagement

Prior Engagement

1.19 Prior to the commencement of the Issues and Options public consultation and in preparing the relevant consultation material, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority engaged with some stakeholders by:

- Providing regular updates about preparation of the relevant public consultation to local and regional technical forums e.g., Surrey's Planning Working Group and South East England Aggregates Working Party.

- Updating Surrey County Council's Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee Sub-Group about the timetable for the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and preliminary work done in respect of the Issues and Options consultation.

- Meeting with representatives of the Weald Action Group (following a specific request from this organisation) to discuss the purpose, scope, and range of the Issues and Options public consultation and answered any questions they had in this regard particularly in respect of oil and gas development.

- Inviting Surrey's 11 Local Planning Authorities to individual meetings to discuss the purpose, scope, and range of the Issues and Options consultation and answer their questions in relation to their plan-areas. Officers met with colleagues from Mole Valley District Council; Runnymede Borough Council; Spelthorne Borough Council; Tandridge District Council; and Waverley Borough Council. At this time, open invitations to discuss the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan at any time over the course of the plan-making period were extended to officers and local elected members.

- Seeking technical and professional feedback from Surrey County Council's own Environment, Transport and Infrastructure officers about the draft Issues and Options consultation material prior to it being finalised for publication.

- Briefing members of Surrey County Council at an all-member development seminar about the purpose, scope, and range of the Issues and Options consultation.

Consultation

1.20 Upon launching the Issues and Options public consultation the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority notified over 650 stakeholders in writing to inform them about the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and invite their feedback on what the plan ought to contain. Surrey County Council's Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure also wrote to Surrey's local members and Members of Parliament to notify them of the same and to ask them to help promote the public consultation. Additionally, the Issues and Options consultation was widely publicised by way of:

- Posters at 12 public libraries across Surrey (e.g., Reigate Library and Addlestone Library).

- Posters at 12 prominent countryside locations across Surrey (e.g., Newlands Corner and Wisley Common).

- Surrey County Council's website and social media (Facebook and Twitter), including targeted social media advertisements aimed at underrepresented groups (females, young people, and individuals from ethnic minority communities). The use of social media resulted in over 334,000 targeted and organic social media impressions with over 580 clicks.

- An email signature graphic and digital link attached to emails of officers within the Environment, Transport, and Infrastructure Service of Surrey County Council.

- A YouTube video commissioned by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority about minerals and waste management development in Surrey and the Issues and Options public consultation which has received over 245 views.

- Surrey County Council's digital publications (Surrey News and Surrey Matters).

- Digital and physical press advertisements in the Woking News and Mail, Surrey Advertiser, Surrey Mirror, and Guildford Dragon.

1.21 In line with the Government's agenda to digitise the planning system, the Issues and Options public consultation was presented to stakeholders on a digital consultation platform hosted by 'Commonplace'. Commonplace provided information about the consultation and divided the consultation material into several topics of interest, with links to discreet documents for each topic including related questionnaires. This allowed stakeholders to easily navigate and respond to any topic that was of interest to them. The use of a digital consultation platform provided several benefits, including:

- Encouraging online engagement with the public consultation as an alternative to traditional methods of engagement (e.g., inspecting documents and making representation in writing).

- Providing information and data in a more digestible format and offering stakeholders the option to consume information important to them and delve into varying levels of detail based on their interest and expertise.

- Providing visible and transparent stakeholder digital participation information and data.

- Facilitating the use of Surrey County Council's social media channels and Environment, Transport, and Infrastructure email links to advertise the public consultation, and publicising it on digital publications such as the Guildford Dragon and Surrey Matters.

- Allowing the integration of alternative ways of displaying information, including a YouTube video about minerals and waste management development in Surrey and the public consultation, and an interactive story-map about the issues set out in the consultation, making use Surrey County Council's real-time Geographical Information System.

- Providing an accessibility menu to cater for a diverse range of stakeholder needs including those relating to neurodiversity, dyslexia, and impaired vision.

- Providing a 'latest news' facility to connect stakeholders with updates about the Issues and Options public consultation, the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, and notifications and details about related events in the community.

1.22 Upon launching the relevant Commonplace platform a total of 9,153 individuals, who had responded to previous unrelated planning consultations using Commonplace and who had asked to be kept informed about similar consultations, were notified about the Issues and Options public consultation upon the launch of the same.

1.23 In total there were 2,369 visitors to the Commonplace platform, with 72 stakeholders responding to the consultation material, providing 205 contributions in total. Of these 205 contributions, 158 were comments and 47 were 'agreements' with the consultation material. Of the 72 stakeholders who responded, 30 commented on 2 or more sections of the consultation material, and the other 42 responded to a single section only. Two-hundred and eight (208) individuals also subscribed to receive 'latest news' updates about the Issues and Options consultation and preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

1.24 Besides the digital consultation material, printed copies of the consultation documents were also provided at 12 public libraries throughout Surrey for the duration of the consultation period, and stakeholders were afforded the opportunity of providing feedback or making representations in writing (email and/or letter). In this regard, and for the purposes of flexibility, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority continued to accept written representations from stakeholders for a reasonable period (some 10-days) beyond the close of the public consultation. A total of 145 representations were made by stakeholders using email and post.

1.25 While 59 of these written representations related specifically to the Issues and Options consultation, 86 raised objections to and concerns about two specific sites, Watersplash Farm and Whitehall Farm. Both these sites are allocated as Preferred Areas for concreting aggregate by the Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 2011. Land at Watersplash Farm already benefits from planning permission (Ref. SP12/01487) for mineral extraction whilst land at Whitehall Farm is currently subject to an undetermined planning application (Ref. RU.21/0597). Although general issues raised by stakeholders about minerals extraction in Surrey will be considered by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, objections to planning applications and specific concerns about planning permissions previously granted are not material to the plan-preparation process and should be raised with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority using other established processes and channels.

1.26 During the consultation period, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority also provided written briefings and offered and arranged meetings with stakeholders who were unable to attend the advertised drop-in events at public libraries or simply wished to find out more about the public consultation or minerals and waste management development in Surrey e.g., Surrey Planning Officers Association, Shackleford Parish Council, Greener Godalming, and some residents.

Drop-In Events

1.27 To support the Issues and Options public consultation, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority organised and advertised 4 public drop-in events across Surrey at the following locations in February and March 2021:

- Farnham Library.
- Reigate Library.
- Guildford Library.
- Addlestone Library.

1.28 At these day-long events officers were on hand to answer questions about minerals and waste management development in Surrey, help stakeholders understand and navigate the Issues and Options consultation package, and engage in discussion around the key issues relating to future minerals and waste management development in the county and what stakeholders think is important to include in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Over the 4 events, 28 stakeholders (former elected members, residents, mineral operators, and representatives of resident associations) attended the relevant libraries to engage with officers. Additionally, officers also engaged with many residents who happened to be visiting their library on the same day and were interested in land-use planning and environmental matters more generally.

1.29 The general themes to emerge from these events can be summarised as follows:

- Stakeholders were generally interested in the work that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority does, recognised the importance of that work, and (on an individual level) appreciated the efforts and commitment of planning officers (and public sector workers in general).
- However, several stakeholders raised concerns about the state of public services (referring to organisations such as the Environment Agency, English Heritage, and district and borough councils) citing examples of where they have experienced poor service or an absence of joined-up thinking/approach etc.
- Stakeholders were grateful that officers were willing to engage with them in person at a local venue. Many requested, should any minerals or waste management sites be identified in their areas, that further local events be held in their areas so that more people are able to contribute to the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
- It was clear that many stakeholders had difficulty comprehending the differing responsibilities of all the various statutory and non-statutory organisations involved in land-use planning in general and waste management in particular. For example, it was a challenge explaining the differences between the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, the Waste Collection Authority, the Waste Disposal Authority, and Local Planning Authorities in the context of the Issues and Options consultation whilst trying to keep conversations on-track and focused on the matters about which the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority were seeking the views of stakeholders.

- Some stakeholders expressed concern about the Government's requirement for the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to plan positively for hydrocarbon development in the context of climate change.

- Similar concern was raised in respect of sand and gravel and the continued need to provide for a 7-year landbank.

- Some stakeholders were fascinated about Surrey's geology and its link to where mineral workings are located. Otherwise, stakeholders did appear to recognise the importance of minerals and the role that they play in sustaining our economy, infrastructure, and lifestyles.

- Stakeholders clearly recognised the importance of proper and sustainable waste management. They care about what happens to their waste once it leaves the kerbside and were very keen to learn more about how they can contribute to facilitating a circular economy. They want to engage with Surrey County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority and the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and make a positive contribution to how waste is managed in the county, but they want it to be easy for them to do so. Some stakeholders were concerned about their waste being managed out of the county or in developing countries.

- Some stakeholders expressed their disagreement with the charging regime in place at Community Recycling Centres and bemoaned sporadic opening hours of these facilities. Some stakeholders were concerned about increasing litter and fly-tipping.

- A couple of stakeholders were keen to know more about Charlton Lane Eco Park and the regulatory position in respect of stack emissions.

- Several stakeholders attended the Addlestone event to express their concerns about the Watersplash Farm site and whether they could register their disapproval of the development and the previous grant of planning permission for the same.

- Stakeholders also raised concerns about Whitehall Farm and the potential for mineral development to take place so close to sensitive receptors.

- Many stakeholders stated they thought that any future mineral development should be at least 1 kilometre from any residential dwellings and other sensitive receptors. In this regard, stakeholders mentioned that they thought this was an acknowledged standardised distance but couldn't recall the source of the information or otherwise provide a reference.

- Some stakeholders were unsure whether they could make a meaningful contribution to the Issues and Options consultation due to the volume and complexity of the relevant information. One resident was intimidated by the size of the hardcopy consultation pack and requested that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority simply summarise the 'headline position' on a single page.

- There was some interest in how the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority plan for future development and how need is anticipated or and forecast.

- The Commonplace consultation platform was very well received by all stakeholders.

Focus Groups

1.30 As part of the Issues and Options public consultation, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority commissioned qualitative research to gather informed and in-depth feedback from some stakeholders about the proposed strategic objectives for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The information collected from this exercise should complement the consultation outputs and provide the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority with additional insight from a representative resident audience who do not typically engage in planning consultation exercises.

