

Minerals & Waste Core Strategies

Joint Technical Evidence Paper

WCS-MCS-2

Links with Districts & Neighbouring
Authorities

Living Draft

November 2007

Contact Details for Gloucestershire County Council

Minerals & Waste Planning Policy:
Tel: 01452 425704
m&wplans@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Minerals & Waste Development Control:
Tel: 01452 425704

Waste Management Unit:
Tel: 01452 426601

 **Council Direct:**
Tel: 01452 505345

Contents

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Gloucestershire County Council

Section 3: Gloucestershire Authorities

Section 4: Appropriate Neighbouring Authorities Plans & Local Development Frameworks

Section 5: Conclusion

Appendix 1: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Cheltenham Borough Council.

Appendix 2: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Cotswold District Council

Appendix 3: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Forest of Dean District Council

Appendix 4: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Gloucester City Council

Appendix 5: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Stroud District Council

Appendix 6: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Tewkesbury Borough Council

Appendix 7: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & Wiltshire County Council

Appendix 8: Notes of meeting between Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy & South Gloucestershire / North Somerset

Section 1

Introduction

1. The purpose of this report is to detail Local Development Framework (LDF) progress and levels of joint working between Gloucestershire County Council as Minerals Planning Authority and Waste Planning Authority and Districts (within Gloucestershire) and Neighbouring Authorities (to Gloucestershire). Detailed notes of meetings are contained in the appendices.
2. The new Planning System requires Planning Authorities to clearly identify the links between the Development Plan Documents (DPDs) it is responsible for and other DPDs or plans produced by other Local Authorities that may have an impact on its implementation.
3. In the case of Gloucestershire, the County Council is responsible for the production of a Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF), and the six district authorities within the County are responsible for the production of their own respective LDFs.
4. The district councils of Gloucestershire are all at different stages in terms of the production of their LDFs, and likewise the timescales for the production of the County's MWDF differs from district council timescales.
5. This report aims to identify the stage each local authority in the County is at and the links between LDFs and the MWDF at a point in time. In addition, this report will also consider appropriate neighbouring authority LDF documents.

Section 2

Gloucestershire County Council



See: www.goucestershire.gov.uk

6. The Gloucestershire Minerals Local Plan was adopted in April 2003. The Gloucestershire Waste Local Plan was adopted in October 2004. Both plans are currently saved although a number of policies have not been saved (See the Minerals & Waste Planning Policy webpages for further details).
7. The Gloucestershire Structure Plan Second Review was adopted in November 1999. In April 2005, the County Council received a Direction from the Secretary of State regarding policies SC.2, SC.3 and SD.9 of the Structure Plan Third Alteration. A cross-party statement was read out at the 8th April County Council meeting. Subsequent to this, GOSW has been contacted with the final intention of the County Council regarding the Structure Plan Third Alteration. In a letter sent 18th July 2005 it was explained that, due to the Secretary of State Direction, the Plan should not be progressed to adoption. The Plan's policies will still remain as 'material considerations' until superseded by the South West Regional Spatial Strategy, due to be adopted in 2008.
8. Gloucestershire County Council adopted its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in December 2005. This detailed how communities would be able to participate in

MWDF plan preparation and the determination of planning applications.

9. In September 2006 Gloucestershire County Council adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) *Waste Minimisation in Development Projects* in September 2006. All local authorities in Gloucestershire are 'signed up' to this SPD and all participated to some degree in its production.

10. Work is progressing on a Minerals Core Strategy (MCS) and a Waste Core Strategy (WCS) and the Issues and Options stages have been completed. The Preferred Options consultation will take place over a 6 week period commencing on the 31st January 2008. Both these DPDs are programmed for adoption in December 2009.

Section 3

Gloucestershire Authorities



Cheltenham Borough Council

See: www.cheltenham.gov.uk

11. Cheltenham Borough Council Local Plan was adopted in June 2006. The Plan was the subject of a High Court Challenge in respect of an omissions site. The Plan and its policies will remain 'valid' for a period of three years post its adoption. As of January 2007, Cheltenham Borough Council had adopted two SPDs and four Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans, none of which have a direct link to the Minerals or Waste LDF. The authority has an adopted SCI.

12. The urban area of Cheltenham is identified as a Strategically Significant Town in the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) June 2006. Cheltenham Borough makes up the majority of this area. The strategy of the RSS is to concentrate significant levels of development at such settlements, and Cheltenham Borough council will be addressing issues arising through such a strategy in forthcoming DPDs.

13. Officers from Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy met with officers from Cheltenham Borough Council on the 1st November 2006. The notes of this meeting can be found in Appendix 1.



Cotswold District Council

See: www.cotswold.gov.uk

14. Cotswold District Council adopted the Cotswold Local Plan in April 2006, and the Plan and its policies will remain 'valid' for a period of three years post its adoption.

15. The Cotswold Local Development Scheme (March 2006) identifies the work program for the Cotswold LDF process for the following three years. It is evident that some reliance will be placed on the Policies of the Adopted Local Plan within that time.

16. The Adopted Statement of Community Involvement (January 2007) identifies Gloucestershire County Council as a statutory consultee on all LDF documentation. This will help ensure that all necessary links between Cotswold District and County Council DPDs can be clearly established and set out.

17. A Kingshill Master Plan SPD is proposed for adoption in the near future, which will guide the development of a significant area of Cirencester over the coming years. This development has clear links with the Adopted Waste Minimisation SPD, and the County Council have advised Cotswold District Council in this respect (need to check that waste minimisation is included).

18. The Draft RSS proposes a very similar level of growth to that proposed in the Adopted Gloucestershire Structure Plan Second Review. The Upper Thames Valley Minerals Resource spans the boundaries of Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Oxfordshire. More significantly, the Cotswold Water Park resource area spans the boundaries of Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, encompassing the local authority boundaries of Cotswold District, North Wiltshire District and Swindon Borough. Policy UT.1 of the Adopted Cotswold Local Plan is concerned with the Water Park, and outlines the circumstances in which development in the Water park might be considered appropriate.

19. Officers from Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy met with officers from Cotswold District Council on the 8th March 2007. The notes of this meeting can be found in Appendix 2.



Forest of Dean
— DISTRICT COUNCIL —

Forest of Dean District Council

See: www.fdean.gov.uk

20. The Forest of Dean Local Plan was adopted in November 2005, and will have a 'shelf life' of 3 years post that date.

21. As of January 2007, the Forest of Dean District Council had a number of DPD ongoing, including the Employment and Tourism DPD

and Housing DPD. The Development Control Policies 1 DPD was also underway, which covers a variety of topics from renewable energy to the re-use of rural buildings.

The Adopted SCI for the Forest of Dean identifies Gloucestershire County Council as a Statutory Consultee. As such the County Council will be invited to comment on all LDF related documentation and major planning applications.

22. The Forest of Dean is identified as a Rural Priority District in the Draft RSS, the aim of which is to improve productivity.

23. Officers from Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy met with officers from Forest of Dean District Council on the 1st March 2007. The notes of this meeting can be found in Appendix 3.



Gloucester City Council

See: www.goucester.gov.uk

24. Gloucester City Council have never adopted a Local Plan.

25. The Council are reasonably well advanced in terms of the LDF. They have a number of DPDs at relatively advanced stages, including the Core Strategy, the Central Area Action Plan and the Site Allocations and Designations (Non-Central Areas) DPDs. They have developed a number of Site Specific Planning Briefs and SPDs.

26. A number of the Central Area Action Plan allocations, and following on, a number of the Site Specific Planning Briefs have an impact on the Adopted Waste Local Plan.

27. The Railway Corridor Allocation/Planning Brief in part covers the 'Railway Triangle', part of which was allocated in the Adopted Waste Local Plan. Part of the area outside of the triangle is currently occupied by a waste operator.

28. The Waste Local Plan allocated land adjacent to the Gasworks on Bristol Road, Gloucester. The Central Area Action Plan Preferred Options paper proposes to allocate this area for employment, which in a general sense would encompass waste uses. The Waste Local Plan also allocated land adjacent to Sudmeadow. Again, this site is allocated as employment land (as opposed to a waste allocation) by Gloucester City Council.

29. Gloucester urban area is identified as a Strategically Significant City in the Draft RSS. As is the case for Cheltenham, Gloucester is proposed as a focus for development, and the administrative area of Gloucester City is proposed to receive a significant level of growth. The urban area of Gloucester is larger than the administrative area, and is proposed to receive a higher level of growth.

30. Officers from Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy met with officers from Gloucester City Council on the 1st November 2006. The notes of this meeting can be found in Appendix 4.



Stroud District Council

See: www.stroud.gov.uk

31. The Stroud District Local Plan was adopted by the Local Authority in November 2005. It was the subject of a High Court Challenge relating to an omissions site. The Local Plan will remain in use for at least 3 years post the date of adoption.

32. The Stroud LDF process is at an early stage of its production. To date, the SCI and LDS have been prepared.

33. Officers from Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy met with officers from Stroud District Council on the 20th March 2007. The notes of this meeting can be found in Appendix 5.



Tewkesbury Borough Council

See: www.tewkesbury.gov.uk

34. Tewkesbury Borough Council adopted the Tewkesbury Local Plan in March 2006. The Plan was the subject of a High Court Challenge relating to an omissions site.

