

CEB Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Issues and Options Consultation 2017

ClewerMAP response 21/07/17

Personal details

- First name **Susan**  
Surname **Shearer**  
Your address \_\_\_\_\_  
Your email address \_\_\_\_\_  
Your organisation **Clewer Manor Area Profile**  
**(ClewerMAP)**
- Respondent capacity  
Other (please specify) **Co-ordinator, ClewerMAP**
- Are you happy for us to contact you following this survey, with updates on Central and Eastern Berkshire minerals and waste work? (Please tick as appropriate) **Yes**

Section 1 – Plan Direction

**Q1** **Yes** A CEB-wide Plan would of necessity require an overarching timescale in relation to unitary authority Plans, many of which are currently undergoing preparation. The JMWM Plan's remit, content and specific guidance directly underpin those LA plans and has a fundamental impact on their strategic sustainable development objectives during a time of anticipated exceptional growth across both Berkshire and neighbouring counties.

This period should give sufficient time for implementation and for monitoring to determine whether it is being applied with optimum effectiveness. We would expect the Plan to have scope within it to respond appropriately, for example, to any significant changes in the supply and/or transportation of aggregates – particularly the availability of sharp sand, which is facing mounting pressures nationally and worldwide – and, similarly, implications for the location of waste processing and disposal sites resulting from new development including at Heathrow Airport.

In light of these and other matters including co-ordinating sites required to meet aspirations of both the JMWP and local authority Development Plans, and to facilitate preparation of the post-2036 Plan, we would support the inclusion of a **scheduled formal review** of this Plan every 3-5 years.

**Q3** **No**

**Q4** Suggested amendments:

“Recognising the importance of the area as a source of minerals **and a through route and destination for minerals coming from outside the area**, Central and Eastern Berkshire....”

Q5 No

Q6 Suggested amendments, to respond to Paras 8.10 and 8.11

o Objective 9

*The Strategic Plan Objectives record the aspiration to safeguard facilities for the movement of minerals and waste by rail and encourage use of other non-road modes where these are more sustainable.*

*The Plan emphasises the importance of aggregates for Berkshire and neighbouring counties, however we feel the Plan is slightly ambiguous in recognizing the significant quantity of minerals being imported into Berkshire.*

*With regard to the movement of minerals, we are aware that transportation of aggregates is the fastest growing rail freight sector in the CEB area. Due to an absence of hardstone in the Southeast region, this involves the UK's heaviest ("Jumbo") trains travelling to London from the Mendips, Leicestershire and Derbyshire with pre-graded stones for redistribution from the Acton Depot. We note that **all rail terminals currently capable of handling aggregates for the Thames Valley** (ie. Acton, Paddington, Hayes, Southall and West Drayton) are **located on the north side of the mainline** between Paddington and Reading, Newbury and Westbury and running under the purpose-built "Flyover" at Reading Station. Although **Slough Trading Estate** is also located to the north of the mainline, we understand that siting a rail freight depot there would almost certainly be infeasible.*

*There is a Branch Line at **Southall** which runs to **Brentford Docks**, however in general, there currently appears to be limited capacity for water-borne transportation of aggregates. A location which could possibly be considered for an additional aggregates rail terminal in East Berkshire is the **Langley Electrification Depot** which is a large industrial site with reasonably good road access and has an existing permission for further development. Additionally, it is close to the **Slough arm of the Grand Union Canal**, which runs along its northern boundary.*

*With the advent of **Crossrail**, timetabling of any additional train services on the northern side, including freight, will be exceptionally difficult since from that point onwards these lines will be running at virtually full capacity. No scope exists to provide services on the southern side, a factor which would affect the Windsor area, for example.*

o Objective 11

*We support the principle of working towards a "**zero waste economy**" to reduce reliance on landfill sites but would nonetheless urge a cautious approach in this respect.*

*Although we are unfamiliar with the detail of other unitary authority Local Plans, we are very aware that **RBWM** has predicated the BLP on the basis of **delivering 100% housing provision to meet OAN**, and there are also major employment sites allocated for both Windsor and*

Maidenhead. As there will be substantial housing and business development planned in all Local Authorities within the CEB area, we feel it would be prudent to identify suitable sites situated appropriately situated to existing and prospective areas of development and which can accommodate increased quantities of landfill should a need for this be demonstrated. Any changes to the size and configuration of Heathrow Airport must be realistically factored into this equation, as indeed for future development needs to be identified for the period beyond 2036. The Plan would need to ensure there is no conflict between this Objective and the aspirations in **Objective 12**.

Q7 Yes

(NB: 8.9 should read, "...building blocks in the area's buoyant economy; they unite..."  
. 8.10 should read, "...wider Thames Valley region. The area's importance is highlighted...")

### Section 2 – Minerals

Q10 Yes

Q11 See response to Q6 – The Plan must address these issues.

Q12 Yes

Q13 Yes

Q14 No

Q15 Yes

Q17 Yes

Q18 Yes

Q20 Yes

Q22 Yes

Q25 Yes

Q26 Yes

Q28 Yes

Q29 Yes

Q33 No

Q49 Yes

Q51 Yes

Q56 No

**Q57** *The use of clay for lining waste pits means a demand for this has the potential to rise with increased development. Although the aspiration of the Plan is to reduce reliance on landfill sites, it would be **short sighted to exclude from long-term planning for the CEB area the possibility of new landfill sites and other mineral needs raised by potential new development.***

**Q58** *No*

**Q59** *See the principle in the answer to Q57*

**Q60** *Don't know*

**Q61** *No*

**Q62** *See the principle in the answer to Q57*

**Q66** *Don't know*

**Q67** *Yes*

**Section 2 – Waste Issues**

**Q81** *Yes*

**Q83** *Yes*

**Q84** *The phrasing of this question is unclear.*

**Q85** *D*

**Q86** *C*

**Q92** *Yes*

**Q96** *Yes*

**Q97** *Yes*

**Q98** *Yes*

**Q99** *Yes*

**Q100** *Yes*

**Q102** *Yes*

**Q104** *Yes*

**Q107** *Yes*

**Q110** *Don't know*

Q111 *Don't know*

Q113 *Yes*