1.31 The qualitative research comprised two deliberative virtual workshops designed and involving content developed by Lake Market Research in partnership with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. So that stakeholders could discuss the relevant subject matter, at the beginning of each workshop, a scene setting presentation was delivered by officers to inform stakeholders about the proposed strategic objectives and the statutory responsibilities of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. Within the presentation and discussion groups stakeholders were shown condensed versions of the proposed strategic objectives that retained their meaning and content but made them easier for stakeholders to understand in a workshop environment.

1.32 Fifty-three (53) stakeholders took part in workshops and responses to the presentation and strategic objectives were positive. Stakeholders recognised the importance of meeting demand for minerals and ensuring the waste generated in the county is managed sustainably. For many stakeholders the workshops were the first real exposure to minerals and waste management land-use planning in Surrey. Overall, stakeholders found the focus group exercises to be insightful and informative. Many felt that the presentation and discussion prompted them to think about how waste and the extraction of minerals is managed, and the role Surrey County Council plays in this respect.

1.33 The general themes to emerge from the workshops can be summarised as follows:

- Stakeholders recognise that minerals and waste management development require careful consideration and planning and understand that this work takes place in the context of local and National policy and sustainability objectives.

- Some stakeholders are concerned about the compatibility of National objectives and policy relating to minerals and waste management development and the need to mitigate against local environmental impacts associated with the same.

- The impact of mineral workings on Surrey's environment is particularly important to stakeholders with the idea of protecting the environment in the forefront of their minds. Some seek a stronger stance on the impact of minerals workings written into proposed Strategic Objective 1.

- There is a reluctance on the part of stakeholders to agree new mineral development, unless there is a genuine need (i.e., an area not served by any

local existing facilities) or a valuable mineral resource (i.e., high demand in Surrey and low availability/supply).

- The location and size of waste management facilities is important to some stakeholders in the context of the countryside, rural areas, and villages. There is concern about their location within and proximity to such areas, the consequent transportation implications, and general impact on such environments.

- In several conversations, stakeholders questioned whether the proposed strategic objectives were written with the intention of Surrey becoming self-sufficient and discussed the prospect of creating cross-county regional partnerships.

- Protection of the Green Belt is a key priority for most stakeholders but consider that the proposed strategic objectives address their concerns in this regard.

- Some stakeholders questioned whether protection of the Green Belt is a realistic objective; and reflected on their own experiences of development in the Green Belt in their local area (in relation to minerals and waste management development and residential development) and the degree to which future protection is possible having regard to development pressures and financial considerations.

- Some stakeholders queried the use of the word ‘enhance’ in the context of the health and amenity of stakeholders, businesses and visitors, and landscapes and townscapes. Stakeholders are unsure how minerals and waste management could bring about enhancements or improvements citing examples of existing development and how this has been manged.

- There is particular interest in maximising the use of recycled materials and prioritising this over the use of primary materials. Stakeholders also favour the concept of reusing, recycling, and recovering waste over its disposal. In this regard stakeholders consider that the proposed strategic objectives are in keeping with environmental changes being made across society and the need to protect future generations.

- Flooding is an important issue to some stakeholders, and they expect the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to address the same in respect of its strategic objectives.

- All stakeholders wish to see the environment and climate change prioritised by the strategic objectives for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Stakeholders consider that the challenges we face in this regard represent an opportunity for innovation and positive changes in the minerals and waste management industries.

- Some stakeholders are concerned that the term ‘biodiversity’ is not clear to everyone and that future communication about this topic is needed particularly in relation to its meaning and the benefits net gain could bring to local communities so that everyone can truly understand its importance and provide their support.

- Stakeholders consider that a thorough plan for measuring outcomes of projects designed to enhance biodiversity in Surrey is important and want more tangible

standards included within the proposed strategic objectives to make them meaningful.

- Most stakeholders consider it important that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority communicate with them about minerals and waste management development in the county. They want to be engaged and play a role in finding solutions to their environmental concerns. Many stakeholders acknowledged that their understanding about the relevant subject matter is very limited (prior to the workshop discussions).

- Many stakeholders recognise that the topic of minerals and waste management land-use planning is complex and challenging. However, it is important to them that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority share information about proposals and provide them with the opportunity of being involved in plan-making and decision-taking.

1.34 A full copy of the research report (including presentation slides) can be provided upon written request to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

Statutory Stakeholders

1.35 Representations made and feedback provided by all stakeholders in response to the Issues and Options public consultation has been collated, grouped, and summarised by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to correspond with the relevant consultation documents and questions. A comprehensive list of all stakeholder comments and the initial response of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to discreet stakeholder comments can be found in Annex A to K attached to this report. Each stakeholder that made a representation or otherwise provided a response has been assigned a unique identification reference (CR = Commonplace Representation, WR = Written Representation). Further detail about stakeholder classification can be found in Annex M. Whilst care has been taken to identify and attribute all representations and feedback accurately, some stakeholder contributions remain anonymous and so it is possible that some feedback has been attributed in error.

1.36 A quantitative summary of the consultation outcomes and the general themes emerging from representations and feedback provided by statutory stakeholders is provided below using the relevant consultation document headings, sections, and questions. The themes emerging and stakeholder comments referenced are not exhaustive.

Introduction and Context

1.37 Stakeholders expressed general support for merging the minerals and waste planning frameworks and preparing a joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders want to understand more about the reasons for and benefits of a joint policy framework. All stakeholders emphasised the importance of preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan so that it seeks to address the challenges of climate change and biodiversity loss.

Proposed Vision and Strategic Objectives

Vision

1.38 Out of the 10 stakeholders who engaged with vision proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, 80% agreed (or generally agreed) and 20% disagreed with what was proposed. Stakeholders suggest that more references are made to the drive towards net zero and lowering carbon emissions; the need to avoid unsustainable transport methods; and biodiversity net-gain.

Strategic Objectives

1.39 Out of 10 stakeholders who engaged with the strategic objectives proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, 70% agreed (or agreed in principle) with all the strategic objectives whilst other stakeholders disagreed with specific strategic objectives as set out below:

- Strategic Objective 1 Minerals Production and Use; 10% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 20% made no comment.

- Strategic Objective 2 Self-sufficiency; 20% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 10% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 3 Safeguarding; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 4 Sustainable Waste Management and Preservation of Primary Resources; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 5 Metropolitan Green Belt; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 6 Health and Amenity; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 7 Landscape, Townscape, and Heritage; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 8 Natural Environment and Biodiversity; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 9 Flood Risk and Water Resources; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 10 Transport; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 11 Hydrocarbon Development; 20% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 10% made no comment.
- Strategic Objective 12 Site Restoration, Enhancement and Long-term Management; 0% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 30% made comment.
- Strategic Objective 13 Climate Change; 20% disagreed (or disagreed in principle) and 70% agreed, 10% made no comment.

1.40 Most stakeholders support the emphasis on tackling climate change in the proposed strategic objectives. However, some are concerned that they do not fully reflect the shift towards net zero, particularly in respect of hydrocarbon development. Some stakeholders consider the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan provides an opportunity to think strategically about the environment in Surrey and establish links with various initiatives, such as, the Biodiversity Action Plan, the Nature Recovery Network, Green Infrastructure Projects and Rights of Way Improvement Plans.

Proposed Spatial Strategy

Minerals Development

1.41 Out of 6 stakeholders who selected a policy option relating to the minerals spatial strategy proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Provide for future minerals needs for key mineral resources solely through the development of extensions to the quarries/minerals sites already present in the county”.

- 33% chose Option 2 “Provide for future minerals needs through the identification and allocation of small numbers of new quarries/minerals sites in locations with good accessibility and away from sensitive landscapes, habitats, and communities”.

- 66% chose Option 3 “Combine elements of options one and two”.

1.42 It is important to stakeholders that future mineral workings and facilities are in more suitable locations away from sensitive receptors and in this regard want to see proper consideration given to minerals safeguarding and site identification/allocation. Stakeholders appreciate that Natural England’s review of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty boundary (likely to conclude in 2023) may have a material impact on how the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority plans for future minerals development particularly in respect of the north-east and south-west of the county.

Waste Management Development

1.43 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a policy option relating to the waste spatial strategy proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:

- 14% chose Option 1 “Maximise the capacity of existing waste management facilities in the county.”

- 29% chose Option 2 “Seek to provide any necessary additional capacity in a small number of new strategic facilities accommodating a range of waste management approaches within or close to the main centres of population where high levels of growth are anticipated and there is good access to the strategic/primary road network.”

- 14% chose Option 3 “Seek to provide any necessary additional capacity in a large number of new non-strategic facilities dispersed across the county with particular focus on areas likely to experience the most rapid pace of growth and development over the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period.”

- The most favoured was Option 4 “Combine elements of Options 1, 2 and 3 and use strategic allocations”, chosen by 43% of stakeholders.

1.44 Some stakeholders prefer the development of a network of smaller waste management facilities to reduce transport distances. Others consider that the size of facilities should be balanced against their potential to improve the quality of the natural environment including biodiversity and water. Stakeholders note that existing waste management facilities may cause conflict between new and planned housing developments.

Protecting the Green Belt, Environment and Communities

Green Belt

1.45 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Green Belt:

- 25% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach”
- 75% chose Option 2 “Update the existing policy approach to reflect guidance on ‘inappropriateness.”

1.46 Stakeholders are concerned about future minerals and waste development in the Green Belt. However, there is a general acknowledgment that minerals can only be worked where they are found, and this may include locations within the Green Belt. In this regard stakeholders want to see an environmental protection policy that provides for green infrastructure and seeks to manage nuisance arising from minerals and waste management development.

Restoration ‘Biodiversity Net-Gain’

1.47 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Restoration ‘Biodiversity Net-Gain’:

- 14% chose Option 1 “All site restoration or enhancement schemes deliver at least 10% biodiversity net-gain.”
- 0% chose Option 2 “All quarry restoration schemes deliver at least 20% biodiversity net gain; and all other site restoration or enhancement schemes deliver at least 10% biodiversity net-gain.”
- 86% chose Option 3 “All quarry restoration schemes deliver 20% biodiversity net gain over the site baseline and a further net gain of at least 10% to create additional headroom within the host area; and all other site restoration or enhancement schemes deliver at least 10% biodiversity net-gain.”