35. To date, Tewkesbury Borough Council have prepared an SCI and LDS, and are in the process of preparing an Area Action Plan for Stoke Orchid.

36. The Draft RSS proposes two significant urban extensions in Gloucestershire, one to Cheltenham and one to Gloucester. The majority of this proposed development, currently around 5,000 dwellings, is within the administrative area of Tewkesbury Borough.

37. Officers from Gloucestershire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning Policy met with officers from Tewkesbury Borough Council on the 8th November 2006. The notes of this meeting can be found in Appendix 6.

Gloucestershire Strategic Partnership

38. The Gloucestershire Strategic Partnership (GSP) is a 'partnership of partnerships', providing the framework within which other partnerships operate. It has 3 main roles:

1. to develop a long-term vision for Gloucestershire
2. to develop an effective Sustainable Community Strategy for Gloucestershire
3. to provide a deliverative forum for exploring new and emerging issues and to recommend ways for taking these forward.

Local Area Agreement

39. The Gloucestershire Local Area Agreement is an agreement between the government and a

partnership of local public and voluntary organisations, led by Gloucestershire County Council through the Gloucestershire Conference.

40. It sets out how local partners will use a range of government funding streams to deliver real improvements in outcomes for local people.

41. Over the past year, partners have worked together to agree a set priorities, based on factual evidence, what local people tell us they want and central government priorities. These form the basis of our LAA, which was agreed with central government in April 2007.

42. LAAs aim to make services more effective and efficient by promoting agencies working together, streamlining funding arrangements, simplifying inspection and reducing bureaucracy.

43. The Gloucestershire LAA is built around five 'blocks'. The development of each block has been led by a countywide thematic partnership. The five blocks, and the partnerships leading their development are:

- Safer and Stronger Communities - Gloucestershire Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership.
- Healthier Communities and Older People - Gloucestershire Healthy Living Partnership.
- Children and Young People - Gloucestershire Children & Young People's Strategic Partnership.
- Economic Development and Enterprise - Gloucestershire First.

- Natural & Built Environment - Environment Partnership being developed.

Sustainable Community Strategy

44. The SCS is a short strategy that outlines the key issues that partners and organisations in Gloucestershire agree they need to address. The SCS sets partners' ambitions for the next 10 years.

45. The SCS does not contain details on specific actions or outcomes - rather these are held in the following documents:

- Gloucestershire Local Area Agreement.
- Action plans of Gloucestershire's main thematic partnerships.
- Children & Young People's Strategic Partnership.
- Documents produced by Gloucestershire First.
- Health & Wellbeing Partnership (being developed).
- Environment Partnership (being developed).
- Gloucestershire Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership.
- Action plans of the 6 district Local Strategic Partnerships.

- Other action plans of the organisations that make up the Gloucestershire Conference.

46. Linkages with the Minerals and Waste planning documents and the Community Strategy were discussed with the Gloucestershire Strategic Partnership team in 2004 following the advent of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The relationship between the Community Strategy and the Local Area Agreement has been (and is) an iterative one. A meeting was held between planning officers and the Sustainable Community Project Team on 20th November 2006. Matters for discussion included the changes/review of the Community Strategy into the 'Sustainable' Community Strategy, and mechanisms for linkages to emerging minerals and waste planning documents. Principal amongst this was incorporation of minerals and waste matters with the LAA. These matters have continued to be reviewed through the completion of the SCS.

Section 4 Appropriate Neighbouring Authority LDFs

47. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 places a greater requirement on local authorities to have greater consideration of plans and policies of neighbouring authorities. Where appropriate, cross working is encouraged.

South Gloucestershire Council

48. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted in May 2002 (See more detailed notes in Appendix 8 on LDF progress, and links to minerals and waste issues in Gloucestershire).

Wiltshire County Council

49. The Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals Local Plan was adopted in November 2001. The Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Local Plan was adopted by Wiltshire County Council and Swindon Borough Council in March 2005. It is a statutory element of the Development Plan for Wiltshire and Swindon and will be relevant to all waste related development proposals. The WLP sets out the waste planning framework for Wiltshire and Swindon for the period to 2011, a framework made up of 27 Preferred Area allocations and 24 waste planning policies. In relation to the LDF process, replacing local plans, see more detailed notes in Appendix 7.

West of England Partnership

50. The West of England Partnership consists of four unitary authorities - Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES), Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire - and a range of social, economic and environmental partners. A jointly produced Waste Strategy is being prepared. It is due to be published in 2008. Gloucestershire County Council has been consulted on this document and officers have attended some of the workshop events in connection with this document.

North Wiltshire District Council

51. North Wiltshire District Council Adopted the North Wiltshire Local Plan in June 2006. This Plan will be valid for a period of three years post adoption.

52. The Adopted LDS for North Wiltshire is currently under review, and the production of the Core Strategy has been postponed until such a time that the revisions to the LDS have been agreed. The soon to be adopted SCI identifies Gloucestershire County Council as an authority which will be consulted on the LDF.

53. As outlined in Section 2, under Cotswold District Council, North Wiltshire administrative area contains part of the Cotswold Water Park. Policy NE8 of the Adopted North Wiltshire Local Plan is concerned with the beneficial after use and protection of areas of the Water Park.

Swindon Borough Council

54. The Swindon Borough Local Plan was adopted in July 2006. While the Cotswold Water Park encroaches into Swindon Borough, there appears not to be any specific reference to the Water Park in the Local Plan. The issue of the Water Park is covered in the Wiltshire Minerals and Waste Local Plans, and the Wiltshire Structure Plan.

55. The Swindon SCI identifies Gloucestershire County Council as an authority that will be consulted throughout the production of LDF documents. To date, none of the DPDs / SPDs have a direct relationship with minerals or waste issues.

Herefordshire Council

56. The Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan was adopted on 23rd March 2007 and will guide development within the County until 2011. 57. The Plan contains a range of policies concerned with minerals and waste. The UDP will be saved for a period of three years post adoption. The LDF process in Herefordshire is in its infancy.

Monmouthshire County Council

58. The Monmouthshire UDP was adopted in June 2006. The UDP covers the areas of minerals and waste planning policy for Monmouthshire.

Section 5 Conclusion

59. This Joint Technical Evidence paper has briefly considered Local Development Framework (LDF) progress and levels of joint working between Gloucestershire County Council as Minerals Planning Authority and Waste Planning Authority and Districts (within Gloucestershire) and Neighbouring Authorities (to Gloucestershire). The detailed notes of partnership working meeting are contained in the appendices.

Appendix 1. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Cheltenham Borough Council / 1st November 2006

Attendees:

Cheltenham Borough Council

Tracey Crews (TC)
Holly Jones (HJ)
Holly Jones (HJ)
Claire Purcell (CP)

Gloucestershire County Council

Kevin Phillips (KP)
Nick Croft (NC)
David Ingleby (DI)
Jess Peacey (JP)

UPDATE ON CURRENT POSITION WITH LDF DOCUMENTS: CHELTENHAM BC DPDS:

3 Development Plan Documents due next year, namely:

- Core Strategy
- Employment
- Housing

A slight delay has been experienced on the production of the above DPDs this is due to CBC's insistence that a Green Belt (GB) review was necessary in order to provide a good evidence base for Employment and Housing DPDs. Attention was drawn to the fact that the Green Belt review should have due regard to PPS10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management. GOSW wanted employment land document produced but CBC argued that this was not possible without the Green Belt review document being produced, this was eventually agreed, consequently the following evidence base studies are being undertaken:

- Green Belt review, land audit being prepared.
- Comparative site study for allocations.
- Retail study.

The following three Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are due for consultation in November 2006:

- Shop fronts design guide.
- Local index of buildings of local importance.
- Cheltenham Central and Swindon Village Conservation Area Appraisal.

In line with the Statement of Community Involvement strong emphasis has been placed upon raising awareness via electronic sources i.e. e-mailshots, however the conventional methods are still employed without much variation.

Discussions have taken place with Tewkesbury Borough Council in respect of a joint Area Action Plan (AAP) for planned urban extension at North West Cheltenham proposed in the draft RSS. Following discussion in respect of capacity and resources to facilitate this AAP, the two authorities have reached agreement that commencement on this DPD is not realistic in 2006. This will be re-addressed in the review of Cheltenham's and Tewkesbury's LDS in 2007 and will be informed by best practice arising from DPD preparation by the two authorities and elsewhere to bring forward a realistic timetable.

WASTE PLANNING AUTHORITY – WASTE CORE STRATEGY:

The consultation on the Issues and Options paper for the Waste Core Strategy is drawing to a close; it appears that greener issues have come out at the forefront. We have now entered the stage of addressing each of the issues, which have been put forward, then the key stage of the Preferred Options paper shall be formed, and a consultation for that is likely to take place in the Spring 2007.

There has been a disappointingly low number of responses received, but CBC were thanked for providing a prompt and complete response. A greater number of representations are expected once consultation is undertaken on the Site Allocations DPD.

The GOSW response to the WCS I&O paper strongly encourages linkages between district councils and working partnerships in order to provide a fully integrated approach to delivering mixed sustainable communities, specifically the review of the GB will offer the opportunity to locate facilities closer to Gloucester and Cheltenham.

Action - NC to provide TC with GOSW response and revised LDS.

MINERALS PLANNING AUTHORITY – MINERALS CORE STRATEGY:

Last month the Issues and Options paper for the Minerals Core Strategy was put out for consultation, the deadline for receiving response is 17th November.

Use of recycled materials as aggregates in construction should be supported and further explored i.e. as at GCHQ and GLOSCAT. We need to develop an appropriate policy framework to safeguard mineral resources and to prevent sterilisation. However, overall there is not too much relevance to this meeting.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL:

Minerals Core Strategy Issues & Options SA Report currently out for consultation. Responses have been received on the Waste Core Strategy Issues & Options SA Report, with GOSW raising a few issues that we will address in our meeting with them on 17th November.

GCC have started an Appropriate Assessment process; we have just sent out a report to Natural England (and a number of other stakeholders) Further AA Reports will be produced for each stage of the DPD process.

GCC's SA Reports are done in-house but peer reviewed by Riki Therivel and generally this seems to work quite well. Cheltenham might consider a similar line of approach.

Action - TC was keen to get details of Riki Therivel as an assessor of in-house Sustainability Appraisals, DI to provide further detail.

SPATIAL APPROACH – FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS:

The current Cabinet for CBC is of a Conservative make-up and a main priority is waste management / minimisation. The Local Development Framework is overseen by the LDF Board, which comprises of the CSP, leader of the Council, relevant divisions of the Council (i.e. Business Partner manager, Community Partner Manager) and key stakeholders. Approximately four meetings per annum occur, the next meeting is on 4th December.

Action – TC to arrange for KP/NC to attend as representatives for GCC in respect of waste minimisation issues.

INTEGRATION OF WASTE USES WITH NEW DEVELOPMENTS:

Co-locating waste facilities on industrial estates should be explored/promoted, however market fluctuations do prevent proper predictions on the size or throughput of facilities. Co-location of waste recycling facilities with businesses that use the materials is a key issue that we can progress jointly. Those using B2 employment land have the most potential.

LIKELY NEED FOR NEW WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES SURROUNDING CHELTENHAM:

Although GCC is still working on the Preferred Options paper, it has become apparent that a high number of responses preferred the provision of dispersed facilities for the management of green, kitchen and biodegradable waste. KP pointed out that the waste policy in the RSS provided for a hierarchy of location, importance was placed upon strategically significant areas and towns.

GREEN BELT PROPOSALS AROUND CHELTENHAM:

A significant amount of land between Cheltenham and Gloucester is part of the GB in Gloucestershire, consequently this may restrict opportunities for waste management facilities however, a key objective of PPS10 is to *protect green belts but recognise the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities*. In doing so there is a need to consider the *wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management*. Essentially this suggests that identification of waste management facilities receives an 'amber' light, although the loss of GB land should be compensated for, this is in part the principle behind the schemes for redrawing and relocating GB's. CBC is awaiting the results from the Applied Environmental Research Council (AERC) regarding this.

Action – TC to forward copy of results to KP/NC when received.

USE OF EMPLOYMENT SITES FOR WASTE MANAGEMENT USES:

CBC indicates that the main growth sector, as identified in the DTZ report, within Cheltenham is manufacturing, whilst needing to support this part of the economy the identification of employment sites needs to be in a wider context, not just B2 Uses, in order to promote/maintain the development of sustainable communities. GCC stated that greater recognition must be given towards waste management facilities as employers, to which CBC agreed.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT:

Although the government is seeking to achieve a target of 60% of all housing to be located on brownfield sites, GOSW is keen to allocate sites with good linkages i.e. railway lines nearby, for the provision of waste management facilities. A gas works site located on Tewkesbury Rd to the north-west of Cheltenham was highlighted as a potential site for development due to good linkages with a rail line nearby. This is a brownfield site and it is estimated that £20 million would need to be invested to decontaminate the site, consequently the financial viability for potential developers is unlikely to permit such a scheme for purely employment use. It is possible to explore a mixed-use site (with housing) in order to attract potential developers.

COMBINED HEAT AND POWER OPPORTUNITIES:

Renewable energy is high on CBC agenda and they are keen to look at opportunities to integrate schemes. CHP has been looked at on the Midwinter site in the adopted CLP but urban extensions will provide further opportunities. CBC Members are keen to develop an "exemplar site" in the Borough.

Action - TC to e-mail NC the notes of the SW energy meeting group.

WASTE MINIMISATION SPD:

TC is concerned that a long delay could be experienced if Members will insist on 'tweaking' the WM SPD. In order to speed up the process of endorsing the SPD at District level CBC suggested they prepare a check list to run parallel to the SPD, which should allow for easier interpretation and implementation of the document. It was pointed out that the SPD contained a checklist on pg.6 which sought to fulfil that role.

NEXT MEETING:

To be convened for in the New Year to discuss preferred options for WCS (and MCS where applicable).

Appendix 2. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Cotswold District Council / 8th March 2007

Attendees:

Cotswold District Council:

Nicky Melville (NM)
Sophie Price (SP)
Scott Williams (SW)

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips (KP)
Robin Drake (RD)

INTRODUCTIONS:

(KP) Introduced the purpose of these meetings. We have already met with Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury and have a further meeting arranged with Stroud. Outcomes from these meetings will go into Evidence Reports for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies. This approach had been advocated by GOSW in consultation on the Core Strategies Issues & Options papers.

(KP) informed that he was leading up the Minerals & Waste team: -
Nick Croft was leading on Waste; Robin Drake on Minerals; David Ingleby on SA and AA and other various projects; and one staff vacancy is to be filled.

(NM) introduced Sophie Price who is managing heritage, landscape and leading upon other projects such as the Cotswold Water Park, and Scott Williams who is the new Waste Manager at Cotswold District Council. Chris Vickery is still team leader of Forward Planning at Cotswold. A new member of staff, Tina (?) has recently joined the Forward Planning team on a part-time basis.

UPDATE ON CURRENT POSITION WITH LDF DOCUMENTS:

(NM) CDC have only recently adopted a new Local Plan (April 2006). This will be 'saved' to at least April 2009. Three DPDs are planned; Core Strategy, Site Allocations document, and Generic Development Control Policies document. The current Local Development Scheme (LDS) for Cotswolds identifies the "*Issues & Options*" consultation stage as taking place during Summer 2007. It is planned for this timeframe to be retained?

(KP) Issues and Options papers for the Waste and Minerals Core Strategies have been out for public consultation during 2006 (*WCS from March and the MCS from September*). It is proposed that the "*Preferred Options*" stage for both of these strategies will now take place in January 2008. This timeframe is still to be approved by SoS through a revision to the Minerals & Waste Development Scheme for 2007 to 2010. Other DPDs such as Development Control Policies and Site Allocations are planned for after the Core Strategies. However, the content of the Site Allocations documents will be subject to outcomes of the Core Strategies and may end up in a very different form? Other work that has been progressed includes; the SA Scoping Report, SA Reports for the two Core Strategy Issues & Options papers and an Appropriate Assessment Baseline Report. These projects have been undertaken in-house and peer reviewed by consultants. Future work that is currently being investigated is a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of Minerals & Waste developments in Gloucestershire, although this is at an early stage in terms of what the requirements are for the MCS and WCS.

(KP) Also informed that the adopted MLP and WLP policies are currently "saved" under transitional arrangements until September 2007. Negotiations are now underway with GOSW as to which policies will be saved for a longer period. An application to save the policies for longer is to be made by the end of March 2007. It is anticipated that both the MLP and WLP Sites will then be saved for the foreseeable future until replaced by new DPDs.

SPATIAL APPROACH – FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS:

GENERAL WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES:

(KP) Introduced the WLP site allocations in Cotswolds – Fosse Cross and Moreton-in-Marsh. Also highlighted was the WLP Inspectors criticism of the lack of provision identified in the South of the Cotswold District area. In response the Adopted WLP identifies those sites to the South of the County boundary (Wiltshire / Swindon UA).

(KP) Briefly explained the changing system of waste planning including PPS10, Regional Waste Strategy and emerging RSS and capacity work for each of the waste streams. The Issues & Options Waste Core Strategy papers seek to identify the waste capacity gaps for Gloucestershire. The headline capacity gaps of relevance to the districts relate to MSW and in particular In-Vessel Composting (IVC) (*a capacity gap of around 90,000 tonnes has been identified for the County as of March 2006*) and residual treatment (*a capacity gap of 200,000 tonnes has been identified for the County as of March 2006*). There are also capacity gaps relating to industrial and commercial waste.

(KP) Also informed that the emerging Joint-Municipal Waste Strategy (JMWS), which is being prepared by the County Council, is charged with resolving the MSW capacity gaps and should be one of the key documents to direct the future location of new facilities. The emerging WCS will be focused on the outcomes of the JMWS in terms of MSW.

(KP) Set out that a key strand to the JMWS is the potential development for waste of Javelin Park in Stroud. This site is also allocated in the Waste Local Plan and has recently been subject to a “Call Inquiry” concerning a proposal for warehouse & distribution use. The Secretary of State decision is due in March 2007.