1.48 Stakeholders note that Surrey has suffered a significant decline in biodiversity as evidence in the Restoration and Enhancement Statement prepared by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. In this context there is general support amongst stakeholders that minerals and waste management development should provide for the highest level of biodiversity net-gain possible. However, some stakeholders want to see a policy commitment to site restoration or enhancement schemes providing more than the mandatory 10% biodiversity net-gain target under the Environment Act to generate a meaningful uplift; they propose that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan follows Surrey Nature Partnership’s recommendation of 20% net-gain for all development. Some stakeholders want waste management development to contribute more towards greater levels of biodiversity and consider there is too much focus at present on mineral development with quarry restoration and enhancement.

Restoration ‘Use of Infilling’

1.49 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Restoration ‘Use of Infilling’:

- 14% selected Option 1 “Restoration to pre-extraction levels through infilling.”
- 0% selected Option 2 “Restoration to a lower level through partial infilling or no infilling.”
- 86% selected Option 3 “Site specific approach.”

1.50 Most stakeholders agree that each development has unique characteristics and is subject to different circumstances and that a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate. There is general support for a phased and progressive approach to mineral restoration schemes. However, some stakeholders note that restoration involving large waterbodies is not suitable near airports due to the risk of birdstrike. Other stakeholders note that large areas of infilled mineral sites can potentially restrict groundwater flow which can lead to flooding, and therefore want to see specific consideration given to the nature and scale of infilling operations and the potential adverse impacts that may arise. Stakeholders note that the responsibilities and financial costs of mineral site restoration lie with minerals operators/developers and, in the case of default, landowners.

Restoration ‘Site Restoration and Enhancement’

1.51 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Restoration ‘Site Restoration and Enhancement’:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Retain the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 approach to the form, content, and structure of the restoration policies for quarry sites”.
- 50% chose Option 2 “Adopt a policy approach based on the type of land-use.”
- 50% chose Option 3 “Adopt a policy approach based on landform and biodiversity net gain.”

1.52 Stakeholders agree that a policy-based approach to restoration and enhancement would allow for consideration of a greater number of issues including biodiversity net-gain. Stakeholders suggest that consideration be given to combining the approaches set out in Options 2 and 3 with a minimum target of 20% relating to biodiversity net-gain.

Climate Change

1.53 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Climate Change:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 0% chose Option 2 “Broad environmental protection policy approach.”
- 40% chose Option 3 “Climate change mitigation policy approach.”
- 60% chose Option 4 “Development-specific climate change policy approach.”

1.54 Some stakeholders emphasised that carbon capture is at early stages of development and would expect protection of aquifers for water supply infrastructure as an imperative. Stakeholders want to see minerals and waste management

development make a meaningful contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the steps applicants/developers can take to reduce or eliminate emissions.

Air Quality

1.55 Of the 9 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Air Quality:

- 11% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 11% chose Option 2 “Broad environmental protection policy approach.”
- 22% chose Option 3 “Single air quality mitigation policy approach.”
- 56% chose Option 4 “Development-specific air quality policies approach.”

1.56 Stakeholders consider that any future minerals or waste management development should be judged on its own merits. However, the impacts such development may have on air quality should be a major consideration in assessing their acceptability; and these impacts need to be established having regard to the proximity and sensitivity of differing receptors and baseline air quality.

Water

1.57 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Water:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 20% chose Option 2 “Single water environment protection policy approach.”
- 80% chose Option 3 “Separate water quality and resources policy and flood risk management policy approach.”

1.58 Stakeholders note that there is a difference between water quality and flood risk management, and that it would be more suitable to have separate policies for each topic. Some stakeholders advise that the potential impacts on water quality and water resources arising from minerals and waste management development represents a technical and variegated area, which would benefit from holistic guidance about water quality and water resources mitigation and management. Some stakeholders advise that the impact minerals and waste management development can have on the quantity and quality of water resources needs to be emphasised. In this regard it is noted that Surrey is underlain by 17 groundwater bodies that fall within the area covered by the Thames River Basin Management Plan. Of the groundwater bodies within Surrey, 12 exhibited ‘poor’ overall status in 2019 and 5 exhibited ‘good’ overall status. Groundwater bodies can be polluted by point sources, such as leachate from landfill sites or effluent from industrial sites, and from diffuse sources such as runoff from agricultural land or roads.

Land and Soils

1.59 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Land and Soils:

- 16% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”

- 33% chose Option 2 “Single land and soils protection policy approach.”
- 50% chose Option 3 “Development-specific land and soil protection policies approach.”

1.60 Although stakeholders expressed approval of the current policy approach because it follows good practice and is in line with National policy, they generally favour Option 3 over Options 1 or 2 as it would provide for defined protection policies relevant specific types of minerals and waste management development.

Nature

1.61 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Nature:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 25% chose Option 2 “Single nature and biodiversity policy approach.”
- 75% chose Option 3 “Separate nature protection and biodiversity net gain policies approach.”
- 0% chose Option 4 “Single strategic nature protection policy approach.”

1.62 Stakeholders consider that protection of the natural environment and biodiversity net-gain are separate issues, and that it would be appropriate to adopt separate policies for each topic. Stakeholders want to see policy that provides for linkages to green infrastructure particularly in respect of quarry restoration. Such links to include targets relating to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Stakeholders also consider that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should take account of local plans prepared by Surrey’s district and borough councils so that ambition and intent is consistent across the county.

Landscape and Townscape

1.63 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Landscape and Townscape:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 40% chose Option 2 “Single landscape and townscape policy approach.”
- 60% chose Option 3 “Single strategic landscape and townscape policy approach.”

1.64 There is general support amongst stakeholders that a single strategic landscape and townscape policy approach would be appropriate for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. However, stakeholders advise that any such policy should be deliverable, flexible, and concise. Some stakeholders want the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to address exceptional circumstances necessary to justify major development within the settings of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Heritage

1.65 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Heritage:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 33% chose Option 2 “Single historic environment policy approach.”
- 50% chose Option 3 “Separate policies approach.”
- 16% chose Option 4 “Single strategic landscape and townscape policy approach.”

1.66 Stakeholders expressed general preference for heritage matters to be addressed in dedicated policies, rather than threaded into other policies.

Movement and Access

1.67 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Movement and Access:

- 16% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 16% chose Option 2 “Two policy approach.”
- 67% chose Option 3 “Three policy approach.”

1.68 Stakeholders advise that within any movement and access policy, the future of transportation should be explored such as electrification, use of flight (e.g., drones), and highly maintained and dedicated Heavy Goods Vehicle routes as an alternative to current approaches. There is general support amongst stakeholders for alternative modes of transport to road, such as rail and water. In this regard some stakeholders consider that there should be requirements in place to push away from current road-based transportation in Surrey.

Communities

1.69 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Communities:

- 14% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 71% chose Option 2 “Multiple policy approach.”
- 14% chose Option 3 “Single strategic policy approach.”

1.70 There is general support amongst stakeholders for a multiple policy approach as they consider that this would provide the most protection to communities. All stakeholders agree that the health of residents should remain a primary concern in any policy approach taken for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders consider that a single strategic policy approach would require considerable financial investment from districts and boroughs particularly in respect of monitoring policies and development. Some stakeholders noted that local plan policies should have equal weight to policy within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Aggregate, Minerals and Infrastructure

Sharp Sand and Gravel

1.71 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option for Sharp Sand and Gravel:

- 75% chose Option 1 "Continue to meet the 7-year landbank required with sales at 0.34 million tonnes per annum."
- 25% chose Option 2 "Continue to meet the 7-year landbank required with sales at 0.39 million tonnes per annum."
- 0% chose Option 3 "Continue to meet the 7-year landbank required with sales at 0.59 million tonnes per annum."

1.72 Some stakeholders are concerned about fluctuations in demand and sales and uncertainty over whether peak sales will be sustained in the long-term.

Soft Sand

1.73 Of the 3 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option for Soft Sand:

- 33% chose Option 1 "Continue to meet the 7-year landbank figure with sales at 0.4 million tonnes per annum."
- 33% chose Option 2 "Continue to meet the 7-year landbank figure with sales at 0.456 million tonnes per annum."
- 33% chose Option 3 "Continue to meet the 7-year landbank figure with sales at 0.57 million tonnes per annum."

1.74 Some stakeholders question demand and whether peak sales can be maintained. Others oppose mineral working in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and support the designation's extension and measures to improve its quality and permanence. Some stakeholders want to see a policy setting out how to sustainably extract minerals within or adjacent to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and mitigate the impact of doing so.

Need for Aggregate Recycling Capacity

1.75 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to the Need for Aggregate Recycling:

- 0% chose Option 1 "An approach that is primarily driven by the need to have sufficient capacity to manage the levels of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste that is expected to arise in Surrey and the surrounding area over the plan period, with targets for recycling and recovery equivalent to those that would have been taken forward in the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019."
- 20% chose Option 2 "An approach that is primarily driven by the need to conserve remaining reserves of primary aggregate (particularly concreting aggregate) by increasing the amount of recycled aggregate produced per year

above the 0.9 million tonne target (for 2026) set in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011."

- 80% chose Option 3 "Adopt a hybrid approach that combines the need to increase the resource efficiency of the wider economy with the need to manage remaining reserves of non-renewable mineral resources."

1.76 Stakeholders consider that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should seek to maximise resource efficiency including the amount of recycled aggregate produced in the county.

The Improvement or Expansion of Existing Aggregate Recycling Facilities

1.77 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding the Improvement or Expansion of Existing Aggregate Recycling Facilities:

- 40% chose Option 1 "Provide for the general improvement or expansion of waste management facilities (including aggregate recycling facilities) through a policy like Policy 8 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019."

- 60% chose Option 2 "Provide for the improvement or expansion of aggregate recycling facilities with stipulating criteria which relevant development proposals would have to meet."

- 0% chose Option 3 "Do not provide for the improvement or expansion of aggregate recycling facilities."

1.78 Some stakeholders are concerned about sites subject to temporary aggregate recycling permissions opening the door to physical extensions and permanent facilities, particularly in the case of temporary mineral workings where there is a real risk that temporary aggregate recycling operations become the primary land-use.

Location of new temporary and permanent aggregate recycling facilities

1.79 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to the Location of New Temporary and Permanent Aggregate Recycling Facilities:

- 0% chose Option 1 "Provide for the identified need for recycling of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste and production of recycled aggregate by allocating land to be developed as permanent facilities."

- 40% chose Option 2 "Maintain the current Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 approach (Policy 3), with a significant proportion (about 62%) of aggregate recycling capacity provided by temporary facilities located on land within established mineral workings."

- 60% chose Option 3 "Adopt a hybrid approach that combines elements of Options 1 and 2 to enable the development of a small number of new permanent Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste recycling hubs supplemented by temporary facilities on suitable land which may include mineral workings."

1.80 Stakeholders are concerned that there is a real risk that temporary minerals sites continue to be used for aggregate recycling in the absence of restoration progress as planned.

Need to Safeguard Existing Rail Aggregate Depots

1.81 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding the Need to Safeguard Existing Rail Aggregate Depots:

- 50% chose Option 1 "Continue to safeguard existing rail aggregate depots as per Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011."
- 50% chose Option 2 "Encourage the relocation of existing rail aggregate depots to locations more suitable to industrial land-uses and activities. Areas of search for new facilities to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan."

1.82 Some stakeholders consider that the existing locations of rail aggregate depots continue to be the most suitable and that there appears to be a shortage of alternative sites. Other stakeholders favour the relocation of Woking Rail Aggregates Depot and note that any relocation of rail aggregate depots needs to take account of impacts on local communities and the best location for redistribution of material.

Improvement and Extension of Existing and Enablement of New Rail Aggregate Depots

1.83 Of the 3 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding the Improvement and Extension of Existing and Enablement of New Rail Aggregate Depots:

- 33% chose Option 1 "Encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots."
- 0% chose Option 2 "Don't encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots."
- 33% chose Option 3 "Don't encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots but enable the development of new facilities in locations more suitable to industrial land-uses and activities. Areas of search for new facilities to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan."
- 33% chose Option 4 "Encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots and enable the development of new facilities in locations more suitable to industrial land-uses and activities. Areas of search for new facilities to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan."

1.84 Stakeholders note that the improvement or expansion of existing rail aggregate depots could lead to an increase in the volume of aggregates transported by rail, whilst risking increased localised impacts. Some stakeholders recognise that transport by rail will not be feasible in all areas of Surrey.

Silica Sand

1.85 Of the 3 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Silica Sand:

- 33% chose Option 1 "Safeguard existing silica sand quarries and any previously identified extensions to their permitted areas of extraction to deliver as close to the 10-year landbank required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 as possible over the plan period."

- 67% chose Option 2 “Safeguard existing silica sand quarries and any previously identified extensions to their permitted areas of extraction and allocate new land to be worked for silica sand to meet the 10-year landbank required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 over the plan period. Allocated sites to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

- 0% chose Option 3 “Safeguard existing silica sand quarries and any previously identified extensions to their permitted areas of extraction and identify areas of search within which new silica sand quarries could be developed to meet the 10-year landbank required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 over the plan period.”

1.86 Stakeholders recognise silica sand as a mineral of National importance and that it is found in relatively few areas. Some stakeholders note that the current landbank for silica sand in Surrey is between 5 and 10 years, but also that it is not clear how close to the 10-year target it is. Some stakeholders suggest that policy is needed to prioritise the protection of the environment over commercial interests.

Brick Clay

1.87 Of the 3 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Brick Clay:

- 33% chose Option 1 “Safeguard existing brick clay resources.”

- 67% chose Option 2 “Safeguard existing brick clay resources, enable extensions to existing quarries, and encourage the recommissioning of dormant clay quarries.”

- 0% chose Option 3 “Safeguard existing brick clay resources and encourage the recommissioning of dormant clay quarries.”

1.88 Stakeholders advocate that any temporal or physical extension to existing clay quarries and brickworks should be based on need; and that the capacity of existing facilities should be maximised over the development of any new facilities. Some stakeholders note that there is not enough information to determine whether dormant brickworks (e.g., Clockhouse and Auclaye) should be safeguarded by the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Chalk

1.89 Of the 2 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Chalk:

- 50% chose Option 1 “Maintain an approach consistent with that set out in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policy MC10), that is a presumption against chalk extraction, no safeguarding of wider chalk resources, and safeguarding of the single existing chalk quarry in Surrey.”

- 50% chose Option 2 “A presumption against new chalk extraction and safeguard wider chalk resources for potential future need and the single existing chalk quarry in Surrey.”

1.90 Some stakeholders do not consider that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should provide for chalk extraction. Others require more information to make an informed judgement about the need for chalk. Some stakeholders note that safeguarding chalk

resources has the potential to act as a significant constraint to future development (e.g., housing).

Fuller's Earth

1.91 Of the 3 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Fuller's Earth:

- 75% chose Option 1 "Maintain an approach consistent with that set out in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policies MC6 and MC10), that is a presumption against the extraction of fuller's earth and safeguarding of fuller's earth resources."

- 25% chose Option 2 "A presumption against extraction of fuller's earth with no provision for safeguarding fuller's earth resources."

1.92 There is general support amongst stakeholders that there should be no provision for the extraction of fuller's earth in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders suggest it prudent to safeguard fuller's earth resources in the event of future need.

Peat

1.93 Of the 4 stakeholders selected a proposed policy option in respect of Peat:

- 50% chose Option 1 "Confirm the presumption against new peat extraction sites as per the National Planning Policy Framework 2021."

- 0% chose Option 2 "Do not include a specific reference to peat in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, but instead rely on the presumption against new peat extraction sites as per the National Planning Policy Framework 2021."

- 50% chose Option 3 "Set out Surrey-specific reasons for resisting proposals for peat extraction, in addition to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 presumption against such development and identify those areas of land within the County requiring specific policy protection in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan."

1.94 There is general support amongst stakeholders that there should be no provision for the extraction of peat in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders note that peatlands are a carbon sink and any policy option pursued should align with the Government's commitment to achieving net zero by 2050.

Building Stone

1.95 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Building Stone:

- 0% chose Option 1 "Maintain an approach consistent with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policy MC10), that is no specific policy provision in relation to building stone but acknowledge, as per the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the potential future need for the mineral within the context of a generic non-aggregate minerals policy."

- 25% chose Option 2 “A criteria-based policy for the extraction of building stone, in particular for Bargate Stone. The policy would set out the broad circumstances in which the extraction of building stone may be considered acceptable.”

- 75% chose Option 3 “A criteria-based policy for the extraction of building stone, in particular for Bargate Stone, as well as identify preferred areas for future extraction. Preferred areas are to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

1.96 Some stakeholders suggest that the supply of building stone should be limited to the repair heritage assets only, and that any stone is sourced from suitable locations as identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Other stakeholders note that extraction of Bargate stone may face challenging constraints and come at considerable cost to the environment.

Conventional Oil or Gas

1.97 Of the 3 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Conventional Oil or Gas:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain an approach consistent with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policy MC12) covering all stages of conventional hydrocarbon exploration, appraisal, production, and decommissioning and restoration of well sites. This approach would not provide guidance as to how appropriate sites might be identified within each of the Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence areas in Surrey. Licence areas to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

- 100% chose Option 2 “Establish separate policies relevant to each stage of conventional hydrocarbon exploration, appraisal, production, and decommissioning and restoration of well sites. Each separate policy to provide relevant guidance and criteria. Further policies could be established to identify Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence areas in Surrey and provide guidance for each area with respect to the identification of suitable well site locations.”

1.98 Some stakeholders, considering the climate emergency, do not support any hydrocarbon development. They advocate that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan align with this approach and the transition to net zero. Some stakeholders suggest that Government policy is moving towards a presumption against new exploration for oil and gas and this should be factored into Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Other stakeholders want to see the creation of buffer zones between hydrocarbon sites and housing zones (reference to the recently approved Plan for Kirby Misperton).

Unconventional Oil or Gas

1.99 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Unconventional Oil or Gas:

- 0% chose Option 1 “An approach tied explicitly to the extant Government position with reference to the development of unconventional hydrocarbon resources. This would allow for the possibility of unconventional oil and gas development in the future should the Government lift the relevant moratorium.”

- 100% chose Option 2 “An approach that takes account of the seismic sensitivity demonstrated in Surrey by the recent Newdigate sequence of earth tremors, and of the thresholds previously used to require the cessation of hydraulic fracturing operations at Preese Hall in Lancashire, to establish an evidence-based moratorium on the development of unconventional oil and gas resources in Surrey for the entirety of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period.”

1.100 Some stakeholders do not consider that there are any suitable policy options available to fully address unconventional hydrocarbon development. Some stakeholders advocate that hydrocarbon development is not consistent with Surrey County Council’s declaration of a climate emergency and the plans of Surrey County Council’s Greener Futures Group. Some stakeholders want the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to define much more clearly what unconventional oil and gas development comprises to provide certainty.

Underground Storage

1.101 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Underground Storage:

- 25% chose Option 1 “An approach that provides for the underground storage of natural gas in suitable geological structures in Surrey.”

- 75% chose Option 2 “An approach that provides for the underground storage of natural gas or carbon dioxide in suitable geological structures in Surrey.”

1.102 Some stakeholders consider that there are sufficient opportunities for carbon capture in Surrey, but these should not detract from the priority to reduce carbon emissions. Other stakeholders are concerned that underground storage may be used as mitigation for further hydrocarbon development. Some stakeholders note that carbon capture is in its early stages and there are no guarantees that it can be relied upon as a major factor within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period.

Waste Management

Waste Management Facilities

1.103 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Waste Management Facilities:

- 50% chose Option 1 “A single policy providing environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria specific to the provision of each type of waste management facility.”

- 25% chose Option 2 “A single policy providing general environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria relevant to all types of waste management facilities. The policy could include a range of different sub-categories providing limited guidance relevant to each type of waste management facility.”

- 25% chose Option 3 “Either Option 1 or Option 2 above, with a sub-policy which allocates specific land or identifies areas of search for general or specific types of waste management facilities.”

1.104 Stakeholders note that not all locations would be acceptable under a 'one size fits all' policy approach to waste management facilities. Some stakeholders are concerned that there is limited guidance relevant to Material Recovery Facilities which may mean that key issues relating to their provision may not be addressed by the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders want to see greater emphasis on the transportation implications of waste management facilities and advocate for local mixed-waste management facilities.