(SW) Investigations underway with Cotswold Waste Collection on future collection strategies particularly in terms of kitchen waste. This will probably be abandoned, as the costs are very prohibitive. At present the estimated cost is over £300,000 per annum to collection around 4,000 tonnes of waste from 36,000 homes across the district.

(SW) CDC is also considering the introduction of the ‘Y Waste Proposal’. This is a project run through the Federation of Small Businesses in partnership with the district council, to facilitate the collection of recyclables from commercial businesses. It involves a collection services with recycling and general waste bags. At present this project is being run in Stroud. However, CDC is in negotiations with local waste operator, Smiths, to roll this out in the Cotswold area.

(RD) Posed a question concerning the general acceptance of CDC to consider the principle of waste on allocated B2 Industrial sites?

(NM) CDC expressed no fundamental policy objection to this. However, stressed that the acceptability of waste will need to be assessed on a site-by-site basis.

(RD) Also asked about future development pressures in the CDC area in the context of sewage treatment capacity.

(NM / SP) The only areas of note were the Cirencester extension at Kingshill and the Cotswold Water Park. The Water Park in particular is experiencing infrastructure pressures such as sewage management, which may need to be looked at. Also the issue of inert waste and infill of worked out mineral sites.

MINERAL ISSUES – MASTER PLAN FOR THE COTSWOLD WATER PARK:

(KP) The County Council has been contacted by Scott Wilson (project consultants) regarding the Water Park Master Plan project. Key concern for GCC is the timescales and how the Minerals Core Strategy can fit with the Master Plan.

(SP) CDC involved in the project through the Joint CWP Committee. There is an Officer / Client Group co-ordinating the Master Plan project. The project is on an expeditious timescale with completion

timetabled for December 2007. It will focus on providing an evidence base for Development Framework's possibly through an Area Action Plan? And governance issues for the Cotswold Water Park area. Its recommendations will be passed on for further work to be carried out by the key stakeholders. GCC representative is Rob Colley who should be in liaison with key staff from the County Council on the project.

MINERAL ISSUES – BUILDING STONE ISSUES:

(SP) Stone slate theft is becoming a big issue for the Cotswolds built heritage. PPG15 requires "direct replacement" of stone slates on listed buildings, which is fuelling the need for this material. A number of historic barn roofs are being stripped, which are increasingly expensive to repair. CDC therefore encourages the MPAs role in ensuring provision is made for natural stone roof tiles. However, are conscious the balance that will need to be achieved between quarrying and environmental / landscape protection particularly where the key resources are within the Cotswold AONB area.

(KP / RD) the Minerals Local Plan includes a natural building stone policy, wherein new proposals must demonstrate a clear need for building stone. Operators must provide information a part of their application that tiling, walling and other building stone products are needed for building conservation purposes. The key issue is whether a more definitive policy link can be made between the resource, provision and building conservation requirements. For example, can need be established for a particular type of natural building stone from a particular resource area?

(SP) Obviously stone from the south of the district is unlikely to be suitable in the north of district for building conservation purposes due to very different colours and textures. However, the divisions between the different resource areas and historic conservation uses are not always that clear and can be quite gradual. Nevertheless, the recently published Local Distinctiveness Study for the Cotswold AONB may provide some assistance. This study has been published through the Cotswold AONB Board.

(KP) One of the key mineral issues for building stone is restoration. As such any future working proposals will need to carefully consider this issue as part of the working programme.

AOB:

(KP) Representations have been made to the RSS concerning aggregate minerals, which affect the Cotswold AONB. However, this is unlikely to be a major issue for the CDC as future working is likely to be focused within the well-established workings already in operation. Furthermore, the adopted MLP has already identified future site allocations to make provision for longer- term reserves.

Appendix 3. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Forest of Dean District Council / 1st March 2007

Attendees:

Forest of Dean District Council:

Nigel Gibbons (NG)

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips (KP)

David Ingleby (DI)

INTRODUCTIONS – WHO DOES WHAT IN EACH TEAM AND BEST CONTACTS:

(KP) Introduced the purpose of these meetings. We have already met with Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury and have got further meetings arranged with Cotswolds and Stroud. Outcomes from these meetings will go into Evidence Reports for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategies.

(NG) He is the best contact for FoD related matters but for SA related work Alistair Chapman would be the best contact.

(KP) Nick Croft leading on Waste Core Strategy, Robin Drake on Minerals, David Ingleby on SA and AA and other various. KP is the contact for any MWDF issues in general. There is a staff vacancy to be filled.

UPDATE ON CURRENT FOD POSITION WITH LDF DOCUMENTS:

(NG) The FoD have been working on another round of Preferred Options – August date likely. GOSW advised that it should include more about housing needs. They are looking again at the main growth areas, including enough detail for a core strategy but not too much as to be inappropriate for the level of plan. In terms of these growth areas there are likely to be major changes in Lydney, Cinderford and also Coleford. Work is progressing with the Cinderford Business Plan. Plans for Lydney are focused on the harbour site.

An Area Action Plan (AAP) is underway for Cinderford. Halcrow have drafted the Issues and Options consultation (ends at the end of March 2007) and then the FoD Council will take up the AAP at the Preferred Options stage.

(KP) KP has already provided input to Halcrow with regard to minerals and waste issues in the initial scoping for the AAP work.

(NG) Some development planned for the northern end of Cinderford.

(KP) What is the brickworks view of this?

(KP) Halcrow are investigating.

(KP) Important to be aware of the Annex to MPS1 on Brick Clay.

(KP) Also important to consider the incorporation of the WLP allocations and waste uses generally around Forest Vale – on the basis of employment generation and B2 use.

(KP) Lydney, any formal DPDs proposed?

(NG) Not as yet, although an AAP may be possible with funding from the RDA. We will try to do this as soon as we can. One of the main issues in Lydney from our perspective is the Bendals site on Harbour Road. We need to look at the waste sites on the approach to the harbour regeneration area.

(KP) Any other DPDs proposed?

(NG) No there are none in the LDS. We were going to do a DC Criteria DPD, but now these elements may be in the Core Strategy.

UPDATE ON GLOUCESTERSHIRE'S MWDF:

(KP) We are just about to submit our revised LDS. January 2008 will start the Preferred Options consultation for both the Minerals and the Waste Core Strategies. Detailed DPDs will follow, such as DC Policies DPD and site allocations, but likely content will depend on outcomes in the MCS & WCS.

(DI) The SA reports were produced at Issues & Options and we are currently working to update the baseline and keep it up to date. The AA Baseline Report has been completed, as has the assessment of the Issues & Options with the help of the County Ecologist. We can assist any of the Districts in terms of the AA and we will send the FoD the link to the AA Report which will be on our website. There is scope

for further joint working in this area. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – this has yet to be undertaken although some work was done as part of the early JSA work feeding into the RSS.

SPATIAL APPROACH – FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS:

(KP) We have sent representations to the RPB on SA / AA probity issues in relation to RSS minerals and waste policies, and have had discussions with Somerset and South Gloucestershire on collaborative working. These discussions are primarily about apportionment issues. In relation to the FoD the Capita Symonds Report picked up on the linkages between the FoD resource and that in South Gloucestershire. By about 2015 it is likely that we will have a problem with longer term supply from the FoD resource area.

PREFERRED AREAS:

- Stowehill / Clearwell – recent permission which has added to the landbank. Long term supply by lateral extension unlikely – possibility of increase in depth.
- Drybrook – Quite a small area, potentially only another 10 years working. By 2011 – 2013 current resource may be worked.
- Stowfield – Quite a lot of reserves and maybe potential to go deeper.
However overall it is likely that reserves will be running out in 15-20 years time.

COAL:

We are hoping to save about 75% of minerals and waste policies, including the coal policies in the MLP. Although they are not used very often and there is not a great deal of activity in this area we feel it prudent to retain these policies, especially as there is no change to the national guidance in MPG3.

INTEGRATION OF WASTE USES WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT:

(KP) In terms of provision for waste, we are following a new way of working – trying to meet the capacity gap i.e. the gap between facilities are on the ground and the sub-regional requirements as set out in the RSS. In Gloucestershire 80-90,000 tonnes IVC are needed. 2 recent permissions have potentially gone some way to meeting this, one being Rose Hill Farm Dymock in the FoD. The FoD has capacity for its compostable garden and kitchen waste, but there may be a need for more. Need for facilities to handle residual waste in Gloucestershire – 200,000 tpa but it is perhaps unlikely that this full amount will be in the FoD – more likely to be in the central Severn Vale. There is a capacity gap of c.230,000 tpa composting and recycling and 140,000 tpa transfer / recovery across the County. These are matters that may be looked at the RSS EIP. There is certainly a requirement for facilities and local sites in the Districts will be required.

FRAMEWORK FOR SITES:

(KP) The framework for sites has not been decided on yet, so it is difficult to inform you on the requirements. However it is likely that the new planning documents will have less sites but with more certainty.

(NG) The existing WLP sites e.g. in Lydney. There is a problem in interpreting the plan in terms of what waste uses etc are acceptable on these sites.

(KP) The parts of the plan to look at are the schedules of indicative uses (pgs 36 & 38).