Wastewater Treatment

1.105 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Wastewater Treatment:

- 57% chose Option 1 "A policy like Policy 12 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 and make no strategic provision for wastewater treatment facilities."
- 0% chose Option 2 "A single policy providing general environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria relevant to all waste management facilities. The policy could include a range of different sub-categories providing limited guidance relevant to wastewater treatment facilities."
- 43% chose Option 3 "Either Option 1 or Option 2 above, with a sub-policy which allocates specific land or identifies areas of search for general or specific waste management facilities including wastewater treatment facilities."

1.106 Some stakeholders consider that the Surrey Waste Local Plan approach remains sound. Other stakeholders consider it appropriate to investigate whether there may be suitable land available for new facilities or physical extensions to existing facilities. Some stakeholders want to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to support the improvement of existing facilities.

Deposit of Waste to Land

1.107 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to the Deposit of Waste to Land:

- 33% chose Option 1 "Continue with the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 approach of providing for separate and specific policies for the disposal of waste to land and the recovery of waste to land."
- 17% chose Option 2 "A single policy providing environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria specific to the provision of new deposit of waste to land capacity."
- 50% chose Option 3 "A single policy providing general environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria relevant to all waste management facilities. The policy could include a range of different sub-categories providing limited guidance relevant to deposit to land facilities."
- 0% chose Option 4 "Either Option 2 or 3 above, with a sub-policy which allocates specific land or identifies areas of search for general or specific waste management facilities including deposit of waste to land."

1.108 There is general agreement amongst stakeholders that new facilities should only be identified or otherwise permitted where there is a demonstrable need that cannot be met by existing facilities. Stakeholders want to see a continuous reduction in the percentage of waste which is landfilled.

Identifying Land for Waste Management Development

1.109 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Identifying Land for Waste Management Development:

- 0% chose Option 1 "An approach which allocates land for specific waste management uses the acceptability of which is to be determined at the planning application stage based on criteria-based policy and need".
- 40% chose Option 2 "An approach which identifies areas of search, with specific waste management uses to be determined at the planning application stage based on criteria-based policy and need."
- 60% chose Option 3 "A combined approach which includes a combination of Option 1 and Option 2 above."
- 0% chose Option 4 "Adopt a criteria-based policy approach only with no allocations or areas of search."

1.110 There is general support amongst stakeholders for flexibility and the identification of areas of search or specific allocations to ensure that any waste management need is met over the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period. In preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan some stakeholders note the opportunity to assess the suitability, viability, and achievability of sites in relation to the definitions provided in Planning Practice Guidance and suggest that such an approach would provide a robust set of site allocations that are more likely to be delivered within the plan period to meet any identified capacity gap.

Calculating Need for Waste Management Development

1.111 Of the 2 stakeholders who responded to "Calculating Need for Waste Management Development": 50% agreed and 50% disagreed with the targets proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Safeguarding

Safeguarding Minerals Resources

1.112 Of the 4 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Safeguarding Mineral Resources:

- 25% chose Option 1 "An approach broadly consistent with Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 by retaining Minerals Safeguarding Areas as currently defined."
- 75% chose Option 2 "An approach that provides for the safeguarding of the county's remaining reserves of potentially exploitable mineral resources in terms of: sharp sand and gravel; soft sand (outside the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty); brick clay; and silica sand. Minerals Safeguarding Areas would

be defined based on the geological resource as identified by the British Geological Survey."

1.113 There is general agreement amongst stakeholders that proposed policy Option 2 may provide a more rigorous and evidenced approach to defining Minerals Safeguarding Areas. Some stakeholders suggest that areas of search could also be provided by the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Safeguarding Minerals Development

1.114 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Safeguarding Minerals Development:

- 25% chose Option 1 "An approach broadly consistent with Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011."
- 75% chose Option 2 "An approach that provides for the safeguarding of existing minerals development, including but not limited to, processing facilities, aggregate recycling facilities, rail aggregate depots, brickworks and tileworks, and provides for the protection of land identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan as suitable for these uses. The policy would also provide for the protection of the viability of existing minerals development."

1.115 Some stakeholders prefer minerals safeguarding to be limited to areas not designated for their landscape quality (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value). Some stakeholders note that minerals safeguarding may cause conflict between planned housing development and that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should not conflict with local plans prepared by district and borough councils. Some stakeholders advocate for the relocation of Woking Rail Aggregates Depot. Some stakeholders want to see any safeguarded land that has been worked and become exhausted restored at the earliest opportunity in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Safeguarding Waste Management Development

1.116 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Safeguarding of Waste Management Development:

- 80% chose Option 1 "An approach broadly consistent with Policy 7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019."
- 20% chose Option 2 "A two-policy approach - the first dealing with safeguarding of land that may be suitable for waste management development, existing waste management facilities, and land that benefits from consent for waste management development; and the second dealing with the protection of the viability of existing waste management facilities."

1.117 Some stakeholders prefer waste safeguarding to be limited to areas not designated for their landscape quality (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value). Some stakeholders note that waste safeguarding may cause conflict between planned housing development and that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should not conflict with Local plans prepared by district and borough councils. Some stakeholders advocate for the relocation of Woking Rail Aggregates Depot.

Duty to Cooperate Statement

1.118 Stakeholders note that Statements of Common Ground should be agreed as appropriate and be made available with the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders request that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority work in partnership with district and borough council to establish the necessary evidence base to justify a higher requirement for biodiversity net-gain above the minimum 10% threshold. Otherwise, stakeholders expect regular positive engagement from the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority throughout the plan-making process.

Position Statements

1.119 When asked for feedback on the usefulness of the position statements, 1 stakeholder answered providing a score of 4 out of 5. Otherwise, stakeholders generally approved of the Climate Change Statement, Restoration and Enhancement Statement, and the Circular Economy Statement. In respect of the latter, some stakeholders want to see the Minerals and Waste Local Plan facilitate an overall increase in reuse and recycling and decrease in residual waste.

Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

1.120 One (1) stakeholder engaged with the question: “Are the sustainability objectives and impact pathways identified for each topic area covered in the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal scoping report adequately?”. This stakeholder agreed that the objectives and impacts pathways are covered adequately. Otherwise, stakeholders expressed general approval of the scoping report. However, one stakeholder suggested that future appraisals and assessments have regard to the Woking Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2021. Another stakeholder notes that issues such as mitigation proposals/compensation for significant adverse effects and monitoring measures on the performance of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan must be included in any future assessment.

Equality Impact Assessment

1.121 One (1) stakeholder engaged with the question: “How useful did you find the Equalities Impact Assessment?” providing a score of 2 out of 5.

Interactive Story Map

1.122 One (1) stakeholder engaged with the question: “How useful did you find the Story Map?” providing a score of 4 out of 5.

Miscellaneous Comments

1.123 Several material comments made by stakeholders in response to the Issues and Options consultation do not correspond neatly to the subject headings above and are therefore summarised here:

- Proposed road improvements to the A3 and M25 could have a significant impact on traffic flows within Woking, which should be considered for any new minerals and waste development in the area.

- Any re-development of minerals and waste sites within Farnham would need to address any infrastructure requirements identified as part of the Farnham Infrastructure Programme.

- There are plans in place to improve Weybridge Town Centre which may have an impact on the wider local highway network. This would need to be considered for any future minerals and waste development in the area.

- General support and congratulations given to Surrey County Council for their work on this Issues and Options consultation including moving towards a digital and interactive consultation platform.

- Concern around the potential negative impacts on the highway network because of future minerals and waste management development, so any new facility should be located as close as possible to the primary road network.

- Considers that the Minerals and Waste Local should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value.

- Suggests that detailed travel plans should be produced alongside any minerals or waste site allocations to ensure travel to and from the same is as sustainable as possible.

- Ensure that the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the National Park Management Plans are taken into consideration.

- Criteria based policies should be set to ensure the protection of designated nature conservation and geological sites. Such policies should clearly distinguish between international, national, and local sites.

- The Minerals and Waste Local Plan should plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement, and management of networks of green infrastructure for the purposes of nature conservation and biodiversity net-gain.

- Green Infrastructure should be incorporated into the plan as a strategic policy area, supported by appropriate detailed policies and proposals to ensure effective provision and delivery.

- Advises that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should include policies to ensure protection and enhancement of public rights of way and National Trails.

- Expects the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to address the impacts of air quality on the natural environment including traffic impacts associated with new development, particularly where this impacts on European sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

- The Minerals and Waste Local Plan should consider climate change adaption and recognise the role of the natural environment to deliver measures to reduce the effects of climate change, for example tree planting to moderate heat island

effects. In addition, factors which may lead to exacerbate climate change (through more greenhouse gases) should be avoided (e.g., pollution, habitat fragmentation, loss of biodiversity) and the natural environment's resilience to change should be protected.

Non-Statutory Stakeholders

1.124 Representations made and feedback provided by all stakeholders in response to the Issues and Options public consultation has been collated, grouped, and summarised by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to correspond with the relevant consultation documents and questions. A comprehensive list of all stakeholder comments and the initial response of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to discreet stakeholder comments can be found in Annex A to K attached to this report. Each stakeholder that made a representation or otherwise provided a response has been assigned a unique identification reference (CR = Commonplace Representation, WR = Written Representation). Further detail about stakeholder classification can be found in Annex M. Whilst care has been taken to identify and attribute all representations and feedback accurately, some stakeholder contributions remain anonymous and so it is possible that some feedback has been attributed in error.

1.125 A quantitative summary of the consultation outcomes and the general themes emerging from representations and feedback provided by non-statutory stakeholders is provided below using the relevant consultation document headings, sections, and questions. The themes emerging and stakeholder comments referenced are not exhaustive.

Introduction and Context

1.126 There is general support amongst stakeholders for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be focused on sustainability. Stakeholders acknowledge that minerals and waste management development is necessary to sustain the economy. However, there is real concern that minerals and waste management development is harmful to the environment, amenity, and human health. Stakeholders want to see a meaningful drive to negate or otherwise minimise the adverse impacts of minerals and waste management development. Some stakeholders are also concerned about the rate of population growth and the impact this will have on the need for more minerals and waste management development in the county. In general, stakeholders approved of the use of digital tools to facilitate the Issues and Options public consultation.

Proposed Vision and Strategic Objectives

Vision

1.127 Of the 27 stakeholders who engaged with the vision proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, 37% agreed (or generally agreed) and 63% disagreed with what was proposed. Many stakeholders do not agree that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should provide for hydrocarbon development or minerals and waste management development in the Green Belt. Some stakeholders are concerned about flooding (particularly in the northwest of the county) and its relationship to mineral extraction and restoration operations.

Strategic Objectives

1.128 Of the 20 stakeholders who engaged with the strategic objectives proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, 40% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 60% disagreed with all the strategic objectives. Some stakeholders also agreed or disagreed with specific strategic objectives as set out below:

- Strategic Objective 1 Minerals Production and Use; of 5 stakeholders who commented 60% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 40% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 2 Self-sufficiency; of 5 stakeholders who commented 60% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 40% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 3 Safeguarding; of 7 stakeholders who commented 71% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 29% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 4 Sustainable Waste Management and Preservation of Primary Resources; of 7 stakeholders who commented 86% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 14% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 5 Metropolitan Green Belt; of 5 stakeholders who commented 80% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 20% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 6 Health and Amenity; of 6 stakeholders who commented 83% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 17% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 7 Landscape, Townscape, and Heritage; of 5 stakeholders who commented 80% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 20% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 8 Natural Environment and Biodiversity; of 4 stakeholders who commented 100% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 0 disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 9 Flood Risk and Water Resources; of 5 stakeholders who commented 100% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 0 disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 10 Transport; of 5 stakeholders who commented 80% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 20% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 11 Hydrocarbon Development; of 3 stakeholders who commented 67% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 33% disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 12 Site Restoration, Enhancement and Long-term Management; of 2 stakeholders who commented 100% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 0 disagreed.
- Strategic Objective 13 Climate Change; of 5 stakeholders who commented 100% agreed (or agreed in principle) and 0 disagreed.

1.129 It is important to stakeholders that minerals and waste are transported in the most sustainable way possible. Stakeholders want to see a greater emphasis on the prevention, reuse, and recycling of waste pursuant to a circular economy.

Proposed Spatial Strategy

Minerals Development

1.130 Of the 28 stakeholders who selected a policy option relating to the minerals spatial strategy proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:

- 36% chose Option 1 “Provide for future minerals needs for key mineral resources solely through the development of extensions to the quarries/minerals sites already present in the county.”

- 18% chose Option 2 “Provide for future minerals needs through the identification and allocation of small numbers of new quarries/minerals sites in locations with good accessibility and away from sensitive landscapes, habitats, and communities.”

- 46% chose Option 3 “Combine elements of options one and two.”

1.131 Some stakeholders recognise the advantages of seeking to limit minerals development to existing mineral sites in the county and not providing for new sites unless there is a demonstrable need. Most stakeholders stressed the need to ensure that existing and future minerals development must not further damage communities, habitats or infrastructure. Some stakeholders advise that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should provide certainty and flexibility.

Waste Management Development

1.132 Of the 23 stakeholders who selected a policy option relating to the waste spatial strategy proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:

- 13% chose Option 1 “Maximise the capacity of existing waste management facilities in the county”.

- 4% chose Option 2 “Seek to provide any necessary additional capacity in a small number of new strategic facilities accommodating a range of waste management approaches within or close to the main centres of population where high levels of growth are anticipated and there is good access to the strategic/primary road network.”

- 8% chose Option 3 “Seek to provide any necessary additional capacity in a large number of new non-strategic facilities dispersed across the county with particular focus on areas likely to experience the most rapid pace of growth and development over the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period.”

- 74% chose Option 4 “Combine elements of Options 1, 2 and 3 and use strategic allocations.”

1.133 Stakeholders want to see a reduction in the number of waste miles in the county. Some stakeholders consider it important that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan provides for local waste management facilities including reuse and repair facilities. Many stakeholders emphasised the importance of transitioning to a circular economy, preventing waste, increasing recycling, and reducing consumption. Some stakeholders want to see a greater mix of complimentary waste management facilities in the county and advocate that this would be more sustainable and therefore acceptable to communities.

Protecting the Green Belt, Environment and Communities

Green Belt

1.134 Of the 17 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Green Belt:

- 18% chose Option 1 "Maintain the established policy approach."
- 82% chose Option 2 "Update the existing policy approach to reflect guidance on 'inappropriateness'."

1.135 Stakeholders are concerned about minerals and waste management development damaging the Green Belt and harming communities. Some stakeholders note that whilst some forms of development are inappropriate in the Green Belt, minerals extraction may not be. Other stakeholders acknowledge that some waste management development will need to be in the Green Belt.

Restoration 'Biodiversity Net Gain'

1.136 Of 18 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Restoration 'Biodiversity Net Gain':

- 44% chose Option 1 "All site restoration or enhancement schemes deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain."
- 11% chose Option 2 "All quarry restoration schemes deliver at least 20% biodiversity net gain; and all other site restoration or enhancement schemes deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain."
- 44% chose Option 3 "All quarry restoration schemes deliver 20% biodiversity net gain over the site baseline and a further net gain of at least 10% to create additional headroom within the host area; and all other site restoration or enhancement schemes deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain."

1.137 Some stakeholders note that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs net-gain metric has been designed with housing development in mind and is therefore limited when it comes to calculating longer-term schemes such as quarry restoration. They suggest that the minerals industry has a long history of providing considerable nature conservation benefits, and that requiring more than the stipulated 10% biodiversity net-gain for quarry restoration would not engender a level playing field across land-use development in Surrey. Some stakeholders want to see the Minerals and Waste Local Plan require the highest level of biodiversity gain for quarries as this would provide for a meaningful uplift in the context of declining biodiversity in Surrey. They note that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should be consistent with Surrey Nature Partnership's recommendation of 20% biodiversity net-gain across all development.

Restoration 'Use of Infilling'

1.138 Of the 17 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Restoration 'Use of Infilling':

- 6% chose Option 1 "Restoration to pre-extraction levels through infilling."

- 0% chose Option 2 “Restoration to a lower level through partial infilling or no infilling.”

- 94% chose Option 3 “Site specific approach.”

1.139 Stakeholders note that each development has different characteristics and faces different challenges, and therefore a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate. Some stakeholders raise concern about the pressures on the availability of suitable restoration material.

Restoration ‘Site Restoration and Enhancement’

1.140 Of the 14 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Restoration ‘Site Restoration and Enhancement’:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Retain the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 approach to the form, content, and structure of the restoration policies for quarry sites.”

- 57% chose Option 2 “Adopt a policy approach based on the type of land-use.”

- 43% chose Option 3 “Adopt a policy approach based on landform and biodiversity net gain.”

1.141 Stakeholders want other environmental, social and land-use objectives to be considered alongside biodiversity net-gain.

Climate Change

1.142 Of the 16 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Climate Change:

- 12.5% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”

- 12.5% chose Option 2 “Broad environmental protection policy approach.”

- 19% chose Option 3 “Climate change mitigation policy approach.”

- 56% chose Option 4 “Development-specific climate change policies approach.”

1.143 Stakeholders emphasised the importance of climate change and Surrey County Council’s declaration of a climate emergency. Some stakeholders want the downstream impact of hydrocarbon development to be considered to establish its acceptability in the context of climate change.

Air Quality

1.144 Of the 17 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Air Quality:

- 23% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”

- 12% chose Option 2 “Broad environmental protection policy approach.”

- 18% chose Option 3 “Single air quality mitigation policy approach.”

- 47% chose Option 4 “Development-specific air quality policies approach.”

1.145 It is important to stakeholders that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan provides clear and comprehensive policy that sets high standards and provides a balanced approach.

Water

1.146 Of the 16 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Water:

- 25% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 19% chose Option 2 “Single water environment protection policy approach.”
- 56% chose Option 3 “Separate water quality and resources policy and flood risk management policy approach.”

1.147 Some stakeholders note that there are significant differences between the impacts of minerals and waste management development in respect of food risk and water quality and so separate policies addressing each topic would be more appropriate.

Land and Soils

1.148 Of the 16 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Land and Soils:

- 31% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 6% chose Option 2 “Single land and soils protection policy approach.”
- 63% chose Option 3 “Development-specific land and soil protection policies approach.”

1.149 Stakeholders recognise that minerals and waste management development may, having regard to their nature and scale, pose differing levels of risk to land and soils.

Nature

1.150 Of the 12 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Nature:

- 0% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 17% chose Option 2 “Single nature and biodiversity policy approach.”
- 58% chose Option 3 “Separate nature protection and biodiversity net gain policies approach.”
- 25% chose Option 4 “Single strategic nature protection policy approach.”

1.151 Stakeholders recognise that nature conservation and biodiversity net-gain are separate but related issues which should be distinguished in policy pursued for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Landscape and Townscape

1.152 Of the 15 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Landscape and Townscape:

- 13% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 53% chose Option 2 “Single landscape and townscape policy approach.”
- 33% chose Option 3 “Single strategic landscape and townscape policy approach.”

1.153 Stakeholders are concerned about the impact minerals and waste management development can have on protected landscapes. Stakeholders advocate a policy approach that reflects National planning policy.

Heritage

1.154 Of the 11 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Heritage:

- 18% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 36% chose Option 2 “Single historic environment policy approach.”
- 18% chose Option 3 “Separate policies approach.”
- 27% chose Option 4 “Single strategic landscape and townscape policy approach.”

1.155 Stakeholders favour a policy approach that deals with landscape/townscape separately to heritage matters. Stakeholders want to have more involvement in decisions that may impact local heritage.

Movement and Access

1.156 Of the 16 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Movement and Access:

- 31% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 38% chose Option 2 “Two policy approach.”
- 31% chose Option 3 “Three policy approach.”

1.157 Stakeholders emphasised the significant adverse impacts of Heavy Goods Vehicles associated with minerals and waste management development may have on the environment and human health. There is widespread support for alternative methods of transport over road transport. Some stakeholders advocate for minerals and waste management development to be limited to sites with direct access to the strategic road network.

Communities

1.158 Of the 14 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Communities:

- 50% chose Option 1 “Maintain the established policy approach.”
- 21% chose Option 2 “Multiple policy approach.”
- 29% chose Option 3 “Single strategic policy approach.”

1.159 Stakeholders are concerned about the impact minerals and waste management development can have on human health, amenity, and the environment. Some stakeholders note a disproportionate burden of minerals and waste management development on communities in the north-west of the county. Others are concerned about the industrialisation the countryside and the impact this may have on rural communities.