(NG & KP) General discussion about the Bendall's site on Harbour Road in Lydney. Potential problem due to the fact that it is on the route / corridor to the regeneration site.

(KP) I think we are meeting you again soon with the GCC DC case officer dealing with the Bendall's site – so we can have further discussions.

(KP) We need to keep track on the Lydney Area Action Plan over coming months.

(NG) Yes Lydney & Cinderford are the main growth / change areas.

(KP) What about Coleford. Any scope for waste management – e.g. at the Saw Mills

(NG) Potentially.

(KP) What about Rank Xerox?

(NG) No scope.

(KP) Increasingly the case that there is a lack of distinction between certain waste operations and B2 use.

FEEDBACK ON WASTE MINIMISATION SPD EVENT AT GLOUCESTER CITY ON 27TH FEBRUARY (AM):

(NG) Feedback from the team members who attended was positive. A useful event.

AOB:

(NG / KP / DI) No other business but GCC and FoD will keep each other informed on LDF & MWDF progress and there will be an opportunity to discuss matters further at e.g. forthcoming meeting on the Bendall's site in Lydney.

Appendix 4. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Gloucester City Council / 9th October 2006

Attendees:

Gloucester City Council:

Mick Thorpe
Chris Hargraves
Meyrick Brentnall

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips
Dave Oakhill
Nick Croft

INTRODUCTIONS:

Points of contact:

MB is officer responsible for providing comments to County on minerals and waste policy issues.

NC is leading on WCS preparation.

CH is leading on LDF preparation.

UPDATE ON CURRENT POSITION WITH LDF DOCUMENTS:

Gloucester City DPDs – preparing four documents: core strategy (CS); DC DPD; central area action plan; rest of city area allocations. All documents have reached the preferred options stage with the Core Strategy and DC policies being approximately 5 months ahead of site specific DPDs. It is intended to submit the CS and DC DPDs in January 2007 with the other two following in June/July 2007. But GOSW advice may mean that Reg 26 needs to be repeated for the CS as the submission doc may look significantly different to the PO version (CH seeking advice on covering legal aspects of test of soundness i.e. is it just factual or presentational changes or is there something more fundamental). More was required on implementation/delivery mechanisms, partners (i.e. who's involved in delivery) and practical links with other strategies e.g. waste infrastructure. GOSW noted that PINs would need an evidence base to be demonstrated and cited Wycombe and Chelmsford CSs as being good examples. The LDS has been revised but not formally signed off yet. With benefit of hindsight it may have been better to prepare CS ahead of site specific DPDs but the urban regeneration of Gloucester is progressing quickly and it will be beneficial to get site plans in place to guide that regeneration.

Waste Planning Authority – waste core strategy (WCS) issues and options consultation just finished. Glos City to respond to the questionnaire (MB to provide response). WPA may prepare an additional mail out comprising some specific alternatives based on the information received during the issues and options consultation. The M&WDS has been revised and approved by GOSW. The MCS and WCS preferred options docs are scheduled for consultation in May 2007. A site specific (waste) DPD is to be commenced during 2007.

Mineral Planning Authority – minerals core strategy (MCS) issues and options currently being consulted upon. Key issue for Glos City will be the sustainable transport links (i.e. rail and water handling for aggregates, possibility of future sand and gravel being shipped into the County to supplement 'home-won' resources. Currently these minerals are taken by canal to a site along Bristol road from pits in Worcestershire).

Sustainability Appraisal.

SPATIAL APPROACH - FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS:

Integration of waste uses with new development:

Docks Regeneration: Glos City view that waste uses are likely to be incompatible with docks regeneration therefore limited potential for integrating such uses as part of current scheme. Some waste uses will have impacts similar to B2 uses (e.g. some recycling activities) and could be integrated along canal corridor, especially the southern end of the bypass past Hempsted bridge and down Bristol Road (old gas works site and land adjacent to RMC plant – current WLP allocations). These specific sites

could usefully be flagged up in GCLDF docs to demonstrate linkages and assisting in delivery of waste infrastructure. Land north of Hempsted bridge to Monk Meadow is being progressed for mixed use (housing and employment) and may be able to accommodate the B2 (don't you mean B1?) compatible waste operations.

Railway Triangle: Visually a key site in City. Used to be peripheral but following growth of City is now a central site. Issues with vehicular access if a link off Metz Way isn't available. GUHRC proposals for stadium potentially conflict with existing waste operations and WLP site allocation – safeguarding Policy 7 (WLP). RSS and PPS10 requires WPA and MPA to safeguard sustainable transport links (i.e. potential for rail linkage for minerals and waste uses). Local Transport Plan aims to pursue sustainable transport of freight and this site is linked to that objective. Southern part of triangle required by network rail for operational purposes. Northern part options for redevelopment need to be considered in light of potential for rail based use to come forward (British Rail Board land sale criteria). Need to consider likelihood of using rail linked waste development as part of site specific DPD. If County as Waste Disposal Authority do not intend to use rail linked facilities then this lessens the likelihood of it coming forward through market provision. Existing waste sites in County comprise part of current waste management provision – relocation issue if other uses are to supersede existing ones. GC site allocations DPD will look at trying to resolve some of the competing interests on this site. WPA need to plan for 'capacity gap' identified in emerging RSS, but recent GOSW response to SW RSS may require revision of regional waste data with knock on effects to WPAs.

Bristol Road (Gas Site): Land contamination issue (English Partnerships yet to agree to contributing to clearing up land contamination issues as a mechanism for assisting uses to relocate and therefore free up other sites for redevelopment). Glos City are seeking uses that generate significant traffic, or are potentially bad neighbour developments, to locate towards the southern end of Bristol Road. A working group is being set up to deal with GHURC issues and KP is likely to represent WPA on that group.

Likely need for new waste management facilities surrounding the City (e.g. Waterwells, Brockworth, Longford). The RSS provides the lead in terms of urban extensions and there is potential for integrating combined heat and power uses, which is an issue that the LDF could identify as an issue to progress thereby raising as an issue for future developers to consider as part of their proposals – there is not necessarily a need for additional MSW support facilities (e.g. civic amenity sites, or waste transfer stations) and this is a matter that will be determined as part of preparation of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS), of which Glos City is a partner. There is however likely to be need for capacity for residual waste treatment to avoid significant fines for landfilling biodegradable waste. Again, this is a matter that the JMWMS is likely to advise on the type and number of facilities required. Opportunities include proposals to north of Glos for 2000+ houses by Hitchens (Tewkesbury application).

Former RAF sites south of the City are largely being redeveloped. Additionally there is a potential LDF site allocation off Naas Lane adjacent to the railway for employment, and potentially a new site for the showmen's guild. But there are problems of rail linkage due to ground levels. Glos City identified Javelin Park as a site that would have good potential for waste management, particularly as it is a site identified in the WLP. KP explained that this site is subject to a call-in by SoS due to employment (B8) application. Sharpness site allocation still in the WLP, which was linked to Glos City via the canal with a transfer station allocation at Netheridge. There is a current application for an in-vessel composting (IVC) facility at a site where previous 'waste use' occurred (Plasmega).

Green Belt proposals to the south of the City around Robinswood Hill, Wineycroft Farm and Tuffley (reflecting the SLA designation). The inner boundary of the proposed greenbelt, in line with the draft RSS follows the built up area of the City taking into account existing commitments. The southern, outer boundary of the GB would need to be fixed by Stroud in their LDF. There is a potential knock-on effect as waste uses get removed from central Glos due to regeneration, and are then pushed to edge of town sites, but if GB boundary closely follows the built area then by default this pushes necessary waste infrastructure further into rural areas. Glos City would rather see sites developed for waste uses in the urban areas as opposed to in rural areas, but subject to amenity issues and tight impact conditions.

Use of employment sites for waste management uses – possibility for integrating B2 and waste management on same sites – both are employment uses and can have similar impacts.

Parkway station is being considered as a passenger terminus and not as one that is freight based. Bus link with park and ride to be provided to City. Site would be in Tewkesbury area to the north of the bypass (Elmbridge).

Preparation of Proposals Map (identification of minerals and waste allocations). Glos City may re-consult on electronic proposals map with minerals and waste adopted local plan allocations shown alongside the Core Strategy. Provide link to Policy 7 (WLP safeguarding policy).

WASTE MINIMISATION SPD:

Recently adopted by County Council – District adoption not necessary though would be useful to bring to members attention. The requirements are part of RSS and the SPD is something that all DC officers across the country will have to implement not just those in Gloucestershire. We are ahead of the game in this respect.

Copies for all DC officers and leaflets for application packs – 20 copies of main document and a few hundred leaflets to be sent to Glos City as soon as available.

DATE FOR NEXT MEETING:

A meeting will be arranged for January/February 2007, to be confirmed in the New Year. In the mean time officers will continue dialogue by e-mail particularly in respect of development of options, alternatives and the preferred options documents.

Appendix 5. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Stroud District Council / 20th March 2007

Attendees:

Stroud District Council:

Peter Gilbert (PG)
Mark Newcombe (MN)

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips (KP)
Nick Croft (NC)

WHO DOES WHAT AT STROUD:

Pete Gilbert	Planning Strategy Manager
Conrad Moore	Principal Planning Officer
Mark Newcombe	Senior Planning Officer (Canals, SA, SCI)
Natalie Foster	Senior Planning Officer (Canals, Regeneration)
Georgina Wood	Planning Officer (Monitoring, land availability, support)
Clare Snow	P-T business support assistant

WHO DOES WHAT AT GLOUCESTERSHIRE:

Kevin Phillips	Minerals and Waste Team Leader
Nick Croft	WCS, SCI
Robin Drake	MCS (Minerals Core Strategy), AMR
David Ingleby	SA and AA, AMR

KP: outlined reason for meeting - Waste Core Strategy (WCS) issues & options papers (issued mid 2006) – Meeting with GOSW – need more partnership working with Districts.

PG: Stroud using consultants for SA.

KP: GCC kept SA in-house but use Riki Therivel to peer review work.

MINERALS & WASTE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME:

KP: Preferred options in January 2008 for WCS and MCS DC policies DPD – combine M&W in one 2 sites documents – waste, minerals LDF seminar – recent aim to include broad locations in Core Strategies.

NC: Outlined Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) purpose and preparation dates – strategic waste strategy for county, also sets out residual aspect, 3 options being considered: Thermal, Autoclave, MBT. Intention to adopt by end of 2007.

KP: LATS fines – cannot landfill – huge cost. The detail from the JMWMS will dictate how prescriptive the WCS can be. Previous PFI contract was put aside by new political administration PFI proposal on MBT solution was not complete package and uncertainty about whether it was best solution for the County.

STROUD DPDS:

PG: LDS approved 2005 revised in 07 (cabinet last Thursday) but need to be further changed and agreed with GoSW.

PG: Core Strategy – September 2007 (I&O) – Submission January 2009. Canal AAP – ahead of CS (I&O next month). Site allocation document (I&O estimated at June/July 08) plus 3 SPDs.

PG: Had suggested a Development Control Policies DPD but GoSW have raised concerns about this.

PG: Need to look at previous employment allocations for mixed uses not just employment. Difficulty in preparing the Canal DPD ahead of the CS – need to agree approach with GoSW. Support use of Sharpness for inter-modal freight uses.

SITE ISSUES:

KP: RSS & RWMS targets – apportion capacity for 3 waste streams C & I (commercial and industrial), MSW (municipal solid waste), C & D (construction and demolition).

PG: How will you decide where facilities go? Use BPEO?

KP: Based on WLP sites but BPEO has been deleted as a policy direction in PPG10. Look at where main arisings are (Gloucester, Cheltenham).

PG: Green Belt issues?

KP: Could be, PPS10 makes specific reference to GBs as justifiable locations for waste – proximate to arisings Javelin Park (non GB) and Bishops Cleeve (in GB) already in WLP Gloucester City regeneration pushing waste uses out to periphery.

PG: Possibility for combined heat and power (CHP)? Kingsway too late but Hunts Grove a possibility.

KP: Possible C&I and C&D sites needed as well as MSW.

PG: Civic amenity sites needed?

NC: Appears to be sufficient provision around the County. JMWMS will inform the WCS about future requirements. At present there is a reasonable geographical spread of CASs around the County.

KP: Hazardous waste is a key issue in WCS Bishop's Cleeve landfill – time limited. RSS policy to retain capacity.

NC: C&D waste capacity appears ok compared with RSS requirements, but in reality there seems to be a shortfall

KP: Javelin Park call-in decision still awaited could be a test case. Morton Valence (Smiths) recent investment and expansion of operations seeking to divert from landfill – principle supported.

KP: Sharpness Docks - gone quiet as a strategic facility but former Plasmega site – Bio-organix IVC facility approved to take biodegradable kitchen waste.

PG: Much promise at the docks for sustainable transport usage.

INTEGRATION OF WASTE USES WITH NEW DEVELOPMENT:

PG: Stroud environmental strategy on SDC website drive to recycle, energy efficiency etc. Commitment to set demanding recycling and renewable energy (RE) targets at Hunts Grove similar to or better than Merton (London Authority) regarding RE.

KP: Javelin Park – GCC resolved to purchase site for in-vessel composting (IVC) and residual treatment which could link to energy for new development at Hunts Grove.

PG: Stroud recently granted planning permission for new road into RAF site North of J12 (S.05/2140/FUL permitted on 6 Jan 2006).

KP: A number of sites around J12 were considered at WLP preparation stage and then again during PFI.

PG: New Green Belt boundary proposals South of Gloucester City. Stroud objected to proposal in RSS - not properly justified – lack of evidence, seemed predicated on a 'swap' for other releases, not linked to other GB parcels.

KP: Waste on employment sites? B2 uses.

PG: Employment land study over recent 10-20 years - looking at widening definition of employment. Not adverse to waste use on site allocated for employment.

NC: Thinking of using B2 as a criteria for waste provision.
PG: Not adverse to that approach – it's an issue of impact.

KP: Proposals map required at PO stage - need to show M&W sites (from MLP & WLP).

FLOOD RISK:

PG: Capita Symonds carried out study of Frome Severn Tidal Tributaries Catchment Flood Management) (Draft January 2007 - Environment Agency).

NC: To type up and distribute notes as evidence for LDF.

Appendix 6. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council / 8th November 2006

Attendees:

Tewkesbury Borough Council:

Toby Clempson (TC)
Lisa Belfield (LP)

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips (KP)
Nick Croft (NC)

UPDATE ON CURRENT POSITION WITH LDF DOCUMENTS:

Tewkesbury BC explained their current position in terms of DPD preparation. Their LDS is currently being reviewed and will be submitted to GOSW shortly. Work is progressing on gathering evidence for Core Strategy preparation. Preferred Options are expected in March 2008 with submission timetabled for a year later. There is ongoing work on housing land and employment land with the recently adopted Tewkesbury Local Plan providing the site allocations in the interim prior to preparation/adooption of a site specific DPD. There are three Area Action Plans proposed. The Stoke Orchard Regeneration AAP is favoured by the community but GOSW would like it reined back until adoption of the Core Strategy. The North Gloucester AAP and North West Cheltenham AAP are linked to growth areas in the RSS but as yet there aren't the resources to pursue them. Tewkesbury are working in partnership with Cheltenham on the best way of progressing the latter.

The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme has been reviewed and approved by GOSW. Preferred options for both MCS and WCS are set for May 2007.

Waste Planning Authority – consultation on the WCS Issues and Options was undertaken during summer 2006. Although the closing date was Sept TBC were encouraged to provide a response on those issues that they considered most pertinent to their area, for which a questionnaire was provided. GOSW response to WCS highlighted the importance of partnership working between two tier authorities (a similar response was sent by GOSW to Gloucester City on their DPDs). Tewkesbury Borough has some of the County's key waste management facilities in its administrative area and it was acknowledged that it is important to work together to address issues.

Mineral Planning Authority – MCS Issues and Options consultation is currently ongoing, due to end on 17th Nov 2006, again TBC were invited to respond on those issues that they considered pertinent to their area.

SPATIAL APPROACH - FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS:

The RSS identifies there is a need for around 10k houses on top of earlier requirements. This is likely to be found through significant urban extensions to Cheltenham and Gloucester, but within the Tewkesbury and Stroud administrative areas. As a consequence there may be a need for new waste management facilities around the urban areas to service these developments. The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) being prepared in partnership between the County and the 6 Districts will set out the requirements to meet any identified need for municipal wastes. Commercial waste provision is set out in the emerging RSS and the waste industry will be key in putting forward proposals for facilities required to manage that waste.

The use of employment sites for waste management is a matter that in the past GCC and TBC have not always agreed upon. The new spatial planning system offers a good opportunity to move forward in a common direction on this issue, particularly where new sites are identified as opposed to historic allocations. There was agreement that employment sites for B2 uses could be appropriate for certain waste management uses, but TBC highlighted that government guidance requires LPAs to clearly state what types of employment are envisaged on a given site. There was also agreement that the two authorities need to work closely on integrating waste uses with new development and 'closing the loop' between the collection/bulking-up and processing of recyclates (the role of the WPA) and the manufacturing processes required to transform the materials into saleable goods (the remit of TBC). The two operations could, and possibly should, be co-located to maximise synergies between uses.

There was a discussion about the options for making site provision. One such option is to identify a significant number of sites, as is the case currently in the adopted WLP. This approach has not necessarily worked out as envisaged due to a large number of proposals coming forward outside of plan allocations. Another option, which potentially overcomes this, would be to identify larger sites in a site specific DPD with smaller sites coming forward on a criteria based approach. In such circumstances it was agreed that provision for waste uses could appropriately be made for smaller operations using locational criteria such as brownfield/Previously used land, industrial/employment land (as distinct from office style employment) and farm diversification.

The Green Belt boundary around Cheltenham/Gloucester is fairly tightly drawn around the urban areas and there are major waste management facilities in this locality (Wingmoor Farm) in adjoining LPA areas. Guidance in PPS10 indicates waste facilities could be a consideration in redrawing the boundaries to exclude such operations. The locational requirement of waste facilities, i.e. proximity to arisings, is an important factor that needs to be taken into account otherwise facilities will need to be located in rural areas effectively 'jumping' the Green Belt.