Aggregate, Minerals and Infrastructure

Sharp Sand and Gravel

1.160 Of the 12 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Sharp Sand and Gravel:

- 67% chose Option 1 “Continue to meet the 7-year landbank required with sales at 0.34 million tonnes per annum.”
- 0% chose Option 2 “Continue to meet the 7-year landbank required with sales at 0.39 million tonnes per annum.”
- 33% chose Option 3 “Continue to meet the 7-year landbank required with sales at 0.59 million tonnes per annum.”

1.161 Stakeholders note that the higher rate of 0.59 million tonnes per annum is closer to the Local Aggregates Assessment rate. Some stakeholders stress the importance of recycled and secondary aggregate in meeting demand. Some stakeholders are concerned about Surrey’s sharp sand and gravel reserves being depleted owing to significant development pressures.

Soft Sand

1.162 Of the 12 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Soft Sand:

- 50% chose Option 1 “Continue to meet the 7-year landbank figure with sales at 0.4 million tonnes per annum.”
- 8% chose Option 2 “Continue to meet the 7-year landbank figure with sales at 0.456 million tonnes per annum.”
- 42% chose Option 3 “Continue to meet the 7-year landbank figure with sales at 0.57 million tonnes per annum.”

1.163 Some stakeholders want to see the Minerals and Waste Local Plan provide for soft sand at the lowest possible rate. Others note that recent (past 3-year) soft sand sales are higher than the 10-year average due to increasing development pressures and so the relevant provision rate should increase accordingly. Some stakeholders are concerned about the other areas relying on Surrey's soft sand reserve and the adverse impact this may on Surrey's residents and environment.

Need for Aggregate Recycling Capacity

1.164 Of the 14 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding the Need for Aggregate Recycling Capacity:

- 43% chose Option 1 "An approach that is primarily driven by the need to have sufficient capacity to manage the levels of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste that is expected to arise in Surrey and the surrounding area over the plan period, with targets for recycling and recovery equivalent to those that would have been taken forward in the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019."

- 36% chose Option 2 "An approach that is primarily driven by the need to conserve remaining reserves of primary aggregate (particularly concreting aggregate) by increasing the amount of recycled aggregate produced per year above the 0.9 million tonne target (for 2026) set in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011."

- 21% chose Option 3 "Adopt a hybrid approach that combines the need to increase the resource efficiency of the wider economy with the need to manage remaining reserves of non-renewable mineral resources."

1.165 Stakeholders acknowledge the link between managing construction, demolition, and excavation waste arisings and the production of recycled aggregate at aggregate recycling facilities. There is general support amongst stakeholders for increased rates of recycling over disposal.

The Improvement or Expansion of Existing Aggregate Recycling Facilities

1.166 Of the 11 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding the Improvement of Expansion of Existing Aggregate Recycling Facilities:

- 9% chose Option 1 "Provide for the general improvement or expansion of waste management facilities (including aggregate recycling facilities) through a policy like Policy 8 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019."

- 73% chose Option 2 "Provide for the improvement or expansion of aggregate recycling facilities with stipulating criteria which relevant development proposals would have to meet."

- 18% chose Option 3 "Do not provide for the improvement or expansion of aggregate recycling facilities."

1.167 There is general support amongst stakeholders for the improvement of recycling facilities in recognition of their support for increased rates of recycling over disposal.

Location of new temporary and permanent aggregate recycling facilities

1.168 Of the 12 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to the Location of New Temporary and Permanent Aggregate Recycling Facilities:

- 33% chose Option 1 "Provide for the identified need for recycling of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste and production of recycled aggregate by allocating land to be developed as permanent facilities."
- 17% chose Option 2 "Maintain the current Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 approach (Policy 3), with a significant proportion (circa 62%) of aggregate recycling capacity provided by temporary facilities located on land within established mineral workings."
- 50% chose Option 3 "Adopt a hybrid approach that combines elements of options one and two to enable the development of a small number of new permanent Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste recycling hubs supplemented by temporary facilities on suitable land which may include mineral workings."

1.169 Stakeholders note that as aggregate recycling and recycled aggregate is a permanent feature of sustainable waste management it is important that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan seeks to preserve or otherwise safeguard existing facilities and provide for new permanent facilities.

Need to Safeguard Existing Rail Aggregate Depots

1.170 Of the 19 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to the Need to Safeguard Rail Aggregate Depots:

- 47% chose Option 1 "Continue to safeguard existing rail aggregate depots as per Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011."
- 53% chose Option 2 "Encourage the relocation of existing rail aggregate depots to locations more suitable to industrial land-uses and activities. Areas of search for new facilities to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan."

1.171 Some stakeholders stress the importance of safeguarding existing Rail Aggregate Depots, the 'agent of change' principle set out in National planning policy and ensuring that new development does not prejudice or adversely impact existing businesses or facilities. Many stakeholders raise concern about the location and impacts of Woking Rail Aggregates Depot and advocate for its relocation out of Woking Town Centre. Others suggest that there is no evidence that there are any suitable alternative locations for Woking Rail Aggregates Depot.

Improvement and Extension of Existing and Enablement of New Rail Aggregate Depots

1.172 Of the 20 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to the Improvement and Extension of Existing and Enablement of New Rail Aggregate Depots:

- 15% chose Option 1 "Encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots."

- 0% chose Option 2 “Don’t encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots.”

- 25% chose Option 3 “Don’t encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots but enable the development of new facilities in locations more suitable to industrial land-uses and activities. Areas of search for new facilities to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

- 60% chose Option 4 “Encourage the improvement and extension of existing rail aggregate depots and enable the development of new facilities in locations more suitable to industrial land-uses and activities. Areas of search for new facilities to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

1.173 Many stakeholders raise concern about the location and impacts of Woking Rail Aggregates Depot and advocate for its relocation out of Woking Town Centre. Others suggest that there is no evidence that there are any suitable alternative locations for Woking Rail Aggregates Depot. Some stakeholders stress the importance of continuing to safeguard Woking Rail Aggregates Depot. Others acknowledge that rail aggregate depots need not be incompatible with other types of development including housing. Some stakeholders want the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to identify new potential locations for rail aggregate depots in preferably in industrial areas. There is general support amongst stakeholders for increased reliance on rail over road, particularly with a likely future reliance on imports.

Silica Sand

1.174 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Silica Sand:

- 57% chose Option 1 “Safeguard existing silica sand quarries and any previously identified extensions to their permitted areas of extraction to deliver as close to the 10-year landbank required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 as possible over the plan period.”

- 43% chose Option 2 “Safeguard existing silica sand quarries and any previously identified extensions to their permitted areas of extraction and allocate new land to be worked for silica sand to meet the 10-year landbank required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 over the plan period. Allocated sites to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

- 0% chose Option 3 “Safeguard existing silica sand quarries and any previously identified extensions to their permitted areas of extraction and identify areas of search within which new silica sand quarries could be developed to meet the 10-year landbank required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 over the plan period.”

1.175 Some stakeholders suggest that a hybrid of Options 2 and 3 would be the preferred approach to silica sand. Some stakeholders want to see the Minerals and Waste Local Plan provide certainty by safeguarding existing silica sand sites and known resources.

Brick Clay

1.176 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Brick Clay:

- 50% chose Option 1 “Safeguard existing brick clay resources.”
- 12.5% chose Option 2 “Safeguard existing brick clay resources, enable extensions to existing quarries, and encourage the recommissioning of dormant clay quarries.”
- 37.5% chose Option 3 “Safeguard existing brick clay resources and encourage the recommissioning of dormant clay quarries.”

1.177 Stakeholders acknowledge that developing existing quarries may be less damaging to the environment than providing for new quarries. Some stakeholders questioned whether energy-intensive bricks are a sustainable building material and whether these can be produced in a low-carbon way.

Chalk

1.178 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Chalk:

- 50% chose Option 1 “Maintain an approach consistent with that set out in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policy MC10), that is a presumption against chalk extraction, no safeguarding of wider chalk resources, and safeguarding of the single existing chalk quarry in Surrey.”
- 50% chose Option 2 “A presumption against new chalk extraction and safeguard wider chalk resources for potential future need and the single existing chalk quarry in Surrey.”

1.179 No overriding themes were identified as part of stakeholder responses.

Fuller’s Earth

1.180 Of the 7 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Fuller’s Earth:

- 57% chose Option 1 “Maintain an approach consistent with that set out in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policies MC6 and MC10), that is a presumption against the extraction of fuller’s earth and safeguarding of fuller’s earth resources.”
- 43% chose Option 2 “A presumption against extraction of fuller’s earth with no provision for safeguarding fuller’s earth resources.”

1.181 No overriding themes were identified as part of stakeholder responses.

Peat

1.182 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Peat:

- 75% chose Option 1 “Confirm the presumption against new peat extraction sites as per the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.”
- 0% chose Option 2 “Do not include a specific reference to peat in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, but instead rely on the presumption against new peat extraction sites as per the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.”

- 25% chose Option 3 “Set out Surrey-specific reasons for resisting proposals for peat extraction, in addition to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 presumption against such development and identify those areas of land within the county requiring specific policy protection in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

1.183 There is widespread support amongst stakeholders against the extraction and use of peat in Surrey.

Building Stone

1.184 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Building Stone:

- 33% chose Option 1 “Maintain an approach consistent with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policy MC10), that is no specific policy provision in relation to building stone but acknowledge, as per the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the potential future need for the mineral within the context of a generic non-aggregate minerals policy.”

- 67% chose Option 2 “A criteria-based policy for the extraction of building stone, in particular for Bargate Stone. The policy would set out the broad circumstances in which the extraction of building stone may be considered acceptable.”

- 0% chose Option 3 “A criteria-based policy for the extraction of building stone, in particular for Bargate Stone, as well as identify preferred areas for future extraction. Preferred areas are to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

1.185 There is general support amongst stakeholders for the extraction of limited volumes of building stone for use in the maintenance and repair of local buildings.

Conventional Oil or Gas

1.186 Of the 9 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Conventional Oil or Gas:

- 44% chose Option 1 “Maintain an approach consistent with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Policy MC12) covering all stages of conventional hydrocarbon exploration, appraisal, production, and decommissioning and restoration of well sites. This approach would not provide guidance as to how appropriate sites might be identified within each of the Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence areas in Surrey. Licence areas to be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.”

- 56% chose Option 2 “Establish separate policies relevant to each stage of conventional hydrocarbon exploration, appraisal, production, and decommissioning and restoration of well sites. Each separate policy to provide relevant guidance and criteria. Further policies could be established to identify Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence areas in Surrey and provide guidance for each area with respect to the identification of suitable well site locations.”