Although minerals are not currently a major issue in Tewkesbury the mineral resource is present in the Severn Vale and may become more of an issue in the future as sand and gravel in the Cotswold Water Park is either worked out or restricted through MOD birdstrike considerations. S&G is currently barged through the Borough from Worcester to a site in Gloucester for processing.

Sustainable transport opportunities. *Water* = Currently the only wharf in the Borough is at the old flour mill, however this is likely to be redeveloped for a mixed use scheme. It was agreed that if additional wharfage facilities were required for either minerals or waste transport in the future these would not necessarily need to be located at locations where there was a past history of such activity. *Rail* = There is a rail head at Ashchurch, for which there is currently interest in its commercial viability. For mineral transport by rail there tends to be a requirement to have processing facilities close to the rail head. Land to the north is vacant and could be expanded into if required.

There is no clear Government guidance on how to plan for hazardous waste management. In attempting to fill this gap the RSS requires a policy approach to be set out for managing hazardous waste. Although site provision does not have to be identified existing sites should be safeguarded provided they are "environmentally acceptable". There was a discussion about what this means in practice and TBC were invited to give us their thoughts on what this means in the context of stakeholders in the Tewkesbury area. This is particularly important as Grundon's planning permission runs out in 2009 and GCC would be the determining authority if such an application were made. The issue was raised that there are currently significant voidspace remaining at the site and to leave the site in its current state is not desirable. Additionally, GCC are attending the SE RSS EiP to set out their objections about the SE strategy for disposing of hazardous waste in Gloucestershire.

Cumulative impact is a matter that PPS10 requires the WPA to consider when locating waste management facilities in areas that have a history of such uses. The companion guide to PPS10 states that asking the local community what they think is a good way to flesh out what cumulative impact entails. Consequently the WCS includes an issue on this matter and TBC were asked to consider in their response to the WCS how cumulative impact could be measured in respect of Tewkesbury's communities.

WASTE MINIMISATION SPD:

Recently adopted by County Council, copies have been provided for all DC officers and leaflets for application packs given to planning reception areas. TBC did not have the documentation available for members of the public in their planning reception area and this was a matter that would be investigated.

There is an opportunity for WPA officers to do a brief presentation to Members or case officers on the implications of waste minimisation if that is considered useful/appropriate.

DATE FOR NEXT MEETING:

Some time in the New Year 2007 to discuss preferred options on the WCS and MCS.

Appendix 7. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and Wiltshire County Council / 14th March 2007

Attendees:

Wiltshire County Council:

Geoff Winslow (GW)
Keith Lane (KL)
Jonathan Manning (JM)
Mark Henderson (MH)

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips (KP)
Nick Croft (NC)
Robin Drake (RD)
David Ingleby (DI)

INTRODUCTIONS:

Officers introduced themselves and their respective roles.

(KP) Introduced the purpose of the meeting in terms of the requirements of GOSW for more partnership working and evidence gathering.

APOLOGIES:

None (a representative from Swindon Borough Council could not be sent due to prior commitments).

UPDATE ON CURRENT POSITION WITH DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS:

Development Scheme timetables

(KP) Went through changes to GCC Development Scheme - January 2008 is timetabled for the Core Strategies Preferred Options consultation.

(KP) In the meantime we are doing a considerable amount of evidence gathering and producing a suite of Evidence Reports as background to the Core Strategies. We are also producing 'Test of Soundness' papers or Evidence Reports dealing specifically with these requirements. The Core Strategies themselves will hopefully only be about 25 to 30 pages long, but with a considerable volume of background evidence. Broad strategic locations (but not sites) will be included in Core Strategies.

(KP) 2009 is the date for commencement for all other DPDs.

(GW) Wiltshire - We have submitted our Revised Development Scheme. We are re- consulting on the Core Strategies and Development Control DPDs (effectively doing a second round of Preferred Options). We are getting consultants to provide an objective overview of the 'soundness' of Core Strategies – they will in effect produce 'soundness' reports (utilising the PAS Framework Template). We are also following the PAS document on 'how to produce a Core Strategy'. Out to consultation in April / May 2007. The main areas we fell down on initially were the Vision, not being locally distinctive enough and lacking any real sense of where new minerals and waste development would be located (in the broadest sense).

Saved Policies

(GW) We have sent off our schedule of Structure Plan policies to the RPB for consideration. In essence we have requested that practically all the minerals and waste policies of the Structure Plan be deleted. Other sections of the Structure Plan are proposed for saving.

(KP) Our initial view at GCC was to save all our SP policies, this view has changed but we still want the Transport policies in the SP to be saved – but as it is this will only be for 9 months.

(KP) [Further outlined GCC position on saved policies] We came to the view that it was prudent to let the SoS make the decision as to which policies were saved and which were not.

(GW) We have requested that of Wiltshire's minerals policies 35 of 53 be saved and we have consulted our District colleagues (and the New Forest National Park Authority) on this.

(KP) We are certainly keen that our site allocations and related policies are saved, this is a priority. In terms of waste sites we may take the approach of keeping strategic sites but opting for a criteria based approach in place of local sites?

(DI) Have you considered the need for Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)?

(KL) We've looked into it and had some advice from the Environment Agency stating that a SFRA should be carried out early on in the plan making process as part of the Sustainability Appraisal and should help inform the 'options.' From their advice it's difficult to know what form a SFRA should take.

[General discussion followed on SFRA and potential costs etc and the implications for sand and gravel working. There was agreement that there may be potential for joint working / joint funding of a SFRA for the Water Park area?]

SPATIAL ISSUES FOR MINERALS – FUTURE AGGREGATE STRATEGY:

Regional perspective

(KP) As we know, no minerals session at the EiP. DI to attend opening session on SSA and AA.

Crushed Rock

(KP) From GCC perspective, in terms of crushed rock we have problems with the collaborative working element of Policy RE10.

Sand & Gravel

(GW) Clearly in the medium to long term we have problems in terms of supply and meeting the apportionment. Wilts (on its own) has about 10 years supply left although this is a theoretical quantum. We need to call for a reapportionment along the lines of the South East beyond 10 years.

(KP) The problem stems from the constant rollover of the status quo in terms of apportionment and the failure to appreciate issues such as flooding for the Severn resource. Sand is the key issue; gravel can be produced via crushed rock.

Gloucestershire perspective Minerals Core Strategy

(RD) [These points already broadly discussed in the meeting]. Discrete consultation on issues and options have taken place and we are now working towards the Preferred Options consultation which should start early in 2008. Currently we are involved in evidence gathering and a series of partnership working meetings. A Response Report to Issues & Options, including responses to cross boundary issues has been published on the GCC Minerals Core Strategy webpage.

Other Minerals DPDs

(RD) Mineral Site Allocations DPD and DC Policies DPD are planned to commence early in 2009.

Wiltshire Perspective Minerals Core Strategy

(GW) [These points already broadly discussed earlier in the meeting].

We are effectively doing a second round of Preferred Options and getting consultants to objectively review previous work from the perspective of 'soundness'. Out to consultation in April / May.

Other Minerals DPD work

(GW) Work on our 'Aggregate Minerals Site Allocations DPD' will now commence in the spring of 2007 investigating key issues and potential site options.

Appendix 8. Minutes of Partnership Working Meeting - Gloucestershire County Council and South Gloucestershire / North Somerset / 14th March 2007

Attendees:

South Gloucestershire / North Somerset

Liz Allison (LA)

Allan Davis (AD)

Gloucestershire County Council:

Kevin Phillips (KP)

Robin Drake (RD)

INTRODUCTION:

(KP) - Introduced the purpose of the meeting. Following GOSW meeting in November 06, GCC are been encouraged to work more closely with its key stakeholders such as districts and neighbouring authorities during the preparation of Minerals and Waste Core Strategies. Meetings have already taken place with most of the Districts in Gloucestershire and a number of other key stakeholders in the County. Furthermore, the submission draft RSS explicitly advises the authorities of Gloucestershire, South Gloucestershire, North Somerset and Somerset to explore collaborative working in seeking to resolve a potential shortfall in crushed rock provision from Forest of Dean resource area in Gloucestershire. This meeting will hopefully scope the potential for collaborative working between the "West-of-England" authorities of North Somerset and South Gloucestershire.

UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PROGRESS:

(KP) – GCC pressing ahead with Minerals & Waste Core Strategies (*Waste Issues & Options available since March 2006 / Minerals Issues & Options available since Sept 2006*) A 3rd revision Development Scheme is in production for submission to GOSW by April 2007. The indicative timetable seeks to move the "Preferred Options" for both Core Strategies from May 2007 to January 2008. During this extended period GCC plan to produce a number of detailed evidence reports. A Development Control DPD will be produced following on from the Core Strategies. However, Site Allocations DPDs are less clear. The nature and content of these DPDs will be subject to the emerging policy of the Core Strategies. Whilst they will be identified in Development Scheme they will include a caveat as to their future production timescales.

(LA) – Strategic minerals policy in South Gloucestershire will look to be covered in the emerging Core Strategy. This is planned for "Issues & Options" consultation between January and March 2008. A revised Development Scheme is currently with GOSW for consideration. A Generic Site Allocations DPD is planned for South Glos. However, this DPD has not been given a detailed timetable within the Development Scheme at this stage. The existing Adopted Minerals Local Plan (May 2002) will seek to provide the local minerals policy for foreseeable future.