1.187 There is general support amongst stakeholders for the provision of separate policies for each stage of hydrocarbon development. Many stakeholders want hydrocarbon development phased out given the 15-year plan period and the likely direction of associated Government policy.

Unconventional Oil or Gas

1.188 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Unconventional Oil or Gas:

- 25% chose Option 1 "An approach tied explicitly to the extant Government position with reference to the development of unconventional hydrocarbon resources. This would allow for the possibility of unconventional oil and gas development in the future should the Government lift the relevant moratorium."

- 75% chose Option 2 "An approach that takes account of the seismic sensitivity demonstrated in Surrey by the recent Newdigate sequence of earth tremors, and of the thresholds previously used to require the cessation of hydraulic fracturing operations at Preese Hall in Lancashire, to establish an evidence-based moratorium on the development of unconventional oil and gas resources in Surrey for the entirety of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period."

1.189 There is widespread concern amongst stakeholders that fracking (and other stimulation methods) being employed to extract oil and gas in Surrey. There is general agreement amongst stakeholders that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should not provide for any unconventional hydrocarbon development.

Underground Storage

1.190 Of the 10 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Underground Storage:

- 20% chose Option 1 "An approach that provides for the underground storage of natural gas in suitable geological structures in Surrey."

- 80% chose Option 2 "An approach that provides for the underground storage of natural gas or carbon dioxide in suitable geological structures in Surrey."

1.191 Stakeholders are concerned as to whether underground storage of gas can be achieved safely.

Waste Management

Waste Management Facilities

1.192 Of the 9 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Waste Management Facilities:

- 11% chose Option 1 "A single policy providing environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria specific to the provision of each type of waste management facility."

- 11% chose Option 2 "A single policy providing general environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria relevant to all types of waste

management facilities. The policy could include a range of different sub-categories providing limited guidance relevant to each type of waste management facility."

- 78% chose Option 3 "Either Option 1 or Option 2 above, with a sub-policy which allocates specific land or identifies areas of search for general or specific types of waste management facilities."

1.193 Stakeholders want the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to provide certainty about the location of future waste management facilities. Many stakeholders want to have a greater say about waste management development in their communities.

Wastewater Treatment

1.194 Of the 8 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Wastewater Treatment:

- 12.5% chose Option 1 "A policy like Policy 12 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 and make no strategic provision for wastewater treatment facilities."

- 0% chose Option 2 "A single policy providing general environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria relevant to all waste management facilities. The policy could include a range of different sub-categories providing limited guidance relevant to wastewater treatment facilities."

- 87.5% chose Option 3 "Either Option 1 or Option 2 above, with a sub-policy which allocates specific land or identifies areas of search for general or specific waste management facilities including wastewater treatment facilities."

1.195 Many stakeholders are concerned about water quality and pollution because of wastewater being discharged to rivers following heavy rainfall events.

Deposit of Waste to Land

1.196 Of the 12 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding the Deposit of Waste to Land:

- 17% chose Option 1 "Continue with the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019 approach of providing for separate and specific policies for the disposal of waste to land and the recovery of waste to land."

- 8% chose Option 2 "A single policy providing environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria specific to the provision of new deposit of waste to land capacity."

- 25% chose Option 3 "A single policy providing general environmental, amenity, need, and locational guidance and criteria relevant to all waste management facilities. The policy could include a range of different sub-categories providing limited guidance relevant to deposit to land facilities."

- 50% chose Option 4 "Either Option 1 or 3 above, with a sub-policy which allocates specific land or identifies areas of search for general or specific waste management facilities including deposit of waste to land."

1.197 Stakeholders acknowledge the difference between recovery and disposal and want to see the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority provide certainty and sufficient control relating to both forms of deposit of waste to land. Some stakeholders stress the importance of a continuing decline in the amount of waste disposed to landfill. Other stakeholders are concerned about engineering developments diverting suitable material away from mineral restoration schemes.

Identifying Land for Waste Management Development

1.198 Of the 13 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option regarding Identifying Land for Waste Management Development:

- 23% chose Option 1 “An approach which allocates land for specific waste management uses the acceptability of which is to be determined at the planning application stage based on criteria-based policy and need.”
- 8% chose Option 2 “An approach which identifies areas of search, with specific waste management uses to be determined at the planning application stage based on criteria-based policy and need.”
- 61% chose Option 3 “A combined approach which includes a combination of Option 1 and Option 2 above.”
- 8% chose Option 4 “Adopt a criteria-based policy approach only with no allocations or areas of search”.

1.199 Many stakeholders do not want the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to allocate any waste sites in the Green Belt. Some stakeholders note that any new waste management facilities should be based on a demonstrable need that cannot be satisfied by existing facilities.

Calculating Need for Waste Management Development

1.200 A total of 5 stakeholders who responded to “Calculating Need for Waste Management Development”: 80% agreed and 20% disagreed with the targets proposed for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders consider that the proposed targets lack ambition. Some stakeholders note that the Waste Capacity Needs Assessment 2019 requires updating. Some stakeholders emphasise the importance of preventing waste and the circular economy.

Safeguarding

Safeguarding Minerals Resources

1.201 Of the 5 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Safeguarding Mineral Resources:

- 60% chose Option 1 “An approach broadly consistent with Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 by retaining Minerals Safeguarding Areas as currently defined.”
- 40% chose Option 2 “An approach that provides for the safeguarding of the County’s remaining reserves of potentially exploitable mineral resources in terms of: sharp sand and gravel; soft sand (outside the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding

Natural Beauty); brick clay; and silica sand. Minerals Safeguarding Areas would be defined based on the geological resource as identified by the British Geological Survey."

1.202 Some stakeholders advocate mineral resources should be safeguarded in a manner that is consistent with National planning policy and guidance, and that mineral resources within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be included within Mineral Safeguarding Areas

Safeguarding Minerals Development

1.203 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Safeguarding Minerals Development:

- 0% chose Option 1 "An approach broadly consistent with Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011."

- 100% chose Option 2 "An approach that provides for the safeguarding of existing minerals development, including but not limited to, processing facilities, aggregate recycling facilities, rail aggregate depots, brickworks and tileworks, and provides for the protection of land identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan as suitable these uses. The policy would also provide for the protection of the viability of existing minerals development."

1.204 Some stakeholders want Mineral Consultation Areas around safeguarded facilities to go beyond site boundaries to ensure that Local Planning Authorities and applicants consult the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority about relevant development proposals. Some stakeholders want to see Woking and Salfords Rail Aggregate Depots to be identified and safeguarded by the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Other stakeholders want to see the relocation of Woking Rail Aggregates Depot to an alternative suitable location.

Safeguarding Waste Management Development

1.205 Of the 6 stakeholders who selected a proposed policy option relating to Safeguarding of Waste Management Development:

- 66% chose Option 1 "An approach broadly consistent with Policy 7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019."

- 34% chose Option 2 "A two-policy approach - the first dealing with safeguarding of land that may be suitable for waste management development, existing waste management facilities, and land that benefits from consent for waste management development; and the second dealing with the protection of the viability of existing waste management facilities."

1.206 There is broad support amongst stakeholders for an approach that is consistent with Policy 7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan. Some stakeholders note the importance of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan not imposing any tighter constraints on non-waste development than are set out in National planning policy and guidance. Some stakeholders stress the key requirements of the National planning policy in respect of safeguarding existing business and facilities, and the importance of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan being robust and explicit about the physical boundaries safeguarded site or facilities and the associated requirements for new development.

Duty to Cooperate Statement

1.207 Some stakeholders are concerned about whether it is sustainable to move minerals and waste from one area of the country to another mainly by road. Some stakeholders note that the depletion of sand and gravel resources may become an issue towards the end of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period. Others are concerned about the expansion of Heathrow Airport and the implications this may have on the capacity of local waste management facilities.

Position Statements

1.208 When asked for feedback on the usefulness of the position statements, 4 stakeholders answered all providing a score of 3 out of 5. In respect of the Climate Change Statement stakeholders note that this is a fast-moving subject and suggest that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan needs to provide flexibility in this regard. Some stakeholders want to see the Minerals and Waste Local Plan stressing the urgency and seriousness of the climate change emergency and a commitment to facilitating net zero by 2050. In respect of the Restoration and Enhancement Statement some stakeholders want to see the Minerals and Waste Local Plan align with the forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy; and consider rights of way particularly in terms of their preservation, maintenance, and enhancement. In relation to the Circular Economy Statement stakeholders want to see clearer links between climate change and the circular economy and suggest that the Minerals and Waste Local plan should seek to facilitate the transition to a zero-waste economy and address the impacts of climate change.

Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal

1.209 Seven (7) stakeholders engaged with the question: “Are the sustainability objectives and impact pathways identified for each topic area covered in the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal scoping report adequately?”.

- 14% agreed that the objectives and impacts pathways are covered adequately.
- 86% disagreed that the objectives and impacts pathways are covered adequately.

1.210 Some stakeholders did not consider that air and noise pollution and flooding had been adequately addressed. Some stakeholders suggested that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan should favour aggregates recycling over the extraction of primary materials.

Equality Impact Assessment

1.211 One (1) stakeholder engaged with the question: “How useful did you find the Equalities Impact Assessment?” providing a score of 2 out of 5.

Interactive Story Map

1.212 Of the 16 stakeholders who engaged with the question “How useful did you find the Story Map?”:

- 12.5% scored 1 out of 5
- 25% scored 2 out of 5.
- 25% scored 3 out of 5.
- 25% scored 4 out of 5.
- 12.5% scored 5 out of 5.

Site Nominations

1.213 The Issues and Options public consultation included a call for sites exercise inviting landowners to nominate land in the county that may be suitable for future minerals or waste management development. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority received 14 mineral site nominations and 10[1] waste site nominations. Further detail relating the relevant site nominations can be found in Appendix L attached to this report.

1.214 The nominated sites, excepting the Coalman Haulage Yard which already benefits from a lawful storage and distribution land-use, will be assessed by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority as part of one or more site identification and evaluation processes. The results of these processes will inform the preparation of the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the relevant identification and evaluation reports will be published as part of the associated public consultation in June 2023.

[1] Edited 10th March 2023 to include three additional waste site nominations that were overlooked in error.