(AD) – Similar to South Gloucestershire in that minerals and waste topics will be covered in the North Somerset Core Strategy. A revised Development Scheme has also been submitted to GOSW. North Somerset did originally plan to prepare a Local Waste DPD. However, this has been removed from the timetable until the "West-of-England" Strategic Waste DPD has been completed. The "Issues & Options" Core Strategy consultation will take place later in the year. However, a series of topic / evidence papers to support "Issues & Options" are due to be published over the coming months.

(KP) – Following contact by GCC, Somerset CC has advised that they are not looking to start their Minerals Core Strategy until 2008, with adoption in 2011. As a result they are not keen in contributing to the discussions at present.

PROGRESS ON "SAVED" POLICIES:

(KP) – Adopted MLP and WLP in 2003 and 2004 respectively. Therefore, GCC are required to make arrangements for "saving" policies beyond the 3-year transitional period from the commencement of the P&CP Act 2004. Following advice from GOSW, GCC has submitted an informal draft of Saved Policies to them for early consideration. As of yet have not received any feedback, but will be formally submitting a set of Saved Policies to GOSW by April 2007. GCC are proposing to save all Site Allocations and

those important local policies for DC purposes. Concern is raised as to the potential policy vacuum should adopted MLP or WLP policies be lost without replacement.

(LA) – A draft schedule of SGC Minerals and Waste Saved Policies was submitted to GOSW in Summer 2006. Feedback has been received on the draft. Waste policies are the key priority for saving beyond the three years. However, mineral policies that will probably go include those for DC purposes, which are repeated in MPS1 and MP2. Other policies that may also go include: AONBs, agricultural land, flood risk and restoration / aftercare. Any site related policies are to be kept including all those for Minerals and Waste. GOSW advised that the schedule does not necessarily need to go through members at this stage and that the April deadline for submitting saved policies will essential “get the ball rolling” for negotiations. It is proposed that South Gloucestershire saved policies will be put before Full Council in due course.

(AD) – North Somerset only recently starting looking at the Saved Policies issue. Key focus has been on progressing to adoption of the Local Plan. Officers are hurriedly looking at saved policies as an insurance, in case the North Somerset Local Plan is not adopted by the end of the transitional arrangements, in September 2007.

REGIONAL AGGREGATES – ISSUES ARISING FROM THE SUBMISSION RSS AND THE APPORTIONMENT OF CURRENT NATIONAL & REGIONAL GUIDELINES (2001-2016):

(KP) – introduced the background to the local apportionment for Gloucestershire (*i.e. 39.09 mt of crushed rock / 18.18 mt of sand & gravel*), the background behind the MLP and the preferred areas for crushed rock identified within it. KP also discussed the development of the RSS following on from the SWRAWP work on the current regional guidelines. KP highlighted the Capita Symonds Report commissioned by the SW Regional Assembly and the recommendation for further regional work to be done by SWRA. However, regional policy detailed in the submission draft RSS does not take the Capita Symonds Report forward, and instead seeks only to pick out several of the potential options and deliver them as regional policy. GCC have made strong representation to earlier consultation on the RSS concerning this approach. It has also made representation to the EiP panel for the RSS. However, this latter representation has been in the context of Strategic Sustainability Appraisal (SSA) Appropriate Assessment (AA) as there is no examination time given over to the regional mineral policies in their own right. GCC is very concerned as to absence of a minerals session at the EiP and has made this position known to SWRA and SWRAWP.

Nevertheless, mineral policy in the submission draft RSS is in place and GCC must carefully consider how it is going to try and deliver it at the local level. A key driver for this is meeting the “*Tests of Soundness*” for the Minerals Core Strategy and clearly demonstrating conformity with the RSS or why it has chosen to taken an alternative approach. In the context of the shortfall in provision of crushed rock from the Forest of Dean and collaborative working between the key SW mineral authorities, are fundamental policy areas that need resolving.

(KP) – highlighted that the headline issue is the lack of leadership from regional assembly and its reluctance to provide guidance or steer collaborative working to achieve a deliverable solution. There are also timeframes issues concerning each of the key SW mineral authorities (*as already discussed above*). Furthermore, is there the political will for joint working? And, how can strategic / environmental appraisal work be carried out at a sub-regional level without SWRA? For GCC, there is no way it can steer all of this work, as it not best placed to determine the relative merits or de-merits, or environmental capacity for areas beyond its own administrative remit.

(LA & AD) – acknowledged the shortfall problem for GCC as identified by Capita Symonds, SWRA and the RSS. They also recognise the problems of delivering collaborative working.

(LA) – highlighted that representations were made by South Gloucestershire regarding the proposed shortfall issue and how the region would seeking to deliver collaborative working to both the SWRAWP and the RSS.

(LA) – Nevertheless, over the short-term period to 2016 the re-apportionment of the shortfall in crushed rock provision from the Forest of Dean resource area does not necessarily pose a major problem. It theoretically could be picked up through the existing landbank for South Glos.

(LA & AD) – Potentially any re-apportionment could cause a domino effect for North Somerset having to pick up demand from South Gloucestershire, which would otherwise supply the Bristol urban area. Again in this context North Somerset currently has a sufficient landbank to potentially meet this small increase.

(RD & KP) – Accepting this may be the case; this still doesn't really resolve the longer-term problem of making provision beyond 2016. Basically, viable crushed rock aggregate in Gloucestershire will be completely exhausted by the mid-2020s unless significant new provision is identified. There is nothing in our evidence to suggest that new provision will be found. Therefore a more strategic solution is going to be required to meet longer-term aggregate demand. This solution could represent a continuation of work started by Capita Symonds, which should have been completed by the SWRA for the RSS.

(AD) – Clarified Gloucestershire's position and agreed that a strategic view of local resources, particular those of the West-of-England, Gloucestershire and possibly East Wales will need to be taken. This must be pursued through SWRA at the earliest opportunity. The key concern here is that Gloucestershire is first authority to reach a shortfall position. However, as time goes by this could become a bigger problem affecting elsewhere in strategic / sub-regional area. The introduction of East Wales is also crucial to the study, as this area does not operate in isolation. It has a clear supply / resource relationship.

(KP) – Supported a proposed regional project to look at crushed rock aggregate resources over the strategic / sub-regional area. This proposal will be referred to in the next representation planned for the SWRAWP and SWRA. Gloucestershire will make sure that North Somerset and South Gloucestershire are kept fully informed and involved in any developments on this front.

(AD) – North Somerset would be happy to support this approach.

(LA) – South Gloucestershire also happy to support this general approach. However raise concern that a strategic / sub-regional view should not just look at this area. But should be much wider across the whole region. The project could a wholesale region review for all crushed rock authorities.

MONITORING WORK:

(LA) – Highlighted that some of the reserve figures given for South Gloucestershire in SWRAWP Reports is not a true reflection of remaining reserves as they include unworkable reserves, which in reality will not come forward (e.g. *the wider extent of the Cromhall permission is not likely to come forward as some of it sits under constraints such as the Leyhill Prison complex*). If better reserve information is required, South Gloucestershire can provide these on request. A concern was raised that the SWRAWP report data had been used in the Capita Symonds study.

In terms of monitoring, South Gloucestershire does not undertake much work and only provides a small amount of information for the Unitary Annual Monitoring Report

(AD) – North Somerset operates a similar approach to South Gloucestershire.

(RD & KP) – GCC complete a full AMR for Minerals and Waste including detailed information on landbanks, supplies and reserves. A little surprised at the limited inputs for South Gloucestershire and North Somerset bearing in mind aggregate minerals represent “core indicators” for performance monitoring by Government.

(LA & AD) – Confirmed the “60:40” split for South Gloucestershire and North Somerset in terms of provision requirements for the Former Avon area. It is envisaged that this situation will not change in the foreseeable future and will be carried forward for the current guidelines to 2016.

CLAY ISSUES:

(LA) – Cattybrook (operated by Ibstock) is the key brickworks in South Gloucestershire. It is major producer of heritage bricks. Clay sources are from on-site working, imports locally from Shortwood, and other clay extraction sites. Can confirm that Shortwood is being worked out for landfill and stockpiling capacity. The preferred area is currently being used for stockpiling, which has permission for 10 – 15 years. At present there is no evidence of a need for clay to support South Gloucestershire's brickworks.

COAL ISSUES:

(LA) – Currently no coal working in the area or evidence that coal working will commence in the future.

(KP) – Coal working very small scale in the Forest of Dean through local free-miners and possible reworking of old colliery spoils. At present economically unviable and coal reworking is constrained by archaeological, heritage and environmental issues associated with old spoil tips. This also negates secondary aggregate potential.

WASTE ISSUES:

(AD) – Introduced a planned workshop for 18/04/2007. This will look at a site methodology project for the strategic “*West-of-England*” Waste DPD. The project is being carried out by ERM Consultants. Key stakeholders such as neighbouring authorities are invited to attend.



Minerals & Waste Planning Policy
Environment Directorate
Gloucestershire County Council
Shire Hall
Westgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 2TH

www.goucestershire.gov.uk